REFERENCES

Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders. 1976a. Bella Coola deictic
roots. IJAL 42.319-30.

————. 1976b. The syntax of CAUSE and EFFECT. Glossa 10.155-74.

————. 1978a. Bella Coola syntax. In Linguistic Studies of Native
Canada, edited by Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye.
Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

————. 1978b. Bella Coola syntax: negation and particles. Pre-
sented to the XIIIth International Conference on
Salishan Languages, Victoria, British Columbia.

Newman, Stanley. 1969. Bella Coola paradigms. IJAL 35.299-306.

Saunders, Ross and Philip W. Davis. 1978. The control system of
Bella Coola. Presented to the XIIIth International
Conference on Salishan Languages, Victoria, British
Columbia.

PRELIMINARY NOTES ON LOWER CHEHALIS (ɫəwáɫməš) MORPHOLOGY

M. Dale Kinkade
University of British Columbia

0. Little information is available either in print, in archives,
or in private hands on Lower Chehalis. All we have are a few early
word-lists, two or three texts and a little vocabulary collected by
Myron Eells (American Philosophical Society Library) corrected by
Boas, vocabulary for Boas' Comparative Salishan Vocabularies manu-
script (APS Library), Charles Snow's M.A. thesis on Lower Chehalis
phonology (1969), and vocabulary collected by Snow and by me. There
has been no information whatever available on morphology or syntax.
At the request of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, I recommenced col-
lecting data on Lower Chehalis last summer. The language has not
been actively used for many years, and the 10 or 12 people who still
know some of it (the oldest is 110) have difficulty recalling it.
Nevertheless, some unexpected vocabulary has re-emerged. I have so
far been unable to collect much morphological information, but have
enough to get a general idea of Lower Chehalis (ɫəwáɫməš) grammar;
syntax and texts may yet be possible when speakers have been brought
together and given a chance to practice.

My purpose here is to make some early remarks about ɫəwáɫməš
morphology. This is premature, but the ɫəwáɫməš and I feel that a
beginning at its description should be made as soon as possible.
This is possible because it turns out that it resembles Upper Che-
halis strongly in its grammatical structure. For this sketch to
make sense, I will have to present it by comparing it with Upper
Chehalis (as revised in a recent manuscript from my earlier publi-
cations; cf. Kinkade 1963-64).

1. Before beginning that, a few comments need to be made about the distribution of the language and its name. The language was originally spoken along the Washington coast from just north of Grays Harbor (south of Quinault territory) south to Willapa Bay, where it was apparently expanding in the 19th Century at the expense of Lower Chinook. It was also spoken along the Chehalis River and on the Wishkah and Wynoochee Rivers; the Satsop seem to have been considered Lower Chehalis politically, but spoke a dialect more similar to Upper Chehalis (data on Satsop, which is no longer spoken, are very scanty, but material in Boas' Comparative Salish manuscript show this to be the case). There were slight differences in the speech of various areas, mostly in terms of vocabulary; one phonological variation was that speakers north of Grays Harbor pronounced initial /y/ as [ĵ], whereas it was [y] in the south.

The name Chehalis has been the source of some confusion. It was earlier applied without an Upper or Lower modifier, usually referring only to the Lower Chehalis. Properly speaking, Chehalis was a place-name (now Westport) čəx̌íls, meaning 'sand'. The name was applied then by whites to the Indians and to the River (possibly in that order), then to the Upper Chehalis who live upriver from (roughly) Oakville to Rainbow Falls. The Upper Chehalis call the river nsúlapš (etymology unknown), themselves sq̓ʷaỷayiɬq̓ (after Mud Bay), and 'sand' čax̌éʔs (with loss of 1). The southern variety of Lower Chehalis now known by most of the remaining speakers is called ɬəw̓áĺməš, and that, following their preference, is the name I will use for the language in this paper.

2. Two things strike me in listening to ɬəw̓áĺməš. One is the extensive and marked glottalization of resonants and use of glottal stops. I find it phonetically impossible to assign glottalization in a sequence of two resonants, one of which is glot-

talized, because glottal closure falls between the two; morphological evidence is necessary for correct assignment. The other striking feature is loss of final syllables (particularly -n and -m) which are retained in Quinault and Upper Chehalis.

ɬəw̓áĺməš syllable structure is also worth a passing notice. Any consonant is apparently able to consitute a syllabic peak, although it is generally vowels, resonants, and fricatives which have this role. In terms of phonetic syllables, two consonants are probably the maximally allowed prevocalic cluster, and post-vocalic consonant sequences are divided into syllables of one or two consonants. I do not yet know the details of phonetic syllable structure, but an example may be illustrative. When asked the word for needle, Nina Bumgarner said tä́čɨ́ʔ, then remarked: "I guess that's three syllables." The three syllables must be tä́-čɨ-ʔ, remarkable as it may be to have ʔ as a syllable; this final -ʔ seems to be a separate morpheme, and a word with it (and they are common) may be pronounced slowly with a final epenthetic ə (thus [tä́ čɨ ʔə]). I consider this epenthetic ə confirmation that ʔ is the final syllable.

I will say nothing further about ɬəw̓áĺməš phonology here; it has been quite adequately treated by Snow (1969). A mere listing of the phonemic units will suffice for present purposes: ʔ a c č č̓ ə h i k k̓ kʷ k̓ʷ 1 ĺ ɬ ƛ̓ m m̓ n n̓ p p̓ q q̓ qʷ q̓ʷ s š t t̓ u w w̓ xʷ x̌ x̌ʷ y ỷ; ƛ has been noted in one Chinook Jargon loan. Vowel length is also distinctive.

3.0. I will discuss various inflectional and derivational categories in the following order: aspect, diathesis, person, inchoative, redirective, diminutive, relational, intensive, and lexical suffixes. I have as yet no (or inadequate) information on ɬəw̓áĺməš number, time, mode, or deixis. All but three of the affixes treated here have cognates in Upper Chehalis serving

similar functions. As in any Salishan language, aspect, diathesis, and person constitute the heart of the inflectional system.

3.1. Aspect. Every predicate must be stated in one of three aspects: continuative, completive, or stative. ɬəwáʔlməš appears to have some of the multiple marking of aspect by variants in suffixes such as is found in Upper Chehalis, but the extent of this is not yet clear; so far such variation has been found for intransitive, middle, third person object, and first and third person subject markers (these variants will be presented below with the appropriate inflectional category). Sometimes aspect is indicated only by the presence of one of these variants, sometimes that plus a prefixed or preposed exclusively aspect-marking element.

Continuative aspect, indicating on-going activities, may be marked by the prefix ʔi-. The exact function of this prefix is not clear, however, since it is not always used on forms that are marked for this aspect by suffixes in a continuative variant. There is also an s- prefix, which in Upper Chehalis is regularly used to indicate continuative aspect, but its role in ɬəwáʔlməš is not yet apparent.

Completive aspect, used for non-durative activities, usually has no unique marker, but may be specified by use of a preposed deictic particle (t is the only one which has occurred so far). One root type has variant forms for completive and continuative aspects: three-consonant roots in which the second consonant is a resonant and the vowel is ə́. The continuative of such roots has the stressed vowel preceding the resonant (Cə́RC-), the completive has it after (CəRə́C-, with an epenthetic ə before the resonant). Examples of such roots in both forms are:

(1) ʔiɬə́lkʷʷən he is falling / tə ɬələ́kʷ he fell
(2) ʔicə́lpʷən it's whirling around / cələ́p it whirled around
(3) ʔicə́lqʷʷən it's breaking / cələ́q it broke

(4) yə́lxʷʷən he's finding (something) / yələ́xʷ he found (s.t.)
Few such contrasting continuative-completive pairs have been elicited yet. Some others, including middle and transitive examples follow.
(5) ʔiqíčʷən he's playing / qíč he played
(6) xə́ɬwən he's going home / t xə́ɬ he went home
(7) q̓ʷə́tʷən it's burning / q̓ʷə́t it burned
(8) láq̓ʷsəqən he's dancing / láq̓ʷsəq he danced
(9) ʔikʷúkʷmitn she's cooking / kʷú·kʷam she cooked
(10) ʔicí·q̓ʷətən he's digging it / cí·q̓ʷən he dug it

Stative aspect, used to indicate a state with no specified (temporal) limits, is indicated by the prefix ʔac- (or ʔəc; these may be free variants). Stative forms are otherwise identical to completive forms, and contrast in the same way with continuative ones:
(11) ʔiƛ̓áʔlsəqən he's standing up / ʔacƛ̓áʔlsəq he's standing
(12) líʔči̓ʔčənən the tide is coming in / ʔaclíʔči̓ʔč the tide is in

Besides these three basic aspects, there is at least one other aspect-like prefix in ɬəwáʔlməš. This is txʷ- 'become, get' (a sort of transitional), which can co-occur with other aspect markers.
(13) txʷq̓ʷíč it got dirty / q̓ʷíč dirty
(14) txʷyə́xʷʷən it's bright out (suddenly) / yə́xʷʸəqən it's getting light
(15) ʔitxʷnə́qən it's getting black / ʔacnə́q it's black

3.2. Diathesis. Under this term I wish to include transitive, middle, and passive inflections. Categories present in ɬəwáʔlməš are intransitive, transitive, detransitive (implying an object without stating it), middle, and passive. Intransitivity must be marked with CVC or CVCC roots in continuative aspect by a suffix -w̓- immediately following the root; completive forms are sometimes inflected with -ɬ, but this appears not to be strictly

diathetic, as it is in Upper Chehalis (which also uses these suffixes on CVC roots, but only on CVCC roots in which the second consonant is a resonant). Examples with -w̓- can be seen above in 1-7. Otherwise intransitive is not marked by inflection.

Transitives are indicated by the presence of object suffixes. Some, but not all, of these are at least historically composed of a transitive suffix -t- and the actual object suffix, but now appear to be fused into indivisible elements. The forms themselves will be given below in 3.3.

The detransitive suffix is -m̓əł (and, unlike Upper Chehalis, has only the one shape):

(16) ti ʔiciq̓ʷm̓əłən he was digging / ciq̓ʷm̓əł dig (a hole)

(17) hílu nəsʔə́xm̓əł I can't see

Middle forms have -mət- in continuative aspect and -m in completive:

(18) yulaʔq̓mətən she's telling lies / yulaʔq̓əm she told lies

(19) ʔipúpmətən it's boiling

(20) łáʔk̓ʷusəm wipe one's face

The only passive forms which have been elicited are completive aspect, where the inflection is a suffix -təm:

(21) ʔík̓ʷtəqtəm it was stolen, they stole it from them

(22) łúm̓ətəm he was pushed

3.3. Person. First and second persons are distinguished in singular and plural; third person is not (or not regularly; I have as yet no distinctive third plural inflections). There is at least some continuative-completive variation in pronominal markers (I have no full sets yet). Subject, object, possessive, and independent (predicative) pronominal forms occur; completive subjects are enclitics, first and second singular possessives are prefixes, and other possessives, continuative subjects, and all objects are suffixes. The forms I am so far able to identify are:

	SUBJECT		OBJECT	
	continuative	completive	continuative	completive
1 sg.	-ən̓š	čən		-əc
2 sg.		č		
1 pl.				-təł
2 pl.				-təł
3	-ən	∅	-ət-	-ən, -ə́n

	POSSESSIVE	INDEPENDENT
1 sg.	n-	ʔə́nc
2 sg.	ʔa-	nú̓ʔ
1 pl.		ʔəním
2 pl.		ʔəláp
3	-s, -ns	

No examples with predicates will be given here.

Imperatives are marked by a suffix -aʔ (in the singular; I have no plural imperatives). A few examples (25, 26) suggest that this may precede object suffixes. Following a negative predicate, and in other dependent predicates, the possessive inflection is used instead of this suffix (27, 28).

(23) wáksaʔ go!

(24) cók̓ʷłaʔ go to bed!

(25) ʔí·k̓ʷaʔən go and get it!

(26) ʔí·šəx̓ʷaʔən bring it here!

(27) hílu ʔaslə́cə̓n Don't fill it!

(28) hílu ʔasconə́n Don't pull it!

The reflexive suffix is -cəš. The only clear example I have so far is completive aspect:

(29) sə́pcəš hit oneself

3.4. Inchoatives are marked with the suffix -ẏəq- (this is one of the three non-lexical affixes so far identified which is

not cognate with a comparable affix in Upper Chehalis, where -áw-
marks inchoatives). Inchoative forms are common in ɬəwáɫməš:
(30) xʷúʔkʷYəqən it's getting smaller / xʷúʔkʷ small
(31) yə́xʷYəqən it's getting light (in the morning)
(32) x̣ə́sYəqən it's getting spoiled / x̣ə́s bad

3.5. **Redirective.** The only redirective found so far in
ɬəwáɫməš is -š:
(33) yə́lx̣ʷšən čən I found it for them / yə́lx̣ʷən čən I found it
(34) yə́lx̣ʷšətən he's finding something someone had hidden /
                    yə́lx̣ʷətən he's finding it

3.6. **Diminutive.** The suffix -uʔ (-huʔ after vowels) marks
diminutives. Vowel changes and glottal insertion also occur, but
the patterns of these are not yet clear.
(35) ɬək̓ʷáňuʔ small earring / ɬək̓ʷáň earring
(36) sx̣ʷáy̓əsuʔ little hat, cap / sx̣ʷáy̓əs hat
(37) təq̓íʔkʷáňuʔ little shirt / təq̓íʔkʷəň shirt
(38) máňuʔ small child / mə́ň child
(39) x̣áʔšuʔ outhouse / x̣áš house (xʷúʔkʷ x̣áš little house)
(40) skʷəňtúhuʔ little chicken / skʷəňtú chicken
(41) kapúʔhuʔ little coat / kapú coat, jacket

3.7. **Relational.** The ɬəwáɫməš relational suffix is -m-.
Few examples of this suffix have turned up so far.
(42) mələ́q̓ʷmən čən I forgot / mələ́q̓ʷ forget
(43) x̣ə́y̓smən he dislikes him

3.8. **-əɬ.** This suffix, referred to in 3.2, has unclear func-
tions in ɬəwáɫməš, but seems to be some sort of intensive. Its
usage is clearly different from its cognate in Upper Chehalis,
where it marks intransitive completives of CVC and CVRC roots.
Only a few examples are given here:
(44) púy̓əɬ really crooked / púy̓ crooked
(45) q̓ʷíčəɬ it's really dark out, it was dirtier / q̓ʷíč dirty

8

(46) sə́xʷəɬ baby was wet, get wet outside / sə́xʷ wet

3.9. **s-** also occurs in ɬəwáɫməš, but I have no idea what its
function is, beyond marking subordinate or dependent predicates,
as in 17, 27, and 28 above.

3.10. **Lexical suffixes** occur as in other Salishan languages.
Most recorded so far in ɬəwáɫməš have cognates in Upper Chehalis.
No examples are given here.

4.0. Because it has not yet been possible to record sen-
tences or texts in ɬəwáɫməš beyond a few simple examples, little
can yet be said about syntax. Two or three short texts were
recorded by Eells and checked by Boas, but it has not yet been
possible to study these and check them with speakers of the lan-
guage in more than a rudimentary way. What can be said is that
the main predicate of a sentence comes first with its sattelite
clitics and particles, then its subject or object. Various unin-
flected predicates (such as hílu not, ɫáq̓ʷ emphatic, xʷə́ɬ
really, interrogatives) may be followed by a dependent predicate
with its appropriate inflections. An interrogative clitic na
follows what is questioned. Examples of uninflected predicates
and na are:
(47) hílu ti cá·ɬaʔšən He didn't have any shoes. (ti past ?)
(48) ɫáq̓ʷ ʔasx̣ələ́n Make it right!
(49) xʷə́ɬ ti ʔəcx̣ə́pəɬ It was really dry.
(50) yə́xʷ ʔasčíns ʔúlps Do you want to go out? (čín- want)
(51) čán tat ʔiswíʔəns Where did he live?
(52) hílu na ʔasčíns qəňáy̓əň Don't you want to hear/listen?
(53) ʔack̓ʷápmən č na Do you know about it?

5.0. As stated earlier, these grammatical notes are preli-
minary. Much more remains to be learned about ɬəwáɫməš grammar,
but it is clear that it has much in common with Upper Chehalis,
although the two languages are by no means mutually intelligible.

9 ·

These notes are based on material collected in the summer and fall
of 1978, largely from Mrs. Irene Shale, but also from Mrs. Nina
Bumgarner, Mr. Clyde Chenoise, and Mrs. Katherine Lorton. Pre-
sumably subsequent work in 1979 and thereafter will fill in many
gaps and add important and clarifying grammatical information
about ɬəwálməš.

REFERENCES

Kinkade, M. Dale 1963-64 Phonology and morphology of Upper Che-
    halis. IJAL 29:181-195, 345-356; 30:32-61, 251-260.
Snow, Charles T. 1969 A Lower Chehalis Phonology. Unpublished
    M.A. Thesis in Linguistics, The University of Kansas.

tuwaduqucid wəɬ dxʷləšucid:

A Comparative Dialect Study

Nile Thompson
Skokomish Tribal Center

The purpose of this paper is to extend the data
provided by Hess (1977) on cognates shared between
Puget Salish (dxʷləšucid) dialects and Twana (tuwadu-
qucid).[1] In doing so, several misconceptions about the
Twana language will be examined.

The data is divided into the following sections:

I. Forms common to Twana and the southern
   Puget Salish dialects but not the
   northern,

II. Forms shared by Twana and the northern
   Puget Salish dialects but not the southern,

III. Contrasting Northern and Southern Puget
   forms, each with a cognate in Twana,

IV. Words where one of the northern dialects
   agrees with Twana while another does not,

V. Words where one of the southern dialects
   agrees with Twana while another does not,

VI. Variation within the dialects of Twana,

VII. Problematic forms.