KOOTENAY-SALISHAN:

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Lawrence R. Morgan

University of California

Berkeley

15th International Conference on

Salishan Languages

August, 1980

Vancouver, B.C.

This paper represents an addition and to some extent a revision of my preliminary report on Kootenay-Salishan comparative work which I presented earlier this year as a University of British Columbia master's thesis. In that work I presented some 129 probable cognate sets which yield a set of sound correspondences which can most easily be explained with the hypothesis that there once was a protolanguage, called Proto-Kootenay-Salishan for lack of a better name, which was ancestral to both Kootenay and Proto-Salishan. Also in that work, I presented 21 other sets which appear to represent examples of linguistic diffusion between Kootenay and Interior Salishan languages. In my thesis I said that distinguishing cognates from borrowings must be an on-going process the first step of which has to be establishing that Kootenay and Salishan are in fact genetically related and that there are at least some cognates to distinguish. The best evidence for a genetic relationship has already been presented there. The purpose of this paper is not to present additional evidence of a genetic relationship but to present some additional Kootenay-Salishan resemblances which are doubtful as cognates and doubtful as borrowings but which may be of some interest for further research. Among these resemblances are the Kootenay relative markers, one of which is inadequately described in existing descriptions of Kootenay and so will be briefly described here.

First, I would like to withdraw two of the sound correspondences I set up as evidence for a genetic relationship. These correspondences were already in the category of problematic or poorly supported correspondences so that reclassifying them does not greatly affect the strength of the evidence for a genetic relationship. The correspondences are Kootenay t

to Salishan c and Kootenay ť to Salishan č. I would like to reclassify
these correspondences and the resemblance sets involved into a category
of problematic resemblances. Rather than calling the sets involved 'probable
cognate sets' or 'probable borrowings' I will number them as 'problematic
resemblance sets'. This new category is also a good place for a number of
resemblance sets I had formerly classed as 'possible cognates' and had not
included in my thesis because of their ambiguous status. I will not list
all of those here. I will list six resemblance sets involving t and c
where no single sound correspondence emerges. The sixth set also involves
a new correspondence between Kootenay k and Salishan x^w which seems to
be corroborated by the seventh set which, however, looks very suspiciously
like an old borrowing.

PRS 1 (formerly probable cognate set 26)

Kootenay t | Salishan c

Interior

matq̇uɫ 'seagull' | macq̇ʷúl̓ 'pelican' | Cm^2

PRS 2 (formerly probable cognate set 27)

Kootenay ť | Salishan č̓

siť 'blanket' | *s-ʔič̓- 'blanket' | (TTK) PS

Interior

síč̓m 'blanket' | Th

síč̓m 'blanket' | Sh

síč̓əm 'blanket' | Cm

PRS 2 (continued)

síc̓əm 'blanket'   Ka

síc̓ 'be blanketed, be blanket'   Cr

        Coast

s?íc̓am 'clothes, clothing'   Se

The reason for including the two sets above as probable cognate sets
in the first place was simply the inconclusive fact that recent borrowing
could be ruled out. Haas (1965) had already suggested set 2 above as
probably representing a case of old borrowing, a fact which I noted in my
thesis.

        PRS 3 (formerly probable cognate set 28)

Kootenay t̓   Salishan c̓

t̓aq̓miła 'deerfly'   c̓ə-c̓əq̓ʷals 'small black flies'   Sq

With only these forms in the set, it is simply not clear what to make
of this resemblance. There are other examples of Kootenay q̓ corresponding
to Salishan q̓ʷ, but the m in the Kootenay form and the lack of it in the
Salishan form is unexplained and constitutes a unique sound correspondence.

        PRS 4 (probable cognate set 92)

Kootenay t   Salishan c or t

-q̓utał 'fat'   *q̓ʷuc- 'fat'   (TTK) PS

        Interior

        q̓ʷuc-t 'fat, stout'   Sh

PRS 4 (continued)

q̓ʷuc-	'fat, grease'	Cm
q̓ʷuc	'be fat'	Ka
q̓ʷuc	'be fat'	Cr
	Coast	
q̓ʷuc	'be fat'	Sq

But note the following forms:

Interior

qʷtéɬ	'fat'		Li
qʷteɬ	'grease'	(Kp)	NSh
qʷotéɬ	'lard'	(Gb)	SSh
	Coast		
kʷtáɬ	'elk fat'		Tw

PRS 5

Kootenay t or c

Salishan t

Interior

yiḱta 'spill, dump out'

yikt 'to fall'   Sh

  yiḱta 'non-liquid to over-
      flow' (//yiḱta//)

//yiḱta-ʔ// 'to dump out
      a non-liquid'

yiḱta-k 'liquid to over-
      flow or spill out'

yiḱta-ku-ɬ 'to spill a

PRS 5 (continued)

liquid, to dump out

a liquid'

But note also:

yikc-ku-ł 'to strain a liquid'

There is also the exclusively Kootenay example of the word

napcuńxa (also pronounced: naptuńxa) 'a twine or thread made

from a certain kind of bark which is used in sewing

the side supports of a canoe'

PRS 6

Kootenay c or s	Salishan t		
Kootenay k	Salishan xʷ		
?amak 'land, ground, earth'	*-mix(ʷ) 'land, people'	(Kp)	PS
	*-ul-mix(ʷ) 'land, ground'	(Kp)	PS
	* tmixʷ 'land, earth'	(Kp)	PS
?aqłcmak-nik̉ (also pronounced:	Interior		
?aqłsmaknik̉)	qlmuxʷ, *qelmxʷ - qlmuxʷ 'Indian,		
'person, people,	human being'		Sh
esp. Indian people'	sqəl̉təmíxʷ 'man'		Cm
The underlying form of	sqil̉təmxʷ 'man, husband'		Cr
this word could well be:	sqaltəmíxʷ 'man, husband'		Ka
//?a-k-qlcmak-nik̉//	Coast		

PRS 6 (continued)

The element -qɫcmak apparently does not occur in any other word, making the underlying form hypothetical.

ʔəcɫtáyŋ(ə)xʷ 'person, Indian' (TTE) Cl
ʔəɫtéyŋəxʷ 'person, Indian' (TTE) So
ʔəɫtélŋəxʷ 'person, Indian' (TTE) Lm

ʔa- 'static aspectual prefix (ie. a nominalizing prefix)'

-k- 'semantically empty root'

-nik̉ 'one, ones (who are)'

PRS 7

The following set is listed as a borrowing (set B15) but the final k of the Kootenay word is unexplained.

Kootenay k   Salishan xʷ

skicuʔk 'Coeur d'Alene Indian(s)'

                                      Interior

                                    skícəʔuxʷ 'Coeur d'Alene'   Cm

                                    s-čícuʔumš 'Coeur d'Alene'   Cr

As much as I would like to find examples which can be demonstrated as instances of grammatical borrowing between Kootenay and Interior Salishan languages, I feel obliged to raise objections to a suggestion that certain first person pronominal elements in Colville, Okanagan, Spokane, and Kalispel are the result of contact with Kootenay. Newman (1979a and 1979b) suggests this in his efforts to reconstruct pronominal

elements in Proto-Salishan. The problem is that Newman sees Kootenay as
having an element ku, composed of a k- 'subject marker' and u- 'first
person actor'. The element k-, which Newman quotes from Garvin (1948a),
is not a subject marker, but is, instead, a 'relative/interrogative proclitic
particle' //k//.[3] In my thesis, I tentatively set up some of the items in
question as probable cognate set 127, although I suspected that linguistic
diffusion might be involved in some way. These items really belong in the
category of problematic resemblances and so I will set them up here as a
problematic resemblance set. The Salishan glosses are incomplete.

PRS 8

Kootenay		Salishan		
hu	'first person pronominal proclitic'[4]	Interior		
		k^wu 'me', 'we'		Cv
-u	'first person object	k^wo 'me', 'us'		Ok
	suffix in the imperative'	k^wu- '1st singular intrans. subject'		Ka
		k^wu 'me'		Sp

Newman also suggests that Kootenay keʔ, 'subject marker', was borrowed
by Spokane and Kalispel as qeʔ- 'first person plural possessive and intran-
sitive subject'. The problem here is even greater. The form Newman is
referring to is kiʔ, which is ostensibly the form of the relative/inter-
rogative particle before monosyllabic verb stems in the third person. The
form kiʔ, then, never occurs associated with first person pronominal affixes,
and there is therefore no clear way that a first person meaning could have
transferred to the element kiʔ. Moreover the element kiʔ appears to be

composed of the //k// relative/interrogative particle plus another particle //hi?// which I will discuss further below.

Newman is not the only person to have speculated on the matter of grammatical borrowing between Kootenay and neighbouring Interior Salishan languages. I did so myself (Morgan 1978) when I suggested that a Colville particle ki?, glossed by Mattina (1974) as 'relative 'that'', might have been borrowed from an earlier form of Kootenay. At the time I made my suggestion, I assumed that the underlying form of the particle in Kootenay was ki?, and therefore that this might have been the form of the particle before all verb stems in an earlier form of the language, not just before monosyllabic verb stems as in modern Kootenay. I now see the underlying form of the Kootenay particle as //k//, and I now see at least the possibility that the Colville particle might actually be cognate to the Kootenay particle.

I offer the following problematic resemblance set without any claims or even suggestions as to which forms might be cognate or which might exist as the result of borrowing or some subtler kind of linguistic diffusion. I am simply asking for more information about the etymologies of the Salishan elements involved. I would not even want to suggest that chance resemblance should be ruled out as a factor.

PRS 9

Kootenay	Salishan	
//k// 'relative/interrogative proclitic particle'	Interior ki? relative particle 'that'	Cv

PRS 9 (continued)

k 'hypothetical-indeterminate
    absolutive article'   Sh

tk/t̓k (seldom) tke?) 'hypothetical-
    indeterminate relative article' Sh

 t/t̓ 'actual-determinate relative
       article'   Sh
       Coast

k̓ʷi   'indefinite article'   Sq

    Other Squamish articles as well as

articles in other Coast Salishan

languages, as below, begin with kʷ-.

kʷ 'remote-definite'   Cl

k̓ʷi 'remote, hypothetical or
      conjectured' (a determiner)   Ld

There are a number of probable cognate sets where Coast Salishan kʷ

corresponds to Kootenay k. I do not have any examples where Kootenay k

corresponds to Coast Salishan kʷ and Interior Salishan k.

One of the reasons for seeing a possible relationship between a

Salishan article kʷ and a Kootenay relative marker //k// is that the other

Kootenay relative marker, ya, which I call a relative pronoun, is resem-

blant in a number of ways to another Coast Salishan article, apparently

best exemplified by Chilliwack yə. The Kootenay relative pronoun has the

form yi before verbs beginning with s, while the Chilliwack article also has

an alternate form yi, although the conditioning factor seems to be different. Interior Salishan languages neighbouring Kootenay also have elements which could conceivably be cognate to the Kootenay relative pronoun ya, such as: Colville //ýi// (also ýa) 'particle, definite' and Shuswap ye 'deictic-anaphoric stem'. I am not in a position to know what to make of these Salishan elements, nor am I in a position to argue that any of them are cognates of the Kootenay relative pronoun ya/yi. Borrowing seems unlikely since even the Interior Salishan elements are only partially resemblant to the Kootenay item. The Kootenay relative pronoun also has a demonstrative form yu, which to my knowledge has no parallel in Salishan.

Before going on to a brief description of the Kootenay relative/inter-rogative marker //k//, and the particle //hiʔ//, I would like to point out that cases of languages borrowing relative markers are not unknown. For example, Eser Erguvanli (1977) describes the development of the Turkish general subordinate clause marker ki under the influence of Persian ke, now the marker of any kind of subordinate clause in Persian. This does not appear to be a straightforward case of borrowing but rather one involving the influence of one language on another. Earlier forms of Turkish did not have a general subordinate clause marker ki but did have an interrogative pronoun kim 'who' which began to be used as a subordinate clause marker by the eleventh century, apparently under the influence of the fact that Persian had ke as an interrogative pronoun 'whom' as well as ke as a relative pronoun. Erguvanli makes a fairly strong case for this as an example of syntactic borrowing, the actual morpheme in question not being borrowed but merely reshaped and changed in function due to long and

sustained language contact.[5]

There is also the example of Spanish que 'what, that' being borrowed into Yaqui, a language of Northern Mexico, as ke, a subordinate clause marker, which either replaces or is used additionally to a native element -kai, which marks subordinate clauses. There are a number of typological parallels between the Yaqui example and the Turkish example.

The reader may get something of a feeling of déjà vu looking at the Turkish and Yaqui examples here. It might seem that the borrowing of relative markers is so common an activity around the world that I could find any kind of morpheme shape I wanted for my examples. Actually, these are the only examples I have been able to confirm. What is fairly common, it seems, is to find languages, including protolanguages, which have k or kʷ as relative and/or interrogative markers and ya/yo type relative pronouns or the like.[6] I have seen enough examples, at least, to force me to think about just what we should expect in the way of chance resemblance. This has led me to collect examples of chance resemblance in general and chance resemblance of grammatical morphemes in particular. Without much trouble I have found enough apparent examples of chance resemblance so that I do not feel compelled to believe that two languages are necessarily related just because they have a set of highly resemblant relative markers, even accompanied by a number of other striking resemblances. On the other hand, who really knows what it means that Hindi has kaun? 'who?, which?' and the relative pronoun and adjective jo '(the one) who, which' while Finnish has interrogative ku-ka 'who?' and relative pronoun jo-ka 'who'? In this case, the resemblances remain or increase as one goes back to

Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Uralic, which it turns out were probably
neighbouring languages. Generations of scholars have been debating
whether Indo-European and Uralic are genetically related or not, and the
end of the controversy is not in sight. The message I get from these examples
is that resemblances are to be collected and investigated but are not things
to be believed in. The first thing to investigate is whether the resemblances
might be due to borrowing. In many cases it may never be possible to come
to any definite conclusions as to whether the resemblances are due to
borrowing, genetic relationship, or chance. There must be such a thing as
the vanishing point for evidence of a genetic relationship. English and
Hindi are definitely known to be genetically related but almost all of the
evident resemblances between the modern languages consist of loan words
borrowed within the last two hundred years. In the case of Kootenay and
Salishan, linguistic diffusion may well have been going on almost contin-
uously since the time of the protolanguage. It may well turn out that the
problems involved in distinguishing between cognates, borrowings, and
chance resemblances are so great that it is unrealistic to think in terms
of ever reconstructing Proto-Kootenay-Salishan. Even if eventually recon-
structed, Proto-Kootenay-Salishan may consist of only a hundred or so items.
Proto-Salishan, on the other hand is a different story. While I can only
raise questions about the origins of the Kootenay relative markers,
Salishanists can be expected to come to some fairly definite conclusions
about the origins of the Salishan articles. In the meantime, I will start
in on the job of describing the Kootenay relative markers here. They are
one of a number of aspects of Kootenay grammar where Kootenay shows itself
to be very different from Salishan.

The Kootenay relative/interrogative marker //k// is one of the most important grammatical elements in the language. Many Kootenay lexical items which translate as English nouns are relativized verbs which have been lexicalized. In this way the k relative marker acts as a nominalizer, although the resulting constructions are not technically nouns. Quite a few Kootenay nouns beginning in k look suspiciously like the relative forms of verbs without there being any corresponding declarative form to prove the etymology. Much of the considerable creative power of the modern language depends on the use of the k relative marker.

Kootenay relative/interrogative forms or 'k- forms' contrast chiefly with declarative forms ending in the the declarative enclitic -(n)i. The following basic paradigm involves a verb stem of more than one syllable hence the absence of the form ki?.[7] The verb in the paradigm below begins with glottal stop which combines with k as well as with the n- declarative prefix to form glottalized consonants. Verbs with initial h as well as the pronouns hu and hin have the k replace the h. The declarative prefix n- follows the pronouns and may be written as a suffix on the first person pronoun hu. In a similar fashion the relative/interrogative k may be written as a suffix attached to one of the particles which may precede it, although the k is itself a particle. There is no pause phonetically between the pronouns and the verb.

?i?t-kin	to make something
?i?t-	make
-kin	by hand
Ḱi?tkin	This form is the normal citation form of the verb.

hu-n ?itkin-i.	I made it.
hin n̓itkin-i.	You (sg.) made it.
n̓itkin-i.	He/she/it/they made it.
hu-n ?itkin-ała?-ni.	We made it.
hin n̓itkin-kił-ni.	You (plural) made it.
n̓itkin-ił-ni.	An unspecified person or people made it.
	It was made.
ku ?i?tkin	that I made it
kin ?i?tkin	that you (sg.) made it
k̓i?tkin	that he (etc.) made it
ku ?itkin-ała	that we made it
kin ?itkin-kił	that you (pl.) made it
k̓itkin-ił	that some unspecified person or people made it,
	that it was made
ku ?i?tkin?	Did I make it?
kin ?i?tkin?	Did you (sg.) make it?
k̓i?tkin?	Did he (etc.) make it?
ku ?itkin-ała?	Did we make it?
kin ?itkin-kił?	Did you (pl.) make it?
k̓itkin-ił?	Did some unspecified person or people make it?, Was it made?

The difference between the relative forms and the interrogative forms is that the interrogative forms are spoken with a rising intonation, while the relative forms are spoken with a falling, declarative, intonation. There are no number or gender distinctions in the third and indefinite (or unspecified)

person, allowing the English glosses to be simplified above. The glosses
will be further simplified below. Thus: n̓itkini 'He/she/it/they made it/
them/him/her' would simply be glossed as 'He made it'. The disappearance
and seeming reappearance of glottal stop throughout the paradigm is entirely
according to regular phonological rule. The rule is sensitive to the presence
of stress which is regular and penultimate. The forms quoted in this paper
are from the Tobacco Plains variety of the language where the n- declarative
prefix is retained where it may be deleted by speakers of other varieties.
This involves words beginning with glottal stop. Speakers of all varieties
of the language agree in replacing the initial h of verbs beginning in h
with the n- prefix and in deleting the n- prefix entirely throughout the
paradigm of verbs beginning in any other consonant. There are no words in
the language which do not begin with a consonant.

One exception to the n- prefix deletion rule is with certain forms
in what might be called 'if/when' clauses. These clauses have neither the
declarative enclitic -(n)i nor the relative proclitic //k//. They do have
the particle //hiʔ// and the declarative prefix n-, but only in those forms
where a monosyllabic verb is the last syllable of the verbal stress-group
(see footnote 7). What is exceptional is that the n- prefix is present
even before verb stems beginning with consonants other than h or ʔ. The
following paradigm involves the verb suʔk 'to be good':

kiʔsuʔk	good, that it is good
hu suʔk-ni	I am good.
hin suʔk-ni	You (sg.) are good.
suʔk-ni	He is good.

napit hu-n̓ suʔk	if I am good
napit hinin̓ suʔk	if you (sg.) are good
napit hin̓ suʔk	if he is good
napit hu suk-nała	if we are good
napit hin suʔk-kił	if you (pl.) are good
napit suʔk-nam	if an unspecified person or people are good, if they (unspecified) are all good

The following underlying forms can be set up for the first three 'if/when' clause forms above:

//hu hiʔ n-suʔk//	(if) I am good
//hin hiʔ n-suʔk//	(if) you (sg.) are good
// hiʔ n-suʔk//	(if) he is good

The particle //hiʔ// emerges more clearly in the imperative forms of monosyllabic verbs. For example:

hiʔ cxa-n!	Speak!, Say something!
cxa	to speak
-n	imperative (addressed to one person)

The particle //hiʔ// also emerges in the following construction:

kin cxał hiʔ cxaʔ	Will you (sg.) speak?, Are you (sg.) going to speak?

The same thing can be said in a shorter form:

kin cxa?ɫ cxa?	Will you (sg.) speak?, Are you (sg.) going to speak?
//cxa?ɫ//	'future' adverb

This shorter form appears to be a regularization of the paradigm. The following two forms represent a full form and a more common contracted form:

kin hi? waɫ?	Did you vomit?
kiń waɫ?	Did you vomit?

The following paradigm of relative forms with the verb cxa 'to speak' shows that with monosyllabic verb stems the particle //hi?// occurs when it is the penultimate syllable, although it contracts with the pronouns hu and hin:

ku? cxa	that I spoke
kiń cxa	that you (sg.) spoke
ki? cxa	that he spoke
ku cxa-naɫa	that we spoke
kin cxa-kiɫ	that you (pl.) spoke
k-cxa-nam	that someone spoke

The third person form of the relative/interrogative particle before monosyllabic verbs is simply //k// plus the particle //hiʔ// automatically reduced to kiʔ by regular phonological rule. The element //hiʔ// is for all practical purposes a meaningless element in the modern language, although the fact that it is in complementary distribution with the declarative enclitic -(n)i in the paradigms where it occurs at all suggests that it should be identified with that enclitic. The n of the declarative enclitic should in turn be identified with the n- declarative prefix. The phonology works out perfectly. The deletion of the n of the declarative enclitic, when that occurs, is by a phonological rule which affects other instances of n. The lack of a glottal stop on the end of the enclitic is also according to a phonological rule. This gives us an element //hiʔ// which occurs both before the verb and after the verb but never before and after the verb at the same time. It looks as though it was originally an auxiliary verb, perhaps a form of the verb root //ʔiʔ-// 'be' which occurs in the form ʔi- in the verb stem ʔin 'to be'. There is actually a family of such elements, including the stative suffix //-iʔ// and a proclitic particle ʔi which is illustrated below:

nam	to go
n̂i nam	He is on his way.
kam	to come
n̂i kam	He is coming along this way

For one speaker, not from Tobacco Plains, an alternate pronunciation
also exists:

ʔi kam	He is coming along this way
hu-n ʔi nał ʔiʔtkin	as soon as I fix it or make it

The best evidence I have that the element //hiʔ// as a proclitic
should be considered an auxiliary verb in origin is provided by the occur-
rence of the declarative prefix both before //hiʔ// and before the verb
stem haʔt 'to have something' in the following sentence:

hu niń haʔt kqaqanaʔłkqac-c ʔat hin ʔumickinxaxnap-ni.
When I have a car you always break it (or wreck it) on me.

hu	I
k-qaqanaʔł-kqac	car
ʔat	generally the case
hin	you
ʔumic-kin	to break something by hand
-xax-	malefactive, 'from' what someone has
-n-	suffix connecting prononinal object suffixes
	to the verb stem
-ap	me
-ni	declarative enclitic
-c	and, subsequently

This form of the verb haʔt in an 'if/when' clause is apparently less common than the form:

      hu niʔ haʔt   when I have

In this case, the declarative prefix n- occurs only before the particle //hiʔ// and not before the verb stem. An even more common form is:

      hu-ń haʔt   when I have

Here the declarative prefix n- occurs only before the verb stem and the particle //hiʔ// is almost entirely gone, surviving only as glottalization on the n- prefix.

The following few examples are offered as general illustrations of the relative/interrogative proclitic //k// and also as illustrations of the three forms of the relative pronoun ya, yi, and yu.

Kin huɬpaɬin ya qakiʔ-kiʔ   Did you hear what he said?

huɬpaɬin	to hear
//qakiʔ//	to say
-ki	(ostensibly) locative enclitic

ya kwuq̓ɬam̓ xma ńitiɬq̓uɬamkin-iɬ-ni.   Those who have long hair should braid it. Whoever has long hair should braid it.

k-wuq̓ɬam̓   that have long hair, also: Chinaman, Chinese

wu-q̓ƚam̓	to be long haired
wu-	long
-q̓ƚam̓	head hair
-ƚam̓	head
xma	should
ʔitiƚq̓uƚam-kin	to braid something
-kin	by hand

cink̓apaƚtiyxan, yu qakiʔ-ki!	Listen to him, what he said!,
	Listen what he's saying!

cink̓apaƚtiyxa	to listen to someone
-n	imperative
kin cink̓apaƚtiyxa?	Did you listen to him?

k̓uƚiʔitnanas-i yi sam-ki.	He passed by only a short distance away.

k̓uƚiʔitnana	to be a short distance
note: kk̓uƚiʔitnana?	Was it a short distance?
-s	subsidiary third person subject suffix
-i	declarative enclitic
s-	continuative
ham	to pass by, to go by
-ki	locative enclitic

FOOTNOTES

1.   My Kootenay linguistic research has been made possible over the years by grants from the National Museum of Man in Ottawa (from 1968 through 1974) and by my association with the Kootenay Language Project, administered by the Kootenay Indian Area Council.

2.   Abbreviations are: Ck   Chilliwack

Cl   Clallam

Cm   Columbian

Cr   Coeur d'Alene

Cv   Colville

Ka   Kalispel

Ld   Lushootseed

Li   Lillooet

Lm   Lummi

NSh   Northern Shuswap

Ok   Okanagan

PS   Proto-Salishan

Se   Sechelt

Sh   Shuswap

So   Sooke

SSh   Southern Shuswap

Sp   Spokane

Sq   Squamish

Th	Thompson
Tw	Twana

Author abbreviations:	Gb	Gibson
	Kp	Kuipers
	TTE	Thompson, Thompson, and Efrat
	TTK	Thompson, Thompson, and Kinkade

3.　　Two of the weaknesses of Garvin's description of Kootenay as published in the IJAL (1948a) come together to create the impression that the language is really very different than it is in this regard. Garvin does not supply paradigms which would have been helpful in this case. He describes a prefix -k- ~ -ki- ~ -kē? as an 'interrogative; subject marker'. In the Journal Word (1948b) he describes it as 'the subject marker or participial prefix'. The term 'participial' is the term used by Canestrelli (1894) and Boas (1927). Canestrelli, who was writing in Latin, translates verbal forms with this element using the word 'qui' which is entirely appropriate from the standpoint of Kootenay.

　　The vowels of the forms quoted by Garvin as alternate forms of this element can be explained as the product of his redundant use of the vowels e·and o·as long vowel equivalents of i and u, respectively. Kootenay has a three vowel phonemic system /i, a, and u/ with almost entirely predictable vowel length from a variety of sources, such as laryngeal deletion between vowels, as well as compensatory lengthening of vowels with certain consonant deletions. The apparent difference of vowel length here is entirely non-distinctive.

4.   One Kootenay speaker has ʔu 'first person pronominal proclitic'
and ʔin 'second person pronominal proclitic' where others have hu and hin,
respectively. For what it is worth, the only other word in Kootenay which
is reported with either h or ʔ is the word ʔuknaqín ~ huknaqín 'Okanagan'
which is an obvious borrowing because of its word final stress.

5.   I would like to thank Carl Zimmer for calling my attention to the
paper by Erguvanli and providing me with a copy.

6.   Some examples are: Indo-European, Uralic, and Yuman. There are quite
a few other apparent examples which I will not even mention since I am not
trying to prove anything by this observation. Yurok has forms which seem
comparable. The Yuman case is interesting as an example, especially as
reported by Mixco (1978); see pages 94 and 95.

7.   This is because the form kiʔ only occurs as a stressed syllable.
With polysyllabic verbs, kiʔ cannot be the penultimate syllable of the
'stress-group', which consists of the verb and associated affixes, particles,
and adverbs. Stress in Kootenay falls regularly on the penultimate
syllable of the word or the stress-group. Stress assignment is cyclical,
applying first to words within the stress-group and then to the stress-group
as a whole. The instances of what Garvin calls 'distinctive secondary stress'
(Garvin 1948a) can be neatly accounted for in this way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviation: IJAL. International Journal of American Linguistics.

Boas, Franz. 1927. Additional Notes on the Kutenai Language. IJAL Vol.
4. 85-104

Canestrelli, Pater Philippo S.J. 1894. Linguae Ksanka (Kootenai)
Elementa Grammaticae - appears in a version annotated by Franz Boas
in: IJAL Vol. 4. 1-84.

Erguvanli, Eser. 1977. A Case of Syntactic Change: Ki constructions in
Turkish. Paper presented at the Summer Linguistic Society of America
meeting, August 13, 1977 at the University of Hawaii.

Galloway, Brent D. 1977. A Grammar of Chilliwack Halkomelem. Unpublished
Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Garvin, Paul L. 1948a. Kutenai. IJAL 14.37-42, 87-90, 171-187.

------. 1948b. Kutenai Lexical Innovations. Word Vol. 4. 120-126.

Gibson, James A. 1973. Shuswap Grammatical Structure. (Ph.D. dissertation
in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. University of Hawaii Working
Papers in Linguistics 5:5. Honolulu.

Haas, Mary R. 1965. Is Kutenai Related to Algonkian? Canadian Journal
of Linguistics 10.77-92.

Hilbert, Vi, and Thom Hess. 1977. Lushootseed. in: Northwest Coast Texts.
Native American Text Series Vol. 2 no. 2.4-32. IJAL.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. The Squamish Language. (Janua Linguarum, Series
Practica 73). The Hague: Mouton.

------. 1974. The Shuswap Language. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica
225). The Hague: Mouton.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1976. On the Phonological Typology of Proto-Salish.
    Paper presented at the XLII International Congress of Americanists,
    Paris.

Lindenfeld, Jacqueline. 1973. Yaqui Syntax. University of California
    Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Mattina, Anthony. 1974. The Narrative of Peter J. Seymour, Blue Jay and
    his Brother-in-Law Wolf (preliminary version). Presented at the 9th
    International Conference of Salish Languages, Vancouver.

Mixco, Mauricio J. 1978. Cochimí and Proto-Yuman: Lexical and Syntactic
    Evidence for a New Language Family in Lower California. University
    of Utah Anthropological Papers 101.

Morgan, Lawrence R. 1978. Linguistic Evidence for Kootenay Prehistory:
    A Preliminary Report. in: Waters of Wealth: A Seminar on the Kootenai
    Region of the United States and Canada - Selected Transcripts.
    Libby Dam Visitor's Center. Libby, Montana.

------. 1980. Kootenay-Salishan Linguistic Comparison: A Preliminary
    Study. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia.

Newman, Stanley. 1979a. A History of the Salish Possessive and Subject
    Forms. IJAL Vol.45 no. 3.207-223.

------. 1979b. Salish Object Forms. IJAL Vol.45 no. 4.299-308.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: A Preview.
    Studies in American Indian Languages, edited by Jesse Sawyer.
    University of California Publications in Linguistics 65. 251-294.
    Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Thompson, Laurence C., M. Terry Thompson, and Barbara S. Efrat. 1974.

  Some Phonological Developments in Straits Salish. IJAL 40. 182-196.

Thompson, Laurence C., M. Terry Thompson, and M. Dale Kinkade. undated.

  Comparative Salish Notebooks, 2 volumes. (consulted 1976).