

# Rumsen Grammatical Anomaly and Linguistic Prehistory

David Leedom Shaul

Department of Anthropology, The University of Wyoming

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Noun Inflection in Rumsen
- 3.0 Adpositions in Rumsen
- 4.0 Verb Inflection in Rumsen
- 5.0 Towards a Linguistic Prehistory of Rumsen

## 1.0 Introduction

Internal classification of the Costanoan/Ohlonean subfamily of the Utian language family has been based on sound change and similarity of vocabulary. This paper shows how a classification based on grammatical data radically changes the existing internal classification of Costanoan/Ohlonean, and calls into question the assumption of mutual intelligibility in the dialect chain into which most of the Costanoan/Ohlonean (hereafter, Costanoan) varieties are placed.

Beeler (1961) split Costanoan into Karkin (around the Carquinez Straits in the northern San Francisco Bay) and all other varieties, which he then bifurcated into Northern and Southern Costanoan subfamilies. Later research (Levy 1976; Okrand 1989; Callaghan 1997; Blevins and Golla 2005) considered non-Karkin Costanoan to be a dialect chain, with the southern geographic varieties (Mutsun, around San Juan Bautista; Rumsen in the Monterey area; Chalon, centered around Mission Soledad) being more diverse and probably not mutually intelligible.

On the basis of sound change (Levy 1976), there is a division between Northern and Southern. Proto-Costanoan /\*č/ remained /č/ in Northern Costanoan, while changing to /y/ in Southern Costanoan languages; Levy 1976). For example, \**pačan* 'blood' becomes /*payan*/ in Chalon and other Northern languages, while remaining /*pačan*/ in Monterey Costanoan and Mutsun, despite the fact that Chalon is the most southern of the Costanoan varieties geographically.

Grammatical features present a different picture. Chalon differs in several important features of grammar from both Northern and Southern, for example the use of the third person marker *i-* on nouns and verbs, and the use of the determiner *ik* before both nouns and verbs), despite sharing many lexical similarities to its neighbors Mutsun and Rumsen.

This paper reintroduces data (already presented in Kroeber 1904) to show that Rumsen differs in several striking ways from all other Costanoan varieties. The grammatical anomalies of Rumsen not only have consequences for the internal

classification of Costanoan, but also have implications for Costanoan (and Utian) prehistory.

The Rumsen language was spoken in the Monterey Peninsula by tribelets of the Costanoan or Ohlone group of languages, which form one half of the Utian language family. The other half of this family is made up of the various Miwok languages.

The language is mostly known from the salvage linguistics of Henshaw (1955), Kroeber (1904, 1910), and Pinart (1952). Most of this was undoubtedly re-elicited by J. P. Harrington in his work with Isabella Meadows, the last fluent speaker. Glimpses of this work are reported in Okrand (1979a, 1979b) and Shipley (1980). Most of Harrington's and Meadows' work, however, has not been made available so for the present purposes I rely on the original records, plus a catechism text (transcription in Cutter 1990). I rely upon my own transcription of the Rumsen catechism text, as well as a companion text in Chalon, the Ohlone variety of the Soledad Mission region (Shaul 2008a). A good overview of the documentary sources and their treatments is in Kelsey (1979) and Blevins and Golla (2005).

Rumsen is not an inflected language (like Indo-European), and the other Costanoan (and Utian) languages. The lack of inflectional morphemes on the noun and verb suggests something about the prehistory of Rumsen, and this is talked about in the last section.

The segmental phonology of Rumsen is not a problem for philological linguistics. The approximate values of letters used in the phonetic transcription are as follow: the vowels have their value in Spanish or Italian; the consonants are as in English, except for /š/ (sh in the English word ship), /č/ (ch in chip), and /' (the catch in English *uh-oh*). Also note that /t/ in Costanoan is dental (made by touching the tip of the tongue against the upper teeth), and that /t/ is alveolar (pronounced, like the English /t/, by putting the tip of the tongue against the ridge above the upper teeth). Vowels may be long, as may medial consonants. Most of the documents record consonant length, and some vowel length. Segmental length is not relevant to the present analysis, however.

The prosodic phonology (Shipley 1980) is complex, but mostly not a problem for philological linguistics. There are three different kinds of stems in Rumsen:

- CVC:V(C) (disyllabic root with medial consonant gemination):
- CV:CV(C) (disyllabic root with long first vowel);
- CVCCV (disyllabic root with metathesis of second vowel and final consonant).

These different root/stem shapes take different derivational suffixes, and so to restore length in the first two kinds of shapes is entirely possible. The prosodic shapes are not relevant to the present analysis.

I transcribe data from Henshaw, Kroeber, and Pinart into the phonetic scheme outlined above. For older documents (the Rumsen and Chalon catechisms), I first cite the

original spelling which is then followed by my transcription and an interlinear gloss. Because the catechism texts in Rumsen and Chalon require comment and the use of cognates to establish the meanings of morphemes, there are many footnotes in this document whose main purpose is to provide the details of etymologies.

The abbreviations used in the word-by-word glosses are as follows: ATT, attributive; COM comitative; DEM, demonstrative; DET determiner; F future tense; LOC locative; NOM nominalizer; OBJ objective case; PL plural; PST, past tense; R, reflexive; Q question marker; R reflexive; REL relative clause marker; SUF suffix. The use of numerals in the glossing indicates person of subject: 1s first person singular ('I'); 2s second person singular ('thou'); 3s third person singular ('s/he, it'); 1pl first person plural ('we'); 2pl second person plural ('you'); 3pl third person plural ('they').

## 2.0 Noun Inflection in Rumsen

Nouns in Rumsen are not typical of the Utian language family. They do not have syntactic cases, as noted very early on by Kroeber (1904:74). There is only one, possibly two productive secondary cases left of the noun paradigm so typical of this family.

### 2.1 Accusatives in Rumsen and Ohlone Languages

In his section on the noun, Kroeber (1904:74) notes that "syntactical cases are wanting." An objective or accusative case marker on the noun, as in other Ohlone (and Utian) languages, is absent. Kroeber gives the following example sentences, and there are others in Henshaw and Pinart data.

néku	waš	ok	táččikimáčan
then	him	sent	Coyote

'then Coyote sent him' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:256)

was	xís	ínix	tí'ius
for.her	made	road	flower(s)

'for her (he) made a road of flowers' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:256)

ka	priki	wíyuš
I	seized	sand

'I seized some sand' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:257)

néku	me	xís	téwwin
then/now	you	make	acorn.mush

	isku	me	amxai	mutut
	so.that	you	eat	may

'now you will make acorn mush so that you may eat' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:257)

ku	ka	yúsen	ša	í:nix
----	----	-------	----	-------

not I like DET road  
 'I don't like this road' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:80)

In Rumsen, the pronouns mark the difference between core cases (*ka*, 'I/my' vs. *kaš*, 'me'), but there is no productive nuclear case marking on nouns.

In Chalon, as is typical of an Ohlone language, there is case marking on nouns.

Chalon Doctrina, [11a]

<i>R. Maquis</i>	<i>iq</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>acampe,</i>	<i>mac</i>	<i>egg-se,</i>
makis	ik	akampe	mak	ek-se
us	DET	[take.away/deliver.of]	our	bad-OBJ

<i>maquis</i>	<i>guatimpe</i>	<i>taractica,</i>
makis	watimpe	tarak-tika
us	bring	sky-LOC

<i>nepesum</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>Iinis</i>	<i>asuepis</i>	<i>Mue.</i>
nepesum	dios	i-inis	asue-pi-s	muwe
that/s why/because	god	3-son	do-R-PST	man

'(In order to) deliver us of our sin, to bring us to Heaven, that's why God the Son became human.'

Chalon Doctrina, [16a]

<i>R. Taractica</i>	<i>Aiues</i>	<i>Diose,</i>	<i>itsasun</i>	<i>elejsun,</i> <sup>2</sup>
tarak-tika	ayuwe-s	dios-e	itsasun	elexsun
sky-LOC	[be.with]-	god-OBJ	then	[go]
	F			

<i>laitspire,</i>	<i>uzegne</i>	<i>aia,</i>
laits-pire	usekne	a-ya
tall-earth	forever	be-PL

<i>azuez</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>ijousome.</i>
asue-s	dios	i-howsom-e
do-PST	god	3-order(s)-OBJ

<sup>1</sup> This is the determiner /ik/ which is found throughout the document. It seems to be unique in to Chalon. It may appear before a noun or verb. In front of a verb, it may signal that there is a direct object. Its use before a noun perhaps makes the reference more definite. On the other hand, its distribution would make sense as an intensifier ('very'). Mason in his review of the Arroyo de la Cuesta material on Mutsun checked some of his reconstituted forms with a 100 word vocabulary he got from an elderly Costanoan speaker who had been born at San Lorenzo. In one of his sentences, this determiner also appears: San Lorenzo /ká:na ek ními oris/ 'I am going to kill (the) bear' (/ká:na/, 'I'; /ek/, determiner; /ními/, 'kill'; /oris/, 'bear').

<sup>2</sup> The glossing of this word is based on a Mutsun form from Mason (1916:420): /ele-/ 'one goes' vs. /else-/ 'many go'. Mason notes four plural verbs made by inserting the infix /-s-/ into the singular form of the verb. The Act of Contrition in Chalon uses this word for a singular subject.

'To/in Heaven to be with God forever, they then go, they (who) did the orders/will of God.'

This accusative marker is similar to that of Mutsun, the Ohlone variety associated with San Juan Bautista Mission. Mutsun (Okrand 1977:144-151) has zero marking for subjective case, and *-(s)e* for objective case. Blevins and Golla (2005) present the transcription and interpretation of a catechism (and related short texts) in a variety of a northern Ohlone variety close to the Chochenyo language of Mission San Jose; the objective case marker *-e* appears on nouns where one would expect an accusative marker.

## 2.2 Secondary Case Marking in Rumsen

The accusative case marker was part of a whole paradigm of Ohlone/Utian noun inflection, including possessive, locative, instrumental, ablative, and comitative cases. Of these, only the locative and instrumental cases appear in any frequency in the data. The locative case is by far the most frequent.

The Rumsen locative case marker had two allomorphs: *-ta(k)* after nouns ending in a consonant, and *-(a)tk* after nouns ending in a vowel.

tarrax-ta	'in heaven' (Rumsen; Doctrina)
wačos-ta	'in the river' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:79)
pitín-ta	'in the belly' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:79)
kaw-tak	'to the beach' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:257)
sama-tk Dios	'at the right (side/hand) (of) God' (Rumsen; Doctrina)
turra-kt	'on earth' (Rumsen; Doctrina)

There is a locative case in Chalon that follows the allophonic pattern of Rumsen: *-tika* after consonants, *-tka* after vowels (the Chalon Doctrina gives: *tarak-tika*, 'in heaven' and *šurisma-tka*, 'in (the) woman'). In Mutsun, the locative case is *-tak* alternating with *-tka* (Okrand 1977:152), with the same distribution of allomorphs as in Rumsen; the same situation is found in the texts of the northern variety of Ohlone close to Chochenyo reported in Blevins and Golla (2005).

There is a rare locative suffix *-nia* that appears frozen on an indefinite in Rumsen; it was not noted by Kroeber in his treatment of Rumsen grammar (1904:75).

Rumsen Doctrina, [12]

<i>P. Annia</i>	<i>utjimocosim</i>	<i>muquianc</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>Ynis?</i>
an-nia	utxi-mocosim	mukiank	dios	inis
where-LOC	more-become	man	god	son
Donde se hizo hombre el hijo de Dios? [Where did the Son of God become human?]				

This suffix is rare in the Rumsen data.

Kroeber (1904:75) noted an instrumental case which is rare in the data, *-um*. It is not common in the data.

isko	me	mút	téwwin-um
so.that	you	may	acorn.mush-INSTR

'so that you may (eat/survive) by means of acorn mush' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:257)

This suffix has cognates in other Ohlone languages: *-(s)um* in Mutsun (Okrand 1977:152) and *-um* in the variety reported in Blevins and Golla (2005).

In summary, Rumsen has only two of the secondary cases (locative, instrumental) that one expects in an Ohlone language. The others have not only locative and instrumental cases, but also: ablative, genitive, and vocative (in addition to subjective and objective). Elaborate case inflections of six to eight basic cases are typical of Utian languages (Ohlone/Costanoan, Miwokan); a good discussion for Mutsun -- but typical of all Utian noun inflections is found in Okrand (1977:144-162). Rumsen is the sole exception to this inflectional grammatical design.

### 2.3 Plural Marking of Nominals in Rumsen

Kroeber (1904:74) noted that there was no plural marking in Rumsen.

No plural is found. In view of the fact that San Juan Bautista, a not very different dialect, has a plural both in nouns and verbs, it is not impossible that Rumsien also possesses a plural but that defective material was obtained on this point.

Kroeber need not kick himself too hard: the catechism text has only one noun marked for plural. Apparently, this usage is rare because Shipley (1980) lists no plural marker among the affixes of Rumsen culled from the Harrington-Meadows Rumsen documentation.

Rumsen Doctrina, [13a]			
<i>R. Escomaques</i>	<i>gichigues</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>sirremaque</i>	<i>quechens</i> <sup>4</sup>
esko-makes	xičiwe-s	sirre-make	kečens
in.order.to-us	[cleanse]-IRR	soul-PL	[sin(s)]
'in order to cleanse souls of sin(s)'			

<sup>3</sup> The root /xičiwe/ has to mean 'cleanse' given the context; in addition, there is a Mutsun cognate 'cleanse' with two shapes: /xiti/ and /xitwi/, both of which mean 'cleanse one's self'. The suffix /-s/ is presumably a future/irrealis suffix cognate to Chalon /-s/, as a future tense marker.

<sup>4</sup> Is this an objective case marker /-s/ (with cognates in other Costanoan varieties) or the absolutive marker for nouns such as appears on the Rumsen word for 'day'?

In Rumsen, most plural arguments are marked by quantifiers, the plural marker *-ya* on verbs, and/or by plural pronouns.

exe	po:r	xuya	ka	ruk
many	flea(s)	PREP	my	house

'(there are) many fleas in my house' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:75)

Rumsen Doctrina, [2a]

<i>R. Tarras</i>	<i>Turract</i>	<i>in</i> <sup>5</sup>	<i>mei.</i>
tarrax	turra-kt	in	mei
sky	earth-LOC	all	thing(s)

En el Cielo, en la tierra, y en todas las cosas. [In Heaven, on the earth, and in all things.]

Rumsen Doctrina, from [5a]

<i>capas</i>	<i>personas</i>	<i>sinaia</i> <sup>6</sup>
kapes	personas	sina-ya
three	persons	[distinct]-PL

'they are three distinct persons'

Rumsen Doctrina, [9]

<i>P. Nesina</i>	<i>capas</i>	<i>Personas</i>	<i>mocapas</i>	<i>Dios?</i>
nesina	kapes	personas	mo-kapes	dios
this	three	persons	Q-three	god

Son tres Dioses estas tres personas? [Are these three persons three gods?]

Rumsen Doctrina, [9a]

<i>R. Cuhue</i>	<i>Capas</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>nesinac</i>	<i>Personas,</i>
kuwe	kapes	dios	nesina-k	personas
not	three	god	this-PL	persons

<i>utieia</i>	<i>huacaia[,]</i>	<i>imjala</i>	<i>ajlust</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>yachaa.</i>
uti-e-ya	wakaya	imhala	ahlu-st	dios	yača'a
3pl-be-PL	3pl	one	only-ATT	god	truly

No son tres Dioses estas tres personas, un mysmo sèr tienen estas tres personas, por esto no tres Dioses sino un solo Dios verdadero. [These three persons are not three gods, they are a single being, and so there are not three gods but only one true God.]

In Chalon, there is a productive plural marker on nouns which is similar to those of other Ohlone varieties (*-mak*).

<sup>5</sup> The quantifier /in/ 'all' has cognates in other Coastanoan varieties; this leaves /mei/ to mean 'thing(s)', as Monterey Costanoan usually does not mark the category of plural.

<sup>6</sup> The element /sina/ is perhaps related to the same sequence in /nesina/ 'this' (/ne/ appears in Monterey Costanoan as 'this' by itself). The plural marker /-ya/ appears in the Chalon text analyzed above.

Chalon Doctrina, [8]

<i>P. Ampits</i>	<i>aia</i>	<i>capam</i>	<i>Personasmac</i>	<i>iazuepis</i>	<i>Mue?</i>
ampi-ts	a-ya	kappam	personas-mak	i-asue-pi-s <sup>7</sup>	muwe
who-Q	be-3pl	three	persons-PL	3-do-R-PST	man

'Who (of) those (who) are the three Persons became a man?'

In Mutsun, the productive plural marker for nouns is *-mak* alternating with *-kma* (Okrand 1977:135). In the northern variety of Ohlone reported by Blevins and Golla (2005), the allomorph *-kma* is attested.

In sum, Rumsen nouns rarely show the plural marker that is common and productive in other Ohlone varieties, in agreement with its general lack of inflectional morphology on nouns. We now turn to a topic that stands in complete contrast to Utian grammatical design: a productive preposition in Rumsen.

### 3.0 Adpositions in Rumsen

Kroeber (1904:75) noted a preposition in Rumsen. His data follows.

neku	xop	xuya	čipil
then/now	arose	PREP	hill

'then (it) rose to the hill' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:75)

wasyilum	xuya	wa	koro
approach	PREP	his	foot/feet

'(he) approached his feet' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:75)

exe	po:r	xuya	ka	ruk
many	flea(s)	PREP	my	house

'(there are) many fleas in my house' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:75)

ott	xuya	me	eten
go	PREP	your	uncle

'go with your uncle' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:75)

The preposition /xuya/ is also common in the Rumsen catechism. I give a single illustration.

Rumsen Doctrina, [12a]

<i>R. Juyai</i> <sup>8</sup>	<i>pitita</i>	<i>tauna</i> <sup>9</sup>	<i>la</i>	<i>chiamc</i>	<i>S.ta Maria</i>
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------	---------------	-------------------

<sup>7</sup> The verb stem /asue-/ means 'do/make' and with the addition of the reflexive suffix /-pi/ means 'become'. A parallel is noted by Okrand for Mutsun (1977:225) with Mutsun /hišše/ 'do/make/' being the base for /hiššen/ 'become'.

<sup>9</sup> The root /tawna/ which must mean 'called' in this context, must be related to the element /tan-/ in /tan-kurrake/ 'whom we call' in (10a).

xuya	i-	piti[n]-ta	tawna	lačiamk	santa malia
PREP	3s	stomach-LOC	[called]	woman	holy.Mary

<i>huacaya</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>gisie</i>	<i>simp</i>	<i>Espiritu S.to</i>
wakaya	sa	xiše	simp	espiritu santo
3	DET	make	[by/by.means.of]	holy.spirit

<i>roteinia</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>impayomb</i>	<i>yachaa</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>amp.</i> <sup>10</sup>
rotei-nia	i	impayomp	yača'a	dios	amp
exist-LOC	3-	[virgin]	truly	god	[because.of]

En el vientre de una Muger llamada S.ta Maria, por obra del Espiritu santo. La muger St.a Maria siempre fue virgen antes del parto, en le parto, y despues del parto. [In the stomach of a woman called Saint Mary, by the work of the Holy Spirit. Saint Mary was a virgin before the birth, during the birth and after the birth.]

In this sentence, not only does the preposition /xuya/ appear, but also the suffix *-nia* on a verb ('exist there') and a suffix *-Vmp*, 'because of'. This latter suffix appears on a postposition (the vowel is from the demonstrative stems *si* and *sa* (metathesized as *as*) producing the forms *simp* and *amp*. These postpositions are probably not related to the instrumental case marker (*-um* alternating with *-yum*), but with the causative suffix in Rumsen *-mp* identified by Shipley (1980).

Chalon displays no prepositions, nor does Mutsun (Okrand 1977), nor does the variety of northern Ohlone reported in Blevins and Golla (2005). It stands out from the rest of Utian languages in this respect. It is also unusual in the world's languages in having only one preposition; this situation is usually found in pidgin and creole languages that developed from pidgins.

#### 4.0 Verb Inflection in Rumsen

In this section I will look at future tense and past tense in Rumsen, and compare them to the Ohlone varieties for which there is comparable data.

##### 3.1 Past Tense in Rumsen

Kroeber (1904:72) notes that there are two ways of marking past tense in Rumsen. One is to use the suffix *-(a)ki* on verbs, and the other is placing the particle *ara* in front of a personal pronoun used as a subject.

ka	rič-aki
I	speak-PST
'I spoke' (Rumsen; Kroeber, 1904:72)	

<sup>10</sup> This postposition or particle, along with /simp/ (with a similar meaning) must have the suffix /-mp/ 'causative' (Shipley 1980:240).

ara	makam	urs-eki
later	you (pl.)	learn-PST

'you (all) have learned' (Rumsen; Kroeber, 1904:72)

In the Kroeber texts and the Rumsen catechism, both of these ways of marking past tense are rare. Instead, time adverbials are used. This is shown in the part of the Rumsen catechism where the resurrection is described, which has a series of verbs in the past tense.

Rumsen Doctrina, [14a]

<i>R. Huisato</i> <sup>11</sup>	<i>tisimp</i>	<i>huacainc</i>	<i>ihasing</i>	<i>Poncio</i>	<i>Pilato,</i>
wisato	tisimp	wakay-nk	i-hasim	ponsiyo	pilato
past.time	[suffer]	3s-[and]	3-[order]	P.	P.

<i>cusa</i> <sup>12</sup>	<i>pajan</i>	<i>juya</i>	<i>S.ta Cruz</i>
kusa	paxan	huya	santa krus
in.the.past	[die]	PREP	holy.cross

<i>lacust</i>	<i>pirastuchap</i> <sup>13</sup>	<i>piquini</i>	<i>huinumb</i> <sup>14</sup>
laku-st	pira-st-učap	pikini	winump
die-ATT	bury-ATT-[having]	[descend]	under/below

<i>capes</i>	<i>tuujs</i> <sup>15</sup>	<i>pusep</i>	<i>simp-jop</i>	
kapes	tu:xs	pusep	simp	xop
three	days	[revive]	by.means.of	arise <sup>16</sup>

<i>pequini</i>	<i>tarrajat</i>	<i>pinaisi</i> <sup>17</sup>
pekini	tarr[a]x-at	pinaisi
[ascend]	sky-LOC	[so]

<i>juya</i>	<i>tarar</i>	<i>samatc</i>	<i>Dios</i>	<i>Apa-ninmu</i>
huya	tarar	sama-tk	dios	apa
there	sit	right-LOC	god	father

	<i>a</i>	<i>tumam</i>
	ninmu	tumam
	REL	able <sup>18</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Compare Mutsun /wisi-/ 'past time' (Mason 1916).

<sup>12</sup> Compare Mutsun /kus/ 'in olden times' (Mason 1916).

<sup>13</sup> Compare Mutsun /pira/ 'bury' (Mason 1916).

<sup>14</sup> Compare Mutsun /winimwi/ 'below/under' (Mason 1916).

<sup>15</sup> The /-s/ on 'day' is a sort of absolutive (Orand 1979b:183) and looks like the suffix that marks objective case in other Costanoan varieties (Mutsun, Chalon, Cochenyo).

<sup>16</sup> The meaning of this verb is given in Kroeber (1904:75).

<sup>17</sup> Compare Mutsun /pina/ '2. hence 1. this/here', (Mason 1916).

<sup>18</sup> Kroeber (1904:72) gives a Rumsen word for 'be able', /tuman/.

Padecio por mandato de Poncio Pilato, lo crucificaron, lo mataron, y lo enterraron. Baxí a los Ynfernos. Tres dias estubo. Resucitó, subió a los Cielos sentado a la diestra de Dios, padre todo poderoso o q[ue] lo puede. [He suffered under the order of Pontius Pilate, they crucified him, killed him, and buried him. He descended into Hell. He was there for three days. He revived, ascended into the Heavens, seated at the right of God, the almighty Father, or (the Father) who is capable of everything.]

In this passage, there is no overt marking on the verbs; the only marking of past time is with adverbs. This extract may be compared to equivalent one in the Chalon catechism.

Chalon Doctrina, [12a]

<i>R. Anapis,</i> <sup>19</sup>	<i>iousostipa</i> <sup>20</sup>	<i>Poncio</i>	<i>Pilato</i>
ana-pi-s	i-howsos-tipa	ponsiyo	pilato
suffer-R-PST	3-ordered-having	P.	P.
<i>guatins</i>	<i>pacstipa</i> <sup>21</sup>	<i>uaca</i>	<i>Jesu</i>
watin-s	paksas-tipa	waka	yesu
go-PST	visit-having.done	3s	J.
<i>ligstipa</i>	<i>Santa Cruztica</i>	<i>ia,</i>	<i>Christo,</i>
liks-tipa	santa krus-tika	i[y]a	kristo
[die]-PST	holy.cross-LOC	also	C.
<i>makis</i>	<i>guatimpe</i>	<i>taractica</i>	<i>tunemen,</i> <sup>22</sup>
makis	watimpe	tarak-tika	tunemen
us	bring	sky-LOC	[so.that]
<i>ig</i>	<i>capasnate</i>	<i>tugii,</i>	
ik	kapasan-te <sup>23</sup>	tuhi-'i	
DET	three-S	day-from/after	
<i>chichiris</i>	<i>uaca</i>	<i>Jesu</i>	<i>Christo,</i>
		<i>ubas</i>	<i>Taractica,</i>

<sup>19</sup> Mason (1916:441) lists Mutsun /ana/-pu/ 'hurt' which must be a cognate to this word. The Mutsun form has the suffix /-pu/ 'reflexive' just as the Chalon word does (/pi/ is the form of the reflexive suffix in Chalon). Mason also gives /anapu/ 'be injured'.

<sup>20</sup> Compare Mutsun /howso-ksi/ 'to command'. The suffix /-tipa/ in Chalon means 'having done'. Blevins and Golla (2005:47) note a suffix /-tup/ 'having verbed' which must be related to the Chalon ending; they cite Mutsun /tupun/ 'finish/complete' and Rumsen /tup-/ as the source for this suffix.

<sup>21</sup> This verb could be related to Mutsun /paski-/ alternating with /pasik-pu-/ 'visit'. Metathesis of medial consonants is common as a derivational device in Costanoan verbs. The line would mean something like 'having gone to visit' but the only implied object of his visitation in this context would be the underworld.

<sup>22</sup> A plausible etymology of this word is /tune/ 'finish/complete' plus /-men/, a form of the nominalizing suffix added to verbs, to yield the meaning 'that done thing' which could have been semantically extended to 'so that'. The root identification is from Mutsun /tune-/ 'finish' (Mason 1916:458).

<sup>23</sup> Orand (1977) notes a noun suffix /-te/ in Mutsun that makes the noun into a verb. The line here means 'for the duration of three days' or 'it being three days'.

čičiri-s [revive]-PST	waka 3s	yesu J.	kristo C.	upa-s ascend-PST	tarak-tika sky-LOC	
<i>nua</i> nuwa [then]	<i>ig</i> ik DET	<i>taura,</i> ṭawra sit	<i>samaca</i> sama-ka right-at	<i>Dios</i> dios god	<i>Apaca,</i> apa-ka father-at	
<i>itsas</i> itsas then	<i>ocomi-s</i> <sup>24</sup> okomi-s [return]-F	<i>nujuna</i> nuhuna there	<i>tum</i> tum from (cf. Mut. -tum]	<i>iguaniti</i> <sup>25</sup> i-waniti 3-		
<i>uaca</i> waka 3s	<i>Jesu</i> yesu J.	<i>Christo,</i> kristo C.	<i>ig</i> ik DET	<i>ara</i> <sup>26</sup> ara later	<i>misis</i> misis good	<i>taractica</i> tarak-tika sky-LOC
<i>guatimpe</i> watimpe bring	<i>pirei</i> pire-i earth-from	<i>Eguismen.</i> ew-ismen living-NOM				

'He suffered, Pontius Pilate having so ordered, and Jesus Christ went to visit [the underworld], (and), having died on the Holy Cross to bring us to Heaven; after three days, Jesus Christ revived, ascended to Heaven to sit at the right of God the Father, (and) from there Jesus Christ (will) later [return] from Heaven to bring people [the living?] from the earth.'

In the Chalon passage, most of the verbs (those not having a conjunctive ending) have the past tense marker *-s*.

In Mutsun, zero marking on a verb is either present or future reference (non-past), and there are two past tenses: *-n* 'recent past' and *-s* 'remote past' (Okrand 1977:262-279). In the northern Ohlone variety described by Blevins and Golla (2005), there is zero marking on verb for present tense, and *-se* for past tense. In both Mutsun and the Ohlone variety described by Blevins and Golla, marking of past tense on the verb is productive, In Rumsen and Chalon, there is no productive marking of past tense.

## 4.2 Future Marking in Rumsen

Kroeber (1904:72) noted that in Rumsen, a future tense could be marked with the particle *ku* placed after a subject personal pronoun and before the verb.

<sup>24</sup> The Costanoan variety of the text redacted by Blevins and Golla (2005) has a future tense in /-sin/ and a past tense in /-se/. In the Chalon of this document, through final vowel loss, both suffixes appear as /-s/. To make matters even more confusing, the objective case marker /-se/ may appear in Chalon as /-s/.

<sup>25</sup> This verb must be related to /watin[i]/ 'go' and its derivative /watimpe/ 'bring', possibly with the metathesis of medial consonants typical of Costanoan verb derivation.

<sup>26</sup> The Mutsun cognate is /aru/ 'ater/afterwards' (Orand 1977:304), with the addition that Mrs. Cervantes gave the form /ara/ as an older form of the word.

ka            ku            rič  
 I            will            speak  
 'I will speak' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1904:72)

This pattern is found in the following passage, which describes the resurrection from the point of view of first person plural. The usage is in bold for easy identification.

Rumsen Doctrina, [17a]

<b>R. Cuve</b> [,]	<i>incat</i>	<i>tanayi</i> <sup>27</sup>		<i>yitujs</i>
kuwe	inkat	tanayi		yi-tu[:]xs
no	[because]	[judgment/pay.back]		3-day
<i>imach</i> <sup>28</sup>	<i>catuque</i> <sup>29</sup>	<i>pirre</i> ,		
imač	katu-ke	pirre		
[if/when]	[verb]-PST	earth		
<b><i>cusa-cu</i></b> <sup>30</sup>	<b><i>mac</i></b>	<i>muchep-mac</i>	<i>sirre</i>	<i>sturrumb</i>
<b>kuša-ku</b>	<b>mak</b>	mučep    mak	sirre	[a]s-turrump
[in.time]-F	we/our	all.of    our	soul	DET-body/bodies
<b><i>cuvemac</i></b> <sup>31</sup>	<i>tanay</i> [,]	<i>pusep</i>		
<b>kuwe-mak</b>	tanay	pusep		
F-PL	[revert]	[revive]		
<i>escomac</i>	<i>cuve</i>	<i>atap</i>	<i>lacusim.</i>	
esko-mak	kuwe	atap	lakusim	
so.that-1pl	not	[again]	die	

No por que el dia del juicio se tornaran à sus Cuerpos y asi resusiterán para nunca mas morir. [No, because on the day of judgment all of our souls return to the bodies and revive never to die again.]

This construction is clearly related to the negative marker in Rumsen (***kuwe*** alternating with ***kwe*** alternating with ***ku***). This passage in Rumsen, with its lack of future tense marking, may be compared with the parallel passage in the Chalon catechism.

Chalon Doctrina, [15a]

<sup>27</sup> Could this word be cognate with Mutsun /tana/ 'turn the table, pay back in own coin' (Mason 1916)? It would fit the semantic requirement of 'judgment day', but also in a later line connote the rejoining together of the bodies and souls of the deceased, in the sense of 'revert'. The same root is used in a sentence from Kroeber: /néku tánai wátin úmun/, 'then hummingbird came back' (Kroeber 1910:256).

<sup>28</sup> Compare Mutsun /imaten/ 'if' which marks a hypothetical, therefore irrealis, condition (one that has not yet happened). This yields the reading 'of/when' in this text.

<sup>29</sup> Kroeber (1911) notes a preterite tense in Monterey Costanoan of the shape /(a)ki/.

<sup>30</sup> The reader will note the use in Monterey Costanoan of the same suffix (/s/) for both future and past. This use of the same marker as anterior is also found in Mutsun, where the anterior marker /ara/ 'shortly, soon (near future or recent past)' can mark either a recent past OR future (Mason 1916).

<sup>31</sup> I translate this line as 'not be many [plural] [but] revert (together) [and] revive'.

<i>R. Eqûe</i>	<i>sutun</i>	<i>laitspire</i>	<i>iama</i>	<i>maquena,</i>	<i>incasin,</i>
ekwe	sutun	laits-pire	i-ama	makena	inkasin
not	die	tall-earth	3-body	just.as/only	cf. inkase, why

<i>inuai</i>	<i>igtuntine</i>		<i>pire,</i>	<i>itmeena,</i>
inuwai	ik tuntine		pire	itme'ena
when	DET [be.done/finished]		earth	

<i>iti</i> <sup>32</sup>	<i>muchez</i>	<i>inoso</i>	<i>iama,</i>	<i>aia</i>	<i>tanana</i>
iṭi	mučes	i-nosow	i-ama	a-ya	tanana
again	[all]-OBJ	3-soul	3-body	be-3pl	[together]

<i>muchemu,</i> <sup>33</sup>	<i>chichinaia,</i>
<i>muče-mu</i>	<i>čičina-ya</i>
[all]-LOC	stand-3pl

<i>ieqûe</i>	<i>ig</i>	<i>iuzca,</i>	<i>ig</i>	<i>sutun.</i>
i-ekwe	ik	i-uska	ik	sutun
3-not	DET	3-eternally	DET	die

'The person does not die, only the body (dies); when the world is finished, again all the souls and the bodies (will) be together, all of them standing (together); they do not die eternally.'

In the Chalon passage, there is no overt future tense marking on verb, as in Rumsen.

In Rumsen, then, there is no tense differences marked on verbs used with past or future reference. The following two sentences show the verb *watin*, 'go' in both future and past contexts. In the first, we see this verb used in a future context.

Rumsen Doctrina, [19]

<i>P. An</i>	<i>huatim</i>	<i>vasirre</i>	<i>nisina</i>	<i>que</i>
an	watim	wa-sirre	nisina-ke	
where	go/come	DEM-soul	this-PL	

<i>chiem</i>	<i>cai</i>	<i>imanu</i>	<i>lacum</i>	<i>vaturrumb?</i>
če-mkai		imanu	lakum	wa-turrump
bad-SUF		when	die	DEM-body

A donde van las almas delos malos Cristianos quando mueren su cuerpo? [To where will the souls of the bad Christians go when their bodies die?]

<sup>32</sup> This particle is related to Mutsun /iṭhin/ 'again' (Orand 1977:302).

<sup>33</sup> Blevins and Golla state that the suffix /-mu/ is an old Costanoan locative, which was replaced by /-tika/ (as in Chalon) and forms of it such as /-tka/ in most Costanoan varieties. It appears often in the document which Blevins and Golla edited (2005:40, 41), and appears several times in the Chalon text here. Mason notes the same suffix for Mutsun (1916:409): /-me/ 'to, into, with (comitative)'.

In a second sentence from the creation story, there is the same verb used in a past context.

néku	tánai	wátin	úmun
then/now	back	go/come	hummingbird

'then Hummingbird came back' (Rumsen; Kroeber 1910:256)

There is no difference between the forms.

In Rumsen, suffix *-s* to verbs is an irrealis marker.

Rumsen Doctrina, [13a]

<b>R. <i>Escomagues</i></b>	<i>gichigues</i> <sup>34</sup>	<i>sirremaque</i>	<i>quechens</i> <sup>35</sup>
esko-makes	xičiwe-s	sirre-make	kečen-s
in.order.to-us	[cleanse]-IRR	soul-PL	[sin(s)]-OBJ

<i>escomajes</i>	<i>vattes</i>	<i>Tarrajta.</i>
esko-maxes	watte-s	tarrax-ta
[in.order.to]-us	bring-IRR	sky-LOC

Para limpiar nuestra[s] almas de nuestros pecados y despues llevarnos al Cielo.  
[To cleanse our souls of our sins and then take us to Heaven.]

Rumsen Doctrina, [14]

<b>P. <i>Intas</i></b>	<i>mur</i> <sup>36</sup>	<i>guisi</i>	<i>turrate</i>	<i>maques</i>	<i>gichigua[,]</i>
inta-s	mur	xisi	turra-t[a]	makes	xičiwa
what-PST	[be.the.case/as]	make	earth-LOC	us	[cleanse]

<i>maques</i>	<i>huattes</i> <sup>37</sup>	<i>Tarrajta?</i>
makes	watte-s	tarrax-ta
us	bring-IRR	sky-LOC

Que hizo Iesucrito aqui en la tierra para limpiar nuestras almas y llebarnos al Cielo? [What did Jesus Christ do here on earth to cleanse our souls and take us to Heaven?]

The development of an irrealis marker from a future tense marker is not very surprising.

In both Rumsen and Chalon, marking of tense on verbs is not common. The same is true of Mutsun: there is no future tense marker (Okrand 1977:262-265). By contrast, in the northern Ohlone variety described by Blevins and Golla (2005), as with past tense marking, the future tense is marked with the suffix *-sin*. So, Rumsen is anomalous in not

<sup>34</sup> The root /xičiwe/ has to mean 'cleanse' given the context; in addition, there is a Mutsun cognate 'cleanse' with two shapes: /xiti/ and /xitwi/, both of which mean 'cleanse one's self'. The suffix /-s/ is presumably a future/irrealis suffix cognate to Chalon /-s/, as a future tense marker.

<sup>35</sup> Is this an objective case marker /-s/ (with cognates in other Costanoan varieties) or the absolutive marker for nouns such as appears on the Monterey Costanoan word for 'day'?

<sup>36</sup> This reading works in all of the contexts where this partial appears in the document (14, 15, 15a, 19a).

<sup>37</sup> The future marker /-s/ also functions as an irrealis marker.

marking past tense, though the lack of any overt marking of inflections on verbs fits the language's pattern with respect to nouns.

## 5.0 Towards a Linguistic Prehistory of Rumsen

To summarize, Rumsen departs from the grammatical design of most Utian languages in the following respects:

- no nuclear (subjective vs. objective) case marking on nouns;
- reduction of secondary cases to two productive categories (locative, instrumental);
- lack of productive plural marking on nouns;
- use of a single preposition;
- lack of tense inflections on verbs;
- marking of tense by means of particles used with personal pronouns.

Rumsen, grammatically, is not a typical Ohlone or Utian language. We will return to this, but first need to outline the historical phonology of Ohlonean languages, to gauge the initial development of Rumsen.

Ohlone/Costanoan internal classification by sound change is summarized by Levy (1976:17-18)). The Karkin language, once spoken along the Carquinez Strait the separates San Pablo Bay from the Sacramento River (north of Oakland and Berkeley), is distinguished from all other Ohlone varieties by retention of Proto-Costanoan \*/o/; all other varieties have /u/:

PC *oṭxin, 'two'	-->	oṭxin (Karkin)
		uṭxin (Chochenyo, Mutsun)
		uṭxi (Chalon)
		uṭis (Rumsen).

Compare this with Proto-Miwokan \*oṭi- (as reconstructed by Levy).

Phonologically, two sound changes divide the other Ohlone varieties into two groups, Northern and Southern. Proto-Costanoan \*/č/ and \*/y/ remained in the Southern varieties (Mutsun, Rumsen) but merged in the Northern varieties (all the others, minus Karkin). In the following cognate set, the Northern varieties are represented by Chochenyo and Chalon.

PC *pačan, 'blood'	-->	payan (Chochenyo, Chalon)
		pačan (Mutsun)
		pačan (Rumsen)

Note that phonologically, Chalon patterns as Northern, despite its southern location (it is in fact the southern most of the Ohlone varieties).

The second sound change is Proto-Costanoan \*/kw/ and \*/w/ merge in Northern, while Proto-Costanoan \*/kw/ and \*/k/ merge in Southern.

PC \*rukwa, 'house' --> ruwa (Chochenyo, Chalon)  
 ruka (Mutsun)  
 ruk (Rumsen)

These two sound changes group Mutsun and Rumsen together. Both are located in the southern part of Ohlone territory held in historic times.

Yet the grammatical differences noted above set Rumsen apart from any of the other Ohlone/Costanoan (and Utian) languages. How could this be? If anything, from the phonological evidence, we would expect that Rumsen would be most like Mutsun in its grammatical system.

The first explanation is that the Rumsen described by Henshaw, Pinart, and Kroeber (collected from around 1880 to 1900) was changed by contact with Spanish and/or English, with the possibility of simplification that may appear when a language is imperfectly learned during the process of language death. This idea is incorrect, because the Rumsen Doctrina text (collected in 1792, but reflecting work done before that time), shows exactly the same grammatical situation as the materials collected about a hundred years later. Indeed, the usefulness of Kroeber's description of Rumsen (1904, 1910) is to be noted, as no other treatment of the language is available.

One other possible explanation is the **age-area** hypothesis, which holds that the area of distribution of a language family or subfamily with the most linguistic diversity is the area that was settled first and occupied by speakers of that (sub)family the longest. Given that the historic Rumsen speech community was bottled up in the Monterey Peninsula, this is an attractive idea.

Another possible explanation is that Rumsen was influenced by surrounding languages as part of a **linguistic area**. This assumes that through bilingualism or multilingualism, Rumsen borrowed grammatical traits (and possibly words and/or phonemes as well) from neighboring languages. The only three languages to historically border the Rumsen speech community were Awaswas (Santa Cruz Costanoan/Ohlone), Mutsun and Esselen. Awaswas and Mutsun both differ from Rumsen on the basis of the grammatical features that distinguish Rumsen from other Ohlone/Costanoan (and Utian) languages. The other language, Esselen, is a linguistic **isolate** with no known related languages. Shaul (1995) describes the sources, single text, and grammar of the Esselen language. It is therefore possible to compare the grammatical characteristics of Rumsen listed above with Esselen.

<b>Rumsen Traits</b>	<b>Present in Esselen?</b>
no nuclear case markers on nouns	yes
2 secondary cases (locative, instrumental)	more than 2
no productive plural marking on nouns	yes

a single, productive preposition	no
no productive tense marking on verbs	no
marking of tense by particle + personal pronoun	no

Esselen, like Rumsen, has no nuclear (subjective/objective) case marking or plural marking on nouns. This trait (non-inflecting nouns) is not unusual, and it is not hard to find in Native American languages.

There is sociolinguistic data that sheds light on the age-area model explanation of Rumsen grammatical divergence from Ohlone/Utian typology. The person who collected the Rumsen and Esselen catechism texts (and a short vocabulary) was told that

The Mission of Carmel is a mixture of Indians of the Eslen and Runsien languages, which two nations are so opposite from each other that it costs infinite effort to reconcile the two because their ill will is reciprocal (Cutter 1990:149).

The Rumsen speech community and the Esselen speech community were traditional enemies; possibly the Rumsens displaced the Esselens causing their mutual, traditional enmity.

It is the other three traits (single productive preposition; no tense marking on verbs; tense marking with particle plus pronoun) that are more distinctive, the sort of pattern that one looks for in a linguistic area. Looking further south, at Salinan (also an isolate), we find the following. Information on Salinan grammar may be found in Mason (1918) and Turner (1987).

<b>Rumsen Traits</b>	<b>Present in Salinan?</b>
no nuclear case markers on nouns	yes
2 secondary cases (locative, instrumental)	yes
no productive plural marking on nouns	no
a single, productive preposition	yes
no productive tense marking on verbs	yes
marking of tense by particle + personal pronoun	yes

Salinan has a single preposition that is used for a wide range of meanings (Shaul 2008b); it also has a locative noun suffix and an instrumental noun suffix, with the locative more frequent in the data.

The last three traits are highly distinctive, and it would be difficult for Rumsen to have developed exactly the same traits as Salinan in isolation. The restriction of tense marking to personal pronouns, as in Rumsen, along with the single preposition (very unusual in natural languages) and presence of the same secondary cases (locative, instrumental) as noun suffixes suggest that Rumsen and Salinan were linguistic neighbors in the past.

This would involve reconstructing the linguistic prehistory of Rumsen as follows:

- Time I: differentiation of Costanoan/Ohlone from Miwokan;
- Time II: separation of Karkin, Northern, and Southern Costanoan/Ohlone;
- Time III: location of Rumsen between Salinan and other C/O varieties;
- Time IV: relocation of Rumsen in the Monterey Peninsula next to Esselen.

In this way, an old linguistic area could have produced what might otherwise be attributed to the age-area model.

### References Cited

- Beeler, Madison S. 1961. "Northern Costanoan." *Internal Journal of American Linguistics* 27(3):191-197.
- Blevins, Juliette and Victor Golla. 2005. "A New Mission Indian Manuscript from the San Francisco Bay Area." *Boletín* 22.1:33-61.
- Broadbent, Sylvia M. 1957. Rumsen I: Methods of Reconstitution. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 23(4):275-280.
- Callaghan, Catherine A. 1997. "Evidence for Yok-Utian." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 63:18-64.
- Cutter, Donald C. 1990. *California in 1792: A Spanish Naval Visit*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Henshaw, H. W. 1955. *California Indian Linguistic Records: the Mission Indian Vocabularies of H. W. Henshaw*. R. F. Heizer, ed. *Anthropological Records* 15(2).
- Kelsey, Harry. 1979. *The Doctrina and Confesionario of Juan Cortés*. Altadena, California: Howling Coyote Press.
- Kroeber, A. L. 1904. "The Languages of the Coast South of San Francisco." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 9.3:273-435.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1910. "The Chumash and Costanoan Languages." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 9.2:237-271.
- Levy, Richard L. 1976. *Costanoan Internal Relationships*. Berkeley: Archaeological Research Facility, Department of Anthropology, University of California.
- Mason, J. Alden. 1916. "The Mutsun Dialect of Costanoan Based on the Vocabulary of de la Cuesta." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 11,7:399-472.

Mason, J. Alden. 1918. "The Language of the Salinan Indians." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 14(1):1-154.

Okrand, Marc. 1977. *Mutsun Grammar*. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1979a. Metathesis in Costanoan Grammar. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45(2):123-130.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1979b. Costanoan Philological Practices: Comment and Criticism. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45(2):181-187.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. "More on Karkin and Costanoan." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 55:254-258.

Pinart, Alphonse. 1952. *California Indian Linguistic Records: the Mission Indian Vocabularies of Alfonse Pinart*. R. F. Heizer, ed. *Anthropological Records* 15(1).

Shaul, David Leedom. 1995. "The Huelel (Esselen) Language." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 61:191-239.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2008a. "Chalon and Rumsen Catechisms." Ms.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2008b. "Salinan Prepositions(s)." Ms.

Shipley, William. 1980. "Rumsen Derivation." In K. Klar, M. Langdon, and S. Silver, eds., *American Indian and Indo-European Studies*, pp. 237-244. The Hague/New York: Mouton.

Turner, Katherine. 1987. *Aspects of Salinan Grammar*. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.