Some Features of Warm Springs Sahaptin

Virginia Hymes University of Pennsylvania.

Melville Jacobs, in his Sketch of Northern Sahaptin Grammar (1931, p.96), suggests that the main outlines of that sketch will be "roughly valid" for the language as spoken at Warm Springs. There was, as Jacobs noted, no documentation of the Warm Springs Sahaptin of that period. However, for the period since the early 1970's, copious text recording and analysis and grammatical and lexical elicitation have made it possible for me to begin to assess differences between Warm Springs Sahaptin and Klickitat, Cowlitz and Walula- Palus as Jacobs described them in the Grammatical sketch and as they emerge in the published texts. (Jacobs 1929, 1931, 1934 and 1937.) Access to Bruce Rigsby's unpublished manuscript of an article on Sahaptin for the forthcoming Language volume of the new Handbook of American Indians being prepared under auspices of the Smithsonian Institution adds the further perspective of modern (post-1950's) Umatilla and Yakima Sahaptin

The folk-linguistic view at Warm Springs, among the people I have worked with there, is that those people in Washington have lots of "ii" and "K". What is the basis of this prevalent notion? Or does it have any basis at all?

As to the "ii"s, there are two origins of the feeling that the northern dialects are full of "ii." One lies in the deictics. Many demonstratives in the Northern dialects have initial í- which is absent in the Sahaptin at Warm Springs and Umatilla, (cf. Rigsby, ms.). In the example that follow, Warm Springs forms are cited first in each instance. Forms from Jacobs are all Cowlitz (Táitnapam) unless otherwise indicated. E.g.: čí 'here' vs. íči; kúuk 'then' vs. íkuuk; čná 'here (loc.) vs. íčna; ǩ̆ʷái 'that one' vs. íǩ̆ʷak; ʷʷná 'there (loc.)' vs. íkʷwəna, íkʷna; číkuuk 'today; at this time' vs. íči íkuuk; čńki 'by means of this' vs. íčənki. But, note íčn 'to here' and íkʷn 'to there '. In Warm Springs, as in Umatilla as presented by Rigsby (ms. p.58 and 59), the allative case forms are the only ones in the ǩ̆ʷái and čí paradigms that have initial í-. It is interesting to not that at Warm Springs the word for the language, which Rigsby explains is related to the demonstrative či in an instrumental phrase, is íčiskin rather than the čískin he reports for Umatilla. In any case the deictics, in which on the whole Klickitat and Cowlitz are more likely to have initial í- than are Warm Springs or Umatilla (or Walula-Palus as reported by Jacobs) are, as frequently occurring words, undoubtedly one source of the sense that there are more 'i's' in the Northern dialects. In addition , there are a number of fairly common lexical items in which those dialects have 'i' or 'ii' where Warm Springs has 'a' or 'aa' 'ai'. E.g. čailwít 'bad' vs. čiilwít ; nišá 'house' vs. niit; tanán 'person, Indian' vs. tíin ; xʷáami 'high' vs. xʷíimi; napt 'two' vs. niipt; áxʷai 'later' vs. íxʷi; and finally, pamá- 'reflexive plural' vs. pimá-.

Similarly, the impression of speakers at Warm Springs that Klickitat and Cowlitz and Yakima have "lots of 'K'" lies in the deictics and in certain lexical items of common occurrence. The prevalence of 'K' in the pronominal and other decitic forms of the northern dialects is even more striking than the í- s. The presence of final 'K' is what most differentiates the personal pronouns in the northern dialects from those at Warm Springs and Umatilla. E.g. íni 'I' vs. ínək (Yak. ínk); ími 'you' vs. ímək (Yak. ímk); pńi 'he' vs. pánək (Yak. pńk) and similarly for other cases of the personal pronouns. Rigsby's Umatilla forms are very close to the Warm Springs forms and all lack final 'K'. The picture is complicated , however, in that Jacobs lists alternates in Cowlitz and Klickitat which look more like Warm Springs and Umatilla forms. In the texts , however, the k-final forms do seem predominant. For the demonstratives and other deictics k-final forms are common in the northern dialects and very rare at Warm Springs and Umatilla.

The second source of an impression of "lots of K" in the northern dialects is that

a fair number of verb stems which end in k in the northern dialects end in č in Warm Springs Sahaptin. Some common ones are : wáič- 'to cross' vs. wáik-; wanič- 'to name' vs. wanik-; xʷíyač- 'to sweat' vs. xʷíyak-; áič- 'to sit' vs. áyik-; níc- 'to bring' vs. ník-; and the gerund forms: anwíčt 'year' vs, anwí t. There are many others. but it is not the case that no Warm Springs verb stems end in k. cf. yik- 'to hear' and many others.

There are a number of minor differences in various grammatical affixes between Warm Springs and the northern dialects: E.g. pamá- 'reflex.pl.' (as noted above) vs. pimá-; -na 'accus.' vs. -nan; -ai/-nai/-yai 'benefactive suffix' vs. -ani/-ni/-iini; -ti 'imperative plural' vs. -tk. The plural imperative -ti seems to be unique to Warm Springs; Rigsby did not find it in use at Umatilla or Yakima. At Warm Springs it is in alternation with -tk but is by far the most common form and is the one always given in elicitation.

More important than the above differences between 1920's northern dialects and post-1950 Umatilla and Warm Springs (as reflected in my own data from Warm Springs and Rigsby's from Umatilla) are differences in the system of interaction of person-marking clitics and verb prefixes. This system of interaction between clitics and prefixes is used to indicate case relations in the three kinds of clauses: transitive, intransitive and those stating possession. Its existence as a system is not clear in Jacobs' grammar and was first worked out by Rigsby in his work on the modern Umatilla and Yakima dialects. His analysis of it applies to Warm Springs as well. In the discussion that follows I will be concerned only with transitive and intransitive clauses and the ways in which subjects and objects are indexed in every clause for person and number. What the system involves is a fundamental distinction in the indexing of first and second person subjects and objects and that of third person subjects and objects. The person and number of the former are indicated by choice among a set of clitics, of the latter by choice among a set of person-marking verb prefixes. The choice of a clitic indicates only that that person and number characterizes either the subject or object of the clause. For example, if the clitic -nam '2nd.pers.sg.' is used at the end of the first word in the clause , one knows only that 'you' is either subject or object. To determine which, one must look to the verb. If it has no prefix marking person, then the clitic has indicated that 'you' is subject. If the verb prefix is i- or pa- , respectively singular and plural third person subject prefixes, then 'you' is object. If on the other hand the verb prefix is á-, then 'you' is subject and the object is third person. E.g. Áunam winata. 'Then you will go'; Áunam i-q̓ínuta 'Then he will see you.'; Áunam á-q̓ínuta 'Then you will see him.' (au 'now, then'; wina- 'go'; q̓inu- 'see'; -ta 'future'). As seen by these examples, the clitics do not of themselves indicate the case status of the first or second person constituents they index. It is their interaction with the prefixes that does this. There is one pair of exceptions to this statement. If the subject is first person and the object is second person, the clitic unambiguously indicates this fact. E.g. Áumas q̓ínuta. 'Then I will see you (sg.)' If either subject or object is plural then the clitic is -mataš.

In contrast to the clitics, the person marking prefixes, with two exceptions, do always unambiguously index case as well as person and number of the constituents they refer to. That is to say that if one sees i- on a verb, there is definitely a third person subject, either actually singular or unmarked for plural. Pa- always indicates a third person plural subject. Pá- indicates that both subject and object are third person and that the subject is singular, and patá- indicates that subject is third person plural and object is third person singular. This is the system as laid out by Rigsby for all of Sahaptin, but based mainly on his work at Umatilla and Yakima. It is the system that has seemed to apply well to the Warm Springs data.

The first of the exceptions to the characterization of verb person-marking prefixes

as restricted to third person, and as capable of unambiguously marking person and number without reference to the clitics, involves a prefix pá- which is homophonous with the third person pá- mentioned above. This pá- is the only verb prefix indicating a non-third person and one recognizes it by its co-occurrence with the second person clitic -nam of the examples above. It then indicates first person object of the second person subject. Áunam páq̓inuta. 'Then you will see me.'

The second exception is to the generalization that the verb prefixes unambiguously indicate case without reference to the presence or absence of clitics. The pá- of the preceding paragraph is not, I think, an exception to this generalization in that both it and the other pá- do indicate object. Reference to the presence or absence of clitic pins down the person of the object, as well, of course, as distinguishing which pá- it is. The case of á- does offer an exception, however. As noted above, in the discussion of the clitics, the verb prefix á- indicates a third person object of the first or second person subject indexed by the clitic. The co-presence of a clitic and á- is what defines the case role of each. If this were the only use of á- then its mere presence would indicate third person object, even though a clitic would always co-occur. But, at Warm Springs á- may also be a variant of third person subject i-. This is the case at Umatilla also, and neither Rigsby nor I have ever felt we had a satisfactory explanation of the variation. Jacobs' grammar indicates the presence of this alternation in the Northwest dialects and the texts bear out the fact of alternation, though neither of Jacobs' very tentative and brief explanations of the basis of the alternations seems to hold up in light of the texts. This is clearly an area for research in all the dialects of Sahaptin. Comparison of the Joe Hunt Klickitat texts with the Cowlits texts seems to show that á- third person subject is more common in Klickitat than in Cowlitz, where its frequency is comparable to that at Warm Springs. An overall impression is that in Klickitat, (as represented by Joe Hunt; I have not checked the Mary Hunt and William Cree texts in the Jacobs collection for this alternation) á- is the most frequent third person singular subject prefix, whereas in the other dialects including Warm Springs i- is the most common. For Umatilla we have no texts available and must rely on Rigsby's grammatical sketch. This could be misleading for the following reason. It is clear from Jacobs field notebooks that in elicited paradigms he got almost entirely i- (probably from the translators). He also gives almost entirely i- in examples of verb forms in the section of the grammar on verb roots. In my elicited data I have almost entirely i-, and I presume that Rigsby does too. Yet all the dialects show alternation of i- with á- and Klickitat shows predominance of á-. In any case, one has to say that given á- on the verb one must check for presence or absence of clitic in order to know whether á- indicates third person subject or, alternatively, third person object of the subject indexed by a clitic.

To summarize thus far then, in the system at Warm Springs and Umatilla the clitics are entirely first and second person, and the verb prefixes with one exception third person. Furthermore, the clitics do not, with the exception of the máš and mátaš pair for second person subject with second person object, pin down the case function of the first or second person; their interaction with the verb prefixes does that. On the other hand, the verb prefixes do, with the exceptions of á- and the second-mentioned pá- unambiguously indicate case function. How do the northern dialects differ from this picture?

The situation with regard to this system of clitics and prefixes is different in a number of ways in the dialects reported in Jacobs' Sketch (1931) and in his volumes of texts (1929,1934,1937). First of all, those dialects have what seems from the Warm Springs and Umatilla prospective an "intruder" among the clitics, namely the third person clitic -pat. This clitic always indicates a third person plural subject and seems to be used only when the object is also third person, marked by an á- prefix on the verb. It often immediately precedes the verb, a fact which led me briefly to suspect that

it represented just a breaking into two parts of the Warm Springs and Umatilla verb prefixatá- which indicates a third person subject acting on a third person object. Closer scrutiny of the texts and of examples in the grammar revealed that the pat clitic can occur separated from á- by intervening lexical material or appear at the end of the verb when the verb is the first word in the clause. The clitic -pat- does not occur in Warm Springs Sahaptin nor in Umatilla and Rigsby suggests in his sketch of Sahaptin (ms.1974) that the origin of Warm Springs and Umatilla patá- may be in the merger of the -pat- of the Northwest dialects with á-, third person object. Another possible origin, however, might lie in the existence in the Walula- Palus reported by Jacobs of a prefix pa'á-. Both Jacobs and Rigsby suggest that this prefix represents a joining of the third plural subject pa- and the general third person object á- of Northwest Sahaptin to form a third- person-plural-subject third-person-plural-object prefix. It seems to me that this might also be the origin of patá-, with ' becoming t. This possibility seems to me to be strengthened by the fact that Warm Springs and Sahaptin forms in general more closely resemble the Walula-Palus form given by Jacobs than the Klickitat or Cowlitz. In any case, the existence of a third person plural clitic in the northwest dialects represents a difference from the Warm Springs and Umatilla specialization of the clitics to index only first and second persons.

Jacobs' grammar also points out another use of á-, one not mentioned by Rigsby for Umatilla nor included in his charts of clitics and verb prefixes. In the dialects studied by Jacobs, á- is not only as third person object of a first or second person subject, and as an alternant of third person singular subject i-, but also to indicate third person subject with third person object (singular or unmarked for number). In this use it is in alternation with pá-. More about this alternation in a later section. At this point , it suffices to point out that what this use of á- means for the system in the northern dialects, is that if á- occurs with a clitic then it indicates just that the object is third person, whereas if it occurs without a clitic, then only context will tell whether it indicates third person subject or indicates both third person subject and third person object. In any case, as in Warm Springs and Umatilla, á- is an exception to the generalization that the prefixes unambiguously indicate case without reference to the presence or absence of clitics.

The investigation of the alternation in the northern dialects of á- with pá- to indicate third person singular subject acting on third person object has turned out to be the most fruitful and exciting result of my attempts to pull together in this paper what I knew of the the differences between Warm Springs Sahaptin and the other dialects. It has led me to the discovery of at least a few uses of á- as third person subject with third person object in one of my Warm Springs texts and to the beginnings of an understanding of what may be involved in the choice between á- and pá- as third person subject with third person object prefix. .My research into this question is at its very earliest stages but the findings so far seem worth reporting at once for their wider relevance to discourse functions of grammatical features.

In the manuscript of Rigsby's sketch of Sahaptin grammar, he reports that pá- is the prefix used to indicate, in and of itself, third person singular subject acting on third person object. Though he mentions that Jacobs reports this prefix in alternation with á- in the Northwestern dialects, he does not indicate any use of the alternate at Umatilla and does not include the á- form in his chart of transitive clause prefixes and clitics (except of course for its use as third person object of first or second subjects.) In my own work at Warm Springs everything seemed to bear out Rigsby's analysis. In fact, I had become unaware, if I ever really was aware, of the use of á- as an alternant of pá- in Jacobs grammar and texts. Rereading Rigsby, and particularly his characterization of pá- as an obviative, led me to look more closely at Jacobs' mention of pá- and á- in the grammar. I was interested in finding out what kind of obviation

was involved. Rigsby had not gone beyond using the word, and since in clauses using pá- the nouns if expressed would always be marked by suffixes indicating which was subject and which was object, I felt the need of information about how pá- was obviative. If it was not in contrast with a non-obviative prefix then how did it tell you, without nouns, which of two third persons was subject and which object. Jacobs on this question, for dialects in which it indeed is in contrast with a non-obviative á-, was only partially helpful. He says that it differs from Algonquian and Kutenai obviative in that pá- is used when the third person object of a third person subject is "the former or first of two persons or things." That it was the object that was involved as first or former was important to learn. While working on a verse analysis of the second Joe Hunt text (Jacobs,1929) I had begun to suspect that pá- was playing some kind of role at least in keeping track of turns at talk. I could not pin it down, however. Unsatisfied with Jacobs' brief description of pá-s obviative function, and knowing now that it was in contrast with á-, I turned again to the Joe Hunt text in order to determine what being "former or first" meant. In other words I was seeking to determine the scope of the obviation. The results were exciting..

Hunt's text (the second in the 1929 volume) is a story of Cougar and his four younger brothers, but actually of Cougar and his youngest brother Wildcat. Jumping into the middle of my verse analysis of the story I soon saw that Wildcat seemed to be the chief recipient of the obviative pá-. Whenever he was object of someone's action the pá- was used, whereas if another character was object of a third person subject á- was used. Trying to trace this back in the narrative for its first occurrence, I found that, though Cougar is the first introduced, and though he carries all the action up to the first use of pá-, that first use of pá- is not when he first becomes object of third person subject, but rather when he first speaks to Wildcat. Until then Wildcat has been mentioned only as last in the list of Cougar's four yougер brothers. This mention of him and the use of the obviative in the verb of Cougar's speaking to him apparently singles him out as the one to count as "first." And indeed for the rest of the story, with a limited number of exceptions, all other uses of pá- in the text to mark third person subject with third person object involve Wildcat as object. Furthermore whenever he is object of the verb with a third person subject pá- is used. To this latter, there is just one exception in this rather long narrative and it is a case where i- is used though the object is expressed and marked for accusative. Thus it does not involve a choice between á- and pá-. If one examines the exceptions to Wildcat's being the object whenever pá- is used, they all involve either Cougar or one other character, Timber Rabbit. Furthermore, in all cases but two Wildcat is subject of the verb with pá- prefix of which any other character is object (whether expressed as noun or not.) Those two cases are at one point in the narrative and involve two parallel occurrences of pá-. Cougar and Wildcat are temporarily together, Wildcat has declared that he can carry it out, that he too is a man. The plan involves killing a dangerous being that threatens them and severing the head so that the head will follow Wildcat and the body Cougar. The plan is carried out and when it is told that the head follows Wildcat pá- is used, and immediately afterward it is told in syntactic parallelism that the body follows Cougar and does not overtake him, both with pá-. This is the only instance of Cougar being object in a pá- construction with a subject other than Wildcat. The two instances of his being object in pá- construction where Wildcat is subject occur, first, when Wildcat has asked Cougar how he will find him again if they separate, Cougar explains how and Wildcat replies to him (Pá- on reply) "OKay". The second occurence is when after Wildcat's last adventure Cougar has found him again and stands looking down at him. Wildcat sees him, and the verb see has a pá- prefix.

The instances of Timber Rabbit being object in a pá- construction all involve Wildcat as subject. There are a number of them during an episode in which Wildcat comes upon Timber Rabbit in his travels and Timber Rabbit suggests they should play together.

The first use of pá- with Wildcat as subject and Timber Rabbit as object occurs in the verb of saying in Wildcat's refusal. Finally they do take turns scratching each other, at Timber Rabbits suggestion and with Wildcat's reluctant compliance.There are about six uses of pá- with Wildcat as subject and an equal number with him as object during the page long episode which ends with Wildcat's killing and skinning Timber Rabbit, all with pá- prefix. Here the role being played by pá- constructions is less clear then in the rest of the narrative. All instances of Wildcat's being object are here, as elsewhere, marked by pá-. Perhaps in this case the use of pá- pretty much reciprocally is indicating something about the importance of this interaction with Timber Rabbit. At the end of it Wildcat "predicts" timber rabbits future as just being food for wildcat. He then rejoins his brother Cougar.

Thus, the obviative pá- turns out to be very interesting indeed and much more investigation is needed of its role in other texts collected by Jacobs and in my Warm Springs data. Looking at one text of Hazel Suppah's I have found that not all occurrences of third person subject with third person object are marked with pá- and that there are indeed two occurrences of á- which may be third person subject with third person object. What is the case is this narrative is that almost all occurrences of pá- can be seen as a choice between using pá- and using a construction with i- marking third person subject and maring the noun if present with -na accusative. The occurrences of pá- seem to be limited almost entirley to cases where members of the East Wind family are object of the action. This would make sense because, though it is a story of the wrestling matches of the North and East winds, the main thread of the narrative is how the orphaned son of the East Wind chief avenges his father's death and rescues his grandparents from mistreatment by the North Wind people. A few pá- forms seem not to fit this analysis. Further work on the narrative may clarify their occurrence. The analysis of one long narrative in which the use of pá- so clearly singles out one character as protagonist, and of another where it singles out a family opens up an exciting area for research, one in which verse analysis of narratives will undoubtedly play a role in working out the discourse and particularly the narrative functions of choice of pá- over other alternatives.

Another area in which the difference between the dialects reported by Jacobs and Warm Springs and Umatilla needs to be pursued for its relevance to discourse and narrative structure is that of the uses of the two prefixes á- and i- as alternate third person subject markers. As noted above, its is clear that for all dialects i- is the elicitation form. Yet á- occurs in this function in all dialects, though with differing frequency. In light of the discovery of the possible discourse and narrative role of pá- as against á- in both KlicKitat and Warm Springs, and in Cowlitz where I have made a hurried check during the writing of this paper and found a probable similar use, it seems not unlikely that what has seemed like free alternation of i- and á- may be serving discourse or narrative functions. To find this out, and to firm up the hypothesized function of pá- vs. á-, it will be necessary to study the texts of individual narrators as well as different dialects. Within KlicKitat one will want to look not only at the published texts by Joe Hunt but also at those by Mary Hunt and William Cree which are in the Jacobs collection. Any modern KlicKitat texts will be relevant as well, both as examples of the dialect and as examples of different speakers. Within my Warm Springs data I will want to study each narrator and each genre of narratives separately in research on the discourse functions of these prefixes.

The final difference between Warm Springs and the other Sahaptin dialects is the one that this paper started out to be about. It lies in two related phenomena. For many words in which the other dialects, including Umatilla, have an obscure vowel (ə or ɨ), the corresponding word at Warm Springs has no vowel at all. Examples are tǫš 'cheeK'; tχš 'willow'; ksks 'little'; kst 'cold'; pčš 'door'. There are many, many more.

The other difference lies in the fact that there are a large number of words in Warm Springs Sahaptin in which a stressed vowel that occurs in that word in the other dialects is not present and the stress has been shifted to the other vowel of the word. These missing vowels may be either obscure stressed vowels (which Jacobs says never drop out in the Northwest dialects in the way that unstressed vowels may) or full vowels. A few examples out of the many I have collected are:(WS forms first) pt'xánu 'wooded mountain' vs. pát'xanu; twít'aš 'grizzly bear' vs. túwit'aš; ápx 'hide,skin' vs. apáx; núkʷt 'meat' vs. nəkʷát. In future. I hope to be able to document this process more fully. Its interest lies, it seems to me, in the suggestion it gives that Sahaptin is a language in which the consonants are somehow more important to the identity of the lexeme than the vowels. If one sees how vowels may be lost, stress may shift and yet the consonantal skeleton of the word remains one is prompted to think of another feature of all Sahaptin dialects. this feature was ponted out by Jacobs and is found in Warm Springs Sahaptin as well. There is a very common process by which adverbs or adjectives are derived from verb roots. The verb roots are typical vowel-less and the adverbials have long vowel aa: e.g ƛ'xʷ 'to use up, to do all of ' becomes ƛ'áaxʷ all; šx 'be angry' becomes šáax 'fierce'; čš 'to fool, tease' becomes čaaš or by a further process ča'áaš 'foolish, silly'; q̓ʷł 'to unti or loosen' becomes q̓ʷaał 'untied, loose'; kkń 'be full' káakm 'full'. Vowels may be inserted to derive new words with an intensive meaning: e.g. łkʷí 'day' becomes łíkʷi all day. Vowels may "breaK" to give a different but related meaning: e.g púuł 'blind' pu'úuł 'almost pretty nearly blind (Verbena Greene at Warm Springs); niix 'nice, good, well' ni'íix 'careful'. In addition vowels may be lengthened for expressive or narrative structural purposes. This is not to say that there are no consonant changes for expressive or derivational purposes in Sahaptin. For example, n to l, š to ś and č to c are very common for diminutivization and for "Coyote talK" or "talking little", a way of talking characteristic of some individuals. There are also a few cases of consonant change for augmentation . Aasá 'claw' to aałá 'huge claw' comes immediately to mind. But overwhelmingly it is the vowels that change for derivational and expressive purposes. Thus perhaps it is not surprising that the kind of dropping out of stressed vowels that seems to have occurred at Warm Springs should take place.

References

Jacobs, Melville. 1929. Northwest Sahaptin Texts. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, Vol.2 no.6. University of Washington Press. Seattle.

1931. Sketch of Northern Sahaptin Grammar. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, Vol.4 no.2. University of Washington Press. Seattle.

1934. Northwest Sahaptin Texts Part I.(English) Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology XIX Part 1. Columbia University Press. New York.

1937.Northwest Sahaptin Texts Part II. (Sahaptin) Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology XIX Part 2. Columbia University Press. New York.

Rigsby,Bruce. ms.1974. Sahaptin Grammar. (In preparation for the Language volume of the Handbook of American Indians to be published by Smithsonian Institution.)