The two particles "ga" in Mainland Comox

John Hamilton Davis
Bellingham, Washington

This paper presents three discourse contexts (imperative, statement, question) of the discourse particle "ga" and gives evidence that "ga" has the same rhetorical force in all three contexts. Then the subordinating particle "ga" is discussed and contrasted with "'ot", both of which are translated as "if" in English. After that, two of the transitivizing suffixes are compared and explained. Because the purpose of this paper is to discuss discourse context, grammatical analyses are relegated to paragraphs with wider margins.

1   Discourse particles

When speaking any language, there are ways to indicate the intended tone of the discourse. If you have listened to interviews on the news media, you will have heard the interviewer asking a question such as, "Why did you become a linguist?" and you will have heard the interviewee answer "I guess …" or "I think …" The interviewee knows very well why (s)he became a linguist. The answer is introduced by the phrase "I think" to make the statement friendlier, less confrontational. Another example is the use of "you know" in conversation, meaning "Do you know (or understand) what I'm saying?" English is full of such phrases intended to indicate the attitude of the speaker. You will be able to think of many more phrases and circumlocutions.

German has discourse particles, such as "gar", "mal", "schon", "wohl", and "zwar" to indicate the tone of discourse. Discourse markers occur in many, many languages of the world.

Because the discourse particles in Mainland Comox are phonologically enclitics, the word "enclitic" will also be used to refer to them in this paper.

Mainland Comox, hereinafter called *'Ay'ajothem*, as Bill Galligos called it, has enclitics which serve as discourse markers. This paper presents data to show that the enclitic *ga* [gʌ] is one such marker and is used in many situations which we speakers of English perceive as being disparate contexts.

The word *'Ay'ajothem* [ʔayʔaǰoθəm] ~ [ʔayʔaǰuθəm] has the root *'ey'* /ʔəẏ/ [ʔi:ʔ] "good" with a change of the vowel from schwa to /a/ and a change of the consonant from /ẏ/ to /ǰ/, the lexical suffix *-oth-* "mouth, lips", and the suffix *-em*, which shows that it's a verb. The repeated first syllable shows that

the action is done repeatedly. The literal meaning is "talking properly"; compare the word *'ay'ajigan* [ʔayʔaǰigʌn] "adroit" with the lexical suffix *-igan* meaning here "body".

I am calling the enclitic *ga* (the most common *'Ay'ajothem* discourse particle) the nonconfrontational particle, a name which my late fiancée Rhonda Weir called it after I had described it to her. At that time I was referring to *ga* as the concessive particle. Rhonda's qualification to rename this particle came from her interactions with and observations of her students from many First Nations coastal communities while teaching at Northwest Indian College near Bellingham, Washington.

In 1969 I asked Bill Galligos what *ga* [gʌ] means and he replied, "It's in the language." In other words, it's so frequent that you can hardly speak without using it. Bill Galligos used this enclitic often when speaking.

There are several discourse enclitics in *'Ay'ajothem*, but this paper focuses mainly on the use and rhetorical force of *ga*.

One speaker in 1969 told me that their language has similarities to German, citing the German word *schlecht* [šlɛçt] "bad" which sounded to him like their word *lhex* [ɬʌχ] "bad". Since then, other speakers have expressed interest in similarities between details of *'Ay'ajothem* and details of other languages of the world, apart from English.

Because speakers between 1969 and 1979 volunteered an interest that languages other than English have analogues in their language, I have included references to other languages in this paper.

2 Requests and invitations and polite commands

One noticeable use of *ga* is in requests. It contrasts with the particle *gi* as in the imperative (1) *Hoy gi!* This means "quit it!" and is not considered polite. But when you want someone to stop doing something annoying, you aren't looking to be polite.

The word *hoy* [hoy] means "end, finish" and *gi* [gi] indicates an emphatic imperative.

When I was at Sliammon in 1969 to 1979, I was often invited to sit down, (2) *kwanachem ga*. I was also told by several speakers that a real order "sit down!" would be (3) *kwanachem gi!*

Kwanachem ga [kʷanʌčɪm gʌ] — the root *kwa-* includes the idea of "there"; the suffix *-nach* in this context means "bottom"; the suffix *-em* shows that the word is a verb.

This enclitic is also used for polite requests, as in (4) *kwat ga* "put it down" and (5) *nam'swh ga ot* "leave it (just) like that".

Sentence (4) is *Kwat* is *kwa-* "there" as in *kwanachem* plus the intent transitive suffix *-t*. The intent transitive has been called "control" in some other Salish languages, but this is an inaccurate and misleading label when describing *'Ay'ajothem*, as I pointed out in "Pronominal Paradigms in Sliammon" (1978 ICSL; see also § 10 below). It is also used for an act attempted without success, definitely not under the control of the actor. Sentence (5) *Nam'swh* [namʔsçʷ] is *nam'* "thus" plus the causative suffix *-swh* then *ga* and the discourse particle *ot*, phonologically an enclitic (see § 6 below).

When I was visiting Mrs Mary George in hospital in Vancouver in 2006, she asked me (6) *xanath ga te qa'ya* "give me the water". When I asked her to repeat what she had said, she said (7) *xanath te qa'ya*, then told me that it was more polite with *ga*. This use of *ga* parallels the English use of the word "please".

[χánʌθ gʌ tə qaʔyɛ] — the verb root is *xana-* with the intent transitive suffix *-t* and the first person object suffix *-h* "me"; the two together are pronounced [θ] as in English "tooth". The word for "water" is *qa'ya* and the article is *te*.

If a speaker uses *ga* in conversation and is then asked to repeat the sentence, the speaker's attention is on the full words with dictionary meaning and sometimes the speaker does not repeat the sentence with the discourse particle. The situation is as though speakers are not always fully conscious of this particle, even though they use it constantly.

3   Softening declarative statements

The particle *ga* is also used to avoid making a bald-faced statement, which might be considered confrontational.
When Mrs Mary George told the story of when Christine Harry fainted and fell down, she used the enclitic *ga* in several sentences. This was contrasted in this story with the evidential particle *ch'ia* "apparently" in the sentence (8) *Ey ch'ia ni' jiaq'* "And she must have fallen down there", an event that Mrs Mary George did not personally witness.

This sentence begins with *ey* [i:] "and" followed by *ch'ia* [č̕ʸɛ] "apparently" and *ni'* [nɛʔ] "there" and *jiaq'* [j̓ʸæqʼ] "fall down".

Although in other contexts ga can co-occur with *ch'ia* as in (9) *Chiam' ch'ia ga?* "why?" (What's the apparent reason?)

[čʸɛmʔ čʸɛ gʌ] is *chiam'* "how, where, when, why" and *ch'ia* "apparently" and then *ga*.

In the following sentences, the particle *ga* indicates first person knowledge, but a desire for nonconfrontational statement, much like the English phrase "I think that …" in the first paragraph of this paper. These sentences include (10) *Hotigan sht ga kwanas ho jew'* "We thought she had gone home"

> The first word in this sentence, *hotigan* [hotegan] refers to opinion or perception, consisting of the root *hot* "say" and the suffix *-igan*, sometimes translatable as "side". Next come *sht* "we" followed by *ga* and *kwanas* [kʷʌnʌs] "whether" and *ho* "go" and *jew'* [ǰuʔ] "home(ward)".

and (11) *Ho ga lh pipa'a salhtwh e kw wachawtwh* "Another woman went to the bathroom."

> The first word *ho* "go" is followed by *ga*, then come the article *lh* [ɬ], the number *pipa'a* [pépaʔa] "one/another person" and *salhtwh* [saɬtçʷ] "woman", the preposition *e*, the article *kw*, and the word *wachawtwh* [wʌčʌwtçʷ] "toilet" consisting of the root *wach-* here referring to bodily elimination and the suffix *-awtwh* meaning "house" or "room".

as well as (12) *Hostom ga e kw kwekwtemawtwh* "They took her to hospital".

> The first word *hostom* "take" has the root *ho* "go" followed by the suffix *-sto-*, a variant of the causative suffix *-swh*, and the suffix *-(e)m*, making the verb passive. Following that is *ga* then the preposition and article and the word *kwekwtemawtwh* [kʷʊkʷtʌmʌwtçʷ] with the root *kwekwtem* "sick" and the suffix *-awtwh*.

These were events that Mrs Mary George did personally witness.

Mary George also gave the sentence (13) *Q'agaha ch ga elh hahan 'imash* "I use a cane when I go walking" (She didn't, but this was an example sentence). This sentence is a statement, but rather than being a bald-faced statement of fact, it is softened by *ga*.

> The first word *q'agaha* is the attributive form of *q'aga* "walking stick" followed by "I" and *ga* then the subordinating particle *elh* "when" and *hahan* the form of "I go" required in subordinate clauses and *'imash* [ʔɛmʌš] "walk".

Another statement from Mrs Mary George is (14) *K'weheyeshewh ch ga* "I made too much."

> The first word [ƙʷʌhiyišʊçʷ] can be broken down as *k'weh-* "excess, over" with the suffix *-eyesh* "unexpectedly" plus the result transitive suffix *-ewh* followed by "I" and *ga*. The result transitive has been called "out of control" in some other Salish languages but this is an inaccurate and misleading label when describing *'Ay'ajothem* — the action can be intentional as well as unintentional, done easily or with effort; the context disambiguates the intent and degree of effort (see my 1978 ICSL paper cited above and § 10 below).   The concept of "make" is from the discourse, not explicit in this sentence.

When Tommy Paul told the story of how the people from before were transformed into birds, he used the particle *ga* when telling the moral of the story — (15) *Nam' ga ta'an 'ewk'w sht eyt*   "We're all like that."

> The first word *nam'* here means "thus" then *ta'an* [taʔʌn] "that" followed by *'ewk'w* [ʔuːƙʷ] "all, every" and *sht* "we"; the enclitic *eyt* [iːt], another discourse particle, means "for sure, of course, really" (see § 6 below).

and (16) *Wha' ga* "On the contrary"

> The word *wha'* means "no" but in the context of the story this is a better translation.

and (17) *Gayatem ga tho kw qayiwmewh* "He asks the people (collectively)."

> The first word *gayatem* "invite" has the passive construction *-t* plus *-em* followed by *ga* and *tho* "go" (Franz Boas noted *tho* as "to, toward" (as dative) in *Thalholhtwh* (Island Comox)) then the article *kw* and *qaymewh* with the collective suffix *-iw* before the lexical suffix *-mewh*.

Tommy Paul did not use the enclitic *ga* when telling the main text of this traditional story. Instead, he used the evidential particle *k'we* throughout, as when he introduced the Transformer with the line (18) *Ho k'we 'i'imash pipa'a tumesh* "A man went walking" containing the evidential particle *k'we* "reportedly".

[ho k̓ʷə ʔɛʔɛmʌš pépaʔa tumiš] consists of *ho* "go" plus *k'we* then *'i'imash* "walking" and *pipa'a* "one person" and *tumesh* "man".

In his story of how Thanch kills the Octopus who has been killing the people, Tommy Paul began with (19) *Ni' k'we te pipa'a tumesh* "There is a man" containing the evidential particle *k'we*.

[nɛʔ k̓ʷə tə pépaʔa tumiš] consists of *ni'* "be there, there is" then *k'we* and the article *te* followed by *pipa'a tumesh.*.

When I was visiting Mrs Mary George in hospital in Vancouver in 2006, she said (20) *Q'wach' ch ga* "I belched" in the same context as we would say in English, "Excuse me for belching." When I asked her to repeat this, she repeated it without the *ga*. This may be optional, like "excuse me" can be in English, or it could have been overlooked, as in sentence (7) above.

This is *q'wach'* [qˈʷač̓] "belch" followed by the pronoun *ch* [č] "I" (in independent clauses) and *ga*.

4   Making questions less abrupt

The particle *ga* is also used in questions. According to several speakers in 1969 and 1970, it's more acceptable to ask (21) *Chiam' chwh ga?* "How are you?" (implying "What's wrong with you?") than to ask (22) *Chiam' chwh?* which is more abrupt.

This is *chiam'* [čʸɛmʔ] "how?", "why?" followed by the pronoun *chwh* [čçʷ] "you" and *ga*.

It's also more polite and less abrupt to ask (23) *Gat chwh ga?* "Who are you?" than to say (24) *Gat chwh?*

This is *gat* [gʌt] "who?" plus the vowelless pronoun *chwh* [čçʷ] "you" and *ga*.

Another example is (25) *Tamay ga ti'i?* "what kind of tree is this?"

The first word [tamʌy] consists of *tam* "what?" with the lexical suffix *-ay* "tree" then *ga* and the deictic *ti'i* [tɛʔɛ] "this" as the subject of the sentence.

Others are (26) *Haha chwh ga lheqesh e kw sinku?* "Are you going across the ocean?" which Mrs Mary George asked me in 1970.

> The first word "go" has the question suffix *-a* then "you" and *ga* then *lheqesh* [ɬʌqɛš] "go across" and the preposition *e* (schwa) then the article *kw* and *sinku* [sɛnku] "open ocean". Another word with the question suffix *-a* is *lhaxaga* "Is it no good (now)?" which is [ɬaχaw] "become bad" with *w>g* before the question suffix *-a,* an instance of sandhi [sʌndi]; see also example (39) below.

and (27) *Q'aq'aymita chwh ga kwa'an?* "do you believe it?"

> The first word [q'aq'aymɛtʌ] is CV-*q'ay*- plus -*mit* "toward" (dative) plus the question suffix *-a* followed by "you" and *ga* then *kwa'an* [kʷaʔʌn] "that".

The phrase (28) *'A'jia chwh ot?* means the same as the Japanese question *ogenki desu ka?* and is used in similar contexts. It is a normal greeting, "Are you well?"

> The root of the word [ʔaːɟʸɛçʷʊt] is *'ey'* "good" with the question suffix *-a* followed by *chwh* "you" and the enclitic *ot,* which can sometimes be approximately translated as "even" or "just". "Is it good?" is *a'jia?* [ʔaːɟʸɛ] or *a'jia ot?*

Between 1969 and 1979, the universal answer to *'A'jia chwh ot?* by people who spoke *'Ay'ajothem* every day was (29) *'aa'* [ʔæːʔ] "yes". But a couple of speakers taught me the joking answer (30) *Ta'ata ch ga lhex?* "Am I usually bad?"

> [taʔʌtʌ č gʌ ɬʌχ] is *ta'at* "usually" plus the question suffix *-a* followed by the enclitic *ch* "I" and the nonconfrontational enclitic *ga* and finally the word *lhex* [ɬʌχ] "bad".

Although the daily speakers of *'Ay'ajothem* from 1969 to 1979 always answered "yes" to my greeting, some would accept (31) *'Ey' chian ot* "I'm well", "I'm just fine" as a possible answer. But today's heritage speakers who speak English every day, all day, use this answer and reject "yes" as an answer — this is taken from the English response to the English greeting "How are you?"

> The phrase [ʔiːʔ čʸɛn ot] contains *'ey'* "good" and *chian* "I" and the enclitic *ot* — a proper answer if the question were

really "how are you?" and not "are you well?" The sentence (32) *'Ey' ot kwa'an* "That's (just) fine/good" contains *'ey' ot* without *chian* "I". In 2007 I phoned an acquaintance and asked *'A'jia chwh ot?* The response was a distressed "How can you ask that question?"; everything was going badly.

The parting greeting, said when English speakers would say "goodbye", is (33) *'imahoyga* [ʔɛmʌhóygʌ] containing the particle *ga*. Younger speakers usually pronounce it as (34) *'imawhiga* [ʔɛmʌçʷígʌ], but Bill Galligos, Mrs Mary George, and some other elders pronounced it as *'imahoyga*. The difference is between rapid and careful speech.

The first two syllables are as in the words *'imat* "step on it" and *'imash* "walk" followed by *hoy* "finished" and then *ga*.

5 The same rhetorical force in all three discourse contexts

Request, statement, question — these three different discourse contexts seem quite disparate to a speaker of English, but in *'Ay'ajothem* the enclitic *ga* has the same rhetorical force, the same function, in all three by placing the tone of discourse into a nonconfrontational mode.

6 Table

In addition to the enclitic *ga*, the discourse particles *ot* and *eyt* are seen in this paper. The rhetorical force of the enclitic *ot* is to focus or limit, somewhat like English "just" or "even" as in the above sentences (5), (28), (31), (32), and sentence (41) below. The enclitic *eyt* [i:t] as in (14) *Nam' ga ta'an 'ewk'w sht eyt* asserts the accuracy of a statement. The observed distributions of these three discourse particles along with the other particles presented in this paper are as follows:

	request	statement	question
nonconfrontational	ga	ga	ga
focus	ot	ot	ot
emphatic	—	eyt	—
command	gi	—	—
interrogative	—	—	-a
apparently	—	ch'ia	ch'ia
reportedly	—	k'we	k'we

The enclitic *ga* is mainly discourse particle, but in some discourse contexts it appears to be in opposition to the evidential particles *ch'ia* [č̓ʸɛ] and *k'we* [k̓ʷə], seemingly implying without asserting first-hand knowledge.

41

7   The homophonous subordinating particle

The discourse particle *ga* is homophonous with the subordinating particle *ga* as in Mrs Mary George's sentence (35) *'A'jia ga thahan 'owelh e negey?* "Is it alright if I go in your boat with you?" This translation of English "if" is different from the word *'ot* as in (36) *'Ot chwh qoqo'am, ho e kwishi q'watem* "If (in case) you're thirsty, go over there to the river" in Tommy Paul's story of how Thanch kills the Octopus who has been killing the people.

> Sentence (35) [ʔaːǰʸɛ gʌ θahan ʔowʊɫ ə nɛgi] is *'ey'* "good" with the question suffix followed by the subordinating particle *ga* then *thahan* consisting of *tho* "go" plus *-an* "I" (in subordinate clauses) and *'owelh* "get aboard" plus the preposition schwa and *negey* "you". The word "boat" is not specified; *'owelh* can refer to any vehicle, but "boat" is supplied by the context.
>
> Sentence (36) [ʔot čçʷ qoqoʔam, ho ə kʷiši q'ʷatəm] is introduced by the word *'ot* "if" followed by *chwh* "you" (in independent clauses) then *qoqo* "drink" plus the desiderative suffix *-am* then *ho* "go" followed by the preposition schwa, *kwishi* "over there", and *q'watem* "river".

As illustrated by the two preceding sentences, conditional clauses with the subordinating particle *ga* are intended to be more tentative than those introduced by the full word *'ot*.

The rhetorical force of *ga* versus *'ot* can be shown by paraphrasing the first sentence as "Would it be alright if I were to …" and the second as "Given the fact that you're thirsty …" or "In case you're thirsty …"

In the story of Mink telling his grandmother to put ashes in Dipper Bird's eyes when they were preparing to wrestle, Tommy Paul used the *'ot* subordinator followed by the *ga* subordinator, placing them in contrast one to another (37) *'Ot zem shiatl'achewh, ga shiatl'achewhan …* "If I put him on his back, if I (manage to) put him on his back …"

> [ʔot tθəm šʸæ�ƛ�ʌčʊçʷ] has *'ot* then *zem* [tθəm] "I will" (in independent clauses; historically from *n + səm*) and then *shia-* "upwards" with the lexical suffix *-tl'ach* "belly" and the result transitive suffix *-ewh*.
>
> The clause introduced by the subordinating particle *ga* ends with the suffix *-an*, the form of "I" required in subordinate clauses.

Two examples of subordinate clauses introduced by the particle *ga* having meaning analogous to "in order to" is Mrs Mary George's sentences (38) *Hanam q'atem ti'i ga kwatan* "This is too heavy for me to put over there."

The first sentence [hanʌm q'atəm tɛʔɛ gʌ kʷatʌn] is *hanam* "too", *q'atem* "heavy", *ti'i* "this", and *ga*, then *kwa-* "there" with the intent transitive suffix *-t* and *-an* "I" in subordinate clauses.

and (39) *Ho ch nepesh te* milk, *ga wha'as lhaxagas* "I'm going to put the milk away so it won't go bad" — a purposive subordinate clause, as in (38).

[ho č nʌpiš tə MILK gʌ çʷaʔʌs ɬaχagʌs] is *ho* "go" *č* "I" *nepesh* "put inside" with the subordinate clause introduced by *ga* and then *wha'* "no, not" with the third person suffix *-as* required by the preceding *ga* then *lhaxaw* "go bad" with the change *w > g* before the third person suffix *-as* which is required by the preceding *wha'*.

A similar purposive meaning is in the sentence (40) *Ni'ith chwh ga taman* "Tell me what to do", "Tell me what I should do".

[nɛʔɛθ čçʷ ga tamʌn] is *ni'i-* "tell" plus *-t* plus *-h* "me" then *chwh* "you" followed by *ga* then *tam* "do what" with the suffix *-an* "I" in subordinate clauses.

Another example of the subordinating particle *ga* introducing a purposive clause is seen as Tommy Paul presents the moral of the story of how people from before were transformed into birds. Just as the birds are all different today, today's people are all different. (41) *Negey ot e gayathim ga tamas ga tamomeshawh kweth xatl'* "Even you're (one who's) asked how you want to be."

[nɛgi ot ə gayɛθɛm gʌ tamʌs gʌ tamomišʌçʷ kʷʊθ χaƛ̓] is *negey* "you" plus *ot* "even" and then schwa, here not the preposition but the overt marker of a cleft sentence, then the one-word matrix clause *gaya-* "ask" plus the intent transitive suffix *-t* with the second person object suffix *-hi* and the suffix *-(e)m* (making a passive construction with the preceding *-t*) followed by *ga* then *tam* "what" plus the suffix *-as* required in subordinate clauses followed by the second subordinate clause starting with *ga* introducing *tam* "what" with the lexical suffix *-omesh* "appearance" (historically *-owmesh* — compare Pentlatch *-olmesh*) plus the suffix *-awh* "you" in subordinate clauses and the article *kw* plus *th* "your" (with epenthetic schwa) and *xatl'* "desire".

8   Rhetorical similarity between the two "ga" particles

The nonconfrontational enclitic *ga* might seem to introduce a feeling of tentativeness in some discourse contexts.

The homophonous subordinating particle *ga* introduces subordinate clauses which seem, to a speaker of English, to be unrelated one to another, but which for a full-time native speaker of *'Ay'ajothem* are semantically related in that they describe events which are desired, or purposive, or not yet known, or not yet real, similar to English subjunctive in some contexts. This is not irrealis, which is expressed by the particle *qelh* [qʌɬ], not discussed in this paper.

The contrast between *ga* and *'ot* is in some discourse contexts analogous to the contrast between German *ob* and *wenn* (or *falls*), both translated into English as "if".

9   Translating "ga" versus "'ot" into a European language

When the function of a particle has several English equivalents, that does not mean that there are different functions. Clauses introduced by the subordinating particle *ga* have English translations which seem unrelated one to another, but at least one European language is capable of expressing this unity of rhetorical force. Many Russian clauses with the conditional particle **бы** are parallel with *'Ay'ajothem ga* clauses. Equivalents of the sentences in § 7 are:

translations of *ga* and *'ot* clauses
(35)   Would it be alright if I were to go with you? (with *ga*)
         Было **бы** хорошо, если **бы** я пошёл с Вами?
(36)   If you're thirsty … (with *'ot*)
         Если Вам хочется пить …
(37)   If I throw him while wrestling … (with *'ot*)
         Если я его брошу, во время борьбы …
         If I were to throw him while wrestling … (with *ga*)
         Если **бы** я его бросил во время борьбы …

translations of purposive *ga* clauses
(38)   The load is too heavy for me to carry. (with *ga*)
         Ноша слишком тяжела, что**бы** я её нёс.
(39)   I'll put the milk into the refrigerator so it won't go bad. (with *ga*)
         Я поставлю молоко в холодильник, что**бы** оно не испортилось.
(40)   Tell me what I should do. (with *ga*)
         Скажи мне, что**бы** я сделал.
(41)   He asks you how you want to look/appear. (with *ga*)
         Он спрашивает, как **бы** ты хотел выглядеть.

10   Rhetorical complementarity in transitive suffixes

Sections 7 and 9 have shown the constrast between the two translations of the English word "if", *ga* and *'ot*, by placing them in complementary discourse contexts. Similarly, the contrast between two of the *'Ay'ajothem* transitivizing suffixes, intent and result, can be shown by placing them in complementary discourse contexts.

If this language is to be retained and taught to not-fully-fluent heritage speakers and new language learners, this complementarity must be described in easily understood explanations, with labels that are not only accurate but also used elsewhere in a person's life. That is why I am using the labels "intent" and "result", which are shown to be accurate by the balanced discourse contexts in which they occur.

The contrast between *ga* and *'ot* as shown by Tommy Paul's sentence (37) above *'Ot zem shiatl'achewh, ga shiatl'achewhan* ... "In case I put him belly up, if I put him belly up …" parallels the discourse contexts quoted in the appendix to my paper "Pronominal Paradigms in Sliammon" (1978 ICSL), taken from stories by three language consultants who were born and raised within the Homalco band. These complementary sentences show the overlapping rhetorical force of the intent and result transitivizing suffixes.

The first sentence (here numbered as 42) is *Pakwatas ey pakwewhas* "(Raven) was watching for it and he saw it" from the story of killing the wind told by Noel George Harry, which contrasts intent and result.

> [pakʷʌtʌs i: pakʷʌçʷʌs] consists of the root *pakw-* plus the intent transitive {-T} with the agentive {-as} followed by *ey* "and" then *pakw-* with the result suffix {-NəW}.

The next sentence, told by Ambrose Wilson in the story about the story of T'ichewaxanam [t'ɛčuwáχnʌm] also contrasts the intent {-T} transitive with the result {-NəW} transitive (here numbered as 43) *Hoy ey k'wetem e kw qayiwmewh. Whukwt. Whe chîamas ey k'wenewh chwh.* "Then the people looked. There was nothing. You couldn't see (the scar)."

> [hoy i: ƙʷʌtəm ə kʷ qayɛwmuçʷ. çʷukʷt. çʷʊ čéʌmʌs i: ƙʷʌnuçʷ čçʷ] is *hoy ey* "then" followed by *k'we-* "look, see" plus *-tem* intent passive then the preposition schwa followed by the collective form of "people"; next is *whukwt* "(there was) nothing"; next is the set phrase *whe chîamas ey* "no way and, nohow and" (indicating impossibility) followed by *k'we-*

again, this time with the result suffix {-NəW} and finally *chwh* "you".

The third sentence in my 1978 paper is from the explanation of the constellations and shooting stars, told by Tommy Paul (here numbered as 44) *Tho ma'tas. Whukwt kw tam ma'ewholh*. "He went to get it. He got nothing." These two sentences again contrast the intent transitive {-T} with the result transitive {-NəW}.

> [θo maʔtʌs. çʷukʷt kʷ tam maʔʊçʷoɬ] is *tho* "go" then *ma't* "take, get" (as intent); the next sentence is *whukwt kw tam* "nothing" with *ma'ewh* "take, get" (as result) plus the past tense suffix *-olh*.

Another pairing is from Tommy Paul's story of how the people from before were transformed into the birds of today, each according to his perference. (45) *K'wet chiawh lhulhuk'w 'ewk'w chînas*. "Look at them flying everywhere."

> [k̓ʷʊt čʸɛçʷ ɬuɬuk̓ʷ ʔu:k̓ʷ čéʌnʌs] is *k'wet* "look" followed by *chiawh* "you" then CV+*lhuk'w* "flying" then *'ewk'w* "every" as part of the set phrase *'ewk'w chînas* "everywhere"

This is followed immediately by the sentence (46) *K'wenewh chwh kw moqw, p'ethiws nam' kw xatl's*. "You see the scoter, black-bodied as is his desire."

> [k̓ʷʊnʊçʷ čçʷ kʷ moqʷ, p'ʌθɛws namʔ kʷ χax̌s] is *k'wenewh* "see" and *chwh* "you" then the article *kw* and *moqw* "scoter", *p'eth* "black" plus the lexical suffix *-iws* "body", *nam'* "thus", the article *kw*, and finally *xatl'* "desire" with the suffix *-s* "his".

In Mrs Mary George's sentence (14) above *K'weheyeshewh ch ga* "I made too much", the result transitive suffix {-NəW} /-əçʷ/ comes after the suffix *-eyesh* /-əyəš/ [-iyiš]. In this instance the specific lack of intent is expressed by the suffix *-eyesh* "unexpectedly".
When Mrs Mary George was a child, another child was tempting fate by throwing rocks at an owl, (45) *Z'iz'q'atas te xixneq'* "He was throwing at the owl." He didn't hit it or even scare it, although it seemed to be annoyed, which frightened the children.

> [t'θɛt'θɛq'atʌs tə χɛχnɛq'] is CV + *z'iq'at* "throw at" (with intent to hit) plus the agent suffix *-as* followed by the article *te* and the word for owl.

These are examples of the evidence that in *'Ay'ajothem* the difference is between intent on the one hand, regardless of success (regardless of control), and result on the other hand, regardless of intent (regardless of control or lack thereof). These two (intent and result) are not directly opposed, as suggested by the terms "control" and "noncontrol" which are inaccurate for *'Ay'ajothem*.

11   Spelling and Pronunciation

In this paper, I am using two levels of spelling: pedagogical orthography and phonetic. This pedagogical orthography stands in contrast to a practical orthography, in that it is intended to make reading easier not only for not-fully-fluent heritage speakers but also for new language learners.

The vowels (with overlapping allophones) are the low vowel spelled as <a>, the phonemic schwa spelled <e>, the front vowel spelled <i> [i] ~ [ɛ], and the back vowel, spelled subphonemically as <o> and <u>. In addition, the digraph <ia> is used after <ch> and other palatal consonants to indicate the allophone [ɛ] preceded by an offglide, analogous to the same spelling in Pinyin.

> The *'Ay'ajothem* word *jiajia* [ɉʸɛɉʸɛ] means "friend, cousin"
> (id est, "homie") as defined by Noel George Harry in 1969.
> Fortuitously, this is pronounced like the Chinese word *jia*
> "family".

The consonants include <wh> [çʷ] (spelling volunteered by Jimi Wilson in 1969), the same as the German *ich*-laut but rounded (in 1969 and 1970 most speakers produced the rounding effect by cupping the tongue, not rounding the lips), definitely not a velar consonant as described in other Salish languages; <x> [χ], similar to the *ach*-laut in German; <q> [q], a post-velar stop; and the apostrophe <'> which indicates the glottal stop [ʔ] between vowels, as in the Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz; it also serves to show a glottalized consonant, whether ejective or laryngealized. The digraph <lh> represents the sound [ɬ] as in Lhasa, the capital city of Tibet, and as the first consonant in the Mongolian word Лхагва "Wednesday". The digraph <tl> represents the laterally released [t] sound as it is spelled in Nahuatl (the language of the Aztec Empire — even today one Mexican word for "hardware store" is *tlapatería*); the trigraph <tl'> is its ejective counterpart. The letter <z> represents [tθ], the sound at the end of the English word "eighth", almost the same as [ts] in "pizza". Historically, the sound [tθ] comes from /n/ "I" plus /s/ nominalizer; a similar change occurs synchronically in Musqueam (Wayne Suttles, personal communication). The sound of the digraph <z'> [t'θ] comes from an earlier [t's]. The sound of <th> [θ] comes from [ts] — the digraph <th> makes morphological analysis transparent (see, for example, sentences (6), (40), and (41) above).

12 Suggestions for related reading

For further reading on the concepts of rhetorical force and discourse context, see the following:

Baker, Mona. 2011. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (New York : Routledge)

Carrithers, Michael. 2005. "Why Anthropologists Should Study Rhetoric" *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 577-583.

Chafe, Wallace, and Johanna Nichols (eds.) 1986. Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology (Norwood, N.J. : Ablex Pub. Corp.)

Grossman, Edith. 2011. Why Translation Matters (Yale University Press)

Heiko, Narrog, and Bernd Heine (eds.) 2011. The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization [electronic resource]. (Oxford : OUP)

Munday, Jeremy. 2008. Introducing Translation Studies (New York : Routledge)

Pym, Anthony. 2009. Exploring Translation Theory (New York : Routledge)

_____

_____

_____

_____