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1 Introduction

In this paper I have attempted a comparison of Bella Coola and Lushootseed, two languages of the Salish family spoken in the Pacific Northwest of the North American continent. Of the two, Lushootseed is the more typically Salishan, being a member of the Coast group with close ties and similarities to neighboring languages, while Bella Coola is perhaps the oldest offshoot of the family and has existed in relative isolation from other related tongues for centuries, undergoing heavy influence from adjacent languages of other phyla, in particular Wakashan. In spite of their long separation, however, the two languages are in many ways remarkably similar, particularly in terms of their syntactic processes, and in my description of their grammars I have tried as much as possible to emphasize this underlying similarity, at times (though I hope not too often) at the expense of a more direct approach that might be more appropriate for a discussion of one or the other of the languages in isolation. To the extent that this has been successful, it may be worthwhile to consider how well this unified treatment of two of the most diverse languages of the Salishan family can be applied to other members of the group.

A word here about the theoretical framework used in this paper might also be in order. For the purposes of describing the grammars of these two languages I have chosen a dependency framework as opposed to the more familiar systems based on constituency, and in particular I have adopted many of the insightful approaches and formalisms of the Meaning – Text Model (MTM) of Mel’ëuk (1988). The salient features of the MTM are its treatment of an utterance as the result of a serial derivation from a semantic to a syntactic to a morphological representation, and its description of the predicate structure of a sentence in terms of the interaction of the lexical properties of the predicative element and its dependent arguments or actants. At the syntactic level this predicative structure may be represented in terms of a dependency tree (D-tree) which consists of a node representing the predicate joined by labeled arrows to the nodes of each of its dependents, which may in turn have dependents of their own (see figure 5 below for an example); each of these arrows represents a certain type of syntactic relation between head and dependent, although for our purposes we will limit ourselves to two such relations—the actant relation (a subcategorized argument relation) and the modifier relation. It is also important to emphasize that in a D-tree the order of nodes in the diagram in no way represents the linear order of elements in the surface form of the sentence; word order is considered to be a property of the morphological level, where lexical items are inflected and organized into a linear string, and linear precedence is taken to be one method available to a language to encode syntactic relations. Interested readers are referred to Mel’ëuk (1988) Dependency Syntax: Theory and Practice for a discussion of the MTM per se and to Hudson (1984) for a discussion of dependency syntax in general.

My primary sources for this grammar have been, for Bella Coola, Nater (1984) and, for Lushootseed, Hess (1993). All data, when not attributed to another source, are drawn from these works; note, however, that I have in all cases retranscribed Nater’s idiosyncratic phonetic notation into the more standard symbols used by Hess.

2 Syntax

Although Lushootseed and Bella Coola represent different extremes of the Salishan language family, they are surprisingly similar in terms of their syntax—indeed, as far as the fundamental grammatical processes of predication, subordination, negation, and the formation of questions go, the two are virtually identical. Both languages seem to share a common Comment – Topic sentence structure in which the Comment portion of the sentence serves as a predicate and the Topic portions function as its actants, a pattern which both languages are able to maintain due to their ability to predicate non-verbal Comments and nominalize verbal Topics. In terms of argument structure, the two languages differ in that Lushootseed seems only to have underlyingly monovalent roots and requires extensive use of voice and inflection to predicate more than a single actant, whereas Bella Coola seems to possess underlyingly divalent predicates that behave in some ways more like the familiar transitive verbs of Indo-European languages. Nevertheless, the languages do resemble each other in that they distinguish between "internal" actants (generally agent/experiencer and patient) and "peripheral" actants that are adjoined to the predicate by prepositions or particles, and both make extensive use of voice as a major component of their grammars.

2.1 Predication and Comment

One of the most distinctive characteristics of Salish in general is the ability of words from any of the “major word classes” to function as sentence predicates, and in this Lushootseed and Bella Coola are no exceptions. While the debate rages on as to whether or not these languages maintain an underlying distinction between verb and noun (see for example Kincade 1983), it is an uncontroversial fact that in Bella Coola and Lushootseed words that—based on their English glosses—would be classified as nouns, adverbs, interrogatives, etc., can appear in predicative position in the sentence bearing full verbal morphology, including (in the case of Bella Coola) pronominal agreement features. The net effect of this is that choice of which part of the sentence will function as predicate depends largely on the communicative structure of the utterance, in particular the Topic-Comment structure, rather than on the constraints imposed by lexical category. In Bella Coola (and it would appear also for Lushootseed), the basic sentence structure is Comment – Topic, with the additional requirement that the Comment be predicated and that the remaining elements in the Topic be realized as actants of that predicate (Davis & Saunders 1978).

Bella Coola and Lushootseed have two methods for realizing this predicative focus. The distinction between the two types relies crucially on the distinction between a predi-
cate's "internal" and "peripheral" actants: internal actants are those which appear in the sentence directly associated with the predicate or as pronominal elements, while peripheral actants may only appear in the sentence as NPs in association with a preposition or adjunctive particle. The simplest form of predicative focus, then, is that which involves the focusing of what would be one of the internal actants of a verbal predicate in a "narratively focused" sentence (that is, in a sentence where the Comment is devoted to the action being performed, as it would be in a typical narrative, "X did this, X did that"). Consider the following examples, (abbreviations are listed at the end of the paper)

(1) (a) (i) ?učala+tab ʔa tiʔiʔ wiwsu tiʔaʔ sqʔøabø?
chase+[pass] prt D children D dog
"The children chased the dog."
(ii) tiʔaʔ sqʔøabø? tiʔučala+tab ʔa tiʔiʔ wiwsu.
D dog D chase prt D children
"The dog is what the children chased."

(b) (i) sp⁵+iš ci+xnas+cx tiʔiʔimlx+tx.
hit+3p/3p D+woman+D D+man+D
"The woman hits the man."
(ii) tiʔiʔimlx+tx+ti+sp⁵+iš ci+xnas+cx.
D+man+D D+hit+3p/3p D+woman+D
"The man is the one the woman hits."

In these examples the peripheral actants (marked with ?a in Lushootseed and x in Bella Coola) from the (i) sentences appear as predicates in the (ii) sentences, with the nominalizing prefix appearing on the predicate of the (i) sentences. Note that in the Lushootseed example the internal argument of the (i) sentence, tiʔiʔ piłpiš, appears in the (ii) sentence as a peripheral actant of the nominalized verb, to which it in fact stands in a possessor-possesed relationship marked—as in ordinary possessives—by the particle ?a (used also to mark possession for an overt third person NP, as in tiʔiʔ piłpiš ʔa tiʔiʔuladx." "the cat's salmon"; see section 2.6). That this is indeed a possessive relation (as opposed to tiʔiʔ piłpiš being a peripheral actant of the sentence predicate) is shown by examples such as

(3) tiʔaʔ sʔuladx+tiʔaʔ ʔa tiʔiʔuladx+tiʔaʔ sʔuiʔaʔad+iš
D salmon D npref+eat+3p poss pro
"The salmon is what it (the cat) ate."

where the erstwhile agent of the sentence is represented by the third person pronominal suffix from the possessive paradigm. Bella Coola displays no such behaviour.

2.2 Subordinate Clauses

The formation of subordinate or "embedded" clauses in both Lushootseed and Bella Coola is closely linked to the process of predicative focus described above. Of the four types of subordinate clauses that Hess lists for Lushootseed, three can be treated in precisely the same manner as predicative focus constructions, where a subordinated clause functions as an actant of another predicate; in the remaining type the embedded clause functions as a modifier of a predicate or, in a related construction found in Bella Coola, of an NP.

2.2.1 Predicative-subordinate clauses

Consider the following:

(4) (a) (i) tiʔaʔ sqʔøabø? tiʔučala+tab ʔa tiʔiʔ wiwsu.
D dog D chase prt D children
"The dog is what the children chased."

While the term "peripheral" is borrowed from Davis & Saunders (1984), their complementary term "nuclear" has been replaced here by "internal" for convenience of exposition.

Note that "NP" is not a term used in dependency syntax as, technically speaking, it denotes constituency; here, it should be read loosely as "a nominal element and its dependents."

The actual gloss of this sentence given in the article is "the rope that the person gave the chief"; however, both Davis & Saunders (1978) and Nater (1984) gloss similar constructions as full sentences, a fact that follows directly from their claim that nominal stems (in this case gis) can function as intransitive predicates. If my re-gloss of this sentence is incorrect, this would necessitate a minor restructuring of the argument to the effect of restricting predicative focus of peripheral actants in Bella Coola to relative clause constructions.
In these sentences, (a) and (b) parallel each other exactly, with the sole difference that in the examples the (i) sentences are headed by nominal stems while those in (ii) are headed by verbs; as pointed out above, however, all words (other than members of the "minor classes") are underlyingly, or have the potential to function as, monovalent predicates, in which case the respective differences between the (i)s and (ii)s are further reduced to the inconsequential distinction of the valency of their predicates. The situation in Bella Coola is identical and the D-tree for this type of structure in either language (using 4(a)ii as an example) would look something like

(5) D-tree for predicative-subordinate clauses

As with predicative focus, if the predicate of the higher clause corresponds to a peripheral actant of the lower clause (as in (b)), then the nominalized s- form of the predicate is required.

Predicatively focused NPs can also serve as actants of other predicates, giving subordinated structures like that represented in (6)

(6) ba=+u+asu'x ti?=a? ha'=t u u k'k'k'=ad q'u'.
 [repetitive]+see D good [perf]+trickle water
 "Again he saw this nice trickling water."

Here the subordinate clause, ha'=t u u k'k'k'=ad, stands in an actant relation to an NP, q'u', and appears between the nominal and the deictic marker; as we would expect in this example, the VP does not appear in nominalized form with s- as q'u' is an internal actant of the intransitive k'k'k'=ad. However, in

(7) tilab k'x a=xag il ti?=a? tu+si=+a=+a? a k"ag"t=ad.
immediately got-loose this [past]+npref+pack+3p poss.pro elk
 "Immediately this elk he had been back-packaging got loose."

s- appears on the embedded clause (as does the pronominal suffix -s) because k"ag"t=ad stands in a peripheral role to the predicate of the embedded clause (cf. tas'ab'a? a ti?=a? k"ag"t=ad "He had been backpacking the elk."). This gives the following D-tree

(8) D-tree for adjective clauses

Although the Bella Coola counterpart to this type of construction is exactly parallel, there is a morphological difference in the treatment of the embedded clause. Compare the sentences in (6) and (7) to

(9) (a) k"x+i+c ti y=ap ti+x msta+tx
 see+1p/3p D+go D+person+D
 "I see the person who is going."

(b) k"x+i+c ti+y a ti+?i ml+k+tx
 see+1p/3p D+good D+man+D
 "I see the good man."

(c) ti+t=q'a ti+s+tx+is+t i+x msta+tx ti+qla=+tx
 D+knife D+npref+cut+3p/3p D+person+D D+rope+D
 "the knife that the person used to cut the rope"

(Davis & Saunders 1984)

Note that in sentence (a), as is the case with the ordinary adjective in (b), the embedded clause bears the deictic prefix, thereby indicating its role as a modifier dependent on the noun, which bears the both the deictic prefix and suffix. In Lushootseed the deictic appears only once, at the beginning of the phrase of which it is a part.

2.2.2 Modifier-subordinate clauses

The final type of Lushootseed subordinate clause given by Hess appears in sentences like

5

6
where the lower clause stands in a modifying relationship to the sentence predicate as an adverbial (all the examples provided by Hess represent time adverbials and conditional expressions). Verbs in these constructions are characterized by the use of the subordinate pronominal clitics (see section 3.3), but in other respects are identical to verbs in a matrix clause; this construction is particularly interesting in that it shows clearly that the marking of VPs with deictics in Lushootseed is only required when these stand as actants of a predicate, not as modifiers. The syntactic structure, however, is highly reminiscent of that in (5)

(10) 7ux"dtak"il čad Lu+4astag"ox"+ad
    [irrealis]+tired I [habitual]+hungry+1p
    “I get tired whenever I am hungry.”

The Bella Coola construction is similar.

(12) (a) 7ux"dtak"il čad Lu+4astag"ox"+ad
    “He was quick as he got up.”

(b) 7ux"dtak"il čad Lu+4astag"ox"+ad
    “They go into their houses (when) the sun sets.”

(c) 7ux"dtak"il čad Lu+4astag"ox"+ad
    “They showed them how to drink.”

In this structure we have a monovalent verb formed by predicative focusing of the wa particle; its single actant slot has been filled by the adjective ya which means that, in effect, the predicate is “saturated” and the lower VP swas tiya functions as a complete predicate standing in modifier relation to ?imlk—precisely the circumstances under which the nominalizing s- appears in the modifier structures in (12) above. This analysis is made even stronger by the fact that there exists a word-order variant, here in the plural, ?at?ku?it wa?imlkuksc swanaw wasa “We know the men who are good”, to which Davis & Saunders give an identical gloss. Hess reports no such structure for Lushootseed.

2.3 Peripheral Actants

Although all verbs in Lushootseed and Bella Coola are maximally divalent in terms of the number of internal actants they allow, it is possible to expression three or more actants in a sentence (although Lushootseed seems to have a have strong prohibition against having three NPs in a sentence and in general prefers to drop as many arguments as is possible for the discourse situation). These actants fall into two categories—actants which are sub-categorized for by trivalent predicates (corresponding to the IO or OBJ2 in Indo-European languages) and prepositional phrases.
An example of the first type of peripheral actant from Bella Coola is given in (15).

(15) nap+is ti+xmsta+tx ti+staltmx+tx x+ti+qlsxw+tx give+3p/3p D+person+D D+chief+D P+D+rope+D
"The person gives the chief the rope."

Here the third actant, qIIsx", is introduced by a preposition, x. In Lushootseed similar peripheral roles may appear in passivized sentences such as

(16) ?upusutab a ti ?X?as ti?q"sabay a ta Kx?
throw+pass)prt D boy D dog prt D stone
"The boy threw a stone at the dog."

where the particle ?a introduces an instrumental role. Note, however, that in general Lushootseed requires the subcategorization of a predicate for some particular actant to be licensed by a verbal suffix, and so constructions such as Bella Coola sentence (15) are more often realized through additional voice distinctions.

The second category of peripheral actants are prepositional phrases. Lushootseed has a set of four prepositions, given in (17).

(17) Lushootseed prepositions

|  at | in, on, at, when |
| dx"at | toward, until, in order to, the reason for |
| tl/ at | from |
| lt/ at | by way of, by means of, source, cause |

In Bella Coola, prepositional phrases are formed by the addition of one of four clitics, three of which are pre-verbal and one of which is post-verbal.

(18) Bella Coola prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>static</th>
<th>dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>centripetal (distal)</td>
<td>?at- &quot;at&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centrifugal (proximal)</td>
<td>x- &quot;via&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These clitics distinguish static/dynamic and a concept Nater terms centripetal/centrifugal, which corresponds roughly to the idea of immediacy or possession as in

(19) (a) ?pi?xwisis ta+?imlk+t8 ta+wac+tx x+ta+stn
hit on-head D+man+D D+dog+D P+D+stick
"The man hit the dog on the head with the stick (he had in hand)."

(b) ?pi?xwisis ta+?imlk+t8 ta+wac+tx ?at+ta+stn
hit on-head D+man+D D+dog+D P+D+stick
"The man hit the dog on the head with the stick (he picked up)."

Note that Davis & Saunders (1975, 1978, 1984) use the terms distal/proximal for centripetal /centrifugal and relate these conceptually to the use of deictic elements.

Another interesting property of these prepositions is that in Bella Coola a prepositional phrase may function as a full predicate, as in

(20) ?at+ti+sumx+t3+kenmak+aw
P+D+day npref work+3p pl.
"It is today that they are working."

Here the appearance of the prepositional phrase in sentence-initial position causes the VP to appear with the nominalizing prefix s-, indicating the status of the prepositional phrase as a peripheral actant of the verb.

As noted above, the nominalizing s- appears in all situations in which a peripheral actant of a VP undergoes predicative focus—that is, when an element that was formerly dependent on the VP now takes that VP as an actant. This gives us an interesting morphological parallel between s- and the adjunctive words such as ?a (Lushootseed) and x (Bella Coola) in that the particles/prepositions serve to license an "extra" relation "downwards" from the VP, whereas the s- prefix serves to license the extra actant relationship "upwards", as in

(21) Peripheral actant relations

Note that in neither case is the valency of the VP actually altered by its relation to the peripheral actant; indeed, in cases where the VP is "saturated" and there is no possibility of its taking a further actant, as in the sentences in (13), the relation becomes a head-modifier relation, marked by an s- prefix in Bella Coola (although it is unmarked in Lushootseed).

2.4 Voice and Valency

In addition to predicative focus and subordination, any discussion of the properties of predication in Lushootseed and Bella Coola must address the issues of voice and valency.
The term valency refers to the number of actants that may be associated with or subcategorized for by a given predicative stem. In Bella Coola the property of monovalency is restricted to what Nater classes as “intransitive” stems: these include both intransitive verbs and predicates formed from nominal, adverbial, and other ordinarily non-predicative classes of word; most verbal predicates, however, are underlyingly divalent in that they subcategorize for a semantic agent/experiencer and a patient. Lushootseed verbs, on the other hand, present a somewhat different picture. As in Bella Coola, there is a group of ordinarily monovalent predicates consisting of the truly intransitive verbs such as *wiw* “to go” or *?uls* “to dive” and those “non-predicative” words that undergo predicative focus; however, unlike Bella Coola, Lushootseed appears to require that actants over and above the first internal actant (the semantic agent/experiencer) be licensed by the addition of morphological marking to the verbal root—in other words, there appear to be no underlyingly divalent stems in the language at all. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail in section 2.4.1 below.

Both languages make use of voice and voice-like processes in the formation of predicates, although of the two Lushootseed seems to rely more heavily on them. The category of voice processes can be defined as those processes which cause a change in the correspondence of semantic roles to syntactic roles of a predicate’s actants without significant changes to the predicate’s actual meaning. It is convenient when discussing voice to make these correspondences clear through the use of diatheses, which are tables of the form given in (22) below, as described by Mel’čuk (1988).

(22) Semantic role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntactic role

In this table, the top row represents the semantic roles of the various actants in the sentence, where “X” is the agent/experiencer, “Y” is the patient, and “Z” may be used to represent any other argument role such as benefactor or instrument that may be represented in the sentence, while the bottom row represents the syntactic roles of the actants, where “1” generally corresponds to the grammatical subject, “2” the direct object, and “3” an indirect object or other oblique complement. The reader will note, however, that to this point the terms “subject” and “object” have been avoided. This is largely due to Hess and Davis & Saunders, who eschew these labels in favour of “agent” and “patient,” most likely to avoid some of the implications that the other terms might bring from their use in discussions of other languages more similar to Indo-European. Unfortunately, “agent” and “patient” are semantic rather than syntactic categories, and in a discussion of voice it is essential to be able to draw a clear distinction between thematic and structural roles; for this reason, let us refer to syntactic role “1” as the first internal actant (A1 = subject), syntactic role “2” as the second internal actant (A2 = direct object), and we can use “3” for all peripheral actants, set off here by a double line (see, however, note 10). Thus, the diathesis in (22) represents the basic, unmarked and unaltered diathesis for Bella Coola trivalent verbs. A change in voice results in a change in this diathesis—that is, in a reordering of the elements in one of the rows with respect to those in the other, indicating that actants at the syntactic level have been assigned different semantic roles (note, however, that in order to preserve the internal/external distinction, I will depart from Mel’čuk’s practice of rearranging the bottom row of the table and will instead change the order of the elements in the top row).

### 2.4.1 Patient-Orientation

As mentioned earlier, it would appear that verbal roots in Lushootseed are underlyingly monovalent and require affixation to license the appearance of additional actants in the sentence. The principal class of affixes which serve this function are used to form stems which Hess dubs “patient/goal-oriented”. See, for example, the sentences in

(23) (a) *?u+?ux* *?a* *?a*

> [perf] + go I take (something).

(b) *?u+?ux* ci *?a*

> [perf] + go D girl

"The girl goes."

(c) *?u+?ux* +tx* *?a* *?a*

> [perf] + go (caus) I take the girl.

(d) *?u+?ux* +tx* ci *?a* *?a*

> [perf] + go (caus) D girl

"(Someone) takes the girl."

While each sentence contains only one overt actant—realized either by the NP (whose syntactic role is determined by the suffix attached to the verb) or by a pronominal particle (whose role is always agent)—the verbs in (c) and (d) to which the causative suffix -tx have been added are in fact only monovalent at the syntactic level, whereas at the semantic level they are divalent. The superficial monovalency of these predicates seems to be the result of a restriction against realizing them with two overt NP actants; this is confirmed by the existence of marked sentences such as *?u+?ux* *?a* *?a* ci *?a* "I took the girl" (Hess, personal communication) where both actants can be realized internally in overt form as long as one of the actants appears as a pronominal particle. This would give us a derivation such as that in (24), which begins with the basic monovalent diathesis of the verb and transforms it into a divalent stem via a process that superficially resembles a change in voice.

---

6Note, however, that Nater does not discuss voice (other than passive) in his enumeration of the Bella Coola verbal suffixes and, as he does not give examples of verbs of the various derivations along with their actants, it is possible that there may be verbal inflections other than those listed here which signal change of voice.

7Further evidence for the underlying divalency of patient-oriented stems can be found in the predicative focusing of sentences such as in (1a), which would be realized as

(1) *wiw* *sp*?a? *?uls* *?a* *?a* *sq*?a*?

Here the passive suffix (required to express both over NP actants in the form predicated on the verb) is no longer needed to license the appearance of the agent NP, which is now the sentence predicate, and the stem therefore bears only patient marking. Nevertheless, the stem must be divalent in that the predicate still functions semantically as its actant and, furthermore, the fact that it is an internal actant is reflected by the absence of the nominalizing prefix.
(24) Lushootseed patient-orientation

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
X & Y & \text{suffix+passive} \\
1 & 1 & \text{-tx}\text{b} \\
1 & 2 & \text{-s} \\
1 & 3 & \text{-c} \\
1 & 4 & \text{-dx}\text{b} \\
1 & 5 & \text{-d} \\
\end{array}
\]

The similarity to more standard voice phenomena results from the fact that the NP cladas acts as the agent in the uninflected predicate but is interpreted as the patient of the causative form; unlike other voice categories, however, patient-orientation does not alter the roles of actants realized as pronominal particles, which may only appear in the first internal position and, hence in both the inflected and the uninflected stem correspond to X, the agent. This implies that the patient suffix does not, in fact, alter the semantic roles assigned to the various syntactic roles in the sentence, but instead indicates that overt third persons must occupy the second internal position and thus be interpreted as patients. Other suffixes in Lushootseed that have a similar effect are

(25) Lushootseed patient-orienting suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tx\text{b}</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s</td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-c</td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dx\text{b}</td>
<td>lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-d</td>
<td>patient-orienting suffix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Bella Coola has transitivizing stems, none of these have the same patient-orienting effect, although the morphological marker for passive has been incorporated into the pronominal suffixes, with the result that passivized stems can only be identified by the fact that they make use of a passive pronominal paradigm (see section 2.3 below), as in

(26) \text{?atps} \rightarrow \text{?atps+tu+ms} \rightarrow \text{?atps+min+c}

\text{eat} \rightarrow \text{eat+[caus]+1p/3p} \rightarrow \text{eat+[pass/cause]+1} \rightarrow \text{"He feeds me."} \rightarrow \text{“(Someone) feeds me.”}

though it is probably more correct to treat this as a form of the true passive, particularly as it is possible to have an "ordinary" divalent form of the verb stem even in the causative.

2.4.2 Passive, Antipassive, and Middle Voice

An interesting feature of voices in Lushootseed is that they seem to be formed one from the other in sequence. The passive, for instance, is formed from stems with patient-oriented suffixes by the addition of the morpheme -b, which combines as follows

(27) Lushootseed passive forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient suffix</th>
<th>Suffix+passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tx\text{b}</td>
<td>-tub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-sab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dx\text{b}</td>
<td>-dub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-dab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, when attached to a root such as luX\text{b} "go home", these affixes give us sentences like

(28) \text{?atps}+luX\text{b}+tu+b \rightarrow \text{?atps+luX\text{b}+tu+b+si} \rightarrow \text{?atps+luX\text{b}+tu+b+si+ulax} \rightarrow \text{"The salmon was taken home by the old woman."}

In terms of the alteration of the diathesis in Lushootseed, this involves the demotion of the agent in the patient-oriented diathesis to a peripheral syntactic role and the promotion of the patient to the "1" position. In Bella Coola the passive is similar in terms of its syntax, although the morphological marker for passive has not been incorporated into the pronominal suffixes, with the result that passivized stems can only be identified by the fact that they make use of a passive pronominal paradigm (see section 2.3 below), as in

(29) \text{nap+im+staltmx+tx+t+X+ms+ta+tx+ti+qulax}+\text{tx+}+\text{give+3p+pass+D+chief+D+person+D+P+D+rope+D}

"The chief was given the rope by the person."

As in Lushootseed, they are derived from a divalent diathesis.

(30) Bella Coola/Lushootseed passive transformation

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
X & Y & \text{suffix+passive} \\
1 & 1 & X \\
1 & 2 & Y \\
1 & 3 & X \\
\end{array}
\]

Note that here the second internal actant has been suppressed, as indicated by the dash (cf. the situation in English); as a result of the demotion of the agent to the periphery of the predicate, it must be realized as an NP adjoined with the particle ?a. The result of this is that the passive in Lushootseed can not be used to express action by first or second person agents, as there is no way in which to express these as NPs and any pronominal particles appearing in the sentence are, as in patient-oriented verbs, interpreted as representing the first internal position, which in the passive belongs to the patient.

Related to the Lushootseed passive is the voice termed by Hess "middle voice". While the derivation of middle voice stems is not clear, their roots appear in association with other derivational suffixes and many of them bear the suffix -b.; here the internal actant corresponds to the agent, while the patient role is demoted to a peripheral position, as in

(31) \text{?atps}+alb+luX\text{b}+si+ulax \rightarrow \text{roasted D(fem) old person prt salmon} \rightarrow \text{"The old woman roasted the salmon."}

Assuming the predicate here is derived from an underlyingly divalent diathesis, we get

(32) Lushootseed middle voice transformation

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
X & Y & \text{suffix+passive} \\
1 & 1 & X \\
1 & 2 & Y \\
1 & 3 & X \\
\end{array}
\]

As in the passive, first and second persons may not appear in peripheral roles—that is, as the patient—due to the restriction of pronominal particles to first internal position.
Similarly, Bella Coola has the antipassive as in (33) (Davis & Saunders 1984).

(33) (a) tx+i+sta+tx ti+i+tq+z+tx ti+i+tq+tx cut+3p/3p D+person+D D+rope+D P+D+knife+D
"The person cut the rope with the knife."

(b) tx+i+sta+tx ti+i+tq+z+tx ti+i+tq+tx cut+antipass+3p D+person+D P+D+rope+D P+D+knife+D
"The person cut the rope with the knife."

Here the suffix -a causes the demotion of the patient of the (a) sentence to a peripheral role in the (b) sentence, as in (with the third role omitted)

(34) Bella Coola antipassive transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This transformation, like the Lushootseed middle voice, serves to demote the patient to the periphery of the predicate.

Bella Coola has another related voice Hess does not report for Lushootseed, the "-amk" voice, which promotes peripheral actants at the expense of the patient:

(35) tx+amk+i+sta+tx ti+i+tq+z+tx cut+amk+3p/3p D+person+D P+D+knife+D
"The person used a knife to cut the rope."
which would be derived as in

(36) Bella Coola -amk transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantics of these voices is discussed by Davis & Saunders (1984).

2.4.3 The yi-Role

The final voice to be discussed here is the instantiation of the Lushootseed yi-role. This voice carries with it the notion of interest and indicates that the action of the predicate is carried out for the benefit or detriment of the actant occupying one of the internal positions; in syntactic terms, this voice has the property of demoting the patient in favour of a peripheral actant which corresponds roughly to the object of "for" in constructions such as "I did it for her". Consider the following examples.

(37) (a) ?u+?ab+yi+d čačas ?a ti sq"obay?.
[perf]+give+[yi]+[patient] D boy prt D dog
"Someone gave the dog to the boy."

In these examples, where the yi-role is realized as a third person NP and appears in association with a patient-oriented suffix, the transformation is as follows

(38) Lushootseed third person yi-role transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cases where the yi-role belongs to a first or second person show a different pattern:

(39) ?u+?ab+yi+tab ċačas ?a ti sq"obay?.
[perf]+give+[yi]+[pass] D D boy prt D dog
"The boy gave the dog to me."

Here, the verb bears passive marking, which makes the agent peripheral and suppresses the second internal actant; as the yi-transformation swaps the patient (in first internal position in the passive) with the yi-role actant, the former becomes peripheral and the latter appears in the first internal position required for all first and second person actants.

(40) Lushootseed first/second person yi-role transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Pronominals

In Lushootseed, first internal actants (A₁) pronominals are particles and generally appear in post-predicative position; the second internal actant (A₂) and other pronominals are either suffixes or prefixes, as indicated in (41).

(41) Lushootseed pronominals and possessives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A₁</th>
<th>A₂</th>
<th>possessive</th>
<th>coordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>čad</td>
<td>-s/-č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>čat</td>
<td>-(ub)čt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>čax</td>
<td>-(č)čd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>čalap</td>
<td>-(ub)čad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last set, the coordinates, are used in the second constituent of a compound sentence. There is also a set of person-clitics used in adverbial subordinate clauses which are essentially the words from the A₁ paradigm minus the prefix či; these are given in section 3.3.
In addition, Lushootseed also has a reflexive suffix, -ut, used in conjunction with the A₂ pronominals (cf. Bella Coola -cut below), and a reciprocal suffix, -agWal "each other".

Both languages have a set of independent predicative pronouns, used emphatically, as members of adjuncts, or as full predicates meaning "I am, you are, etc."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent pronouns</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lush.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Lush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>?aca</td>
<td>?mc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>dac</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>cadix</td>
<td>tx/cix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Nater classifies the third person predicative pronouns of Bella Coola in a separate class of words called identifiers, which are similar to predicative pronouns, but differ in that they can serve as copular verbs, linking two overt actants in a sentence, as in

(a) tix layx ti+manc
   [identifier] D D+father
   "This is my father."

(b) tix+ tx ?ac
   [identifier] his things
   "These things are his."

Both predicative pronouns and pronominal identifiers may also take verbal suffixes such as the imperative-causative (rendering "let it be that ... !") or -nix "to think, consider" to create sentences such as ñununixic ta Frank "I thought you were Frank".

In ordinary sentences, however, Bella Coola has a complex system of pronominal suffixes consisting of separate paradigms for active, passive, causative, and passive-causative constructions, most likely formed via fusion from various permutations of Proto-Salish pronominal suffixes and passive/causative affixes. For verbs with two actants, the paradigm in (44)—formed from the fusion of A₂+₁ morphemes—applies. (45) represents the paradigm used with two-actant causative verbs, while (46) presents the passive and passive-causative suffixes. For verbs with only one actant, the paradigm in (47) is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bella Coola A₂/A₁ suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(45) Bella Coola causative/non-passive A₂/A₁ suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bella Coola passive pronominal suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(47) Bella Coola A₁/possessor suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bella Coola A₁/possessor suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (45) and (46), when A₁ and A₂ reference coincide the reflexive morpheme -cut- is used with the A₁ suffixes; second-person A₂ suffixes reverse the usual order of morphemes. Bella Coola also has a pair of reciprocal suffixes, -tmaxw/-nmaxw—the first expressing control or intentionality and the second expressing inadvertence or lack of control.

2.4 Questions

Yes/no questions in Lushootseed are quite straightforwardly marked by the interrogative particle ?u, usually placed after the predicate or pronominal particle; there is generally no other difference between the question and the corresponding declarative sentence.

Similarly, Bella Coola uses the enclitic -a affixed to the predicate to indicate interrogation, often in combination with other clitics such as ka (irrealis) which may be affixed to nominal stems with the meaning of "any" as in

(a) ?aH+a?ala+?awxwa ka+caacaws
   exist [interrogative] here [irrealis] church
   "Are there any churches here?"

Wh-questions in both languages are only slightly more complex. Lushootseed requires the predicative focus of Wh-elements such as g"ar "who" or stab "what"; the verbal predicate of the corresponding declarative sentence then appears preceded by the hypothetical/remote deictic k"i (see section 3.1), as in

(a) ?aH+a?ala+?awxwa"a ka+caacaws
   exist [interrogative] here [irrealis] church
   "Are there any churches here?"
When the -ks is dropped, many of these stems serve as indefinite expressions with the meaning of “some” or “any” and also function like relative pronouns in English do in the reporting of indirect speech; as in Lushootseed, all of the interrogatives serve as full predicates, and can take pronominal suffixes. In addition, the -ks morpheme can appear on verbal stems in combination with other affixes to form questions, as

(53) (a) stam+ni+kix+s?iks what+think+3p/2p [interrogative]
   “What do you think it is?”

   (b) ?a?alacix+?iwa+nu+ks how+[semilative]+2p [interrogative]
   “How are you feeling?”

2.5 Negation

Lushootseed makes use of two patterns of negation. The first involves the placement of the negative adverb x'?i in sentence-initial position and the affixation of a proclitic la- to any following adverb or to the predicate. This has the effect of negating the predicate in much the same way as negation works in more familiar Indo-European languages, although in Lushootseed sentences negated this way seem to carry an imperative weight that is expressed in these languages by other means.

The second type of negative is the existential negative. It too makes use of the sentence-initial x'?i, but in these constructions the negative adverb becomes the sentence predicate and the predicate of the corresponding declarative sentence is nominalized with s-, appearing with the hypothetical deictic kWj and the subjunctive prefix g'-. As with other peripherally focused adverbials, any pronouns associated with the former predicate of the declarative sentence are realized as pronominal subordinate clitics, as in

(54) (a) ?u?g?aled ?aks [perf]+eat you
   “You ate.”

   (b) x'?i? k'i?g'+ad+s+s+u+s?h?ad [neg] D [subjunctive]+2p+npref+[perf]+eat
   “You did not eat.”

These types of sentences have the import of negating the existence or truth of the statement in its entirety; it can be used to deny the existence of something as well as to negate the possession of something (cf. the Russian possessive expressions of the form U mensya (net) ... “There is (not) to me ...”).

Negation in Bella Coola works much the same way, making use of the morpheme ?ai. In forming the standard type of negative sentence, ?ai'' is used as an adverb and is placed sentence-initially (an unusual place for an adverb in Bella Coola), the sentence predicate appearing in association with the irrealis ka. As in Lushootseed, ?ai'' may also appear as a predicate in existential negatives, although it appears from Nater’s few examples that the use of these is restricted to the denial of the existence of objects and it is not used to subordinate declarative predicates. ?ai'' may also be used attributively in constructions such as
In Lushootseed the possessor-possessed relation is marked in the same way that the dependency of an actant on a nominalized predicate is; if the possessor is represented by a pronominal element, it takes the form of a suffix attached to the possessed (that is, the governing NP is marked in much the same way that a verb in another language might bear agreement features for a subject or object), whereas if the possessor NP is overt, it is adjoined to the possessed by the ?a particle in exactly the same way that a peripheral actant would be adjoined to a VP, for example,

(55) a. staltmx+c
   chief+1
   "I am chief."

(b) ti+staltmx+c
   D+chief+1
   "my chief"

(c) ti+staltmx+s Mary
   D+chief+3p Mary
   "Mary’s husband"

There is a similar parallel between Bella Coola possessives and intransitives as well. Here, a single paradigm of pronominal suffixes is used to represent agent/experiencer in intransitive predicates and to indicate possession when used with NPs; for example,

(56) a. x’ubt+s
    "his paddle"

(b) x’ubt ?a ti hadli
    "Henry’s paddle" (rare)

There is a similar parallel between Bella Coola possessives and intransitives as well. Here, a single paradigm of pronominal suffixes is used to represent agent/experiencer in intransitive predicates and to indicate possession when used with NPs; for example,

The distal and proximal forms may be used on their own as pronominals.

The deictic system of Bella Coola is even more involved. In addition to the “indefinite” forms ti-iti- which resemble the Lushootseed unique-adjectival deictics, Bella Coola has large set of morphemes consisting of prefix-suffix pairs which are applied to a noun and

3.1 Deixis

Both Lushootseed and Bella Coola make use of pre-nominal deictic elements. These elements typically have two forms, one unmarked for gender and another (formed by the insertion of the infix -s- after the initial consonant of the morpheme) indicating that the referent is female; in both languages this is often the only method of distinguishing male from female, and gender seems to be almost entirely natural. Bella Coola and Lushootseed both distinguish proximal and distal referents as well. The Lushootseed deictic elements are given in (57) and (58).

(57) Lushootseed adjectival deictics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>non-contrastive</th>
<th>hypoth/remote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-fem</td>
<td>ti?h</td>
<td>ti?a?</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>k’si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>ci?h</td>
<td>ci?a?</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distal and proximal forms may be used on their own as pronominals.

The deictic system of Bella Coola is even more involved. In addition to the “indefinite” forms ti-iti- which resemble the Lushootseed unique-adjectival deictics, Bella Coola has large set of morphemes consisting of prefix-suffix pairs which are applied to a noun and
carry the notion of definiteness. In phrases consisting of a noun and modifiers, the prefix is applied to the modifying element(s) as well as to the noun, but the suffix appears only on the noun, which is typically phrase-final (see example (9b)). The paradigm for these elements distinguishes gender/number, distance, and demonstrative/non-demonstrative; the forms are given below.9

(59) Bella Coola deictic circumfixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-fem</td>
<td>fem</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon</td>
<td>ti-icity</td>
<td>ci-cayt</td>
<td>wa-ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-dem</td>
<td>ti-tx</td>
<td>ci-cx</td>
<td>ta-lax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ta-t</td>
<td>?i-t</td>
<td>ta-tix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ta-t**</td>
<td>ta-tix</td>
<td>ta-tix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final function of deictics in both Bella Coola and Lushootseed is that mentioned earlier, where the deictic elements serve to mark NPs and VPs as actants of predicates.

3.2 Inflectional Affixes

Bella Coola and Lushootseed both have rich affixal systems which are used to express a wide and varied range of concepts. (60) below presents a schema for Lushootseed inflectional affixes based on Hess (1993).

(60) Lushootseed inflectional affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I General</th>
<th>Class II Person</th>
<th>Class III Nominalizing</th>
<th>Class IV Verbal</th>
<th>stem</th>
<th>Class IV Verbal</th>
<th>Class II Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g-</td>
<td>Xen-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>?u-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-lap</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tu-</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>?as/-as-</td>
<td>-s/c</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>la/-a</td>
<td>-(ub)/ut</td>
<td>-(ub)/ut</td>
<td>-(ub)/ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dax-</td>
<td>las-</td>
<td>-(ik)id</td>
<td>-(ik)id</td>
<td>-(ik)id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lucu-</td>
<td>-(ub)/urad</td>
<td>-(ub)/urad</td>
<td>-(ub)/urad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affixes in Class I may be applied to both verbs and nominals and more than one of them may be affixed to a given stem, generally in the order indicated in the table; Class II affixes are the possessive pronominals, also used with the Class III Nominalizing prefixes discussed above. Class IV affixes are exclusively verbal and are affixed directly to the stem; the prefixes serve as aspect markers and the suffix is the passive marker discussed in 2.2. In contrast to Lushootseed, Bella Coola makes use primarily of suffixation, as indicated in the schema adapted from Newman (1969) given in (61).

(61) Bella Coola suffixation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Aspectual</th>
<th>Modal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Unfortunately, Newman gives no examples of morphemes belonging to these categories and, as Nater does not classify Bella Coola morphemes according to function, it is difficult to know precisely which Bella Coola suffixes Newman would categorize as belonging to which class. For this reason, the morpheme lists will use the Lushootseed system in (60) as a point of departure for comparison, with Bella Coola morphemes grouped according to their semantic and combinatorial similarity to Lushootseed rather than according to language-internal paradigms or categories.

3.2.1 Verbal Affixes

In Lushootseed the verbal prefixes from Class IV in (60) form a mutually exclusive set whose members are affixed directly to a predicate stem; these prefixes are purely aspectual in nature; as in Bella Coola, tense is not expressed in the verbal morphology.

(62) Lushootseed aspectual prefixes

| ?u-  | perfective |
| ?as- | stative    |
| la-  | progressive|
| las- | progressive state (from "la- + ?as-") |
| lacu-| continuous |

Bella Coola also has a set of verbal prefixes,

(63) Bella Coola verbal prefixes

| tm-  | just, only |
| tam- | cumulative, iterative |
| sm-  | already, right away, from the beginning |
| kam- | the same |
| ?at- | progressive state |
| ?ix- | distributive |
| nus- | customary |
| ?anu-| continuous |

With the exception of ?at- and possibly ?anu-, however, these prefixes do not correspond semantically to the Lushootseed affixes, although Nater classifies them as aspectual. On the other hand, the following verbal suffixes, which Nater does not classify as aspectual, do seem to express aspect or aspect-like qualities:

(64) Bella Coola aspectual suffixes

| -a   | present progressive |
| -tmn | habitual |
| -alus| desiderative |
| -alst| deprivative |

9In addition to its locative meaning, the proximal/middle/distal distinction also distinguishes among objects on the basis of reality/familiarity/definiteness; see Davis & Saunders (1975) for an account of the semantics of Bella Coola deixis.

10This prefix may also be used in front of uninflated verbal stems to form nouns, as in ?at-+quf (to write) = "something written, a document, etc."

11The last two are from Newman (1976), who adds that of the verbal only ?anu- is productive and all are rare.
There are also two circumfixes that fall into this category—*nus*- X-(mx) "always X-ing" and
*nu*- X-*ik*, another desiderative.

### 3.2.2 General Affixes

The five Class I affixes, classified here as "general", are used to express various moods
or states that pertain to the word being modified and may be added to both verbal and
nominal stems. In Lushootseed these are:

(65) Lushootseed general prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g-</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kl-</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu-</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu-</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>additive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bella Coola has a set of morphemes of this type as well, although most are suffixes.

(66) Bella Coola general affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>irrealis(^{12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>&quot;disconnection&quot;, change, past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4(i)/-4(i)</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aks</td>
<td>a number of, plurality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lwa</td>
<td>semblative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-am/-anm</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the Lushootseed affixes, these may be attached to both nominal and verbal stems.

### 3.3 Clitics

Like adverbials, Bella Coola clitics are organized into a strict ordinal hierarchy as indicated in the table below (adapted from Nater 1984).

(67) Bella Coola clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A -a</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-k'</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B -(?)-</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C -ma/-m-</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D -7fl</td>
<td>coercive/imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E -a-lu/-a-tu</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\)According to Nater, this is a proclitic rather than a true prefix. Newman (1969a) claims that it is a particle.

Nater also lists three clitics associated with imperatives which do not appear in his hierarchiclist, these are: -?isi repetitve imperative ("do it again!") , ?Hu "do it first, for a
while", -na "please" (following an imperative). The semantics and combinatorial
properties of Bella Coola clitics are extremely complex and are discussed at length by Nater.

The use of clitics in Lushootseed, on the other hand, seems to be limited to the morpheme
-ax" "now" (which is appended to verbs or adverbs) and a set of person clitics
appearing in adverbial subordinate clauses (see section 2.2.2). These are given in (68).

(68) Lushootseed subordinate clause person clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>ad/ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>ail/ail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that these endings appear to be the same as the A1-pronominal paradigm presented in (41) above, minus the prefix e.

### 3.4 Adverbials

In Lushootseed there are two types of adverbial morphemes, one of which serves exclusively as a predicate adverb and the other which may also serve other roles in the sentence. Members of the first set are:

(69) Lushootseed predicate adverbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clickc/cay</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clickx/xid</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da+x'/daw</td>
<td>just now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dax&quot;</td>
<td>[?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g+a+x&quot;</td>
<td>eventually, soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put</td>
<td>very much so, in a great way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tilab</td>
<td>immediately, bluntly; right there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x'at ti</td>
<td>as though, like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x'ul</td>
<td>just (that and nothing else)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second set is given in (70).
Lushootseed predicate adverbs II

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buk'w</td>
<td>hiqab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cəxu̇l</td>
<td>also, too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuk'/cug'</td>
<td>well; ought, should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day̩</td>
<td>in contrast to the usual or expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gəcəw̱̱ọ́</td>
<td>ultimately, in fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haʔk'/hag'</td>
<td>x'uḇ̱ị</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haʔt</td>
<td>x'uʔalaʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ha)aʔab</td>
<td>yaw̱̱ị</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hik*</td>
<td>big, very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nater lists relatively few adverbs proper for Bella Coola and all denote direction.

Bella Coola directional adverbs

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?uux̱ṉk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?uux̱uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tq'ṉx̱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txuła</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tx'ñayax̱</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other adverbials are formed from various expressions of time and location; when these expressions do not appear predicatively, they are treated as peripheral actants and generally appear sentence-finally. Note also that many of the adverbial functions listed here for Lushootseed seem to correspond to the functions of the enclitics in (67) and certain of the derivational affixes listed in the Appendix.

3.5 Particles

Lushootseed employs a system of five predicate particles that are used to express the attitude of speakers towards the content of what they are saying. These particles are

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uʔx̱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dʔeʔt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lʔeʔt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aʔw̱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six̱</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also included in the class of particles are the interrogative particle, ʔu (section 2.4), and the pronominal particles (see section 2.3). Note that many of the functions of these words in Lushootseed are fulfilled in Bella Coola by the enclitics listed in (67).

There are three classes of Bella Coola words that Nater classifies as particles; none of these, however, corresponds either in function or syntactic category to the Lushootseed morphemes listed here. The first group are the non-predicative adverbs (see 71 above) and the second are the conjunctions, ʔu/ʔin "and", and puʔ̱ minus. The last group are interjections, of which Nater lists some 12, including words such as yu'ut "hello," ʔaw̱ "yes," and ʔax̱ax̱ "yuck". On the other hand, Newman (1969a) lists the morphemes s "and," ʔaṯ "in, on, at," ʔuṯu in spite of," and ka (irrealis) as particles as well, while Davis & Saunders (1979)—who also class ka as a particle—add four more morphemes to the list:

(73) Bella Coola particles

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>caʔk*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luʕ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Davis & Saunders (1979) discuss the semantics and pragmatics of these particles, which correspond roughly in function to the Lushootseed particles in that both sets of morphemes express speaker-attitude or the relationship of the speaker to what is being said.

4 Word Order

As mentioned above, the basic unmarked word order for both languages appears on the surface to be VSO (or, more precisely, Predicate - Agent/Experiencer - Patient); however, it might be more accurate to say that the overall word-order is Comment - Topic and that the predicate-initial pattern is a consequence of the requirement to predicate the Comment portion of the sentence. Of the two languages, Bella Coola appears to be the more inflexible with respect to the predicate-initial pattern; this may be due in part to the fact that historically such elements as particles and adverbs that once appeared sentence initially may have been reduced to prefixes and proclitics. Lushootseed, on the other hand, regularly allows the fronting of adverbs and particles, as in

(74) ũxub caʔt ʔu ʔaʔul ʔutuʔk*.
    ought caʔt [interrogative] just go-home
    "Should we just go home?"

Here we see not only the fronting of the adverb, but the fronting of the particles caʔt and ʔu (which normally follow the verb) as well; when one or more adverbs appear at the head of a sentence, these particles must come after the first adverb.

In terms of what follows the predicate, both languages almost invariably order Agent NP actants before Patient NP actants and VP actants before NP actants; once again, Bella Coola is the less flexible of the two. Because Lushootseed makes use of pronominal particles, there tends to be some variation in the Agent >> Patient precedence, as the pronominal particles must appear closer to their predicate than an NP (irrespective of their thematic roles), as must the interrogative particle.

In both languages, modifiers of nominal elements (both adjectives and adjective clauses) precede the element they modify; with the exception of adverbial words in Lushootseed, both languages place adverbials and prepositional phrases in post-predicate position, generally at the end of the sentence. Deictic elements are phrase-initial in Lushootseed and both phrases-initial and final in Bella Coola.
Appendix: Bella Coola Derivational Affixes

Bella Coola relies heavily on derivational affixes for a wide range of functions that in Lushootseed are accomplished by clitics, articles, or other means. For the purposes of comparison to the Lushootseed morphemes in section 3, the productive inflectional affixes listed by Nater are given here.

(75) Bella Coola derivational prefixes

verbalizers—prefixed to intransitive stems to form verbs
- txat- “coming from” (with place)
- tuxt- “going to” (with place)
- tam- “to make” (affixed to what is made)
- tix- “to catch a number of” (affixed to numbers)
- tutu- “to have a physical asymmetry” (affixed to body parts, etc.)
- kat-/kas- “to gather, hunt, harvest” (affixed to plants, animals, etc.)
- kit- “to lack” (with nouns)
- x+ “to possess” (with nouns)
- kut- “to have a lot” (with nouns)
- ?aas- “to have, contain, use” (with nouns)
- ?asi- “to consider the taste of something as ..” (with food)
- ?anus- “to have lost” (with nouns)
- ?ik- “to speak the language of” (with name of ethnic group)
- ?it- “to wear” (with clothing)
- ?is- “to gather, consume” (with flora or plant-products)
- ?ius- “to put on” (with clothing)
- ?un- “to be fond of” (with intransitive verbs and food nouns)
- ?unus- “to go somewhere for the purpose of” (with intransitive)

spatial prefixes
- tx- “the place where .. is located” (with location)
- txu- “towards an area” (with location)
- tx- “from an area, ethnic group” (with location)
- txih- “towards a geographical area” (with location)
- ?a “to be located in” (with location)
- ?u “direction, motion towards” (with location)
- stam- “together with”
- nu- “inside, in the water”
- ka- “under, downwards”
- ?anu “having no fixed location” (with verbs)
- ?inix- “to be extra”
- ?us- “top surface”

(76) Bella Coola derivational circumfixes

ka- “next” (forms adverbs from nouns denoting time periods)
kanus- “having a certain smell/taste” (derives verbs and adjectives)
(?a++)tu- “last” (forms adverbs from nouns denoting time periods)

(77) Bella Coola nominalizing suffixes

- ta/-sta “that which is used for” (with verbs)
- -ma/-ama “that which is used for” (with verbs)
- -lik/-lik “performer of an action” (with verbs)
- -tp/-atp “tree, plant” (with names of fruits and edible parts of plants)
- -t “use” (with nouns)
- -mx “inhabitant, native of” (with location)
- -mc “all one’s relatives” (with family)
- -tam “time, season, month of” (with nouns)

Another set of derivational suffixes is exclusively verbal and corresponds to the Lushootseed suffixes of the -tx class. These are

(78) Bella Coola verbal suffixes

- m intransitivizer; activizer; medium voice
- a active-intransitive
- amk adjunct-incorporative
- n transitive
- amx autonomous-transitive
- cut reflexive
- max reciprocal
- (o)tu/-nix causative-transitive
- nm/-nm causative-intransitive
- (l)ayx passive-lack of control-intransitive
- ay-nix passive-lack of control-transitive
- slst deprivative
- a(n)-mx “tree, plant” (with names of fruits and edible parts of plants)
- -l(-)m habitual
- nus- “all one’s relatives” (with family)
- -lus desiderative
- -lit desiderative

Many of these affixes are most likely fusions of historically distinct morphemes; one indication of this pointed out by Nater is the division of the verbal suffixes into a t-class and an n-class, where the verbal stems beginning in t express control or intention whereas the n-initial suffixes lack this connotation or imply the opposite.

Abbreviations

1p first person
2p second person
3p third person
caus causative
D deictic
fem feminine
neg negative

npref nominalizing prefix
P preposition
pass passive
perf perfective
poss possessive
pro pronoun
prt particle
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