

M. Dale Kinkade  
University of British Columbia

Inchoative occurs as a secondary aspectual category in most (if not all) Salishan languages, and is particularly well developed in interior languages. There all the languages have three affixes to indicate this category, and they seem to have similar distributions within each language. The category was not recognized as such until recently, nor were connections made between the affixes until Larry Thompson realized the complementarity between two of them; this is described in the Thompson and Thompson manuscript of the Thompson language. The pieces can be found in other descriptions of Interior Salishan languages, and the facts about them appear to correspond.

Inchoative is a secondary aspectual category in Interior Salish. As a secondary category, it can co-occur with one of the primary categories--perfective, imperfective, and stative. In spite of its secondary nature, it is extremely common.

What follows will be a description of the facts about inchoatives in Columbian. In particular, questions will be raised about a number of peculiarities about the distribution of these affixes, although few answers will be attempted. This is because synchronic evidence does not seem to explain these oddities; it is hoped that comparative work (currently being undertaken by Jan van Eijk) will help to provide explanations. Issues to be considered are the following:

- 1) the multiplicity of affixes to mark inchoative
- 2) the complementarity of infix -ʔ- and suffixed -p
- 3) confusion of -p 'inchoative' and =ap 'base' (a lexical suffix)
- 4) root reanalysis
- 5) restriction of root types available for inchoative
- 6) occurrence vis à vis stative -t

Although all the issues raised will not be resolved here, it is hoped that setting them forth in this way can lead to further insights.

1. Columbian has three affixes that indicate inchoative: an infix -ʔ- and two suffixes, -p and -wɪlʰx. The -p always occurs immediately following the root, while -wɪlʰx follows the stem, including lexical suffixes. Both precede major aspectual suffixes and transitivizers. The first two are in complementary distribution, a fact first observed for Thompson by Larry Thompson. The third, although it occurs in a different position from the others, must be considered a different affix, with slightly different meaning, and will be labeled 'developmental' here to distinguish it. It can, in fact, both contrast with and co-occur with the other marker, as in 1-3.

- (1) k<sup>o</sup>áç-t 'he's strong'  
k<sup>o</sup>áçʔc' 'he's better'  
k<sup>o</sup>ac<sup>o</sup>k<sup>o</sup>ac<sup>o</sup>-t-wɪlʰx 'he gets stronger after illness'
- (2) sʰən, sʰənsʰən-t 'quiet person, gentle, tame'  
sʰən-p 'tame, get tame, get gentle'  
sʰənsʰən-t-wɪlʰx 'he got gentle'
- (3) tʰəʃ-p 'get hard, dried up and got hard'  
tʰəʃ-p-wɪlʰx 'it's getting hard'

Available data do not yield a clear picture of the exact difference between 'inchoative' and 'developmental', although the latter seems to emphasize the ongoing nature of the activity more than the former. Since 'developmental' occurs on stems that may already contain other affixation, it is less restricted in its usage. For

<sup>1</sup> My work on Columbian Salish has been supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and from The University of Kansas. I thank Ingrida Brenzinger for useful discussions of aspect which helped to understand some of the questions raised in this paper. Non-standard use of symbols is as follows: ʃ for a voiced pharyngeal resonant, <sup>o</sup> to mark rounding, and = to separate lexical suffixes.

'Developmental' is also unlike 'inchoative' in that it occurs readily--indeed most commonly--with the stative suffix -t, which does not occur at all with the simple inchoative (except as explained below). Examples with -t are in 4.

- (4) xəs-t-wɪlʰx 'get well'  
ppaw'-t-wɪlʰx 'it's getting lighter'  
tʰayəm-t-wɪlʰx 'it's getting weak'  
kʰs-t-wɪlʰx 'rotten fruit, it's spoiling'

Examples of 'developmental' following the root directly are in 5.

- (5) tam-wɪlʰx 'something disappears'  
tʰət-wɪlʰx 'something used until it got too dirty'

following a lexical suffix in 6.

- (6) wəsxn=alq<sup>o</sup>-wɪlʰx 'he's getting tall'  
tʰy=awt-wɪlʰx 'next year'

and following out-of-control reduplication in 7.

- (7) pəx<sup>o</sup>x<sup>o</sup>-wɪlʰx 'they're scattering'  
xəʔa<sup>o</sup>-wɪlʰx 'weak'

2. The two variants of the inchoative affix are in complete complementary distribution, and the choice between them is partly phonological, partly morphological in nature. The major difference has to do with strength of the root, that is whether it is strong (is underlyingly stressed and retains stress) or weak (is underlyingly unstressed and is stressed only when nothing stronger follows). The -p suffix occurs only following weak roots (possibly with a very few exceptions), and only the -ʔ- infix can occur with strong roots. This in itself is not quite complementary, and that is because the infix appears to occur as well with a few weak roots. The status of these last is not entirely clear; there are instances of these roots acting sometimes strong, sometimes weak in terms of stress. The explanation for this may lie in part with the ablaut system of Columbian, since strong roots often have ablaut variants with a weak root (with ə as the vowel). If this is the case, then those forms in which the root looks weak (with stress on a suffix) would represent the ə-grade, and the forms with the -ʔ- infix would be from the full-grade.

Both the difference in the two variants and in their distribution is odd; there is no obvious phonological reason why ʔ should alternate with p, nor why an infix should alternate with a suffix. Since the suffix is the more consistent in its occurrence, it may be that it is in the process of replacing the infix; further study, particularly comparative, is needed to determine this. Because weak roots are much more common than strong ones, the suffix turns up much more frequently than the infix. Meanings of the two certainly appear to be identical. Note the forms in the following sets, first of ʔ in 8-10 then of -p in 11-13.

- (8) cix 'lukewarm'  
na-cix-n 'I warmed it up' (na- 'locative')  
na-cix 'water gets warm'
- (9) k<sup>o</sup>əl=s 'ruddy complexion'  
k<sup>o</sup>aʔl=ús 'face turns red, embarrassed'
- (10) p'iq 'ripe, bake, roast'  
n-p'iq=cín 'burn one's mouth' (n- 'locative')  
p'iq 'it's ripe, it's cooked'  
p'iq=cín 'a cook'

- (11) hám 'damp'  
hám-p 'something damp, dissolve, melting'
- (12) ták<sup>o</sup> 'quiet, silent, stuffy, thick (clouds)'  
n-ták<sup>o</sup>tk<sup>o</sup>=ána<sup>?</sup> 'hard of hearing'  
ták<sup>o</sup>-p 'choke, smother, suffocate'  
n-ták<sup>o</sup>tk<sup>o</sup>-p=ána<sup>?</sup> 'ears plugged up'
- (13) tár-n 'I ripped it, I unravelled it' (-n 'I')  
tár-r 'it's ripped, it's ripped out'  
tár-p 'it unravelled itself, it ripped out, it's ripped'

That native speakers consider the two to be variants of a single morpheme is confirmed by a correction given to the inchoative of a weak root. Speaker A provided 14.

- (14) \*páx<sup>o</sup>-p 'bloated'.

Speaker B recognized what was intended with this form, but did not consider it correct, and changed it to 15, the regular inchoative of a weak root.

- (15) páx<sup>o</sup>-p 'bloated'.

3. The weak suffix -p does appear in a few cases to follow a strong root. It is more likely, however, that these are instances not of 'inchoative' but of the reduced form of =ap, a lexical suffix meaning 'base, egg, rope'. Unlike most lexical suffixes, =ap often retains its vowel when unstressed; however, it can indeed occur without a vowel, as in 16.

- (16) pál=p 'braided rope'  
na-má<sup>t</sup><sup>o</sup>=p 'broken egg'  
ni<sup>?</sup>-c'áw=p=qn 'get baptized' (ni<sup>?</sup>- 'locative')

Instances such as 17 with -p after a strong root are therefore probably best interpreted as having the lexical suffix rather than 'inchoative', even though the meaning of the forms does not make this clear.

- (17) n-<sup>?</sup>úcc=p=ya<sup>?</sup> 'scorpion'  
xáy=p 'high mountains'  
k'<sup>i</sup>-wák<sup>o</sup>=p 'hide (as a cloud over the sun)' (k'<sup>i</sup>- 'locative')  
k-t'úcc=p 'small things lodged along the shore' (k- 'locative')

Interpreting such forms this way leaves the claim that the -p variant of 'inchoative' occurs only following weak roots virtually without exceptions, the three forms in 18 being the only ones found.

- (18) na-k'ám'm'-p 'got left behind'  
k'<sup>i</sup>-c'ík'-p=c'a<sup>?</sup>-n 'I lit the firewood, I set fire to it' (k'<sup>i</sup>- 'locative'; -n 'I')  
λ'ic'-p 'strong, stout'

This last item contrasts with 19, where 'inchoative' is clearly present and followed by the lexical suffix.

- (19) λ'ic'-p=ap 'strong rope'

Sometimes a -p suffix might at first glance be thought to be the lexical suffix because of meaning, but stress may indicate otherwise. Thus in 20, the root is weak, so stress would shift to a lexical suffix; since stress is on the root, the suffix must be 'inchoative'.

- (20) k-t'ók<sup>o</sup>-p=xn 'blow-out, flat tire'

4. Ordinarily in Salish the integrity of a root is maintained (except for certain morphophonemic alternations) throughout word formation, including the various types of reduplication and infixation. With the infixation of inchoative -<sup>?</sup>-, however, the root undergoes radical reanalysis. First, the root, which was strong before infixation, becomes weak, and stress moves to variable-stress suffixes, as in 21-23.

- (21) k'k'íta<sup>?</sup> 'near, close'  
k'<sup>i</sup>?<sup>?</sup>t-mí-nn 'I approached him, I got near him' (-mí 'relational'; -nn 'I')  
t-k'<sup>i</sup>?<sup>?</sup>t=ús 'close to the fire'
- (22) sáx<sup>o</sup>-əx<sup>o</sup> 'it's thawing' (-əx<sup>o</sup> 'imperfective')  
ka-sá<sup>?</sup>x<sup>o</sup>-míx 'it's going to melt' (kas- 'unrealized'; -míx 'imperfective')
- (23) kat-x<sup>o</sup>ús=k<sup>o</sup> 'beer' (kat- 'locative')  
kat-x<sup>o</sup>u<sup>?</sup>s=átk<sup>o</sup> 'foam (bubbly)'

Second, the infixed -<sup>?</sup>- becomes C<sub>1</sub> of the root for purposes of reduplication. Thus with CVC reduplication to indicate 'plural, distributive', we find 24-25.

- (24) tət'tít=kst 'wet hands'  
tət'tít<sup>?</sup>t=xn 'wet feet'
- (25) x<sup>o</sup>əsx<sup>o</sup>ús-t 'it's foamy'  
n-x<sup>o</sup>u<sup>?</sup>x<sup>o</sup>u<sup>?</sup>s=cín 'animal with foam around its mouth'

With C<sub>1</sub> reduplication to indicate 'out-of-control', we find instances such as 26-27 (where there is an extra vowel before the repeated glottal stop; this vowel is epenthetic and a copy of the preceding vowel).

- (26) náq<sup>?</sup> 'bad odor, rotten'  
s-na<sup>?</sup>q<sup>?</sup>-míx 'it's rotting' (-míx 'imperfective')
- (27) p'ók<sup>o</sup>=l'əx<sup>o</sup> 'bare ground'  
p'a<sup>?</sup>a<sup>?</sup>k<sup>o</sup>=ús 'south slope, sunny side of a mountain'

Both these reduplications can even occur together, as in 28.

- (28) ni<sup>?</sup>-sú<sup>?</sup>sú<sup>?</sup>ú<sup>?</sup>t=lq<sup>?</sup>s 'elephant' (locative-stretch=nose; root sú<sup>?</sup>t-)

It is not clear why this infix should also result in reanalysis of the root. However, the change of the status of the root from strong to weak may be analogical. In the first place, there are far more weak roots in the language than strong ones. Secondly, virtually all those with <sup>?</sup> as second consonant are weak; I know of only one clear exception, given in 29.

- (29) λ'ú<sup>?</sup>=cn 'silent'

Here the lexical suffix meaning 'mouth' is variable in terms of stress, and would attract stress following a weak root.

5. For reasons that are unclear, with very few exceptions the only root types that occur (or have been found to occur) with 'inchoative' inflection are CVC. To be sure, this is the dominant (surface) root type in Columbian, although that alone is no reason for this limitation.<sup>1</sup> Two (or three) of the exceptions are strong roots:

<sup>1</sup> Note that in English comparative and superlative inflection of adjectives is similarly restricted by root type. Only monosyllables and certain bisyllables can be compared. Furthermore, even some monosyllables cannot be compared. For some speakers \*righter and \*wronger are unacceptable, and surely comparative forms of non-basic color terms are bad (e.g. \*mauver, \*puccer, \*rosier).

- (30) c'aʔq<sup>o</sup>ú-n'-m 'read' (-n' ʔ; -m 'middle voice')  
 s-c'aʔq<sup>o</sup>ú-n'-əx<sup>o</sup> 'he's reading' (-əx<sup>o</sup> 'imperfective')  
 (cf. c'q<sup>o</sup>ú-n-m 'say, pronounce, name', s-c'q<sup>o</sup>ú-mx 'he's reading')

- (31) taʔmút 'round hemp bag'  
 (cf. təmtəmút=n 'clothes')

Another possible instance with a strong root is 32.

- (32) ʔaʔwáituʔx<sup>o</sup>-n 'I stalk game' (-n 'I')  
 (cf. ʔawáituʔx<sup>o</sup> 'sneak after game')

However, the analysis of this form is uncertain. With weak roots, only two non-canonical forms, given in 33-34, have turned up, and the first of these may prove to have the lexical suffix =ap 'base, egg, rope'.

- (33) cqnaʔ-p=íkn 'he heard a shot'  
 (cf. cqánaʔ 'hear')

- (34) n-təʔq-p-n-cút 'someone running' (n- 'locative'; -n 'control'; -cut 'reflexive')  
 (cf. tər'q-n 'I kicked him', tər'q-n-cút 'he kicked himself')

One possible explanation for this restriction of 'inchoative' to CVC roots is that we have missed an allomorph of the affix. In 35 and 36, 'wait' appears to have an unexplained -aʔ increment in two forms; an ending of just this shape is fairly common throughout Interior Salish, and has yet to be explained or adequately glossed. Most of its occurrences do not seem to have anything to do with 'inchoative', although the forms of 'haunt' do.

- (35) ʔam'aʔ=cín'-m 'wait for deer' (-m 'middle voice')  
 s-n-ʔam'aʔ=cín=tn 'a blind'  
 (cf. kí-ʔám-n 'wait')

- (36) k<sup>o</sup>úsk'aʔ 'get haunted'  
 k<sup>o</sup>úsk'aʔ-an-c 'I got haunted' (-an 'control'; -c 'me')  
 k<sup>o</sup>úsk'aʔ 'get haunted'

Since forms with the -aʔ ending rarely occur without it, contrasts are unavailable to allow more to be said about it.

6. There are generally few restrictions on what can co-occur with 'inchoative', and it is found with a large variety of lexical, derivational, and inflectional affixes (including both transitive and intransitive ones; see below). One rigorous restriction, however, is that 'inchoative' does not occur with stative -t, even though this stative suffix does usually occur with 'developmental', which has a meaning very much like 'inchoative'. This restriction may make sense semantically, if it is considered anomalous to mark a single form for both a state and the beginning of change. Indeed, there are numerous pairs of words in which -t and 'inchoative' contrast.

- (37) k<sup>o</sup>á-c'-t 'strong'  
 k<sup>o</sup>á-c' 'he's better'

- (38) ʔ'í-c'-t 'strong, stout'  
 ʔ'í-c'-p 'strong, stout'

However, an exception to this co-occurrence restriction is made when the inchoative form is plural. Columbian has several ways of indicating plurality, the most common of which is CVC-reduplication. Another method, found in very few roots, is the replacement of the stem-vowel (perhaps only ə) with i; this vowel change does not affect strength for stress. This second method is clearly residual in the language; inchoative-stative sequences occur with both types. With the replacement vowel we find examples like 39-41.

- (39) íśt'-p 'bounce'  
 ít'-p 'explode, go to pieces after an explosion'  
 ít'-p-t 'they're bouncing'

- (40) ʔ'í-x-p 'grow, grow up'  
 ʔ'í-x-p-t lx 'they grew up'

- (41) x<sup>o</sup>á-t'-p 'run away, run'  
 ʔal-x<sup>o</sup>í-t'-p-t 'a bunch getting up' (ʔal- 'translocative')

With reduplicated plurals, both variants of the inchoative occur, as in 42-44.

- (42) c'álc'al-p-t 'ugly'

- (43) x<sup>o</sup>á-r-p 'shake, tremble, quiver'  
 x<sup>o</sup>árx<sup>o</sup>ər-p-t 'nervous (person), impatient'

- (44) c'áʔx 'blush, embarrassed, ashamed'  
 c'áʔc'aʔx-t 'feel ashamed of someone'

7. Inchoative affixes otherwise occur freely with virtually all other types of affixation. They are found with other aspects, with both transitive and intransitive stems, with various transitivizers and personal inflection, with any kind of reduplication, and with lexical suffixes. None of this is particularly unexpected. The basic aspect categories in Columbian are perfective, imperfective, and stative. When 'inchoative' occurs with one of these, it modifies that basic category, but does not change it. Examples of 'inchoative' with several categories have appeared above: with positional prefixes (8, 10, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 28, 34), locative prefixes (41), plural or descriptive reduplication (12, 24, 25, 28, 42), out-of-control reduplication (18, 26-28, 41, 43, 44), lexical suffixes (9, 10, 12, 18-21, 23-25, 27-29, 33), aspect affixes (unrealized in 22, imperfective in 22, 26, 30), middle voice suffix (30), person suffixes (18), reflexive (21). Other co-occurrences are given in 45-47.

- (45) Aspect  
 sc-yaʔk'-míx 'it's burning' (sc- 'imperfective')  
 sc-ʔ'əx-p-míx 'he's growing up'  
 ʔac-láh-p 'river, flowing' (ʔac- 'stative')  
 ʔaš-təm-p 'burning' (ʔaš- is a variant of ʔac-)

- (46) Autonomous  
 ka-yʔk<sup>o</sup>-lx=áw's 'cross a field' (-ilx 'autonomous')

- (47) Transitivizers  
 k<sup>o</sup>uʔí-mí-nn 'I used it up' (-mí 'relational')  
 n-yaʔk<sup>o</sup>-stú-s 'he took him across' (-stu- 'causative'; -s 'he')  
 c-həm-p-mn-stú-s 'he came down (in price)' (c- 'stative')  
 k<sup>o</sup>uʔí-nú-nn 'I used it up' (-nú 'non-control transitive')  
 ləx<sup>o</sup>-p-nú-nn 'I wounded him'  
 c-tuʔq-xít-ms 'they passed me the bone' (-xit 'indirective'; -ms 'me')