

NOTES ON THE COMPARISON OF**WAKASHAN AND SALISH****Terry J. Klokeid****University of Hawaii****0. Introduction****1. Universal and typological rules****2. Swadesh's structural comparisons****3. A sketch of Nitinat syntax****4. Summary and conclusions****Prepared for**

**Fourth International Conference
on Salish Languages,
University of Victoria,
British Columbia, August 25-6, 1969**

relationship of the languages, in the absence of supporting information, is not a matter agreed upon by comparative linguists:

It is possible to have hundreds of sets of correspondences between languages in matters of precise detail, including phonology, and still not be dealing with genetically related languages. (Miller 1967:87)

Gary Parker (personal communication; 1965, in press) indicates the extent to which two languages may exhibit shared features and yet be unrelated: Quechua, in some four and a half centuries of contact with Spanish, has borrowed hundreds of vocabulary items, and has changed its vowel inventory from an original set of three to a set of five, which Spanish has. But in one aspect of the grammar, borrowing has been minimal: Quechua, to its postposed system of case marking, has added only two prepositions taken from Spanish, and even those are generally used in addition to, rather than instead of, the corresponding native postposed elements (1965:21).²

Thus, if two languages share grammatical rules, then this would constitute evidence additional to, and probably stronger than, sets of phonetic correspondences in vocabulary. As Hoffer (1969) points out, a major problem here is that certain rules may be shared by all languages (universal rules, U), and others are shared by typologically related languages. A typological relationship (TR) holds when shared rules involve word ordering and grammatical categories present, but without shared phonological realization of grammatical elements. A genetic relationship (GR) involves languages related by common origin. Their common origin is established by demonstrating that they share rules throughout their syntax and phonology. Much recent work has been done in the search for universal rules (e.g. Fillmore 1968) and the establishing of typologies (e.g. Greenberg 1966). Following Hoffer (1969), I take the view that

The Salish and Wakashan languages examined fall into one basic order type: Nt, Nk, Kw; Sq, Sn, Sh, and Ka are all Pr, VSO languages. All except Ka are AN (for Ka data is lacking). Thus none of the phenomena which Greenberg gives as holding for VSO languages can be used to establish GR between Wakashan and Salish. Examples of these are summarized below. The first five are true for all languages and the second set of eight for VSO languages. (Numbering here does not correspond to Greenberg's.)

U

1. Subject noun phrase (NP) precedes object NP in declarative sentences.
2. In conditional statements, condition precedes conclusion.
3. Demonstrative, numeral, adjective precede the noun in that order, or follow in the same order or the mirror image of it.
4. Case and number precede the noun in that order, or follow in the reverse order.
5. Pronominal categories include at least three persons and two numbers.

TR

1. VSO languages are prepositional.
2. Genitive follows noun in prepositional languages.
3. SVO exists as an alternative order.
4. There are no question particles or affixes specified in position by reference to a particular word in the sentence.
5. Interrogative words are always placed sentence-initially.
6. An inflected auxiliary precedes the main verb.
7. VSO languages have the order NA in NPs. But there are a few exceptions to this:

Xinca Tagabilili, Tsou (Philippine Austronesian)

Sn, Ka, Sq, Sh (Salish)

Nt, Nk, Kw (Wakashan)

Quileute Chimakuan

semantic typology, and in addition appears to be highly susceptible to borrowing.

Item (15), the 'predicative use of nouns', is found, as Boas noted years ago⁶, in all languages which lack an equivalent of the verb 'be'.

Thus, many of Swadesh's comparisons are based on typological similarities and cannot be used as they stand for GR.

3. Sketch of Nitinat

If the descriptive linguist organizes his grammar with comparative study in mind, then the ultimate comparison will be greatly simplified. A method for organizing the syntactic rules has been suggested, and an illustrative sketch of Nitinat is now presented. After each set of GR rules, the corresponding structures

of the languages which do not use them will be given informally. The author would welcome substantive comments on the ordering and formulation of these rules.

The grammar below has the following kinds of rules:

- (1) A universal base (UB), shared by all languages (Bach 1968). Unordered phrase structure and feature development rules of which the right-hand-sides are unordered sets.
- (2) A typological component (TR rules) which assign ordering or indicate inflections, etc. (greenberg 1966). Unordered transformational rules.
- (3) A genealogical component (GR rules), transformational rules shared by genetically related languages (Hoffer 1969), in this case: (a) Wakashan, (b) Nootkan.
- (4) Individual language rules (IL rules), transformational rules unique to one language, in this case, Nitinat.

A particular language may be an exception to some TR or GR rule. Semantic interpretation, which would follow the U rules, is not considered here. Phonological rules, not stated formally below, should probably also be divided

(iii) SD: (Det), (Numeral), ($\left\{ \begin{matrix} \text{Adjective} \\ \#S\# \end{matrix} \right\}$), (Noun)

SC: 1, 2, 3, 4 → 1+2+3+4

These rules reflect the three basic order types of Greenberg's typological schema, and place Wakashan and Salish in his basic order type 2 (1966:108).

The other TR rules listed in section 1 of this paper should be placed here also.

(3) GR rules

(3a) Wakashan

(i) SD: Modal, Verb, [-Participant
-Listener
-Plural]
1 2 3

SC: 1 → 1 + 3

The features for person and number of the subject are duplicated in the Aux. It is a very common rule, found also for example in Salish and Nyungic (cf. Hale 1967:3), but it is not clear whether it should be considered a typological rule.

(ii) SD: Verb, X, [+Subject
 +Participant]

SC: 3 → null

A first or second person pronoun does not appear overtly in the subject NP. In Nootka, the deletion is optional.

In Shuswap, pronouns of all three numbers are prevented from appearing in the subject NP.

(iii) SD: Aux, X, #, Y, Modal, Z, #, W
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

SC: 5 → [-Nominal]

In subordinate clauses, the Modal must be [-Nominal]. Person categories, tense, etc., are retained in the Aux of the subordinate clause.⁷

(3b) Nootkan

(i) SD: Modal, Verb, [-Subject], $\begin{bmatrix} \text{-Agent} \\ \text{-Participant} \end{bmatrix}$

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

SC: 1 → 1+4, 3 → 4

Person categories partly determine which NP becomes subject and what the voice of the verb is. Rule (i) states that if the Agent is first or second person, it is subject. The verb is not marked for voice, i.e. is 'active'.

(ii) SD: Modal, Verb, [-Subject], $\begin{bmatrix} \text{-Goal} \\ \text{-Participant} \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} \text{-Agent} \\ \text{-Participant} \end{bmatrix}$

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

SC: 1 → 1+5, 3 → 5, 2 → [-Passive]

If the Agent is third person and the Goal first or second, the Goal must be subject. When the Goal is subject, the Verb is [-Passive] (passive marker is /-'it/).

(iii) SD: same as (ii), but with Goal marked [-Participant]

SC: 1 → 1 + $\begin{bmatrix} \text{eGoal} \\ \text{-eAgent} \end{bmatrix}$,

3 → $\begin{bmatrix} \text{eGoal} \\ \text{-eAgent} \end{bmatrix}$

2 → [ePassive]

If both the Goal and Agent NPs are third person, either may be subject.

Kwakiutl differs in that any of the NPs: Goal, Agent, Instrument, Dative may become subject, and the person categories do not determine which.

Squamish, however, appears to have the same syntactic rules as Nootkan, except that third person acting on first may sometimes be active, though commonly passive.

The phonological rules for [-Iteration] appear to be the same for all Wakashan: the alternation of s and k in the suffixes reflects the same process as the alternants for Nootkan [-Duration].

In Shuswap, there is aspect marking in the verb only:

imperfect: Ø

perfect: m

(4) IL rules for Nitinat

(i) In coordinate clauses, if the Agent is the same, and there is a first person marker present, then the latter is realized as /iy/ (rather than as /s/ or /id/, cf. p.10) in all clauses after the first. The first person need not be the Agent. In Kw, if the subject is the same in both clauses, the marker of subject is deleted from the second. According to Boas (1947:283), BellaBella (Wakashan), Quileute (Chimakuan), Nanaimo, Lillooet, and Chehalis (Salish) all share the rule found in Kw. But Sq has no deletion or replacement rule at all for coordinate clauses.

These various rules are exemplified below:

	I was seen and I ran away.	I saw him and I ran away.
English	Ø	Ø
Nt	I	iy
Kw	Ø	Ø
Sq	I	I

Meaning of symbols: Ø: delete person marker 'I'

I: retain " "

iy: replace person marker by /iy/

FOOTNOTES

1. Chimakuan is largely omitted from consideration in this paper because the basic source, Andrade in HAIL 3, is unavailable to the author.

This paper was originally submitted to Prof. Bates Hoffer III, for Linguistics 651, University of Hawaii, spring 1969. The author's analysis of Nitinat and Nootka has benefitted from comments by W. H. Jacobsen, Jr. and S. Starosta on earlier formulations. Critical readings of an earlier version of the paper by Prof. Hoffer and C.-J. Bailey are gratefully acknowledged. The author's fieldwork on Nitinat in the summers of 1966 and 1968 was supported by Faculty Research and Canada Council grants to Prof. G. N. O'Grady, University of Victoria; and his fieldwork on Northern Nootka (Kyuquot, Chiclisit) in May, 1967, was supported in part by a Faculty Research grant to Prof. O'Grady, and in part by a Canada Council grant to Prof. Morris Swadesh, University of Alberta. The author is grateful to Prof. Laurence C. Thompson for providing research space at the Pacific and Asian Linguistics Institute, University of Hawaii, 1968-9, where much of the analysis of Nitinat syntax was done.

2. A more extensive systems of conjunctions has been borrowed from Spanish into Quechua. But unlike the prepositions, which no previously established rule could introduce, the conjunctions conform to a pattern of some very common subordinate particles already in Quechua. (Gary Parker, personal communication) Grammatical borrowing is much easier within one typology than across typologies.

5. Primary sources of data(unless otherwise acknowledged) and language abbreviations:

WAKASHAN: (1) Nootkan branch:

(a) Makah (Mk): Wm. H. Jacobsen, Jr., personal communication, 1966-9

(b) Nitinat (Nt): the author's data, collected 1966, 1968

that there is even stronger evidence in Nt (and possibly also in Nk) than the Nk sentences from which Bach draws some of his motivation (p.115) for his proposal.

7. In Mk and Nk, the person categories are apparently not overtly marked in subordinate clauses. The pattern in Kw. is limited to temporal clauses, and the person marker is the same as the possessive form (Nootkan lacks distinct person markers for possessives.)

8. Topicalization in Nootkan was first brought to my attention by W. H. Jacobsen, Jr., who first described its application in Mk (personal comm.)

Hess, Thomas Melville. 1967. Snohomish Grammatical Structure.

University of Washington dissertation.

Hoffer, Bates III. 1969. On the syntactic comparison of Okinawan and Japanese. To appear in Journal-Newsletter of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, Yale.

Jacobsen, Wm. H. Jr. 1969. Origin of the Nootka Pharyngeals.

IJAL 35.125-53.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. The Squamish Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary. The Hague, Mouton.

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1967. The Japanese Language. Chicago.

Newman, Stanley. 1968. A comparative study of Salish lexical suffixes. Paper presented to the Third International Salish Conference, University of Victoria.

Parker, Gary. 1965. Grammatica del Quechua Ayacuchano. Lima, Peru, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Mardos.

_____. In press. Ayacucho Quechua Grammar and Dictionary. The Hague, Mouton.

Sapir, Edward and M. Swadesh. 1939. Nootka Texts. Philadelphia, LSA.

Swadesh, Morris. 1939. Nootka Internal Syntax. IJAL 9.77-102.

_____. 1949. Linguistic approach to Salish prehistory. In M. W. Smith, ed., Indians of the Urban Northwest, 161-73. New York.

_____. 1953a. Mosan I: a problem of remote common origin. IJAL 19.26-44.

_____. 1953b. Mosan II: Comparative vocabulary. IJAL 19.223-36.

_____. 1953c. Salish-Wakshan Comparisons noted by Boas. IJAL 19.290-1.

Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel Language. Oslo, Det Norske Videnskaps Akademi.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1966. Explorations in semantic theory. In T. Sebeok et al, eds., Current Trends in Linguistics III.