

# łəwálməš (Lower Chehalis) morphosyntax\*

Dave Robertson, PhD

Lower Chehalis Language Project (Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe)

**Abstract:** We greatly expand the morphosyntactic description of łəwálməš (Lower Chehalis), one of the least-studied Salish languages. Noting significant Chinookan and Chinook Jargon, and probably limited Central Coast Salish, borrowing, we fill in numerous paradigmatic and observational gaps in the previous literature. Among our findings are a revision and expansion of the known aspect system, along with identification of tense marking and sensitivity to aspect in the voice system. Polarity and mood, especially imperatives, are more complex than previously shown. Hitherto mostly blank person/number paradigms are now filled, with alternate forms of probably distinct function also found. Numerous reduplicative templates exist, including apparently an odd vocalic type. Not only lexical suffixes but also lexical circumfixes and prefixes exist. Serial-verb constructions, a fairly novel concept in the Salish literature, are common.

**Keywords:** łəwálməš, Lower Chehalis, Tsamosan, documentation, revitalization, Shoalwater Bay, Chinook, Chinook Jargon, serial verb constructions

*I have as yet no (or inadequate) information on łəwálməš number, time, mode, or deixis. (Kinkade 1979:3)*

*Much more remains to be learned about łəwálməš grammar...Presumably subsequent work...will fill in many gaps and add important and clarifying grammatical information... (Kinkade 1979:9-10)*

---

\* Symbols used: = lexical affix, + clitic, √ root, - grammatical affix, [ ] infix, ( ) optional form, ? person marker expected but not known, (?) item of doubtful form or existence, . boundary between members of a compound or of a complex gloss, • reduplication, \_ verb serialization, Ø non-overt exponence within an otherwise overt paradigm, \* historically reconstructed form. Abbreviations: 1, 2, 3 (persons), APPL applicative, C consonant, CAUS causative, COP copula, CPLET complete, CTRST contrastive/topical, DEF definite, DEM demonstrative, DIM diminutive, DIST distal, DISTR distributive, EVID evidential, FEM feminine, FOC focus, FUT future, HEAR hearsay, HORT hortative, IMPER imperative, IMPF imperfective, IMPL.TR implied transitive, INCH inchoative, INDEF indefinite, INSTR INSTRUMENTAL, INTNS intensifier, INTR intransitive, IRR irrealis, MDL middle, MEDL medial, MOT motion, NEG negative, NOM nominalizer, NONF nonfeminine, NVIS nonvisible, OBJ object, PASS passive, PERF perfective, PL plural, POSV possessive, PRED predicative, PREP preposition, PROX proximal, Q polar question, R resonant, RDUP reduplication, RECIP reciprocal, REFL reflexive, REL relational, SG singular, ST stative, STEMX stem extender, SUBJ subject, SURPR surprise, TPC topicalizer, TRSL transitional, V vowel, V̇ stressed vowel, *wh* content question.

## 1 Introduction

The literature on the Maritime Tsamosan Salish language *ləwálməš* (Lower Chehalis) of extreme southwestern Washington state is scant, cf. Van Eijk's specialist bibliography (2008:118, 122, 124, 127). Published material is limited to a few brief old word lists (the most substantial being those of Scouler 1841, Hale 1846, Swan 1857, Curtis 1907–1930). The only formal descriptions of it are brief unpublished ones based on fieldwork in the 1960s and 70s: a phonology (Snow 1969) and some morphology notes (Kinkade 1979). The last L1 speakers of *ləwálməš* passed on in the 1980s and 90s, but community members recall listening to them speak it (T. Johnson and E. Davis, p.c.). Efforts have gotten underway to collect and analyze its existing documentation; the Lower Chehalis Language Project (LCLP) of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, Tokeland, WA has been at work for about a year. We have found previous descriptions invaluable, but (as Kinkade said in his 1979 piece, quoted above) many questions have stood unanswered. Luckily, a significant amount of archival material collected by Myron Eells, Franz Boas, John Peabody Harrington, Leon Metcalf, and local people exists to answer a large number of those questions about how the language works, and this study shares our expanded findings about *ləwálməš* as of Spring 2014.

This study centres on morphology, but in the interest of conveying how the parts go together, it inevitably refers also to our observations about syntax and to some extent phonology and language contact. We have considered it important to also point out functional word classes of *ləwálməš*, some of which materially change the understood picture of the language. We tend to list all known members of closed classes in this study's examples, partly with a view toward more easily creating community teaching and learning materials. For similar reasons, the theoretical framework we take is essentially the relatively approachable 'Basic Linguistic Theory' of R.M.W. Dixon (2010).

Those features of *ləwálməš* that we do not mark with the initials 'LCLP' (i.e. first identified by the Lower Chehalis Language Project) can be assumed to have been first noted by Kinkade in his brief 1979 ICSNL paper.

We preface this discussion by observing that roots in *ləwálməš* are typically of the form *C'VC*, *C'VCC* or alternating *CəRC/CəR'VC*. All things being equal, roots tend to remain stressed regardless of morphological operations on them. There are however exceptions, which we have not as yet systematically worked out. The reader is referred to Snow (1969) for the best extant summary.

## 2 Aspect

The aspect (Kinkade 1979:4) of the *ləwálməš* verb is usually reflected by multiple exponences. In a typical example, a single word can bear an aspect prefix plus a voice suffix plus a subject suffix, each a member of a distinct aspectual paradigm within its category. The main distinction in any case is between imperfective and perfective aspects (Kinkade's 'continuative' and 'completive', respectively). The data at hand suggest to us that Kinkade's 'stative' and the 'completive' that we have identified can be viewed as simply subtypes of perfective, while his

‘transitional’ and ‘inchoative’ are perhaps not exactly aspectual after all. For the possibly aspectual reduplications •*CVC* ‘CONTINUOUS’ and •*CVCVC* ‘INTERMITTENT’, see Section 16.2.

## 2.1 Imperfective

Two or three markers of imperfectivity are identified by Kinkade. Some can cooccur, in patterns whose finer shades of meaning might emerge in the course of further study (LCLP). There is a prefix *ʔi-* as in (1, 2):

- (1) x<sup>w</sup>ə́ł      ʔi-√yúl-w̄-n  
 very      IMPF-√crazy-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘acting crazy’ (NB.cs19670512.347)

- (2) tit              ʔi-√ciq<sup>w</sup>=ús-n  
 DEF.NONF   IMPF-√dig=round.thing-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘clam-digging’ (NB.cs19670512.55)

*CəRC* root form also signals imperfectivity, as in (3, 4):

- (3) √yəl<sup>w</sup>-w̄-n  
 √find.IMPF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘he found him’ [sic] (NB.mdk19670426.25)

- (4) ʔi-√ləl̄k<sup>w</sup>-w̄-n  
 IMPF-√fall.IMPF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘he is falling’ (Kinkade 1979:4)

And perhaps *s-* (parsed as NOMINALIZER), which conveys imperfective aspect in Upper Chehalis, does so in *ləwálməš*, cf. (5, 6):

- (5) s-√páq-n  
 NOM-√bloom-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘it’s blooming’ (NB.cs19670405.100)

- (6) s-√məyínat  
 NOM-√sing  
 ‘to sing’ (NB.cs19670405.222)

## 2.2 Perfective

The perfective appears to have more numerous formally distinguished nuances in the language than the imperfective has (LCLP). The stative ‘aspect’ markings below have so far been found only on perfective verb forms, so we treat this as a subtype of the perfective (LCLP). Note that certain categories of words such as

imperatives, and nouns made with the lexical prefix *pəs*= ‘place for...’, appear to all be in the perfective aspect

One common sign of perfectivity is a lack of added marking on a stem, as in (7, 8):

(7)  $\sqrt{qíč}$ -Ø  
 $\sqrt{\text{play.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘play, have fun (men)’ (NB.mdk19670524.1)

(8)  $\sqrt{q̣}^w\acute{á}t$ -Ø  
 $\sqrt{\text{burn-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘it burned’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

Another is a prefix *t-* (*tə-*) as in (9, 10):

(9)  $t$ - $\sqrt{x}ół$ -Ø  
 PERF- $\sqrt{\text{go.home-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he went home’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

(10)  $tə$ - $\sqrt{ł}ákw$ -Ø  
 PERF- $\sqrt{\text{fall.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he fell’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

Kinkade suggests on the analogy of Upper Chehalis that also  $\acute{ł}it$  may be a perfective marker (presumably a prefix or clitic). But that form appears to be a separate, stressed adverbial word meaning ‘already’. Reasons for this analysis include the facts that it hosts e.g. the yes/no question clitic *+na* and cooccurs with other perfective marking before the verb/stem, as in (11, 12):

(11)  $\acute{ł}it+na$        $\acute{w}əc$ - $\sqrt{s}áx^w$ - $əł+čš$   
 already+Q    ACTL- $\sqrt{\text{wet-INTNS+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘Are you wet already?’ (NB.mdk19670601.34)

(12)  $\acute{ł}it$        $tx^w$ - $\sqrt{p}əxáč$ -Ø       $ti$        $\sqrt{q}ənún$ -s  
 already    TRSL- $\sqrt{\text{split-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$     DEF.NONF     $\sqrt{\text{mouth-3.POSV}}$   
 ‘[already] split his mouth’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone8.6)

*CəRəC* root form also signals perfectivity, as in (13, 14):

(13)  $\sqrt{y}əláx^w$ -Ø  
 $\sqrt{\text{find.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he found (something)’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

- (14) tə-√ləlók<sup>w</sup>-Ø  
 PERF-√fall.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘he fell’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

### 2.2.1 Stative

There are no separate stative pronouns--the perfective subject pronouns are used with verbs of stative form—and statives are formed by prefixing *ʔəc-* (or *ʔəs-*) to otherwise identifiably perfective verbs, suggesting that this is a subtype of the latter (LCLP). Example are shown in (15–17):

- (15) q<sup>w</sup>ím ʔəc-√lál-səq-Ø  
 just ST-√stand-INCH(?) -3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘he’s just standing’<sup>1</sup> (NB.mdk19670524.64)

- (16) ʔəc-√pót<sup>w</sup>-ət-Ø  
 ST-√foggy-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘it’s very foggy’ (NB.cs19670405.120)

- (17) ʔít+na ʔəc-√səx<sup>w</sup>-ət+čš  
 already+Q ST-√wet-INTNS+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘Are you wet already?’ (NB.mdk19670601.620)

### 2.2.2 Completive (LCLP)

A postposed completive-aspect particle *ʔu* possibly can be compared with the Lushootseed prefix *ʔu-* ‘PERFECTIVE’ (Bates et al. 1994:19). All instances so far found are in the perfective aspect, making the completive yet another subtype thereof. Examples are in (18, 19):

- (18) √k<sup>w</sup>áx<sup>w</sup>-š-n-Ø ?  
 √reach-APPL-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF CPLET  
 ‘he found him’ (NB.mdk19670426.24)

- (19) ʔəc-√túl-š ʔu  
 ST-√hear-APPL CPLET  
 ‘(?)I heard it’ (NB.cs19670405.227)<sup>2</sup>

Use of this marker following a predicate makes explicit that the given state of affairs has actually occurred and is finished. This is similar to realis mood, but

<sup>1</sup>In the position, not the process, of standing up from a sitting position.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the same verb without the evidential: *ʔəc-√túl-š* ‘I hear’ [sic] (NB.cs19670405.226).

all statements without this particle default to a realis interpretation, if not emphatically so. The occurrence of this marker together with *ʔi* EVID.IRR, as in (20–21), demonstrates to our satisfaction that it is not realis mood:

- (20)  $tx^w-\sqrt{k^w\acute{o}n\acute{a}}=\check{c}-x^w-\emptyset$   $ʔu$   $ʔi$   
 TRSL- $\sqrt{\text{get}}=\text{hand-CAUS.MOT-3.SUBJ.PERF}$  CPLET EVID.IRR  
 ‘he got it; he grabbed it’ (NB.mdk19670502.69)
- (21)  $\sqrt{\acute{s}\acute{a}}\cdots n$   $ʔu$   $ʔi$   $ʔ\acute{o}-\sqrt{w\acute{e}}$   $s-\sqrt{wi}ʔ$   
 $\sqrt{\text{there}}[\text{INTNS}]$  CPLET EVID.IRR 2.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$  NOM- $\sqrt{\text{live}}$   
 ‘you’re going to live there forever’ (NB.mdk19670426.63)

### 2.3 Transitional

Kinkade’s ‘transitional’ marks a change of state, as with the concepts ‘become...; turn...; get...’. This form occurs with both perfective and imperfective verbs, to which is prefixed  $tx^w$ -. Therefore this appears to be a subtype of those aspects, and may itself not be strictly aspectual (LCLP); examples are shown in (22–24):

- (22)  $tx^w-\sqrt{\acute{q}^wi\acute{c}}-\emptyset$   
 TRSL- $\sqrt{\text{dirty-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘it got dirty’ (NB.mdk19670502.70)
- (23)  $tx^w-\sqrt{t\acute{a}p-st-\acute{a}m}-\emptyset$   
 TRSL- $\sqrt{\text{bump-CAUS-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘bump (fairly hard)’ (NB.mdk19670524.32)
- (24)  $tx^w-\sqrt{n\acute{o}\acute{x}\acute{a}}\cdots s-n$   
 TRSL- $\sqrt{\text{fall.asleep}}[\text{INTNS}]-3.SUBJ.IMPF$   
 ‘he didn’t fall asleep right away’ (NB.mdk19670426.21)

### 2.4 Inchoative

Kinkade’s ‘inchoative’ marker  $-\acute{y}\acute{a}q$  (perhaps with allomorphs  $-\acute{a}q$ ,  $-s\acute{a}q$ ,  $-t\acute{a}q$  LCLP) may not be strictly aspectual (LCLP), because it seems to freely occur together with either imperfective or perfective pronouns as in (25, 26):

- (25)  $\sqrt{x^w\acute{u}}ʔk^w-\acute{y}\acute{a}q-n$   
 $\sqrt{\text{small-INCH-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘it’s getting smaller’ (Kinkade 1979:5)
- (26)  $\sqrt{x\acute{o}p}-\acute{y}\acute{a}q-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{dry-INCH-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘empty’ [sic] (NB.mdk19670519.39)

### 3 Tense LCLP

One optional tense marker has been identified so far in łəwálməš, the future. We do not know yet if imperfectives are possible. Future tense marking is accomplished by preposing a root √wəł (√wə, ł) which seems to take *secondary* stress; the verb it modifies takes primary stress, as in (27–29):

- (27) √wəł t-√kaláh-m+č+na  
 √FUT PERF-√play.ball-MDL+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘are you going to play ball?’ (NB.mdk19670502.91)
- (28) √wəł √čáx<sup>w</sup>=yəp+čš+na tit s-√k<sup>w</sup>əl  
 √FUT √wash=clothing+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF+Q DEF.NONF NOM-√day  
 ‘are you going to wash (clothes) today?’ (NB.mdk19670601.591)
- (29) √wəł √ʔík(-)təq-n+čł tat √xáʔaq  
 √FUT √steal(-)INCH(?) -3.OBJ.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF DEF.NONF √child  
 ‘we will steal that child’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone4.5)

By a regular phonological rule, this marker is pronounced wə before the *s-* of a subordinate clause’s nominalized verb, as in (30):

- (30) tám ʔə-√wə s-√múx<sup>w</sup>-əc  
 what 2.SG.POSV-√FUT NOM-√pay-1.SG.OBJ.PERF  
 ‘what will you pay me?’ (NB.mdk19670426.41)

Immediately following the vowel *u* (perhaps any labialized sound?), it appears to reduce to *ł* as in (31, 32):

- (31) √hílu ł t √pa<sup>w</sup>-íʔ<sup>3</sup>  
 √NEG √FUT INDEF √one-??  
 ‘not alone!’ (NB.cs19670626.1074)

---

<sup>3</sup>The analysis here is tentative. The form *t* perhaps is analyzable as the PERF- prefix. The suffix *-íʔ* is of unknown function, but its form and its cooccurrence with a numeral bring to mind the Chinookan and Chinook Jargon form in (i):

- (i) √ixt-i  
 √one-time(?)  
 ‘once’ (Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde 2012:97)

- (32) ʔámu    √t    √cút-Ø    √xʷəníxʷəni  
 if          FUT    √say-3.SUBJ.PERF √Qoneqone  
           √cá-st-aʔ-l                    ti            √wíł+čł                    wí  
           √straighten-CAUS-IMPER-PL DEF.NONF √canoe+1.PL.POSV    TPC(?)  
           √wəł    √cá-n-č  
           √FUT    √straighten-3.OBJ.PERF-2.SG.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘If he speaks [says] Qoneqone[, ‘Make straight our canoe,] you make it  
 straight’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone 3.10)

#### 4 Voice

A number of voice-related distinctions are made: intransitive (and implied-transitive), transitive, causative, middle, passive, applicative and relational.

##### 4.1 Intransitive

The simplest signal of intransitivity is the lack of added marking, as denoted by an underlined blank in (33, 34):

- (33) √qíč-\_\_\_\_-Ø  
 play.NONF-\_\_\_\_-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘he played’ [Perfective] (NB.mdk19670524.1)

- (34) √qʷíč-\_\_\_\_-Ø  
 √dark-\_\_\_\_-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘dirty; dark’ (NB.mdk19670502.71)

A suffix -w on imperfectives of CVC and CVCC roots (the majority of roots, LCLP) has the same effect, as seen in (35–37):

- (35) √qíč-w-n  
 √play.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘to play’ [Imperfective] (mdk1978wordlist.126)

- (36) √qʷáč-w-n  
 √burn-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘burn’ (mdk1978wordlist.101)

- (37) √yáłk-w-n  
 √roll.IMPF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘it’s rolling’ (NB.mdk19670502.56)

According to Kinkade, another suffix -ał, on some perfectives, ‘appears not to be strictly diathetic’ i.e. not necessarily voice. We in fact analyze this affix as



something more like an intensifier (LCLP) (Section 12), but we present examples (38, 39) in the present Section for the reader’s benefit:

- (38) ʔəc-√cíʔk<sup>w</sup>-əł-Ø  
 ST-√lie-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘He’s lying down.’ (NB.mdk19670519.105)

- (39) √łə́k<sup>w</sup>-əł-Ø  
 √hang-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘hang (up clothes, fish)’ (NB.mdk19670519.67)

An implied-transitive (‘detransitive’) suffix *-m̄əł*, says Kinkade, removes the overt syntactic object from a transitive word. This suffix occurs with both imperfectives and perfectives. Examples appear in (40, 41):

- (40) √cíq<sup>w</sup>-m̄əł-Ø  
 √dig-IMPL.TR-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘(he) digs (a hole)’ (Kinkade 1979:6)

- (41) ʔi-√sút<sup>̄</sup>-m̄əł-n  
 IMPF-√vomit-IMPL.TR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘vomit’ (NB.cs19670405.81)

## 4.2 Transitive

Unlike most branches of Salish, transitivity is signaled simply by the presence of both a subject marker and an object suffix. (See under Section 8 ‘person’ for all those forms.)

## 4.3 Causative (LCLP)

The ‘causative’ appears not to be strictly a voice affix, because it exceptionally combines with voice markers such as the middle seen in the following examples. It perhaps bridges the derivational and the inflectional in function, as does the ‘causative’ of Kamloops Chinuk Wawa (Robertson 2011:124–126). More research is called for. The suffixes identified so far as ‘causative’ seem to be perfective, but we suspect further data may change this view.

Two ‘causative’ suffixes have been noted in our work so far. The first is *-st/-stu*, obviously from Proto-Salish *\*-stəw* (Kroeber 1999:25); it is exemplified in (42–44):

- (42) √łiw-st-m-Ø  
 √come.off-CAUS-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘take’ [literally, make it come off] (NB.mdk19670502.22)

- (43) tx<sup>w</sup>-√táp-st-m-Ø  
 TRSL-√bump-CAUS-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘bump (fairly hard)’ (NB.mdk19670524.32)
- (44) √cíl=stálš  
 √five=times  
 ?a-?i-s-√wác-əm-stu-s  
 3.FEM.SG.POSV-?⁴-NOM-√throw.down-MDL.PERF-CAUS-3.POSV  
 ‘5 times she threw her down’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone5.10)

The second seeming causative is -šəx<sup>w</sup> (-x<sup>w</sup>), on motion verbs. Because this suffix is not accompanied by object markers, its behavior is like that of a middle/applicative (cf. Section 4.6). In that light, we note that the examples so far identified of its non-motion verb counterpart just above are all in overtly middle voice. More research is called for; examples are seen in (45, 46):

- (45) √?i-šəx<sup>w</sup>-Ø  
 √come-CAUS.MOT-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘he brought it down’ (NB.mdk19670502.41)
- (46) √?asú-šəx<sup>w</sup>-Ø  
 √take-CAUS.MOT-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘she takes them along’ (??.me188?.17.962)

#### 4.4 Middle

The ‘middle’ voice conveys a subject doing something for its own benefit or ‘by itself’. Here as in the relational voice (below), the two main aspects are distinguished. The suffix *-mət* (*-mət*) signals the imperfective middle, as in (47, 48):

- (47) ?i-√q̣<sup>w</sup>il-mət-n  
 IMPF-√bleed-MDL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘he’s bleeding’ (NB.cs19670405.83)
- (48) √yul=á?q̣<sup>w</sup>-mət-n  
 √crazy=talk-MDL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘she’s telling lies’ (Kinkade 1979:6)

And *-m* (not to be confused with *-m*, the perfective relational, Section 4.7) is perfective middle, as in (49, 50):

---

<sup>4</sup> This morpheme may be a nominalizer.

- (49)  $\sqrt{yul}=\acute{a}\acute{?}\acute{q}-m-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{crazy}=\text{talk-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘she told lies’ (NB.mdk19670519.101)
- (50)  $\sqrt{\acute{c}\acute{x}^w}=\acute{a}\acute{?}\acute{c}\acute{a}\acute{?}-m-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{wash}=\text{hand-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘wash hands’ (NB.mdk19670601.10)

#### 4.5 Passive

In the passive with *-tm*, only perfective forms have been found (LCLP). It remains to be determined whether an imperfective version exists. Examples are given in (51, 52):

- (51)  $\sqrt{sk^w\acute{a}k^w\acute{u}m}-tm-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{ghost}-\text{PASS-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘get ‘ghosted’’ (BC.mdk19670511.57)
- (52)  $\sqrt{?ik^w(-)}t\acute{a}q-tm-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{steal(-)INCH(?)-PASS-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘it was stolen’ (Kinkade 1979:6)

#### 4.6 Applicative

The examples of applicative (Kinkade’s ‘redirective’) *-š* so far identified include both imperfectives and perfectives, as seen in (53, 54):

- (53)  $\acute{?}i-\sqrt{y\acute{a}y}-š-\acute{c}l-n$   
 $\text{IMPF}-\sqrt{tell}-\text{APPL-1.SG.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   
 ‘he told me’ (NB.mdk19670524.86)
- (54)  $\sqrt{k^w\acute{a}x^w}-š-n-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{reach}-\text{APPL-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘he found him’ (NB.mdk19670426.24)

See the remarks on the possible applicative-like nature of *-šax<sup>w</sup>* ‘Causative’ at Section 4.3.

#### 4.7 Relational

These forms signal something the subject perceives (thus their use on the verbs of cognition and perception below), with perhaps other uses too. Kinkade identifies one Relational suffix, which seems to turn out to be perfective (LCLP), while our work suggests a separate imperfective counterpart (LCLP). This latter is *-mās/-mās*, as seen in (55):

- (55)  $\sqrt{k}^w\acute{a}p\text{-}\acute{m}\acute{s}\text{-}n$   
 $\sqrt{\text{get-REL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘he knows (now)’ (NB.mdk19670502.73)

The perfective relational is  $-m'$  or  $-m$  (Kinkade has the latter; not to be confused with  $-m$ , the perfective middle, Section 4.4). Examples are seen in (56, 57):

- (56)  $\sqrt{m}\acute{o}l\acute{a}q^w\text{-}m\text{-}n\text{-}\acute{c}n$   
 $\sqrt{\text{forget-REL.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘I forgot’ (Kinkade 1979:8)

- (57)  $\sqrt{w}\acute{a}\acute{z}\acute{c}\text{-}m\text{-}n\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{watch-REL.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he watched it’ (NB.mdk19670502.66)

## 5 Main vs. subordinate clauses

Main clauses take subject, and when relevant, object markers. Subordinate clauses instead express their subjects via possessive markers (Kinkade 1979:7). The notions expressed by subordination in  $\acute{l}\acute{w}\acute{a}l\acute{m}\acute{s}$  include negations and *wh*-questions. See the Section on Person (Section 8) for all these forms.

## 6 Polarity

Positive and negative polarity are distinguished at the predicate level as well as by interjections. Phrasal-level polarity, e.g. in forming negative *wh*-items, has not been identified. Language contact with Chinook Jargon has led to the coexistence of several negative operators, with the native Salish ones having almost completely given way to the introduced ones. There is variation between two negation strategies, one certainly native to Salish which renders the negated clause as a subordinate, the other perhaps innovative and/or borrowed which negates within the main clause.

### 6.1 Positive (LCLP)

Lack of overt marking on a predicate signals positive polarity. That is, if a statement is not negated, it is assumed to be positive, as in (58, 59):

- (58)  $\sqrt{w}\acute{a}$      $s\text{-}\sqrt{q}\acute{i}t\text{-}m\text{-}\acute{c}l$   
 $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$      $\text{NOM-}\sqrt{\text{line.fish-MDL.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘we’re going to fish with a hook & line’ (LH.cs19670619.122)

- (59) ʔáлта √xʷə́ł-n ʔi-√pamás-ýəq-n  
 now √very-3.SUBJ.IMPF IMPF-√cold-INCH-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘the days are getting colder’ (NB.cs19670712.386)

Two separate positive-polarity interjections substitute (as ellipsis) for entire clauses or sentences, as in (60, 61):

- (60) ʔá  
 oh  
 ‘oh’ / ‘yes’ (CW.cs19670720.814)

- (61) náxʷ  
 yes  
 ‘yes’ / ‘indeed’ (NB.cs19670405.255)

## 6.2 Negative

Negation is marked by means of separate words preceding any material they modify.

### 6.2.1 Predicate-level (LCLP)

Negation is observed at the predicate level. The negative operator inflects like a perfective, but the clauses it modifies, being distinct from it syntactically, can be either imperfective or perfective.

The usual negative operator for latter-day speakers has been √*hílu*, one of many words borrowed from Chinook Jargon (Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde 2012:84). This word stands in initial position in the complex predicate phrase. It acts as an intransitive main clause by itself, with the negated idea normally being put into a subordinate clause as in (62, 63):

- (62) √hílu-Ø n-s-√kʷáp-m-n  
 √NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF 1.SG.POSV-NOM-√get-REL.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF  
 ‘I don’t know.’ (NB.cs19670405.26)

- (63) √hílu-Ø+na ʔə-s-√ʔit-əł  
 √NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q 2.SG.POSV-NOM-√sleep-INTNS  
 ‘Haven’t you had your bath yet?’ (NB.cs19670512.15)

A couple of examples have been found that seem to have main-clause internal negation. That is, it is in these constructions that √*hílu* most clearly looks like the first member of a serial-verb construction (Section 25), demonstrably agreeing in person with the word it modifies. Subordinate-clause marking is absent, as in (64, 65):

(64)  $\sqrt{h}ilu\text{-}\emptyset$   $\text{ʔ}\acute{a}c\text{-}\sqrt{w}i\text{ʔ-n}$   $\acute{s}i\text{ʔ}\bullet\sqrt{s}i\text{ʔ}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\text{ST-}\sqrt{\text{reside-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   $\text{RDUP}\bullet\sqrt{\text{here}}$   
 ‘he doesn’t live here’ (NB.mdk19670601.71)

(65)  $\sqrt{h}ilu\text{-}\emptyset$   $ı$   $k^w\acute{a}\text{ʔ}c$   $\sqrt{x}\acute{a}p\text{-}\acute{a}l\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\text{PREP}$   $\text{slightly}$   $\sqrt{\text{dry-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘It’s not very dry.’ (NB.mdk19670519.29)

It is with  $\sqrt{h}ilu$  that negations of *wh*-words are formed. This apparently occurs only in later sources. An example of this is (66):

(66)  $\sqrt{h}ilu\text{-}\emptyset\text{+na}$   $\sqrt{t}\acute{a}m \text{ [...]}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q}}$   $\sqrt{\text{what [...]}}$   
 ‘isn’t anything [...]?’ (?) (NB.mdk19670426.6)

Negative *wh*-expressions in earlier sources may have been formed differently, if we can judge by the single example shown in (67):

(67)  $\sqrt{ʔ}i\acute{i}(-)mi\acute{l}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{nothing}}$   
 ‘nothing’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.69)

The preceding is obviously cognate with another negative operator (LCLP), the native Salish  $\sqrt{mi}lt$  and its variant  $\sqrt{mi}ltan$  (compare Upper Chehalis and Cowlitz  $\sqrt{mi}lta$ , Kinkade 1991:84 and 2004:55). In the later sources, this is seemingly an interjection (see Section 6.2.2), but in older sources, which lack  $\sqrt{h}ilu$ , it functions (also) as a subordinate- and main-clause negating root, as seen in (68–70):

(68)  $\text{ʔ}\acute{a}$   $\sqrt{mi}lt\text{-}\emptyset$   $\sqrt{\acute{x}}\acute{a}\acute{q}^w\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $oh$   $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\sqrt{\text{good-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘oh not good’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.57)

(69)  $\sqrt{mi}lt\text{-}\emptyset$   $\sqrt{w}\acute{a}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$   
 $s\text{-}\sqrt{ʔ}ik^w(-)t\acute{a}q\text{-}t\text{-}\acute{a}l\acute{a}p \text{ ...}$   
 $\text{NOM-}\sqrt{\text{steal(-)INCH(?)}\text{-3.OBJ.IMPF-2.PL.SUBJ.IMPF ...}}$   
 ‘not you will steal...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.3)

(70)  $\text{ʔ}\acute{u}$   $\sqrt{mi}ltan\text{-}\emptyset$   $t$   $\sqrt{w}i\text{-}t\text{-}s \text{ (?) ...}$   
 $oh$   $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\text{INDEF}$   $\sqrt{\text{COP(?)}\text{-}(?)\text{-3.SUBJ.?? ...}}$   
 ‘O not so...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.1)

## 6.2.2 Polar interjections

Interjections substituting (as ellipsis) for an actual negative clause or sentence (LCLP). There are several; two are apparently native Salish, shown in (71, 72):

(71) ʔáxʷ  
NEG  
'not' (NB.mdk19670426.30)

(72) mɪt  
NEG  
'not' (NB.mdk19670426.29)

Another possible negative interjection is a loan from Chinook Jargon, shown in (73):

(73) wik  
NEG  
'no, not' (NB.mdk19670601.6)

However, unlike other Chinook Jargon loans such as  $\sqrt{h}ilu$  and  $\sqrt{?}áлта$ , this *wik* is not definitely found integrated into a  $\text{ləwálməš}$  matrix; aside from its use in elicited isolation above, it is so far known only in entire borrowed Chinook Jargon utterances such as those in (74, 75):<sup>5</sup>

(74) wik ʔáлта  
NEG now  
'enough, now' (NB.mdk19670601.7)

(75) wik sayá ʔáлта mímlus  
NEG far now die  
['almost dead now'] (NB/IS.cs19670825.1216)

## 7 Mood (and modality)

Three moods are distinguished in  $\text{ləwálməš}$ : declarative (*realis*), interrogative and imperative. One deontic modal expression, of inability, has been identified.

### 7.1 Declarative (*realis*) (LCLP)

We take the positive-polarity declarative as the basic form of verbs. Unlike the interrogative and imperative, and negatives, nothing overt is added to a verb to

---

<sup>5</sup>Because they do not occur in a  $\text{ləwálməš}$  matrix, we do not analyze the Chinook Jargon words as to part of speech here.

form this mood. (The majority of examples in this study are declarative). All such forms default to a realis interpretation; there is an optional irrealis-like evidential particle, Section 17, and we believe that irrealis marking per se will become apparent to us with further research.

## 7.2 Interrogative (LCLP)

There are two kinds of questions, polar and content, with certain subtypes bridging the two.

### 7.2.1 Polar (yes/no) questions

Two strategies are most common in forming polar questions. In one, the clitic *+na* (perhaps a loan from Chinookan, but widespread in Tsamosan languages, cf. Kinkade 1991:87 and 2004:56) attaches after the first stressed word of any class in the sentence, as seen in (76–79):

(76)  $\sqrt{\text{nú}}\text{?}+\text{na}$        $\text{ʔə}-\sqrt{\text{ná}}[\text{ʔ}]\text{sč}-\text{u?}$   
 $\sqrt{2.SG.PRED+Q}$   $2.SG.POSV-\sqrt{\text{young}}\text{er.brother}[\text{DIM}]-\text{DIM}$   
 ‘is [he] your little brother?’ (NB.mdk19670524.43)

(77)  $\sqrt{\text{x}^{\text{w}}\text{á}\lambda}-\text{Ø}+\text{na}$        $\text{ʔəc}-\sqrt{\text{čá}}\text{p}=\text{ɪʔnɪ}+\text{č}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{very}}-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q$   $2.SG.POSV-\sqrt{\text{have.cold}}(?)=\text{time}()+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF$   
 ‘Do you have a really bad cold?’ (NB.cs19670512.65)

(78)  $\sqrt{\text{nax}^{\text{w}}\text{á}}-\text{ɪ}-\text{Ø}+\text{na}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{true}}-\text{INTNS}-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q$   
 ‘Is that right?’ (NB.cs19670512.62)

(79)  $\text{tx}^{\text{w}}-\sqrt{\text{wák}^{\text{w}}\text{s}}-\text{n}+\text{na}$        $\text{ʔá}\text{łta}$   
 $\text{TRSL}-\sqrt{\text{go}}-3.SUBJ.IMPF+Q$  now  
 ‘Did he go?’ (NB.mdk19670519.59)

The other frequent approach employs  $\sqrt{\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}}$ , itself a *wh*-word (see Section 7.2.2) at the beginning of the sentence (it seems to literally mean ‘how much’). We analyze this as an inflecting root because it is sometimes used with overt subject suffixes. Examples are shown in (80, 81).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Both  $\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}\text{s}$  and  $\text{wíyáx}^{\text{w}}$  (the following item) must come from the same root  $\sqrt{\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}}$  ‘Polar Q’ historically. The data we now have, though, suggest that  $\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}\text{s}$  (< $\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}\text{-s}$  [with -3.POSV or perhaps the alternative form of -3.SUBJ, Section 8.1]) has become a single root of its own, for example taking the 3.IMPF.SUBJ suffix *-n*. And  $\sqrt{\text{wí}}.\sqrt{\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}}$  can be understood as a compound,  $\sqrt{\text{wí}}$  [COP]. $\sqrt{\text{yáx}^{\text{w}}}$ . (See at Section 3 for more on  $\sqrt{\text{wí}}$ .)



- (80)  $\sqrt{y\acute{x}^w s-n}$  t  $\sqrt{\acute{q}^w \acute{u}l\grave{m}\acute{s}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{how.much-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$  INDEF  $\sqrt{\text{milk}}$   
 ‘Is there any milk?’ (NB.mdk19670519.114)
- (81)  $\sqrt{y\acute{x}^w s-\emptyset}$   $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{-s-}\sqrt{\acute{k}^w \acute{\text{a}}\text{p-m-n}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{how.much-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$  2.SG.POSV-NOM- $\sqrt{\text{get-MDL.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘Did/do you know?’ (NB.mdk19670519.94)

Another *wh*-word,  $\sqrt{wi.}\sqrt{y\acute{x}^w}$  (compare the future tense, Section 3) seems to have a more specifically copular meaning, ‘is there any?’ / ‘are there any?’. In contrast with (76) above, it functions to question possession rather than the possessor’s identity, as seen in (82):

- (82)  $\sqrt{wi.}\sqrt{y\acute{x}^w-\emptyset}$   $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{-}\sqrt{\text{p}\acute{\text{a}}\text{t}\acute{\text{a}}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{COP.}\sqrt{\text{how.much-3.SUBJ.PERF}}}$  2.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{\text{butter}}$   
 ‘Do you have any butter?’ (NB.cs19670731.794)

## 7.2.2 Content (*‘wh-’*) questions

A number of content question lexemes have been identified, but we do not yet know how to say ‘how’. These question words are fully stressed, inflected main-clause root forms. They precede the semantically primary predicate, which is used in the possessed, (usually) nominalized subordinate-clause form as seen in (83, 84):

- (83)  $\sqrt{\text{t}\acute{\text{a}}\text{m}-\emptyset}$   $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{-s-}\sqrt{\text{c}\acute{\text{u}}\text{t}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{what-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$  2.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{\text{say}}$   
 ‘What did you say?’ (NB.mdk19670601.37)
- (84)  $\sqrt{y\acute{x}^w s-\emptyset}$   $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{-s-}\sqrt{\text{t}\acute{\text{i}}\text{x}^w\text{-n}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{how.much-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$  2.SG.POSV-NOM- $\sqrt{\text{catch-3.OBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘How many did you catch?’ (BC.mdk19670511.5)

In a parallel to our observations on variation in negative predicates at Section 6.2.1, the root for ‘who’,  $\sqrt{w\acute{\text{a}}\text{t}}$ , is interpreted differently according to whether its complement is someone’s property, as shown in (85, 86):

- (85)  $\sqrt{w\acute{\text{a}}\text{t}-\emptyset}$   $\sqrt{\acute{s}\acute{\text{a}}\text{k}^w\text{-s}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{who-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\sqrt{\text{EVID.HEAR}}$   
 ‘Who is it?’ (NB.mdk19670601.45)

- (86)  $\sqrt{wát}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $\sqrt{hək^w=á[ʔ]n-uʔ-s}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{who-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \sqrt{\text{pierce=ear[DIM]-DIM-3.POSV}}$   
 $\sqrt{tíʔn.}\sqrt{šiʔ}$   
 DEM.PROX.NONF.  $\sqrt{\text{CTRST}}$   
 ‘Whose earrings are these?’ (NB.mdk19670519.33)

Similarly, ‘where’,  $\sqrt{čán}$  or the compound  $\sqrt{wi.}\sqrt{čán}$ , can be asked with the semantically primary predicate serialized (unsubordinated). This perhaps applies only when questioning the location of an entity, as in (87), rather than that of an event as seen in (88):

- (87) ( $\sqrt{wi.}\sqrt{čán}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $ʔə\text{-}s\text{-}\sqrt{laqán}$                        $\sqrt{tísʔn}$   
 $(\sqrt{\text{COP.}})\sqrt{\text{where-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \text{ 2.SG.POSV-NOM-}\sqrt{\text{buy}} \text{ DEM.NONF.MEDL}$   
 ‘Where did you buy that?’ (NB.mdk19670524.35)

- (88)  $\sqrt{wi.}\sqrt{čán}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $ʔi$                        $tat$                        $n\text{-}\sqrt{lalám}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{COP.}}\sqrt{\text{where-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \text{ EVID.IRR} \text{ DEF.NONF} \text{ 1.SG.POSV-}\sqrt{\text{oar}}$   
 ‘Where are my oars?’ (NB.mdk19670524.9)

Questions about ‘when’ have a complex, perhaps serial-verb, *wh-* structure as seen in (89, 90):

- (89)  $\sqrt{q^wát}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $ʔi$                        $\sqrt{šán}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $ɬ$   
 $\sqrt{\text{when}(?)\text{-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \text{ EVID.IRR} \sqrt{\text{where-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \text{ PREP}$   
 $\sqrt{túl\text{-}w\text{-}n+tíʔ}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{come-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL}}$   
 ‘When are they coming?’ (NB.mdk19670601.41)

- (90)  $\sqrt{q^wát}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $ʔi$                        $\sqrt{šán}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{when}(?)\text{-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \text{ EVID.IRR} \sqrt{\text{where-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 $ɬ \quad \sqrt{wák^w\text{-}s\text{-}n+tíʔ}$   
 PREP  $\sqrt{\text{go-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL}}$   
 ‘When are they going?’ (NB.mdk19670601.40)

As elsewhere in Salish and other languages of the region, distinct verb roots exist which contain both lexical and content-interrogative semantic components, such as ‘do what?’ in (91, 92):<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Comparison with example (93, 94) below and with Upper Chehalis and Cowlitz suggests that the form of the root is  $\sqrt{ʔin(i)}$ . (Kinkade 1991:13, 2004:10). Therefore the following  $(\bullet)sn$  would seem to be an exceptional reduplication of *s* plus that root (with usual reduction of unstressed vowel to schwa/syllabicity of nasal stop), rather than the typical reduplication of root material only as seen in Section 16.

(91)  $\sqrt{hílu}\text{-}\emptyset\text{+na}$                        $\sqrt{tám}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q}}$     $\sqrt{\text{what-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 $\text{ʔə-ps}=\sqrt{\text{ʔín(•)sn}}$   
 2.SG.POSV-place= $\sqrt{\text{do.what(•)RDUP(?)}$   
 ‘what you do mischief?’ [sic]                      (NB.mdk19670426.7-8)

(92)  $\sqrt{hílu}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $\sqrt{tám}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$     $\sqrt{\text{what-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 $\text{n-s-}\sqrt{\text{ʔín(•)sn}}$   
 1.SG.POSV-NOM- $\sqrt{\text{do.what(•)RDUP(?)}$   
 ‘I’m not doing anything’ (?)                      (NB.cs19670731.863)

This trait (and probably the same root) figures in another apparent complex *wh*- form (*t*)  $\sqrt{wi}\text{-}\emptyset$  *t*  $\sqrt{ʔíni}\text{-}\emptyset$ , the only way we have identified so far to express the concept of ‘why?’, as in (93, 94):<sup>8</sup>

(93)  $\sqrt{wi}\text{-}\emptyset$                       *t*                       $\sqrt{ʔíni}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{COP-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$     $\text{INDEF}$     $\sqrt{\text{do.what-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 $\sqrt{wəł}$     $\text{ʔi-}\sqrt{\text{yí+č}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$     $\text{IMPF-}\sqrt{\text{walk+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}$ [sic]  
 ‘what are you walking for?’                      (LH.cs19670619.154)

(94) *t*                       $\sqrt{wi}\text{-}\emptyset$                       *t*                       $\sqrt{ʔíni}\text{-}\emptyset$                        $\sqrt{wi}$   
 $\text{INDEF}$     $\sqrt{\text{COP-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$     $\text{INDEF}$     $\sqrt{\text{do.what-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$     $\text{FOC(?)}$   
 $\text{ʔi-}\sqrt{\text{łáqč-w-n+č}}$   
 $\text{IMPF-}\sqrt{\text{cry.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}$ [sic]  
 ‘what are you (boy) crying about?’                      (LH.cs19670619.267)

### 7.3 Imperative

A variety of imperative-marking strategies have been identified in the language (LCLP). Part of this variation seems to do with person and number, part with polarity, but not all choices of marking are understood yet.

#### 7.3.1 2<sup>nd</sup> person

Imperative marking per se, *-aʔ*, exists only with positive polarity. It has so far been found only on verbs in the perfective aspect; further research may determine whether imperfective commands are possible. Imperative suffixation is added to

---

<sup>8</sup>This speaker exceptionally mixes perfective and imperfective marking within the same verb. He also adds a *def.nonf* at the beginning of the second example for reasons we do not understand; varies between  $\sqrt{wəł}$  ‘fut’ and  $\sqrt{wi}$  ‘foc(?)’ where the latter might be expected; and mixes 2nd and 3rd person subject marking in the last verb of the second example.

the end of the verb stem. Unlike other verbal moods, in the imperative this subject exponence precedes any object markers. We do not yet know much about indirect objects. Examples of 2<sup>nd</sup>-person commands are shown in (95, 96):

(95)  $\sqrt{q}w\acute{i}\lambda\text{-a}\text{?}\text{-n}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{cut-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘Go ahead & cut it!’ (NB.cs19670405.245)

(96)  $\sqrt{y}\acute{a}l\text{-}\acute{a}\text{?}\text{-}\acute{a}c$   
 $\sqrt{\text{help-IMPER-1.SG.OBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘Help me!’ (NB.mdk19670502.63)

There may be some variation in placement of imperative suffixes with relation to voice endings, as with *-məl* and *-m* in examples (97, 98):

(97)  $\sqrt{\check{c}}i\text{?}\text{-}m\acute{e}l\text{-}a\text{?}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{sit-IMPL.TR-IMPER}}$   
 ‘Sit down!’ (NB.cs19670405.232)

(98)  $\sqrt{\check{c}}\acute{e}x^w=\acute{u}s\text{-}a\text{?}\text{-}m$   
 $\sqrt{\text{wash=face-IMPER-MDL.PERF}}$   
 ‘Wash your face!’ (NB.mdk19670601.599)

The plural imperative adds a further suffix *-l* as seen in (99–101):

(99)  $\sqrt{x}\acute{o}l\text{-}a\text{?}\text{-}l$   
 $\sqrt{\text{go.home-IMPER-PL}}$   
 ‘You kids go home!’ (NB.mdk19670519.421)

(100)  $\sqrt{w}\acute{a}k^w\text{s-}a\text{?}\text{-}l$      $\sqrt{q}i\check{c}\text{-}a\text{?}\text{-}l$   
 $\sqrt{\text{go-IMPER-PL}}$      $\sqrt{\text{play.NONF-IMPER-PL}}$   
 ‘Go out and play, kids.’ [boys] (NB.cs19670626.1032)

(101)  $\sqrt{c}\acute{a}\text{-st-}a\text{?}\text{-}l$      $ti$      $\sqrt{w}i\acute{l}\text{-}\acute{c}\acute{l}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{straighten-CAUS-IMPER-PL}}$     DEF.NONF     $\sqrt{\text{canoe-1.PL.POSV}}$   
 $n\text{-}\sqrt{?}ik^w\acute{l}\acute{a}k^w$   
 1.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{\text{wife}}$   
 ‘Straighten out our canoe, my wives!’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.12)

But sometimes a plural imperative form is made instead by the addition of the 2.PL.SUBJ (i.e. indicative) clitic, in its usual position after any object, to a formally singular imperative, as in (102):

- (102)  $\sqrt{y\acute{a}l-\acute{a}?\acute{a}c+\acute{c}\acute{a}lp}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{help-IMPER-1.SG.OBJ+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘You folks help me!’ (NB.mdk19670502.65)

This strategy combines imperative marking *per se* with a usage whereby indicative verb forms can sometimes function as imperatives.

Indicative marking alone can have imperative force, as seen in (103):

- (103)  $\sqrt{n\acute{a}w-m=\acute{a}\acute{c}+\acute{c}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{be.careful-MDL.PERF(?)=hand(?) + 2.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘(You) be careful’ (NB.mdk19670519.42)

### 7.3.2 Non-2<sup>nd</sup> person

Outside of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person, a range of other strategies is employed to form imperatives. One is hortative *kúy* (LCLP), which we understand to have been borrowed from Chinookan. (But it is reasonable to compare  $\acute{l}\acute{a}w\acute{a}l\acute{m}\acute{a}\acute{s} \acute{k}^w\acute{í}?$  ‘give’.) This is a particle standing first in the sentence, accompanied by an indicative verb as in (104):

- (104)  $\acute{k}\acute{u}y \quad ?i-\sqrt{k}^w\acute{u}stu-t$   
 HORT IMPF- $\sqrt{\text{move-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘let us move’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.39)

As with the 2<sup>nd</sup> person, the indicative form of the verb by itself can function to command someone (LCLP) as in (105):

- (105)  $\sqrt{y\acute{a}k^w-\acute{t}+\acute{c}\acute{t}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘let us move!’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.40)

A variant of this strategy involves preposing *cú* (LCLP), a hortative interjection or particle—we are not sure yet—before the indicative verb; perhaps it is the native  $\acute{l}\acute{a}w\acute{a}l\acute{m}\acute{a}\acute{s}$  counterpart to *kúy*. An example is shown in (106):

- (106)  $c\acute{u} \quad \sqrt{y\acute{a}k^w-\acute{t}+\acute{c}\acute{t}}$   
 HORT  $\sqrt{\text{move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘Up! Let us move!’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.9)

### 7.3.3 Negative imperatives

Negative imperatives are created by subordination, i.e. with a possessor marker (Section 8.3) and nominalization (Section 13) of the predicate. These are thus identical with negative indicatives, as seen in (107, 108):



## 8.1 Subject

Subjects essentially fall into a set of imperfective suffixes and perfective clitics (with a  $\emptyset$  3<sup>rd</sup> person perfective).

The imperfective subject paradigm is as in Table 1:

**Table 1** Imperfective subjects

	<b>SG/default</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1</b>	<i>-nš/--nš</i>	<i>-t</i> (LCLP)
<b>2</b>	<i>-čš/-č</i> (LCLP)	<i>-əlap</i> (LCLP)
<b>3</b>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n(+ti?)</i> (LCLP)

Examples of these forms are shown in (110–116):

- (110) ʔi-√q̣wú-yəq-nš  
 IMPF-√belch-INCH-1.SG.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘I’m belching’ (NB.mdk19670601.20)
- (111) √čəx<sup>w</sup>=ihʔəq-m-čš  
 √wash=foot-MDL.PERF-2.SG.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘you wash your feet’ (NB.mdk19670601.12)
- (112) ʔəs-√láv(-)ləq-t-m  
 ST-√call(-)INCH(?) -1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF-2.SG.OBJ.IMPF(?)  
 ‘we call thee’ (??.me188?..827)
- (113) kúy ʔi-√ḳwústu-t  
 HORT IMPF-√move-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘let us move’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.39)
- (114) √mít-∅ √wə  
 √NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF √FUT  
 s-√ʔik<sup>w</sup>(-)təq-t-əlap ...  
 NOM-√steal(-)INCH(?) -3.OBJ.IMPF-2.PL.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘not you will steal...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.3)
- (115) √wák<sup>w</sup>s-n  
 √go-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘they went’ (??.me188?.16.952)

- (116)  $\sqrt{\text{ʔis-n+ti?}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{come-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL}}$   
 ‘they [are] coming’ (NB.mdk19670601.39)

The perfective subject paradigm is shown in Table 2:

**Table 2** Perfective subjects

	<b>SG/default</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1</b>	+čn	+čł (LCLP)
<b>2</b>	+č	+člp/+čp (LCLP), +ps (LCLP)
<b>3</b>	-Ø, -s (LCLP)	-s+ti? (LCLP)

Examples of these forms are shown in (117–125):

- (117)  $\text{ʔəc-}\sqrt{\text{ʔá?q-əł+čn}}$   
 ST- $\sqrt{\text{thirsty-INTNS+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘I’m thirsty’ (NB.cs19670405.221)
- (118)  $\text{t-}\sqrt{\text{múx}^w\text{-n+č+na}}$   
 PERF- $\sqrt{\text{pay-3.OBJ.PERF+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF+Q}}$   
 ‘did you pay him?’ (NB.mdk19670524.14)
- (119)  $\sqrt{\text{wəł}}$   $\sqrt{\text{ʔik}^w(-)\text{təq-n+čł}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$   $\sqrt{\text{steal(-)INCH-3.OBJ.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘we will steal [him]’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone4.5)
- (120)  $\sqrt{\text{ʔucáł+čp}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{together+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘Don’t you all go by yourselves’ (NB.cs19670626.240)
- (121)  $\text{ʔámu+ps}$   $\text{t-}\sqrt{\text{ʔəxá-n+člp}}$   $\text{q}$   
 $\text{if+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF}$   $\text{PERF-}\sqrt{\text{see-3.OBJ.PERF+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\text{??}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{tí.}\sqrt{\text{ši}}}$   $\text{s-}\sqrt{\text{tək}^w\text{ół-n}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{DEM.PROX.NONF.}\sqrt{\text{CTRST}}}$   $\text{NOM-}\sqrt{\text{bow-INSTR}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{wi+ps}}$   
 $\text{TPC(?)+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 $\text{t-}\sqrt{\text{x}^w\text{əy-c+člp}}$   
 $\text{PERF-}\sqrt{\text{flee-1.SG.OBJ.PERF+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘if you see that bow, you [will then] flee [me]’  
 (CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.2)



- (122)  $\sqrt{\text{lá}^{\text{w}}\text{-l-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{sit-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘they sit’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone8.160)
- (123)  $\sqrt{?}\text{asú-šx}^{\text{w}}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{take-CAUS-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘she takes them along’ (??.me188?.17:962)
- (124)  $\text{t-}\sqrt{\text{xál-s}}$   
 $\text{PERF-}\sqrt{\text{finish-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he finishes [it]’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.5)
- (125)  $\sqrt{\text{šá}^{\text{n}}}$      $\text{tat}$      $\text{ps}=\sqrt{\text{lá}^{\text{w}}\text{-səq-s+ti?}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{there}}$      $\text{DEF.NONF}$      $\text{place}=\sqrt{\text{dance-INCH(?) -3.SUBJ.PERF+PL}}$   
 ‘place to hold dances’ (NB.mdk19670519.6)

The above are used in the declarative and interrogative moods; the imperative mood has distinct 2<sup>nd</sup>-person subject forms (Section 7.3.1).

## 8.2 Object

An object is expressed as a suffix on the verb stem. It usually is immediately followed by marking of any subject that is nonidentical with the object; that is, reflexives and reciprocals seem to lack any separate subject marking.

The imperfective object paradigm is shown in Table 3:

**Table 3** Imperfective objects

	<b>SG/default</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1</b>	<i>-čl</i> (LCLP)	<i>-tʃ</i> (LCLP)
<b>2</b>	<i>-m</i> (LCLP)	<i>-məlap</i> (LCLP)
<b>3</b>	<i>-(ə)t</i>	?
<b>REFL</b>	?	
<b>RECIP</b>	?	

Examples of these forms are given in (126–130):

- (126)  $ʔ\text{i-}\sqrt{\text{yá}^{\text{y}}\text{-š-čl-ən}}$   
 $\text{IMPF-}\sqrt{\text{tell-APPL-1.SG.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘he told me’ (NB.mdk19670524.86)

- (127) ʔəs-√łáw(-)ləq-t-m  
 ST-√call(-)INCH(?)-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF-2.SG.OBJ.IMPF(?)  
 ‘we call thee’ (??.me188?.15.827)
- (128) √cún-tl-n  
 √say-1.PL.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘he says to us’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.49)
- (129) ʔəs-√łáw(-)ləq-t-mələp  
 ST-√call(-)INCH(?)-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF-2.PL.OBJ.IMPF  
 ‘we call you’ (??.me188?.15:829)
- (130) √híʔ=qiʔ-t-n  
 √put.together=head(?)-3.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘he put them together’ (NB.mdk19670426.35)

The perfective object paradigm is shown in Table 4:

**Table 4** Perfective objects

	<b>SG/default</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1</b>	<i>-(ə)c</i>	<i>-təl, -t (LCLP)</i>
<b>2</b>	<i>-c (LCLP)</i>	<i>-təl</i>
<b>3</b>	<i>-n/-ə́n</i>	
<b>REFL</b>	<i>-cəš</i>	
<b>RECIP</b>	<i>-wə́x<sup>w</sup> (LCLP)</i>	

Examples of these forms are shown in (131–137):

- (131) √łáw(-)ləq-c+č  
 √call(-)INCH(?)-1.SG.OBJ.PERF+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘you call me’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.22)
- (132) t-√múx<sup>w</sup>-c-Ø+na  
 PERF-√pay-2.SG.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q  
 ‘did he pay you?’ (NB.mdk19670524.15)
- (133) √cún-tl-Ø  
 √say-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘he says to us’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.51)

- (134)  $\sqrt{\text{śáq-m-l-s}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{hate-MDL.PERF-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘they hate us, they’re not our friends’ (NB.mdk19781129.39)
- (135)  $\sqrt{\text{šiġ-án-Ø}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{eat-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ~ ‘to eat it’ (NB.mdk19670502.30)
- (136)  $\sqrt{\text{sóp-cəš}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{hit-REFL.PERF}}$   
 ‘hit oneself’ (Kinkade 1979:7)
- (137)  $\sqrt{\text{tal•tal-wóx}^w}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{shout-RDUP-RECIP}}$   
 ‘to shout’ (NB.cs19670626.1069)

The object markers seem to be used for both direct and indirect objects, but we do not know much yet about the latter. Within the verb, no more than two core arguments are expressed. One preliminary generalization is that the animacy hierarchy plays a role. Thus inanimate direct and indirect objects rank lower than animate ones, and are therefore not expressed by affixes. A few examples with core indirect objects, i.e. ditransitive verbs, are shown in (138–140):

- (138)  $\sqrt{\text{k}^w\text{í?-təl-Ø}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{give-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he gave it to us’ (IS.mdk19781015.172)
- (139)  $\sqrt{\text{cún-təl-Ø}}$  ...  
 $\sqrt{\text{say-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$  ...  
 ‘he says to us...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.51)
- (140)  $\sqrt{\text{cún-tl-n}}$  ...  
 $\sqrt{\text{say-1.PL.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$  ...  
 ‘he says to us...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.49)

Certain verb roots and stems besides ditransitives appear to characteristically incorporate implied semantic object arguments, making explicit object suffixes unnecessary. (An analogy might be drawn with those roots and stems that imply a *wh*-question, Section 7.2.1.) Following are the examples known so far; all can be characterized as verbs of transfer, whether of an object or of knowledge. All are third-person; we do not know yet if other persons behave similarly. In each, overt *-ət* 3.OBJ.IMPF or *-n* 3.OBJ.PERF would be expected, the missing affix in (141–146) being symbolized here by an underlined space:

- (141)  $\sqrt{\text{ʔi-šəx}^w}$ -\_\_-Ø  
 $\sqrt{\text{come-CAUS-__-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
‘he brought it down’ (NB.mdk19670502.41)
- (142)  $\sqrt{\text{ʔasú-šəx}^w}$ -\_\_-Ø  
 $\sqrt{\text{take-CAUS-__-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
‘she takes them along’ (??.me188?.17.962)
- (143)  $\sqrt{\text{yələx}^w}$ -\_\_-Ø  
 $\sqrt{\text{find.PERF-__-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
‘he found (something)’ (Kinkade 1979:5)
- (144)  $\sqrt{\text{yəl}^w}$ -w̄-\_\_-ən  
 $\sqrt{\text{find.IMPF-INTR-__-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
‘he found him’ (NB.mdk19670426.25)
- (145)  $\text{ʔámu}$   $\sqrt{\text{t}}$   $\sqrt{\text{cút-__-Ø}}$   $\sqrt{\text{x}^w\text{əníx}^w\text{əni}}$   
if  $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$   $\sqrt{\text{say-__-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   $\sqrt{\text{Qoneqone}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{cá-st-aʔ-l}}$   $\text{ti}$   $\sqrt{\text{wí}+\text{čl}}$  ...  
 $\sqrt{\text{straighten-CAUS-IMPER-PL}}$   $\text{DEF.NONF}$   $\sqrt{\text{canoe+1.PL.POSV}}$  ...  
‘If he speaks [says] Qoneqone, “Make straight our canoe,”...’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone 3.10)
- (146)  $\sqrt{\text{qən=áyn-məs-__-n+ti?}}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{listen(?)=ear-REL.IMPF-__-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL}}$   
‘they listen to him’ [sic] (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.4)

### 8.3 Possessor

We have not yet established in what ways possession may behave differently for inalienables versus alienables, or for kin, part-whole, and other relationships, cf. Aikhenvald (2013). We observe that body parts receive possessor marking when expressed as free words, and otherwise are incorporated as lexical suffixes (Section 14.1). As in other Salish languages, subjects receive possessor marking in subordinate clauses, which are usual in negations, content questions, et al. The paradigm of possessor (‘possessive’) markers is shown in Table 5:

**Table 5** Possessors

	<b>SG/default</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1</b>	<i>n-</i>	<i>-čəl</i> (LCLP)
<b>2</b>	<i>ʔə-</i>	<i>-lp</i> (LCLP)
<b>3</b>	<i>-s, -ns</i>	

Examples of these forms are shown in (147–152):

- (147)  $\sqrt{?}ánčǎ-Ø$  n- $\sqrt{x}á?q-a?-Ø$   
 $\sqrt{1.SG.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF}$  1.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{child-PL-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘my children’ (NB.cs19670405.24)
- (148)  $?ǎ-\sqrt{č}ít+na$   $\sqrt{t}á?n$   
 2.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{older.brother+Q}$   $\sqrt{DEM.NONF.DIST}$   
 ‘is that your older brother?’ (NB.mdk19670524.41)
- (149)  $\sqrt{?}áním-Ø$   $\sqrt{x}áš-čǎt-Ø$   
 $\sqrt{1.PL.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   $\sqrt{house-1.PL.POSV-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘this is our house’ (NB.mdk19670601.79)
- (150)  $\sqrt{?}ǎláp-Ø+na$   $\sqrt{x}áš-lp-Ø$   
 $\sqrt{2.PL.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q}$   $\sqrt{house-2.PL.POSV-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘is that you-folks[‘] house?’ (NB.mdk19670601.78)
- (151) s- $\sqrt{m}átǎx^w-ns$   
 NOM- $\sqrt{brother.in.law-3.POSV}$   
 ‘his brother-in-law’ (NB.mdk19670502.43)
- (152)  $\sqrt{y}ǎq-s$   
 $\sqrt{name-3.POSV}$   
 ‘his name’ (NB.mdk19670502.75)

Still not known are how to express what might be called reflexive and reciprocal possession, i.e. the translations of ‘one’s own’ and ‘each others’.

Polar (yes/no) questioning of the fact of possession, rather than of the identity of the possessor, is accomplished with the compound  $\sqrt{wi}.\sqrt{y}ǎx^w\sqrt{COP}.\sqrt{how.much}$  ‘is there any?’ / ‘are there any?’; see (82) under Section 7.2.1.

#### 8.4 Predicative

The paradigm of predicative (‘emphatic’) pronouns is a set of free, stress-bearing words used for example in topicalizing an argument. Table 6 contains the paradigm of the predicative pronouns:

**Table 6** Predicative pronouns

	<b>SG/default</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1</b>	$\sqrt{?}ǎnc/\sqrt{ǎnč}$	$\sqrt{?}ǎním$
<b>2</b>	$\sqrt{n}ú?$	$\sqrt{ǎ}láp$
<b>3</b>	$\sqrt{c}ǎn'$ (LCLP)	$\sqrt{c}ǎn'+ti?$ , $\sqrt{\quad}+ti? cǎn'$ (LCLP)

Examples of these forms are shown in (153–159):

- (153)  $\sqrt{ʔ}ənc$        $t\text{-}\sqrt{k}^{wəx^w}\text{-}ən+čn$   
 $\sqrt{1}.$ SG.PRED    PERF- $\sqrt{}$ break-3.OBJ.PERF+1.SUBJ.PERF  
                      $tit$                        $\sqrt{ká[ʔ]}p\text{-}uʔ$   
                     DEF.NONF                 $\sqrt{}$ cup[ $\sqrt{DIM}$ ]-DIM  
                     ‘*I broke the cup.*’    (NB.cs19670512.32)
- (154)  $\sqrt{nú}ʔ\text{-}\emptyset$      $ʔə\text{-}\sqrt{mát}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{2}.$ SG.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF    2.SG.POSV- $\sqrt{}$ head-3.SUBJ.PERF  
                     ‘*your head*’    (NB.cs19670405.56)
- (155)  $\sqrt{ší}ʔ\text{-}\emptyset$      $\sqrt{ʔ}əním\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{}$ here-3.SUBJ.PERF                 $\sqrt{}$ 1.PL.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF  
                     ‘*it’s us!*’    (NB.mdk19670601.48)
- (156)  $ʔú$      $\sqrt{ʔ}əláp$                        $\dot{\lambda}anaʔ$   
                     oh     $\sqrt{2}.$ PL.PRED    EVID.SURPR  
                     ‘*Oh – it’s you guys!*’    (NB.mdk19670601.50)
- (157)  $ɬac$        $\sqrt{c}ə́n$   
                     DEF.FEM     $\sqrt{3}.$ PRED  
                     ‘*her(s)*’    (NB.mdk19670502.79)
- (158)  $\sqrt{c}ə́n+tiʔ$        $\sqrt{x}áš\text{-}s$   
 $\sqrt{3}.$ PRED+PL     $\sqrt{}$ house-3.POSV  
                     ‘*that’s their house*’    (NB.mdk19670601.82)
- (159)  $\sqrt{x}^{wáq^w}+tiʔ$      $\sqrt{c}ə́n$   
 $\sqrt{}$ all+PL                 $\sqrt{3}.$ PRED  
                     ‘*That was them*’    (NB.mdk19670601.645)

## 9 Number (LCLP)

Number marking per se is limited to the plurals of a few nouns. In this closed set of words, the plural exponence is usually twofold. Glottalization generally is infixated right after the stressed (root) vowel, thus  $\sqrt{V}[\text{ʔ}]$ . And a vocalic reduplication plus glottal stop (thus  $\bullet\sqrt{V}ʔ$ ) is postposed to the first coda consonant of the root/stem.

For CVC roots this looks like suffixation, while for longer roots it generates infixation; for economy we represent it thus, [bracketed], in the examples. In phonological form this structure is comparable with the diminutive, Section 11, which however lacks this vowel harmony-like operation. Vowel harmony is somewhat rare but not unknown elsewhere in Salish (e.g. Sloat 1972, Jacobs

2012). However, the present operation seems to us more accurately described as vowel reduplication, though that is very rare crosslinguistically and not previously described in Salish.

It is not yet known if this plural marking is optional or required. Examples are shown in (160–162):

(160)  $\sqrt{c\acute{u}t}\bullet[u?]$   
 $\sqrt{\text{foot}}[\bullet\text{RDUP.PL}]$   
 ‘feet’ (NB.cs19670405.74)

(161)  $\sqrt{x\acute{a}[?]}q\bullet[a?]$   
 $\sqrt{\text{child}}[\text{PL}][\bullet\text{RDUP.PL}]$   
 ‘children’ (NB.cs19670405.23)

(162)  $\sqrt{\acute{c}i[?]}k^w[\bullet i?]t$   
 $\sqrt{\text{light}}[\text{PL}][\bullet\text{RDUP.PL}]$   
 ‘lamps, lights’ (NB.mdk19670502.82)

Some pluralities are apparently expressed with the root  $\sqrt{q\acute{o}x}$  ‘lots of...’ either compounded with a following noun root/stem, or taking a lexical suffix expressing the pluralized nominal. This occurs with (some) collective nouns—things considered as a set more than as several separate individuals. Examples are given in (163–164):

(163)  $\sqrt{q\acute{o}x}$ .  $\sqrt{c\acute{o}q\acute{a}t}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{lots.of}}$   $\sqrt{\text{tree}}$   
 ‘forest’ (??me188?.472)

(164)  $\sqrt{q\acute{o}x}=m\acute{l}x\acute{o}\acute{s}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{lots.of}}=\text{people}$   
 ‘[a group of] people’ (NB.cs19670405.25)

For markers having primarily number function but tied in with person, see a pluralizing affix on third-person subject pronominals at Section 8.1, Section 8.4 and an affix that pluralizes second-person imperatives at Section 7.3.1.

For a reduplicative template that appears to pluralize the predominant type of diminutive, see Section 16.1.

## 10 Gender (LCLP)

Lower Chehalis is like other Coast Salish languages in distinguishing two genders in its articles (Section 19) and demonstratives (Section 20). One gender marks biologically feminine entities while the other is an ‘elsewhere case’, so we term the genders ‘feminine’ (FEM) and ‘non-feminine’ (NONF).

But *ləwálməʃ* takes this grammatical distinction even farther, in having separate gendered roots/stems for several verbs. This can be perhaps compared with those roots/stems that contain other implicit information about arguments, be they *wh-* items (Section 7.2) or objects (Section 8.2). We tentatively speculate that such unique gendered verb pairs could be due to influence from Chinookan, where every verb bears at least distinct gendered prefixes referring to subjects and objects (Boas 1989:165). Examples are shown in (165–168):

- (165) a.  $\sqrt{qə́ləq}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{run.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘run (a boy) (any male)’ (NB.cs19670405.235)
- b.  $\sqrt{pásəq}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{run.FEM-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘run (a girl) (any female)’ (NB.cs19670405237)
- (166) a.  $\sqrt{qáxəp}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{tell.lies.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘lie (man)’ (NB.mdk19670519.100)
- b.  $\sqrt{yul=á?q}\text{-m-}\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{crazy=talk-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘a woman lying’ (NB.mdk19670519.102)
- (167) a.  $\text{ʔi-}\sqrt{\text{ʔú}k^w}\text{-w-n}$   
 $\text{IMPF-}\sqrt{\text{weep.FEM-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘tears, a girl crying’ (NB.cs19670405.79)
- b.  $\text{ʔi-}\sqrt{\text{tá}qč}\text{-w-n}$   
 $\text{IMPF-}\sqrt{\text{cry.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘a man crying’ (NB.cs19670405.80)
- (168) a.  $q^wim\ t\text{-}\sqrt{wátq-yəq}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 just PERF- $\sqrt{\text{fall.over.FEM-INCH-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘she just fell over’ (NB.cs19670731.1240)
- b.  $q^wim\ t\text{-}\sqrt{\text{tə}ləč}\text{-}\emptyset$   
 just PERF- $\sqrt{\text{fall.over.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$   
 ‘he just fell over’ (NB.mdk19670519.44)

In one similar pair, one item is gender-neutral and the other nonfeminine (masculine), shown in (169):



- (169) a. ʔi-√qanič̣-mət-n+tiʔ  
 IMPF-√play.group(?)-MDL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL  
 ‘The children (boys & girls) are playing’ (NB.cs19670626.1040)
- b. √qíč̣-Ø  
 √play.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘play, have fun (men)’ (NB.mdk19670524.1)

## 11 Diminutive

Grammatical diminutivity in læwálməš expresses smallness of an entity, or an event’s occurring to only a limited extent (it is used on both nouns and verbs). This kind of ‘little’-ness tends to have an affective (emotional) overtone, so it means something different from saying literally e.g. a ‘little thing’. The examples below will illustrate this point.

One main strategy overtly signals diminutivity. It is characterized by two components. One is suffixation of *-uʔ* (*-huʔ* following a vowel); the other is (usually) either infixation of [ʔ] or glottalization of an underlyingly unglottalized consonant inside the word. Whichever glottal exponence is employed, it occurs just after the stressed vowel [and is shown abstractly as ʔ here]. Examples of this strategy are shown in (170–173):

- (170) √xá[ʔ]š-uʔ  
 √house[DIM]-DIM  
 ‘outhouse’ <√xáš ‘house’ (Kinkade 1979:8)
- (171) s-√kʷəntú[ʔ]-huʔ  
 NOM-√grouse(?)[DIM]-DIM  
 ‘little chicken’ <s-√kʷəntú ‘chicken’ (Kinkade 1979:8)
- (172) s-√xwá[ʔ]yəs-uʔ  
 NOM-√hat[DIM]-DIM  
 ‘little hat; cap’ <s-√xwáyəs ‘hat’ (Kinkade 1979:8)
- (173) √sí[ʔ]təl-uʔ-Ø  
 √swim[DIM]-DIM-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘to play in the water’ <√síʔtəl ‘to swim’  
 (NB.mdk19670524.560, 559 resp.)

When the stressed vowel in the root/stem is underlyingly *á*, that changes to *á* as in (174):

- (174) s-kʷə•√kʷá[ʔ]m-uʔ  
 NOM-RDUP•√inland[DIM]-DIM  
 ‘animal; insect; etc.’ <s-kʷə•√kʷám ‘evil spirit’ (NB.cs19670512.8)

For a reduplicative template that appears to pluralize the preceding type of diminutive, see Section 16.1.

A quite marginal second diminutivization strategy involves an apparent vowel change to *-i-* inside a word of reduplicated form (LCLP). This vowel mutation and reduplication resemble other Coast Salish languages' diminutives, e.g. Lushootseed *bíʔ•√bədàʔ* 'young child, small child' (Bates et al. 1994:35). This second strategy has been identified in only one item, which may have been borrowed from some Coast Salish language via Chinook Jargon (it is widespread in the region's languages), shown in (175):

- (175)  $\sqrt{pí[ʔ]š•piš}$   
 $\sqrt{cat•RDUP[DIM]}$   
 'cat' (LH/EO.cs19670817.956) < $\sqrt{púʔš(?)}$  'cat'  
 (LH/EO.cs19670817.955)

Similar in force to the diminutive is the attenuative adverb *kʷáʔc* 'slightly', its antonym being *xʷáʔ* 'very' (cf. Section 21).

## 12 Intensive

Intensive marking, signaling 'really, very, completely' is effectively the opposite of the diminutive. This seems to be able to go on adjectives, nouns and verbs. It takes three forms, each of which upon further research may be found to bear a unique nuance of meaning. One form is the suffix *-əl*, sometimes glossed in English by *ləwálməʃ* speakers as 'real', but in fact usually untranslated as seen in (176–178):

- (176)  $\sqrt{qíxʷ-əl-Ø}$   
 $\sqrt{lard-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 fat (a person)' (NB.cs19670405.86)
- (177)  $ʔəc-√yícəq-əl-Ø$   
 ST- $\sqrt{sick-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 'he's sick' (NB.cs19670405.88)
- (178)  $\sqrt{xáp-əl-Ø}$   
 $\sqrt{dry-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 'real dry' (NB.cs19670405.186)

A second intensification strategy, very widespread in the Pacific Northwest Sprachbund, is  $[\dots]$  (extra-long stressed vowel; *á* changes to *á*) (LCLP). Examples are shown in (179–181):

- (179) tx<sup>w</sup>-√nəxá[...]<sub>s-n</sub>  
 TRSL-√sleepy[INTNS]-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘he didn’t fall asleep right away’ [~he spent a loooong time  
 sleepy] (NB.mdk19670426.21)
- (180) √tá[...]<sub>?x<sup>w</sup></sub>  
 √far[INTNS]  
 ‘he travelled far’ (NB.mdk19670426.22)
- (181) √ná[...]<sub>w</sub> √nułt=áĭ=məš  
 √big[INTNS] √man=STEMX=people  
 ‘big man’ (NB.mdk19670426.17)

A third intensifier is suffixation of *-i?* (LCLP). This is perhaps a distributive; it occurs on CVC- reduplicated verbs of motion as in (182–184):

- (182) √k<sup>w</sup>iw•k<sup>w</sup>iw-i?  
 √crawl•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR  
 ‘crawl around (for a purpose)’ (NB.cs19670512.66)
- (183) q<sup>w</sup>im n-s-√yil•yil-i?  
 just 1.SG.POSV-NOM-√walk•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR  
 ‘I’m just walking around’ (NB.cs19670512.4)
- (184) √yil•yil-i?-w-n+čn  
 √walk•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘I’m just walking around’ (NB.cs19670512.27)

There is also non-morphological intensification via adverbs: *x<sup>w</sup>áĭ* and *lét* ‘very’. The former is used with extremely high frequency and, in our impression, in more environments than e.g. English ‘very’; more research should help determine its patterns of use. The latter is borrowed from Chinook Jargon. An antonym of both is the attenuative adverb *k<sup>w</sup>á?c* ‘slightly’. (Cf. Section 21.)

### 13 Nominalization

Nominalization in *łəwáĭməš* might be described as making a noun-like unit out of a more verb-like one. As in other Salish languages, this *s-* prefixation is a component in the formation of negative verbs, some future verbs, *wh-* question verbs, subordinate clauses, etc. It is to be found on both imperfectives and perfectives. The vagueness of its meaning is summed up in Kinkade’s pronouncement, ‘I have no idea what its function is, beyond marking subordinate or dependent predicates’ (1979:9). A variety of examples are shown in (185–189):

- (185) s-√xíxʔm  
 NOM-√strawberry  
 ‘strawberry’ (NB.cs19670524.550)
- (186) s-√páč-uʔ  
 NOM-√hard.basket-DIM  
 ‘hard basket’ (NB.mdk19670601.611)
- (187) √hílu ʔə-s-√qə́lám  
 √NEG 2.SG.POSV-NOM-√intelligent  
 ‘not very intelligent, retarded’ (NB.cs19670405.77)
- (188) √tám ʔə-√wə́ s-√múx<sup>w</sup>-əc  
 √what 2.SG.POSV-√FUT NOM-√pay-1.SG.OBJ.PERF  
 ‘what are you going to pay me?’ (NB.mdk19670426.53)
- (189) √wát ʔə-s-√yə́q  
 √who[sic] 2.SG.POSV-NOM-√name  
 ‘what is your name?’ (NB.mdk19670524.482)

## 14 Lexical affixes

The typically Salish ‘lexical’ affixes have meanings that are more like nouns than the various grammatical and abstract categories already discussed above. The majority are lexical suffixes, but unlike some Salish languages, łəwálməš also makes use of a lexical circumfix and several lexical prefixes.

### 14.1 Lexical suffixes

Lexical suffixes are added to the end of a word stem. A word can have more than one lexical suffix on it. Grammatical endings can be added after these. Lexical suffixes, as ‘classifiers’, play an important role in counting; there are different sets of numerals for counting various objects, such as canoes, people in canoes, etc.

The meanings of lexical suffixes are not always easy to reverse-engineer. Many, especially those containing resonant consonants like /l m n w y/, can occur with those consonants glottalized: /l̥ m̥ n̥ w̥ y̥/. Many of these suffixes have several variant forms not necessarily predictable by phonological rules. The stress on these suffixes may be variable. These affixes need much more research.

Kinkade (1979:9) acknowledges but gives no examples of lexical suffixes, so (190–235) sample some so far identified by the LCLP:

**=aʔq̣, =əq ‘language, talk’**

- (190) √yul=áʔq̣-m  
√crazy=talk-MDL.PERF  
‘a woman lying’ [telling lies] (NB.mdk19670519.101)

**=aʔš ‘foot’ (?)**

- (191) √cál=aʔš  
√shoe=foot  
‘shoes (a pair)’ (NB.cs19670405.197)

**=ačan, =čən, =ičn, =ihəč ‘back’**

- (192) √qʷəluṗ=ihəč  
√?=back  
‘come-back salmon (salmon after spawning)’ (NB.cs19670405.268)

**=al STEM EXTENDER before lexical suffixes**

- (193) √ləw̄=ál=məš  
√?=STEMX=people  
‘Indian language, Lower Chehalis’ (NB.cs19670405.256)

**=al ‘friend’ (?)**

- (194) √pastn=ál  
√white.man=friend  
‘white man friend (not present)’ (BC.mdk19670511.41)

**=al ‘tree’**

- (195) √cəq=ál  
√upright(?)=tree  
‘tree (gen.)’ (Kinkade 1978wordlist.415)

**=amš, =məš ‘people’**

- (196) s-√táʔxʷ=amš  
NOM-√far=people  
‘person from far away, foreigner’ (IS.mdk19781130.5)

**=ańəx<sup>w</sup> ‘salmon; year’ ?**

- (197) √łəp=áí=ańəx<sup>w</sup>  
√?=STEMX=salmon  
(a personal name) (NB.mdk19670502.74)

**=apš ‘stream’**

- (198) √ʔəx<sup>w</sup>íí=apš  
√?=stream  
‘Willapa’ (NB.mdk19670601.32)

**=asqm ‘smell’**

- (199) √łaʔq̣<sup>w</sup>=ásqm  
√good=smell  
‘sweet smell’ (NB.mdk19670524.48)

**=ax<sup>w</sup> ‘house’**

- (200) √xəl=áx<sup>w</sup>  
√do.like.that=house  
‘someone who boards with you’ (NB.mdk19670426.55)

**=ay stem extender**

- (201) √łaʔ=áy=čəp=íə  
√chop(?)=STEMX=wood=INST  
‘axe’ (NB.cs19670512.12)

- (202) s-√qəx=áy=íəń-s  
NOM-√lots.of=STEMX=child-3.POSV  
‘his children’ (NB.mdk19670502.86)

**=ayn ‘ear’**

- (203) √qan=áyn-məs-n+tiʔ  
√listen(?)=ear-REL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL  
‘they listen to him’ [sic] (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.4)

**=č 'flesh'**

- (204) √náv=č  
 √big=flesh  
 'body' (NB.cs19670512.24)

**=č 'hand; water'**

- (205) tx<sup>w</sup>-√kwəná=č-x<sup>w</sup>-Ø ?u ?i  
 TRSL-√get=hand-CAUS.MOT-3.SUBJ.PERF CPLET EVID.IRR  
 'he got it; he grabbed it' (NB.mdk19670502.69)

- (206) √łá?q-ł=č  
 √thirsty-INTNS=water  
 'thirsty' (NB.cs19670405.220)

**=čəp 'fire; firewood'**

- (207) √paχ=áy=čəp  
 √split=STEMX=wood  
 'he's splitting wood' (NB.mdk19670524.543)

**=əq 'bed; feather' (?)**

- (208) s-√tq=al=əq=ínm  
 NOM-√?=STEMX=feather=bed  
 'feather matting' (NB.cs19670731.1176)

**=əs, =s, =us 'face; round thing'**

- (209) √łáqč-nš ?əc=ál=əs  
 √cry.NONF-1.SG.SUBJ.IMPF ST=STEMX=eye  
 ['I cry "[my] eye"'] (CC.fb1890Qoneqone7.8)

- (210) √čəχ<sup>w</sup>=s=ýáq-a?-n  
 √wash=round.thing=inside-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF  
 'wash the dishes!' (NB.mdk19670601.16)

- (211) √čəχ<sup>w</sup>=ús-a?-m  
 √wash=face-IMPER-MDL.PERF  
 'Wash your face!' (NB.mdk19670601.599)

- (212) tit  $\eta i\text{-}\sqrt{\text{ciq}}^w=\acute{u}s\text{-}n$   
 DEF.NONF IMPF- $\sqrt{\text{dig}}=\text{round.thing-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   
 ‘clam-digging’ (NB.cs19670512.55)

**= $\acute{a}x$  ‘arm’ ?**

- (213)  $\sqrt{\acute{\lambda}ap}=\acute{a}l=\acute{a}x$   
 $\sqrt{\text{under}}=\text{STEMX}=\text{arm}$   
 ‘armpits’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone5.9)

**= $i\eta k^w$  ‘waist’**

- (214)  $\sqrt{i\acute{a}q}=i\eta k^w\text{-}m$   
 $\sqrt{\text{tie.up}}=\text{waist-MDL.PERF}$   
 ‘shirt’ (NB.mdk19670524.37)

**= $i\eta xn$  ‘roots’**

- (215)  $\sqrt{iaq}=i\eta xn$   
 $\sqrt{\text{tie.up}(?)}$ =roots  
 ‘root for hard baskets’ (NB.mdk19670524.27)

**= $ih\eta aq, =ih\eta aq^?$  ‘foot, leg’ ?**

- (216)  $\sqrt{c\acute{a}x}^w=ih\eta aq^w\text{-}m+\acute{c}\acute{s}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{wash}}=\text{foot-MDL.PERF}+2.\text{SG.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘you wash your feet’ (NB.mdk19670601.12)

**= $i\acute{\lambda}ax^w$  ‘year’ (?)**

- (217)  $\sqrt{\acute{\lambda}\acute{c}}=i\acute{\lambda}ax^w$   
 $\sqrt{?}$ =year  
 ‘?’ (perhaps ‘next year’) (NB.mdk19670426.6)

**= $i\acute{\lambda}s$  ‘end, point; rock’ (?)**

- (218)  $\sqrt{c\acute{a}x}=i\acute{\lambda}s$   
 $\sqrt{\text{sandy}}=\text{point}$   
 ‘Lower Chehalis; tarty taste’ (NB.cs19670405.110)



**=inč ‘inside’ (?)**

- (219) ʔámu √č́ólš-m=inč-n √č́áwł...  
if √enter-MDL.PERF=inside(?)-3.SUBJ.IMPF √spring.salmon...  
‘If he goes into weir the spring salmon...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.8)

**=inm ‘bed’ (?)**

- (220) s-√tq̄=aləq=inm  
NOM-√?=feather=bed  
‘feather matting’ (NB.cs19670731.1176)

**=ləs ‘hair’**

- (221) √čəχ<sup>w</sup>=ləs-aʔ-m  
√wash=hair-IMPER-MDL.PERF  
‘wash your hair!’ (NB.mdk19670601.22)

**=lʔə ‘INSTR (tool, instrument)’**

- (222) √cič̣=lʔə  
√shoot=INSTR  
‘gun’ (NB.mdk19670519.65)

**=ləṇ ‘child’**

- (223) s-√qəx=áy=ləṇ-s  
NOM-√lots.of=STEMX=child-3.POSV  
‘his children’ (NB.mdk19670502.86)

**=młχəš ‘people’**

- (224) √qəχ=młχəš  
√lots.of=people  
‘[a group of] people’ (NB.cs19670405.25)

**=ṃəš ‘earth, land, place; river’**

- (225) √təč̣=ál=ṃəš  
√across=STEMX=river  
‘(go) across’ (NB.mdk19670426.27)

=*nwət* ‘mind, heart’

- (226)  $\sqrt{k}wí?(-)x^w=nwət$   
 $\sqrt{give(-)CAUS.MOT(?)=mind}$   
‘think’ (NB.mdk19670524.89)

=*qin̄* (=qi?) (?) ‘head’

- (227)  $s-\sqrt{y}əl̄=qin̄$   
NOM- $\sqrt{round}=head$   
‘slave’ (NB.cs19670405.44)

- (228)  $\sqrt{hi}ʔ=qiʔ-t-n$   
 $\sqrt{put.together-head(?)}$ -3.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘he put them together’ (NB.mdk19670426.35)

=*qs* ‘nose, point’

- (229)  $\sqrt{míx}^w=qs$   
 $\sqrt{smile(?)=point}$   
‘smile’ (BC.mdk19670511.22)

=*stl̄s̄* (?) ‘times, occurrences’

- (230)  $\sqrt{cíl}=stl̄s̄$   
 $\sqrt{five}=times$   
 $ʔa-ʔi-s-\sqrt{wác-əm-stu-s}$   
3.FEM.SG.POSV-<sup>9</sup>-NOM- $\sqrt{throw.down-MDL.PERF-CAUS-3.POSV}$   
‘5 times she threw her down’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone5.10)

=*stəq* ‘fire’ ?

- (231)  $\sqrt{x}əʔl̄=stəq$   
 $\sqrt{burn(?)=fire}$   
‘ashes’ (NB.cs19670405.124)

=*tən*, =*tə̄* ‘INSTR (tool, instrument)’

- (232)  $\sqrt{tul̄}=ihʔəq=tə̄$   
 $\sqrt{stretch=leg=INSTR}$   
‘trousers’ (NB.mdk19670524.94)

---

<sup>9</sup> This morpheme may be a nominalizer.

=*uc* ‘mouth’

- (233)  $\sqrt{\dot{c}ep}=\acute{u}c=qs$   
 $\sqrt{?}=\text{mouth}=\text{point}$   
‘beard’ (NB.cs19670512.16)

=*y’aq* ‘inside’ ?

- (234)  $\sqrt{\dot{c}ax^w}=s=y’aq-a?-n$   
 $\sqrt{\text{wash}}=\text{round.thing}=\text{inside-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF}$   
‘wash the dishes!’ (NB.mdk19670601.16)

=*y’ap* ‘clothing’

- (235)  $\sqrt{w\acute{a}l} \sqrt{\dot{c}ax^w}=y’ap+\acute{c}š+na$  tit s- $\sqrt{k^w\acute{a}l}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{FUT}} \sqrt{\text{wash}}=\text{clothing}+2.\text{SG.SUBJ.PERF}+Q$  DEF.NONF NOM- $\sqrt{\text{day}}$   
‘are you going to wash (clothes) today?’ (NB.mdk19670601.591)

#### 14.2 Lexical circumfix (LCLP)

One circumfix, having a more lexical than grammatical meaning, has been identified. It is *nš=* =*tn* ‘group of kin (relatives), the relation being specified by the stem. We do not yet know whether this can be used freely with other kin terms than what is seen in (236), or whether it can cooccur with other lexical affixes:

- (236)  $nš=\sqrt{?}i\acute{m}\acute{a}c=tn-s$   
 $\text{kin.group}=\sqrt{\text{grandchild}}=\text{kin.group-3.POSV}$   
‘his grandchildren’ (NB.mdk19670502.87)

#### 14.3 Lexical prefixes (LCLP)

It seems only one lexical prefix is allowed per word. Following in (237–246) are those identified so far:

*čs=* ‘color’

- (237)  $\acute{c}s=\sqrt{n\acute{a}q}$   
 $\text{color}=\sqrt{\text{black}}$   
‘black’ (NB.cs19670405.91)

*čt=* ‘inhabitants’

- (238)  $\acute{c}t=\sqrt{\acute{c}an\acute{u}k}$   
 $\text{inhabitants}=\sqrt{\text{Chinook}}$   
‘Chinook tribe’ (Curtis1907–1930.12)

- (239) čt=ʔác-√mĩč  
 inhabitants=ST-√?  
 ‘northern Shoalwater Bay people’ (~‘inside-bay people’)  
 (Curtis1907–1930.1)

**náw= ‘big’ (takes primary stress; the stem it modifies takes secondary stress)**

- (240) náw=s-√x̣wòx̣w  
 big=NOM-√old.man  
 ‘big old man’ (NB.cs19670405.47)

- (241) náw=s-√pə̀lq  
 big=NOM-√penis  
 ‘big penis’ (BC.mdk19670511.18)

**nú= (?) ‘village’ (takes primary stress; the stem it modifies perhaps takes secondary stress)**

- (242) nú=s-√x̣wəcəq  
 village=NOM-√?  
 ‘village on the point north of Bay Center’ (Curtis.1907–1930.42)

- (243) nú=√muyłənl  
 village=√crabapple?  
 ‘Crabapple Town, on the site of Tokeland’ (Curtis.1907–1930.26)

**ps= ‘place for...’ (?); this forms nouns from verbs in completive aspect, usually along with another locative, either the relative šán’ ‘(the place) where \_\_\_’ or the preposition nú?:**

- (244) √šán ps=√ʔúl=ps-s tat s-√q̣wúx̣w  
 √there place.for=√exit=hole-3.POSV DEF.NONF NOM-√smoke  
 ‘smokehole’ (NB.mdk19670524.49)

- (245) nú? ɪ tat ps=√ciwim-m+čl  
 PREP ? DEF.NONF place.for=√pray-MDL.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘church, place of prayer’ (NB.cs19670512.52)

- (246) √šán tat ps=√láq̣w(-)səq-s+ti?  
 √there DEF.NONF place.for=√dance(-)INCH(?)-3.SUBJ.PERF+PL  
 ‘place to hold dances’ (NB.mdk19670519.6)

## 15 Compounding (LCLP)

It is not always easy to distinguish the morphological operation of compounding from syntactic ones such as potential serial-verb constructions, etc. Even by the most accommodating definition, compounds are not frequent in łəwálməš. Their use may have been reinforced through contact with Chinook Jargon or English, in both of which compounding is widespread. (See also my remarks about negated *wh-* items at Section 6.2.1.) Details like placement of primary stress, and pitch contours, remain to be worked out with future research.

We provisionally use a somewhat restrictive definition of compounding that include (a) two stressable roots in sequence, neither bearing overt inflection, the sequence being elicitable in isolation, and (b) two potential phonological words in sequence with a single primary stress on the first word. Known possible sequences are varied, including noun-noun, and demonstrative-adverb. Examples are shown in (247–249):

(247) √lapúm.√cəq=át  
√apple.√tree  
'apple tree' (NB.cs19670512.277)

(248) √čóx<sup>w</sup>-aʔ-n                      √tíʔn.√šiʔ  
√wash-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF    √DEM.NONF.PROX.√CTRST  
'wash this!' (NB.mdk19670601.19)

(249) √x<sup>w</sup>ə́ł    √xəsáʔ-ł    √qáʔx    √táʔn.√šn̄  
√very    √bad-INTNS    √dog    √DEM.NONF.DIST√CTRST  
'he's just a common, mongrel dog (insulting someone)'  
(NB.cs19670626.1225)

## 16 Reduplication (LCLP)

Reduplication in łəwálməš is not well understood yet. As is typical for Salish, it normally copies material from the root rather than e.g. the phonological word or stem. (For an exceptional reduplication based on reanalysis of prefixal material plus root, see the examples of √ʔin 'do what' under Section 7.2.2.) All but one of the seven observed templates involves, at minimum, consonantal material; some include vowels as well.

Our arbitrary working assumption is that, barring other evidence, it is the root that is stressed in the resulting form, with the copied material unstressed. (Vowels in unstressed syllables may reduce to schwa.) In terming reduplications preposed or postposed, our point of orientation is the underlyingly stressed vowel of the root.

There are several reduplicative templates, which seem to carry different meanings. It remains to be established which of the observed patterns are productive. At least one variety seems to have been borrowed from Chinookan.

## 16.1 Preposed reduplication

Two varieties of preposed reduplication have been identified. One can be schematized as  $CV^\bullet$  and perhaps imparts a sense of plurality (cf. Section 9). This operation is usually accompanied by the diminutive infix+suffix (Section 11), as seen in (250, 251):

(250) s-k<sup>w</sup>ə•√k<sup>w</sup>á[?]m-u?  
NOM-RDUP•√inland?[DIM]-DIM  
'animal; insect; misbehaved [children]' (NB.cs19670512.8)

(251) čə•√čáɫ-u?  
RDUP•√maggot-DIM  
'maggots' (NB.mdk19670519.109)

A second template in which the copied material precedes the root is  $CV^\bullet C^\bullet$ , of uncertain interpretation. An example is shown in (252) (which is another illustration of the stressing of schwa resulting in *á*):

(252) x<sup>w</sup>át•√x<sup>w</sup>ətəq-a?  
RDUP•√jump-IMPER  
'hurry up!' (NB.cs19670615.870)

## 16.2 Postposed reduplication

At least five varieties of reduplication place the copied material after root segments. Formally the simplest is  $\acute{C}$ , reduplicating the consonant immediately after the stressed vowel, cf. Kinkade. It is not yet known how this reduplication might operate in a word whose stress has been attracted to an affix. An example is shown in (253):

(253) √łú<sup>ˈ</sup>k<sup>w</sup>•k<sup>w</sup>-a?  
√high•RDUP-IMPER  
'a little higher!' (NB.cs19670626.1066)

The only seeming reduplication we have identified as not involving consonantal material is a noun-pluralizing, coda-consonant oriented infix [ $\bullet V^\bullet$ ] of limited occurrence (Section 9). This is the only putative reduplication that adds non-root phonological material (here a glottal stop) to the copy. Possibly it can be thought of as a more typical  $\bullet VC$  (see the next reduplication below) after a glottal infix has been added after the stressed (root) vowel. An example is repeated in (254):

- (254)  $\sqrt{ci}[\text{?}]k^w[\bullet i\text{?}]t$   
 $\sqrt{\text{light}}[\text{PL}][\bullet\text{RDUP.PL}]$   
 ‘lamps, lights’ (NB.mdk19670502.82)

More complex in form is the stress-attracting  $\bullet\acute{V}C$ , shown in (255, 256):

- (255)  $\sqrt{x}i\acute{w}\bullet iw$   
 $\sqrt{\text{fear}}\bullet\text{RDUP}$   
 ‘fear, frighten’ (Kinkade 1979)

- (256)  $s-\sqrt{w}\acute{q}\bullet i\acute{q}$   
 NOM- $\sqrt{\text{frog}}\bullet\text{RDUP}$   
 ‘frog’ (EO.cs19670720.726)

The two next more complex forms seem to carry aspect-like (Section 2) meanings. One is  $\bullet\text{CVC}$ , with a sense of ‘continuous action’, as shown in (257–260):

- (257)  $\text{?i}-\sqrt{c}\acute{a}x^w\bullet c\acute{e}x^w=\acute{c}-\acute{w}-n$   
 IMPF- $\sqrt{\text{drip}}\bullet\text{RDUP}=\text{water-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   
 ‘drip continuously’ (NB.mdk19670519.23)

- (258)  $\sqrt{l}\acute{a}k^w\bullet l\acute{a}k^w+\acute{c}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{fall}}\bullet\text{RDUP}+2.\text{SG.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘you might fall’ (NB.mdk19670519.42)

- (259)  $s-\sqrt{y}i\acute{l}\bullet y\acute{i}l-i\text{?}$   
 NOM- $\sqrt{\text{walk}}\bullet\text{RDUP-INTNS.DISTR}$   
 ‘walking around’ (NB.cs19670405.238)

- (260)  $\sqrt{h}i\acute{l}u-\emptyset$                        $\text{?}\acute{a}-s-\sqrt{c}\acute{u}t\bullet\text{cut}-\emptyset$   
 $\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF}}$      $2.\text{SG.POSV-NOM-}\sqrt{\text{say}}\bullet\text{RDUP-3.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘don’t be saying those things!’ (IS.mdk19781014.245)

Another and for Salish uncharacteristically complex form is  $\bullet\text{CVCVC}$ , a full-root reduplication. This is sometimes accompanied by post-tonic glottalization in the root portion, cf. certain types of diminutive (Section 11) and plural (Section 9) marking. The meaning conveyed seems to be an aspect-like ‘intermittent action’. This kind of reduplication, and the words involved in it, may be borrowings from Chinookan; certainly the  $\text{CVC}\acute{V}C$  roots involved are larger and far rarer than the CVC and CVCC forms typical of  $\acute{l}\acute{a}w\acute{a}l\acute{m}\acute{a}\acute{s}$ . Several examples of this distinctive form are given in (261–265):

- (261) √čəpáʔx•čəpəx-w-n  
√lightning•RDUP-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘it’s lightning off and on’ (NB.mdk19670502.54)
- (262) t-√xəpáp•xəpap  
PERF-√/?•RDUP  
‘hand-car on a railroad’ (BC.mdk19670511.3)
- (263) √yəx<sup>w</sup>áx<sup>w</sup>•yəx<sup>w</sup>ax<sup>w</sup>-w-n  
√light(?)•RDUP-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘blinking lights’ (NB.cs19670731.1245)
- (264) ʔi-√xəpə́q•xəpə́q-w-n  
IMPF-√strike•RDUP-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘they [stones] always strike together’ (CC.fbQoneqone5.9)
- (265) √čiyáʔs•čiyaʔs  
√robin(?)•RDUP  
‘robin’ (LH.cs19670619.214)

## 17 Evidentials (LCLP)

Not identified in previous work, but fairly prominent in the data, are several forms that seem to optionally interpose a speaker’s attitude toward the veracity of a statement. The shades of meaning among these evidentials are as yet not totally clear. Just one evidential can occur per proposition. All have so far been found only in declarative mood. All but one are unstressed postposed particles (or perhaps enclitics) following a predicative phonological word; the odd one out is a stressed root.

One of the particles, ʔi, functions similarly to irrealis mood: it indicates a state of affairs that the speaker is portraying as possible, rather than claiming it to have actually happened. Examples are shown in (266, 267):

- (266) √šán      √cút-n ʔi  
√there    √say-3.SUBJ.IMPF EVID.IRR  
‘before he spoke’ (NB.mdk19670426.45)
- (267) √šá[···]n      uʔ    ʔi  
√there[INTNS]    CPLET EVID.IRR  
‘for ages and ages’ (NB.mdk19670502.6)

We do not analyze ʔi as a mood marker but as an evidential, because its use seems so infrequent that it could not possibly be obligatory. Mechanisms for conveying irrealis mood marking per se are not yet clear to us, though we expect future research to improve our understanding of them.



There is also an evidential, *ɣána*, which quite clearly conveys a sense of a speaker's surprise at an unexpected state of things. Examples are given in (268–271):

(268) ʔú      √nú?              ɣána?  
oh      √2.SG.PRED      EVID.SURPR  
'Oh, it's you.'  
(NB.mdk19670601.639)

(269) ʔú      √ʔəláp              ɣána?  
oh      √2.PL.PRED      EVID.SURPR  
'Oh, it's you folks.'  
(NB.mdk19670601.640)

(270) t-√wáy-n-Ø                              ɣána?  
PERF-√leave-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF      EVID.SURPR  
'he left (something)...'  
(NB.mdk19670519.460)

(271) t-√x<sup>w</sup>íc-m-əc-Ø                              ɣána?  
PERF-√go.ahead-MDL.PERF-1.SG.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF      EVID.SURPR  
'they go ahead of me they' (?)  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone4.1)

Another item, the root √šák<sup>w</sup>, seems to have hearsay evidential force (compare the strategy for quoting speech, Section 26), as shown in (272–276):

(272) √tám      √šák<sup>w</sup>-s  
√what      √EVID.HEAR-3.SUBJ.PERF  
'what is it?; what did you say?'  
(NB.mdk19670601.36)

(273) √śán      √šák<sup>w</sup>-s  
√where      √EVID.HEAR-3.SUBJ.PERF  
'where is it?'  
(NB.mdk19670601.43)

(274) √wát      √šák<sup>w</sup>-s  
√who      √EVID.HEAR-3.SUBJ.PERF  
'who is it?'  
(NB.mdk19670601.46)

(275) √śán      √šák<sup>w</sup>      (ʔə)c-√wíʔ-ns  
√there      √EVID.HEAR      ST-√COP-3.POSV  
'he lives there'  
(NB.mdk19670601.70)

(276) √šák<sup>w</sup>              s-√q<sup>w</sup>íł  
√EVID.HEAR      NOM-√blood  
'this looks like blood'  
(NB.cs19670405.82)

The evidentials can be seen as functioning modally (cf. Section 7).

## 18 Conjunctions (LCLP)

At least two conjunctions are evident in the data. There is a conditional, *ʔámu*, usually glossed as ‘if; when’, shown in (277, 278):

(277) ʔámu     √čólš-m=ínč-n                             √ćáwł...  
if            √enter-MDL.PERF=inside(?)-3.SUBJ.IMP    √spring.salmon...  
‘If he goes into weir the spring salmon...’   (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.8)

(278) ʔámu     √ł       √cút-Ø                             √xʷəní•xʷəni...  
if            √FUT   √say-3.SUBJ.PERF    √Qoneqone...  
‘If he speaks Qone’qonē...’                             (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.63)

There is also a coordinating conjunction *či*, ‘and’. Any limits on which kinds of units can be joined by this word are not yet known. It is possible that verbs/predicates cannot be conjoined with it, because *łəwálməš* uses apparent ‘serial-verb constructions’ (see below, Section 25). Certainly a noun can be joined to another noun, or a numeral to another numeral, with it, as seen in (280, 281):

(279) √xʷəní•xʷəni   či       ʔi-s- [*sic*] ti s-√qʷáy=łń-s  
√Qoneqone       and   3.NONF.POSV  
‘Qone’qonē and his children.’                             (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.41)

(280) √cəm=túmš   či       t √páw  
√two=ten       and   INDEF √one  
‘21’   (?? .me188?.607)

## 19 Articles (LCLP)

The optional uninflected article is a determiner preceding the noun it modifies. These *łəwálməš* particles have non-feminine and feminine gender, which is typical for Coast Salish languages, though it is so far unclear whether feminine is consistently distinguished. Number is not distinguished, but there are definite and indefinite articles, and we hypothesize that there is at least a proximal/distal distinction as well. The indefinite article lacks all the preceding distinctions, however. An article can optionally precede any possessed nominal (Section 8.3). More work needs to be done to understand how the article system works. Table 7 shows the paradigm we have identified so far:

**Table 7** Articles

	<b>DEF</b>	<b>INDEF</b>
<b>NONF/default</b>	<i>tit</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>ti</i>	

	DEF	INDEF
	<i>ta/tə</i>	
FEM	<i>təc</i>	

Examples of these forms are shown in (281–285):

- (281)  $\sqrt{h}ic-w-n$  tat  $\sqrt{x}á?aq$   
 $\sqrt{grow-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$  DEF.NONF  $\sqrt{child}$   
‘he grows that child’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone6.5)
- (282)  $\sqrt{x}wəlá?$  tit  $\sqrt{q}ál$   
 $\sqrt{warm}$  DEF.NONF  $\sqrt{water}$   
‘this water is warm’ (NB.cs19670731.1135)
- (283) tit  $\sqrt{h}óccəč+čn$  † ti  $\sqrt{?}íləš$   
DEF.NONF  $\sqrt{dream+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF}$  ? DEF.NONF  $\sqrt{last.night}$   
‘I dreamed last night’ (NB.mdk19670519.369)
- (284)  $\sqrt{q}ələš$  təc  $\sqrt{x}wú?k^w$   
 $\sqrt{poor}$  DEF.FEM  $\sqrt{child}$   
‘poor little girl!’ (NB.cs19670731.1113)
- (285)  $\sqrt{h}əč$  ta  $\sqrt{h}áqsn$  † t  $\sqrt{l}apúm$   
 $\sqrt{full}$  DEF.NONF  $\sqrt{box}$  ? INDEF  $\sqrt{apple}$   
‘a box full of apples’ (NB.cs19670512.333)

For the apparent use of the INDEF form to signal attribution, see Section 22.

It is unclear to us so far whether the articles are restricted to items interpretable as nominals. More research is needed to clarify the significance of non-nominalized examples like (286):

- (286) tit  $?i-\sqrt{ciq}^w=ús-n$   
DEF.NONF IMPF- $\sqrt{dig}$ =round.thing-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘clam-digging’ (NB.cs19670512.55)

The preceding seems to us probably comparable with (287), which shows the expected overtly nominal form of the (borrowed English) verb:

- (287) tit  $s-?i-\sqrt{h}untin'+ti?$   
DEF.NONF NOM-IMPF- $\sqrt{h}untin'+PL$   
‘he [sic] was hunting all the time—they get a lot of game’  
(NB.mdk19670426.4)

## 20 Demonstratives (LCLP)

The demonstratives embody distinctions similar to those observed of the articles: two genders and four degrees of distance (proximal, medial, distal, and non-visible). However, all of the demonstratives are definite. We tentatively observe that demonstrative use is rare in the earliest sources, but frequent in the latest. The paradigm we have been able to piece together is shown in Table 8:

**Table 8** Demonstratives

	<b>PROX</b>	<b>MEDL</b>	<b>DIST</b>	<b>NVIS</b>
<b>NONF</b>	√ <i>tíʔn</i>	√ <i>tísʔn</i> , √ <i>tíšʔn</i> , √ <i>tísaʔn</i>	√ <i>táʔn</i>	√ <i>táʔn</i>
<b>FEM</b>	√ <i>cíʔn</i>	√ <i>císʔn</i>	√ <i>cəláʔn</i>	?

Examples of these forms are shown in (288–292):

- (288) √*kʷəl-áʔ-n*                      √*tíʔn*                      *tit*                      √*qál*  
 √pour-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF    √DEM.NONF.PROX    DEF.NONF    √water  
 ‘pour this water out!’                      (NB.cs19670731.1137)
- (289) √*ʔi-šəxʷ-aʔ*                      √*tísʔn*  
 √come-CAUS-MOT-IMPER    √DEM.NONF.MEDL  
 ‘bring that here!’                      (NB.cs19670512.311)
- (290) ʔə-√*čít+na*                      √*táʔn*  
 2.SG.POSV-√older.brother+Q    √DEM.NONF.DIST  
 ‘is that your older brother?’                      (NB.mdk19670524.523)
- (291) ʔi-√*xíl-məl-n+na*                      √*táʔn*  
 IMPF-√do.so-IMPL.TR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+Q    √DEM.NONF.NVIS  
 ‘Is that man working?’                      (NB.mdk19670601.649)
- (292) √*cíʔn*  
 √DEM.FEM.PROX  
 ‘this one (reference to females)’                      (NB.cs19670405.148)

Contrastive/topical (?) forms are available too, distinguishing just two degrees of distance (proximal versus distal). These are formed by compounding with a following, unstressed form of a location adverb, √*šíʔ* ‘here’ or √*šn* (reduced from √*šán*) ‘there’. This paradigm is shown in Table 9:



- (297) lǎt √čəpəq  
 very √strong  
 ‘a very strong (man)’ (NB.cs19670626.975)
- (298) (ti) √nác-ýəq  
 DEF.NONF √long.time-INCH  
 ‘a long time’ (NB.cs19670731.1235)
- (299) √táʔx<sup>w</sup>  
 √far  
 ‘far’ (NB.cs196704045.145)
- (300) túl √táʔx<sup>w</sup>  
 from √far  
 ‘from far away’ (NB.cs196704045.146)
- (301) túl √šiʔ  
 from √here  
 ‘from “this” direction’ (NB.cs19670626.1023)
- (302) túl √šəʔ  
 from √there  
 ‘from “that” direction’ (NB.cs19670626.1024)
- (303) √lúk<sup>w</sup>  
 √up  
 ‘up/high’ (NB.cs19670405.142)
- (304) √táʔp  
 √down  
 ‘down/low’ (NB.cs19670405.143)
- (305) √ʔis-n √šqatínim  
 √come-3.SUBJ.IMPF √this.way  
 ‘this way’ [towards here] (NB.mdk19670601.667)

The locative deictics √šiʔ and √šiʔ•šiʔ ‘here’ and √táʔ<sup>w</sup> ‘there’, as well as √ʔáʔta ‘now’, are also used like discourse particles (LCLP), if we can judge by the English translations supplied by speakers. These uses imply the event’s connection with the broader context of the utterance. Examples are shown in (306–309):

- (306) √ʔáлта      √šíʔ      ʔi-√túls-ẁ-n  
 √now      √here      IMPF-√rain-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘It’s raining now.’ (literally ‘Now here it’s raining.’)  
 (NB.cs19670626.1027)
- (307) √šíʔ      ʔəc-√čín-s      √sút-məl-n  
 here      ST-√want-3.POSV      √vomit-IMPL.TR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
 ‘I’m going to vomit.’ (literally ‘Here [what] it wants [is] to vomit.’)  
 (NB.mdk19670519.582)
- (308) √łák<sup>w</sup>      √tísʔn  
 √there      √DEM.NONF.MEDL  
 ‘that there’  
 (NB.mdk19670601.657)
- (309) √łák<sup>w</sup>      √łáq<sup>w</sup>      √ʔáлта  
 √there      √good      √now  
 ‘That’s just right’  
 (NB.cs19670626.1065)

For these words’ use in generating ‘contrastive’/topical demonstratives, see Table 9ff. at Section 20.

One sign of the existence of a class of adverbs is that these are not e.g. aspectual: each occurs freely with imperfectives and perfectives, as seen in the examples. Another characteristic of this word class is that adverbial words in Lower Chehalis, as in most languages, have some freedom to come before the verb or after it, as seen in (310, 311):

- (310) √ʔáлта      ʔi-√muláq-mət-m  
 √now      IMPF-√springtime-MDL.IMPF-MDL.PERF  
 ‘Spring is here’  
 (NB.cs19670626.1057)
- (311) ʔi-√muláq-mət-m      √ʔáлта  
 IMPF-√springtime-MDL.IMPF-MDL.PERF      √now  
 ‘The weather is starting to get nice’  
 (NB.cs19670626.1058)

Some arguably adverbial concepts, however, are expressed affixally, as in the prefix *ta-* ‘again’ in (312):

- (312) ta-√k<sup>w</sup>ənát-n-Ø      ta      √páw  
 again-√take-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF      DEF.NONF      √one  
 ‘again he takes one’  
 (CC.fb1890Qoneqone7.1)
- (313) ta-tx<sup>w</sup>-√čəlóq-n-s  
 again-TRSL-√break.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
 ‘again it breaks’ [sic]  
 (CC.fb1890Qoneqone7.2)

It can be argued also that some of the reduplications (Section 16) have adverbial force.

## 22 Adjectives (LCLP)

There is evidence for a separate adjectival word class. It may be a small class, as in many of the world's languages (Payne 1997:63ff). One distinctly adjectival trait in łəwálməš is that they (but perhaps not adverbs) can appear in different degrees. The base degree is of course the unmodified adjective. The comparative is so far unattested, but the base form preceded by the word síw indicates excessive degree ('too...', sometimes translated by elder speakers as 'very') and presumably the superlative, as in (314, 315):

(314) √x<sup>w</sup>áĭ síw √qapás tit √qáĭ  
 √very too √salty DEF.NONF √water  
 'There's too much salt in this water.' (NB.cs19670626.1056)

(315) síw √ĭúĭ<sup>w</sup>  
 too √high  
 'too high' (NB.cs19670626.1063)

Adjectives can be modified by intensives, like x<sup>w</sup>áĭ or -(ə)ĭ 'very', as in (316):

(316) √nax<sup>w</sup>á-ĭ+na  
 √right-INTNS+Q  
 'Is that right?' (NB.cs19670512.62)

Color adjectives are the only words that can take the lexical prefix čs= 'color', as seen in (317–320):

(317) čs=√náq  
 color=√black  
 'black' (NB.cs19670405.91)

(318) čs=√k<sup>w</sup>íq  
 color=√green  
 'green' (NB.cs19670405.92)

(319) čs=√ćíq  
 color=√red  
 'red' (NB.cs19670405.93)

(320) čs=√ĭáĭ<sup>w</sup>  
 color=√white  
 'white' (NB.cs19670405.94)



When modifying a noun, quite often an attributive (this includes numerals) is followed first by the indefinite article *t* and then the noun. This is true even with definite nouns. Examples are shown in (321–323):

(321) √łúk<sup>w</sup> t √ʔáɫəs  
 √high INDEF √chief  
 ‘God’ (NB.cs19670626.1165)

(322) √sál t √yónəs  
 √two INDEF √tooth  
 ‘two teeth’ (NB.cs19670405.65)

(323) √x<sup>w</sup>úk<sup>w</sup> t √xáš  
 √small INDEF √house  
 ‘a small house’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.2)

More research is needed in order to determine conditions governing this article’s use or absence in attribution.

Our preliminary impression is that adjectives behave differently from other roots also in being aspectless. That is, we have not noted adjectives with overt aspect morphology per se attached. We do not interpret this absence as -Ø 3.SUBJ.PERF marking, since it does not alternate with other person/perfective marking.

### 23 Prepositions (LCLP)

There seem to be just a couple of very basic prepositions. The ones identified so far are exemplified in (324, 325):

(324) tuɫ √nám.s-√cač  
 from √finished.NOM-√??  
 ‘Shoalwater Bay; being from the Lower Chehalis tribe’  
 (NB.mdk19670524.569)

(325) q<sup>w</sup>ím ʔi-√qíč-ŵ-n+ti?  
 just IMPF-√play.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL  
 nu? ɪ tat √qál  
 in PREP? DEF.NONF √water  
 ‘they’re just playing in that water’ (NB.mdk19670524.561)

Similar to those verbs that imply a direct-object argument (cf. 141–146 under Section 8.2), some verbs imply a locational goal. Thus an overt locational functional item (preposition or relative meaning ‘where’) need not be used with such verbs, as in (326, 327), where the potential site of a preposition is indicated by an underlined blank:

- (326)  $\sqrt{k^wax^w}$ -š-n \_\_\_\_\_  $\text{ʔi-}\sqrt{xəpəq} \bullet xəpəq$ -w-n  
 $\sqrt{\text{reach-APPL-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$  \_\_\_\_\_  $\text{IMPF-}\sqrt{\text{strike}} \bullet \text{RDUP-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   
 $\sqrt{\dot{q}áys}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{stone}}$   
‘they arrive where they always strike together stones’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone6.1)
- (327)  $\sqrt{yílxt}$ -n \_\_\_\_\_ t \_\_\_\_\_  $\sqrt{máq^wm}$   
 $\sqrt{\text{arrive-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$  \_\_\_\_\_ INDEF  $\sqrt{\text{prairie}}$   
‘they arrive at a prairie’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone4.2)

## 24 Interjections (LCLP)

We understand the interjections as ellipses, substitutes for saying an entire sentence. Almost all are of simplex form. They are exemplified in (328–341):

- (328)  $\text{ʔá}$   
oh  
‘oh’ / ‘yes’ (CW.cs19670720.814)
- (329)  $náx^w$   
yes  
‘yes’ / ‘indeed’ (NB.cs19670405.255)
- (330)  $hílu$   
NEG  
‘no’ (CW.cs19670720.813)
- (331)  $mílt$   
NEG  
‘no’ (CW.cs19670720.812)
- (332)  $mílt$ -n  
NEG-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘do not’ (EO.cs19670720.718)
- (333)  $wík$   
NEG  
‘no; enough’ (NB.cs19670615.872)
- (334)  $\dot{\lambda}áx^w$   
NEG  
‘no’ (NB.cs19670426.42)

- (335) hí           ʔi-√q̣<sup>w</sup>ú-ḡəq-ñš  
hey(?) IMPF-√belch-INCH-1.SG.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘here! excuse me! I’m belching.’ (NB.mdk19670601.20)
- (336) cú           √yá<sup>k</sup>w-ł+čł!  
HORT √move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF  
‘Up! Let us move!’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.9)
- (337) ʔú           √míłtan-Ø           t           √wí-t-s (?) ...  
oh       √NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF INDEF √COP-(?)-3.SUBJ.?? ...  
‘O not so...’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.1)
- (338) ʔúhaʔa  
my.goodness  
‘my goodness’ (NB.cs19670405.114)
- (339) híhaʔa  
my.goodness  
‘my goodness’ (NB.mdk19670502.7)
- (340) húłi  
?  
‘?’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.3)
- (341) ʔəsqaʔ  
thank.you  
‘thank you’ (CW.cs19670720.811)

## 25 Serial verb constructions (LCLP)

In łəwálməš frequently a series of predicates runs together as serial verbs, a phenomenon that has been discussed only a little in the Salish literature. Kroeber briefly notes a ‘serial-verb-like’ construction in Cowichan (1999:170fn), and his examples of prepositionlike verbs at pp.46–47 look serial-like although they are not discussed in that light, but the majority of discussion is in the work of Gerdts and Kiyosawa, effectively summarized in their 2010 book. The single study known to us of Salish serial verbs is Montler (2008) on Klallam. In other words those sequences of verbs all are in the same clause, i.e. without conjunctions, complementizers, or prepositions joining them; they are identical in subject, aspect, tense and mood (and perhaps usually in voice). Some examples are shown in (342–344), where seeming serial conjoining is indicated by the ligature ◡:

- (342)  $\sqrt{?}is-n$   $\sqrt{?}úcət-ẉ-n$   
 $\sqrt{come-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   $\sqrt{enter-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   
 ‘she come [and] enters’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone10.10)
- (343)  $x^wát•\sqrt{x^w}ətəq-a?$   $\sqrt{č}əq^w-I-a?$   $\sqrt{p}ək^w=čəp-a?$   
 RDUP• $\sqrt{jump-IMPER}$   $\sqrt{get.up-INTNS-IMPER}$   $\sqrt{ignite=fire-IMPER}$   
 ‘hurry up, get up, and make a fire!’ (NB.cs19670615.868)
- (344)  $\sqrt{?}áлта$   $\sqrt{x^w}ə\dot{\lambda}-n$   $\sqrt{?}i-\sqrt{pamás-ýəq-n}$   
 now  $\sqrt{very-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   $\sqrt{IMPF-\sqrt{cold-INCH-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}$   
 ‘the days are getting colder’ (NB.cs19670712.386)

Some adverbs such as  $\sqrt{x^w}ə\dot{\lambda}$  above are apparently optionally inflected, in which case they form serial-verb constructions with the verbs they modify. Any limitations on the kinds of verbs that can be involved in serial verb constructions remain to be investigated in further research.

## 26 Quoted speech (LCLP)

To quote someone’s speech, a verb of speaking is followed by the exact words that the quotee said, as in (345, 346):

- (345)  $\sqrt{c}ún-təl-n$   $\sqrt{c}ást-a?-l$   $t_i$   
 $\sqrt{say-1.PL.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF}$   $\sqrt{straighten-IMPER-PL}$  DEF.NONF  
 $\sqrt{w}í+čł...$   
 $\sqrt{c}anoe+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF...$   
 ‘he says to us, “make straight our canoe...”’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.1)
- (346)  $\sqrt{p}áw t$   $s-\sqrt{k}^wəł$   $\sqrt{c}únt-n$   $t_i$   
 $\sqrt{one INDEF}$  NOM- $\sqrt{day}$   $\sqrt{say-3.SUBJ.PERF}$  DEF.NONF  
 $s-\sqrt{qəx}=áy=łn-s$   $cú$   
 NOM- $\sqrt{lots.of=STEMX=child-3.POSV}$  HORT  
 $\sqrt{y}ə\dot{k}^w-I+čł$   
 $\sqrt{move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}$   
 ‘one day he says to his children, “Up! Let us move!”’  
 (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.9)

This can be contrasted with the uses of the hearsay evidential  $\dot{s}ək^w$  (Section 17).

## 27 Conclusion

We have added numerous observations to the known picture of  $łəwálməš$ . The delineation of what is known and what still needs research makes our

understanding of the language significantly more nuanced and allowing us to pursue vigorous revitalization.

## 27.1 Summary of findings

Our broadest assessments include the existence of significant Chinookan and Chinook Jargon, and probably limited Central Coast Salish, borrowing and the filling of numerous paradigmatic and observational gaps. Our specific new observations include:

- Observations on root-shape tendencies.
- Aspect:
  - The fundamental status of the imperfective/perfective split.
  - The stative and the newly identified completive are subtypes of perfective.
  - Non-aspectual forms:
    - The suffix *-əʔ* seems to be an intensifier rather than a perfective.
    - The transitional and inchoative (we show likely allomorphs of the latter) are not aspectual.
  - Certain reduplicative templates may be aspectual.
- We have established tense marking for the first time.
- Voice marking:
  - There is a ‘causative’ which has two subtypes, causative proper and ‘causative of motion’.
  - The passive is apparently restricted to perfectives.
  - There are imperfective versus perfective subtypes of relational marking.
- Polarity:
  - We present the first explicit discussion of positive polarity marking.
  - Negation operates at either a predicate level or interjectionally; there are multiple synonymous negative operators.
- Mood:
  - We point out the mood distinctions in the language.
  - The declarative is tantamount to realis.
  - The interrogative has polar and content subtypes.
  - The imperative is conveyed by multiple strategies depending on person and other factors.
- Person (and number) marking:
  - Filling in formerly mostly-deficient paradigms.
  - There are alternate forms for some items.
  - There exist both a number-unspecified third person and of a third-person plural marker, the latter having clitic status and being restricted to animate subjects.
  - There is a reciprocal marker.
- An odd vocalic reduplication signifies plural number.

- The basic gender distinction is between a feminine of limited occurrence and a pervasive nonfeminine.
- A frequently used category is ‘intensive’ marking, with at least three forms, one of them a sort of distributive.
- We give the first list of lexical suffixes for this language, and are the first to identify two similar categories: lexical prefixes and a lexical circumfix.
- There exist both compounding and numerous types of reduplication.
- Certain word classes are briefly noted for the first time: evidentials, conjunctions, articles and demonstratives.
- The distinguishing behavior of two important classes, adverbs and adjectives, is surveyed.
- We also introduce prepositions, interjections, and serial-verb constructions, the latter a fairly novel idea in the Salish literature.
- We end with a glance at quoted speech.

## 27.2 Future research

The findings of this study point to the need for numerous specific avenues of continued related research:

- Prosody in general; specifically that of compounds and of main versus subordinate clauses.
- The possible distinctions of meaning and function among the various imperfective aspect markers.
- The range of functions of the ‘causative’, including the potential connections between the ‘causative of motion’ and the middle and applicative voices.
- The expression of irrealis mood.
- Whether imperatives can have imperfective aspect.
- Functions of newly identified variant person/number markers, and variation in the relative ordering of subject and object markers.
- Probable differences in meaning among the several intensifiers.
- The pragmatic/discourse uses of *xʷə́ʔ* ‘very’.
- The meanings and phonological behavior of the lexical affixes.
- Meanings of the various reduplications.
- Whether adverbs, like adjectives, can take comparative and other degrees.
- Restrictions on verbs involved in serial verb constructions.
- The function of expressions joining definite articles with non-nominalized predicates
- Conditions governing the use and non-use of the indefinite article in attributive expressions.

The Lower Chehalis Language Project also anticipates producing general phonetic and phonological analyses of *ləwálməš*. Many relevant observations have been given in passing in this document, which can be added to those of Snow (1969) to provide a more extensive treatment of this language’s sounds. It is likely

that significant findings will emerge. For example, we suspect that vowel length may actually not be contrastive (counter to Kinkade's impression and different from e.g. Cowlitz), and that an examination of prosody will contribute useful insights about compounds, main versus subordinate clauses, and so on.

We also look forward to describing the syntax of ləwálməš, and the formation of connected speech (discourse), so that learners can begin creating sentences to say what they need to say.

We intend also to show the structure of the lexicon. In practical terms, this means we can produce a working dictionary of ləwálməš at any point in our work process. A major goal is to compile all the information we have found about the language into a substantial book-format dictionary, as has been done for the closely related Cowlitz and Upper Chehalis (Kinkade 1991, 2004).

We expect to document apparent issues of consistent Chinookan influence on the grammar and lexicon as well as possibly phonology, reflecting the reality that the ancestors usually were good at speaking several languages. This interlanguage influence is apparent in our data on scales from nonce code-switches to pervasive grammatical change.

In addition, and of real heritage interest for the local community, we predict that the present project will extend to reveal significant information about the under-studied role of Lower Chehalis in the initial formation of Chinook Jargon. This last topic has begun to be addressed from the lexical standpoint by Kinkade and Powell (2010), but we believe a broader approach is likely to result in greater insights. We envision for example a pragmatic study of what speakers considered a 'citation form'. That is, we wonder which words could be and were uttered in isolation – either in answer to an outsider, or to tell that person how to say a certain concept in ləwálməš. We anticipate substantial benefits to pidgin/creole studies of a deepened understanding about this non-Indo-European lexified contact medium's history.

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2006). Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb constructions*, 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2013). Possession and ownership: A cross linguistic perspective. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Possession and ownership: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–64. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Explorations in Linguistic Typology: 6.)
- Bates, Dawn, Thom Hess, and Vi Hilbert. (1994). *Lushootseed dictionary*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Boas, Franz. (1904). The vocabulary of the Chinook language. *American Anthropologist New Series* 6:118–147.
- Boas, Franz. (1989). A Franz Boas reader: The shaping of American anthropology, 1883–1911. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. (2012). Chinuk Wawa: Kakwa nsayka ulman-tilixam laska munk-kəmtəks nsayka / As our elders teach us to speak it. Grand Ronde, OR: Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde.
- Curtis, Edward S. (1907–1930). The North American Indian: Being a series of volumes picturing and describing the Indians of the United States, the Dominion of Canada, and Alaska. 20 vols. Norwood, MA: Plimpton Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hajda, Yvonne. (1990). Southwestern Coast Salish. Pp. 502–517 in Suttles, Wayne (ed.), *Northwest Coast*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution. (Handbook of North American Indians, volume 7.)
- Hale, Horatio. (1846). Ethnography and philology. Vol. 6 of United States Exploring Expedition during the years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard.
- Hukari, Thomas E. (1981). Some phonological problems in the Cowichan *l*-infix plural. *Papers of the International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*.
- Jacobs, Peter. (2012). Vowel harmony and schwa strengthening in Skwxw7mesh. Pp. 99–147 in Dunham, Joel, John Lyon and Natalie Weber (eds.), *Papers for the 47<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*. (University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, volume 32.)
- Kinkade, M. Dale. (1979). Preliminary notes on Lower Chehalis (łəwálməš) morphology. Papers of the fourteenth International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. (1991). *Upper Chehalis dictionary*. Missoula, MT: University of Montana. (University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 7.)
- Kinkade, M. Dale. (2004). *Cowlitz dictionary and grammatical sketch*. Missoula, MT: University of Montana. (University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 18.)
- Kinkade, M. Dale and Jay Powell. (2010). And now, finally, the last word on the Lower Chehalis loanwords into Chinook Jargon. Pp. 197–203 of Beck, David (ed.), *A Festschrift for Thomas M. Hess on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Bellingham, WA: Whatcom Museum. (Whatcom Museum Publications No. 21.)
- Kiyosawa, Kaoru and Donna B. Gerds. (2010). *Salish applicatives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kroeber, Paul. (1999). *The Salish language family: Reconstructing syntax*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (Studies in the Anthropology of North American Indians Series.)



- Kuipers, Aert. (2003). *Salish etymological dictionary*. Missoula, MT: University of Montana. (University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 16.)
- Montler, Timothy. (1991). *Saanich, North Straits Salish: Classified word list*. Hull, QC: Canadian Museum of Civilization. (Canadian Ethnology Service Paper No. 119, Mercury Series.)
- Montler, Timothy. (2008). Serial verbs and complex paths in Klallam. *Northwest Journal of Linguistics* 2(2):1–26.
- Mounce, William D. (1994). *The morphology of Biblical Greek: A companion to basics of Biblical Greek and the analytical lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Payne, Thomas E. (1997). *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, David. (2011). *Kamloops Chinuk Wawa, Chinuk pipa, and the vitality of pidgins*. PhD dissertation, University of Victoria.
- Robertson, David. (2014). *Ethnohistorical dictionary of Kamloops Chinuk Wawa*. Ms. in author's possession.
- Root, Matthew [research assistant to Dr. Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins]. (2003). *Untitled [Selected łəwálməš word lists and a text, recorded by Franz Boas]*. University of Victoria, Department of Linguistics.
- Scouler, John. (1841). Observations on the indigenous tribes of the N.W. Coast of America. *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 11:215–251.
- Sloat, Clarence D. (1972). Vowel harmony in Coeur d'Alene. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 38:234–239.
- Snow, Charles. (1969). *A Lower Chehalis phonology*. MA thesis, University of Kansas.
- Swan, James G. (1857). *The northwest coast: Or, three years' residence in Washington Territory*. New York: Harper.
- Swanton, John R. (1900). Morphology of the Chinook verb. *American Anthropologist* 2(2):199–237.
- Van Eijk, Jan P. (2008). A bibliography of Salish linguistics. *Northwest Journal of Linguistics* 2(3):1–128.