Achumawi Database: Summary for May 2020

The current backup can be downloaded (with instructions) from the usual location at
http://zelligharris.org/achumawi-db.html

1. My DEL grant resumes Monday 1 June. Work since 1 June last year has given me a head start on the morphological analysis, though the primary intention has been to clean things up so the analysis can proceed more efficiently.

2. I've continued working through the lexicon, merging duplicate entries, allomorphs, and dialectal variants, and cleaning up inconsistencies. Sometimes I have to reconsider (again) whether a given morpheme is a suffix or a word. Examples that I now consider postpositions include *wáka, ka* "agentive", *wa* "by, with", *wáté* "at, on, ...", *wáẏtu* "from", *ćó* "plural", *can* "individual, discrete, several". All of these except *ćó* have allomorphs that extend a preceding word-final consonant.

   When I come to an entry with a complex word, such as an inflected verb, I use the Show Entry in Concordance function. After I break each of the concorded items down in the Analysis view, I remove that entry from the lexicon, unless it has some marked irregularity of form or meaning, or a prominent function (e.g. the names of the bands). When a given morpheme within a word is not in the lexicon yet, so that I can't analyze the word completely, I go on a search for instances of that morpheme and create an entry for it. In this way, inflected verbs and other complex words are coming out of the lexicon, and individual morphemes are being added to the lexicon. It's a slow process with lots of rabbit holes to chase through, but when I do get to the entries for verbs it will go more quickly because the "show entries in concordance" function doesn't find any if I have already analyzed them.

   I'm up to the H section of the lexicon, where I found some verbs beginning with *h-*, the shortened form of *lh-*, hence the next topic.*

3. I've been setting the complexity of pronominal affixes aside for later analysis, but this month I've worked out a bit more of their semantics. You may be familiar with how prefixes refer to the subject or agent and (for transitive verbs) the object or patient. For example, *s-* says that I, the speaker, am involved, *k-* involves you, *sk-* says you are the agent and I the patient (*skituuṫíísi* "you shot me"). (This suggests OSV word order, which is typologically very rare.) In 1st person the nonsingular is *lh-/h-* (*lháámá* "you and I ate", *slháámá* "he and I ate"), and in 2nd person it is *k-* + *c-* (*káámá* "you ate", *kicámmá* "you two ate"). Nonsingular is sometimes used as plural. With transitive verbs, the *lh-* or *h-* prefix says that I and one or more other people are involved, but is ambiguous as to number and as to which is the agent. The 1st person prefix *s-* in *slh-* asserts that the other person or persons indicated by *lh-* are on my side, not yours. Because the *s-* prefix identifies who is included, not who is excluded, the conventional 'inclusive/exclusive' label contradicts the semantics.

   The *-umá* suffix (*-tumá* after vowel) asserts that some additional 3rd person is involved as an agent. With intransitive verbs, or when no patient is asserted, adding *-uma* to the nonsingular makes it plural (*lhámmíumá* "We ate", *kicámmíumá* "You pl. ate"). With a transitive verb, the additional 3rd person is the agent and the prefix identifies the patient (*witappʰááci* "he's teaching, he's a teacher,"

---

* The 1st person nonsingular *lh-* (with epenthetic schwa) is reduced to *h-* downriver sometimes, upriver always, but *slh-* becomes *səh-* upriver.

ẏitappʰáácumá, "he's teaching him"; *sóóċá* "I bit it", *síićíumá* "something bit me"). Less frequently, this agent may even be pleonastically indicated by a 3ʳᵈ person prefix in OSV pronoun order (*syétẇíumá* "he killed me", *syituutíísumá* "he shot me"). These transitives cannot be construed as plural, because the 3ʳᵈ person plural ending is the reciprocal *-íwci*, and the 1ˢᵗ person nonsingular is *lh-*.

In the H section of the lexicon there were some transitive verbs beginning with *h-*, designating a 1ˢᵗ person participant plus at least one other, and ending with *-icka* (*-ticka* after vowel). Below is a subset of the examples of *-icka* in the database (and you can search for more). As with *-umá,* there is a relatively simple path through the appearance of confusing complexity. A description follows the examples.

1	*haṁísqʰám hínímmáácicka*	I saw you alone, just you
2	*haǩmim hínímmáácicka*	I saw you two
3	*ittʰééka lháwwicka*	I gave it to you
4	*itʰúúlééka slháwwicka*	we gave it to you two/plural
5	*hiikʰááticka*	I cut you (the t is in the root *kʰát*)
6	*hicóókʰááticka*	I cut you pl.
7	*hicíṅímmáácicka*	we two saw you
8	*haǩmim hicíṅímmáácicka*	I saw you two
9	*hicínímmáácicka tóólol*	I saw you all
10	*tóólol ẇákam hicíṅímmáácicka*	they and I saw you
11	*haǩmim tóólol ẇákam hicíṅímmáácicka*	they and I saw you two
12	*hicíṅímmáácicka haǩ ẇákam*	you two saw me
13	*ittʰúúlééka lhcááwááticka*	we gave it to you
14	*itʰúúlééka yá tlhcááwícka*	we gave it to you plural
15	*ittʰééka lháwwícka*	I'm the one who gave it to you
16	*ṁicistʰú lhcáwwícka.*	I gave it to you two/plural
17	*tóólol lhcááwícka.*	I gave it to you all
18	*ittʰúúlééka lhcááwícka*	we gave it to you
19	*lhcááwicka*	he and I gave it to you and him
20	*ittʰúúlééka lhcááwááticka*	we're the ones who gave it to you
21	*ṁicistʰú lhcáwwicka*	I gave it to you two
22	*tóólol lhcáwwicka*	I gave it to you all
23	*ittʰééka lháwwicka*	I'm the one who gave it to you
24	*itʰúúlééka (yá) lhcáwwícka*	we gave it to you plural

25	*ittʰúúlééka lhcááwááticka*	we gave it to you plural
26	*lhituutı́ı́sicka*	I shot you
27	*kituutı́ı́sicka*	he shot you
28	*kíliisuuyáticka*	he's pointing at you
29	*kánwaakʰááticka*	he cut you
30	*kisááticka*	you were told, one told you

The *-icka* suffix adds a 2nd person patient to a transitive verb with a 1st person subject. It makes a 2nd person prefix the patient relative to an implicit 3rd person agent.

The *lh-..-icka* construction asserts that the participants are 1st and 2nd person, but is ambiguous as to which is plural. Because the *-icka* suffix places the 2nd person in the patient role, *lh-..-icka* asserts the 'exclusive we' as agent (1st person + 3rd person) and *slh-* (the usual exclusive form) does not usually occur. However, in (4) *itʰúúlééka slháwwicka* "we gave it to you two/plural" the *s-* may affirm that both the 1st and 2nd persons are plural, or it could also be the pleonastic emphasis that we saw in *syétwíumá*. That's the only example of *slh-..-icka* in the database, but considering e.g. *ṁicistʰúúlééka skicááwá* "you plural gave it to me" I think the corresponding verb with roles reversed would be *ṁicistʰúúlééka slháwwicka* "you plural gave it to me/us" and probably *itʰú ćó ṁicistʰúúlééka slháwwicka* "you plural gave it to us". Context usually resolves the ambiguity of these constructions, so that an independent pronoun like *itʰééka* "1st person agent" has or can have the effect of emphasis: "I'm the one who gave it to you."