Introduction. Like the other Salishan languages, Bella Coola possesses an affix -s- that precedes stems, and Bella Coola also possesses a second, closely related prefix, sis-, that is not pan-Salishan. Our purpose in this paper is to characterize the semantics and grammar of these two forms.

Any language will be organized to enable the expression and communication of a NARRATED EVENT; something happens or something is, and that perception or recollection is conveyed by a speaker to a listener. The implementation of this communication is commonly called a "speech act" (cf., e.g. Searle 1969), and like all historical occurrences it must exist within a matrix of other occurrences, some of which will also be speech acts. All languages are additionally organized to express this contextualization as well, in that they possess the formal means/patterns to communicate a variety of relationships between the speech act and the experience/knowledge shared by the speaker and listener. It is this aspect of meaning that makes the NARRATED EVENT relevant to the listener (sensible) by relating its terms and/or assertion (the whole) to what he already knows of the world (his prior knowledge of occurrences—speech acts and others). The application of language resources to this end has commonly been labelled "pragmatics" (cf. e.g. Lyons 1977:114-15). It is the expression of these two broad domains of meaning that imposes upon the grammar of a language its primary patterns.

The identification of terms and relations within a NARRATED EVENT and their structuring results in a PROPOSITION, that may be thought of in the manner of Fillmore (1968, 1971 and 1977) and Chafe (1970) as consisting of an EVENT and a number of PARTICIPANTS. This semantic organization must then receive formal expression; for example, EVENT may be consistently placed at some fixed point in a sequence, while PARTICIPANTS occupy other points. OR EVENT may be accompanied by an additional, morphological device (e.g. to signal Fillmore's Modality), as the PARTICIPANTS may be accompanied by inflection (e.g. Case) to distinguish among the PARTICIPANTS as well as distinguishing the PARTICIPANTS as a group from the EVENT. In short, the formal appara of sequence and morphological marking give an indication of the presence of the semantic distinctions. But, because the formal resources of a language are limited, it frequently happens that a single mark must serve multiple functions and signal, say, not only semantic information pertaining to the NARRATED EVENT, but also information as to the context in which that EVENT is communicated. A simple illustration of this in Bella Coola is the—at least—dual function of utterance initial position:

(1) 4ikm-Ø ti-wač-tx
[run-it -dog- ]
'The dog is running'

(ti- ... -tx are deictic markers that are discussed below.) Initial position, occupied here by 4ikm-Ø 'run', marks that semantic material as the EVENT, but that same position also marks the material occupying it as in some sense "new" in the context in which (1) is uttered. Thus (1) answers the question 'What's the dog doing?' but not 'Who (or 'what') is running?' An answer to the latter question might be

(2) ti-wač ti-4ikm-tx
'It's a dog that's running.'

The choice between (1) and (2) pertains not to different NARRATED EVENTS (The same thing has happened regardless of how it is organized for communication.), but to what knowledge is assumed to be shared by the speaker and listener, as reflected by the contextualization accomplished by one or the other question; and this is a matter of the matrix of occurrences that contain the utterance. Initial position encodes EVENT as well as information that lies outside the experience of the listener.

1.0 s-. It is the semantic and grammatical patterns of the PROPOSITION: adumbrated above that are relevant to an understanding of the productive functioning of s- in Bella Coola; and it is upon that productive usage that we will focus in this paper. The productive semantic and grammatical pattern that s- evinces has also provided the source for innumerable lexicalizations. Where the source of lexical items is still productive we may expect to discover a continuum of degrees of lexicalization in the same manner that noun compounding in English yields forms with varying degrees of semantic opacity, formal bondedness, etc. (cf. Downing 1977). We acknowledge the existence of the lexicalized s- initial lexemes and a scale of lexicalization analogous to the English noun compounds, but we concentrate here upon the system that has produced this
result.

To understand the semantics of 5 we must further detail the semantic and formal structure of the proposition. We have noted that utterance initial position signals the EVENT of a proposition. Independently of this, the morphological prefix ti- (also ta-, ci-, ti-, wa- and tu- depending upon gender, number and deixis. Cf. Davis and Saunders 1975b) signals the particularization of the semantic content of the following root (or stem). Thus, wač in (3) wač-Ø ti-²îkm-tx means "be-dog" and identifies the particularized PARTICIPANT of ti-²îkm-tx 'the one (who is) running' as exhibiting those properties that enable one to cooperatively assert wač of the PARTICIPANT as a reasonable identification of it. In contrast to (3), ti-wač in (2) asserts—because of its utterance initial position—that 'the one (who is) running' is a particular dog. The deictic prefix marks a PARTICULAR, whereas its absence marks a DOMAIN. The PARTICIPANTS in a PROPOSITION will then be all, necessarily, deictically prefixed. The EVENT may or may not be.

In Bella Coola, as in other languages, PARTICIPANTS within a PROPOSITION will typically fulfill some ROLE. The specific character of ROLES will, of course, vary across languages; and within a language it is the EVENT that characteristically determines the ROLES of the co-occurring PARTICIPANT(S). Thus, in (1) above the ROLE of ti-wač-tx may be that of EXECUTOR, while in (4) kį-Ø ti-wač-tx

fall-he -dog-]

'the dog is falling'

the ROLE is less EXECUTOR-like and may be, rather, that of EXPERIENCER. EVENTS are not restricted to occurrence with one PARTICIPANT per PROPOSITION; more may appear, and they will also fulfill EVENT-identified ROLES:

(5) tx-is ti-²îmsta-tx ti-³îlx-x-tx

[cut-he/it -person- -rope- ]

'the person is cutting the rope'

(6) nap-is ti-²îmsta-tx ti-staltmx-tx x-ti-³îlx-x-tx

[give-he/him -person- -chief- Prep- -rope- ]

'the person is giving the chief the rope'

We see in (5) that ²îmsta, as wač in (1), may be perceived as EXECUTOR, while ³îlx 'rope' appears to be something like the ROLE fulfilled by wač in (4), i.e. EXPERIENCER. Where two ROLE-PARTICIPANTS are present, the EVENT may express the person and number of each, e.g. -is in (5). Linear sequence then distinguishes the two ROLES, and it is this marking that prompts one to label Bella Coola as VSO. In (6) we find a third PARTICIPANT (staltmx 'chief') manifesting a ROLE that is characterized by the receipt of the rope. If we construct a scale of possible ROLES such that the most motile one is located at the left extreme and the least motile, most passive ROLE is at the right, then for sentence (5), the ROLE of ²îmsta 'person' falls to the left relative to the ROLE of ³îlx 'rope':

motile_________EXECUTOR EXPERIENCER

and the 'passive' ROLE of tx 'cut' is EXPERIENCER regardless of whether it is inanimate (e.g. ³îlx 'rope') or animate (e.g. wač 'dog'). The addition of a third ROLE forces a further segmentation of the right portion of the scale, so that we have for (6):

motile_________EXECUTOR EXPERIENCER IMPLEMENT

The distinction of an IMPLEMENT ROLE is also possible for (5):

7) tx-is ti-²îmsta-tx ti-³îlx-x-tx x-ti-³îlx-x-tx

[give-he/him -person- -rope- -knife- ]

'the person cut the rope with the knife'

Sentence (7) is exactly parallel to (6). The EVENT of (4) — kį 'fall' — then differs from the EVENT of (1) — likm 'run' — in that likm "intersects" this scale further to the left than kį and selects a more motile ROLE. (Cf. Davis ms. b. for discussion of similar patterning in English, the continua involved and the ill-definedness of ROLES when divorced from the context of their use.)

The language permits overt expression of more than two ROLES, but when such is the case, Bella Coola betrays an inequality between the first two and the remainder. Note first that the language encodes information (person and number) only for the first two, and the third requires a marking in addition to its rightmost sequential positioning, viz. the Preposition x-. This parallel treatment of the first two ROLES in the above examples (in opposition to the remainder) extends to their expression under contextual conditions conducive to the use of pronouns. The EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER are then given zero expression, while the third requires an overt form (Cf. Davis and Saunders 1975a.
The shared semantic content hinted at by the common formal properties of the EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER in (6) and (7), and now confirmed by the symmetrical presence of Passive and Anti-passive, is constituted by the placement of focal attention within the PROPOSITION, i.e., upon the EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER in (6) and (7), while the other ROLES do not carry it there. (Cf. Davis ns. a. for further discussion of the cognitive bases of language and their patterning in languages of diverse types.)

The above observations and conclusion suggest that we distinguish semantically between the NUCLEUS of a PROPOSITION—containing the EVENT and one, at most two, PARTICIPANT-ROLE(S) that will bear focal attention—and a PERIPHERY containing the remainder of the PROPOSITION. (A similar proposal is made for English by Halliday 1970. Cf. also Davis ns. b.) The semantic peripherality—absence of focal attention—is explicitly indicated by certain utterances containing -amk, a derivational suffix that is added to the EVENT of a PROPOSITION. As in (9), (10) and (11), wherein NUCLEAR ROLES were removed from focal attention, so may PERIPHERAL ROLES be included; for example,

12

(10) tx-amk-is ti-\textsuperscript{4}msta-tx ti-\textsuperscript{1}lnsx\textsuperscript{-}tx [cut-he/it -person -knife -rope] 'The person used a knife to cut the rope'

A simple two-ROLE utterance such as (5) also has an alternative expression with -amk, but with the EXPERIENCER continuing to occupy a spot in the NUCLEUS and without, thereby, coding focal attention to the IMPLEMENT:
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(14) tx-amk-is ti-\textsuperscript{4}msta-tx ti-\textsuperscript{1}lnsx\textsuperscript{-}tx [cut-he/it -person -rope] 'The man cut the rope among other things'

It is sentences on the model of (14) that place the meaning of -amk into relief. Sentence (14) is appropriate to a context in which the person who is the EXECUTOR cut items among which happened to be the rope; but cutting the rope was not central to his action. It was secondary—PERIPHERAL—to the primary—NUCLEAR—performance. The distinction between NUCLEAR and PERIPHERAL is also clearly present in those pairs:
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(15) a. kaw-ic ti-sm\textsuperscript{4}kk-tx [deliver-1/it -fish] 'I'll deliver the fish'

b. kaw-amk-ic ti-sm\textsuperscript{4}kk-tx [deliver-1/it -fish] 'I'll deliver the fish on my way'

(16) a. \textsuperscript{4}lu\textsuperscript{4}x-is ti-nap-tx [steal-he/it -thing] 'He stole the thing'

b. \textsuperscript{4}lu\textsuperscript{4}x-amk-is ti-nap-tx [steal-he/it -thing] 'He walked off with the thing'

(17) a. lis-tis wa-\textsuperscript{4}msta-c [push-he/them -person] 'He pushed the people'

b. lis-amk-tis wa-\textsuperscript{4}msta-tx [push-he/them -person] 'He pushed the people aside'

In (15b) the delivering is incidental to the primary purpose of the trip, whereas in (15a) it is the only reason; in (16b) the person who stole the object may...
have taken it inadvertently while stealing something else, or even if while visiting he examines the object and leaves having forgotten to replace it, (16b) will be appropriate. In (17b) the peripherality is overtly present in the ‘aside’; the EXECUTOR is not interested in pushing people as an end in itself, but in clearing a path. He is secondarily and incidentally pushing people. In (14)-(17) we see that -emk- indeed signals PERIPHERAL and combines that semantic property with the ROLE that grammatically, immediately follows the EXECUTOR. But comparison of (14)-(17) with (12) and (13) also shows that -emk- is not uniquely associated with some specific ROLE, combining as it does with EXPERIENCER — in (14)-(17) — and IMPLEMENT — in (12)-(13). We also see that -emk- is optionally present when the EXPERIENCER ROLE occupies the NUCLEUS, but that when the IMPLEMENT is accorded a position within the NUCLEUS, -emk- is obligatory. Compare (13) with (18):

(18) *tx-is ti-?inl-tx ti-tipla-tx

PERIPHERALITY is a property inherent in the IMPLEMENT ROLE, IMPLEMENT being always PERIPHERAL to the EVENT, the “happening” that involves the PARTICIPANTS as filling ROLES; but, in appropriate circumstances, IMPLEMENT may assume NUCLEAR status with respect to the PROPOSITION.

Each EVENT in the language will establish its ROLES and also which ones will be NUCLEAR for it and which ones, PERIPHERAL. Those ROLES are then known for each EVENT to be either NUCLEAR or PERIPHERAL, and knowing that imparts a semantic structure to the PROPOSITION as a whole, a schema for which might appear as follows (cf. Saunders and Davis 1978):

(a) EVENT

(b) EVENT

(c) EVENT

(19) PROPOSITION

NUCLEUS

EXECUTOR ROLE

EXPERIENCER ROLE

IMPLEMENT ROLE

PERIPHERY

Other configurations are possible depending upon the EVENT; in contrast with tx ‘cut’, the EVENT nuyam ‘‘sing’’ acquires but one inherently NUCLEAR ROLE — the EXECUTOR — and two PERIPHERAL ones — the EXPERIENCER and IMPLEMENT:

(20) nuyam-Ø ti-?inl-tx -u-ti-stal-tx x-ti-syut-mu-tx

[sing-he -man- Prep -chief- Prep -song-your- ]

‘The man is singing the chief your song’

Once the pattern that relates ROLES to each EVENT as inherently NUCLEAR or PERIPHERAL — (19a), (19b), (19c), etc. — becomes one of the PROPOSITION as well, it can be (and is) exploited by placing PERIPHERAL ROLES into the NUCLEUS of the PROPOSITION, e.g. (12) and (13), or NUCLEAR ones into the PERIPHERY, e.g. (20). It is the inherent EVENT-determined NUCLEARITY-PERIPHERALITY of ROLES and the PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEARITY-PERIPHERALITY that the former engenders which produce the semantic interplay that identifies both as distinct aspects of the PROPOSITION. We consider the above examples to amply illustrate the presence of the NUCLEAR-PERIPHERAL distinction in Bella Coola. (The semantic organization of the PROPOSITION and the structuring of the sentence that it implies is further discussed in Saunders and Davis in prep. English shows a distinction similar to the EVENT-determined NUCLEARITY or PERIPHERALITY of ROLES in allowing each EVENT/Verb in the language to select proto-typically a ROLE or ROLES and to occur optionally with an additional one, the distinction between the proto-typical ROLE(s) and the others being formally recognized in various ways. Cf. Davis ns. b. for discussion.)

1.1 It is within the frame of semantic distinctions encompassed by the opposition of NUCLEUS to PERIPHERY that 9- functions, and we begin by considering its occurrence in the expression of PARTICIPANTS, particularly in the Bella Coola equivalent of relative clauses. The formation of a PARTICIPANT requires that it be made PARTICULAR, and this semantic content is signalled by the deictic prefix (cf. above). The prefix does not, however, further identify the PARTICULAR by fixing it in space-time; this is the semantic province of the deictic suffixes, that identify the PARTICULAR in terms of the speaker’s witnessing of it relative to the space and time of the conversation. (Cf. Davis and Saunders 1975b for details.) If such specification is omitted, it is thereby claimed that the PARTICULAR is unwitnessed by the speaker; thus,

(21) ti-?inl-tx

(22) ti-?inl-Ø
In (21), the PARTICULAR (ti-) man (ʔjlmk) is said to be visually witnessed by the speaker at the time of the conversation and within a certain distance of it (-tx); while in (22), the PARTICULAR (ti-) man is claimed to be unseen by any time by the speaker (-q). The identification of a PARTICULAR by relating it via the speaker's experience to the spatio-temporal locus of the conversation is but one way of achieving the precise specification of the PARTICULAR. A PARTICULAR is also sufficiently identified if its ROLE in some PROPOSITION is provided. For example,

(23) ʔjlmk ti-ɬap-tx
[-man -go -]
'The man who is going.'

Thus, -tx, -q and ti-ɬap-tx all function in paradigmatic fashion in the identification of the PARTICULAR that the deictic prefix asserts to exist. In (23), the PARTICULAR is identified as the one fulfilling the EXECUTOR ROLE of the EVENT ɬap in the PROPOSITION that follows the PARTICULAR ʔjlmk. When other identifying PROPOSITIONS with differing ROLES are employed, any of the ROLES may serve to specify the PARTICULAR. The PROPOSITION expressed in (6), for example, contains EXECUTOR, EXPERIENCER and IMPLEMENT; and a PARTICULAR may be identified by its filling any of the three:

(24) ʔjbstCX ɬap-tx x-ɬisx-w-tx
[-person -give-he/him -chief -Prep -rope -]
'The person who gave the chief the rope.'

(25) ɬistm CX ɬap-is ʔjbstCX x-ɬisx-w-tx
[-chief -give-he/him -person -Prep -rope -]
'The chief whom the person gave the rope.'

(26) ɬisx-w ɬap-is ʔjbstCX ɬistm CX
[-rope -give-he/him -person -chief -]
'The rope that the person gave the chief.'

It is in (26) that we begin to see the function of -q: here it is associated with an inherently PERIPHERAL ROLE, the IMPLEMENT. Sentence (7) provides a parallel to (26):

(27) ɬis CX ɬap-is ʔjbstCX ɬisx-w-tx
[-knife -cut-he/it -person -rope -]
'The knife the person cut the rope with.'

Occasionally, EVENTS that occur with a single NUCLEAR ROLE (i.e. that are grammatically Intransitive) will appear with a PERIPHERAL ROLE as in (28):

(28) ʔyam CX ʔjbstCX ɬis CX ɬis CX
[-person -Preps -song-your -]
'The person is singing your song.'

The involvement of ɬis CX 'song' in the EVENT of ʔyam CX 'sing' is sufficient to identify it by its participation in that PROPOSITION:

(29) ɬis CX ɬap CX ɬis CX ɬis CX ɬap CX ɬis CX
[-rope -give-he/him -person -]
'The rope the person gave.'

When the PARTICIPANTS that occupy identifying PERIPHERAL ROLES have those ROLES recast into the PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEUS, as in (12) and (13), those ROLES may still serve to identify some PARTICULAR PARTICIPANT, but the inclination is not to employ -q; thus,

(30) ɬis CX ɬap CX ɬis CX ɬap CX ɬis CX
[-rope -give-he/him -person -]
'The rope the person gave.'

but

(31) ɬis CX ɬap CX ɬap CX ɬis CX
[-rope -give-he/him -person -]
'The rope the person gave.'

The last is said to 'sound a little funny.' When the reverse happens (viz., a NUCLEAR ROLE is perceived as PROPOSITIONALLY PERIPHERAL), as when the EVENT-NUCLEAR EXPERIENCER of (5) appears in the PROPOSITIONAL PERIPHERY of (11), that new PERIPHERAL ROLE may still serve to specify some PARTICULAR:

(32) ɬis CX ɬap CX ɬap CX ɬis CX
[-rope -give-he/him -person -]
'The rope the person cut.'

The presence of the Identifying ROLE in the PERIPHERY of the PROPOSITION again elicits the -q- prefix on the EVENT.

The above phrases suggest that -q- is not associated with a single ROLE, but that it is appropriate to ROLES that happen to appear without focal attention, i.e. in the PERIPHERY of a PROPOSITION. The presence of expressions wherein the identified PARTICULAR is omitted as in

(33) ɬap CX ɬap CX ɬap CX ɬap CX
[-rope -give-he/him -person -]
'The rope the person cut.'

may give the impression that there should exist in the language forms such as
We also find from where frequently the aspect-and a but that is secondary to (and
PARTICIPANTS, when the modifying structure of Adjective and
compounding a new category, the 'voices; and from
PROPOSITION to identification by
(35) to (40). The ROLES in the nonce circumstances of
It is the removal of inflection that signals the shift from identification by
PROPOSITIONAL ROLE to identification by NAME, i.e. from (34) to (39) and from
(35) to (40). The ROLES in the nonce circumstances of (34) and (35) are
reified to create a new independent category or DOMAIN. It is as in English
when the modifying structure of Adjective and Noun in the good guy becomes by
compounding a new category, the good guy: a sub-type constructed for an occasion
is removed from the immediate circumstances of its creation to become an
independent DOMAIN of perception (cf. Davis ms. b. for further discussion).

Another tactic that Bella Coola may employ in the construction of new
DOMAINS is the addition of the derivational suffix -ta to the forms of the third
person singular of (34) and (35). Because the PERIPHERAL ROLE is
frequently the EMPLEMENT, -ta may give the impression that it forms 'instruments',
but that is secondary to (and derives from) its marking of PERIPHERAL ROLE
PARTICIPANTS. Thus, from 1p-is 'he shears it' we may find 1p-ta 'shears'; but we
also find from ?iusayx-0 'he passes/gets by', the form ?iusayxista 'place
where people meet' or 'passage'. From thm-0 'he speaks', we find thmista
'voice'; and from ?mt-0 'he sits up/down', ?mtsta 'resting place', etc.

It is important to emphasize that the creation of new lexemes is but one
aspect—and a minor one for the grammar of Bella Coola—of -ta prefixation.

It is also important to note that -ta does not denote ROLE, but only PERIPHERAL;
and this is one difference between -ta and *-mk-. The latter specifically designates
ROLES as PERIPHERAL. The presence of ROLE in the above examples of
relative clauses with -ta is effected by the deictic ti—its itself prefixed to
the expression of a PROPOSITION— that denotes a PARTICULAR PARTICIPANT; -ta
simply adds the semantic content of PERIPHERAL to that, and the total then
implies a PERIPHERAL ROLE. The suffix *-mk- further differs from -ta
in that the former denotes a PERIPHERAL ROLE that is also a carrier of focal attention
within the PROPOSITION, while -ta, as we have seen above in (31), must denote
that the material to which it is relevant remains in the PERIPHERY of the
PROPOSITION.

That -ta marks PERIPHERAL semantic content should make it appropriate to
the expression of the "circumstantial" PROPOSITIONAL material of time and space; and indeed this is so. Time and space are morphologically plural in
Bella Coola (cf. Davis and Saunders 1375a), so that we find these expressions
(Space is considered below with si-):

(41) ta-s-ta-?i-nu-tX
(42) ta-s-?i

The absence of deictic suffix in (42) indicates a failure to identify the time
the boundaries) and the result is a span of time.

1.2 It is frames such as
(43) (ti-*msta) ti-
that express the PARTICIPANT and the ROLE in our examples to this point, but
the language does not constrain the expression of PERIPHERAL to this context.
In utterances such as
(44) ?mmap-i4 ti-*msta-tX s-iap-s
[know-we/him person go-he] we find -ta in a different formal context, but with the same function. Sentence
(44) is close to working as a nonrestrictive relative clause. The content of
s-iap-s does not identify the man in (44) as it would if it occurred in (43); here, it provides the information that, in addition to knowing the man, we also
know that he is going: 'We know the man and that he is going' (cf. Davis and Saunders 1978). But that increment of knowledge, the expression of which in (44) is prefixed by s-, is not the focal point of the utterance; it is an addition, PERIPHERAL remark. Sentence (45) is usually glossed as 'We know (that) they are going' and thus conveys the impression—a false one. Cf. Davis and Saunders In prep.—that so-called 'embedding' may be present here. This utterance is, rather, the exact parallel of (44); only here the 'thing known' is expressed by its absence, thus 'it'; and a more literal gloss of (45) would be 'We know it, they're going'.

Sequences such as s-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}ap-s}, because they are marked as signalling PERIPHERAL information, imply some NUCLEUS with respect to which they hold that status; but this does not mean that such phrases cannot be uttered without the preceding NUCLEUS, and we do find that such phrases as

(46)  s-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}ap-s}

are possible as complete utterances. Sentence (46) is appropriate to a context in which some assertion, \textit{\textsuperscript{ap} ti-stal\textit{\textsuperscript{mx}-tx} 'The chief is going' or the like, has occurred; (46) indicates an understanding of that utterance (or other context) and elicits a confirmation. Thus, 'Is he really going?' or 'He's going, eh?' are suitable glosses. Sentences like (46) require an informational setting that both speaker and listener are aware of, and if it is not present a direct yes-no question, e.g. \textit{\textsuperscript{ap} ti-s-'a} 'Is he going?', is necessary. Or again if someone sees a large fish and relates his experience with

(47)  \textit{\textsuperscript{ap}-tu} ta-sm\textit{\textsuperscript{k}}-t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}-ic} ?ala\textsuperscript{a}awa

'[big-it-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}fish} -see-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}it across the street}]

'The fish that I saw across the street was indeed big'

his listener may respond with

(48)  s-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}ap-s}

'Has it as big as you say?'

'So it's big, huh?'

It is the explicitly PERIPHERAL information marked by s- that elicits an answer. Mention of a PARTICIPANT, e.g. \textit{\textsuperscript{sm\textit{\textsuperscript{k}}-tx} 'the fish'; or an EVENT, e.g. \textit{\textsuperscript{ap} ti}

'He's going'; or a PROPOSITION not marked as PERIPHERAL will not produce this effect. For example, a response to (47) might be

(49)  \textit{\textsuperscript{ap}-s}

'[big-it]

This alternative to (48) does not require confirmation; it simply denotes acceptance of the prior assertion: 'That big.' If the utterance of a PROPOSITION marked as PERIPHERAL (s-) implies a NUCLEUS, then absence of the latter is perceived as a request to produce it (in Grice's [1975] terms, this is a blatant flouting of the maxim of quantity.); and in this context, the answering NUCLEUS is the same PROPOSITION, unmarked for PERIPHERALITY (without s-). This usage has a corollary, namely, that the material prefixed by s- in (46) and (48) is not strongly asserted, but rather mentioned and assumed to be in the experience of the listener. In general, the greater the semantic dependency of a PROPOSITION, the greater its lack of assertiveness and the greater its function of mentioning. The occurrence of s-prefixed PROPOSITIONS appear to have in this regard something in common with the so-called "anti-topics" (except that here it is a PROPOSITION rather than the usual PARTICIPANT. Cf. Givón 1975.197, Chafe 1976.53 and Davis ms. a.) in being additions, increments present to prevent misunderstanding or as aids to better seeing the relevance of the NUCLEAR PROPOSITION; and as such, and with focal attention placed elsewhere upon the NUCLEAR portion, their assertiveness is correspondingly diminished.

1.3 A last usage of s- combines properties from its occurrences described in sections 1.1 and 1.2. Consider these sentences:

(50)  ya-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}a} ta-\textit{\textsuperscript{mlk}-tx} ti-s-?\textit{\textsuperscript{al}}-ala-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}a}

[good-he =man- -Indian doctor-he]

'The man was good as an Indian doctor'

(51)  ya-\textit{\textsuperscript{-}a} ti-\textit{\textsuperscript{mlk}-tx} ti-s-\textit{\textsuperscript{ks-tus}} ti-\textit{\textsuperscript{q-y}nt} \textit{\textsuperscript{mt} imut}

[good-he =man- -fix/cause he/it -car]

'The man is good as fixing cars.'

These differ from the identifying-by-ROLE forms of (26), (27), (29), etc. in several ways. First, the paradigmatic relationship of -\textit{\textsuperscript{mlk}}, deictic suffix, and identifying relative clause is absent. In (50), for example, the suffix -\textit{\textsuperscript{tx} identifies} ?\textit{\textsuperscript{mlk}} 'man' as one observed by the speaker in DISTAL space-time (cf. Davis and Saunders 1975b); and the following ti-s- phrase does not and cannot have the semantic function of constraining the PARTICULAR ?\textit{\textsuperscript{mlk}} to some unique one. Secondly, the agreement of deictic prefixes observed in constructions wherein a subsequent phrase does identify a preceding PARTICIPANT by ROLE, e.g. ti-...ti- in (23), is not required here. Thirdly, PARTICIPANTS in such phrases as (24) may themselves be deictically identified: thus ti-stal\textit{\textsuperscript{mx}-tx
and ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx. But here that identification is not possible, and the fol-
lowing variations of (50) and (51) are not acceptable:
(52) *ya-\textsuperscript{o} ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx ti-s-\textsuperscript{7}ahuk\textsuperscript{-}ala-\textsuperscript{o}-\textsuperscript{tx}
(53) *ya-\textsuperscript{o} ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx ti-s-\textsuperscript{k}s-tus ti-\textsuperscript{q}X'tini\textsuperscript{mut-}tx
While phrases like ti-s-\textsuperscript{7}ahuk\textsuperscript{-}ala-\textsuperscript{o} 'as an Indian doctor', ti-s-\textsuperscript{4}Xamm-\textsuperscript{o} 'as a hunter', etc. clearly
clearly differ from the relative clause forms of section 1.1, they have in common the presence of a deictic prefix and the concomi-
tant specification of a ROLE. The parallelism of utterances such as (50) with the
forms of section 1.2 is also instructive:
(54) (a) ya-\textsuperscript{o} ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx ti-s-\textsuperscript{7}ahuk\textsuperscript{-}ala-\textsuperscript{o}
(b) ya-\textsuperscript{o} ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx s-\textsuperscript{7}ahuk\textsuperscript{-}ala-s
Forms like s-\textsuperscript{7}ahuk\textsuperscript{-}ala-s in (54 b) and elsewhere add PERIPHERAL PROPOS.
tIONAL information, while those exemplified in (54 a) add PERIPHERAL ROLE information and
differ from forms like ti-s-nuyd-s-tx in that the latter provide ROLE information that is
PERIPHERAL to the PROPOSITION contained in the phrase itself, i.e. to nuyd-s. The PERIPHERALITY of (54 a) is like that of (54 b); both signal
information PERIPHERAL to what precedes, i.e. ya-\textsuperscript{o} ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx. Sentence
(54 a) might be glossed in English as 'The man is good when he's an Indian
doctor [performs his duties as one]'. It identifies an aspect of ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk\textsuperscript{-}tx 'the
man', but not his essence; it does not therefore identify him as square?!. as

The specification by s- of a PARTICIPANT's guise has served as a second
source of lexicalizations. Thus, we have these pairs among many:
(55) (a) s\textsuperscript{7}is
\quad [slice-he/it]
\quad 'He's slicing it'
(b) s\textsuperscript{7}ki
\quad [spring salmon sliced into fillets]
(56) (a) xnas-\textsuperscript{o}
\quad [female-it]
\quad 'It's female'
(b) s\textsuperscript{7}onis
\quad 'effeminate person'
(57) (a) Xs-\textsuperscript{o}
\quad [fat-he]
\quad 'He's fat'
(b) s\textsuperscript{7}Xs
\quad 'fat, grease'

Only the constructions of 1.1 and 1.3 are sources of lexicalizations; and
since it is only those two that specify PARTICIPANTS' ROLES, this seems rea-
sonable. It is this lexicalized s- that is occasionally in works on Salishan
(Kuijpers 1967.284 and 1974.182) labelled a 'nominalizer'; but there is in
Bella Coola no good basis for asserting a grammatical dichotomy of Noun vs.
Verb, and the semantic PARTICIPANT-EVENT opposition is not contained in
the lexical items themselves, but signalled by the grammar. Thus, to call s- a
'nominalizer' is only to recognize the historical source of certain s-initial
lexemes as those constructions that serve to express ROLES.

2.0 s\textsuperscript{i}. While the s- prefix of the previous section is pan-Salishan, there
exists in Bella Coola a second prefix s\textsuperscript{i}, that appears to have no direct cor-
relate in the other Salishan languages. Ablauted forms are not unusual in
Bella Coola (Cf. xnas ~ xns above.); and a fairly frequent alternation is i ~
\textsuperscript{o}. We thus find for the Medio-passive morpheme both -\textsuperscript{m} and -\textsuperscript{mi}; for the
Perfective particle both \textsuperscript{i} and \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{i}}; for the Inferential Dibitative particle both
\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{k} and \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{ki}, etc. The temptation is therefore strong to see s- and s\textsuperscript{i} as a
continuation of this pattern. The temptation is increased by the similar se-
matic content of the two and the similarity of their grammatical contexts.
The s- and s\textsuperscript{i}- prefixes differ from the other ablaut pairs above in that s- and
s\textsuperscript{i} have become contrasting forms, whereas the others remain allomor-
phic variants, albeit grammatically conditioned ones. Assuming s- to be the historical
origin of s\textsuperscript{i} (We note also that the zero forms of \textsuperscript{m}, \textsuperscript{i} and \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{k} are the more
frequent and less constrained.), the relative youth of s\textsuperscript{i} is reflected not only
by its appearance in one Salishan language, but also by the comparatively
fewer lexicalizations that have a s\textsuperscript{i} construction as their source.

2.1 The s\textsuperscript{i}- prefix functions as does s- in expressing the Bella Coola equivalent
of relative clauses and in those where the identifying ROLE is in the PERIPHERY.
Whereas s- corresponds to those PERIPHERAL ROLES that are otherwise expressed
by the Preposition s\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}, s\textsuperscript{i} corresponds to those expressed by '\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m}' and '\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m}'.
(Cf. footnote 5.) Thus, for
(58) nuyd-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{m}} ci-xnas-cx \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{m}}-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m}-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m}\textsuperscript{-\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m}
\quad [sing-she \quad \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m} \quad \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m} \quad \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m} \quad \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}\textsuperscript{m}]
\quad 'The woman is singing to the man'
we have
(59) ti-\textsuperscript{7}imlk ti-si-nuyd-s ci-xnas-cx
\quad 'the man the woman is singing to'
and

(60) ti-si-nuyam-t-s-tx
‘the one she’s singing to’

The Preposition ?a+- occurs in analogous fashion:

(61) ?ap-Ø ci-xnas-cx ?a+-ti-7imlk-tx
[go-she -woman- Prep.-man-]
‘The woman is going with the man’

(62) ti-7imlk ti-si-?ap-s ci-xnas-cx
[man -go-she -woman-]
‘the man the woman is going with’

(63) ti-si-?ap-t-s-tx
‘the one she’s going with’

Because (64) is possible

(64) ?ap-Ø ci-xnas-cx ?a+-ti-7imlk-tx
‘The woman is going to the man’

both (62) and (63) are ambiguous and have second glosses of ‘the man the woman is going to’ and ‘the one she’s going to’, respectively. And because ?a+- is, among other things, an expression of semantic CAUSE (cf. Davis and Saunders 1976), (62) is a third way ambiguous: ‘the man because of/for whom she is going’. In the same manner that

(65) ti-si-nix-a-nu-tx
[ -saw-AP-you-]
glosses as ‘the thing you’re sawing’ or ‘the thing you’re sawing with’,

(66) ti-si-nix-a-nu-tx

glosses as ‘the one you’re sawing for’. The Preposition ?a+- is further commonly used in the designation of spaces:

(67) ?apsut-iti ?a+-nuXalk
[live-we Prep-Bella Coola]
‘he live in Bella Coola’

And as g- was commonly involved in the expression of the temporal circumstance of a NUCLEAR PROPOSITION, so is si- the common expression of spatial circumstances:

(68) ta-su?k ta-si-?apsut-iti-tX
[ -house -live-we-]
‘the house we lived in’

(69) ta-cimilt; ta-si-?iXam-c-tX
[ -valley -hunt-I-]
‘the valley that I hunted in’

(Again space —like time—is deictically plural.)

The lexicalizations from this range of usages reflect place,

(70) (a) si7apsu2
‘where one settles’
(b) ta-si7apsu2-tX
‘the place of settlement’

(71) (a) si7aps
‘where one eats’
(b) ta-si7aps-tX
‘the place one eats’
or they reflect CAUSE (‘purpose’),

(72) (a) si?Xan
‘the thing one is stingy because of/about’
(b) ti-si?Xan-tX
‘the reason one is stingy’

(73) (a) si7ik
‘thing one always has to run for’
(b) ti-si7ik-tX
‘the thing one has to run for’

(74) (a) siya
‘reason for being good’
(b) ti-siya-tX
‘the thing one has to be good for’

In (73) and (74), semantic CAUSE is recognized in the ‘has to’ or ‘got to’ component of the English gloss. Counter to this primary usage, names for most of the months show the si- prefix, the implication being that the prefix may mark time as well as place:10

(75) (a) sik”lx
‘March [when it gets warm]’
(b) si?isam++
‘June [when we eat spring salmon]’
(c) si?is?ili
‘August [when we eat dog salmon]’
(d) si?isways+
‘September [when we eat coho salmon]’
(e) si?ixaayx
‘November [when they gather]’
(f) si?im
‘December [when it sits down]’
etc.

But since the Preposition ?a+-, closely associated with si-, may denote ‘at’
a place or 'at' a time, appearance of such forms is not to be completely unsuspected. The younger si- continues its encroachment into the semantic domain of 5-.

2.2 As the prefix 5- appears outside contexts that simultaneously signal a ROLE, so may si- occur. Consider

(76) "?a?i-naw wa^-fmtsa-c si-pul-s
 [be located-they -person- -come-he]
 'The people here is why he came'

(77) "?anap-ic si-lap-nu
 [know-I/it -go-you]
 'I know why you're going'

In both, the si- prefixed material is clearly analogous to the forms of (44) and (45), and the observations made there are valid here as well. We also note that in the same way that the 5- prefixed PROPOSITION may stand as an utterance, as in (46) and (48), so here si-initial PROPOSITIONS are possible, under the same circumstances of discourse and with the same elicitation of confirmation:

(78) si-lap-s
 'Is that the reason he's going?'

(79) si-4as-s
 [ -be ill-he]
 'Is that why he's sick?'

(80) si-?i?ayx-s
 [ -get caught-he]
 'So this is the place he got caught, huh?'

There appear to exist no forms on the model of the 5- phrases of section 1.3, and any lexicalizations with si-initial must then result from the constructions of 2.1

3. Conclusion. The si- prefix—as the 5- one—denotes (i) PERIPHERALITY to the EVENT on which it is affixed (if the whole is then in turn deictically prefixed to identify a PERIPHERAL ROLE) or (ii) PERIPHERALITY to the material that precedes it, i.e. the preceding NUCLEAR portion of the PROPOSITION; and the prefix functions in the latter case to signal that the entire PROPOSITION that follows it (to which it is affixed) is PERIPHERAL to the preceding NUCLEUS. In both cases it appears that the NUCLEAR-PERIPHERAL distinction that is relevant to 5- and si- is the PROPOSITIONAL one, and not the ROLE-inherent, EVENT-determined one. The PERIPHERY of the PROPOSITION, that 5- and si- express, seems to be complementarily divided between them. If there is any pattern to the division, it is that 5-, associated with the more PROXIMAL Preposition 5-, is less PERIPHERAL and more tightly bound to the NUCLEUS than si- with its association with the more DISTAL Prepositions ?uk- and ?uf-.

There is good reason then—both formal and semantic—to conclude that 5- and si- in contemporary Bella Coola derive historically from the same source, and it is only by understanding their grammatical and semantic patterning that one can understand the multitude of lexemes those patterns have spawned.
Bella Coola is a Salishan language spoken on the central coast of British Columbia, Canada. We wish to thank here those who have helped us to an understanding of their language, especially Charles Snow and Margaret Siwallace. We also acknowledge financial support of this work provided by the Linguistics Division of the British Columbia Provincial Museum, the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund of the Whatcom Museum Foundation, Bellingham, Washington; and the Canada Council (Grant 410-770025).

Upper case notation is employed throughout this paper to identify semantic oppositions; a term written with only the first letter in upper case is a grammatical one.

These, obviously, do not exhaust the communicative capacity of language, and it is, at least partially, the process of analysis and understanding of language that requires that human experience be segmented and attributed to this or that portion of it.

Our focus here is on the structuring of events and participants, and we set aside other components, e.g. Fillmore's (1968.24 et passim) Modality.

Bella Coola possesses four prepositions, that have been described in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATIVAL</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROXIMAL</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTAL</td>
<td>?at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common glosses for x are 'by' and 'with'; for wix?x, 'from'; for ?at, 'at' and 'with'; and for ?u/t, 'to' and 'until'. Cf. Davis and Saunders 1975a and 1978.

Once this acknowledged peripheral element is made NUCLEAR, it may then also occur as the only NUCLEAR ROLE, i.e. in a passive construction:

\[ \text{tx-ank-im ti-tq'a-tx} \]

'The knife was used to cut with'.

In phrases that identify some ROLE and contain a form expressing an EVENT that selects two NUCLEAR ROLES (i.e. a transitive predicate), the inflection on that form has the shapes -x 'he/him' and -tan 'he/them' when the EXECUTOR is third person singular and the EXPERIENCER is third person singular and third plural, respectively, and it is the EXECUTOR ROLE that the phrase signals as the identifying ROLE, i.e. the one who did it as opposed to the one it was done to or done with. Cf. Davis and Saunders 1978 for further remarks.

The third singular inflection -x on forms expressing an EVENT that selects one NUCLEAR ROLE (i.e. Intransitives) appears in place of -o under circumstances that are commonly called 'embedded'. Cf. Davis and Saunders In prep.

\[ \text{McIlwraith (1948.612. Vol. 2) cites this form with the gloss 'Supernatural good luck'.} \]

\[ \text{McIlwraith (1948.610-11. Vol. 2) cites names for ten of the months constructed in this fashion.} \]
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