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PRELIMINARY NOTES ON LOWER CHEHALIS (kwalinam) MORPHOLOGY

H. 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 manuscript (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 collecting 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 (kwalinam) 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 kwalinam morphology. This is premature, but the kwalinam 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 Chehalis 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 publications; cf. Kinkade 1965-64).
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 Winochee 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 [j], 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) ƛ̓əq̓əł̓əs, 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 nə̓q̓ələp (etymology unknown), themselves ƛ̓əq̓ələp (after Mud Bay), and 'sand' ƛ̓əq̓əł̓əq̓əs (with loss of ɬ). The southern variety of Lower Chehalis now known by most of the remaining speakers is called ƛ̓əGA̓M̓əs, 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 ƛ̓əGA̓M̓əs. 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 glottalized, 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.

ƛ̓əGA̓M̓əs syllable structure is also worth a passing notice. Any consonant is apparently able to constitute 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 ƛ̓əGA̓M̓əs, then remarked: "I guess that's three syllables." The three syllables must be ƛ̓əGA̓, remarkable as it may be to have a syllable; this final ƛ̓əGA̓ 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 ƛ̓əGA̓ ə). I consider this epenthetic ə confirmation that ƛ̓əGA̓ is the final syllable.

I will say nothing further about ƛ̓əGA̓M̓əs phonology here; it has been quite adequately treated by Snow (1969). A mere listing of the phonemic units will suffice for present purposes: ? a c d e o h i k k' k'' l m n p q s t u v w x y z. 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 ƛ̓əGA̓M̓əs 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. *ia~aimas* 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 ?i-. 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 *ia~aimas* is not yet apparent.

Completive aspect, used for non-durative activities, usually has no unique marker, but may be specified by the presence of one of these variants, sometimes that plus a prefixed or preposed exclusively aspect-marking element.

Examples of such roots in both forms are:

(1) ?iiaak~?on he is falling / taiaak he fell
(2) ?iail?on it's whirling around / ciailp it whirled around
(3) ?icaiq~?on it's breaking / caiaq it broke

3.2. Diathesis. Under this term I wish to include transitive, middle, and passive inflections. Categories present in *ia~aimas* 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 -i- immediately following the root; completive forms are sometimes marked with -a, 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 -w- 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 de-transitive suffix is -dia (and, unlike Upper Chehalis, has only the one shape):

(16) *ti '-ic'qwa'ian he was digging / ciq'wa'ig dig (a hole)
(17) h'lu nos'ge I can't see

Middle forms have -mat- in continuous aspect and -m in completive:

(18) yul5'qmon she's telling lies / yul5'qamon she told lies
(19) ?i'm mon it's boiling
(20) ?i'm mon wipe one's face

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

(21) ?i't'qmon it was stolen, they stole it from them
(22) ?i'm mon 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 continuous-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, continuous subjects, and all objects are suffixes. The forms I am so far able to identify are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sg.</td>
<td>-ent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg.</td>
<td>-ent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl.</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pl.</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSESSIVE</td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sg.</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg.</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl.</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pl.</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No examples with predicates will be given here.

Imperatives are marked by a suffix -a' (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) wäksa? go!
(24) cäksa? go to bed!
(25) ?ik'a'on go and get it!
(26) ?i'saxa'on bring it here!
(27) h'lu ?asla'q Don't fill it!
(28) h'lu ?ascon Don't pull it!

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

(29) säksi? hit oneself

3.4. Inchoatives are marked with the suffix -qon- (this is one of the three non-lexical affixes so far identified which is
not cognate with a comparable affix in Upper Chehalis, where -aw marks inchoatives. Inchoative forms are common in iawaimas:

(30) x'w'k'qwn it’s getting smaller / x'w'k' small
(31) y'w'qwn it’s getting light (in the morning)
(32) q'k'qwn it’s getting spoiled / q’s had

3.5. Redirective. The only redirective found so far in iawaimas is -s:
(33) y'alf'qwn I found it for them / y'alf'w' an I found it
(34) y'alf'qwsatan he’s finding something someone had hidden / y'alf'w' atan

3.6. Diminutive. The suffix -u? (-hu? after vowels) marks diminutives. Vowel changes and glottal insertion also occur, but the patterns of these are not yet clear.

(35) iak'jahu? small earring / iak'jah earring
(36) sfwayatu? little hat, cap / sfwayas hat
(37) taq'k'wafuU? little shirt / taq'k'wa shirt
(38) m'nah small child / m'nah child
(39) q'k'q couthouse / q'k'c house (x'w'k' q'k' little house)
(40) f'shu? little chicken / f'su chicken
(41) kpu?hu? little coat / kpu coat, jacket

3.7. Relational. The iawaimas relational suffix is -m-. Few examples of this suffix have turned up so far.

(42) mal'q'w' on I forgot / mal'q' forget
(43) y'q'w' e man he dislikes him

3.8. -a. This suffix, referred to in 3.2, has unclear functions in iawaimas, 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) pu'q' really crooked / pu'q' crooked
(45) q'k'q q'k' it’s really dark out, it was dirtier / q'aq' dirty

3.9. - also occurs in iawaimas, 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 iawaimas have cognates in Upper Chehalis. No examples are given here.

4.0. Because it has not yet been possible to record sentences or texts in iawaimas 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 language in more than a rudimentary way. What can be said is that the main predicate of a sentence comes first with its satellite clitics and particles, then its subject or object. Various uninflected predicates (such as h'lhu not, q'k' emphatic, q'aq' 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) h'lhu ti c'k'q'w' on He didn’t have any shoes. (ti past)
(48) q'k'w' q'w' Make it right!
(49) x'w'k' ti q'k'q'q' It was really dry.
(50) y'k'w' q'w'c'w' Do you want to go out? (c'w' want)
(51) q'k'w' tat q'w'c'w' Where did he live?
(52) h'lhu na q'w'c'w' Don’t you want to hear/listen?
(53) q'k'q'w' na Do you know about it?

5.0. As stated earlier, these grammatical notes are preliminary. Much more remains to be learned about iawaimas grammar, but it is clear that it has much in common with Upper Chehalis, although the two languages are by no means mutually intelligible.
These notes are based on material collected in the summer and fall of 1978, largely from Mrs. Irene Shale, but also from Mrs. Nina Bungarner, Mr. Clyde Chenoise, and Mrs. Katherine Lorton. Presumably subsequent work in 1979 and thereafter will fill in many gaps and add important and clarifying grammatical information about Iséismu3.
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tuwa'duqúcid vàl dxʷləgúcid
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 (dxʷləgúcid) dialects and Twana (tuwa'duqúcid). 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.