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1. In his well-known article on noun incorporation, E. Sapir mentions Salish among the American linguistic stocks in which this process is "entirely absent": Athabascan, Chinookan, Yokuts, Siouan and Eskimo. He adds, in a footnote, that 

2. Fieldwork on Mainland Comox (Sliammon dialect, spoken in the Sliammon Reserve, near Powell River, B.C., Canada) was done in summer and fall 1975, thanks to an award from the Mutual Educational Exchange Program, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. I wish to thank my informants, Liz Harry, Mary George, Ron Galligos and Marion Harry, for their (patient) help. 

2. "The problem of noun incorporation in American languages", American Anthropologist, vol.13, 1911, p.281-282. At the same time, F. Boas noted in his Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian languages that "a more thorough knowledge of the structure of many American languages shows that the general designation of all these languages as polysynthetic and incorporating is not tenable...The Chinook may be given as an example of lack of polysynthesis...The Athapascan and the Haida and Tlingit..., though polysynthetic, do not readily incorporate the object...The Iroquois alone has so strong a tendency to incorporate the nominal object into the verb" (ed. by P.Holder, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1966, p.71). I will not limit myself here to Amerindian languages, since languages belonging to other stocks also exhibit features characteristic of incorporation. 

"the "substantivals" of Salish and Kwakiutl...are not instances of true noun incorporation." It is the purpose of the present paper to show that, on the one hand, lexical suffixes and noun incorporation are indeed best considered to be distinct processes, on the other hand the Sliammon dialect of Mainland Comox, a Salishan language (North Georgia branch of the Coast division), does present both processes.

2.1. Noun incorporation, in the broadest sense, consists in a tight association of a noun with a verb, with marks of various types, in form and/or position. The incorporated noun sometimes keeps the same form as in the absolute use, but in many languages, it loses its nominal marker, or certain initial and/or final elements, or replaces them by others. Moreover, the incorporated noun is suffixed or prefixed to the verbal stem, according as the language is or is not verb-initial. In some languages, it is infixed. All these possibilities are represented in the following examples:

(1) Takelma: gwen-wa.ya-sgut?ús-gat-hi
(neok-knife-out (aor., distr. with redupl.)-instr. suff.)
With his knife, he cut their necks (Sapir, op. cit., p.274)

(2) Nahuatl: ni-í-tle-watsa / in-nakatl
(I-it-fire (absolute form: tle-tl)-roast / the-meat)
I roast the meat (ib., p.260-261)

(3) Oneida: je-yad-6-da
(again she (z again + ye she)-body (absolute form: o-yada)-verb class vowel-be thus)
Again she seemed (ib., p.277)

(4) Sosra: jam-jo:1-ten
(catch-fish (absolute form: a'jo:n)-does)
He is fish-catching

Yana: k?ut-xáí-si-ndja
(want-water (absolute form: xána)-present-I)
I am thirsty (Sapir, op. cit., p.268)

Ojibwa:pági-nindž-i
(nindž: hand; pagí: it is swollen)
He has a swollen hand (ib., p.281).

2.2.1. The noun which undergoes incorporation can represent the patient (or experiencer), the goal, the location or the instrument. Since the function markers, when they occur, are deleted by the very process of incorporation, it is not always obvious which of these types of complements the incorporated noun stands for. The only clear fact is the combination of a noun with a verb, yielding a complex word with its internal syntax and its own stress, as opposed to the structure in which the noun, along with its determining elements, is formally and positionally independent from the verb. If we nevertheless try to restitute the syntactic and semantic relationships which are obliterated by the operation, we can suppose that, in the above given examples, the incorporated noun represents the experiencer((3)), the goal ((1), (4) and (5)), the location (or experiencer?) ((6)) or the instrument ((1) and (2))

Furthermore, within one and the same...

5. It is worth mentioning, however, that in some ergative languages such as Nass-Gitksan (Tsimshian language of northern British Columbia; see Bruce Rigsby, "Nass-Gitksan: an analytic ergative syntax", LAl, 41,4, 1975, p.346-354), Yana, Southern Paiute (see Sapir, op.cit., p.269 fn.2) or Dyirbal (North Queensland), the same process applies to the incorporation of the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive. This might put into question the claim that "most ... morphologically ergative languages are ergative only superficially: in syntactic terms, they are accusative" (S.R. Anderson, "On the notion of subject in ergative languages", Symposium on subject and topic, USCB, 1975, p.11).

6. The incorporation of a noun as an instrument is an important trait of Takelma. It even happens, as is stated by Sapir (Takelma, in Handbook of American Indian languages, Oosterhout, The Netherlands, 1969, repr. after the ed. of 1922, p. 69), "that a verb form has two instrumental, one, generally WITH THE HAND, expressing indefinite or remote instrumentality, the second, a noun or demonstrative, expressing the actual instrument by means of which the action was accomplished." Example (1) above contains an instrumental suffix -hi, in addition to the incorporated noun waya knife.
language, the incorporated noun does not necessarily appear with the same syntactic value in all instances. In Nahuatl, for example, it can stand for the instrument, as in sentence (2) above, but also for goal (sentence (4) below), location or experiencer. In Yana, sentence (5) above shows an incorporated nominal form xai which stands for the goal, but several other types are represented, including a variant of the experiencer resembling the bahuvrīhi type of compound nouns (in which the second term refers to something being possessed by someone or by something, as in Skr. bahu-vrīhi, much-rice, which means having much rice):

(7) ḍ̄̄-wai-si
   (be two-deer (absolute form: bāna)—present)
   He has two deer or He is two-deered (Sapir, op. cit. p. 271).

2.2.2. When incorporation occurs, the verb usually becomes intransitive. If it was already so, then it sometimes indicates what happens to the patient. Thus, in Malagasy, instead of

(8) māti / ni-vādi-ni
   (died / the-wife—of him)
   His wife died,

one may say

(9) māti-vādi / izi
   (died—wife / he)
   He was widowed.

If the verb was transitive before incorporation, its relationship with the complements becomes formally identical with the one which characterizes the intransitive verb. For example, in Fidjian, the transitive and agreement markers are both deleted in case of noun incorporation; in Nahuatl, the objective pronominal element cannot coexist with an incorporated object (sentence (43) below; in sentence (2) above, the stands for the instrument); in Chukohee, an ergative language, the same

---

marker occurs on the intransitive verb and on the verb with an incorporated object: compare

(10) tumg-át / jegtel-g?at
    (friends-nomin. / escape-asp.m.)

The friends escaped (Mardirussian, op. cit., p.385)

and

(11) tumg-át / kopra-ntwat-g?at
    (friends-nomin. / net-set-asp.m.)

The friends set nets (ib., 8).

2.2.3. Consistent with the foregoing is the fact that the incorporated noun cannot as a rule take determiners, such as articles, deictics, pluralizers, adjectives and the like. Thus, in Turkish, a cognate object in the shape of a noun from the same root is generally supplied when a normally transitive verb is used without a specific direct object. This cognate object cannot take determiners:

(12) kar-lm / dikiş-diki-yor
    (wife-my / sewing-sew-cont.)

My wife is sewing

There is, therefore, a strong tendency towards using incorporation, preferably, for non-referential or generic situations, and avoiding it (in that case having recourse to independent constructions of the noun along with its determiners) for proper nouns or specific nouns whose association with the verb refers to single activities. However, "generic" does not necessa-

8. In an attempt at a cross-linguistic characterization of noun incorporation, it does not seem tenable to reduce it to object incorporation. In doing so (see, for example, Mardirussian op. cit., p.383, who speaks of "object incorporation, or, in more general terms, noun incorporation), one might seem to privilege one among various possibilities.

9. The same holds true in respect of certain constructions found in European languages, which, however, are not cases of incorporation, because they contain, not a verb, but a nominalized form of a verb. In Dutch, for example, de leraar, the teacher, cannot be inserted between aan het at it and plagen, tease (i.e. within the Dutch equivalent of the English progressive form). One can only say Karel/is/de-leraar/aan-het-plagen, Charles is teasing the teacher. If the noun is inserted, it is generic and does not take determiners: Grace/is/ aan-het-rijst-koken, Grace is cooking rice (Jan Koster, "Dutch as an SOV language", Linguistic Analysis, 1, 2, 1975, p.123-124. Incidentally, the author speaks here of incorporation, but does not strive to justify the term).
rily mean that activity referred to is not particular, and in fact, in most incorporating languages, many instances can be found referring to particular acts or situations. After giving several examples of that sort in Southern Paiute, Sapir writes: "Inasmuch as Paiute can express, and generally does express, the object of the verb by providing the unincorporated noun with the accusative ending -a or ~va, the problem presents itself of when noun incorporation and when the syntactic method is used to express the object. This cannot be satisfactorily answered at the present time; it can only be suggested that what may be called typical or characteristic activities, that is, those in which activity and object are found regularly conjoined in experience (e.g. rabbit-killing, looking for a trail, setting a net), tend to be expressed by verbs with incorporated objects, whereas "accidental" or indifferent activities (e.g. seeing a house, finding a stone) are rendered by verbs with independent, syntactically determined nouns" (op. cit., p.264). But Sapir adds immediately after: "It must be admitted, however, that a hard and fast line between "characteristic" and "accidental" activities would be difficult to draw." Further below, he states that in Nahuatl as well as in Paiute (their genetic relationship within Uto-Aztecan being often urged), noun incorporation is "but a particular form of modifying the primary meaning of the verb by prefixing another stem to that of the verb; and in both languages, the objective relation is more often expressed by syntactic means than by noun incorporation" (ib., p.267). This would seem to imply that "accidental" events involving an action and a goal are more often spoken of than "characteristic" events. There is no way to control such an assertion. Be that as it may, as far as the objective relation is concerned, a clear difference is found to exist, in numerous cases, between the two formulas. For example, the well-known structure which Nahuatl shares with Chinook and many other languages, and which has incorrectly been termed "objec-
tive pronominal incorporation\(^{10}\), i.e. the apposition of a noun to an objective pronominal element, ordinarily refers to an accidental state of affairs, as opposed to noun incorporation: compare

(13) ni-k-qua / in-nakati
   (I-it-eat / the-meat)
   I eat the meat

and

(14) ni-nika-qua
   (I-meat (incorporated form)-eat)
   I am a flesh-eater (Sapir, op. cit., p. 260).

As a consequence of this tendency of incorporated nouns to be generic in meaning, they don't seem to be able to trigger transformations which imply specific reference: conjunction reduction, Equi-NP deletion, passivization, relativization. Likewise, the associations of verbs with incorporated nouns tend to become idiomatic. In Malagasy, for example,

(15) láva / ni-tongo-nd-rakoto
   long / the-foot-feet-of-Rakoto)
means "Rakoto's feet are long",

whereas

(16) láva-tongo-tra / rakoto
   (long-foot-feet-experiencer m. / Rakoto)
means "Rakoto walks a lot" (Mardiroussian, op. cit., p. 386-387).

2.3. If we try to define the linguistic status of noun incorporation such as it is exemplified in the various languages we have mentioned, it looks as though it had the features of composition rather than those of derivation. English compounds like those cited by Sapir (op. cit., p. 255-256) for example, i.e. steam-engine, concert-singer and song-writer, are identical with regard to their formation, yet the first noun represents an instrument in one case, a location in the second one and a

\(^{10}\) Sapir (ib., p. 260) takes over this terminology without explicitly pointing out the contradiction it implies: the so-called "pronominal incorporation" is precisely the formula which, formally as well as semantically, stands in contrast to noun incorporation.
goal in the third one. It so happens, however, that while English does possess the corresponding compound verbs, to
steam-run, to concert-sing and to song-write, such verbs are
not readily formed, even though "there is not the slightest
theoretical reason" (ib., p. 256) against their existence 11. As
far as the composition of an instrumental substantive is con-
cerned, it seems that English tends to prefer it in nominali-
zed forms of the verb such as participles: we have man-made
or hand-woven, but not to man-make or to hand-weave. The same
holds true in respect of objective substantives and the bah-
vrThi type: beach-combing, clam-digging and one-legged are
usual, but the corresponding verbs don't seem to exist.

Even if compounds of the concert-sing type were quite
natural and numerous, it would remain that they differ from
the above mentioned cases of noun incorporation in at least
two significant respects: first, the noun does not undergo
formal changes as is the case in most incorporating langua-
ges; second, while the position of the incorporated noun with
reference to the verb depends on what type of sequence is
usual on the level of the complete sentence, the noun in the
English compounds is always preposed, even though English is
an SVO language. Incorporation is therefore an original pro-
cess, at least if compared with composition in English. How-
ever, it is closer to composition than to derivation.

It is worth noting that another European language, French,
presents a vestigial type of compound verbs which comes close
to the Paiute or Takelma data. As mentioned by E. Benveniste 12,
maintenir contains a noun in instrumental use (main) preceding
a verb which is normally inflected (tenir). But this is a non-
productive process and the speakers do not analyze that kind
of verbs into their constitutive elements. Note that the whole
compound has been borrowed by English, where it is even less

11. As Sapir himself recognizes (ib., p. 256 fn. 1), "verbs li-
ke "to typewrite" are of course only apparent exceptions; they
are only secondarily verbal in character, being denominative
derivatives from already existing compound nouns."
12. "Convergences typologiques", L'Homme, Mouton, VI, 1966,
n°2, p. 5-12.
analyzable than in French, since English has **hand** and **keep** instead of **main** and **tenir**. As for French compounds such as **prendre plaisir** (take pleasure), the absence of the article and the position of the nominal element would indicate that they are similar enough to cases of incorporation, were it not that the relation is always predicate-object and consequently does not present the variety and looseness that we have observed in incorporating languages.

3. If compared with what has been said of incorporation, lexical suffixes, at least such as they appear in Mainland Comox, present very specific features. These will now be studied.

3.1. Far from being incorporated copies or reduced or altered forms of independent lexical items, the overwhelming majority of these suffixes are not related to any freely occurring lexical elements. On the contrary, most items with a semantic content comparable to that of a given lexical suffix turn out to be complex associations in which the lexical suffix itself is an integral part, as is also the case in Squamish, Upper Chehalis, Tillamook, etc. These associations, when used with distal or proximal articles or with possessives, can function as subjects, corresponding to the agent, to the patient or to the experiencer. In that use, we may call them nouns, though keeping in mind that they can, if combined with other elements, function as predicates. Since there is a semantic relationship between this kind of nouns and certain suffixes in the Salishan languages and since, more importantly, these suffixes refer to notions generally considered lexical (objects, body parts, temporal, spatial and natural concepts), they have been variously termed "substantival" by Kroeber (1909) and Sapir (1911), "nominal" by Gladys Reichard (1938), "etymological" by May Edel (1939), "field" by H. Vogt (1940) and "lexical" by D. Kinkade (1963), whose terminology has generally been accepted among Salishanists.

13. The same phenomenon exists in Kwakiutl as well as in Chemakum. It has also been observed in Siouan languages such as Ponka (where the bound elements are prefixes).
But this does not imply that the lexical suffixes are derived from noun roots, "nor is their historical source to be sought in any class of root morphemes. The evidence indicates that these suffixes have been, as they are now, a coherent set of non-nuclear morphemes, with their own viability for change and productiveness." To give a more precise illustration of this fundamental difference between lexical suffixes in Comox and incorporated nouns of other languages, I propose a list in which I present the independent nouns having a semantic content related to that of a suffix. I reduce it, for lack of space, to a number of items which is very small in proportion to the one a "complete" list should contain. Several terms in the list refer to body parts. There is no formal reason to assign a specific status to these particular suffixes, whose Squamish counterparts have been termed "somatic" by A. Kuipers. They function in exactly the same way as other non-somatic suffixes, just as in Southern Paiute the incorporation of certain forms of nouns designating body parts does not have a separate status. It is on another level that they may be grouped together, i.e. semantically, since they constitute a coherent class from that point of view.

Furthermore, body part lexical suffixes reflect not a portion but the entire semantic content of corresponding lexical items. However, the reciprocal statement is false: many meanings which are not found in the nouns. This is one of the reasons why they cannot be assimilated to English prefixes such as ohiro- (=hand), gastro- (=stomach), etc., let alone the fact that the latter belong to the "scientific" vocabulary, which is not the case with the lexical suffixes.

15. This list does not contain the items given by Herman Haeberlin ("Distribution of the Salish substantival lexical suffixes", ed. by M.Terry Thompson, Anthropological linguistics, 16,6, 1974, p.340) as appearing only in Comox. I have not found them in the Sliammon dialect. [-iq, given for nose by Haeberlin (p.253 which also cites an -iq variant), is [-eq in my data.
16. In Takelma, however, according to Sapir (op.cit., p.272-273), the behavior of the corresponding forms gives them "more decidedly the appearance of being incorporated than other nouns."
17. This is the case in Bella Coola, according to R. Saunders and Philip Davis, "The internal syntax of lexical suffixes in Bella Coola", IJAL, 41,2, 1975, p.106.
18. Only a few nouns have meanings some of which are not found in the suffix (see below for tūmif and mō-ōs).
19. The same is true of other prefixes, such as pyro- (=fire) or hydro- (=water).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>suffixes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 -êyos(-)</td>
<td>-om(-)</td>
<td>berry, food, edible thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -mexW(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>floor, bottom, lower part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 -neč(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>rear, root, base, hidden part, anus, tail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 -dye(-)</td>
<td>tdmis</td>
<td>person, human being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 -qâx-?ay(-)</td>
<td>mok(^{\prime\prime})-m(\prime)n</td>
<td>gullet, gap, hole, pipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 -?eäa(\prime)a(-)</td>
<td>më?-os</td>
<td>top of the head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 -âw-k(\prime)p(-)</td>
<td>q(\prime)eyx</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 -?é:jé(-)</td>
<td>?éy-i(\prime)</td>
<td>house, arm, finger, hold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 -awtxW(-)</td>
<td>?âye</td>
<td>tree, wood, plant, long round object, bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 -?ay(-)</td>
<td>jë?je</td>
<td>nose, promontory, long object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 -?eqV(-)</td>
<td>màq:sn</td>
<td>belly, inside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 -lëwe(-)</td>
<td>k(\prime)â?wa</td>
<td>stomach, breast, heart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 -ay(\prime)(-)</td>
<td>xâmum</td>
<td>back, spine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 -?â¿g-?ë(-)</td>
<td>?ëy-ë-in</td>
<td>canoe, bowels, container, side, flesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 -ëg-ë(-)</td>
<td>nûxW-ë</td>
<td>thigh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 -?û-ep(-)</td>
<td>qâm-ap</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 -?û-os(-)</td>
<td>qâ?wum</td>
<td>waist, side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 -ëga(-)</td>
<td>sày-ë-g-m</td>
<td>neck, ear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 -?âna(-)</td>
<td>sày-ë-na</td>
<td>mouth, voice, language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 -?æn(-)</td>
<td>sày-?æn</td>
<td>throat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 -?là(-)</td>
<td>sày-?là</td>
<td>penis, sexual organs, stick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 -aq'(-)</td>
<td>xàl-aq'</td>
<td>foot, leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 -?ë(-)</td>
<td>?ë-?ë</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 -ëns(-)</td>
<td>më-?ës</td>
<td>face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 -ës(-)</td>
<td>jë-?ës</td>
<td>tooth, sharp edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 -?yje(-)</td>
<td>tæt-?yje</td>
<td>cheek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 -?yex(-)</td>
<td>?ë-së-ëx(-)</td>
<td>elbow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 -?ë-eë(-)</td>
<td>x(\prime)ët-x(\prime)-?ë-eë(-)</td>
<td>chin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Only the first given meaning is common to the lexical suffix and the noun.

21. The sign "(-)" indicates that the lexical suffix can be followed by other suffixes in verb phrases. In the nouns in column B (19 through 29), it is the last suffix.
For items 1, 2 and 3, as yet no corresponding nouns have been found. Items 4, 5 and 6 do not bear any resemblance to the nouns in column B. Furthermore, tūmīf (probably analyzable, itself, as tū-mif) means person, but also man, hunter or hero, while -āye(-) refers to human beings of any sex; mōk'-mān is formed by addition of mōk'- swallow and -mān, a suffix referring to persons or things working as performers or instruments for certain activities; -ēw'-wā(-) means top of the head, but mōʔ-os has both this sense and the sense of face, for which the lexical suffix is -os(-).

Items 7 through 18 are ordered (more or less arbitrarily, of course), according to a growing formal resemblance between suffix and noun. Let us recall that there are morphophonemic alternations in Comox between i and y on the one hand, g and w on the other hand. I have used hyphens for the nouns that are probably or very likely analyzable into smaller elements. Items 19 through 22 correspond to cases of lexical suffixes appearing as integral parts of the nouns. The say-in four nouns of the list is a very widely used stem: it generally refers to any part of a set. The jé- in items 23 and 26 of column B is probably a reduced form of jéʔje tree, metaphorically applied to body parts.

The lexical suffixes are not all morphological primes.

I have hypothesized that items 5 and 15 are further analyzable and I have tentatively written hyphens. -ēw-os(-) eye probably contains -os(-) face; -ēʔje-t-eq chin contains -ēʔje(-) cheek and -eq, which might be related to Squamish -q bottom -k′, p(-)(7), -iʔ(-) (14), -cp(-) (16) and -ex(-) (28) are variants of pan-Salish suffixes respectively meaning fire, back, bottom and arm (Haeberlin, op. cit., p. 230), so that 16 thigh would be tree-bottom and 28 elbow would be tree-arm; the final -n in -qen(-) mouth and -jín(-) foot might represent an old instrumental suffix, which also shows up as a part of the two productive instrumental suffixes -mān (al-

---

22. say- might be related to the pan-Coast-Salish suffix -al(a) place of (Haeberlin, op. cit., p. 231), with change of l to y (common in Sliammon) and prefix s- (nominalizer?) dating back to a time when the syllabic structure of Comox still allowed prefixation.

so used for human beings working as performers of certain activities) and -ton.

It is evident from the foregoing that the lexical suffixes constitute an archaic system which is characterized by its coherence and its autonomy with regard to the nouns with meanings related to theirs. This alone would suffice to show the difference between these suffixes and the incorporated nouns in languages such as Nahuatl, Southern Paiute, Yana, etc. Moreover the lexical suffixes are tightly attached to the stems with which they appear in sentences. They never show up as independent nouns with articles, deictics or possessives. They have no plural. They therefore behave as derivational, not compositional elements, and in that respect they are again very different from incorporated nouns.

The Mainland Comox lexical suffixes are immediately attached to the stem, preceding all other suffixes. The stem is either verb-like or noun-like: this fact, in Comox as well as in other Salishan languages, justifies a distinction between lexical and all other suffixes. Still another distinction is provided by their stress pattern. While all other suffixes are unstressed in Comox, the lexical suffixes having more than one syllable always bear a secondary stress on their first syllable, despite their tight association with the stem. In some cases (see item 27 above), this syllable even has the primary stress.

3.2. In consequence of these characteristics, it may seem artificial to try to state the kind of relationship the lexical suffixes bear to the stem with which they are used, as though they were derivable from nouns by a copying transformation. We have seen that diachronically they are not. It is however possible to conceive of the morphology of the complex "word" to which they belong, as an internal syntax in the sense applied to Nootka by Swadesh.

24. Certain monosyllabic lexical suffixes also have a secondary stress when the stem has more than two syllables (example (25) below).
I have not found any cases of sequences of two lexical suffixes juxtaposed within a single word and reflecting two different syntactical relations. Such cases have been observed in other Salishan languages (for Bella Coola, see Ross and Saunders, op. cit.). I have found very few cases of instrumental meanings. Here are examples of some of the usual types of associations that are represented in Comox:

(17) $A'p'oi-fin-\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w-o$  
(break-lex.suf.leg-quest.-2 p. neutral-anteriority m.)  
Did you break your leg?

(18) $A'p'oi-fin-\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w$  
(break-lex.suf.leg-2 p. patient-3 p. agent-posteriority m.)  
It will break your leg.

(19) $\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w-sayqen-s$  
(hit-lex.suf.mouth-imp.m.-2 p. agent/mouth-of him)  
Hit him right in the mouth!

(20) $t'\text{\text{-}-}n\text{-}\check{c}x^w$  
(blood(red.progr.)-lex.suf.ear-mediopass.m.-2 p. neutral)  
Your ear is bleeding.

(21) $\check{c}x^w-\text{\text{-}-}a$  
(hurt-lex.suf.throat-1 p. neutral)  
I have a sore throat.

(22) $\check{c}x^w-\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w$  
(hair-lex.suf.leg-3 p. neutral)  
He has hairy legs.

(23) $\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w-\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w$  
(thick-lex.suf.top of the head-2 p.pl. neutral)  
You people are narrow-minded.

(24) $x^w-\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w/\check{c}x^w-\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w$  
(not be-quest.-2 p. neutral / bad-lex.suf.eye-2 p. infin.)  
Aren't you short-sighted?

(25) $\text{\text{-}-}\text{\text{-}-}\check{c}x^w$  
(white man-lex.suf.language-link.vowel-mediopass.m.-3 p. neutral-quest.)
Does he speak English?

(26) tám-é / k
\text{w}-θ-náx\text{w}eł

(be what-lex.suf.canoe / dist.-2 p. poss.-canoe)

What kind of canoe do you have?

Instead of the formal unity of the process of suffixation, the corresponding sentences without lexical suffixes would contain nouns in various functions. In this respect, the phenomenon may be compared with the difference between incorporation and non-incorporation of the noun in incorporating languages. But from the semantic point of view, the comparison is no more tenable. To illustrate this, let us replace example (21) by

(27) ?áx / tó-tó-sáyláž

(hurt / prox.-1 p. poss.-throat)

Here emphasis is laid on the painful aspect of the affection, while the formula with a lexical suffix is not so marked. Consequently, the difference between the use of lexical suffixes and the syntactic solution in Comox is not one of characteristic towards accidental implications (see 2.2.3. above), but rather of ordinary towards emphatic ones. Moreover, the syntactic solution is statistically less frequent than the synthetic one, in contradistinction to what Sapir writes about Nahuatl and Paiute (p. above).

4. Although I have not gone into much detail, it clearly appears from the foregoing that lexical suffixation in Comox is a process which cannot be treated as a particular case of noun incorporation. It so happens that Comox, while widely using lexical suffixes, also presents cases of noun incorporation, though on a limited scale. Here are first some illustrations:

(28) ?áx-tūmɪʃ-ō

(good-hunter-1 p. neutral)

I am a good hunter

(29) xťe-ō / ląx-sáltx\text{w}-\text{m}

(not be-1 p. neutral / bad-wife-1 p. infin.)

I am not a bad wife
(30) māmāla-mām-ʔ-̬xʷ
(white man-be so-link.vowel-2 p. neutral)

You act like a white man.

tūmifu, ʔa1txʷ and māmāla, respectively hunter, wife and white man, are nouns which can freely occur in other environments. When they are preposed((30)) or postposed((28) and (29)), their form does not undergo any change. Furthermore, two kinds of relationships to the verb can be stated: (28) and (29) illustrate the experiencer, and (30) the predicate subjective use of the incorporated noun. Another construction may also be used instead of (28) and (29), the meanings being roughly the same:

(31) ?fi:–o1n-tūmifu
(good-1 p. intr.-hunter)

(32) xʷn-ʔ / ʔa1x–m–sāltxʷ
(not be-1 p. neutral / bad-1 p. infin.-wife).

With this construction, a personal pronoun belonging to the intransitive paradigm must be used if the stem has a static meaning, like fi: good (the negative auxiliary verb xʷn which requires a pronoun of the infinitival paradigm, is not the stem with which the noun is incorporated; example (32)). The noun, in this construction, is the last postposed element, but it is still a case of incorporation, since 1) the noun is not accompanied by determiners 2) it has no function on the level of the whole sentence 3) it is associated to a stem which has a static sense, and this association expresses a characterization, not an accidental event.

With regard to sentence (30), it is clear that māmāla is an incorporated noun, since nam be so, behave as, is a verb-like element. māmāla, as seen in example (25) above, can also serve as a noun-like stem, followed by a lexical suffix such as -qen(−) language, the whole complex meaning to speak English. In this same function, it can be followed by a non-lexical suffix 25, as in example (33):

25. This process can be compared with the one observed in Paiute qani-ntou to build a house or Yana hauyauba-inigui?a to contain nothing but deer fat. Sapir (op. cit., p. 254) writes that qani house and hauyauba deer fat "can not be considered as incorporated, for the verbal elements -ntou... and -inigui?a are not verb stems but verb-forming affixes morphologically comparable to English -ize in verbs of the type materialize, pauperize."
To sum up, noun-like stems are equivalent to verbs when followed by lexical or factitive suffixes, etc., and personal pronouns. But when they precede or follow verb-like elements, they illustrate a case of noun incorporation. Despite the looseness of the noun-verb distinction in Comox from a formal viewpoint, functional criteria based on types of combinations and on the resulting meaning allow one to speak without circularity of noun incorporation as a process comparable to the one studied in 2 above.

5. As H. Woodbury has remarked, "given that noun incorporation is relatively widespread among American Indian languages, and that it was recognized at least as early as 1819, it is surprising that it has been given as little attention as it has. Since Sapir's dispute with Kroeber concerning its existence, little has been done to follow through on Sapir's general conclusions concerning the grammatical functions of this process." Even following through on them, it is necessary to make some reserves, if only to show that, while lexical suffixes and noun incorporation must be considered two distinct processes, there exists at least one Salishan language in which they turn out to be both represented. It is hoped that further studies will make it possible to confirm or invalidate the claim that this linguistic family does, to some extent, belong to the group of incorporating languages, despite the fact that the lexical suffixes, a feature highly characteristic of Salish and other north-west Pacific languages, are not a case of noun incorporation.

27. Woodbury mentions (ib.) P.S. Du Ponceau, "Reports of the Corresponding Secretary" Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1, 1819, and Mémoire sur le système grammatical de quelques nations indiennes de l'Amérique du nord, Paris, 1838.
28. This is not an isolated case among American languages. Concerning Takelma, see fn. on p.
29. Mainland Comox, to which this study is restricted, is probably not, being a Coast language, one of the richest in lexical suffixes.