1. The intent of this paper is to present some information on agent hierarchies in Upper Chehalis. Because of the nature of the data on this language, this information is almost certainly only fragmentary, but perhaps worth looking at in relation to other studies of hierarchies in nearby Salishan languages (Jelinek and Demers 1983; Gerdes 1983). Since the hierarchies in Upper Chehalis are apparently quite different from those in the languages to the north (Lushootseed, Lummi, Halkomelem, Squamish), further studies will be in order to try to understand how these various patterns came about, and why they differ from language to language, even when the languages are quite closely related. Among other things, the hierarchies in the languages north of Upper Chehalis seem to have a relationship to ergativity in those languages; that is not the case in Upper Chehalis.

Studies devoted specifically to hierarchies in language seem to be relatively recent (besides the references above, see particularly Silverstein 1976, Zwicky 1977, and, for a recent study of Algonquian hierarchies, Jolley 1983). I know of none from the early sixties when I was doing field work on Upper Chehalis, and when it would have been possible to elicit specific pertinent information. Since this was not possible at the time, I must now rely on my field notes (which concentrate on other topics) and on texts, and some information on hierarchies may thus have to be only inferential. Much remains to be done on Upper Chehalis texts; Boas left some 380 pages of texts, but only published a third of one story. My own collection of texts is much smaller. There is undoubtedly a vast amount of syntactic information recoverable from these texts, but that remains to be done.

I have noted two agent hierarchies in Upper Chehalis, one having to do with second person objects, and the other with third person. I see no connection between the two.

2. The first of these hierarchies is a prohibition on the cooccurrence of a second person object suffix (singular or plural) with a first plural subject. This restriction applies in both aspectual sets of person markers, where continuative aspect subjects are suffixes and non-continuative aspect subjects are enclitics; object suffixes precede both types of subject markers. The following table of Upper Chehalis object and subject markers is included to facilitate recognition of these components in example sentences given later.
subject is indicated with a possessive affix. Since the first person plural complete subject clitic and possessive suffix are phonologically identical, these constructions differ from those in 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 in that I leave a space before a subject clitic, and their dependent status is marked by a prefixed s-.

17. mίtà t s'aγdαnγis 'we didn't see us'
Contrast this with 18 and 19.
18. mίtà t aγdαγtulì 'you didn't see us'
19. mίtà t s'aγtulì 'he didn't see us'

2.1. Besides involving a different set of avoidances, there is another aspect of this Upper Chehalis hierarchy which differs from languages to the north. Where those languages resort to passive constructions (Jelinek and Demers 1983, Hem 1973), Upper Chehalis simply uses a third person object with an object complement to indicate second person. I have no evidence that passives are used there for this purpose, but it may be possible. Passives are common in Upper Chehalis, and occur frequently in texts, but I have made no specific study of them to see what restrictions in their usage there may be. Any person can be subject/patient of a passive construction:

20. lit tαt'sαw'satm 'he was left'
21. lit tαt'sαw'satm 'i was left'
22. lit tαt'sαw'satm s 'you were left'
23. lit tαt'sαw'satm 'alp 'you (pl.) were left'
I have far fewer examples of passives in the continuous aspect in my Upper Chehalis data, but have no evidence that there are any other restrictions on them. Their construction is different, however; the subject/patient is indicated by an object suffix, not a subject clitic, as in non-continuous aspect constructions:

24. sαgā'yγanisonis 'my teeth are chattering'
25. aγdα'yγnisonis 'i am catching cold'
(These are very peculiar constructions, even for Salish. The passive marker here is -st, for which I know no cognates. Nearly all my examples of continuous passives have third person subject/patients, where the subject is often zero, but states of health are typically continuous passives as in these examples.)

3. The other Upper Chehalis agent hierarchy has to do with human vs. non-human third person subjects and objects. Here the restriction seems to be that a predicative with a non-human subject may not have a human object expressed by one of the usual object suffixes. But again, passive is not the technique used to avoid these constructions. Instead, Upper Chehalis has an obviative suffix which is used in these instances to express a human object. (As far as I know, among Salishan languages only Upper Chehalis, Cowlitz, and Columbia have obviative suffixes.) The obviative suffix is -(t)wal-/- (t)wal-, and simply replaces the usual third person object suffix. As an obviative, it is used as a device to index multiple third persons in a sentence, as in Algonquian. Boas (1931:109) gives clear examples of this usage:

26. tit q'ìwts, hóy n ta s'ìwtm 'he called her and she saw it'
27. tit q'ìwts, hóy n ta s'ìtwali 'he called her and she saw the one who called'

Such constructions are relatively straightforward, and occur frequently in texts. But the obviative is also used when a human is the object of a sentence with a non-human subject. These constructions always puzzled me until I recently realized that they reflect a hierarchical distinction. Most examples I have are with an animal as subject:

28. 'it q'ìtwali tát qαγ 'the dog growled at him'
29. sαtwal tát qαγ 'the dog is looking for him'
30. s'ìtwali tát qαγ 'the dog was afraid of him'

A human object with an indefinite subject also seems to call for the obviative:

31. s'ìwε's cutεn wά 't yátwaln 'somebody took him home'
32. s'ìwε's wά 's'ìtwaln 'somebody is calling him'

How all this fits together I do not know, and further study of the Upper Chehalis obviative is needed.

4. I draw no conclusions from these data. It seems clear that agent hierarchies in Upper Chehalis are different from those in at least some other Salishan languages. To understand how such differences might have arisen will require much more knowledge about hierarchies in Salish and other languages of the Northwest. More also needs to be known about hierarchies in other languages of the world. The Upper Chehalis system shows some parallels to the Kiksht system described by Silverstein (1976), but the relevance of these parallels is unclear to me, since the Kiksht hierarchy is coordinated with the split-ergative case system of that language, whereas case is scarcely relevant to Upper Chehalis (unless one wishes to view the pronominal markers as expressing case, in which instance the language is strictly nominative-accusative).

FOOTNOTES

1. My Upper Chehalis data were collected from 1969 onward under the auspices of the American Philosophical Society Library, Indiana University, and the National Science Foundation. Forms cited here were obtained from the late Silas Heck.

2. Unfortunately my field notes have no examples of non-dependent possessives with subjects of the type discussed by Boas (1974) 'we are your fathers', 'you are our father(s)'. Perhaps examples will turn up in texts.
3. Note that with an obviative object suffix, a complement, when present, refers to the subject of the predication. With a regular third person object suffix, such a complement would refer to the object, and with an intransitive predicate the complement refers to the subject; this is the usual Salishan pattern.

a. ?it ?q̣ən tit q̣əʔa? 'he saw the dog'
b. ?it ẉq̣́ʔ tit q̣əʔa? 'the dog ran'

This, as far as I can tell, is as close as Upper Chehalis comes to ergative-type constructions.
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