

## Agentivity and the Animacy Hierarchy in Kashaya

Kira Hall

University of California, Berkeley

The clitic /yac/ in Kashaya, a Pomoan language of Northern California, has three general uses.<sup>1</sup> As an agent marker, it indicates agenthood on the subject of a sentence. As a nominalizer, it can derive nominals from adjectives, nouns, verbs, and verb expansions. As what might be called an honorific,<sup>2</sup> it can mark respect on pronouns or personal names which refer to inlaws, indicate that the referent of the kinship term or personal name to which it is attached is deceased, or give non-human nouns an anthropomorphized title. Although previous analyses of the Kashaya morphological system have viewed the different occurrences of the clitic as semantically distinct (Oswalt 1961), all three uses can be unified with reference to the *animacy hierarchy* (Comrie 1981). If the commonly proposed three-level linguistic parameter extending from human through animal to inanimate is expanded to include a fourth level that is beyond human, the three uses of the clitic /yac/ are easily unified. Such an analysis contributes not only to the explanation of case marking in Kashaya, but also to a more general understanding of languages which make distinctions based on animacy.

In his study of language universals and typology, Comrie defines animacy as a three-way hierarchy with the category 'human' as highest on the hierarchy, the category 'animal' as intermediate, and the category 'inanimate' as lowest:<sup>3</sup>

The Animacy Hierarchy
Human > Animal > Inanimate

Comrie (pp.52-53,178-80) distinguishes between animacy, which is an inherent property of noun phrases, and semantic case, which is a relationship between a noun phrase and its predicate, and argues that few languages feature an interaction between the two in the formal properties of language. The case-marking system in Kashaya, however, seems to be determined by an interaction of both lexical semantics (animacy) and clause-level semantics (transitivity). If the event defined at the clause level is prototypically transitive, for instance, the agent and patient markings on the verbal arguments will reflect that transitivity. Likewise, if the arguments themselves are perceived as 'more animate' or 'less animate' at the lexical level, their markings will reflect this as well.

What is particularly interesting within the Kashaya system of case marking is the employment of the agent marker /yac/ when neither clause-level semantics nor lexical semantics requires it. When the marker is affixed to the subject of an intransitive verb, for example, it serves to increase the subject's degree of animacy. If affixed to a human subject of an intransitive verb, it implies increased involvement on the part of the subject so that the subject performs the action consciously and deliberately. If attached to a non-human animate subject of an intransitive verb, it either anthropomorphizes the subject overtly so that a noun like 'bear' in a story will receive the interpretation 'Mr. Bear', or it indicates that the animal thought about the action before deciding to perform it.<sup>4</sup> If attached to an inanimate subject of an intransitive verb (although this affixation occurs more rarely), it anthropomorphizes the subject as a person bearing the name of that entity, e.g. a person bearing the name 'Miss Flower'. The addition of the clitic /yac/, then, not only increases the animacy of nouns belonging to the human level of the animacy hierarchy so that they play a more active role in the event expressed by the verb, but also raises nouns belonging to the animal and inanimate levels of the hierarchy to human status.

Comrie also points out that some languages categorize kinship terms, proper nouns, and pronouns as greater in animacy than other common nouns belonging to the human level. This appears to be the case in Kashaya. While the /yac/ agent marker is normally required on all animate common nouns which act as the subject of a transitive sentence, it is never employed as an agent marker on the subjects of transitive sentences which are kinship terms, pronouns, or proper nouns. When the /yac/ clitic is attached to such nouns, which Comrie refers to as 'inherently animate', it instead acts as a type of respect marker. If it is attached to a pronoun or to a personal name which refers to an inlaw, the /yac/ clitic acts as an honorific, while if it is attached to a kinship term or to a personal name which does not refer to an inlaw, it indicates that the referent being spoken about is no longer living. Such a distinction seems to indicate that a fourth level should be added to Comrie's three-way hierarchy, one that is, in a sense, 'superanimate'. Members of this category are perceived as even more animate than those in the human category. While the /yac/ clitic on a pronoun implies that the referent is older, wiser, and therefore even more 'animate' and worthy of respect than the average man or woman, the /yac/ clitic on a kinship term or personal name implies that the referent is deceased and therefore beyond animacy.

The Animacy Hierarchy in Kashaya						
Superanimate	>	Human	>	Animal	>	Inanimate

When the agent marker /yac/ is added to a human subject that is inherently high in animacy, then, it moves the subject to a level above human in which participants, whether alive or dead, are perceived as having increased worldly and spiritual understanding.

The three sections of this paper examine the agentive, nominalizing, and honorific instances of the /yac/ clitic in an effort to unify all three uses under a semantic analysis. The first section examines the general system of case marking in Kashaya, a system that is controlled by both clause-level and lexical semantics, with particular attention given to the use of the agent marker /yac/. The second section discusses the nominalizer /yac/ and its role in the construction of the Kashaya relative clause, a role that closely parallels the agentive use of /yac/ in the monoclausal Kashaya sentence. The third section analyzes the honorific uses of the clitic /yac/ with reference to a revised four-level animacy hierarchy.

### 1. Case-Marking in Kashaya and the Agent Marker -ya?

Kashaya has four distinguishable case categories: agent, patient, vocative, and comitative. The agent case, which is prototypically associated with the agentive subject of a transitive clause, is marked with the inflectional marker /-m/, while the patient case, which is prototypically associated with the patient object of a transitive clause, is marked with the inflectional marker /-l/. The agent marker has allomorphs [-m] and [-ø]. The patient marker is realized as [-l] after a vowel and [-el] after a consonant (there is also a suppletive allomorph [-to] used with personal names):<sup>5</sup>

#### Inflectional Markers in Kashaya:

Agent case nominals:      suffixed with /-m/    ([-m], [-ø])  
 Patient case nominals:   suffixed with /-l/    ([-l], [-el], [-to])

Oswalt points out that when the -m and the -l are attached to common nouns acting as agent or patient of the sentence, they are regularly preceded by both the assertive {'-} and the nominalizer {-e-}, and are thus realized phonetically as -ʔem and -ʔel.<sup>6</sup> For the purposes of this paper, then, I will refer to these markers more generally as the agent marker -ʔem and the patient marker -ʔel.

There is a second system of agent and patient marking in Kashaya, which is formed by affixation of these inflectional endings to the clitic /yac/. According to Oswalt (p.115), the morpheme /yac/ has the allomorphs [yac] before a word boundary and [yaco] before the suffixes

/-l/ (patient) and /-de/ (vocative). The allomorph *yac* combines with  $-\emptyset$  to form the agent marker *-ya?* (word-final *-c* is realized as a glottal stop), and the allomorph *yaco* combines with *-l* to form the patient marker *-yacol*, as illustrated below:

*Yac* markers in Kashaya:

Agent case nominals: suffixed with *-ya?* ( $< -yac + -\emptyset$ )  
Patient case nominals: suffixed with *-yacol* ( $< -yaco + -l$ )

The *-ya?* affix is the primary choice for the marking of agenthood, while the *-?el* affix is the general marker for patienthood. The affixes *-?em* and *-yacol* have more specific uses than their *-ya?* and *-?el* alternatives. The agent marker *-?em* indicates definiteness on the noun in addition to agenthood, and the patient marker *-yacol* is primarily used for marking the oblique case in ditransitive constructions and for marking patienthood on nominalizations. While agent markers are employed most commonly on the subjects of transitive sentences, patient markers are employed either on the objects of transitive sentences or on the subjects of intransitive sentences. Agent markers can also be used in intransitive sentences, however, if the semantics of the event in question calls for increased involvement on the part of the subject, a phenomenon to be addressed in greater detail below.

O'Connor (1987) discusses the Northern Pomo equivalents of the *-ya?* and *-?el* markers, arguing that the *-ya?* is a clitic marker while the *-?el* is inflectional. In keeping with O'Connor's distinction between clitic and inflectional markings, the Kashaya case markers can be grouped as follows:

Inflectional Markers in Kashaya:

Agent case nominals: suffixed with *-?em*  
Patient case nominals: suffixed with *-?el*

Clitic markers in Kashaya:

Agent case nominals: clitic *-ya?*  
Patient case nominals: clitic *-yacol*

As O'Connor points out in her analysis of Northern Pomo, the two paradigms differ in markedness. The unmarked use is for the agent case to be coded with *-ya?* and the patient case with *-?el*. The agent case receives the inflectional *-?em* marking only if definiteness is implied, while the patient case receives *-yacol* marking only if the element in question is a nominalization or an oblique object.

It is worth mentioning at the outset that all uses of the patient marker *-yacol* involve some degree of animacy or agentivity at some level. In ditransitive constructions, *-yacol* marks the indirect object, a position which is regularly filled by an object high in animacy. As a nominalizer, *-yacol* marks both agent and patient; that is, it marks an *agentive* relative acting as *patient* in the main clause. As an honorific, *-yacol* indicates that the noun to which it is attached has greater animacy than other nouns within the same level of the animacy hierarchy. The clitic *lyac*, then, is basically agentive, and the patient marker *-yacol* is used only when some level of agentivity is involved. These uses of *-yacol* will be discussed in greater detail under sections 2 and 3.

Although case marking in an Agent/Patient system is necessarily characterized by variation, it is to a large extent predictable with reference to prototype theory. The obligatory employment of the *-ya?* agent marker on the subject of a sentence is dependent on two general factors: first, how closely the clause-level event conforms to a transitive prototype, and second, how closely the subject of the sentence is perceived as conforming to an animate prototype. Semantic

considerations at both the verbal level and the nominal level are therefore fundamental to the system of case marking in Kashaya.

At the verbal level, the choice between marking and nonmarking depends on the semantic transitivity of the event in question. In their paper on global transitivity, Hopper and Thompson (1980) propose ten factors which affect a clause's transitivity, factors which together seem to determine the employment of the agent marker *-ya?* in Kashaya:

	High Transitivity	Low Transitivity
1. Participants	2 or more participants (A and O)	1 participant
2. Kinesis	action	nonaction
3. Aspect	telic	atelic
4. Punctuality	punctual	nonpunctual
5. Volitionality	volitional	nonvolitional
6. Affirmation	affirmative	negative
7. Mode	realis	nonrealis
8. Agency	A high in potency	A low in potency
9. Affectedness of O	O totally affected	O not affected
10. Individuation of O	O highly individuated	O nonindividuated

Rice (1987) similarly argues in her paper on the English passive that transitivity is dependent upon the speaker's interpretation of the event in question. This is precisely the case with *-ya?* marking in Kashaya, which is sometimes required on the subjects of sentences which are syntactically intransitive. If such sentences express an event which is high in semantic transitivity, regardless of the number of arguments indicated overtly in the syntax, then *-ya?* marking on the subject is obligatory. A subject whose verb requires it to have what Hopper and Thompson refer to as 'kinesis', 'volitionality', or 'agency', for instance, will always be marked with the *-ya?* clitic. Likewise, an inanimate subject whose verb requires it to have what Hopper and Thompson refer to as 'potency', and which is therefore capable of 'affecting' an object, will also receive *-ya?* marking. The clitic *-ya?* is thus required when the perceived event is semantically, not syntactically, transitive.

A semantic approach, then, accounts for the expected *-ya?* marking on agents of transitive sentences as well as the less expected *-ya?* marking on subjects of intransitive sentences. Sentences (1), (2), and (3) below are typical Kashaya transitive sentences whose subjects are affixed with the agentive marker *ya?*, the first sentence having a human agent, the second an animal agent, and the third an inanimate agent:<sup>7</sup>

(1) *ʔaca?-ya? ahša qanehqaw*  
 man-Ag fish catch  
 The man caught the fish.

(2) *hayu-ya? natahiʔbaya qanew*  
 dog-Ag baby bite  
 The dog bit the baby.

(3) *topulu-ya? aha: pi:lala*  
 hatchet-Ag wood split  
 The hatchet split the wood.

All of the above sentences are high in transitivity, both syntactically and semantically. In each sentence, an event is expressed which involves action. There are two participants in the event, a subject that is high in agency and an object which is directly affected by the action it performs. While the first two sentences have an object acting with volition, however, sentence (3) does not. Although a hatchet is generally considered inanimate and therefore incapable of volition, it is high in what Hopper and Thompson call 'potency', directly affecting its object by splitting it.

More interesting are those sentences which are high in transitivity semantically, but not syntactically. In sentences (4)-(6), *-ya?* marking on the subject is obligatory even though the subject is the only argument overtly present in the syntax.

- (4) *?aca?-ya?*    *pi?ya*  
 man-Ag        recognize  
 The man recognizes.
- (5) *donomu:caba:-ya?*    *šuwinciw*  
 volcano-Ag        erupt  
 The volcano is erupting.
- (6) *?ima:ta-ya?*    *hanem*    *da:-qa*  
 woman-Ag    kick        want  
 The woman wants to kick.

Since the case-frames of the verbs *pi?ya* 'recognize', *šuwinciw* 'erupt', and *da:-qa* 'want' all require high-animacy arguments, *-ya?* marking is obligatory. The verb *pi?ya* in sentence (4) requires its subject to have a high degree of animacy in that only humans, or non-humans with a cognitive capacity characteristic of humans, are able to 'recognize' objects in the world around them. If the *ya?* were absent, the subject would be interpreted as a patient instead of an agent, and the resulting sentence would mean 'you recognize the man'. The subject of sentence (5), although inanimate, is potent. The event expressed is high in what Hopper and Thompson call 'kinesis', an event lacking in directional orientation and depending upon intensity of stimulation. Sentence (6) involves a woman who is acting with volition in that she 'wants' to perform the action. The verb *da:qa* 'want' consists of a causal suffix *-qa* affixed to a verb whose basic meaning is 'like'. Not surprisingly, the causative suffix *-qa* regularly requires *-ya?* marking. The potency of 'causing' an event to occur is clearly related to agentivity.

The choice between marking and nonmarking is often influenced by lexical semantics as well, or rather, by the inherent animacy of the subject in question. If the subject noun is one that is an 'unusual' agent, so to speak, *-ya?* marking will be employed in order to identify it as the agent of a particular action. The *pus'i* 'dead person' in sentence (7) below, for instance, is marked with the agent marker *-ya?*, but the *?aca?* 'man' in sentence (8) is not:

- (7) *pus'i-ya?*        *ca:du*  
 dead person-Ag    see  
 The dead person sees.
- (8) *?aca?*        *ca:du*  
 man            see  
 The man sees.

Since a 'dead person' is inanimate and therefore incapable of physical activity, it is an unusual agent of the verb 'seeing'. The subject of sentence (7) must therefore be marked with *-ya?* so as to

indicate that it is in fact acting as agent. Without *-ya?* marking, the sentence would be interpreted as 'He sees the dead person' with the argument in question acting as patient. Sentence (8), on the other hand, does not need the agent marker on its subject since 'seeing' is assumed to be an attribute of animate beings.

There are also those sentences which are syntactically transitive but semantically intransitive. Such sentences do not receive *-ya?* marking in Kashaya. In sentence (9) below, there are two arguments to the verb *mayic'biw* 'resemble', but the subject is not marked with an agent marker:

- (9) *nataqawi hiʔbaya-ʔel mayic'biw*  
 baby man-Pat resemble  
 The baby resembles the man.

Here, the two arguments *nataqawi* 'baby' and *hiʔbaya* 'man' are likened to one another. Rice calls sentences like (9) above 'symmetrical imperfectives', pointing out that the action involved is nonpunctual. She argues, in an effort to account for their inability to passivize in English, that such sentences are semantically intransitive. When the *-ya?* marker is affixed to the subject of a Kashaya symmetrical imperfective, the meaning is changed. Sentence (10), for instance, would be interpreted as 'The baby acts like the man', a sentence which involves not only greater punctuality, but also greater differentiation between subject and object:

- (10) *nataqawi-ya? hiʔbaya-ʔel mayic'biw*  
 baby-Ag man-Pat acts like  
 The baby acts like the man.

As in sentence (4), the subject of this sentence must possess a high degree of animacy. Here, the baby consciously decides to act like someone else, a cognitive capability that is limited to members belonging to the human category of the animacy hierarchy.

The occurrence of the agent marker *-ya?*, then, can also add a particular nuance to the meaning of the verb. If the subject is marked with *-ya?* when neither inherent clause-level semantics (transitivity) nor inherent lexical semantics (animacy) requires it, the event in question will be perceived as involving volition. Since a human subject is more likely to perform an act with volition than a non-human subject, lexical level considerations will influence the decision to employ the agent marker. The subject will be more likely to receive *-ya?* marking if it is inherently 'more animate' on the animacy hierarchy. Subject nominals denoting humans are more likely to be marked with the agent case clitic than are subject nominals denoting animals. Similarly, subject nominals denoting animals are more likely to be marked with the agent case clitic than are subject nominals denoting inanimate objects. As Rice (p.422) argues, transitivity is best viewed not as a lexical or grammatical category, but rather as part of 'the intensional/construal arsenal available to a speaker and employed to organize and communicate something about an event other than content'.

In sentences (11)-(13) below, for example, the speaker employs the agent marker in order to communicate increased animacy on the part of the subject. If the subject of an intransitive sentence is human, it will normally not be marked with *-ya?*. The speaker can employ this marking, however, in order to convey the added nuance that the subject of the sentence is acting with volition. When the *-ya?* marker is employed in sentences that are both syntactically and semantically intransitive, as in sentences (11)-(13) below, the subject is perceived as volunteering, or rather consciously deciding, to perform the action:

- (11) *ʔacaʔ-yaʔ moʔbi*  
 man-Ag ran  
 The man volunteered to run. (i.e. decided to run a race)
- (12) *ʔima:ta-yaʔ bacubi*  
 woman-Ag jump  
 The woman purposefully jumped.
- (13) *ʔacaʔ-yaʔ mitiw*  
 man-Ag lie down  
 The man decided to lie down.

Without *-yaʔ* marking, sentences (11), (12), and (13) would be translated simply as 'the man ran', 'the woman jumped', and 'the man is lying down', respectively. With *-yaʔ* marking, all three sentences express intent on the part of the subject. This might explain why sentence (12) can also be interpreted as 'out of a whole group, the woman jumped'. The woman is individuated by her increased animacy, so to speak, as she is the only one of a group who performs the action deliberately.

Incidentally, the agent marker *-ʔem* is often used in sentences like (12). Since the *-ʔem* suffix marks definiteness on the noun as well as agenthood, it is considered the better choice for the contrastive interpretation mentioned above. Like the *-yaʔ* marker, the *-ʔem* marker denotes a conscious and deliberate involvement on the part of the subject. The subjects of the Kashaya sentences 'The woman fell from the tree' and 'The woman drowned', for instance, are normally marked with the patient marker *-ʔel*, since 'falling' and 'drowning' are not usually understood as conscious choices. When these subjects are marked with the suffix *-ʔem*, however, as in sentences (14) and (15) below, the expressed action is viewed as deliberate instead of accidental:

- (14) *ʔima:ta-ʔem qhale-ltow lo*  
 woman-Ag tree-from fall  
 The woman (a particular woman) deliberately fell from the tree.
- (15) *ʔima:ta-ʔem sinam*  
 woman-Ag drown  
 The woman (one out of a group) willingly drowned  
 (i.e. willingly gave up her life by drowning).

In sentence (14), the speaker comments on a woman who, for whatever reason, deliberately chose to fall from the tree. In sentence (15), the speaker discusses a woman who willingly gave up her life by deciding to drown herself. As with *yaʔ*, then, the employment of the agent marker *-ʔem* implies increased volition or awareness on the part of the subject.

The *-yaʔ* marker can also be used to distinguish between action and state, a distinction which parallels that between telic and atelic events. When the agent marker is employed in a sentence like (16) below, the resulting sentence is given an active, telic interpretation, as exemplified in sentence (17):

- (16) *ʔacaʔ ma:kina manqaw*  
 man car drives  
 The man drives (i.e. knows how to drive).

- (17) *ʔacaʔ-yaʔ ma:kina manqaw*  
 man-Ag car drives  
 The man is driving (i.e. towards the speaker).

While the first sentence expresses a state of being, the second sentence expresses an action which has a definite endpoint. In the latter sentence, the speaker sees a man behind a steering wheel driving towards him, a man who is consciously performing the action expressed by the verb. The man in sentence (16), on the other hand, is merely a person who knows how to drive as a latent capability. Since the second sentence is a more overt expression of action than the first, it again implies increased animacy on the part of the subject.

It is worth noting that the *-yaʔ* marker will turn an intransitive sentence into a transitive sentence when the verb is one which can act both transitively and intransitively. If the *-yaʔ* marker is employed in the intransitive sentences exemplified in (18) and (19) below, for instance, the resulting sentences can only receive the transitive interpretations of (20) and (21), respectively:

- (18) *ʔacaʔ tilitilimuli*  
 man roll around  
 The man rolled around.

- (19) *ʔoho mukui*  
 fire burn  
 The fire burned.

- (20) *ʔacaʔ-yaʔ tilitilimuli*  
 man-Ag rolled around  
 The man rolled (someone else) around.

- (21) *ʔoho-yaʔ mukui*  
 fire-Ag burn  
 The fire burned (it).

Sentences like (18) and (19), which contain a verb which can be either transitive or intransitive, cannot have a volitional agent as in many of the *-yaʔ* marked examples discussed earlier.

Subjects of intransitive sentences which are animals receive the *-yaʔ* marking less frequently than human subjects of intransitive sentences. This is not particularly surprising since humans, and not animals, are thought to act with agency and volition. When the agent marker is suffixed to an animal subject, the animal is also perceived as operating with volition. It is anthropomorphized, so to speak, moving to a higher level on the animacy hierarchy. The following sentences are typical Kashaya anthropomorphizations:

- (22) *qhaboʔ-yaʔ qotoqotolaw*  
 snake-Ag roll down  
 The snake rolled down the hill.  
 (i.e. a snake who made himself roll down the hill)

- (23) *s'ihta-yaʔ caʔbi*  
 bird-Ag fly  
 The bird flew.  
 (i.e. a bird, perhaps in a story, who volunteers to fly)



- (24) *hayu-ya? mo:du*  
 dog-Ag run  
 The dog ran.  
 (i.e. a dog who decides to begin running)

There are two interpretations of such sentences: one in which the subject is perceived as generally capable of rational thought and is referred to as 'Mr. Bear' instead of simply 'bear', and one in which rational thought is temporarily imputed to the animal-- an animal, for instance, who 'decides' to perform an action. Under the first interpretation, sentences (22)-(24) are translated as 'Mr. Snake turned over', 'Mr. Bird flew', and 'Mr. Dog ran' respectively, a phenomenon which will be discussed in greater detail in Section 3. Under the second interpretation, the subject consciously decides to perform the action, as glossed in the parentheses below each translation. In sentence (22) the snake 'makes himself' turn over; in sentence (23) the bird 'volunteers' to fly; and in sentence (24) the dog 'decides' to begin running. Such sentences are often used in the telling of stories.

Sentences (22)-(24) can be used to refer to animals outside of stories only when the subject is perceived as having greater animacy than others in his group. Sentence (24), for instance, could be used to explain a scenario in which several dogs are about to be shot, and one of them gets smart and decides to take off. The syntactically comparable sentence *hayu-ya? choyi?*, however, which can be translated roughly as 'the dog decided to die', is limited to use in a story. Although a speaker might attribute intention to a dog that runs from a gun, he is not likely to do so to a dog that dies.

The *-ya?* marker can also be used on the animal subjects of certain transitive sentences. Sentences (25) and (26) below both contain the same two arguments and the transitive verb *ciyacqa* 'fear', but the latter has the agent marker while the former lacks it:

- (25) *hayu ?aca? ciyacqa*  
 dog people fear  
 The dog is afraid of people.
- (26) *hayu-ya? aca? ciyacqa*  
 dog-Ag people fear  
 The dog is afraid of people (i.e., he actively dislikes them).

In the *-ya?* marked sentence, the dog is perceived as more involved in the action of the verb. He does not merely *passively* fear people, he *actively* dislikes them. A speaker might use this sentence to explain a scenario in which a dog runs off at the sight of people because he is lazy and does not want to be made to work. Here, the dog both fears and dislikes his adversary.

Inanimate subjects of intransitive sentences are marked with the agent marker much less frequently than either human or animal subjects. When the *-ya?* clitic is affixed to an inanimate subject which would not normally take agent marking, the subject is anthropomorphized to a person bearing the name of the inanimate entity, in the same way that an animal like 'bear' is anthropomorphized to 'Mr. Bear'. Volition can never be attributed to inanimate subjects, however, even within the confines of a story. Members belonging to the lowest level of the animacy hierarchy cannot be perceived as possessing the animacy of humans.

The three levels of the animacy hierarchy, then, behave differently when it comes to *-ya?* marking. While animal and inanimate subjects are anthropomorphized to the human level, human subjects become more animately involved in performing the action of the verb. The employment of the agent marker in those sentences where it is not required serves to increase the subject's

animacy, thereby increasing the semantic transitivity of the sentence as a whole. If the Kashaya system of case-marking is viewed with reference to both the animacy hierarchy and the transitivity paradigm, those instances of the agent marker *-yaʔ* which cannot be wholly attributed to either clause-level semantics or lexical semantics can be accounted for.

## 2. The Kashaya Relative Clause and the Agentive Nominalizer */yac/*

The clitic */yac/* can also act as a nominalizer on adjectives, nouns, verbs, and verb expansions. Of particular interest are those nominalizing instances of verbal affixation in which the clitic */yac/* acts as a relative marker. The role of the nominalizer */yac/* in the Kashaya relative clause closely parallels the role of the agent marker */yac/* discussed in the previous section.

The nominalizer */yac/* can be attached to a verb or verb expansion to yield what in English is translated as a subject relative clause. The relative clause can include single verbs, verbal expansions of Patient + Verb, verbal expansions of Agent + Verb, or verbal expansions of Agent + Patient + Verb:

- (27) Verb + Nominalizer (headless relative)  
*[qanehqa:-yaʔ]*  
 [catch-Nom] NP  
 the one who catches
- (28) Patient + Verb + Nominalizer (headless relative)  
*[ʔahša qanehqa:-yaʔ]*  
 [fish catch-Nom] NP  
 the one who caught the fish
- (29) Agent + Verb + Nominalizer (internally headed relative)  
*[ʔacaʔ-yaʔ qanehqa:-yaʔ]*  
 [man-Ag catch-Nom] NP  
 the man who catches
- (30) Agent + Patient + Verb + Nominalizer (internally headed relative)  
*[ʔacaʔ-yaʔ ahša qanehqa:-yaʔ]*  
 [man-Ag fish catch-Nom] NP  
 the man who caught the fish

Both the agent marker *-yaʔ* and the patient marker *-yacol* are used to form 'agentive nominals', that is, nominals which feature an agent as the performer of a particular action. The nominalizer *-yaʔ* is used to mark an agentive relative functioning as agent in the main clause, while the nominalizer *-yacol* is used to mark an agentive relative functioning as patient in the main clause. 'Patientive nominals', i.e. nominals which feature a patient as the recipient of a particular action, are marked with the inflectional marker *-l*. The three types of markings and their different interpretations are illustrated in sentences (31)-(33) below.<sup>8</sup> (The agentive nominalizer *-yaʔ* and the agentive nominalizer *-yacol* are both abbreviated as 'AgNom'; the patientive nominalizer *-l* is abbreviated as 'PatNom'.)

- (31) Agentive relative functioning as agent in the main clause (*-yaʔ*)  
*[ʔahša qanehqa:-yaʔ]*                      *to*                      *qanew*  
 [fish catch-AgNom] NP                      1PsSgPat                      bite  
 The one who caught the fish bit me.

- (32) Agentive relative functioning as patient in the main clause (-*yacol*)

[ʔahša qanehqa:-*yacol*] e: to daw  
 [fish catch-AgNom] NP Asr 1SgPat like  
 I like the one who caught the fish.

[ʔahša qanehqa:-*yacol*] choyi?  
 fish catch-AgNom] NP die  
 The one who caught the fish died.

- (33) Patientive relative functioning as patient in the main clause (-*l*)

[ʔahša qanehqa:-*ya-l*] ʔe: to daw  
 [fish catch-VisEv-PatNom] NP Asr 1SgPat like  
 I like the fish which was caught.

[ʔahša qanehqa:-*ya-l*] choyi?  
 [fish catch-VisEv-PatNom] NP die  
 The fish which was caught died

Incidentally, the data suggests that an agentive relative having two arguments, such as the one in example (30) above, cannot be marked with *-yacol*. Employment of this marker appears to be limited to one-argument relatives. Perhaps surprisingly, those two-argument relatives which are agentive and act as patient in the main clause are marked with the inflectional marker *-l*.<sup>9</sup>

The inflectional marker *-m* can also be employed on an agentive relative clause acting as agent of the larger sentence, as in sentence (34) below.

- (34) Agentive relative functioning as agent in the main clause (-*m*)

[ʔahša qanehqa:-*ya-m*] to qanew  
 [fish catch-VisEv-AgNom] NP 1PsSgPat bite  
 That particular one who caught the fish bit me.

The reasons for employing the *-m* marker instead of the *-yaʔ* marker on the relative clause are entirely consistent with those for employing the *-m* marker on the agent of a semantically transitive sentence. In both cases, the inflectional marker serves to indicate definiteness on the part of the subject.

It is easy to see how these nominalizing uses of the clitic *-yaʔ* and the agentive uses of the clitic *-yaʔ* might intersect. In particular, in relative clauses where the expected agentive nominalizer is *-yacol*, if the agentive nominalizer *-yaʔ* is used, the relative clause will become more agent-like within the larger sentence and less patient-like. The *-yaʔ* marker will then indicate that the subject is participating actively in the action instead of passively, or rather, that the subject is performing the action expressed by the verb with agency and volition.

The Kashaya version of the relative clause in the English sentence 'the one who felt sick died', for example, would regularly be marked with the nominalizer *-yacol*. The noun phrase 'the one who felt sick' is an agentive relative which acts as patient of the larger sentence, a construction which takes the *-yacol* marker as in (35):

- (35) [ʒolom tanqa:-*yacol*] choyi?  
 [sick feel-AgNom] NP die  
 The one who felt sick died.

- (36) [Solom tanqa:-ya?] choyi?  
 [sick feel-AgNom] NP die  
 The one who felt sick volunteered to die.

When such a construction is marked with the nominalizer *ya?*, however, as in example (36), the interpretation is one which involves volition on the part of the subject. The sentence might be used to explain a scenario in which a group of men are on a ship lost at sea and there is not enough food to go around. One of them, since he is sick anyway, decides to sacrifice himself for the rest by jumping overboard. The subject is no longer a passive participant in the action, but an active one.

Sentences (37), (38), and (39) are additional examples of this phenomenon. In each of these examples, a volitional interpretation is given to the performance of an event which would otherwise be interpreted as nonvolitional.<sup>10</sup>

- (37) [duyam'-ya?] choyi?  
 [old-AgNom] NP die  
 The one who was old volunteered to die.
- (38) [haqohqo:-ya?] choyi?  
 [crazy-AgNom] NP die  
 The one that went crazy decided to take his life.
- (39) [ʔahʂa mitma:-ya?] choyi?  
 [fish catch-AgNom] NP die  
 The one who caught the fish volunteered to die.

Again, such relatives would regularly be marked with the nominalizer *-yacol*. When marked with the nominalizer *-ya?*, however, the subject is perceived as performing the action of the verb deliberately.

### 3. The Animacy Augmenter /yac/ and the Animacy Hierarchy

The /yac/ clitic can also function as what might loosely be called an 'honorific'. Not only can it award a title to a non-human noun so that a simple noun like 'bear' becomes 'Mr. Bear', but it can also award a special status to certain human nouns, in particular, those nouns which Comrie specifies as 'inherently high' in animacy. If the /yac/ clitic is affixed to a pronoun or to a personal name which refers to an inlaw, it will indicate that the referent is worthy of respect; if affixed to a kinship term or to a personal name which does not refer to an inlaw, it will indicate that the referent is no longer living. In the same way that the /yac/ clitic gives animate status to a non-human noun, then, it also gives what might be called 'superanimate' status to certain human nouns already high in animacy. In this respect, the clitic functions as what might be called an 'animacy augmenter' (abbreviated below as 'AnAug').

Sentences (40)-(43) illustrate the phenomenon mentioned briefly in Section 1 whereby the derivational marker /yac/ changes a simple non-human noun into an anthropomorphized title.

- (40) buʔaqa mo:du  
 bear run  
 The bear is running.
- (41) buʔaqa-yac? mo:du  
 bear-AnAug run  
 Mr. Bear is running.

(42) \**cidom mon'*  
 flower run  
 The flower is running.

(43) *cidom-ya? mon'*  
 flower-AnAug run  
 Miss Flower is running.

The 'honorific' nominals act as agent in the above sentences. When they act as patients, they are marked with *-yacol*, as illustrated in sentence (44) below. If the interpretation 'the bear' is desired instead of 'Mr. Bear', as in sentence (45), the inflectional suffix *-ʔel* is used:

(44) *ʔa: buʔaqa-yacol ca:du*  
 1PsSg bear-AnAug see  
 I saw Mr. Bear.

(45) *ʔa: buʔaqa-ʔel ca:du*  
 1PsSg bear-Pat see  
 I saw the bear.

The non-human subjects in sentences (41), (43), and (44) above are 'honored', so to speak, with the level of animacy reserved for humans on the animacy hierarchy. The subject of sentence (41) and the object of sentence (44) is either a bear who more generally possesses the animacy of humans, i.e. the 'Mr. Bear' of an imaginary story, or a 'man-made' bear who is really human, i.e. the man who wears a bear costume in certain Kashaya dances. Since members belonging to the inanimate level of the animacy hierarchy cannot be perceived to possess the animacy of humans, the subject of sentence (43) is simply a person who is called by the name 'Miss Flower'. The *-ya?* clitic in sentences (41) and (43) is not functioning as an agent marker. As discussed in Section 1, the agent marker *-ya?* would indicate that the subject consciously decides to run. Here, the *-ya?* is clearly functioning as a derivational marker. The interpretations 'Mr. Bear' and 'Miss Flower' closely parallel a second possible interpretation with nominals of this sort, i.e. 'the one which is a bear' and 'the one which is a flower'.

Examples (46)-(47) illustrate the phenomenon in which the */yac/* marker acts as a type of respect marker on pronouns, personal names, and kinship terms. In a basic transitive sentence, the agent marker would never be affixed to such nouns, a phenomenon in keeping with Comrie's claim that such nouns are viewed as already high in animacy.

(46) *mu:-ya? mo:du*  
 3PsSg-AnAug run  
 He (my in-law) is running.

(47) *Tim-ya? mo:du*  
 Tim-AnAug run  
 Tim (my father-in-law) is running.

(48) *ʃuʃun-ya? ima:ta q'oʔdi*  
 aunt-AnAug woman good  
 My aunt (deceased) was a good woman.

(49) *Tim-ya? aca? q'oʔdi 'yo*  
 Tim-AnAug man good PAST  
 Tim (deceased) used to be a good man.

While the *-yaʔ* indicates that the *mu* of sentence (46) and the *Tim* of (47) are people worthy of respect, i.e. inlaws, it indicates that the *šušun* of sentence (48) and the *Tim* of sentence (49) are no longer living (perhaps paralleling English expressions like 'my late aunt'). These uses of *-yaʔ* clearly resemble the uses of *-yaʔ* in sentences (41) and (43), except that in these sentences the subjects are human instead of animal or inanimate. When the *-yaʔ* marker is attached to such nouns, the referent is perceived as possessing greater animacy than other humans on the animacy hierarchy. Such an analysis appears to be consistent with some of the traditional spiritual beliefs of the Kashayans, namely that their loved ones go 'to the place of understanding', *ʔama:-q'oʔdi-tol*, (more literally, 'the place of good') after death. If the Kashayan has had a proper burial ceremony, he will leave the earth, meet all of his ancestors, become a young person again, and immediately know everything that there is to know about the physical and spiritual worlds.<sup>11</sup> It may also be of interest that the agentless phrase *ya:khe ʔa:pen* 'our father' is equated with 'God the father' and the corresponding *-yaʔ* marked phrase *ya:khe ʔa:pen-yaʔ* with an 'earth father' or parent. The sentence 'God the father sees me' is regularly translated without the agent marker (i.e., *ya:khe ʔa:pen ca:du*), but the sentence 'My father sees me' is often translated with the agent marker (i.e., *ya:khe ʔa:pen-yaʔ ca:du*), a distinction which may exist because 'God' and 'man' belong to different levels on the animacy hierarchy. If the noun 'God' is inherently 'superanimate' instead of 'animate', a speaker may find it redundant to employ *-yaʔ* marking.

When nouns inherently high in animacy act as patients, they are marked with the derivational marker *-yacol*, as illustrated in sentences (50)-(52) below.

(50) *ʔa: mu:-yacol ca:du*  
 1PsSg 3PsSg-AnAug see  
 I saw him (my in-law).

(51) *ʔa: Tim-yacol da:qa*  
 1PsSg Tim-AnAug like  
 I liked Tim (deceased)/ I like Tim (my father-in-law)

(52) *šušun -yacol ba:nawa:du*  
 aunt-AnAug lie  
 My aunt (deceased) used to lie to me.

If the alternative patient markers *-ʔel* and *-to* are suffixed to pronouns, personal names, or kinship terms, the nominal in question will not receive the honorific interpretation. The sentence *ʔa: mu-ʔel*<sup>12</sup> *ca:du*, for instance, can only be interpreted as 'I saw that one' and the sentence *ʔa: Tim-to da:qa* as 'I like Tim', with both 'that one' and 'Tim' referring to people who are not in-laws. The same is true for ditransitive constructions, which can otherwise take either *-ʔel* or *-yacol* as the marker of the oblique object. Although the direct object of the ditransitive construction must always be marked with *-ʔel*, the indirect object can be marked with either *-ʔel* or *-yacol*. When an honorific acts as the oblique object, however, the marker *-yacol* is obligatory, as demonstrated by the differing interpretations in sentences (53) and (54) below.

(53) *ʔahša-ʔel ʔa: mu:-yacol di:qaw*  
 fish-Pat 1PsSg 3PsSg-AnAug give  
 I gave the fish to him (my in-law).

- (54) *ʔahša-ʔel ʔa: mu-ʔel di:qaw*  
 fish-Pat 1PsSg 3PsSg-Pat give  
 I gave the fish to that one (not an in-law).

If the suffix *-ʔel* is used on the pronoun instead of *-yacol* as in sentence (54), the oblique object will receive the more general demonstrative interpretation 'to that one' instead of the honorific interpretation 'to my in-law'.

Incidentally, when expressions like 'Mr. Bear' or 'Miss Flower' are used in transitive sentences, which require their subject to have *-yaʔ* marking, a complex nominal involving a form of the assertive must be used instead of a simple noun followed by the affix.<sup>13</sup> Examples (55)-(57) illustrate the different interpretations given to the two types of nominalizations when employed in transitive sentences.

- (55) *buʔaqa-yaʔ ahša qanehqaw*  
 bear-Ag fish catch  
 The bear caught a fish.
- (56) *[buʔaqa-ʔe:-mu-yaʔ] ahša qanehqaw*  
 [bear-Asr-3PsSg-AnAug] NP fish catch  
 Mr. Bear caught a fish.
- (57) *\*cidom-yaʔ ahša qanehqaw*  
 flower-Ag fish catch  
 The flower caught a fish.
- (58) *[cidom'-e:-mu-yaʔ] ahša qanehqaw*  
 [flower-Asr-3PsSg-AnAug] NP fish catch  
 Miss Flower caught a fish.

Since flowers cannot catch fish, sentence (57) is, of course, ungrammatical. Complex nominalizations must be employed in both (55) and (57) in order to get a 'Mr. Bear' and 'Miss Flower' interpretation, respectively. Such nominal constructions are interesting in that the *-yaʔ* is attached to the 3rd person singular personal pronoun, an affixation which otherwise only occurs when the referent is human. A more literal translation of the two nominals would be something like 's/he (respectful) who is a bear' and 's/he (respectful) who is a flower'.

If a fourth level is added to Comrie's three-way animacy hierarchy, one whose members are even more animate than those belonging to the human level, these honorific uses of */yac/* can be easily unified with the agent-marking and agentive nominalizing uses of */yac/* discussed in the previous sections.

The Animacy Hierarchy in Kashaya						
Superanimate	>	Human	>	Animal	>	Inanimate
pronouns + <i>/yac/</i>		<--- pronouns				
proper nouns + <i>/yac/</i>		<--- proper nouns				
kinship terms + <i>/yac/</i>		<--- kinship terms				
		human nouns + <i>/yac/</i>	<--- human nouns			
		animal nouns + <i>/yac/</i>		<--- animal nouns		
		inanimate nouns + <i>/yac/</i>			<--- inanimate nouns	

Just as non-human nouns become animate with the addition of the clitic, human nouns which are already high in animacy become superanimate. Similarly, human nouns which are not inherently high in animacy, i.e. common human nouns, become more animate with respect to a particular event when the affixation occurs. This suggests that the agent marker /*yaʔ*/, the agentive nominalizer /*yaʔ*/, and the animacy augments /*yaʔ*/ should all be analyzed with reference to a revised animacy hierarchy.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

Ag	Agent Case Marker
AnAug	Animacy Augmenter
AgNom	Agentive Nominalizer
Asr	Assertive
Cont	Contrastive
Dem	Demonstrative
Nom	Nominalizer
Pat	Patient Case Marker
PatNom	Patientive Nominalizer
VisEv	Visual Evidential

#### ENDNOTES

- 1 The Kashaya examples in this paper were elicited from Milton 'Bun' Lucas, a Kashayan storyteller and songwriter, in a field methods class at UC Berkeley directed by Leanne Hinton.
- 2 The choice of terminology here is provisional and less than satisfactory; my reasons for categorizing these three instances of *-yaʔ* affixation as 'honorific' will become clear in the context of the paper. I will suggest another term in Section 3.
- 3 Some languages make fewer distinctions of animacy (e.g. human and non-human, animate and inanimate), while others make even finer distinctions of animacy within each of these three categories.
- 4 I should mention that although my consultant regularly gave the interpretation of 'Mr. So-and-So' to non-human animate subjects with *-yaʔ* marking, Robert Oswalt (personal communication) has not come across this interpretation in his fieldwork with other Kashaya speakers.
- 5 There is a third patient allomorph [-*to*] and, according to Oswalt (p.111), a third agent allomorph [-*d*] which occur in more limited environments. The patientive suffix *-to* regularly occurs after personal names, so that the Kashaya for a sentence like 'I saw Tim' will be *?a: Tim-to ca:du* and not *\*?a: Tim-?el ca:du*. The agentive suffix *-d* regularly occurs after what Oswalt (p.116) refers to as the syntactic suffix {=<sup>o</sup>-}, a suffix which is used to derive personal names or appellations from adjectives or nouns (and which also occurs in kinship nouns). Oswalt offers the following example: {*kuhnu*} 'bead' + {*?aha*} *llhall* 'mouth' + {=<sup>o</sup>-} + {-*d*} > /*kuhnuhanʔ*/ 'Bead-Mouth (a personal name)'.
- 6 (Text and example from Oswalt:112-3) 'Verbal expressions nominalized by means of the suffix {-*e*-} Nominalizer require either the Subjective case suffix {-*m*} or the Objective case suffix {-*l*}. The construction is especially common with the Assertive verb {'-}, in which case the verb is



better translated by 'the' rather than the more literal 'the one who is', and then seems to be principally a means by which to indicate whether the noun is the subject or object':

Example:

/ʔacac' 1 em 2 ʔima:ta 3 ʔel 4 cadu 5/

'The (subjective case) 2 man 1 sees 5 the (objective case) 4 woman 3'.

7 Patient markers are sometimes omitted for reasons I do not fully understand. The occurrence of *-ʔel* typically implies a strong feeling of definiteness which is not present in these sentences.

8 The logical fourth possibility-- a patient relative clause functioning as an agent in the main clause-- is not attested in my data.

9 I have not elicited many of these sentences, but my consultant consistently rejected *-yacol* marking on two-argument relatives. It seems that the relative clauses in the sentences 'I saw the man who caught the fish' and 'I saw the fish that the man caught' will both be translated into Kashaya as [*ʔaca-yaʔ ahsa qanehqa:-ya-l*], and that the meanings of the two sentences will be differentiated by repetition of the appropriate patient in the main clause. In the first sentence, the word for 'man' will be repeated in the main clause and in the second sentence, the word for 'fish' will be repeated. More data is needed, however, before I can affirm that *-yacol* marking never occurs on two-argument relatives.

10 The subjects in sentences (37) and (38) are nominalized adjectives. Although I have limited my discussion to the nominalization of verbs and verb expansions for the most part, the nominalizer */yac/* can also be affixed to adjectives and nouns. When */yac/* is affixed to an adjective like *q'oʔdi*, for instance, the resulting noun *q'oʔdi-yaʔ* (or *q'oʔdi-yacol* if patient of the main clause) will mean 'a good one' or 'a good person'. Nouns seem to receive */yac/* affixation more rarely. My data includes examples like *pelesu-yaʔ* 'prisoner' (< *pelesu* 'prison' + *-yaʔ*) and *mathim-yaʔ* 'man who dances on a foot drum' (< *mathim* 'drum' + *-yaʔ*). The nominalizer */yac/* is also often affixed to a preposition preceded by a place noun (e.g. 'California' + *bake* 'from' + *-yaʔ*) to yield a nominalization meaning 'the one who is from X' (e.g., 'California'-*bake-yaʔ* 'Californian').

11 All of my information on traditional Kashaya spiritual beliefs is from my consultant, Milton 'Bun' Lucas.

12 I am not sure whether I have transcribed this word correctly or made the proper morphological divisions. Unfortunately, I have not had time to elicit additional sentences of this type from my consultant.

13 The complex nominal is perhaps employed to avoid two consecutive instances of *-yaʔ* marking, agent followed by honorific. Such an affixation (i.e. *\*yaʔ-yaʔ*) appears to be ungrammatical in Kashaya.

#### REFERENCES

- Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56.2:251-299.

O'Connor, Mary Catherine. 1987. Topics in Northern Pomo Grammar. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Oswalt, Robert L., 1961. A Kashaya Grammar (Southwestern Pomo). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Rice, Sally. 1987. Towards a transitive prototype: Evidence from some atypical English passives. Proceedings of Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 13: 422-434.

Number 15

# Occasional Papers On Linguistics

Proceedings of the 1990 Hokan-Penutian Languages  
Workshop, Held at the University of California,  
San Diego, June 22-23, 1990.



Department of Linguistics  
Southern Illinois University  
at Carbondale

OCCASIONAL PAPERS ON LINGUISTICS

Number 15

Papers from the  
1990 Hokan-Penutian Languages Workshop

Held at

University of California, San Diego

June 22-23, 1990

Department of Linguistics  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, Illinois

Library of Congress Catalog Number  
90-085532

## PREFACE

The 1990 meeting was the twentieth anniversary of the First Hokan conference, which met at the University of California, San Diego. From time to time, the conference has met with other groups such as the Penutian conference and the Uto-Aztecan conference. It now regularly meets with the Penutian conference.

The conference is again indebted to Margaret Langdon and the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, San Diego, for hosting the conference. Our thanks are also due to the various graduate students who took care of the numerous details such as supplying the endless coffee.

The papers in this volume appear in the same order as they did on the program at the conference. Unfortunately, a few of the presenters were not able to send in a paper for publication. All of the papers in the volume except the last one were presented at the 1990 meeting.

In 1983, 1984, and 1985, very few of the presenters sent in their papers for publication. In 1986, a few papers from each of these years were assembled into a single volume. Werner Winter sent his 1983 paper in so early that the editor lost it in the files, and Winter's paper was omitted from the 1986 volume. It is now egg-on-the-face time for the editor. Winter's paper is included in this volume as the last paper. *Mea culpa.*

Arrangements have been made with Coyote Press, P.O.B. 3377, Salinas, CA 93912, 408-422-4912, to reprint the various Hokan and Hokan-Penutian conference volumes. Dr. Gary S. Breschini of Coyote Press has told me that he will try to keep all the volumes in print. I have just sent him part of the original manuscripts and will be sending him the rest of the manuscripts very shortly. Only a very few of the original publications are still available. Please see the list at the end of the volume for details on the few remaining original volumes. I do not know how long it will be until Coyote Press will begin issuing reprints of the backissues.

James E. Redden

Carbondale, December 1990

Historical Note: The proceedings of the First Hokan conference were edited by Margaret Langdon and published by Mouton. I have edited all the other volumes of proceedings except those of 1988 and 1989, when I was in Africa. The 1988 and 1989 volumes of proceedings were edited by Scott Delancey in the series published by the Department of Linguistics at the University of Oregon. Please do not request these two volumes from me. Please address orders for the 1988 and 1989 volumes to: Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403. I hope that Scott will be willing to publish the Hokan-Penutian volumes regularly, when I retire in a few years.

JER

CONTENTS

Nominalization in Jamul Diegueño Richard Epstein	1
Lenition in Jamul Diegueño Michel Achard	11
Some Differences between Two Speakers of Jamul Diegueño Amy Miller	23
The Use of Auxiliary Verbs in Jamul Diegueño Kim Kellogg	32
The Perfective-Imperfective Opposition in Kishaya Robert L. Oswalt	43
Suffixal Aspect and Tense-Aspect in Northern Pomo Mary Catherine O'Connor	52
The Role of Lexicalization in Shaping Aspectual Systems: Central Pomo Marianne Mithun	62
Glottalized and Aspirated Sonorants in Kashaya Eugene Buckley	75
Kashaya Swith Reference David Gamon	92
Agentivity and the Animacy Hierarchy in Kashaya Kira Hall	118
Patterns of the Generic and Particular in Wintu Narrative Texts Suzanne Wash	136
Vowel Length and Pitch in Yavapai Kimberly D. Thomas and Alan Shaterian	144
Aspiration in Tolkapaya Yavapai Pamela Munro	154
Noun Incorporation in the Yuman Languages: The Relationship between <i>wa-</i> and <i>ya-</i> Joshua T. Katz	163
Walapai Kinship Terminology James E. Redden	178
Diegueño: How Many Languages? Margaret Langdon	184
Non-Walapai Words in Walapai Werner Winter	191
Publication Notice	198