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1. Introduction

Sahaptin/ Ichishkíin (Ich)
- Location: Plateau Region, Northwestern U.S.A. Spoken along the Columbia River and its tributaries in north central and northeastern Oregon and south central Washington
- Language vitality: The languages are severely endangered, although it is difficult to specify exact numbers of speakers. Estimate: no more than 50 fluent elder speakers of all dialects. 100-150+ learners

1.1 Typological overview

Ichishkíin is a synthetic to polysynthetic language with rich verbal morphology and complex verb stem structure. Verbs stems have inherent transitivity. Word order is flexible. Grammatical relations are indicated by case-marking, verb agreement and second position enclitics; it is both head and dependent-marking. The language is sensitive to hierarchies based on person, animacy, topicality and number. The categories of S, A and O show a three-way split in marking on nouns. The A category is further split, in that different case markers are used depending whether the object is a speech act participant (obligatory) or third person (additional direct/inverse “optional” split).

1.2 Hierarchical effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAP</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Mixed: Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mixed: Inverse</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Intransitive clauses

SAP S:
(1) \( aw=nash \) wyá-ɬamayk-sha
\( now=1Sg \) while-going-lose-IMPV ¹
‘Now I am getting lost’ (Ich tx)

(2) páyn-a
arrive-PST
‘I arrived’ OR ‘you arrived’ (NzP, Rude 1985:31)

(3) qeceex (iin) kúu-se
even=1Sg (1Sg.PN) go-IMPV
‘even I am going’ (NzP, Aoki 1970:129)

3SgS:
(4) íwáyťya áswan páchupa ishći̩pa
I-wáyťi-ya áswan páchu-pa ishći̩-pa
3Sg.S-run-PST boy half-LOC road-LOC
‘the boy ran down the middle of the road’ (Ich tx)

¹ Abbreviations are as follows: 1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, A agent, ALL allative, CAUS causative, CSL cislocative, DEF definite, DIR direct, DI dual, ERG ergative, F feminine, FUT future, GEN genitive, HAB habitual, HUM human, IMPV imperfective, INV inverse, INST instrumental, LOC locative, Mol Molalla, NEG negative, NP Nez Perce, NZR nominalizer, O object, OBJ object, OBLIG obligatory, OBV obviative, OPT optional, Pl plural, PN pronoun, PPF present perfect, PRO pronoun, PRX proximate, PST past, Q question, RCP reciprocal, REL relativizer, S/A subject of intransitive/agent of transitive, SAP speech act participant, Sg singular, TO topical object, Tr Transitive, = clitic boundary, - affix boundary.
Table 1 Summary of Sahaptic intransitive clauses with singular S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pronominal enclitic</th>
<th>S case marking</th>
<th>verb prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>=nash (Ich)</td>
<td>Unmkd PN (opt) —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=x (NzP)*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>=nam</td>
<td>Unmkd PN (opt) —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=m (NzP)*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>i- (Ich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hi- (NzP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NzP pronominal enclitics are used in only some environments.

2. Mixed scenarios

SAP>3

(7) Cháwnash ánach’axi áwit’yawita k’áx̣mnan  
    chav=nash ánach’axi áwit’yawita  k’áx̣mnun  
    NEG=1Sg again 3O-kill-FUT  prairie.chicken-OBJ
    ‘I’ll never again kill a prairie chicken’ (Ich tx)

(8) ‘ew- ‘wí-ye  
    3O-shoot-PST  
    ‘I shot him/her’ OR ‘you shot him/her’ (NzP, Rude 1985:32)

(9) weetee=x  ‘e-twíik-ce  
    Q=1Sg 3O-accompany-IMPF  
    ‘shall I go with him/her?’ (Aoki 1970:130)

(10) kínye  ’ipéetesne  ‘ew’néhnenu  mëxšéemx
    kínye  ’ipéete-ne  ‘ew- ‘néhnenu-u  mëxšéemx
    this.OBJ  sacred.bundle-OBJ  3O-take-FUT  mountain.ALL
    ‘You will take this sacred bundle to the mountains’ (NzP tx, Rude 1985:253)

SAP>2

(11) ikushnash tishapáttawałx’ana  Xašíxhínim
    ikush=nash t-šapá ttawałx’-inga-na  Xašíxh-ním
    thus=1Sg 3Sg.S/A-CAUS-grow-HAB-PST  Xašíxh-INV.ERG
    ‘In that way, Xašíxh raised me’ (Ich tx)

(12) páyuχa=nash i-tawí-sha-na  pínímk
    páyu-χa=nash  i-tawí-sha-na  pínímk
    very=MOD=1Sg 3Sg.S/A-love-IMPV-PST  PN.ERG.3>1/2
    ‘he must really love me’ (Ich tx)

(13) tamánwitnínash  tinápayunta  
    tamánwit-ním  =nash  i-nápayun-ta
    law-INV.ERG=1Sg 3Sg.S/A-defend-FUT
    ‘The law will support me’ (Ich tx)

(14) hi-‘wí-ye
    3S/A-shoot-PST
    ‘s/he shot me’ OR ‘s/he shot you’ (NzP, Rude 1985:32)

(15) weetee=x  hi-twíik-ce
    Q=1Sg  3S/A-accompany-IMPF
    ‘shall s/he go with me?’ (NzP, Aoki 1970:130)

(16) koná  ‘åatwayne nmáaqsním  hiíceene
    koná  ‘åatwayne-ním  nmáaqsním  hiíce-ne
    there  old.woman-ERG  one-ERG  say-PST
    ‘there, an old woman told me’ (ZP tx) (Aoki 79.15.01)
(17) hì-paynyóyo' 'éé koná 'itúúnm
hì-paynó-yo' 'éé koná 'itúú-nm
3S/A-arrive.at-FUT you that.LOC something-ERG
'something will come to you there' (NzP tx, Rude 1985:254)

i-/hi- vs. á-/e-
(18) kunash ák'ínutá
ku-nash á-k'ínu-ta
and =1Sg 3O-see-FUT
'and I will see him/her/them' (Ich)

(19) kunash ík'ínutá
ku-nash i-k'ínu-ta
and =1Sg 3Sg.S/A-see-FUT
'and s/he will see me' (Ich)

Table 2 Comparison of Sahaptian transitive clauses: mixed scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ich</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>pronominal enclitic</th>
<th>A case marking</th>
<th>O case marking</th>
<th>verb prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>neph (1Sg)</td>
<td>Unmkd PN (opt)</td>
<td>-nem (OBJ (opt if overt)</td>
<td>á- (3O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>neph (1Sg)</td>
<td>OBJ PN (opt)</td>
<td>-i- (3Sg-S/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NzP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>pronominal enclitic *</th>
<th>A case marking</th>
<th>O case marking</th>
<th>verb prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>=x (1Sg)</td>
<td>Unmkd PN or éé PN (opt)</td>
<td>-ne (OBJ (oblig if overt)</td>
<td>'e- (3O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>=x (1Sg)</td>
<td>OBJ PN or éé PN (opt)</td>
<td>hi- (3S/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NzP pronominal enclitics are used in only some environments.

3. Non-local scenarios
3.1 Non-local: Ichishkiin

DIR:
(20) t ówáwa'yanana myánash manäm wawya'á
i-ówáwa'-ya-na myánash- manäm wawya'á-
3Sg.S/A- whip-HAB-PST child-OBJ.PL whipman-O
'the whipman (PRX) used to whip the children (OBV)' (Ich tx)

(21) ku awkú ína b'áxnu áyat-nan
ku awkú i-in-ta b'áxnu áyat-nan
and then 3Sg.S/A-tell-PST prairie.chicken woman-OBJ
'then Kaxnu told the woman (wife)' (Ich tx)

INV:
(23) Chaw pák'ínutá wisalítháyín
Chaw pá-k'ínu-ta wisalíthá-yín
NEG INV-see-FUT hunter-OBJ.VERG
'the hunter (OBD) will not see him (PRX)' (Ich tx)

(24) ku kwnak witguptín páwinpa
ku kwnak witgupt-in pá-wïn-pa
and there blizzard-OBJ.VERG INV-take-PST
'the (OBD) caught him (PRX)' (Ich tx)

(25) pátamanwyá ichínak ttičámnán
pá-tamanwi-yá ichínak ttičámn-nan
INV-create-PST this.OBJ earth-OBJ
'he (OBD) created this earth (PRX)' (Ich tx)

3.2 Non-local: Nez Perce
(26) pée'-wiye
3TR-shoot-PRF
's/he shot him/her' (NzP, Rude 1985:32)
(27) kaa náaqsnim koniká pádayqsaya kúuski
and one-ERG that.side.LOC pour-PST water-INST
mástayína mástayí-na face-OBJ
‘and on that side the one poured water on (his) face’ (NzP tx, Rude 1985:269)

(28) ku'itúunm hináassapahwaxqana hináashimta'xqana we'nípt
3 S/A -SAPA-hiwax-qa-na song
hi-náas-hímta'x-na we'nípt
‘something used to give them visions and teach them songs’ NzP tx (Aoki 1979.15.23)

NzP “antipassive” – detransitivized- construction.
(29) hi-i'sépt tsélúuy
3NOM-carry.on.back-PST quiver
‘He carried a quiver Phinney 69,7, p. 34 the glutton
(30) hi-pe'-npt-ée-ne nukt
3NOM-PNOM-get- go-perf meat
‘they went to get meat’

Table 3 Comparison of Sahaptian transitive clauses: non-local scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ich</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A case marking</th>
<th>O case marking</th>
<th>verb prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>3SgPRX</td>
<td>3SgOBV</td>
<td>Unmkd</td>
<td>-nan (OBJ) (opt if overt)</td>
<td>i- (3Sg.S/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>3SgPRX</td>
<td>3SgOBV</td>
<td>-in (OBV.ERG)</td>
<td>-nan (OBJ) (oblig if overt)</td>
<td>pá- (INV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NzP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-n(i)m</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>péé-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Agent case marking: towards Proto-Sahaptian forms

Table 4 Comparison of A case markers within Sahaptian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A case-marking</th>
<th>Ichishkiín</th>
<th>Nez Perce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3&gt;SAP</td>
<td>-nim</td>
<td>-n(i)m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&gt;3</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-n(i)m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 -n(i)m: CISlocative source?
(31) a. i-wiihayk-a 3Sg.S/A-descent-PST 3Sg.S/A-wii-descent-CSL-PST
‘s/he went down’ ‘s/he came down’ (Ich)
(32) ku nash itáymuníma
ku =nash i-táymun-im-a
and =1Sg 3Sg.S-inform-CSL-PST
‘he informed me’ (Ich)

(33) a. pátaymu 3Sg.S/PNOM-inform-CSL-PST
b. tamtaay nim INV-inform-CSL inform-CSL
‘tell me!’ (Ich) ‘tell me the news’ (NzP tx, Phinney 1934:53)

In Nez Perce, this cislocative is required when 2nd acts on first:
(34) Ø-'ewí-ya
1/2NOM-shoot-PST
‘I shot you’ (NzP, Rude 1985:32)
(35) Ø-'ewí-m-a
1/2NOM-shoot-CSL-PST
‘You shot me’ (NzP, corrected from Rude 1985:32)

Proto-Sahaptian *-im ‘hither’ (Rude 1991, 1997)

The Molalla cislocative also occurs on verbs where the motion is towards the speaker or established point, also, on all verbs with a first person object.
forms alternations

The 4 have cislocatives with *-m. (Rude 2006:141)

\*-m Proto-Penutian ‘come’: Np, Ich, Molalla, Cayuse, Takelma and Kalapuya have cislocatives with -m. (Rude 1991). (Klamath -ebg, -bg, Barker 1964.)

4.2 -n(í)m: Genitive source?
The NzP genitive case marker is the same as the ergative marker, with the same alternations. The Sahaptin genitive maintains the same segments, but has the forms -mí/-nmí.

(36) npaislámi
n-pay-sla-m-i
1Sg.O-kill-FUT-CSL-3.S
‘she will kill me’ (Mol, Pharris 2006:141)

(37a) háama-nm ciq’áamqal
man-GEN dog
‘the man’s dog’ (NzP)

(37b) iwínsh-mít k’usík’usi
man-GEN dog
‘the man’s dog’ (Ich)

(38) ciq’áamqalm pá’a'naxpayka pipísne
ciq’áamqal-m pá’a-’naxpayk-a pipís-ne
dog-ERG 3TR-carry.arrive-PST bone-OBJ
‘the dog brought the bone’ (NzP, Rude 1985:198)

(39) háama-nm ciq’áamqal pá’a’naxpayka pipísne
hdáama-nm ciq’áamqal pá’a-’naxpayk-a pipís-ne
man-GEN dog-Ø 3TR-carry.arrive-PST bone-OBJ
‘the man’s dog brought the bone’ (NzP, Rude 1985:198)

(40) k’usík’usínim/nash iwínshmít ichánpa
k’usík’usi-nim=nash iwínsh-mít i-cháp-a
dog-OBV,ERG=1Sg man-GEN 3Sg.S/A-bite-PST
‘the man’s dog bit me’ (Ich)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 Plateau Penutian genitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Klamath</th>
<th>-'am/-lam</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molalla</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NzP</td>
<td>-nim/-nm/-m</td>
<td>-nim/-nm/-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich</td>
<td>-nmí/-nmí</td>
<td>-nmí/-nmí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Molalla data from Pharris 2006; Klamath data from DeLancey 2005)

The Plateau Penutian data suggest *-m as another possible Proto-Sahaptian form.

- A suggested pathway: GEN to INV to ERG; GEN and CSL may have same source.

In Nez Perce, the ergative marker and the genitive marker do not co-occur. ¹

(41) ciq’áamqalm pá’a’naxpayka pipísne
ciq’áamqal-m pá’a-’naxpayk-a pipís-ne
dog-ERG 3TR-carry.arrive-PST bone-OBJ
‘the dog brought the bone’ NzP (Rude 1985:198)

(42) háamanm ciq’áamqal pá’a’naxpayka pipísne
hdáama-nm ciq’áamqal-Ø pá’a-’naxpayk-a pipís-ne
man-GEN dog-Ø 3TR-carry.arrive-PST bone-OBJ
‘the man’s dog brought the bone’ NzP (Rude 1985:198)

The ergative but not the genitive has a variant form used with kin terms in both languages: -pim in Ichishkíin and –pim in Nez Perce. The genitive marker does not have this variation, suggesting the genitive pre-dated the ergative marker.

(43) náaqcki lééheyki pikéeipim páangana
náaq-ki lééhey-ki pikée-pim páa-n-qana
one-INST day-INST mother-ERG 3TR-tell-REMOTE.PST
‘one day her mother said (to her)’ NzP tx (Aoki 1979.10.31)

4.3 -in Associative

-(í)in is an associative case marker in both Ich and NzP. It is also a dual marker in Ich. The associative suffix triggers plural agreement on the verb.

UO Linguistics Colloquium
May 16, 2014
‘they brought them all out’ (Ich tx)

(50) kupert kwnak áwyaanakwa myúma
ku =pat kwnak á-wyáñakw-a myú-ма
and =3Pl that.LOC 3O-abandon-PST wife’s.brother.Pl
‘and his brothers-in-law deserted him there’ (Ich tx, Jacobs 1937:10.6.2)

=pat as O

(51) wáxpushnim₃₃pat iníkwina
wáxpush-nim₃₃pat i- nltkwn-a
rattlesnake-INV.ERG=3₃Pl 3Sg.S/A-swallow-PST
‘a rattlesnake swallowed them’ (Ich tx, Jacobs 1937:11.7.4)

5. Ichishkíin inverse voice

5.1 Neighbors as source

(52) pålat'ishana Spílyáín
‘Spílyá was looking at him’

Kinkade et al. list 1998 features shared by Plateau languages; Ichishkíin shares many of the features they list. Lexical and grammatical correspondences between Sahaptian and Salish have long been noted (see e.g. Boas 1940, Aoki 1970, Pharris and Thomason 2005, among others), there is a history of travel through and across the Cascades (Hunn 1990, Kinkade 1995), intermarriage, trade, and certainly what elders say about the languages family members knew and spoke supports this. Hunn suggests this language contact has been going on for a couple of thousand years, since the expansion of Interior Salish.

Upper Chehalis:

(53) A in first clause becomes P in second, still topical, triggers TO
s-talaqapín-t-n tac yáy-n’s
IMPF-call-TR-3S F.DEF older.sister-3PS
‘he calls his sister’

ƛ’a s-wi-na ’it mát-wali
FUT IMPF-be-3PS PF fetch-TO
‘to come fetch him’ (Kinkade 1990,344)
P in first clause is topical, uses TO, then is A in second clause.

Although ogre MOD want-IMPF-kill-TO
‘even if the monster wants to kill him’

Although ogre MOD want-IMPF-kill-TO
‘even if the monster wants to kill him’

‘he, will overcome him (the monster)’ (Kinkade 1990, 345)

Ichishkiin’s construction patterns more with the Salish topical object construction than the Kutenai obviation system, although some of the functions are shared among the three languages.

Going out on a limb here…follow me back to the Ichishkiin inverse and speculate about the forms involved. Specifically, where does the pá-prefix come from, and how did it and the agent marker come to co-occur.

The reciprocal prefix then could be the source of the inverse prefix.

And, this can occur with a suffix –in.

‘they gather together’

‘the two women argued’
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1 However, in Ichishkíin the genitive and ergative can co-occur.

(1) k’usik ‘usínjmnash iwínshmi ichánpa
k’usik ‘usi-nʃm=nash iwínsh-mi i-chánp-a
dog-ERG.3=1/2=1Sg man-GEN 3Sg.S/A-bite-PST
‘the man’s dog bit me’ Ich