

Pit River Languages Project

Summary of work during March 2025

You can download the current Achumawi backup from

- <http://zelligharris.org/Achumawi/achumawi-db.html>

I have updated the automatically generated Achumawi webonary at

- <https://www.webonary.org/odissi/>

If you use Keyman to type Pit River on a PC

You will see a notice about upgrading to a new version of Keyman.

When you upgrade to this April 2025 version, you must also download and install a new pit_river.kmp file from our website. On the main download page, click Keyboards, then follow the instructions on the page that opens.

This does not affect the keyboard on your Android device.

My focus now is on pulling together a descriptive grammar. An outline of the grammar is in [Outline.odt](#).

The sections in this report are not in the usual order. Discussion of the Achumawi grammar work is placed last because of its length and complexity.

1. 'Acwuké' database project
2. Acúmmá 'ó tiši ííma'cci'
3. Grammar

The first two sections are from Paul Cason and Lisa Craig, reporting their work.

This and all prior monthly summaries are archived under a [Monthly Reports](#) link at <https://zelligharris.org/Achumawi/achumawi-db.html>.

1 'Acwuké' database project

Requests for audio: We are in process of obtaining audio recordings of Leonard Talmy demonstrating his pronunciation of example words and phrases. We also have recordings of elders to listen to.

Data entry: There were no significant issues in the regular work of entering Talmy's material into the Atsugewi FLEx database has continued through the month.

Keyman issue: However, when Paul downloaded and installed the latest update to Keyman the keyboard customization stopped working. Uninstalling it and re-installing it is expected to restore it to service.

2 Acúmmá 'ó tiši ííma'cci'

Language Classes & Resources: Classes focused on translating the creation story this month. We distributed

new language-learning card decks for home use by parents, teachers, and independent learners. These decks feature writable dry-erase surfaces for added flexibility.

Youth Language Workshop: On March 22, team members Connor, Lisa, Radley, Harper, and Paul participated in a Youth Language Workshop hosted by AICLS' Youth Development Committee. We shared experiences and insights with a motivated group of Native youth committed to language preservation across California. This collaboration led to an exciting opportunity: an invitation to contribute an interview for the upcoming summer feature on languages in *News from Native California*. We will have more to say about this next month.

3 Grammar

This month I have worked out most of the structure of verb prefixes. You could accuse me of procrastinating for fifty years, but in the face of their challenging complexities I was unable to recognize their underlying simplicity until I understood the mobility of verb roots and realized the problems of mapping their semantics to English glosses.

Below is a draft section of the grammar. There are obvious gaps. Some subsections are still only sketched with examples and notes: the final subsections on suffixes, the conclusion of the *m*- subsection, the *w*- and *y*- subsections and the subsection on the remote past complexes. But the overall resolution of the issues is an important development, and should be useful for language learners.

In her Shasta grammar, Shirley Silver threw up her hands and said there were only frozen prefix complexes that could not be analyzed. Possibly this may someday be reconsidered.

There follows Section 3.6 of Chapter 3, 'The Verb Phrase'.

3.6 Pronominal affixes

Achumawi verbs typically begin with one or more prefixes which are translated as English pronouns, often together with adverbs. De Ángulo described these paradigmatically, as conjugated declensions in various modes or moods (Figure 3.1).

TABLE OF AFFIXED PRONOUNS.

PERSON	INDICATIVE	SUBORDINATE	OPTATIVE	VOLITIONAL, PRESENT	VOLITIONAL, FUTURE
"I"	<i>s-</i>	<i>st-</i>	<i>sl-</i>	<i>l-</i>	<i>mál-</i>
"thou"	<i>k-</i>	<i>m-</i>	<i>lg-</i>	<i>t-</i>	<i>k-</i>
"he, she, it"	<i>y-</i>	<i>t-</i>	<i>l-</i>	<i>tsl-</i>	<i>mál-</i>
"thou and I"	<i>h-</i>	<i>ts.h-</i>	<i>slh-</i>	<i>lh-</i>	<i>màh-</i>
"he and I"	<i>s.h-</i>	<i>sts.h-</i>	<i>ìslh-</i>	<i>slh-</i>	<i>smàh-</i>
"ye both"	<i>gìdz-</i>	<i>mìdz-</i>	<i>lìkts-</i>	<i>dz-</i>	<i>dz-</i>
"they both"	<i>ei y-</i>	<i>dìdz-</i>	<i>ld-</i>	<i>tsìnd-</i>	<i>mád-</i>
"ye and I"	<i>h-. .-má</i>	<i>st.h-. .-má</i>	<i>slh-. .-má</i>	<i>lh-. .-dzà</i>	<i>màh-. .-dzà</i>
"they and I"	<i>s.h-. .-má</i>	<i>stsìs.h-. .-má</i>	<i>ìslh-. .-má</i>	<i>slh-. .-dzà</i>	<i>smàh-. .-dzà</i>
"ye all"	<i>gìdz-. .-má</i>	<i>màdz-. .-má</i>	<i>lhts-. .-má</i>	<i>dz-</i>	<i>dz-</i>
"they all"	<i>y-. .-ú</i>	<i>d-. .-ú</i>	<i>ld-. .-ú</i>	<i>tsìnd-. .-dzà</i>	<i>màd-. .-dzà</i>
"I-thee"	<i>h-. .-tskà</i>	<i>t.h-. .-tskà</i>	<i>lh-. .-tskà</i>	<i>lh-</i>	<i>mìh-</i>
"he-thee"	<i>k-. .-tskà</i>	<i>m-. .-tskà</i>	<i>lg-. .-tskà</i>	<i>tsim-</i>	<i>mìd-</i>
"thou-me"	<i>sk-</i>	<i>sm-</i>	<i>sl-</i>	<i>st-</i>	<i>sk-</i>
"he-me"	<i>sy-. .-má</i>	<i>stìd-. .-má</i>	<i>slìd-. .-má</i>	<i>sìnd-</i>	<i>smìd-</i>

Figure 3.1. De Ángulo's paradigm sets. (De Ángulo & Freeland 1931: 91).

Even a quick visual scan discloses repeated substrings such as *s*, *l*, *lh*, *y*-, and so on, suggesting that further analysis might be possible.

A pitfall of eliciting paradigm sets is that you get what you ask for. Even in a vibrant language community with many speakers across all generations, the helpfully compliant consultant may include artificial constructs that fit the paradigmatic pattern by analogy, and may omit forms which are encountered in freely produced utterances, especially in narratives and other texts. A survey of the verb prefixes in the Achumawi database assembles a zoo of diversity that escapes the above paradigmatic bounds. Here is a list of some prefix sequences beginning with *s*-, just a fraction of the diverse combinations that are attested in the database:

Table 3.1. A subset of prefix combinations, with *s*- initial

<i>s-</i>	<i>sáámá</i>	I eat, I ate
-----------	--------------	--------------

sc-	<i>scááqáátumá</i>	It comes to us
	<i>scááwáátumá</i>	Someone/they give us, hand to us
	<i>scóósáátumá, scóósáátiníumá</i>	Someone/they said to us, we were told
	<i>scóstíwcumá</i>	He answered us back
sh-	<i>sihissííí</i>	we agreed
slh-	<i>ó sl̥hiśí</i>	I said (to him)
	<i>sl̥háwwí</i>	We (excl. nonsingular) gave it (we inclusive = <i>lháwwí</i>)
	<i>sl̥háwwíumá</i>	We (excl. plural) gave it
	<i>sl̥háwwicka</i>	We gave it to you
sk-	<i>skááwá</i>	You gave it to me
sk'-	<i>skááwá</i>	Did you give it to me? (Question intonation)
		You should give it to me! (Affirmative intonation)
skc-	<i>skicáwwá</i>	One gave it to us (incl.); you two gave it to me
		You (you and he?) gave me, you gave us incl.
skc'-	<i>skicáwwá</i>	You 2 should give to me
sl̥-	<i>sl̥ááyuuka</i>	I'd like to go too
	<i>sl̥ímmátsi</i>	Would that I wake!
	<i>sl̥ámmíuma</i>	We wish to eat
	<i>sl̥ápta</i>	If I go
slh-	<i>táq^há pá qa wáhhac sl̥híswac</i>	He and I will get bread again. I'll get bread for him again
slc-	<i>sl̥citápwaaci</i>	Help me!
slk-	<i>sl̥kitt^héw</i>	You should listen to what I say
	<i>háy sl̥kínúw</i>	You should think about me.
sl̥j'-	<i>sl̥áám</i>	If I eat, I might eat, would that I eat!
	<i>sl̥áapta</i>	If I go, I might go, would that I might go!
	<i>sl̥úpta</i>	I ought to go
	<i>sl̥íííííyáq</i>	I might accidentally hit one (with a stone)
sm-	<i>smáámi</i>	Might I eat?
	<i>smáámá</i>	Did I eat?
	<i>smálictik'</i>	I might get scared
	<i>smiśí</i>	Was I talking? do you say to me? might you say to me
smh-	<i>smháámá</i>	Did he and I eat?
	<i>smhállilláqti, smhállilláqtumá</i>	Do we like it?
smc-	<i>yáámá twiyí cé smícáácínóo tipsíwci</i>	"She's eating" I guess he thought
	<i>smicáácínóo</i>	He might have done wrt me

<i>smt-</i>	<i>smtaahí</i> <i>smtánás</i> <i>smitaak^háátúyumá</i> <i>smtálíllaqtumá</i>	You go ahead of me; Let her sing a charm/love song to me! Is he cutting it for me? Does he like me?
<i>snt-</i>	<i>sintaak^hát</i> <i>sintám</i>	He will (intends to) cut me! Let him eat me!
<i>st-</i>	<i>stáwwá</i> <i>stáwwáátumá</i> <i>stámmá</i> <i>stáámá</i> <i>táq stiýí</i>	Give me! Someone gave to me Eat us! I already ate (a while ago); that I eat What am I?
<i>stih-</i>	<i>stiháámá</i>	We (excl) must have eaten it! That he and I eat.
<i>stit-</i>	<i>stitínímmáácumá</i>	They 2 must have seen me
<i>stí-</i>	<i>táq wáli sa ya yályú wiýááké' stiýí!</i>	What kind of man am I?
<i>stc-</i>	<i>c^hú sticóosi kúcumá itt^húúni tatýí ka</i> <i>sticákasaswacínóo</i>	What will our mother say to us? He shepherded us.
<i>stih-</i>	<i>táq c^hú icc^r wíc sticéuwí</i> <i>táq c^hú icc^r wíc stihicéuwíumá</i>	What does it look like I'm doing? What does it look like we're doing?
<i>stlh-</i>	<i>táq stlhicciúma</i>	What are we?
<i>stit-</i>	<i>stiticéptaswacumá</i> <i>kí 'ka mów stituwáátuma íé tiici,</i> <i>ki wáli ka stituwáátuma?</i> <i>stitínímmáácumá</i>	Is he watching me? Who might it be who is being this way to me to do this way, Who is being this way to me? They 2 must have seen me
<i>stk-</i>	<i>c^hú stikáámá</i>	Did I eat? (How/what did I eat? de Ángulo)
<i>stkih-</i>	<i>c^hú stkháámá, c^hú stkhámmíumá</i>	Did we eat? (How/what did we eat? de Ángulo)
<i>stlú-</i>	<i>hew stlúw</i>	Don't let me forget!
<i>stlh-</i>	<i>stlháátíwci , stlháátíwcumá</i>	We must have had a fight
<i>stm-</i>	<i>stmóólaaci</i>	You (evidently) feed me

stw-	<i>stwátúúla'áyí</i>	It tastes so very good to me!
	<i>stwaasáámí</i>	I gathered things (recently)
	<i>stwálissuuyáti</i>	I pointed at him
	<i>stwináhwa</i>	I couldn't see it
	<i>stwinúnnéhmíci</i>	I overslept
	<i>míícim hay stwínúuwí</i> <i>cp. hay sínúuwí qá pálmás</i>	I remembered yesterday I remember now
stawa-	<i>c^hú stawááci kúci qa páálá máátíy ca</i>	What am I (supposed, required) to do today?
	<i>skak skak stawaacúúci</i>	I was snoring
sty-	<i>styáátíwci</i>	I must have had a fight.
	<i>tóólol styááwíumá</i>	They gave it all to me
	<i>styálisqááti tsiyí</i>	He and I are pointing at him
	<i>styánciíimí</i>	I lost it (lit. by my <i>ci</i> loose control it <i>ci</i> fell <i>im</i> away)
st ^h áy-	<i>st^háyáámá</i>	I must have eaten it!
	<i>st^háyáátíwci</i>	I must have had a fight!
	<i>cé st^háywi hay tuci</i>	I never thought that ...
	<i>cé st^háywi tinímmátsi</i>	I couldn't wake up
	<i>hew st^háyuwí</i>	I forgot (but now remember)
	<i>cp. hew suwí</i>	cp. I don't remember
	<i>ascé t^háyuwí</i>	It's cold!
	<i>ámitt^héwcan t^háyuwí</i>	It's a girl! (announcing birth)
sy-, siy-	<i>syáámúccum</i>	He lifted me (in arms) syámmfúmá He eats me (etc., with -um)
	<i>syísáátumá, síysáátumá, síísáátumá</i>	He said to me; I was told
	<i>siyáwwíumá</i>	It was given me
	<i>siyééyilakumá</i>	He follows me
	<i>siyúumá</i>	He is to me
	<i>siyuwáátumá</i>	He is wrt me.

Such a zoo! But it is actually far less complex than it seems. There are only a dozen morphemes which occur in various combinations:

- s* Speaker (first person; I, we)
- k* Hearer (second person; thou, you)
- c* Hearers (nonsingular second person; you)
- h* Speaker-hearer (we, transitive I-you)
- l* Intention, will
- m* unmanifest (might be)
- t* Manifest (news to hearer)

<i>t^ha</i>	News to speaker
<i>w</i>	Durative state: characteristic, habitual, durative condition
<i>y</i>	Transient state: current condition
<i>cky-</i> , <i>ckw-</i>	remote past 3 rd person
<i>'</i>	Potential (ought to be)

The two statives *w* and *y* may function as 3rd person prefixes as described in the section on implicit pronouns. The analysis of the eleventh item, the compound prefix *cky-*, *ckw-*, is still speculative. The other compounds have reasonably straightforward analyses, as exemplified by those beginning with *s-* which are listed at the beginning of this section. The twelfth item appears as the glottal stop onset of the stem in e.g. *táq l'ám* 'What might she eat?', *táq sl'ám* 'What might I eat?', in the glottalization of *k'* for the second person interrogative and 'polite imperative' forms, and probably accounts for the variable glottalization of *l'*, *m'*, *w'*, *y'*.

Suffixes mentioned in context of one prefix or another are describe more completely in other sections.

Imposing the 2-dimensional table structure of verb-conjugation paradigms only obscures the semantic contributions of these morphemes. The constraints on combinability are more pragmatic than paradigmatic. Several modifying suffixes that occur with one or another of these prefixes are described at the end of this section.

Implicit pronouns

In the absence of an explicit 1st person or 2nd person prefix, an implicit 3rd person argument is presumed. Consequently, a number of prefixes with particular functions may appear to be 3rd person pronouns, even the argument indicator *t-* marking a subordinate clause when the subordinating higher operator (often in the 'say' family) has been zeroed. The stative *w* and *y* are clear examples.

Direct address is an exception. When direct I-you address is clearly the context, *m-* 'unmanifest' is interpreted as 2nd person, as is also the case with the argument indicator *t-* in imperative forms, for which a 'say' verb of command is the zeroed subordinating higher operator. Examples are given below in the sections devoted to these prefixes.

s: 'Speaker' (first person, I, we)

The *s-* prefix is used for first-person references, except that when both speaker and hearer are involved, *h-* is used instead (q.v. below).

Examples with *s-* ‘first person’ are presented at the beginning of this section.

sáámá ‘I ate’

The suffix *-um* designates a 3rd-person agent, so that *s-* is the patient.¹ This may be glossed with a passive verb or with an impersonal or indefinite ‘someone’:

síísáátumá One told me, I was told

íe síísáátumá qa ís wáka That’s what people told me

sínínúmá He brought me

The long vowel *ii* may be a reduction of the transient stative *y-* interpreted as 3rd person. There are *s-..-umá* verbs in which the stem begins with a short *i*.

The combination of *s-* with the evidential usage of *t-* is pronounced [*c^h*].

it tsiyí [*it^h c^ht^yí*] ‘It’s me’

After a vowel that *t* at the beginning of a word-initial consonant cluster ordinarily closes the preceding syllable.

céémul twiyí [*céémol t^{hw}wi^yí*] ‘He’s Coyote’

q^he twiyí [*q^xe^yt^h wi^yí*] ‘It’s that one; that’s the one’

In this case, the evidential *t-* is rearticulated, even with the phonetic realization of *ts* as [*c^h*]:

it ká tsiyí [*it^h kát^h c^ht^yí*] ‘It is indeed me!’

k- ‘hearer’ (second person, you)

The explicit ‘thou, you’ prefix on a declarative verb is *k-*.

kááma ‘You’re eating, you ate’

When it is followed by the ‘–’ ‘potential’ prefix (glottal stop, q.v. below), the result is a laryngealized *k[’]*. The ? punctuation represents question intonation: high, slightly rising, with sentence-final reduction toward whisper or devoicing. The ! punctuation represents exhortative intonation, the ‘polite imperative’: level or

1 This *-um* derives from the possessive *u* plus *m* ‘down to, down into’. When it occurs after a noun or a name it may be glossed ‘__’s place’, as in *qá kac^húni wačííni um* ‘their uncle’s place’ (i.e. where he lived) or *Céémul um* referring to Coyote’s designated personal space in the communal winter house.

slightly falling, with somewhat more amplitude and more fortis articulation than a simple assertion.²

<i>kámmi</i>	‘You should eat!’
<i>káámá</i>	‘Are you eating? Did you eat?’

A few of the other affixe combinations are described here. Add *c-* for the nonsingular (or dual if contrasted with plural):

<i>kicáámá</i>	‘You (2 +) ate.’
<i>kícáámá</i>	‘Did you (2 +) eat?’

To make this nonsingular form explicitly plural, the *-um* suffix refers to an additional 3rd-person participant:

<i>kicámmfumā</i>	‘You pl. ate.’
<i>kícámmfumā</i>	‘Did you pl. eat?’

The *-icka* suffix indicates a 2nd-person patient:

<i>kámmicka</i>	‘Someone ate you.’
<i>kámmicka</i>	‘Did someone eat you?’

The following example illustrates a combination with the *w-* stative, glossed as 3rd person. The gloss on *ḳ-* (in *cé kúwwí* ‘are you not!’) is neither interrogative nor imperative, but within the language and apart from this English metalanguage the intended meaning is straightforward.

<i>ḳwacállúcécaswaci,</i>	You’ve been cleaning (roots and) lifting (to feed him)!
<i>má tkiyí cé kúwwí tinúúsaay</i>	That’s why you haven’t harvested!

At the end of the first verb, *swaci* is an auxiliary on the *c* ‘do, be’ root, with first argument *w-* and indefinite second argument *s-* ‘something’.

c: second person nonsingular³

This prefix was introduced with *k-* in the preceding section. To illustrate this more fully, consider *skicáwwá*, a simple verb comprising the root *áw* ‘give’ preceded by

- s-* first person
- k-* second person
- c-* nonsingular (second person)

2 Elsewhere in the grammar (Chapter 5, Reductions), these are traces of zeroed higher-level operators which represent the semantics explicitly.

3 The initial vowel in *ó iciší* ‘you two talk!’ suggests that the underlying form of this prefix could be *íc-*, but the status of the initial stem vowel is currently unsettled.

In a transitive verb, pronoun order is OSV. This can be glossed in three ways:⁴

<i>skicáwwá</i>	‘You (nonsingular) gave it to me’
	‘You gave it to us (inclusive of you nonsingular)’
	‘One gave it to us (inclusive)’

If context is not sufficient, an independent pronoun can disambiguate.

<i>micist^húúlééka skicáwwá</i>	‘You (nonsingular) gave it to me’
<i>miimééka skicáwwá</i>	‘You gave it to us (inclusive of you nonsingular)’
<i>kac^hééka skicáwwá</i>	‘One gave it to us (inclusive)’

The same construction is seen with *k-*:

<i>skicáwwá?</i>	‘Did you (nonsingular) give it to me?’
<i>skicáwwá!</i>	‘You (nonsingular) should give it to me.’

The question and the ‘polite imperative’ entail direct address by the speaker to the hearer. This greatly reduces the likelihood of the inclusive first person interpretations.

This construction may be used for plural as well as for dual. The suffix *-um* makes this explicitly plural by designating an additional 3rd-person participant:

<i>skicáwwúumá</i>	‘you gave it to us’
--------------------	---------------------

When speakers were asked to distinguish dual and plural number, they added an independent pronoun:

<i>minééka skicáwwúumá</i>	‘you’re the one who gave it to us’
<i>minééka ya má tskciyí skicáwwúumá</i>	‘You indeed you are who gave it to us’

This prefix does not specify the affiliation of the 3rd person who makes it plural, whether on the speaker’s side or the hearer’s. This results in some ambiguities in the English glosses.

<i>skicáwwá</i>	One gave it to us (incl. 2+).’
	‘You (2+) gave me.’
	‘You gave it to us (2+).’
<i>skicáwwúumá</i>	One gave it to us (incl. pl.).’
	‘You (pl.) gave me.’
	‘You gave it to us (pl.).’

It can occur without the *k-* 2nd person pronoun with the inclusive 1st person plural (including the hearer).

<i>sýcáwwám</i>	‘Let him eat us!’ (<i>s- y- ʔ- c- w-</i>)
<i>c^hú sticóósi kúcumá itt^húúni tatýí ka</i>	‘What will our mother say to us?’

4 The vowel *a* at a margin often betokens will or volition.

With the exclusive plural, it appears to be reduced from a combination with the evidential *t-* making the cluster *ty*:

<i>styacéptaswacinóo</i> > <i>scacéptaswacinóo</i>	‘He watched us.’
<i>scááqáátumá</i>	‘It comes to us’ (approaches, presses against)
<i>scááwáátumá</i>	‘They give us, they hand to us’
<i>scóósáátumá</i>	‘We were told, one told us’
<i>scóostíwcumá</i>	‘He answered us back.’

***h-* ‘I-you’**

Whereas *s-* is the usual way to refer to the speaker (first person) in intransitive situations, and to the speaker as patient in hearer-speaker transitive situations (*skáwwá* ‘you gave it to me’), the *h-* prefix is used instead for the speaker as agent in speaker-hearer transactions (I-you) and for first person plural forms (‘we’).

<i>allu hiníumá</i>	‘We’re hungry’
<i>hineeláátiwi</i>	We played around.
<i>háwwicka</i>	I gave it to you
<i>ó hiśááticka</i>	I said to you

Hortatory expressions with preceding *l-* ‘intention, will’ in the combinations *lh-* and *l̃h-* are described more fully in the next section. Often, *lh-* occurs without a clearly hortatory gloss.

<i>allu lhíníumá</i>	‘We’re hungry’
<i>lháwwicka</i>	‘I gave it to you’
<i>ilískéékí lhiyí</i>	‘We’re playing music’

Previous researchers have treated *h-* and *lh-* as alternants of the same pronominal prefix. De Ángulo described the inclusion of *l-* as an attribute of downriver dialects. A decade later, Voegelin attributed the choice to dialects somewhat differently.

The *h-* prefix occurs in other combinations.

<i>mháámá.</i>	‘Did you and I eat?’ (nonsingular inclusive)
<i>smháámá.</i>	‘Did he and I eat?’ (nonsingular exclusive, i.e. <i>s-</i> = ‘my side’)
<i>mhámmíumá.</i>	‘Did you and I eat?’ (pl. inclusive)
<i>smhámmíumá.</i>	‘Did they and I eat?’ (pl. exclusive)
<i>tímáátánóm mhiśá, má ánca kímáátánmi.</i>	‘When I say “Look down!” then you should look down.’

Here, too, the *h-* may occur with the continuant prefix elided.

<i>táq^há mhnímmáácóo ~ hnímmáácóo</i>	‘May we see one another again!’
--	---------------------------------

***l-* ‘intention, will’**

Glottalized and plain alternants of the *l-* prefix occur in the record. The glottalization of word-initial continuants is easily missed, and these alternant forms may in fact be in free variation.

<i>lám!</i>	I’ll eat!
<i>lhám!</i>	let’s eat! (nonsingular)
<i>lháámi kúci</i>	we are going to eat!
<i>lhámmíumá</i>	we eat; let’s eat! (plural)
<i>slhámmíumá</i>	Let’s eat! (excluding you)
<i>lhámmá</i>	let me eat you!
<i>lhuwí táq lhám</i>	What shall we eat? (nonsingular)
<i>lhuwíuma táq lhámmíica</i>	What shall we eat? (plural)
<i>c^hú mów lhíy</i>	‘What shall we do?’ (‘How might it be our state, what we do?’)

The word-initial continuant is often omitted in speech, in the linguist’s transcription, or both.

<i>háámi kúci</i>	we are going to eat.
<i>hámmíumá</i>	we eat
<i>shámmíumá</i>	we eat (excluding you)

Just how often the *l-* is elided is a matter of some uncertainty and perhaps confusion in the data. The initial unstressed *l-* is easily elided, even in exhortations where the volitional meaning of *l-* is necessary (e.g. *lhúpta!* ‘Let’s go!’ next to *lúpta!* ‘I’ll go!’), and when it is pronounced as a syllabic *l* with no epenthetic vowel, or even as a voiced aspirate *l^h* one can readily understand how it might escape a linguist’s ear, especially in what might be called *al fresco* transcription under less than ideal circumstances.

There may be dialect differences, but this question, too, is fraught. In a rapid tour through Pit River country, Carl Voegelin recorded only declarative forms without the volitional senses, and reported the following as dialect variations.⁵

<i>lh-</i> , <i>slh-</i>	Atwamsini (Big Valley), Acúmmááwi (Fall River Valley)
<i>h-</i> , <i>c^həh-</i>	Ilmááwi (below Fall River)
<i>c^həh-</i> , <i>sc^həh-</i>	Hámmááwi (upriver south of Alturas)

These forms differ from what de Ángulo reported, though most of his material is from the Alturas area (Qússialléqta ‘juniper flat’) and Big Valley. The forms other than *h-* and *lh-* are probably exclusive nonsingular or plural forms with *s-* or *ty-* ~ *c-*. It appears that de Ángulo and Voegelin came to these somewhat divergent conclusions on the basis of limited data, without recognizing the full range of possible prefix combinations, while treating these as unanalyzed unitary prefix morphemes.

5 Voegelin, Carl F. (1941). Notes on Klamath-Modoc and Achumawi dialects. *IJAL* 12:96-101.

Although the most frequent occurrences of *l̥-* are in first-person usages like those above (and of course this is necessarily so for exhortation), it does occur with other pronouns, for example, with *k-*:

	‘If you eat; you wish to eat’
	‘You want to eat’
<i>lkáámá</i>	‘If someone ate you’
<i>lkám</i>	‘if you run’
<i>lkámmicka</i>	‘You should tell her!’, ‘Why don’t you tell her?’, ‘Why doesn’t he tell it to you?’
<i>lkahuumá</i>	‘Tell it for her!’
<i>líkítámmaakúyi</i>	‘You must have lice!’
<i>líkítámmaakúyúyi</i>	‘You ought to share the food, you ought to give some of the food.’
<i>aamíç umá lkíçiiiláka</i>	‘Someone should think about you.’
<i>lkííla</i>	
<i>hay íkínúw</i>	

Radin recorded a few forms with *lw̥-*.

<i>lwúnná</i>	‘if he comes’, ‘May he come!’
<i>lwúnná umá</i>	‘He might have come’
<i>lwhuumá</i>	‘if he runs’

There is even a combination with the *t-* which has ordinarily been glossed as an imperative

<i>táq ltám</i>	What will you eat?
<i>táq ltámmíica</i>	What will you (plural) eat?
<i>aasí tsiyí amq^hákam ltámmá.</i>	‘I can’t, but I’ll try to eat it!’
<i>slítuuqááluma</i>	‘He might hit me.’
<i>slítiilá umá míssuç</i>	‘He might give me meat.’
<i>sltitámmaakúyi umá</i>	‘Perhaps he’ll tell me.’
<i>slhintámmaakúmá</i>	‘We tell him.’
<i>slhintámmaákumá</i>	‘We tell the story.’

’- Potential (ought to be)

This is most clearly evident as a prefix morpheme when it appears before the stem vowel.

<i>táq l’ám?</i>	‘What will she eat? What might she eat?’ (talking to oneself)
<i>táq sl’ám?</i>	‘What should I eat? What might I eat? What’s there for me to eat?’
<i>q^hahé sl’áámá háné’</i>	‘I wish I could eat that one.’
<i>sl’úpta</i>	‘I ought to go.’
<i>táq mówa l’áámmíica</i>	‘What are they going to eat?’ ‘What might they eat?’
<i>íçisúpsaayáke tímcan sl’úw</i>	‘(Two) take care of yourselves if something bad happens to me.’
<i>waçíiniwí wáte kicúpté c^hú sa amá sl’úw</i>	‘Go to your uncle’s if anything happens to me.’

taqqáľcan umá s'íníumá

‘Maybe I might find something, something might come to me.’

The glottalization of the continuants *ľ-*, *m̥-*, *w̥-*, *y̥-* is far less clear and consistent in the record. Nobody recognized its significance, including me, and it is easy to miss in transcription.

I have proposed that it appears in the glottalization of *k̥-* for the second person interrogative and ‘polite imperative’ forms. However, de Angulo and Radin may have recorded forms with the sequence *lk̥-* where *k-* + *̥* is not reduced to *k̥-*.

lka'áámá

‘You wish to eat, you would eat, if you eat’

lka'ámmicka

‘He would (like to) eat you, if someone ate you’

lka'áhuumá

‘if you run’

For these, de Ángulo writes rising tone, *lg-ǎ́má*, *lig-ǎ́má*, and Radin has *lɔqɔhomɔ* ‘if you run’ next to *slaḥoma* ‘If I run’, which I understand to be *sla'áhuumá*.

***m-* ‘potential, unmanifest’**

The *m-* prefix appears with glosses involving a variety of English pronouns, second person, third person, and impersonal. From an English gloss point of view, it is inherently ambiguous. From within the language, it says only that some aspect of what the verb is talking about is potential or unmanifest. A generic gloss could be “it might be that ___”. This is particularly clear when another pronoun is explicitly present, as in

hew umá muwí.

‘Maybe he forgot.’

te umá muwí.

‘Maybe that’s it.’

When there is no explicit pronoun, context identifies the referent. In the following conversation about gardening, the *m-* is interpreted as 3rd person in the first two sentences, and then is glossed with a 2nd person pronoun in the third sentence.

ámoq wáka umá tmiyí máámá.

‘Worms must have eaten it.’ (Worm|agent|maybe|it might be|possibly ate it.)

wálamúúsá ka umá tmiyí máámá qá wattu.

‘Maybe it was a mole that ate the root.’

wéé, cé tmuwwí titawwááti!

‘Oh, it must be you didn’t water it!’

The agentive *wáka* and its reduced allomorph *ka* identifies the 3rd person subject in the first two sentences. A literal reading of the third sentence is “Oh,|not|it might manifestly be|make the rounds [with water]”. The agency of the hearer is not explicitly represented, but it is implicit because the speaker is addressing the hearer in the conversational situation.

wawá muwí qá as

‘Is the water big (in the road)?’

wawá muwí

‘You’re big.’

táqqááli tuccáámé tmuwí

‘You evidently can’t do anything.’

With question intonation, *m-* is used with 3rd-person questions in contrast to *k-* for 2nd-person questions:

<i>máámá</i> (vs. <i>káámá</i>)	
<i>smáámá</i>	‘Did he eat?’ (vs. ‘Did you eat?’)
<i>allu m̐uwí, má tmiyí m̐áámá qa wáhhac?</i>	‘Did I eat?’
<i>allu yuwí, má twiyí m̐áámá qa wáhhac.</i>	‘Was he hungry, is that why he ate the bread?’
<i>allu yuwí, má twiyí yáámá qa wáhhac.</i>	‘He was hungry, that’s why he must (might) have eaten the bread.’
	‘He was hungry, that’s why he ate the bread.’

However, when a question word precedes the verb, *m-* is more likely to be a 2nd-person question insofar as the question word is likely to be addressed to the hearer:

<i>táq m̐ów m̐áámí kúci?</i>	What will you eat?
<i>c^hú misunwí?</i>	How do you feel?
<i>c^hú m̐ópsíw?</i>	What do you think?

In the following conversation fragment, Porcupine is responding to Coyote’s interest in his shoes:⁶

<i>pi!</i>	‘Here!’
<i>c^hú muwí?</i>	‘How are you?’ (i.e. ‘How do you like them?’ Alternatively: ‘How is it?’)
<i>t^húsýí tici tm̐anuwí qa pi.</i>	‘These are good ones.’
<i>íimúntíwa!</i>	‘Look them over!’
<i>pi tm̐anuwí qa kláála ckiší céémul wáka.</i>	‘Are these the shoes?’ said Coyote.

The following sentence is translated with a 2nd-person gloss:

<i>mináyumá lhípsíwcicka.</i>	I thought you were dead.
-------------------------------	--------------------------

The literal translation is “‘He must be dead’ I thought about you’, or “‘He might be dead’ I thought about you’.

This variability is shown by the ambiguity of the combination of *m-* with o *í-* ‘intention, will’ (q.v. above). Speakers glossed *mí-* with either 3rd person or 1st person as the subject or agent, using the same 1st-person gloss as for *í-* alone.

<i>íám</i>	I will eat! Let me eat!
<i>míám</i>	I will eat!
<i>míám</i>	He should eat! Let him eat!

The addition of *m-* defers the immediacy of *íám!* De Ángulo interpreted this as a future volitional tense (*málám*).

Volition and potential both bring the unmanifest into manifestation. The difference between them

6 This is Porcupine’s glib sales patter (which de Ángulo treated as one sentence), followed by Coyote’s question whether these are the shoes whose prints in the snow he had admired.

is not easy to capture succinctly in the English glosses. To express the conditionality distinction between 1st-person *í-* and 1st-person *mí-* in English, the impersonality of *m-* must be explicit.

<i>táq mówa máámi kúci?</i>	Whatever will you eat?
<i>táq mówa mcáámi kúci?</i>	Whatever will you eat? (nonsingular)

These examples below are glossed with either 1st or 3rd person subject,. The 1st-person interpretation is pragmatically less probable, but available, and context may favor one interpretation or the other.

<i>mil mlúw</i>	It might be that I will willfully be confused!
	Let him be confused!
<i>c^hú sa aamhá ó mlís</i>	I might say whatever I want!
	Let her say whatever she wants!

An example translated with a relative clause further illustrates how the essentially impersonal *m-* may be interpreted diversely. The free translation is “The man who came yesterday said he would come today”, but the second clause quotes him saying ‘I might come’.

<i>míicim qa ís yáát^huuki</i>	Yesterday the man came
<i>amq^há mluut^huuka wiśí qa páálá.</i>	that one said ‘I might come’ today

Immediately following this, illustrating how the pragmatic interpretation of *m-* is sensitive to context, Mrs. Rhoades gave a 3rd-person gloss for the identical word:

<i>mlut^huuka</i>	He might come.
-----------------------------	----------------

To be clear, in *amq^há* “S” *wiśí* the *amq^há* is the anaphoric subject of *wiśí*, it does not correspond to English *that* in *he said that “S”*.

mti
cahóóma^hka mtíiyuumi ‘the dog might die’
cé tuccó tiluuyááki, wawá mtíici. ‘Don’t stretch, you might grow!’ (i.e. you’re tall enough)

smc- *smicáácínóo* he might have done
mh .. ca (instead of *uma*) *m-* unmanifest *c* addition to 2nd person *a* volition

Irrealis : *m-*, ‘-

m- táq minímmá What do you see? [*táq ttánuwí* What is it?];
táq c^hú miší What did you say? *c^hú miší* What do you mean?
táq c^hú miyí What did you do with it? *c^hááwa c^hú miyí* Where were you/Where did you put it?
c^hú muwí. t^húsýí tuci tmánuwí qa pi.
c^hú múw lhíy What shall we do?
taqqáwcan c^hú missááticka Did he say anything to you? [3rd person

\smic

mc- táq mówa mcáámi kúci Whatever will you eat?
mcálílléqti You (2+) might like; *C^héyé mcápte kúci?* Where are you 2+ going?
c^hú mcóóci kúcumá What should you do?
táq wáli c^hú m^cuwíumá What's the matter with you?
mh- We 2+ , I-you
ml- I will eat! (fut. volitional); *mluuk^háátam* She might have fainted.
mil mlúw Let him be confused! Let him forget!
mt- mtilísté puwááwí ka A buck might hook you; *mtíílúúmi* You might get stuck in mud
c^hú mtóóci kucá What will he do to you?

The negative *cé* plus a word glossed 'be' or 'do' is idiomatically translated 'I guess'.

<i>q^ham cé múw tínínnááci tucci</i>	I guess it didn't grow
<i>cé mícííní titílíwi qa waslíw.</i>	I guess they sent for the soldiers.
<i>hew cé múw tici</i>	I guess she forgot.

It is idiomatic in isolation:

<i>cé mucci?</i>	Why not?
<i>cé mucci qa ís?</i>	Did you ever see an Indian who didn't?

The *h-* prefix occurs in other combinations.

<i>mháámá.</i>	Did you and I eat? (nonsingular inclusive)
<i>smháámá.</i>	Did he and I eat? (nonsingular exclusive, i.e. <i>s-</i> = 'my side')
<i>mhámmíumá.</i>	Did you and I eat? (pl. inclusive)
<i>smhámmíumá.</i>	Did they and I eat? (pl. exclusive)

tí máátánóm mhiśá, má áncà kímáátánmi. When I say “Look down!” then you should look down.

Here, too, the *h*- may occur with the continuant prefix elided.

íáq^há mhnímmáácóo ~ hnímmáácóo

‘May we see one another again!’

Glottalized and plain alternants of the *m*- prefix occur in the record. The glottalization of word-initial continuants is easily missed, and these alternant forms may in fact be in free variation.

***t^ha*- ‘news to speaker’**

This appears to be an idiomatic use of the root *t^ha*, *t^he* ‘hear, listen, mind, obey’ as a preposed enclitic

t^háy- *t^háyuwí, mállíssámé’ t^háyuucííní*

t^hám- *q^hám t^hámiyí qa aamíc*

t^hán *éléplaaláwí t^hániyí; mapsilíí t^hániyí; cehaayí t^hániyí; uq^hááqí t^hániyí mimú tuuwáámé;*

wé isí t^hániyí Well, he must be talking. *wínámmaací t^hániyí*

acpú mów t^hánisííní qa pálmás áyту.

acpuuyí t^hánisííní qa pálmás áyту.

twášííní.

t- argument indicator

On the face of it, this is the most difficult prefix to comprehend under one definition, because its varied semantics derive from a higher-level operator entering on it, which is not always overtly spoken. It occurs frequently under a stative operator.

<i>ćé suwí tít^hééwi</i>	‘I didn’t hear.’
<i>pi q^há kuwááticka titaawaayúúyická.</i>	‘She cooked this for you.’
<i>túúni kú yuwá húúta</i>	‘Rattlesnake will come.’
<i>tétwi kú kuwááticka</i>	‘He’s going to kill you.’

That operator may be zeroed, leaving the appearance that *t-* is a pronominal prefix.

wawá tít^halúumi [yuwí] qá as tánáláátaawi. ‘Fetching water [is] a lot of work.’

When a verb of command in the ‘say’ family enters on a sentence, with a volitional form of the verb stem and hortatory intonation, the superordinate ‘command’ verb can be zeroed.

<i>támmá!</i>	‘Eat!’
<i>taapámcoó!</i>	‘Put it down!’

If a statement of the evidentiary basis for what is said is superfluous in the given context, it may be zeroed and the *t-* argument indicator under it attests that the remaining assertion is inferred from something that the speaker knows. This accounts for how the ‘evidential’ use of *t-* ranges from ‘hearsay’ to ‘manifestly evident’. The effect often is of providing information that is known to the speaker and new to the hearer, in contrast to *t^ha* in the preceding section. In this kind of usage, the argument-indicator *t-* can be combined with the other prefixes

<i>hew tihuuwicka</i>	‘I forgot you.’
<i>c^hú tihóóci kúci. c^hú tihóóci kúcumá.</i>	‘What are we going to do?’
<i>húúta ka iicí tkuwááticka.</i>	‘Rattlesnake will bite you.’
<i>yatwí tkówááticka.</i>	‘They will kill you.’
<i>q^hé ka tkcuwwááticka kicámmáálicka tóólol.</i>	‘That’s the one who hit all of you.’
<i>qac tyánuwí</i>	‘It’s a sanding stone.’
<i>ćókca tyániimi</i>	‘It’s shallow.’
<i>ttáamá, tyámmíwci</i>	‘They must have eaten it.’

It may be combined with a prior occurrence of the argument-indicator *t-* under a previously-entered operator, resulting in *tt-* (the first one aspirated or with a partly devoiced or otherwise reduced epenthetic vowel).

<i>té mow sicó’oy, ka tsicó’oy ckwapsíwci.</i>	‘What was I doing? That’s what I was doing!, she thought.’
<i>q^hé tím ttiyí ttápté.</i>	‘Right there is where they’ve gone!’

táq ttánuwí qá pi? ‘What is this?’

Still further combinations are possible.

táq wáka sl̥t̥icépt̥aswacumá ‘What could be watching me’

qa q^hé t̥micépt̥aswacicka ‘That one was watching you’

The combination *ty* may merge phonemically with *c^h*.

‘What does he do?’

táq tyicci ttíy̆i ‘Let him eat!’

tylammá, tylám ‘Let him go!’

tylúpta ‘Let him see you!’

tyminímmááci ‘Let him eat you!’

tymámmi ‘Let them eat!’

tyntám ‘Let them eat!’

salaaquupá tywaqááci ‘Sheep is grazing’

This can introduce an ambiguity between *sty-* and *sc-* with the second person nonsingular *c-*.

scááwáátumá ‘They give it to us’

styóónáykumá ‘She’s chasing us’

tétwi kú styóówáátumá ‘She’ll kill us’

styánciimí qá itt^hú sāt icaaquuláké. ‘I lost my pocket knife’ (evidently fell from me by looseness)

There is at present no such derivation for occurrences of *t-* ‘3rd person nonsingular’.

tytám! ‘let them (two) eat!’

tytááhuuma! ‘let them (two) run!’

tytáátíwci ‘They two were fighting’ (hearsay)

ttáámá ‘They two are eating.’

mtoosá? ‘Did they two drink?’

mtáámaati ‘Did they two sleep?’, ‘Let them two sleep!’

There are a number of other cases that do not yet fit comfortably in this analysis. This section closes with a list of six ‘hearsay’ examples.

tyáátíwciwci

tytáátíwci ‘They were fighting.’ (Written *c^há-*)

tyáátíwci ‘They two were fighting’ (Written *ctá-*)

tymáátíwci ‘He was fighting’ (Written *c^há-*)

tymtáátíwci ‘You were fighting’ (Written *cmá-*)

tymtáátíwci ‘You two were fighting’ (Written *cmitá-*)

tymtattíwcumá ‘You plural were fighting’ (Written *c^hmitátiwcuma*)

w- ‘characteristic, habitual condition’ (3rd person)

y- ‘current condition’ (3rd person)

syétwíumá qá wawá puwwááwí 'ka

A big buck killed me. [Knocked me unconscious.]

cky-, ckw- ‘remote past 3rd person’

ty- ka + 3rd person *y-* or *w-*

Remote past 3rd person:

ck- *c^həkV*

ckw- *c^hkwV*

cky- *c^hkyV*

tyt-/ct- *ctápti* They went (recent past), *ctáptééni* They went (remote past)

ckyápte ~ *ckápte*, but *ckyáásá*

y-

itt^hééwicka yuwáásá. I heard you singing.

w-

N *u*-Vstem > [N] *w*-Vstem

um

Patient or agent 3rd party: *-um*

If an explicit subject is stated, it must be marked as the agent with *wáka* (reduced to *ka* after a vowel)

<i>sínínúmá</i>	‘he brought me’ (<i>in</i> ‘transition, change state, move’ + <i>-in</i> ‘past’)
<i>cktétwíumá qa céémul</i>	Coyote was killed
<i>q^hé ka kámmáálícka</i>	That’s the one who hit you.
<i>q^hé ka tkcuwwáátícka kicámmáálícka tóólol</i>	That’s the one who hit all of you
<i>q^hé ka týíwáátumá íyámmáálumá</i>	That’s the one who hit her.
<i>q^hé ka týíwáátumá íyámmáálumá qa q^hé có</i>	That’s the bunch who hit her.

-icka

Patient 2nd person: *-icka*

Maybe V-ic ‘ka whence *icka~icà*. *itt^hééwicka yuwáásá*. I heard you singing.

syálišcááticka I came over to converse with you; *sáliisuyyáticka* I recommended you

deA: Grammar: 1014-1028 *c^hú tkhámmicka* etc.