

UC Berkeley

Survey Reports, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages

Title

Tsimshianic /-initial Plurals: Relics of an Ancient Penutian Pattern

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3bx3m4md>

Author

Tarpent, Marie-Lucie

Publication Date

2000

TSIMSHIANIC /-INITIAL PLURALS:
RELICS OF AN ANCIENT PENUTIAN PATTERN

MARIE-LUCIE TARPENT

Mount Saint Vincent University

1. INTRODUCTION. Sapir's 'Penutian phylum', characterized by him in few sentences (1929), is often considered to rely on vague typological similarities rather than substantive evidence.¹ Lexical resemblances have been attributed to 'massive borrowing', and the important feature of reduplication to non-conclusive iconicity (Silverstein 1979:664). Such a priori views have prevented serious consideration of the morphological evidence.

In systematic comparisons of Tsimshianic with 'Penutian' languages, taking as their point of departure reconstructed Proto-Tsimshianic (Tarpent 1990, 1994, 1996, 1997, in prep.), the number and the type of morphological resemblances, both in structure and in actual morphemes, found throughout the phylum, strongly support the hypothesis of genetic relationship between the constituent families, including Tsimshianic. Particularly important are what appear to be shared retentions or relic forms.

One of these is the plural verbal affix in //, which corresponds to a normally segmentable morpheme or formant in several of the languages; in addition, traces of an archaic Proto-Tsimshianic pattern discernible in submorphemic alternations between /-initial plural and velar-initial singular verbal stems are also found in several other Penutian languages (Tarpent 1997:78), suggesting that this pattern is of great antiquity. The existence of such an unusual relic feature, added to lexical similarities in the stems showing these alternations, strongly supports the hypothesis of genetic unity of some version of the Penutian group as a whole.

2. THE TSIMSHIANIC LANGUAGES AND THEIR ANCESTOR. The Tsimshianic languages are spoken in Northern British Columbia, close to the tip of the Alaska panhandle. The Maritime branch includes Southern Tsimshian (ST) and Coast Tsimshian (CT), while the Interior branch is comprised of Nisqa'a (N) and Gitksan (G). ST and N are the two crucial ones for reconstruction of the proto-language as they are demonstrably the most conservative in phonology and morphology.

ST and CT have five long and five short vowels plus four diphthongs, N and G have five long and (in native words) three short vowels, plus three diphthongs, but only two vowels need to be reconstructed for Proto-Tsimshianic (PTsim): these are noted *e and *a, representing /ə/ and /a/ respectively; the PTsim vowel nucleus could also include an optional element noted as H, probably originally a schwa-glide, whose presence, added to the influence of surrounding consonants or glides, accounts for a great variety of vowel correspondences within the family (Tarpent 1990, 1994 and in prep.). The cover symbols E and A indicate that the basic vowels *e and *a could occur either with or without the presence of H in alternate forms of the same root (e.g. *CEC = *CéC/*CéHC). In most cases this presence is only detectable under stress.

Proto-Tsimshianic morphological structure (Tarpent 1997:70-76) is based in most cases on a *(C)CVC root to which affixes are added for derivation and inflection. In addition, the element H probably represented a morpheme with *imperfective* meaning, sometimes including *repetitive* meaning, as suggested from its occurrence in some very old plurals (Tarpent 1994; see example (1) and 3.2.2., 3.2.3. below). There are also reasons to assume that some *CVC roots go back to an earlier, Pre-Proto-Tsimshianic (PPTsim) bipartite stage **CVh-**VC (e.g. [21] below). Similarly, initial consonant clusters can often be traced back to loss of a vowel, e.g. CCVC <

¹ I had originally intended to give a general presentation on my growing file of "Penutian morphological elements," i.e. those occurring through most of Sapir's (1921) Penutian. Since the file was much too large and complex to present during the allotted time, I decided to concentrate on only one of the elements. Hence the title "Relics of a plural pattern" added for the conference presentation, and the new title of the final version.

*CVC-VC. In particular, PTsim initial glottalized C's can be traced back to PPTsim ? + C, so PTsim *C'VC < PPTsim **?VC-**EC (Tarpent 1997:71).

3. TSIMSHIANIC PLURAL-FORMATION (VERBS). The distinction between singular and plural is of great importance for Tsimshianic verbs, less so for nouns. Apart from very rare oddities such as²

- | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| (1) ST | <i>ksü:X</i> | '(pl Subj) to go out (of a house)' | PTsim | <i>*kséHqw</i> |
| ST, N | <i>ksáxw</i> | '(sg Subj) to go out' | | <i>*kséqw</i> |

where the distinction is evidenced in the vowel (reflecting the former presence or absence of H), Tsimshianic plural verb stems are formed most generally by reduplication, less commonly by prefixation. Numerous irregularities in both types of plural-formation testify to their antiquity, with evidence for at least three distinct historical periods (e.g. for Nisqa'a: 'Early, Classical and Modern', Tarpent 1983).³ Although the meaning distinction between the two types is occasionally blurred in the modern languages, there is still a basic difference in semantic and grammatical meaning.

3.1. REDUPLICATION. I mention reduplication only as a contrast to prefixation in both morphological and semantic terms. Reduplication is by far the most common method of plural formation in verbs. Full reduplication, typically CVC)CVC on a root CVC (where ") follows the reduplicated syllable), indicates *repeated action* by or on the experiencer of the action. For *intransitive verbs*, this usually means a single action performed by plural subjects, as in

- | | | | | |
|-------|----------------|-------|------------|-----------|
| (2) N | <i>qas)qús</i> | pl of | <i>qús</i> | 'to jump' |
|-------|----------------|-------|------------|-----------|

For *transitive verbs*, reduplication indicates either repeated action on the same object, as in

- | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|---|-------|--------------|---|
| (3) ST | <i>q'ats)q'óts</i> | 'to cut, cut up, slice, dice, etc. (sg/pl Obj)' | pl of | <i>q'óts</i> | 'to cut (sg Obj)' (= make a single cut) |
|--------|--------------------|---|-------|--------------|---|

or repetition of the same action on several objects, as in (3) and also in

- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------|---|-------|----------------|--|
| (4) N | <i>lu:=kix)ká?</i> | 'to stare at (several persons in turn)' | pl of | <i>lu:=ká?</i> | 'to stare at (one person)' (<i>lu:=</i> 'in', <i>ká?</i> 'to see (s.)') |
|-------|--------------------|---|-------|----------------|--|

('=' indicates the boundary of proclitic and verb)

Contemporary irregular forms such as N *q'á:ʔaX*, plural of *q'áq* 'to be open' (< **q'áHq)q'aq/*q'áq*), *si:saX*, plural of *sáq* 'to be sharp' (< **séHq)seq/*séHq*), and many others, which show a different stress pattern as well as other irregularities, attest to the antiquity of the CVC)CVC formula in Tsimshianic. So do cases of reduplication occurring independently of derivational prefixation, as for instance in N *ʔapá:paq'askw* < **ʔa- *páHq)paq-ʔskw* '(pl Subj)

²Sources of Tsimshianic data: except where otherwise indicated, N and ST data are from my own fieldwork (see fn. 9), CT data from Dunn (1978) (sometimes rephonemized), G data from Bruce Rigsby (p.c.) ST, CT *ü* is a high central unrounded vowel or corresponding glide.

³The major features of the description of Nisqa'a plural formations presented in Tarpent (1983) are still correct in their basic outline, and these basic features also apply to Gitksan, Southern Tsimshian and Coast Tsimshian, but many of my speculations about the derivations of some of the more irregular, older or isolated N forms are outdated now in the light of comparative evidence from the other Tsimshianic languages. In particular, it was only in 1990 that I was able to interpret some puzzling vowel alternations by hypothesizing the intervention of the element "H"

to be affected by a strong emotion, e.g. upset, excited'. A more recent, productive version of the formula (as in [4]) allows stems of any length to be pluralized by the reduplicative method.

3.2. PREFIXATION. The other traditional method of pluralizing *intransitive* stems (including intransitive verbs and adjectives) is prefixation. The plural prefix *lə-* (with vowel adjustment) is now unproductive and only a limited number of forms make use of it.⁴ As with reduplication, irregularities in some of the forms attest to the antiquity of this method.

3.2.1. REGULAR FORMATIONS (MOST RECENT). In the majority of forms, the prefix *lə-* is clearly segmentable, and stress falls on the root. Semantically, *lə-* prefixation indicates that the same single actions are performed or single states experienced individually but together by several subjects, almost always *persons*: older consultants translate these forms as '(they, etc.) all ...'. At least in N, the prefix is usually accompanied by the very common "medial" suffix noted as *-T* (phonologically usually /ʉ/ or /ə/ [sic], often deleted in absolute final position). Typical examples are:

(5) N	<i>lə-ʔáks-T</i>	pl of	<i>áks</i>	'to drink'
(6) N	<i>li-ts'é:x-T</i>	pl of	<i>ts'é:x</i>	'(person) to be full (after eating)'
(7) N	<i>la-Xsít</i>	pl of	<i>Xsít</i>	'to vomit'
(8) N	<i>lu-xwtákw-T</i>	pl of	<i>xwtákw</i>	'to shoot'
(9) N	<i>l-láy'-T</i>	pl of	<i>láy'</i>	'(head, container, house) to be large'
(10) CT	<i>li-pá:s</i>	pl of	<i>pá:s</i>	'to be afraid'
(11) CT	<i>lu-wá:y</i>	pl of	<i>wá:y</i>	'to paddle'
(12) CT	<i>la-hé:tiks</i>	(pl Subj) 'to swim'	N <i>hátiks</i>	'(person, dog, etc.) to swim'

In N the affixal frame *lə-...-T* is especially common with words formed with the prefix *ʔa-* 'spontaneously, without obvious agency', as in

(13) N	<i>ʔa-l(i)-lá:n-T</i>	pl of	<i>ʔalá:n</i>	'(boat, person) to be slow-moving, lag behind'
(14) N	<i>ʔa-l-láys-T</i>	pl of	<i>ʔaláys</i>	'to be "lazy", reluctant'
(15) N	<i>ʔa-li-ski-T</i>	pl of	<i>ʔaskí</i>	'to be ugly, unusual- or abnormal-looking'

That the plural prefix occurs after the *ʔa-* prefix, and is directly attached to the root, shows that *lə-* prefixation must be older than *ʔa-* prefixation (cf. a similar case with reduplication above).

In a few cases, the plural form has the combination *lə-...-T*, and the singular the suffix *-tkw*, as in

(16) N	<i>li-ptál-T</i>	pl of	<i>ptál-tkw</i>	'to climb'
--------	------------------	-------	-----------------	------------

⁴Many other intransitive stems, including descriptive adjectives, use the prefix *qa-*, formerly only a *distributive plural* used with nouns. No irregularities are associated with *qa-*.

(17) N *li-skwá:y'-T* pl of *skwá:y'-tkw* 'to rest'

It is possible that in such cases the *-tkw* suffix indicates reflexivity, since both stems also occur suffixless with different (though compatible), less personal meanings (*ptál* '[tide] to rise', *skwá:y'* '[action] to come to an end without achieving result').

In the following cases, the *lə-* prefixed and the *-tkw* suffixed forms have diverged semantically, but the same original relationship can be recovered: the suffixed forms apply to a group of persons acting as a single entity, but the prefixed form must have applied originally to individuals *all* doing the same thing:

(18) N *lisán* '(sg or pl Subj) to travel to another community in order to find summer work in canneries' PTsim **-sén*

The PTsim stem **sEn* is found in CT *sá:n* 'to put (pl Obj) aboard' (Boas 1911:382), CT *sá:ntk*, ST *sá:n-tkü* (< **sén-tkw*), N *sín-tkw* (< **séHn-tkw*) '(pl human Subj) to ride in a boat, be aboard'.

3.2.2. REFORMATIONS BY *lə-* PREFIXATION ON ALREADY PLURAL STEMS. On the other hand, *lə-* plurals include some 'pleonastic' or doubly-marked reformations on more archaic plural stems (Tarpent 1983), especially those with Velar prefixes, as in

(19) N *lu-xwtí:tix-T* pl of *xwtáx* 'to be hungry'

(PTsim sg stem **kw-^{*}téx* ; reduplicated pl stem **kw-^{*}téHx*)*tex*)

(20) CT *la-Xkwí:taks* pl of *Xkwátk* '(person)to be cold, have a cold'

cf. *kwátk* '(sg Subj) (object) to be cold'

(PTsim sg stem **kwÉt-* > pl. stem **q-^{*}kwéHt-^{*}q-s*, sg. (**q-*)**kwét-^{*}tkw*)

(21) ST *la-Xstó:yX* pl of *XstóX* 'to sleep'

(PTsim sg stem **qs-^{*}téq* [< ***tEh-^{**}Eq*] , pl stem **qs-^{*}téHh-^{*}Eq*)

This use seems to indicate that at one time the stems were no longer perceived as unambiguously plural forms and that the prefix was added in order to confirm the plural meaning (cf. a similar justification for N reduplicated forms in 5.1.1. below).

3.2.3. OLDER FORMATIONS STRESSED ON PREFIX. In a few *l-* initial plural forms, stress is on the prefix, causing reduction and/or adjustment of the stem vowel (this older pattern of stress on the penultimate is also attested in other forms, e.g. the oldest layer of reduplicative patterns, as in the proto-form for the plural in (19) above): the prefix is reconstructed as **lEh-* (**léHh-* under stress).⁵

Modern forms:		PTsim plural:	
(22) ST <i>lí:tik</i>	pl of <i>ták</i>	'to wake (s.o.) up'	<i>*léHh-[*]tek</i>
(23) N <i>lískit</i>	pl of <i>skát</i>	'to be born'	<i>*léHh-[*]sket</i>

⁵One of the clues to the former presence of *H is ST, CT long /i:/ corresponding to N, G short /i/, in stressed positions (Tarpent 1994). Note also that some of these verbs are transitive, unlike the more modern forms. PTsim roots are not inherently transitive or intransitive.

(24) ST *li:mXs* pl of **máXs* ‘to grow’ **léHh- *maqs*
 (= N *limqs-T/*máqs*; the unstressed stem vowel is deleted by an independently motivated rule, between a syllabic resonant and an obstruent; **máqs* is attested in derivatives)

(25) ST *kw-li:tix* pl of *kw-táx* ‘to be hungry’ **kw- *léHh- *tex*
 (compare this prefixed plural with the reduplicated N form in [19] above)

(26) CT *qa-li:paXsk* pl of *qa-páXsk* ‘to shake o.self’ **qə- *léHh- *paq-s-kw*
 (Boas 1911:380)⁶

In addition to the pattern of initial penultimate stress, the antiquity of this pattern is shown by other irregularities such as different affixes, alternate forms of the plural (both seen in alternate N plurals for ‘to shoot’, compare [27] and [8] above), or unusual reduplication, as in

(27) N *lituxw* (old) pl of *xw-tákw* ‘to shoot’ **léHh- *tekw*

(28) N *-li:xw* stem of the irregularly reduplicated form
li:li:xw-T pl of *yáxw* ‘to hide’ **léHh- *yexw*

(cf. CT *li:-yü:* pl of *yü:* ‘to hide’, rephonemized from Boas 1911:380)

3.2.4. SUB-MORPHEMIC ALTERNATION *l-/K-* (OLDEST FORMS). In what must be the oldest formations, some *l*-initial plurals correspond to a singular beginning with a consonant; this is especially common with singular stems beginning with a *palatal*, which are paired with an *l*-initial plural stem: these are probably relic forms (see more below, 5.1.).

A number of verbs have an *l*-initial plural stem corresponding to a singular stem beginning most often with a palatal consonant (*k-* or *y-*), in which neither consonant seems amenable to morphological segmentation in a synchronic analysis,⁷ as in:

(29) ST *lí:mk* pl of *kí:mk* ‘to wipe (sthg)’

(30) ST, N *ló:* pl of *kó: [gyó:]* ‘(boat, vehicle) to be motionless: at anchor, moored, parked; (person) to behave, act, live (in a certain way)’

(31) CT *lá:* pl of *yá:* ‘to walk, go’

(32) N *lúkw* pl of *yúkw* ‘to move (in the direction indicated by a proclitic)’

⁶retranscribed; cf. N *qa-páqskw* ‘to thrash around, to struggle’ (archaic reduplicated plural *qa-pá:paqskw* < **-páHq)paq-*, cf. same stem in ‘to be upset, etc.’ in 3.1.). The morpheme *qa-* in these forms is a derivative prefix of undetermined meaning at present, not the homophonous plural morpheme of fn. 4.

⁷Two irregular plurals, N *li:páykw-T* pl of *kipáykw* ‘to fly’ (and similar forms in the other languages), and N *li:n’itimqs* pl of *kin’ítkw* ‘to get up’, appear superficially to have prefixes *li:-* and *ki-* respectively, but the long unstressed vowel of the plural and, for the second word, the morphological irregularities in correspondences with the other languages, make the history of these forms difficult to reconstruct at present. The popular explanation of *kipáykw* ‘to fly’ as *kip-háykw* ‘to eat-odor’ can be ruled out as folk-etymology although similar forms are attested in the other languages.

and there are also *l*-initial plural forms without (morphologically) singular counterparts, such as

- (33) N *liskw* ‘(pl Subj) to hang’ (suppletive plural of *y’áq* ‘to hang’, which also has orig. meaning ‘to sway, to shake’)

In such cases, it is impossible to characterize the initial consonant as a ‘prefix’, but obviously the *l*- initial formant is associated with *plural* meaning, just like the *lə*- prefix of morphologically analyzable forms. Let us just note that initial *l*- has been associated with the *plural* throughout the recoverable history of Tsimshianic. In the next two sections, both the prefix and the sub-morphemic formant are compared to similar items in ‘Penutian’ languages.

4. DUAL/PLURAL AFFIXES THROUGHOUT ‘PENUTIAN’. The Tsimshianic prefix *lə*- < **IEh*- can now be considered in a wider perspective, both internally and externally .

4.1. TSIMSHIANIC **IEh* ‘PLURAL’ AND **nEh* ‘RECIPROCAL’. The old Tsimshianic *plural* verbal prefix *lə*- (< **IEh*-) is not isolated in the language, but occurs in close parallelism with the *reciprocal* prefix *nə*- (< **nEh*-), which is still productive. In both cases, there is normally a specific prefix/suffix combination which ‘frames’ the stem word to create *intransitive* forms applying mostly to actions and relationships of *persons*. Some N examples (which have counterparts in the other languages) are:

- (34) N *lə-ʔáks-T* ‘(pl Subj) to drink’ (pl of intr stem *ʔáks* ‘to drink’)

- (35) N *ni-Limó:m-T* ‘to help each other’ (reciprocal built on trans stem *Limó:m* ‘to help [s.o.]’)

- (36) N *ni-wák-T* ‘to be brothers’ (reciprocal built on kin term *wák* ‘[male’s] brother’)

Such affixal “frames” are frequent in Tsimshianic. They consist of proclitic/suffix combinations in which the proclitic can be quite variable but the suffix is always a medial or medio-passive suffix (*-T*, **-tkw* or *-s*). *Proclitics*, most of which indicate motion, location or direction, are normally only loosely bound to the stem, but the presence of such a suffix indicates that the proclitic-stem combination is to be treated as a single unit (cf. the status of English *out* in *to run out* vs. *to outrun*). However, *prefixes* other than the plural and reciprocal are firmly bound to the stem and do not need to be supplemented by a suffix. This discrepancy suggests that *the present plural and reciprocal prefixes were originally proclitics*, i.e. relatively free morphemes, rather than bound prefixes (Tarpent 1997:80). Note also that **IEh* and **nEh* have the CVC shape characteristic of Tsimshianic roots, while true affixes have C(V)- or -(V)C only.

4.2. ‘PENUTIAN’ LANGUAGES. Hymes (1957:78-79) called attention to the Penutian-wide distribution of verbal affixes ‘of the general phonemic shape *nV*, *IV*’; affixes in /n/ ‘share the sense of plurality in the relations of persons’ i.e. have *reciprocal* or *mutual kin* meanings. Like Tsimshianic, most Penutian languages have affixes in /l/ and /n/ with *plural/collective* or *dual/reciprocal/comitative* meanings. Depending on the affixal pattern of individual languages, these may be prefixes, or more often, suffixes (Tarpent 1997:80-81). This difference in the place of affixation makes sense if potential cognates of PTsim **IEh* and **nEh* were originally freer morphemes and later became affixes, in conformity with the affixation pattern prevailing in individual languages. The frequent restriction of occurrence of /l/ and /n/ formants to unproductive subsets of morphemes, especially pronouns, in most of the languages which have them suggests that these are archaic survivals.

4.2.1. FORMS COMPATIBLE WITH PTSIM **nEh* ‘DUAL/RECIPROCAL’. Although *dual* and *reciprocal* do not mean the same grammatically, they have in common the fact that they refer to

two participants. Similarly, *comitative* can be viewed as yet another aspect of duality. These three meanings are variously distributed between affixes including the formants *n* and *l*, especially since not all languages have the category of dual, which may have merged with plural.

This does not mean that only these formants have all or any of the meanings in question in a given language. For instance, Bodega Miwok has a comitative *ni-*, but Miwok dual morphemes are unrelated to it (Catherine Callaghan, p.c.). Such facts do not invalidate my point, since (here or elsewhere) an originally dual morpheme may be preserved as comitative, while another morpheme has assumed the dual function. In any case, I am not asking the question “Do all the Penutian dual and plural, etc. morphemes correspond exactly to the PTsim morphemes in form and function?” but “Given the form/meaning/function of the PTsim morphemes, what morphemes in other languages are both formally similar and semantically and functionally compatible?” Although the formants *n* and *l* are often associated with other formants or affixes in individual languages, they do occur throughout the Penutian domain.⁸

a) prefixes

Co Han *ne-* in ‘comitative’ affixal frame *ne...-(h)e/a* ‘with ...’
 Mk *nə-* in ‘comitative’ affixal frame *nə...-iʔyu* ‘with ...’

We can perhaps add also Cay *ni-* in <*nipik*> ‘they’. This Cayuse form is not the only one given for ‘they’, there is also <*cappick*> (perhaps [qápi:k]). Even though the Cayuse grammatical data available are only fragmentary, the existence of two separate morphemes both translated ‘they’ suggests that one is (or was originally) dual and the other plural. Dual, etc. forms in *n-*, and plural forms in *q-*, attested in other languages (e.g. Mol *qa-* stem of several non-singular pronouns, Win *q-* initial of collective suffixes) make it probable that Cay *nipik* must have been a dual, at least at some point in its history.

b) suffixes

‘dual’, ‘comitative’ or ‘reciprocal’

-*n-* initial

Siu *-naw(a)* ‘reciprocal’
 Co *-ne:i* ‘reciprocal’ (also ‘distributive’)

Co *-nʔi* ‘dual’
 Mol *-ni-* ‘dual’ formant in pronominal forms; (cf. also *-uni* ‘3 dual’)
 Mi Mib *-ni* ‘comitative case’ (≠ dual)

⁸Many of these morphemes are mentioned in Tarpent (1997:80-81). Language abbreviations: Al *Alsea*, Cay *Cayuse*, Chin *Chinook* (Kath *Kathlamet*), Co *Coos* (Han *Hanis*, Mk *Miluk*), Kal *Kalapuya* (MR *Mary's River*, S *Santiam*), Mai *Maiduan*, Mi *Miwok* (Mib *Bodega Mi*, Mins *Northern Sierra Mi*, Miss *Southern Sierra Mi*), Mol *Molale*, NP *Nez Perce*, Sah *Sahaptian* (NS *North Sahaptin*), Siu *Siuslaw*, Tak *Takelma*, Win *Wintun* (Pat *Patwin*), Yok *Yokuts* (Chaw *Chawchila*, Chuk *Chukchansi*, Gash *Gashowu*, Wik *Wikchamni*, Yb *Buena Vista*, Yd *Yawdanchi*, Yl *Yawelmani*). See bibliography for sources.

-n- final

Co	<i>-äni:</i> ‘one another’ (< <i>-än-i:</i> ?); (also ‘distributive’)
Tak	<i>-an-</i> , <i>-in-</i> ‘reciprocal action’
Sah	<i>-in</i> ‘dual suffix’ (rather ‘comitative’, in nouns)
NS	<i>-i:n</i> ‘dual suffix’ (rather ‘comitative’, in nouns) (cf. Tak <i>-i:l</i> below)

‘Mutual kin’:

Co	<i>-îni:</i> used for ‘mutual kinship’, “etymologically related to the verbal distributives <i>-ne:i</i> , <i>-äni:</i> .” (LF) (cf. above)
----	---

‘Plural’ or ‘collective’:

-n- initial

Co	<i>-ne:i</i> ‘distributive’ (also ‘reciprocal’)
Kal	<i>-ni</i> ‘plural’ suffix attached to 3rd person prefixes

-n- final

Co	<i>-n</i> , <i>-n-</i> ‘plural element’ in some nouns <i>-äni:</i> ‘distributive’ (< <i>-än-i:</i> ?); (also ‘one another’)
Mol	<i>-yan-</i> ‘plural’ formant in some <i>suffixed pronominal forms</i>
Tak	<i>-han</i> (<i>-an</i> after C) ‘collective plural’ of some <i>human nouns</i>
Yok Yd	<i>-in</i> ‘plural’ in <i>pronouns</i> <i>-i:n</i> ‘plural’ or ‘collective’ with <i>animate (numerals)</i> <i>-hin</i> , <i>-han</i> ‘collective plural’ (<i>inanimate nouns</i>) <i>-yan</i> , <i>han</i> ‘plural enclitics’ used in <i>imperatives</i>

Reduplicated *-n-* forms designating *groups of people*:

Ch Kath	<i>-na:na</i> ‘groups of people with a common designation’ (e.g. chiefs)
Mai	<i>-nono</i> ‘a pile, crowd, lot of ... [persons]’
Yok	<i>-(i)n'in</i> ‘people, inhabitants, of ...’ (> tribal names)

cf. also

Mai	<i>-nini</i> in <i>péney-nini</i> ‘four’ (<i>péney-</i> ‘two’)
-----	---

Complex forms including *-n-* formant:

Ch	<i>-in-iks</i> ‘plural’ of a few nouns (<i>-iks</i> , <i>-uks</i> , <i>-aks</i> also ‘plural’)
Kal	<i>-ni:k</i> in <i>gwiniik</i> ‘3 pl pronoun’ (pron. stem <i>gwi-</i>)
Mi Mins	<i>-a:ni-k</i> ‘plural; many; a group, bunch, etc.’

4.2.2. FORMS COMPATIBLE WITH PTSIM *IEh ‘PLURAL’

4.2.2.1. PREFIX. Thus far I have not found evidence of *l-* prefixation before verb stems outside of Tsimshianic (however, I have not been able to consult all possible sources). An exception might be found in Siuslaw: after explaining that Siuslaw does not mark plurality in the verb, Frachtenberg added in a footnote: “I have found only one case of such a differentiation. I

was told that the stem *qaa-* ‘to enter, to put in’, refers to singular objects, while the stem *Lxaa-* can be used with plural objects only” (1922b:535 fn.1).

Frachtenberg did not think that such meager evidence was enough to establish a morphological relationship between the two forms, but the stem *Lxaa-* would seem to be plausibly derivable from **l-qaa-* since only *L* occurs before consonants, and plain velar or uvular stops do not occur after *L*. This one instance is hardly enough to make a case, but might be significant if more comparative evidence of the same kind comes to light.

4.2.2.2. SUFFIXES. However, there is plentiful evidence for *l* in suffixes, usually with *plural* meaning, sometimes also with *dual* meaning:

a) ‘*plural/collective*’

Al	-l	‘plural’ in some forms (e.g. <i>yo:l-</i> ~ <i>yu:l-</i> pl of <i>yEa</i> ‘to talk, speak’)
Co	-l	‘plural’ of some stems (alternating with <i>-n-</i> for other stems)
Km	-l’-	‘plural’ suffix in some <i>pronouns</i>
Tak	-l	‘plural’ of some stems (alternating with <i>-n-</i> for other stems)
Win	-le-	‘pronominal plural’
	-VIVIV(h)a	‘disparity of subject: many separately to ...’ (reduplicated verbal form)

cf. also

Yok Yl	-hal	‘inanimate collective’ (note <i>-han</i> suffix above in Yok and Tak)
Yl, Chaw,	-ʔ...l	‘times’
Chuk, Gash		

b) ‘*dual*’

Sah NS	-l-	‘dual’ meaning in some forms;
Win	:-l	‘pronominal dual’ (e.g. <i>ne:l</i> ‘we, dual inclusive’; here <i>ne-</i> ‘1sg’)
	(-)lel	‘dual’ in <i>pa:lel</i> ‘two, pair, both’

cf. also

Tak	-di:l	“dual”, actually ‘comitative’ (‘with X’) in <i>nouns</i> (possibly < <i>-t-i:l</i> , cf. Sah- <i>i(:)n</i> ; cf. also Tak plural <i>-than</i> < <i>t-han</i>)
-----	-------	--

4.2.2.3. COMPLEX AFFIXES. There are also *-l-* components of more limited distribution in complex *plural pronominal affixes*, usually contrasting with *dual* ones which include other consonants. Depending on the language, these complex affixes may be prefixed or suffixed to the verb. In Chinook, they are prefixes: compare *-lx-* ‘1 pl incl’ with *-tx-* ‘1 du incl’. Similarly complex forms occur for instance in Coos or Siuslaw, but they must be used with great caution, since the complexity of the forms and the lack of clear morphological correspondences between the various languages suggest analogical reformation and/or influence from neighboring languages such as Salishan. Trying to unravel these problems is beyond the scope of this paper.

However, it is relevant that Klamath and Wintu have what appear to be parallel, alternate 1st and 2nd person plural forms with suffixes including formants *l/* and *l/* (DeLancey 1987:51): comparison with Chinook makes it quite likely that these parallel forms were originally *plural* and *dual* respectively (cf. alternate ‘plural’ forms in Cay above), even though they might now be exclusively plural. In any case, all these provide more support for an original plural morpheme or formant in *l/* widely distributed in Penutian.

4.2.3. SUMMARY ON / AND *n* FORMANTS. As in Tsimshianic, there are parallel affixal formants in /l/ and /n/ in many Penutian languages, where they occur most often in suffixes, in keeping with the prevailing affixal pattern in those languages. That their occurrence is often restricted to certain non-productive morphological categories, commonly pronouns, means that these are probably old inherited morphemes. That forms in /n/ especially occur about as often with plural as with dual meanings could indicate loss of the dual category (with *dual* > *plural*), since not all the attested languages have a dual. It may also be relevant that /l ~ n/ interchange frequently occurs because of consonant gradation, which is morphologically productive in some of the languages. Relics of this gradation could explain that in some cases forms in /l/ and /n/ seem to be specialized, for instance between human and inanimate nouns.

5. PLURAL FORMANT *l*- REPLACING INITIAL ROOT-CONSONANT. As in Tsimshianic, there is scattered evidence in other Penutian languages of *l*- initial CVC stems or roots with plural meanings, sometimes alternating with singular stems beginning with palatal or uvular/glottal consonants. In many cases the consonants are the same as in Tsimshianic, or closely related. Singular and/or plural stems involved in this alternation have similar meanings in Tsimshianic and other languages. Unfortunately, I have only been able to consult a limited amount of material on other languages, so that the fact that some languages are not represented in the examples below does not therefore mean that the feature in question does not occur in them. However, the *L*-/*k'*- initial alternation which occurs in some Alsea verb forms is independent of the one discussed here.

5.1. TSIMSHIANIC. As mentioned above (3.2.4.), the Tsimshianic languages have a small number of what appear to be plural 'roots' in *l*- corresponding to singulars in *k*-, *ɣ*-, and also but less often *q*- or *h*- (i.e. palatal and uvular/glottal stops and glides), here all represented by the cover term *K*. In several cases, only one member of an *l*/*K* stem pair is attested in a given language, but the other one occurs with the same or a very similar meaning elsewhere in the family. There are also several *l*- initial stems with plural meaning occurring without a corresponding singular, and a few which are not identified as either singular or plural but which could have been plurals originally. In these cases the *l*/*K* alternation cannot be explained simply by deletion of the initial consonant after addition of the prefix **IEh* (i.e. **IE/AC* cannot be from **IEh*-**KE/AC*), nor is it likely that addition of a monosegmental *l*- prefix would have caused deletion of the *K* consonant (i.e. **IE/AC* cannot be from **l*-*KE/AC*). More probably, in PTsim (or even PPTsim) the stems were originally bimorphemic (as were some others, independently attested, e.g. in [21]), thus ***KEh*-***VC* for the singular, later **KVC*, and ***IEh*-***VC* for the plural, later **IVC*. The meaning of the initial elements subsumed under ***KEh* cannot be determined at present. Alternations among the four *K*-consonants may have been due at least in part to consonant gradation, many traces of which exist in various Penutian languages, even where it is not a productive process (as it is for instance in Sahaptian).

5.1.1. Most Tsimshianic cases have *palatal-initial* singular stems:

a) *k*- initial:

				Ptsim	
(37) N	<i>ló:</i>	pl of	<i>kó:</i> [gyó:]	'(boat, car) to be moored, parked'	<i>*l/káw</i>
(38) N	<i>lá:L</i>	pl of	<i>ké:L</i> [gyé:L]	'(person) to lie down, be in bed'	<i>*l/káHL</i> or <i>*l/káHh-L</i>

(here the long *é:* of the singular form is due to a general N rule raising long **á:* after palatals and sibilants, Tarpent 1983)

- (39) ST *lü:nks* *kü:nks* [gü:nks] ‘to be dry’ **l/kéHw-n-ks*
- (40) ST *lámk* *kámk* ‘to be hot, warm’ **l/kém-k*
- (41) ST *lí:mk* *ki:mk* ‘to wipe (sg/pl Obj)’ **l/kéHm-k*
- (42) ST *láp* *káp* [gyáp] ‘to dip up (sg/pl Obj)’ **l/kép*

In N such plural stems are often reduplicated, as in

- (43) N *lim)lámk* pl of *kámk* ‘to be warm, hot’ **l/kém-k*
- (44) N *lim)lím*k *kím*k ‘to wipe (sg/pl Obj)’ **l/kéHm-k*
- (45) N *lip)láp* *káp* [gyáp] ‘to dip up (sg/pl Obj)’ **l/kép*
- (46) N *lip)láp*in *kápin* [gyábin] ‘(aquatic mammal)
to come up for air’ **l/kép-n*
- (47) N *lip)láp*ks *kápk*s [gyápk] ‘to be high’ **l/kép-ks*
- (48) N *ʔas-lip)lá:paX* *ʔas-ká:paX* ‘to talk incessantly,
be a chatterbox’ **ʔats- *l/káHp-q*

These cases are attributable to a secondary formation emphasizing plurality (cf. reduplication also in N *lí:li:xw* (28) and addition of *lə-...-T* to already plural forms, 3.2.2. above).

b) *y*- initial

- (49) CT *lá:* pl of *yá:* ‘to go, walk’ **l/yá(H)h*
- (50) N *lúkw* *yúkw* ‘to move (us. in
direction of proclitic)’ **l/yéHkw*

Some non-plural stems of the shape ST *lí:C*, N *líC* can be plausibly related to singular forms in *yáC* (Tarpent 1983):

- (51) N *-lil-p* stem of ‘to roll (sg/pl)’ **léHl-*
cf. *yál-* ‘to move in circular motion’ **yéł*
- (52) ST *lí:ts-X*, N *líts-X* ‘to count, read (sg/pl Obj)’ **léHts-q*
cf. *yáts-* ‘to hit, beat (sg Obj)’ **yéts*

(probably from hitting fingers on a support in order to count, while counting aloud: **-q* ‘by vocal means’)

5.1.2. A few other stems have *uvular or glottal* initials: these are rarer than the palatal initials, but it is possible that this rarity is due to semantic change obscuring the relationship between singular and plural stems which now appear unrelated, as well as to the preservation of only one of the stems in several cases.

a) *h*- initial

- (53a) G *lítxw* pl. of *hítxw* (= N *hítkw*) ‘to stand’ **l/héHt-*
 (stem *lit/hit-*)
- (53b) N *lítiks-* (pl only) ‘(laundry) to be/put in water’ **léHt-*
 (stem *lit-*)
- cf. N *hátiks* ‘(person, dog, etc.)
 to swim’ (stem *hat-*) **hét-*

The original meaning in (53b) must have been ‘to stand in water’, i.e. ‘bathe’ rather than ‘swim’ (-*iks* cf. *ʔáks* ‘water’ < **ʔéks*; loss of initial *ʔ* is attested in other compounds which include **ʔéks*) (Tarpent 1983).

Another case in which the plural and singular stem have acquired separate meanings is:

- (54) N *-lánx* in *t'im-lánx* ‘neck’ (*t'im-* < *t'á:-m-* ‘place of’) **lé/án-x*
 N *hánx* ‘to be thin (not thick)’ **hé/án-x*

The N form *hánx* has a reduplicated plural *han(h)ánx* which also means ‘temples (of the head)’ (two places where the head narrows in front, and is narrower than, for instance, the prominent cheekbones common in the population of the West Coast). The *l*- initial form *lánx* in *t'im-lánx* ‘neck’ is most likely an old plural corresponding to *hánx*: the neck is another body part that is definitely thinner than the head above and the shoulders below. That this form is built on a plural stem reflects the symmetry of the neck, which appears ‘thin’ from all viewpoints in comparison with the rest of the body.

b) *q*- initial

Examples of *q*- initial singular stems with *l*- initial plural stems are also few. An obvious one is:

- (55) N *línX* pl of *qínX* ‘(tree) to fall’ (PTsim form still unclear)

In the following example, CT has reformed a reduplicative plural on an originally plural stem, as shown by comparison with other CT and Nisqa'a forms which preserves the *q*- initial singular stem:

- (56) CT *láp-* in *láʔapal* ‘(sg) “(stars) to twinkle”’ **lé/áp-ʔl*
 (> new pl form
lak)láʔapal)
- CT *qáp-* in N *qáp(k)saʔal-T* ‘(star) to twinkle’ **qé/áp-(k)-s-ʔl-T*
qápsl ‘to wink’ **qé/áp-s-ʔl*
qap'é:ltk ‘to wink’ **qE/áp-éh-ʔl-tkw*

In the following example, the N *l*- initial form, which is related to a *q*- initial form also attested in ST, has acquired a distinct meaning: from the singular stems

- (57a) ST *qá:úlkü* ‘to wind/wrap sthg’ **qéHw-l-kw*
 N *qílkw* (around s.)’

one would expect an *l*- plural such as N *lilkw*, which indeed exists:

- (57b) N *lilkw* ‘to lace (shoes, leggings, etc.)’ **léHw-l-kw*

(Note that lacing the old type of leggings or boots means wrapping cords around the leg.)

Other non-plural forms in N *liC* can be plausibly related to forms in *qiC* :

(58) N	<i>liL-k</i>	‘to (keep) watch on, tend (sg or pl Obj)’	<i>*léHL-k</i>
	<i>liL-k-s</i>	‘to keep watch, keep an eye on things’	
N	<i>qiLXkw</i>	‘to shout, holler’	<i>*qéHL-q-tkw</i>

The form *qiLXkw* analyzes as **qiL-q(t)kw* (**-q* ‘at/by mouth’, esp. ‘by vocal means’; *-tkw* adds intransitive meaning). If the original meaning of **liL/*qiL* was ‘to watch, be watchful’, *qiL-q-* could have been ‘to keep watch by vocal means’ = ‘to give warning by shouting’, later simply ‘to shout’.

5.1.3. Some *l-* initial verbs are plurals without a corresponding singular (isolated or suppletive forms):

(59) N	<i>lin’</i>	‘(wind, etc.) to cause (trees) to fall’ (= <i>linX-?n</i> , see (55); <i>-?n</i> ‘causative’)	
(60) ST	<i>lámtsaX</i>	‘(pl human Subj) to come in, enter’ (suppletive pl of <i>ts’i:n</i>) (= N <i>lámtsaX/ts’in</i>)	<i>*lé/ám-ts-q</i>

The association of *l-* initial forms with the plural suggests that some similar forms now used for both singular and plural could have been exclusively plural at one time, later acquiring a more general meaning, for instance:

(61) ST	<i>li:mx</i> ; CT <i>li:mi</i> ; N, G <i>límx</i>	‘(sg or pl Subj) to sing’	<i>*léHm-x</i>
---------	---	---------------------------	----------------

(where the H in the PTsim form supports the original plural hypothesis, see 3. above)

5.1.4. CONCLUSION ON TSIMSHIANIC. Tsimshianic *l-* initial (submorphemic, not prefixed) forms represent an archaic pattern. PTsim **CVC* stems are normally reconstructed as including the initial consonant. Isolating this initial involves splitting the PTsim “root” to recover the PPTsim stage: e.g. N *liC* ~ *KiC* < **léHC* ~ *KéHC* < ***iEh-***EC* ~ ***KEh-***EC* (see (21) for independent evidence for such bipartite PPTsim forms). It is relevant that none of the *K*’s in the *l-/K-* pairs are glottalized, since initial glottalized consonants can all be traced to PPTsim ***?EC-* which does not fit the alternation pattern (see 2. above).⁹

5.2. ‘PENUTIAN’ LANGUAGES. The existence of *l-* and *K-* initial roots with similar meanings, where *l-* initial roots are often associated with plural meaning, suggests a similar origin in Tsimshianic and in other Penutian languages which have this pattern. Wintun has some

⁹Dunn (1978) gives some CT forms which seem to conflict with this generalization, but his data include so much individual and/or dialectal phonetic variation that it is difficult to establish a reliable base form for comparative work. In fieldwork with a single ST consultant (Mrs. Violet Neasloss, probably the last competent speaker of the language), I have often found it very difficult to determine whether I was consistently hearing a glottalized or non-glottalized consonant, or a uvular or velar. However, it is usually possible to establish reference points from minimal or near minimal pairs. In most cases, glottalization or non-glottalization of initial ST consonants agree with the situation in Nisqa’a, the language with which I am most familiar, having learned it while residing in a Nisqa’a community (New Aiyansh, B.C.), from excellent speakers who have also become very competent writers (especially Mrs. Verna Williams, Mrs. Rosie Robinson and Mrs. Nita Morven). I take this opportunity to thank all these wonderful consultants and very dear friends.

clear internal examples of this alternation but it also exists elsewhere. Non-paired roots and stems with the same or compatible initial consonants and the same or a compatible meaning are even more frequent. Note that as in Tsimshianic, the stops involved are not usually glottalized except in languages like Takelma, where consonant gradation plays a morphological role, and Wintun, which has many traces of now unproductive initial consonant gradation, e.g. *c-/ch-/c'-*, which must have a secondary origin. Only a few examples are mentioned here, but it is likely that a systematic search throughout the Penutian domain would turn up many more.

5.2.1. SOME WINTU EXAMPLES.

5.2.1.1. *l-//y-* *lew-* 1 > *lewča* ‘to pick (as berries)’
 ‘cf. *yew-ča* “to pick, pluck, gather (as berries)”’ (AS; see 5.2.2.1)

5.2.1.2. *l-//q-*

(1) *lOr-* ~ *lo:r-* ‘grind, rub, file’

Win	<i>lo:ra</i>	‘to file or grind in order to sharpen’
	<i>loroqna:</i>	‘rub hands together; grind (teeth)’
	<i>loruna:</i>	‘grind o’s teeth’
	<i>lura:</i>	‘to grind’
Pat	<i>loru</i>	‘to grind sharp or smooth’

(2) *qOr-* in

Win	<i>qori</i>	‘powder from pounded seeds or grasshoppers; seed for flour’
	<i>qura:</i>	‘to grind’
Pat	<i>koru</i>	‘to grind’ (there is no <i>q</i> in Pat, <i>k</i> corresponds instead)

5.2.2. TSIMSHIANIC AND OTHER EXAMPLES (in this context E/A are cover symbols for root-vowel types, not reconstructions unless indicated):

5.2.2.1. *lE/Aw* 1 // *kE/Aw* / *yE/Aw* 1 ‘to pick, gather, assemble, etc.’

5.2.2.1.1. Meaning 1 ‘to pick, gather, etc. (usually food items)’

a) *l-* initial

Root-final *-w*

Win	<i>lew-</i> 1 > <i>lewča</i>	‘to pick (as berries)’ (cf. above)
-----	------------------------------	------------------------------------

Root-final *-b-* or *-p* (*w ~ b/p* is a common correspondence in Penutian)

Tak	<i>leb-</i> , <i>le:b-</i> <i>lebe-</i> <i>lé:plap</i>	‘pick and eat (eg seeds)’ “‘pick up” and eat (seeds)’ (non-repetitive vb-stem) ‘(non-aor) pick and eat many (seeds)’ (redup = repetitive vb-stem)
Yok Yv	<i>lapa:y</i>	‘gather greens’, Yt <i>tapay</i> ‘pick, gather’ (VG 80:61) (The correspondence <i>l ~ t</i> is normal between these two Yok dialects.)

b) *k*- initial

Root-final *-w*

without initial augment

PTsim	<i>*kEw</i> >	'take, pick, get, gather, etc.'
	<i>*kéw</i> > ST <i>káw</i> [gá:w], N <i>kú:</i> [gú:]	'to take, pick up (sthg)'
	<i>*kéHw-ʔl</i> > ST <i>kü:'l</i> , N <i>kíl'</i>	'to pick (berries), dig for (clams, etc.)'
	<i>*kéHw-kw</i> > ST <i>kü:kü</i> , N <i>kí:kw</i>	'to buy (sthg)'
	<i>*kEw-m</i> > N verb-forming prefix <i>kim-</i>	'to buy ... (sg Obj)'
	<i>*kéHw-t-ks</i> > ST <i>kü:tk</i> s, N redup <i>ki)kítks</i>	'to look, search for s.'
Co	<i>k.o:w-</i> (LF), <i>g.uw-</i> , <i>g.u:-</i> (MJ)	'pick (berries)'
Kal	<i>geew-</i> in <i>geewi</i> , <i>geewa</i>	'to gather sthg'

with initial augment or prefix

Al	<i>-ku:-</i> in <i>pku:ts-</i> 'to pick, gather (e.g. shellfish, edible insects), catch (food animals)' (<i>p-</i> common verbal prefix or augment)
Si	<i>-ku-</i> ~ <i>-kwa-</i> in <i>Laku-</i> ~ <i>L(a)kwá-</i> ~ <i>Lokw-</i> ~ <i>Likw-</i> 'fetch, get, gather, take, etc.' (<i>L(V)-</i> common verbal prefix or augment)
Yok Wik	<i>-čhiw</i> in <i>phičhiw</i> 'catch' (<i>-č-</i> assibilated from <i>k-</i> ; <i>phi-</i> cf. Al <i>p-</i> above?)

Root-final *-b* or *-p*

Win Pat	<i>k'ap</i> 'to be caught' (note C- ~ C'- from consonant-gradation as above)
	<i>k'apma</i> 'to trap' (<i>-ma</i> causative)
	<i>kapu</i> 'to dig' (cf. above, 'dig for clams', and below, 'dig for roots')

c) *y*- initial

Root-final *-w*

Si	<i>yaw-</i> , <i>yuw-</i> 'to pick (berries, etc.), to get (pitch, etc.), to dig [for roots]' > <i>yú.yauwt!</i> 'one who picks, picker' (agentive suffix <i>-t!</i>)
Mai	<i>jawe</i> 'to gather, pick (berries, clover, etc.)';
Win	<i>yew-</i> > <i>yewča</i> 'to pick, pluck, gather (as berries)' (cf. <i>lew-</i> 1)(AS)
Yok Yb	<i>yuwet</i> "comprar"

and perhaps also

Mi Mip	<i>ju:ju-</i> 'to gather (tr)' (older redupl. on stem <i>**ju:-</i> ? cf. Yok below)
--------	--

Root-final *-b* or *-p*

Km	<i>{yeb-}</i> 'dig', e.g. <i>/yebni:ya/</i> 'digs for s.o.'
Win	<i>yube</i> 'to pick water grass', 'to gather berries in a basket'

5.2.2.1.2. Meaning 2 ‘to gather, assemble (people)’

PTsim **kEw* ‘to take, pick, gather’ is also found in

- (62) CT *lə-kü:nsk* ‘be together (humans);
one family, one group
of people’; **kéHw-ʔn-ʔskw*

(*lə-* ‘plural’, cf. above 3.2.1.; **-ʔn* ‘causative’, **-ʔskw* ‘antipassive’; hence literally ‘causing [people] to gather’)

The other descendants of PTsim **kEw* (see above 5.2.2.1.1.) do not have a plural counterpart in the modern languages (suppletive stems are used), but such a form could be expected to have an older plural counterpart **lEw*. This form, unattested as a bare stem, is preserved in words which were originally noun-incorporating verbs:

- (63a) ST *lú:lkit*, CT *lúulkit* ‘to hold a “feast” (potlatch)’ **léw-ʔl+kEt*

- (63b) N *lil'kit* **léHw-ʔl+kEt*

Compare **lé(H)w-ʔl* with the singular forms in 5.2.2.1.1. (b) above: ST *kü:l*, N *kil'-* ‘to pick, gather s.’ is from **kéHw-ʔl*; **kEt* ‘people’ occurs as the nominal component of several words interpretable as old noun-incorporating verbs. Hence the original meaning of the forms for ‘feast’ must be ‘gathering/assembling people’. In CT this switch to the specialized, ceremonial meaning explains that the new, morphologically transparent term *ləkü:nsk* was coined for a less exceptional gathering of people. This meaning of gathering *people* as well as food or other resources is also found in other Penutian languages for similar corresponding stems in *l-* or in *k-*:

a) *l-* initial

PTsim **lEw* > ST *lú:lkit*, CT *lúulkit*, N *lil'kit* ‘to hold a “feast” (see [63])
Yok Ywl **lOw-* in
**lOwOn* ‘attend feast’, “cf. Chukchansi *low-e?* ‘to gather’” (VG)
**yOlOw-* ‘to gather’ (= **yo-low*, VG 1964:62)

(the last form is one of many examples suggesting archaic prefixation in a distant proto-language, cf. Tarpent 2000)

b) *y-* initial (*p-* final root, cf. above)

Win *yup-* in
yupa ‘(people) to gather’
winyupus ‘get-together, big time’ (*win-* ‘people’)

c) *k-* initial

Kal *geewu* ‘to assemble (intr)’
geewuhwna ‘gathering, assemblage’ (= *ge:wufna*; *-na* nominal)
Yok Ywl *ke:wi* ‘to meet’
Chuk *ke:w-e?* ‘to meet’ (cf. above *low-e?* ‘to gather’)

cf. also

Win Pat *k'awo*: 'to get together, gather' (C- ~ C'- gradation frequent in Win)

5.2.2.2. *lE/Aw 2 // yE/Aw 2 / hE/Aw* 'speak, shout, etc.; think, imagine, feel'

a) *l*- initial

Kal *law*- 'call', *lalaw* 'shout' (perhaps borrowed from Tak)
Tak *le(:)w*- stem of *leu-/le:wilau*- 'call by name'
la:w- 'call sbdy', *la:law* 'shout, call'
Win *lew*- 2 > *leweqa* 'to tell'
Mi Miss *liwa*- 'word, language', *liw:a*- 'talk'
Mins *liwa*- 'to talk, to say, to speak (esp Indian); animal to make the characteristic sound; word, language, story, news, question, voice' (several derivatives)

b) *y*- initial

root-final -*w*

PTsim **yEw* > **yéw-L-mq* > ST *yá:wLmX*, N *yú:Limq* 'to advise, lecture (sbdy)'
Al *yEa* 'to speak' (could be [*yəa ~ yüa*] < **yEwa* ?), pl *yo:l-*, *yu:l-*
(< **yəw-l* ? note -*l* plural suffix here)
Sah NS *-yawau*- 'to cry, halloo'
Kal S, MR *yuw*i 'to make noise'
S *yuwile*, *yuwule* 'to talk about (sthg)'
Tak *yaway-/yiw-*, *yiw*in 'to talk';
yi:w-/yiw- in
yi:w-an- 'play (musical instrument)' (-*an-* causative)
de:-yi:w- 'to sound (intr), give forth a sound'
Yok Yn *yo:yo* 'to call, summon' (< old redup. form? cf. Mi *ju:ju-* above)

root-final -*b-* or -*p*

Win *yupa* 'to speak prophetically or like a shaman'

c) *h*- initial

PTsim **hEW*
**héHw* > ST *há:ü*, CT *há:w*, N *hí* 'to say, what is said, how one feels'
e.g. N *hí=L qó:t-y'* 'I think (lit. "my heart says")' (*qó:t* 'heart', -*y'* '1S'); ST *wi-há:ü-tkü*, CT *wi-há:w-tk*, N *wi-hí-tkw* > *wiyítkw* 'to cry';
**héw* > ST *há:w*, N *-hú* 'what is said, etc.'; ST *sim-há:w*, N *simú*
< *sim-hú* 'to be true, to be the truth' (*sim* 'well, best, etc.');

Co *sim-há:w-tkü*, N *simútkws* 'to believe, esp. to be a Christian'
haw- 'to think, to imagine'
héwes 'a lie', -*hawas-* in *e?hawasaná:is* 'you are lying to me'
Mk *hEwE:sE:nu* 'tell a lie'
Tak *hew-* in *hewehaw* 'to think, imagine' (us. with *gel-* 'breast' = here 'heart')
Mai *héw* 'Sure.'
Mi Mins *haw-* in *hawy:c-y-* 'to tell', *hawycny-* ~ *hawicny-* 'to tell, to explain, to guide, to show'

5.2.2.3. *lE/Am-// hE/Am-*

a) *l-* initial

PTsim	<i>*lE/Am : *lé/ám- > ST, N lám-</i> in <i>lámtsaX</i> ‘(pl Subj) to enter’ (suffix <i>-tsaX < *-ts-q</i> , unglissable at present)
Tak	<i>lem-</i> in <i>lem(e)k!-</i> ‘(people) move, go; to take along (pl Obj)’ <i>lemeʔ-x-/lemʔ-x-</i> ‘(people) go, come together’ e.g. <i>leméʔx</i> ‘they all went’, <i>leméʔk</i> ‘they took them along’ <i>s-gwi dí: lémk!iauk</i> ‘where have they all gone, any way?’ e.g. in composition with <i>he:ʔ-</i> ‘away, off’ > ‘to destroy, kill (pl Obj)’ as in <i>he:ʔ-i:-lémek!iʔn</i> ‘I killed them off’ (<i>-i:-</i> ‘hand’)
Kal	<i>la:mo, lam:u</i> ‘to go in’ <i>la:miʔ, lam:i</i> ‘to take in’

b) *h-* initial

- meaning 1 ‘bring together into one bundle or group’

Si	<i>ham-</i> in <i>hamx-</i> ‘to tie’ (<i>ham-x-</i>) (= bring together into one bundle) (ex’s given are of tying <i>hair, hands</i> , as well as sthg on sthg else)
Tak	<i>hem(e)-k!-</i> ‘to assemble’ (= ‘get/bring together into one group’) <i>al-heme-k-</i> ‘to meet (one person)’
Yok Ywl	<i>ho:m-in *hO:mOn</i> ‘to welcome, greet’

- meaning 2 ‘bring/take out (sg Obj, or one group, mass etc.)’

Co	<i>hem-/ham-</i> ‘bring out, take out (sg Obj)’
Kal S	<i>hemyet</i> [<i>hem-y-et ?</i>] in <i>deni-hemyet</i> ‘and then they would take them [acorns] out’ (in one mass)
Tak	<i>hem-g-</i> ‘take out (sg Obj, or in one group/bunch/mass)’ e.g. <i>ba-i-hemegáʔn</i> ‘I took (food) out’ (<i>ba-i-</i> ‘out’)

5.2.3. Example unattested in Tsimshianic: *lim // yim / *kim* ‘flash, blink, shut eyes, etc.’

a) *l-* initial

Win Pat	<i>lim-</i> in <i>limbak</i> ‘to flash at intervals; to blink (pl) at intervals’ <i>limba:ku</i> ‘to blink (sg)’ (backformed from <i>limbak ?</i>) (<i>-bak, -bok</i> suffix or formant > ‘compounds of iterative motion or appearance’)
---------	---

b) *y-* initial

Co	<i>yim-</i> in <i>yiʔmat</i> ‘“is twinkling” (his eyes)’ (probably = ‘is blinking’) <i>yiʔmyim</i> ‘eyelash’ “compare <i>yim-</i> ‘to twinkle’” (LF)
----	---

c) *k-* initial > assibilation before *i*

Win	<i>čʔim-</i> (glottalization < C-gradation ?) in <i>čʔimča</i> ‘to bat o’s eyelids’ <i>čʔimčʔimča</i> ‘to blink continuously’
-----	---

č'imi:ra 'to blink (fast or repeatedly), etc.'
č'ime:qa 'to close o's eyes, have o's eyes closed, be asleep (esp. children)'
 Yok Yl **c'imik'-wiyi* 'shut the eyes rapidly' (*wiyi* 'to do')

cf. also without glottalization

Co *tsim-* in redup. form *tsi'msimt* '(pl Subj) to sleep (suppletive form)'
 (<*tsi'm*)*tsim-t*)
 Mi Miss *sympy-* 'to close the eyes'

5.3. INITIAL C-ALTERNATIONS VERSUS ABERRANT CORRESPONDENCES. The examples above show that the pattern of alternating initial consonants in *l-* and in *K-* occurs not only in Tsimshianic, but also in other languages, although not all show a pairing of forms. While *l-* is often associated with the plural, there is at present no way of explaining the difference between the various consonants subsumed under the cover symbol *K*, but it is likely that the originally bipartite nature of many Tsimshianic stems at a remote historical level (*CVC < **CV*h***VC) could be postulated also in the other languages.

The alternation pattern which is evident in the above examples can explain some cases of what appear to be phonologically aberrant correspondences. For instance, Broadbent & Pitkin (1964) found a few examples of a correspondence Win *-h-* /Mi *-l-*, as in 'cough': Win *q'uhe*, Pat *k'ohi/o*, Miss *kol:e* (p. 37) which they attributed to an 'aberrant protoconsonant **lh*' (p. 30). Such a correspondence is indeed very strange, and in this particular case the stem of the Win and Pat forms could be interpreted simply as onomatopoeic and unrelated to the Mi form.

The case of 'sing' is more interesting: Pat *moho, mohi* 'song' (cf. also *muhu* 'to sing'), Mics *myl:i-* 'song', Miss *myl:i-*, *my:ly-* 'song' (p. 43; Mi alternations between long and short vowels and between long and short medial consonants are morphologically conditioned). It is relevant that all these forms begin with *mV-*: an initial sequence *mV-* is attested in numerous forms in a number of Penutian languages, not only as an apparently submorphemic formant (as in Wintun and Miwok), but also as a normally segmentable prefix (as in Tsimshianic and Alesha) (Tarpent 1997, 2000).

Rather than being due to an aberrant phonological correspondence *h/l*, the Pat and Mi forms for 'sing, etc.' could be interpreted as deriving from ancestral forms including the formant *mV-*, prefixed to *h-* and *l-* initial versions of ancient roots compatible on the one hand with PTsim **hE/Aw* 'speak, etc.' (see above) in a remote ancestor of Patwin, and on the other hand with a corresponding alternate **lE/Aw* in a remote ancestor of Miwok (i.e. at a deeper level than currently reconstructed Proto-Miwok). The fact that these languages are now exclusively suffixing does not mean that their ancestors could not have had prefixes, and it is probable that Sapir's "characteristic Penutian form of stem", namely CVCV(C), which is particularly noticeable in the languages of California, is a secondary development from either **CVC-**VC or **CV-**CVC (Tarpent 2000). These are only hypotheses at present, but they appear to converge at least in these examples.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1. TSIMSHIANIC AND PENUTIAN. The presence of /l/ and /n/ shaped affixes or formants with similar meanings in the morphology of Tsimshianic and of many Penutian languages is suggestive, but could have other explanations since the sounds are very common and these formants are often combined with others. But the occurrence of parallel *l-* and *K-* initial 'roots' in which the *l-* form is most often associated with the plural (or at least, never exclusively with the singular) is so unusual that it is difficult to attribute it to anything else than shared inheritance. Nor is this grammatical resemblance divorced from lexical and phonological resemblances, since Tsimshianic patterns of alternations in individual *l-* and *K-* initial roots also occur in phonologically similar roots, with the same or compatible meanings, in the other

languages considered. The tradition of comparative linguistics teaches us that it is submerged, unproductive features which provide the strongest evidence for distant genetic relationship. This instance of convergence of grammatical with lexical and phonological evidence is one of the strongest, if not the strongest thus far, of the many features that suggest Tsimshianic affiliation and Penutian genetic unity.

6.2. PENUTIAN-WIDE COMPARISON. In most attempts to establish the potential genetic relatedness of the members of the 'phylum' postulated by Sapir, emphasis has been on surface similarities rather than on the deeper layers of morphological structure, what Sapir called 'the most intimate and fundamental features of the morphology' (1921:59). The depth of historical reconstruction possible within the Tsimshianic family and the very strict constraints imposed by the structure of the proto-language provide morphological and phonological anchor points with which to compare features of other Penutian languages, some of which are otherwise barely noticeable except as curiosities (e.g. the unusual coincidence of the Wintun stems *lew-* and *yew-*, both 'to pick (berries)'), or appear to run counter to normal phonological processes (e.g. the Win/Mi *h/l* 'aberrant correspondence'). The recognition of the potential kinship between *l-* initial and *K-* initial stems, and between stems beginning with any of the four *K* consonants, opens up new avenues for Penutian-wide comparison, since correspondences which may have been unnoticed, or dismissed because of the lack of phonological plausibility might now be fitted into patterns which, although they may be submorphemic in the modern languages, may nevertheless be very regular.

At a mid-point between general typological characterization (Sapir's phyla) and the emphasis on 'lexical sets' appropriate among closely related languages but of limited usefulness for long-range comparison, attention to demonstrably archaic morphological features leads back to individual surface forms with a deeper understanding of their origin and increased confidence in the validity of the comparisons.

REFERENCES

- BOAS, FRANZ. 1911. Tsimshian. HAIL vol. I. 283-422.
- BROADBENT, SYLVIA, AND HARVEY PITKIN. 1964. A Comparison of Miwok and Wintun. Studies in Californian Linguistics, ed. by William Bright, 19-45. UCPL 34. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- CALLAGHAN, CATHERINE. 1984. Plains Miwok Dictionary. UCPL 105. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 1987. Northern Sierra Miwok Dictionary. UCPL 110. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- _____. 1997. Evidence for Yok-Utian. IJAL 63:1.18-64.
- DELANCEY, SCOTT. 1987. Morphological Parallels between Klamath and Wintu. Proceedings of the 1987 Hokan-Penutian Conference, ed. by J. Redden, 50-60. Carbondale, IL: Dept. of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University.
- DUNN, JOHN. 1978. A Practical Dictionary of the Coast Tsimshian Language. Mercury Series. Canadian Ethnology Service paper no. 42. Ottawa: National Museum of Man.
- FRACHTENBERG, LEO. 1920. Alsea texts and myths. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 67. Washington.
- _____. 1922a. Coos. Franz Boas (ed.), Handbook of American Indian Languages, volume 2, 297-429. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- _____. 1922b. Siuslawan (Lower Umpqua). Franz Boas (ed.), Handbook of American Indian Languages, volume 2. 431-629. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- GOLLA, VICTOR. 1964. Comparative Yokuts Phonology. Studies in Californian Linguistics, ed. by William Bright, 54-66. UCPL 34. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- HYMES, DELL. 1957. Some Penutian elements and the Penutian hypothesis. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 13:67-87.
- RIGSBY, BRUCE. 1966. On Cayuse-Molala relatability. *IJAL* 32:489-98.
- _____. 1969. The Waiilatpuan problem: More on Cayuse-Molala relatability. *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes* 3:68-146.
- SAPIR, EDWARD. 1909. *Takelma Texts*. Anthropological Publications of the University Museum vol. II no. 1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- _____. 1921. A characteristic Penutian form of stem. *IJAL* 1-2:67.
- _____. 1922. *Takelma*. Franz Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, volume 2. 1-296. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- _____. 1929. Central and North American languages. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th ed.) 5:138-141.
- SCHLICHTER, ALICE. 1981. *Wintu Dictionary*. Report #2, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.
- SHIPLEY, WILLIAM. 1964. *Maidu Grammar*. UCPL 41. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- SILVERSTEIN, MICHAEL. 1979. Penutian: An Assessment. *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*, ed. by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, 650-91. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- TARPENT, MARIE-LUCIE. 1983. Morphophonemics of Nisgha plural-formation: a step towards Proto-Tsimshian reconstruction. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 8:123-214.
- _____. 1989. A grammar of the Nisgha language. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Victoria (Canada).
- _____. 1990. Nisgha vowel alternations. *Papers from the 25th ICSNL [International Conference on Salishan and Neighboring Languages]*. 313-334. Vancouver: Dept. of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.
- _____. 1994. Tsimshianic stress-assignment and the words for 'meat, bear'. *Papers from the 29th ICSNL*. 243-264. Pablo, Montana: Salish Kootenai College.
- _____. 1996. Re-attaching Tsimshianic to Penutian. *Proceedings of the Hokan-Penutian workshops 1994 and 1995*. 91-112.
- _____. 1997. Tsimshianic and Penutian: problems, methods, results and implications. *IJAL* 63:1.65-112.
- _____. 2000. The original structure of Sapir's 'characteristic Penutian form of stem'. Paper presented to Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas. Chicago, January 6-9.
- _____. in prep. The reconstruction of Proto-Tsimshianic.
- WHISTLER, KENNETH. 1981. Ablaut in Hill Patwin. in Report #1, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages. 42-94. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.

REPORT 11

**SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND
OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES**



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE
HOKAN-PENUTIAN WORKSHOP**

**June 17-18, 2000
University of California at Berkeley**

**Laura Buszard-Welcher, Editor
Leanne Hinton, Series Editor**

REPORT 11

**SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND
OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE
HOKAN-PENUTIAN WORKSHOP**

**June 17-18, 2000
University of California at Berkeley**

Laura Buszard-Welcher, Editor

Leanne Hinton, Series Editor

Copyright © 2002
by the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages

cover design by Leanne Hinton (Santa Barbara Chumash rock painting)

PREFACE

The year 2000 was the 30th anniversary of the first Hokan languages conference. That first conference was imagined, planned and run by Prof. Margaret Langdon at the University of California at Berkeley, with the assistance of Prof. Shirley Silver of California State University at Sonoma. Almost every year since then, Hokan workshops and then Hokan-Penutian workshop in the previous few years had been either very small or even cancelled due to the lack of a sufficient number of people submitting paper titles. There was some thought of abandoning the Hokan-Penutian workshops altogether. Margaret felt that it would be a shame for this long tradition to end without a last hurrah, and so I offered to hold a Hokan-Penutian Workshop at Berkeley in conjunction with the “Breath of Life” Language Workshop for California Indians. The Breath of Life Workshop is a biennial gathering of California Indians here at Berkeley, and is designed primarily for people whose languages have no speakers left. We give them tours of the campus archives and show them how to use publications, fieldnotes and recordings of their languages for their own purposes – primarily language learning and teaching. I felt it would be a good thing to show the linguists who spent their careers working on these endangered languages to see the use their work is being put to by the descendents of the very people they worked with years ago. Therefore, the first session of the Hokan-Penutian Workshop consisted of presentations by the participants in the Breath of Life Workshop. The anticipation of this treat may have played a role in bringing a relatively large crowd here in 2000, perhaps along with billing the workshop as “The (Last?) Hokan-Penutian Workshop.” Sixteen papers (not counting the Breath of Life presentations) were given at the workshop, eight of which are published in this volume.

With both the Hokan and Penutian hypotheses in doubt, there is always a question as to which languages should be included at the workshop. Although my sympathies are with the “splitter” camp in linguistics, I’m definitely a social lumpener. Therefore, for purposes of the workshop I chose to define “Hokan” and “Penutian” as rubrics rather than language stocks, and advertised the workshop as being “for any language that has ever been hypothesized to be Hokan or Penutian.” We thus have papers ranging from Tsimshianic to Zuni, and—oh, well – we even accepted Juliette Blevin’s excellent paper on Yurok, an Algic language, which has never been hypothesized as either Hokan or Penutian.

At the business meeting held at the end of the Hokan-Penutian workshop, no-one wanted to say that this was the last one. Instead, we voted to continue with the workshops on a biennial basis, to be held here at Berkeley from now on, overlapping with the Breath of Life Workshop as it did in 2000. As I write this preface, the two years have already passed, and we are preparing for the 2002 Breath of Life Workshop, which this year will overlap with – not the Hokan-Penutian Workshop – but the 50th Anniversary Celebration of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages. The upcoming conference for the Celebration subsumes participants in Hokan-Penutian Workshops. I imagine that our biennial gathering will continue on; whether it will be a Hokan-Penutian workshop in 2004 or something broader than that remains to be seen.

Leanne Hinton
Director of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE
HOKAN-PENUTIAN WORKSHOP**

June 17-18, 2000
University of California at Berkeley

Juliette Blevins <i>Notes on Sources of Yurok Glottalized Consonants</i>	1
Catherine Callaghan <i>Problems of Writing a Historical Grammar</i>	19
Victor Golla <i>The History of the Term "Penutian"</i>	24
Anthony Grant <i>Fabric, Pattern, Shift and Diffusion: What Change in Oregon Penutian Languages Can Tell Historical Linguists</i>	33
Margaret Langdon <i>The Story of Johnny Bear: A European Tale in 'Iipay Kumeyaay</i>	57
Lynn Nichols <i>Two Zuni Passives</i>	72
Marie-Lucie Tarpent <i>Tsimshianic l-Initial Plurals: Relics of an Ancient Penutian Pattern</i>	88
Esther Wood and Leanne Hinton <i>A Report on George Grekoff's Collection of Chimariko (and Other) Materials</i>	109
Leanne Hinton <i>The Proceedings of the Hokan-Penutian Workshops: A History and Indices</i>	115