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Abstract: We greatly expand the morphosyntactic description of ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš (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.
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I have as yet no (or inadequate) information on ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš number, time, mode, or deixis. (Kinkade 1979:3)

Much more remains to be learned about ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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, 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 completive, 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, V́ stressed vowel, wh content question.

1 Introduction

The literature on the Maritime Tsamosan Salish language ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš (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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš, 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš are typically of the form CV́C, CV́CC or alternating CəRC/CəRVC. 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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) xʷə́ƛ̓ ʔi-√yúl-w̓-n
   very IMPF-√crazy-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF
   ‘acting crazy’ (NB.cs19670512.347)

(2) tit ʔi-√ciqʷ=ús-n
   DEF.NONF IMPF-√dig=round.thing-3.SUBJ.IMPF
   ‘clam-digging’ (NB.cs19670512.55)

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

(3) √yə́lxʷ-ʷ-n
   √find.IMPF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF
   ‘he found him’ [sic] (NB.mdk19670426.25)

(4) ʔi-√lə́l̓ kʷ-w̓-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 ɬə́w̓ ál̓ maš, cf. (5, 6):

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

(6) s-√mayín̓ at
   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 \( p\text{as}= \) ‘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) \( \sqrt{qič}-Ø \)
\( \sqrt{\text{play}}.\text{NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘play, have fun (men)’

(8) \( \sqrt{qʷó tô}-Ø \)
\( \sqrt{\text{burn}}.\text{3.SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘it burned’

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

(9) \( t-\sqrt{χ̣ól}-Ø \)
\( \text{PERF-Ø} \sqrt{\text{go.home}}-\text{3.SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘he went home’

(10) \( tə-\sqrt{ɬəl̓ ə́kʷ}-Ø \)
\( \text{PERF-Ø} \sqrt{\text{fall}}.\text{PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘he fell’

Kinkade suggests on the analogy of Upper Chehalis that also \( ʔí \) 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) \( ʔí ł+na \quad ʔəc-\sqrt{sə́xʷ}-əɬ+čš \)
already+Q \( \text{ACTL-Ø} \sqrt{\text{wet}}-\text{INTNS+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘Are you wet already?’

(12) \( ʔí t x̣-\sqrt{pəx ̣ə́č}-Ø \quad ti \quad \sqrt{qənún}-s \)
already \( \text{TRSL-Ø} \sqrt{\text{split}}-\text{3.SUBJ.PERF} \quad \text{DEF.NONF} \sqrt{\text{mouth}}-\text{3.POSV} \)
‘[already] split his mouth’

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

(13) \( \sqrt{yəl̓ ə́xʷ}-Ø \)
\( \sqrt{\text{find}}.\text{PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘he found (something)’

(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 \( ?\text{ac-} \) or \( ?\text{as-} \) to otherwise identifiable perfective verbs, suggesting that this is a subtype of the latter (LCLP). Example are shown in (15–17):

(15) \( \text{qʷím} \quad ?\text{ac-}√λ̓ ə́kʷ-Ø \)

just ST-√fall.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF

‘he fell’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

(16) \( ?\text{ac-}√\text{pə́tkʷ-əɬ-Ø} \)

ST-√foggy-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF

‘it’s very foggy’ (NB.cs19670405.120)

(17) \( ?\text{it}+\text{na} \quad ?\text{ac-}√\text{sə́xʷ-əɬ+čš} \)

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 \( ?\text{u} \) possibly can be compared with the Lushootseed prefix \( ?\text{u-} \) ‘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) \( √\text{kʷaxʷ-š-n-Ø} \)

\( ?\text{reach-APPL-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF CPLET} \)

‘he found him’ (NB.mdk19670426.24)

(19) \( ?\text{ac-}√\text{túl̓-š} \quad ?\text{u} \)

ST-√hear-APPL CPLET

‘(?) I heard it’ (NB.cs19670405.227)

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

---

\( ^1 \) In the position, not the process, of standing up from a sitting position.  
\( ^2 \) Compare the same verb without the evidential: \( ?\text{ac-}√\text{túl̓-š} \) ‘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) txʷ-√kʷəná=č-xʷ-Ø
    TRSL-√get=hand-CAUΣ.MOT-3.SUBJ.PERF CPLET EVID.IRR
    ‘he got it; he grabbed it’ (NB.mdk19670502.69)

(21) ʔ/šá·····n ʔu ʔi ʔə-√wò s-√wíʔ
    √there[INTNS] CPLET EVID.IRR 2.SG.POSV-√FUT NOM-√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 txʷ-. 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) txʷ-√qʷić̓-Ø
    TRSL-√dirty-3.SUBJ.PERF
    ‘it got dirty’ (NB.mdk19670502.70)

(23) txʷ-√t̓óp-st-əm-Ø
    TRSL-√bump-CAUS-3.SUBJ.PERF
    ‘bump (fairly hard)’ (NB.mdk19670524.32)

(24) txʷ-√nəx̣á···s-n
    TRSL-√fall.asleep[INTNS]-3.SUBJ.IMPF
    ‘he didn’t fall asleep right away’ (NB.mdk19670426.21)

2.4 Inchoative

Kinkade’s ‘inchoative’ marker -y̓əq (perhaps with allomorphs -əq, -səq, -təq 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) √xʷúʔkʷ-ʔəq-n
    √small-INCH-3.SUBJ.IMPF
    ‘it’s getting smaller’ (Kinkade 1979:5)

(26) √x̣p-ʔəq-Ø
    √dry-INCH-3.SUBJ.IMPF
    ‘empty’ [sic] (NB.mdk19670519.39)
3 Tense LCLP

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

(27) √wə́ɬ t-√kaláh-m+č+na
   √FUT PERF-√play.ball-MDL+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF
   ‘are you going to play ball?’
   (NB.mdk19670502.91)

(28) √wə́ɬ √c̓ə́xʷ=ɬəp+č+na
tit s-√kʷə́ɬ
   √FUT √wash=clothing+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF+Q DEF.NONF NOM-√day
   ‘are you going to wash (clothes) today?’
   (NB.mdk19670601.591)

(29) √wə́ɬ √ʔíkʷ(-)təq-n+čɬ
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 wə́ before the s- of a subordinate clause’s nominalized verb, as in (30):

(30) tám ?ə-√wə́ s-√múxʷ-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 l as in (31, 32):

(31) √hilu √l t √paw̓-i?³
   √NEG √FUT INDEF √one-??
   ‘not alone!’
   (NB.cs19670626.1074)

³The analysis here is tentative. The form t perhaps is analyzable as the PERF- prefix. The suffix -iʔ 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) ?ám̩u √ňi √cúť-Ø √xʷəñíxʷəni
‘if’ FUT √say-3.SUBJ.PERF √Qoneqone
√cá-st-aʔ-1 ti √wil+čl wi
√straighten-CAUS-IMPER-PL DEF.NONF √canoe+1.PL.POSV TPC(?)
√wəl √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) √qič-___-Ø
play.NONF-___-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘he played’ [Perfective] (NB.mdk19670524.1)

(34) √q̓wic̓-___-Ø
√dark-___-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘dirty; dark’ (NB.mdk19670502.71)

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

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

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

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

According to Kinkade, another suffix -əɬ, 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-√cíʔkʷ-əɬ-Ø
     ST-√lie-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF
     ‘He’s lying down.’ (NB.mdk19670519.105)

(39) ʔlákʷ-əɬ-Ø
     √hang-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF
     ‘hang (up clothes, fish)’ (NB.mdk19670519.67)

An implied-transitive (‘detransitive’) suffix -məɬ, 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) √cíqʷ-məɬ-Ø
     √dig-IMPL.TR-3.SUBJ.PERF
     ‘(he) digs (a hole)’ (Kinkade 1979:6)

(41) ʔi-√sút̓-məɬ-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) √liw-st-m-Ø
     √come.off-CAUS-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF
     ‘take’ [literally, make it come off] (NB.mdk19670502.22)
The second seeming causative is -šəxʷ (-xʷ), 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) √ʔí-šəxʷ-Ø
   √come-CAUS.MOT-3.SBJ.PERF
   ‘he brought it down’

(46) √ʔasú-šəxʷ-Ø
   √take-CAUS.MOT-3.SBJ.PERF
   ‘she takes them along’

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 -mat (-mát) signals the imperfective middle, as in (47, 48):

(47) ?i-√qʷíl̓-mat-n
   IMPF-√bleed-MDL.IMPF-3.SBJ.IMPF
   ‘he’s bleeding’

(48) √yul=áʔq̓-mat-n
   √crazy=talk-MDL.IMPF-3.SBJ.IMPF
   ‘she’s telling lies’

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

4 This morpheme may be a nominalizer.
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) √skʷakʷúm-tm-Ø
   √ghost-PASS-3.SUBJ.PERF
   ‘get ‘ghosted’”
   (BC.mkd19670511.57)

(52) √ʔíkʷ(-)təq-tm-Ø
   √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) ?i-√ýáy-š-čl-n
   IMPF-√tell-APPL-1.SG.OBJ.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF
   ‘he told me’
   (NB.mkd19670524.86)

(54) √kʷáxʷ-š-n-Ø
   √reach-APPL-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF
   ‘he found him’
   (NB.mkd19670426.24)

See the remarks on the possible applicative-like nature of -šəxʷ ‘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 -m̓əs/-məs, as seen in (55):
The perfective relational is -m̓ 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) \(\sqrt{kʷáp-\text{m̓ə-s-n}}\)
\[\sqrt{\text{get-REL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF}}\]
\(\text{‘he knows (now)’}\) (NB.mdk19670502.73)

(57) \(\sqrt{\text{mə́q̓-m-n+čn}}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{forget-REL.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF}}\)
\(\text{‘I forgot’}\) (Kinkade 1979:8)

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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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) \(\sqrt{\text{wə̀-q̓ it-m+čl}}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{FUT-NOM-line.fish-MDL.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}\)
\(\text{‘we’re going to fish with a hook & line’}\) (LH.cs19670619.122)
Two separate positive-polarity interjections substitute (as ellipsis) for entire clauses or sentences, as in (60, 61):

(60) ?á
   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.POVSV-NOM-√get-REL.PERF-3.OBJ.PERF
   ‘I don’t know.’
   (NB.cs19670405.26)

(63) √hílu-Ø+na  ?s-s-√ʔít-əł
   √NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q 2.SG.POVSV-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):
It is with \textit{hilu} that negations of \textit{wh}-words are formed. This apparently occurs only in later sources. An example of this is (66):

(66) $\sqrt{\text{hílu}}$ -Ø $+$ na  $\sqrt{\text{tám}}$ […]
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SBJ. Perf}} + \sqrt{\text{Q what}}
\end{equation*}
‘isn’t anything […]?’ (?) (NB.mk19670426.6)

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

(67) $\sqrt{?iʔ(-)mi失望}$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{\text{nothing}}
\end{equation*}
‘nothing’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.69)

The preceding is obviously cognate with another negative operator (LCLP), the native Salish $\sqrt{\text{míɬt}}$ and its variant $\sqrt{\text{míɬtan}}$ (compare Upper Chehalis and Cowlitz $\sqrt{\text{mílta}}$, 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 $\sqrt{\text{hilu}}$, it functions (also) as a subordinate- and main-clause negating root, as seen in (68–70):

(68) $\sqrt{ʔá}$  $\sqrt{\text{míɬt}}$ -Ø $\sqrt{\text{ƛ̓ áq̓ʷ}}$ -Ø
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{\text{oh not good}}
\end{equation*}
‘oh not good’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.57)

(69) $\sqrt{\text{míɬt}}$ -Ø $\sqrt{\text{wəʔ}}$
$\sqrt{\text{NEG-3.SBJ. Perf}}$  $\sqrt{\text{FUT}}$
\begin{equation*}
s-\sqrt{ʔiʔ(-)taq-t-əɬəp …}
\end{equation*}
‘not you will steal…’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.3)

(70) $\sqrt{ʔú}$  $\sqrt{\text{míɬtan}}$ -Ø $\sqrt{\text{ʔiʔ-s (?)}}$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{\text{oh not so}}$
\end{equation*}
‘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) ƛ̓ə́xʷ
    NEG
    ‘not’  
    (NB.mdk19670426.30)

(72) míɬ
    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 √hílu and √ʔáɬta, this wik is not definitely found integrated into a ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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):

(74) wik ʔálta
    NEG now
    ‘enough, now’  
    (NB.mdk19670601.7)

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

7 Mood (and modality)

Three moods are distinguished in ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš: 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 imperative and interrogative, and negatives, nothing overt is added to a verb to

---

5Because they do not occur in a ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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) √núʔ+na ?ə-√náʔ]sč-u?
   √2.SG.PRED+Q  2.SG.POSV-√younger.brother[DIM]-DIM
   ‘is [he] your little brother?’

(77) √xʷə́ƛ̓-Ø+na ?əc-√čáp=ɬʔ nɬ+č
   √very-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q  2.SG.POSV-√have.cold(?)=time(?)+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF
   ‘Do you have a really bad cold?’

(78) √naxʷáɬ-Ø+na
   √true-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q
   ‘Is that right?’

(79) txʷ-√wákʷs-n+na ?áltə
   TRSL-√go-3.SUBJ.IMPF+Q now
   ‘Did he go?’

The other frequent approach employs √yə́xʷs, 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):^6

---

^6Both yə́xʷs and wíyə́xʷ (the following item) must come from the same root √yə́xʷ ‘Polar Q’ historically. The data we now have, though, suggest that yə́xʷs (<yə́xʷ-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 √wí√yə́xʷ can be understood as a compound, √wí [COP].√yə́xʷ. (See at Section 3 for more on √wí.)
Another *wh*-word, √wì.√yə́xʷ (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) √wì.√yə́xʷ-Ø ʔə-√páta
>cop.√how.much-3.SUBJ.PERF 2.SG.POSV-√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) √tám-Ø ʔə-s-√cút
>what-3.SUBJ.PERF 2.SG.POSV-√say
‘What did you say?’ (NB.mkd19670601.37)

(84) √yə́xʷs-Ø ʔə-s-√tíxʷ-n
>how.much-3.SUBJ.PERF 2.SG.POSV-NOM-√catch-3.OBJ.PERF
‘How many did you catch?’ (BC.mkd19670511.5)

In a parallel to our observations on variation in negative predicates at Section 6.2.1, the root for ‘who’, √wát, is interpreted differently according to whether its complement is someone’s property, as shown in (85, 86):

(85) √wát-Ø ʔə-s-√šákw-s
>who-3.SUBJ.PERF √EVID.HEAR
‘Who is it?’ (NB.mkd19670601.45)
Similarly, ‘where’, √čán or the compound √wi. √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) (√wi.)√čán-Ø ʔə-s-√ləqán √tísʔn
(√COP.)√where-3.SUBJ.PERF 2.SG.POSV-NOM-√buy DEM.NONF.MEDL
‘Where did you buy that?’

(88) √wi.√čán-Ø ʔi tat n-√lalám
√COP.√where-3.SUBJ.PERF EVID.IRR DEF.NONF 1.SG.POSV-√oar
‘Where are my oars?’

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

(89) √q̓ʷát-Ø ʔi √šán-Ø l
√when(?)-3.SUBJ.PERF EVID.IRR √where-3.SUBJ.PERF PREP
√túl-w-n+ti?
√come-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL
‘When are they coming?’

(90) √q̓ʷát-Ø ʔi √šán-Ø
√when(?)-3.SUBJ.PERF EVID.IRR √where-3.SUBJ.PERF
l √wákʷs-n+ti?
PREP √go-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL
‘When are they going?’

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).  

Comparison with example (93, 94) below and with Upper Chehalis and Cowlitz suggests that the form of the root is √ʔín(i). (Kinkade 1991:13, 2004:10). Therefore the following (•)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) √hilu-Ø+na √tám-Ø
√NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q √what-3.SUBJ.PERF
ʔə-ps=√ʔín(•)sn
2.SG.POSV-place=√do.what(•)RDUP(?)
‘what you do mischief?’ [sic]  (NB.mdk19670426.7-8

(92) √hilu-Ø √tám-Ø
√NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF √what-3.SUBJ.PERF
n-s-√ʔín(•)sn
1.SG.POSV-NOM-√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) √wi-Ø t √ʔín-Ø, the only way we have identified so far to express
the concept of ‘why?’, as in (93, 94): 8

(93) √wi-Ø t √ʔín-Ø
√COP-3.SUBJ.PERF INDEF √do.what-3.SUBJ.PERF
√wə̓ł ?i-√yíl̓+c
√FUT IMPF-√walk+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF[sic]
‘what are you walking for?’  (LH.cs19670619.154)

(94) t √wi-Ø t √ʔín-Ø √wi
INDEF √COP-3.SUBJ.PERF INDEF √do.what-3.SUBJ.PERF FOC(?)
ʔi-√ləq̓č-w̑n+c
IMPF-√cry.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+3.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 2nd 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

8 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 √wə́ł ‘fut’ and √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 2nd-person commands are shown in (95, 96):

(95) √qʷiƛ̓-aʔ-n
√cut-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF
‘Go ahead & cut it!’ (NB.cs19670405.245)

(96) √yəl-áʔ-əc
√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 -məɬ and -m in examples (97, 98):

(97) √číʔ-məɬ-aʔ
√sit-IMPL.TR-IMPER
‘Sit down!’ (NB.cs19670405.232)

(98) √c̓əx ̣ʷ=ús-aʔ-m
√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) √x̣ə́ɬ-aʔ-l
√go.home-IMPER-PL
‘You kids go home!’ (NB.mdk19670519.421)

(100) √wákʷs-aʔ-l  √qič-aʔ-l
√go-IMPER-PL  √play.NONF-IMPER-PL
‘Go out and play, kids.’ [boys] (NB.cs19670626.1032)

(101) √cá-st-aʔ-l  ti  √wil-čʃl
√straighten-CAUS-IMPER-PL  DEF.NONF  √canoe-1.PL.POSV
n-√ʔikʷlák̓ʷ  1.SG.POSV-√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):
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) \quad \sqrt{náw}-m=\ac+\č \sqrt{be.careful-MDL.PERF(?)=hand(?)+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF}

‘(You) be careful’


7.3.2 Non-2nd person

Outside of the 2nd 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 \(ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš kʷíʔ\) ‘give’.) This is a particle standing first in the sentence, accompanied by an indicative verb as in (104):

\[(104) \quad \sqrt{kúy} \ \?i-\sqrt{move}-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF

‘let us move’

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

\[(105) \quad \sqrt{yə́k̓ w}-l+\č \sqrt{move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF

‘let us move!’

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 \(ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš\) counterpart to \(kúy\). An example is shown in (106):

\[(106) \quad \sqrt{cú} \sqrt{yə́k̓ w}-l+\č \sqrt{move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF

‘Up! Let us move!’


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):
7.4 Modality

One expression of mode has been identified. It is a deontic modal of inability, \( \sqrt{x̣áqʷaɬ} \). This is evidently a loan from Chinook Jargon or Chinookan, cf. \( x̣áwq̣al \) ‘unable to, can’t’ “from a Chinookan particle” (Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde 2012:252). It operates analogously to \( \sqrt{hílu} \), with the semantically primary predicate expressed as a subordinate clause, as shown in (109):

\[
\text{(109) } \sqrt{hílu}-Ø \quad \?ə-s-txʷ-√y̓ úl
\text{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF } 2.\text{SG.POSV-NOM-TRSL-√crazy}
\]

‘Don’t get crazy!’

No positive-polarity modal of ability has yet been identified.

The evidential particles (Section 17) can be understood as also having modal force.

8 Person (and number)

Three persons and two numbers are distinguished in the marking for subjects, objects, and possessors, and in free predicative pronouns. As is typical for Tsamosan, subjects and objects each further subdivide into imperfective and perfective paradigms. Typically for the Northwest Sprachbund, 3\(^{rd}\) persons distinguish plurality only optionally. Examples in the following subsections show that the optional and infrequent +ti? ‘3.PL’ is restricted to animate subjects (broadly construed to include predicative pronouns) – a typical Pacific Northwest instantiation of the animacy hierarchy. (Compare Robertson’s observations on 3.PL in Kamloops Chinuk Wawa, 2012:181–182.) There is some variation in the relative ordering of object and subject endings, perhaps having to do with the subject-/animacy hierarchy but needing further investigation.

In the following discussion, reflexives and reciprocals will be addressed under Section 8.2, ‘objects’, because they are always semantically transitive.
8.1 Subject

Subjects essentially fall into a set of imperfective suffixes and perfective clitics (with a \(-\emptyset\) 3rd person perfective).

The imperfective subject paradigm is as in Table 1:

**Table 1** Imperfective subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG/default</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-n̓ š/-n̓ š</td>
<td>-t (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-čš/-č</td>
<td>-ələp (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n(t̓ i?) (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(110) \(ʔi-\sqrt{qʷú-ýəq-n̓ š}\)  
IMPF-\(\sqrt{belch-INCH-1.SG.SUBJ.IMPF}\)  
‘I’m belching’  
(NB.mdk19670601.20)

(111) \(\sqrt{čəxʷ=íhʔə}\)q-m-čš  
√wash=foot-MDL.PERF-2.SG.SUBJ.IMPF  
‘you wash your feet’  
(NB.mdk19670601.12)

(112) \(?əs-\sqrt{läw(-)ləq-t-m}\)  
ST-\(\sqrt{call(-)INCH(?)-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF-2.SG.OBJ.IMPF(?)}\)  
‘we call thee’  
(??..me188?..827)

(113) \(ʔú\)y̓ ʔi-\(\sqrt{kʷústu}\)t  
HORT IMPF-\(\sqrt{move-1.PL.SUBJ.IMPF}\)  
‘let us move’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.39)

(114) \(\sqrt{miłt-Ø}\)  
\(\sqrt{wə̀}\)  
\(\sqrt{NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF\ ırut}\)  
s-\(\sqrt{ʔi láq-t-ələp\ …}\)  
NOM-\(\sqrt{steal(-)INCH(?)-3.OBJ.IMPF-2.PL.SUBJ.IMPF}\)  
‘not you will steal...’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.3)

(115) \(\sqrt{wákʷs-n}\)  
\(\sqrt{go-3.SUBJ.IMPF}\)  
‘they went’  
(??..me188?.16.952)
The perfective subject paradigm is shown in Table 2:

**Table 2** Perfective subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG/default</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+čn</td>
<td>+čl (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+č</td>
<td>+člp/+čp (LCLP), +ps (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-Ø, -s (LCLP)</td>
<td>-s+tiʔ (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(117) ʔəc-√ƛ̓ áʔ q-əɬ+čn  
ST-√thirsty-INTNS+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF  
‘I’m thirsty’  
(NB.cs19670405.221)

(118) t-√múxʷ-n+č+na  
PERF-√pay-3.OBJ.PERF+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF+Q  
‘did you pay him?’  
(NB.mdk19670524.14)

(119) √wə̀ɬ √ʔíkʷ(-)təq-n+čɬ  
FUT √steal(-)INCH-3.OBJ.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF  
‘we will steal [him]’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone4.5)

(120) √ʔucál̓ +čp  
√together+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF  
‘Don’t you all go by yourselves’  
(NB.cs19670626.240)

(121) ?ámu+ps  
t-ʔəxá-n+člp  
if+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF PERF-√see-3.OBJ.PERF+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF ??  
ʔt.i.ʔsi  
DEM.PROX.NONF.√CTRST NOM-√bow-INTR  
wi+ps  
TPC(?)+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF  
t-ʔx*ʔy-c+člp  
PERF-√flee-1.SG.OBJ.PERF+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF  
‘if you see that bow, you [will then] flee [me]’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.2)
The above are used in the declarative and interrogative moods; the imperative mood has distinct 2nd-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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG/default</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-č̕l (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-m (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-(ə)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECIPE</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(126) "ʔi-√y̓áy̓-š-č̕l-ən  
IMPF-√tell-APPL-1.SG.OBJ.IMPF-3.SBJ.IMPF  
‘he told me’  
(NB.mdk19670524.86)"

---

(122) √lákʷ-1-Ø  
√sit-INTNS-3.SBJ.PERF  
‘they sit’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone8.160)

(123) √ʔasú-šxʷ-Ø  
√take-CAUS-3.SBJ.PERF  
‘she takes them along’  
(??.me188?.17:962)

(124) t-√x̣ál-s  
PERF-√finish-3.SBJ.PERF  
‘he finishes [it]’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.5)

(125) √šán̓ tat ps=√lákʷ-əq-s+tí?  
√there DEF.NONF place=√dance-INCH(?)-3.SBJ.PERF+PL  
‘place to hold dances’  
(NB.mdk19670519.6)
The perfective object paradigm is shown in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG/default</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-(ə)c</td>
<td>-təɬ, -ɬ (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-c (LCLP)</td>
<td>-təɬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-n/-ọn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF'L</td>
<td>-cəš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECIP</td>
<td>-wáxʷ (LCLP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(131) ɬáw(-)ɬq-c+č
\[\sqrt{\text{call(-)INCH(?)-1.SG.OBJ.PERF+2.SG.OBJ.PERF}}\]
‘you call me’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.22)

(132) t-muxʷ-c-Ø+na
\[\sqrt{\text{pay-2.SG.OBJ.PERF+3.SUBJ.PERF+Q}}\]
‘did he pay you?’ (NB.mdk19670524.15)

(133) cún-tl-Ø
\[\sqrt{\text{say-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF}}\]
‘he says to us’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.51)
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) √kʷíʔ-təɬ-Ø
√give-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SBJ.PERF
‘he gave it to us’
(IS.mdk19781015.172)

(139) √cún-təɬ-Ø ...
√say-1.PL.OBJ.PERF-3.SBJ.PERF ...
‘he says to us...’
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone2.51)

(140) √cún-tl-n ...
√say-1.PL.OBJ.IMPF-3.SBJ.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 -ə 3.OBJ.IMPF or -n 3.OBJ.PERF would be expected, the missing affix in (141–146) being symbolized here by an underlined space:
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG/default</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>-čəl (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ʔə-</td>
<td>-lp (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-s, -ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Possessors
Examples of these forms are shown in (147–152):

(147) √ʔə́nčə-Ø n-√χáʔq-ʔaʔ-Ø
√1.SG.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF 1.SG.POSV-√child-PL-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘my children’ (NB.cs19670405.24)

(148) ?ə-√čít̓+na √táʔn
2.SG.POSV-√older.brother+Q √DEM.NONF.DIST
‘is that your older brother?’ (NB.mdk19670524.41)

(149) √ʔəním-Ø √χáš-čəɬ-Ø
√1.PL.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF √house-1.PL.POSV-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘this is our house’ (NB.mdk19670601.79)

(150) √ʔəláp-Ø+na √χáš-lp-Ø
√2.PL.PRED-3.SUBJ.PERF+Q √ house-2.PL.POSV-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘is that you-folks[“] house?’ (NB.mdk19670601.78)

(151) s-√mátxʷ-ns
NOM-√brother.in.law-3.POSV
‘his brother-in-law’ (NB.mdk19670502.43)

(152) √yə́q-s
√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 √wì.√yə́ xʷ √COP.√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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG/default</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>√ʔə́nč/-ʔə́nč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>√núʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>√cán (LCLP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of these forms are shown in (153–159):

(153) \( \sqrt{\mathrm{ʔnc}} \ t-\sqrt{k\wedge x}\wedge -\mathrm{\dot{\mathrm{\#}}}n+\mathrm{\dot{\mathrm{\#}}}n \)
\( \sqrt{1.\mathrm{SG.PRED}} \ Perf-\sqrt{\text{break}}-3.\mathrm{OBJ.PERF}+1.\mathrm{SUBJ.PERF} \)
\( \text{tit} \quad \sqrt{k\wedge [?] p-u?} \)
\( \mathrm{DEF.NONF} \quad \sqrt{\text{cup}}[\mathrm{DIM}]-\mathrm{DIM} \)
‘I broke the cup.’

(154) \( \sqrt{n\mathrm{\#}u}-\emptyset \quad \text{ʔo-}\sqrt{}\dot{\mathrm{\#}}m\mathrm{\#}t-\emptyset \)
\( \sqrt{\mathrm{2.GS.PRED}-3.\mathrm{SUBJ.PERF}} \quad 2.\mathrm{SGP.SV}-\sqrt{\text{head}}-3.\mathrm{SUBJ.PERF} \)
‘your head’

(155) \( \sqrt{s\mathrm{\#}i}-\emptyset \quad \sqrt{\text{ʔ}\wedge \mathrm{\#}n\wedge m}-\emptyset \)
\( \sqrt{\text{here}-3.\mathrm{SUBJ.PERF}} \quad \sqrt{\text{1.PL.PRED}-3.\mathrm{SUBJ.PERF}} \)
‘it’s us!’

(156) \( \text{ʔu} \quad \sqrt{\text{ʔ}\wedge \mathrm{\#}l\wedge p} \quad \dot{\mathrm{\#}}a\wedge n\wedge \mathrm{\#} \)
\( \text{oh} \quad \sqrt{2.\mathrm{PL.PRED}} \quad \mathrm{EVID}.\mathrm{SURPR} \)
‘Oh – it’s you guys!’

(157) \( \text{lac} \quad \sqrt{\text{c\wedge \#}n} \)
\( \mathrm{DEF.FEM} \quad \sqrt{3.\mathrm{PRED}} \)
‘her(s)’

(158) \( \sqrt{\text{c\wedge \#}n+\mathrm{\#}t} \quad \sqrt{x\wedge \#\wedge s} \)
\( \sqrt{3.\mathrm{PRED}+\mathrm{PL}} \quad \sqrt{\text{house}-3.\mathrm{POSV}} \)
‘that’s their house’

(159) \( \sqrt{x\wedge \#q\wedge +\mathrm{\#}t} \quad \sqrt{\text{c\wedge \#}n} \)
\( \sqrt{\text{all}+\mathrm{PL}} \quad \sqrt{3.\mathrm{PRED}} \)
‘That was them’

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 infixed right after the stressed (root) vowel, thus \( \sqrt{}[?] \). And a vocalic reduplication plus glottal stop (thus \( \sqrt{}\wedge [?] \)) 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) √cúɬ•[uʔ]
√foot[•RDUP.PL]
‘feet’ (NB.cs19670405.74)

(161) √xá[ʔ]q•[aʔ]
√child[PL][•RDUP.PL]
‘children’ (NB.cs19670405.23)

(162) √ciʔ[ʔ]k̓ʷ•[iʔ]t
√light[PL][•RDUP.PL]
‘lamps, lights’ (NB.mdk19670502.82)

Some pluralities are apparently expressed with the root √qə́x ‘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) √qə́x. √cəqáɬ
√lots.of √tree
‘forest’ (??.me188?.472)

(164) √qə́x=mlxəš
√lots.of=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 əəwálməš 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. √qəłəq-Ø  
       √run.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
       ‘run (a boy) (any male)’  
       (NB.cs19670405.235)  
   b. √pəsəq-Ø  
       √run.FEM-3.SUBJ.PERF  
       ‘run (a girl) (any female)’  
       (NB.cs19670405237)  

(166)  
   a. √qəxəp-Ø  
       √tell.lies.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
       ‘lie (man)’  
       (NB.mdk19670519.100)  
   b. √yul=áʔq-m-Ø  
       √crazy=talk-MDL.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF  
       ‘a woman lying’  
       (NB.mdk19670519.102)  

(167)  
   a. ʔi-√ʔúkʷ-w̓-n  
       IMPF-√weep.FEM-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
       ‘tears, a girl crying’  
       (NB.cs19670405.79)  
   b. ʔi-√ləqč̓-w-n  
       IMPF-√cry.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF  
       ‘a man crying’  
       (NB.cs19670405.80)  

(168)  
   a. qʷím t-√wáτq-yəq-Ø  
       just PERF-√fall.over.FEM-INCH-3.SUBJ.PERF  
       ‘she just fell over’  
       (NB.cs19670731.1240)  
   b. qʷím t-√tələč-Ø  
       just PERF-√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-√qaníč̓-m̓ət-n+ti?
IMPF-√play.group(?)-MDL.IMPF-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL
‘The children (boys & girls) are playing’ (NB.cs19670626.1040)

b. √qíč-Ø
√play.NONF-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘play, have fun (men)’ (NB.mdk19670524.1)

11 Diminutive

Grammatical diminutivity in ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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) √xáʔš-uʔ
√house[DIM]-DIM
‘outhouse’ <√xá ‘house’ (Kinkade 1979:8)

(171) s-√kʷəntúʔ-huʔ?
NOM-√grouse(?)[DIM]-DIM
‘little chicken’ <s-√kʷəntú ‘chicken’ (Kinkade 1979:8)

(172) s-√xʷáʔys-uʔ?
NOM-√hat[DIM]-DIM
‘little hat; cap’ <s-√xʷáʔys ‘hat’ (Kinkade 1979:8)

(173) √síʔtə-uʔ-Ø
√swim[DIM]-DIM-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘to play in the water’ <√síʔtəɬ ‘to swim’
(NB.mdk19670524.560, 559 resp.)

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

(174) s-kʷə•√kʷáʔm-ʔuʔ?
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 \(biʔ\•\bədəʔ\) ‘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):

\[
\begin{align*}
(175) & \quad \sqrt{\text{pi[ʔ]\š•piš}} \\
& \quad \sqrt{\text{cat•RDUP[DIM]}} \\
& \quad \text{‘cat’ (LH/EO.cs19670817.956) } < \sqrt{\text{púʔš(?)}} \text{ ‘cat’ (LH/EO.cs19670817.955)}
\end{align*}
\]

Similar in force to the diminutive is the attenuative adverb \(kʷáʔ\) ‘slightly’, its antonym being \(xʷə́ ƛ̓\) ‘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 \(-əɬ\), sometimes glossed in English by łowálmǝš speakers as ‘real’, but in fact usually untranslated as seen in (176–178):

\[
\begin{align*}
(176) & \quad \sqrt{\text{qíxʷ-əɬ-Ø}} \\
& \quad \sqrt{\text{lard-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \\
& \quad \text{fat (a person)} \quad \text{(NB.cs19670405.86)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(177) & \quad \sqrt{\text{ʔəc-√yícəq-əɬ-Ø}} \\
& \quad \text{ST-√sick-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF} \\
& \quad \text{‘he’s sick} \quad \text{(NB.cs19670405.88)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(178) & \quad \sqrt{\text{x̣ə́p-əɬ-Ø}} \\
& \quad \sqrt{\text{dry-INTNS-3.SUBJ.PERF}} \\
& \quad \text{‘real dry} \quad \text{(NB.cs19670405.186)}
\end{align*}
\]

A second intensification strategy, very widespread in the Pacific Northwest Sprachbund, is \(f\cdots f\) (extra-long stressed vowel; \(ə\) changes to \(á\)) (LCLP). Examples are shown in (179–181):
A third intensifier is suffixification of -iʔ (LCLP). This is perhaps a distributive; it occurs on CVC-reduplicated verbs of motion as in (182–184):

(182) √kʷiw•kʷiw-iʔ
√crawl•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR
‘crawl around (for a purpose)’

(183) qʷim n-s-√yíl̓ •yil̓ -iʔ
just 1.SG.POSV-NOM-√walk•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR
‘I’m just walking around’

(184) √yíl̓ •yil̓ -iʔ-w-n+čn
√walk•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF
‘I’m just walking around’

There is also non-morphological intensification via adverbs: xʷʔūk̓ and lēʔt ‘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 kʷáʔč ‘slightly’. (Cf. Section 21.)

13 Nominalization

Nominalization in ł̓aw̓ álmaš 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):
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, ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 /lmnwuy/, can occur with those consonants glottalized: /l̓m̓n̓w̓y̓/. 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:
=aʔq̓, =əq̓ ‘language, talk’

(190)  \( \sqrt{yul} = \text{aʔq̓-m} \)
\( \sqrt{\text{crazy}} = \text{talk-MDL.PERF} \)
‘a woman lying’ [telling lies]  
(NB.mdk19670519.101)

=aʔš ‘foot’ (?)

(191)  \( \sqrt{\text{cál}} = \text{aʔš} \)
\( \sqrt{\text{shoe}} = \text{foot} \)
‘shoes (a pair)’  
(NB.cs19670405.197)

=ačan, =čən, =ičn, =ihəč ‘back’

(192)  \( \sqrt{qʷəlup} = \text{ihəč} \)
\( \sqrt{?} = \text{back} \)
‘come-back salmon (salmon after spawning)’  
(NB.cs19670405.268)

=al STEM EXTENDER before lexical suffixes

(193)  \( \sqrt{\text{lo̓w}} = \text{áł-məš} \)
\( \sqrt{?} = \text{STEMX=people} \)
‘Indian language, Lower Chehalis’  
(NB.cs19670405.256)

=al ‘friend’ (?)

(194)  \( \sqrt{\text{pastn}} = \text{áł} \)
\( \sqrt{\text{white.man}} = \text{friend} \)
‘white man friend (not present)’  
(BC.mdk19670511.41)

=al ‘tree’

(195)  \( \sqrt{\text{cəq}} = \text{áł} \)
\( \sqrt{\text{upright(?)}} = \text{tree} \)
‘tree (gen.)’  
(Kinkade 1978wordlist.415)

=amš, =məš ‘people’

(196)  \( s-\sqrt{\text{táʔxʷ}} = \text{amš} \)
\( \text{NOM-\sqrt{far}} = \text{people} \)
‘person from far away, foreigner’  
(IS.mdk19781130.5)
=an̓əxʷ ‘salmon; year’?

(197)  √ʔəp=áł=an̓əxʷ
√?=STEMX=salmon
(a personal name) (NB.mdk19670502.74)

=apš ‘stream’

(198)  √ʔəxʷíl̓=apš
√?=stream
‘Willapa’ (NB.mdk19670601.32)

=asqm ‘smell’

(199)  √ʔəqʷ=ásqm
√good=smell
‘sweet smell’ (NB.mdk19670524.48)

=axʷ ‘house’

(200)  √x̣əl=áxʷ
√do.like.that=house
‘someone who boards with you’ (NB.mdk19670426.55)

=ay stem extender

(201)  √ʔə=áy̓=čəp=íə
√chop(?)=STEMX=wood=INST
‘axe’ (NB.cs19670512.12)

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

=ayn ‘ear’

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

(204) \(\sqrt{náw}=\dot{c}\)
\(\sqrt{big}=\text{flesh}\)
‘body’

(NB.cs19670512.24)

=č ‘hand; water’

(205) \(txʷ-\sqrt{kʷəná}=\dot{č}-xʷ-∅\)
\(\text{TRSL-}\sqrt{get}=\text{hand-CAUS.MOT-3.SUBJ.PERF CPLET EVID.IRR}\)
‘he got it; he grabbed it’ (NB.mdk19670502.69)

(206) \(\sqrt{ƛ̓ áʔ\text{q-}}=\dot{č}\)
\(\sqrt{thirsty-\text{INTNS}}=\text{water}\)
‘thirsty’

(NB.cs19670405.220)

=čap ‘fire; firewood’

(207) \(\sqrt{pax}=\dot{y}=\dot{čap}\)
\(\sqrt{split}=\text{STEMX}=\text{wood}\)
‘he’s splitting wood’

(NB.mdk19670524.543)

=əq ‘bed; feather’ (?)

(208) \(s-\sqrt{tq̓ =al}=\dot{əq}=\text{inm}\)
\(\text{NOM-}\sqrt{?=\text{STEMX}=feather=bed}\)
‘feather matting’

(NB.cs19670731.1176)

=əs, =s, =us ‘face; round thing’

(209) \(\sqrt{lāq̓ -n=∅c= ál=əs}\)
\(\sqrt{cry.\text{NONF-1.SG.SUBL.IMPF ST}=\text{STEMX}=\text{eye}}\)
[‘I cry “[my] eye”’?] (CC.fb1890Qoneqone7.8)

(210) \(\sqrt{cəxʷ=s=yåq-a?-n}\)
\(\sqrt{wash=\text{round.thing=inside-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF}}\)
‘wash the dishes!’

(NB.mdk19670601.16)

(211) \(\sqrt{cəxʷ=ús-a?-m}\)
\(\sqrt{wash=\text{face-IMPER-MDL.PERF}}\)
‘Wash your face!’

(NB.mdk19670601.599)
(212) tit ?i-√ciqʷ=ús-n
DEF.NONF IMPF-√dig=round.thing-3.SUBJ.IMPF
‘clam-digging’ (NB.cs19670512.55)

=əχ ‘arm’ ?

(213) √ƛ̓ əp=ál=əx̣
√under=STEMX=arm
‘armpits’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone5.9)

=iʔkʷ ‘waist’

(214) √t̓əq̓ =íʔk̓ʷ-m̓
√tie.up=waist-MDL.PERF
‘shirt’ (NB.mdk19670524.37)

=iʔxn ‘roots’

(215) √t̓əq̓ =iʔxn̓
√tie.up(?)=roots
‘root for hard baskets’ (NB.mdk19670524.27)

=ihʔaq, =ihʔaq ‘foot, leg’ ?

(216) √cəxʷ=íhʔaq-m+čš
√wash=foot-MDL.PERF+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF
‘you wash your feet’ (NB.mdk19670601.12)

=ilaʔxʷ ‘year’ (?)

(217) √ləč̓ =ílaʔxʷ
√?=year
‘?’ (perhaps ‘next year’) (NB.mdk19670426.6)

=ils ‘end, point; rock’ (?)

(218) √cəx=íls
√sandy=point
‘Lower Chehalis; tarty taste’ (NB.cs19670405.110)
=ínč ‘inside’ (?)

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

=ínm ‘bed’ (?)

(220) s-ʔtq̓=aləq=ínm
NOM-ʔ?=feather=bed
‘feather matting’
(NB.cs19670731.1176)

=łəs ‘hair’

(221) ʕčəxʷ=łəs-a?-m
ʔwash=hair-IMPER-MDL.PERF
‘wash your hair!’
(NB.mdk19670601.22)

=ɬʔə ‘INSTR (tool, instrument)’

(222) ʕcič=ɬʔə
ʔshoot=INSTR
‘gun’
(NB.mdk19670519.65)

=łən̓ ‘child’

(223) s-ʔqəx=áy=łən̓-s
NOM-ʔlots.of=STEMX=child-3.POSV
‘his children’
(NB.mdk19670502.86)

=mləxš ‘people’

(224) ʔqəx=mləxš
ʔlots.of=people
‘[a group of] people’
(NB.cs19670405.25)

=maš ‘earth, land, place; river’

(225) ʔlič=ál=maš
ʔacross=STEMX=river
‘(go) across’
(NB.mdk19670426.27)
=nwət ‘mind, heart’

(226) $\sqrt{xw}i(-)nwət$
\[
\sqrt{\text{give}}(-)\text{CAUS.MOT}(-)=\text{mind}
\]
‘think’  
(NB.mdk19670524.89)

=qiʔ (=qiʔ) (?) ‘head’

(227) s-$\sqrt{\text{yəl}}=\text{qiʔ}$
\[
\text{NOM-$\sqrt{\text{round}}=\text{head}}$
\]
‘slave’  
(NB.cs19670405.44)

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

=qs ‘nose, point’

(229) $\sqrt{\text{mix}}=\text{qs}$
\[
\sqrt{\text{smile}}(?)=\text{point}
\]
‘smile’  
(BC.mdk19670511.22)

=stlš (?) ‘times, occurrences’

(230) $\sqrt{\text{c‘il}}=\text{stlš}$
\[
\sqrt{\text{five}}=\text{times}
\]
‘5 times she threw her down’  
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone5.10)

=staʔ ‘fire’?

(231) $\sqrt{\text{xā}}\text{ʔ}=\text{staʔ}$
\[
\sqrt{\text{burn}}(?)=\text{fire}
\]
‘ashes’  
(NB.cs19670405.124)

=τən, =ʔə ‘INSTR (tool, instrument)’

(232) $\sqrt{\text{tul}}=\text{ihʔəq}=\text{ʔə}$
\[
\sqrt{\text{stretch}}=\text{leg}=\text{INSTR}
\]
‘trousers’  
(NB.mdk19670524.94)

---

9 This morpheme may be a nominalizer.
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=uc ‘mouth’

(233)  \( \sqrt{\text{çep}}=\text{uc}=\text{qs} \)
     \( \sqrt{?}=\text{mouth}=\text{point} \)
     ‘beard’  \( \text{NB.cs19670512.16} \)

=yaq ‘inside’?

(234)  \( \sqrt{\text{cəx}}=s=\text{yəq}=a?-n \)
     \( \sqrt{\text{wash}}=\text{round.thing}=\text{inside}-\text{IMPER}-3.\text{OBJ.PERF} \)
     ‘wash the dishes!’  \( \text{NB.mdk19670601.16} \)

=yəp ‘clothing’

(235)  \( \sqrt{\text{wɔ̌l}} \sqrt{\text{cəx}}=\text{yəp}+\text{čs}+\text{na} \)
     \( \sqrt{\text{FUT}} \sqrt{\text{wash}}=\text{clothing}+2.\text{SG.SUBJ.PERF}+Q \)
     \( \sqrt{\text{DEF.NONF}} \sqrt{\text{NOM}-\text{day}} \)
     ‘are you going to wash (clothes) today?’  \( \text{NB.mdk19670601.591} \)

14.2 Lexical circumfix (LCLP)

One circumfix, having a more lexical than grammatical meaning, has been identified. It is \( nš= \text{=tn} \) ‘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)  \( nš=\sqrt{\text{ʔiməc}}=\text{tn}-s \)
     \( \sqrt{\text{kin.group}}=\sqrt{\text{grandchild}}=\text{kin.group}-3.\text{POSV} \)
     ‘his grandchildren’  \( \text{NB.mdk19670502.87} \)

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)  \( \text{čs}=\sqrt{\text{nə̃q}} \)
     \( \text{color}=\sqrt{\text{black}} \)
     ‘black’  \( \text{NB.cs19670405.91} \)

čt= ‘inhabitants’

(238)  \( \text{čt}=\sqrt{\text{čənúk}} \)
     \( \text{inhabitants}=\sqrt{\text{Chinook}} \)
     ‘Chinook tribe’  \( \text{Curtis1907–1930.12} \)
(239) čt=ʔác-
\(\sqrt{\text{milč}}\)
inhabitants=ST-
\(\sqrt{?}\)
‘northern Shoalwater Bay people’ (~’inside-bay people’)
(Curtis1907–1930.1)

\(\text{náw= ‘big’ (takes primary stress; the stem it modifies takes secondary stress)}\)

(240) náw=s-\(\sqrt{x} \dot{\text{ò}}x^w\)
big=NOM-\(\sqrt{\text{old.man}}\)
‘big old man’
(NB.cs19670405.47)

(241) náw=s-\(\sqrt{p̣ə\text{̀lq}}\)
big=NOM-\(\sqrt{\text{penis}}\)
‘big penis’
(BC.mdk19670511.18)

\(\text{nú= (?) ‘village’ (takes primary stress; the stem it modifies perhaps takes secondary stress)}\)

(242) nú=s-\(\sqrt{x} \dot{\text{w}}c\text{̀a}q\)
village=NOM-\(\sqrt{?}\)
‘village on the point north of Bay Center’
(Curtis.1907–1930.42)

(243) nú=\(\sqrt{\text{muyənl}}\)
village=\(\sqrt{\text{crabapple?}}\)
‘Crabapple Town, on the site of Tokeland’
(Curtis.1907–1930.26)

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

(244) \(\sqrt{\text{šán̓}}\)  ps=\(\sqrt{?}\text{úl}=ps-s\)
tat  s-\(\sqrt{q} \dot{\text{w}}\text{̀Ú}x^w\)
‘smokehole’
(NB.mdk19670524.49)

(245) nú? l tat  ps=\(\sqrt{\text{ciwim-m+c}}\)
PREP  ?  DEF.NONF  place.for=\(\sqrt{\text{pray-MDL.PERF+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}\)
‘church, place of prayer’
(NB.cs19670512.52)

(246) \(\sqrt{\text{šán̓}}\)  tat  ps=\(\sqrt{\text{låq}^w(-)}\text{səq}-s+ti?\)
‘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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš. 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=áɬ
    √apple.√tree
    ‘apple tree’  

(248) √c̓ə́xʷ-aʔ-n √tíʔn.√šiʔ
    √wash-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF √DEM.NONF.PROX.√CTRST
    ‘wash this!’

(249) √xʷə́ƛ̓ √x̣əsáʔ-ɬ √qáʔx √táʔn.√šn̓
    √very √bad-INTNS √dog √DEM.NONF.DIST√CTRST
    ‘he’s just a common, mongrel dog (insulting someone)’

16 Reduplication (LCLP)

Reduplication in ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 √ʔín ‘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 $C^*)$ 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) $s$-$k^*•\sqrt{?}m$-$u$

NOM-RDUP•$\sqrt{inland?}$-[DIM]-DIM

‘animal; insect; misbehaved [children]’

(NB.cs19670512.8)

(251) $\dot{c}^*•\sqrt{c^*\dot{a}l}$-$u$

RDUP•$\sqrt{maggot}$-[DIM]

‘maggots’

(NB.mdk19670519.109)

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

(252) $x^*\acute{a}t$-$\sqrt{x^*\hat{a}q}$-$a$

RDUP•$\sqrt{jump}$-[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 $^*C$, 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) $\sqrt{\acute{\hat{a}k}^*k^w}$-$a$

$\sqrt{high}$-[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 $[V^?]$ 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 $^*VC$ (see the next reduplication below) after a glottal infix has been added after the stressed (root) vowel. An example is repeated in (254):

(254) $\sqrt{\acute{\hat{a}k}^*k^w}$-$a$

$\sqrt{high}$-[RDUP]-[IMPER]

‘a little higher!’

(NB.cs19670626.1066)
More complex in form is the stress-attracting •VC, shown in (255, 256):

(255) √x̣iw̓•íw
√fear•RDUP
‘fear, frighten’ (Kinkade 1979)

(256) s-√waq̓•iq̓
NOM-√frog•RDUP
‘frog’ (EO.cs19670720.726)

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

(257) ʔi-√cáxʷ•cəxʷ=č-w̓-n
IMPF-√drip•RDUP=water-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF
‘drip continuously’ (NB.mdk19670519.23)

(258) √lákʷ•ɬəkʷ+č
√fall•RDUP+2.SG.SUBJ.PERF
‘you might fall’ (NB.mdk19670519.42)

(259) s-√yíl̓•yil̓-ʔ
NOM-√walk•RDUP-INTNS.DISTR
‘walking around’ (NB.cs19670405.238)

(260) √hílu-Ø ʔo-s-√cút•cut-Ø
NEG-3.SUBJ.PERF 2.SG.POSV-NOM-√say•RDUP-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘don’t be saying those things!’ (IS.mdk19781014.245)

Another and for Salish uncharacteristically complex form is •CVCV, 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 CVCV́C roots involved are larger and far rarer than the CVC and CVCC forms typical of ləwálməš. Several examples of this distinctive form are given in (261–265):
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) ʔi

(267)

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, šana, which quite clearly conveys a sense of a speaker’s surprise at an unexpected state of things. Examples are given in (268–271):

(268) ũ√nú? šana?
oh√2.SG.PRED EVID.SURPR
‘Oh, it’s you.’ (NB.mdk19670601.639)

(269) ũ√ʔəláp šana?
oh√2.PL.PRED EVID.SURPR
‘Oh, it’s you folks.’ (NB.mdk19670601.640)

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

(271) t√xʷíc-m-əc-Ø šana?
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 šə́kʷ, seems to have hearsay evidential force (compare the strategy for quoting speech, Section 26), as shown in (272–276):

(272) štám šə́kʷ-s√what√EVID.HEAR-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘what is it?; what did you say?’ (NB.mdk19670601.36)

(273) šsán šə́kʷ-s√where√EVID.HEAR-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘where is it?’ (NB.mdk19670601.43)

(274) šwát šə́kʷ-s√who√EVID.HEAR-3.SUBJ.PERF
‘who is it?’ (NB.mdk19670601.46)

(275) šsán šə́kʷ (ʔo)c-√wíʔ-ns√there√EVID.HEAR ST-√COP-3.POSV
‘he lives there’ (NB.mdk19670601.70)

(276) šə́kʷ s-√qʷíl√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, ũámu, usually glossed as ‘if; when’, shown in (277, 278):

(277) ũámu √č̓ə́lš-m=ínč-n √c̓áwl...  
if √enter-MDL.PERF=inside(?)-3.SUBJ.IMPF √spring.salmon...  
‘If he goes into weir the spring salmon...’  
     (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.8)

(278) ũámu √í √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 ləwálməš 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 ?i-s- [sic] ti s-√qʷáy=ɬn̓-s  
√Qoneqone and 3.NONF.POSV  
‘Qone’qonē and his children.’  
     (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.41)

(280) √cam=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 ləwálməš 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEF</th>
<th>INDEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONF/default</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>INDEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta/ţə</td>
<td></td>
<td>ləc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(281) √łíc-w̓-n tat √xáʔaʁq
     √grow-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF DEF.NONF √child
     ‘he grows that child’
     (CC.fb1890Qoneqone6.5)

(282) √xʷəl̓áʔ tit √qál̓
     √warm DEF.NONF √water
     ‘this water is warm’
     (NB.cs19670731.1135)

(283) tit √łəcċəč+čn ḥ ti √ʔíl̓əš
     DEF.NONF √dream+1.SG.SUBJ.PERF ḥ DEF.NONF √last.night
     ‘I dreamed last night’
     (NB.mdk19670519.369)

(284) √qəłəš ləc √xʷúʔkʷ
     √poor DEF.FEM √child
     ‘poor little girl!’
     (NB.cs19670731.1113)

(285) √łəč ta √ʔáqs🇳 ḥ t √lapúm
     √full DEF.NONF √box ḥ INDEF √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-√ciqʷ=ús-n
     DEF.NONF IMPF-√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-ʔi-√huntin’+ti?
     DEF.NONF NOM-IMPF-√huntin’+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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>MEDL</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>NVIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONF</td>
<td>√t̓iʔn</td>
<td>√t̓isʔn, √t̓išʔn, √t̓ísaʔn</td>
<td>√táʔn</td>
<td>√t̓táʔn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>√c̓íʔn</td>
<td>√c̓ísʔn</td>
<td>√c̓əláʔn</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(288) √kʷəl̓-áʔ-n √t̓iʔn tit √q̓áł
‘pour this water out!’ (NB.cs19670731.1137)

(289) √ʔí-šəxʷ-aʔ √t̓ísʔn
√come-CAUS-MOT-IMPER √DEM.NONF.MEDL
‘bring that here!’ (NB.cs19670512.311)

(290) ʔə-√číʔ+na √táʔn
2.SG.POSV-√older.brother+Q √DEM.NONF.DIST
‘is that your older brother?’ (NB.mdk19670524.523)

(291) ʔi-√x̣íl-m̓əl-n+na √táʔn
IMPF-√do.so-IMPL.TR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+Q √DEM.NONF.NVIS
‘Is that man working?’ (NB.mdk19670601.649)

(292) √c̓íʔn
√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 √šn̓ (reduced from √šán̓) ‘there’. This paradigm is shown in Table 9:
Table 9 Contrastive demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>DIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONF</td>
<td>√tíʔn.√šiʔ, √tíʔ.√šiʔ (?)</td>
<td>√táʔn.√šn̓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>√cíʔn.√šiʔ</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of these forms are shown in (293–295):

(293)  √c̓ə́xʷ-aʔ-n    √tíʔn.√šiʔ
wash-IMPER-3.OBJ.PERF √DEM.NONF.PROX.√CTRST
‘wash this!’ (NB.mdk19670601.19)

(294)  ?ámú+ps        t-√ʔəxá-n+člp    q
if+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF    PERF-√see-3.OBJ.PERF+2.PL.SUBJ.PERF  ?
√tíʔ.√ši s-√t̓ək̓ʷə́ɬ=n …
√DEM.NONF.PROX.√CTRST NOM-√bow=INSTR …
‘if you see that bow…’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone9.2)

(295)  √cíʔn.√šiʔ
√DEM.FEM.PROX.√CTRST
‘this (girl, female)’ (NB.mdk19670601.659)

A demonstrative is a freestanding, stressed word expressing an argument. The elders often translated sentences of ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš containing these into English without demonstratives, instead saying ‘Sew it!’ or ‘Swallow it!’

A demonstrative can also function to modify (specify) a noun. Because a demonstrative is a full root (predicate) itself (and because such specification is evidently not compounding), an article (Section 19) normally intervenes between it and the noun.

It should be noted that to express ‘this way’ (direction), a separate adverbial word is used (see Section 21).

21 Adverbs (LCLP)

There is a small set of words that describe the setting of an event: where it happened, how it was done, when, etc. Adverbs can be simplex particles or of complex structure. Some of those we have identified are shown in (296–305):

(296)  √ʔáltə    ?i-√háns-w-n
√now    IMPF-√thunder-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF
‘now, it’s thundering’ (NB.cs19670615.874)
The locative deictics ƛ̓úkʷ and šíʔ•šiʔ ‘here’ and ɬákʷ ‘there’, as well as ʔálta ‘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):

(297)  lateinit
very
‘a very strong (man)’

(298)  (ti)  nác-yəq
DEF.NONF long.time-INCH
‘a long time’

(299)  táʔxʷ  far
‘far’

(300)  túl  táʔxʷ
from far
‘from far away’

(301)  túl  shíʔ
from here
‘from “this” direction’

(302)  túl  šáʔ
from here
‘from “that” direction’

(303)  ƛ̓úkʷ  up
‘up/high’

(304)  láƛ̓p  down
‘down/low’

(305)  ?ís-n  šqatíñm
come-3.SUBJ.IMPF this.way
‘this way’ [towards here]

The locative deictics ƛ̓úkʷ and šíʔ•šiʔ ‘here’ and ɬákʷ ‘there’, as well as ʔálta ‘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):
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) ʔálta ʔi-ʔmúlág-m̓əł-m
now IMPF-ʔspringtime-MDL.IMPF-MDL.PERF
‘Spring is here’ (NB.cs19670626.1057)

(311) ʔi-ʔmúlág-m̓əł-m ʔálta
IMPF-ʔspringtime-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 ʔa- ‘again’ in (312):

(312) ʔa-ʔkʷənant-n-Ø ta ʔpáw
again-ʔtake-3.OBJ.PERF-3.SUBJ.PERF DEF.NONF ʔone
‘again he takes one’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone7.1)

(313) ʔa-txʷ-ʔqálq-n-s
again-TRSL-ʔbreak.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 ləw̓ ál̓ məš 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 sìw indicates excessive degree (‘too...’, sometimes translated by elder speakers as ‘very’) and presumably the superlative, as in (314, 315):

(314) √xʷáł̓ sìw √qapàs tit √qál
√very too √salty DEF.NONF √water
‘There’s too much salt in this water.’ (NB.cs19670626.1056)

(315) sìw √ƛ̓ úk̓ w
too √high
‘too high’ (NB.cs19670626.1063)

Adjectives can be modified by intensives, like xʷáł̓ or -(ə)l ‘very’, as in (316):

(316) √naxʷá ł+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=√kʷíq
color=√green
‘green’ (NB.cs19670405.92)

(319) čs=√c̓ íq
color=√red
‘red’ (NB.cs19670405.93)

(320) čs=√láq̓ w
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):

\[
(321) \quad √ƛ̓ úk̓ w \quad t \quad √ʔálə
\]
\[
\text{high INDEF chief}
\]
\[
‘God’ \quad (NB.cs19670626.1165)
\]

\[
(322) \quad √sál \quad t \quad √yáñəs
\]
\[
\text{two INDEF tooth}
\]
\[
‘two teeth’ \quad (NB.cs19670405.65)
\]

\[
(323) \quad √xʷúkʷ \quad t \quad √x̣áš
\]
\[
\text{small INDEF house}
\]
\[
‘a small house’ \quad (CC.fb1890Qoneqone1.2)
\]

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):

\[
(324) \quad tūl \quad √ná̱m.s-√cač
\]
\[
\text{from √finished.NOM-√??}
\]
\[
‘Shoalwater Bay; being from the Lower Chehalis tribe’ \quad (NB.mdk19670524.569)
\]

\[
(325) \quad qʷim \quad ?i-√qič-ð̓-n+ti?
\]
\[
\text{just IMPF-√play.NONF-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF+PL}
\]
\[
\text{in PREP? NONF √water}
\]
\[
‘they’re just playing in that water’ \quad (NB.mdk19670524.561)
\]

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) √kⁿáxʷ-š-n √reach-APPL-3.SUBJ.IMPF √ʔi-√χəɾəq̓•χəɾəq̓-w-n
√strike•RDUP-INTR-3.SUBJ.IMPF
√q̓áys
√stone
‘they arrive where they always strike together stones’
(CC.fb1890Qoneqone6.1)

(327) √yílxʷ-n t √máqʷm
√arrive-3.SUBJ.IMPF INDEF √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) ʔá
oh
‘oh’ / ‘yes’
(CW.cs19670720.814)

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

(330) hilu
NEG
‘no’
(CW.cs19670720.813)

(331) milt
NEG
‘no’
(CW.cs19670720.812)

(332) milt-n
NEG-3.SUBJ.IMPF
‘do not’
(EO.cs19670720.718)

(333) wik
NEG
‘no; enough’
(NB.cs19670615.872)

(334) ƛ̓ə́xʷ
NEG
‘no’
(NB.cs19670426.42)
25 Serial verb constructions (LCLP)

In ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 ᴲ:
Some adverbs such as \(x^w\̌x^w\) 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) \(\sqrt{\text{cún}-\text{təl}-n}\) \(\sqrt{\text{cást-a}\text{-}1}\) \(\text{ti}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{say-1.PL.OBJ.IMPF}-3.SUBJ.IMPF}\) \(\sqrt{\text{straighten-IMPER-PL}}\) \(\text{DEF.NONF}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{wil}+\text{čl}}\ldots\)
\(\sqrt{\text{canoe}+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}\ldots\)
‘he says to us, “make straight our canoe...” ’ (CC.fb1890Qoneqone3.1)

(346) \(\sqrt{\text{páw}\text{t}}\) \(\text{s}^\text{-}\sqrt{\text{k}^w\text{̌x}}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{cúnt-n}}\) \(\text{ti}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{one INDEF NOM-}\sqrt{\text{day}}\text{say-3.SUBJ.PERF} \text{DEF.NONF}}\)
\(\text{s}^\text{-}\sqrt{\text{qəx}=\text{áy}=\text{ln-s}}\text{cú} \text{NOM-}\sqrt{\text{lots.of}=\text{STEMX}=\text{child-3.POSV} \text{HORT}}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{y}^w\text{̌x}^w+1.čl}\)
\(\sqrt{\text{move-INTNS+1.PL.SUBJ.PERF}}\)
‘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 \(\text{šə́ k}^w\) (Section 17).

27 Conclusion

We have added numerous observations to the known picture of ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš. 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 -əɬ 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 xʷə́ƛ̓ ‘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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš. 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš, 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš 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 ɬəw̓ ál̓ məš. We anticipate substantial benefits to pidgin/creole studies of a deepened understanding about this non-Indo-European lexified contact medium’s history.
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