

Paul D. Kroeber
Indiana University, Bloomington

At least three languages of western Oregon mark wh-questions with a special particle or affix that is distinct from the polarity question marker. Wh-questions are thereby distinguished from other constructions that involve interrogative pronouns. In at least one of these languages, too (Alsea), the particle is largely restricted to sentences that have the full interactional force of questions (expecting an answer from an addressee). The geographical distribution of the relatively uncommon trait of a particle specifically for wh-questions crosscuts language family boundaries, appearing in Tillamook but not, apparently, in other Salish languages in the vicinity, and also appearing in some but not all of the putatively Penutian (at any rate, non-Salish) languages of the Oregon and Washington coast: possibly some local diffusion of the trait has occurred.

After sketching a partial typology of interrogative particles as they interact with wh-questions (section 1), I lay out in more detail the facts of Alsea (section 2) and Tillamook (section 3) as I currently understand them. I then more briefly consider the patterns found in the rest of the Salish family (section 4) and in other languages of the southern Northwest Coast (section 5), tentatively considering the issue of diffusion.¹

1. PARTICLES IN WH-QUESTIONS

Cross-linguistically, polarity questions are frequently marked by a particle (sentence-peripheral,

¹ Tillamook and all the non-Salish languages exemplified here (except Trique) are extinct. Data on languages other than Tillamook are drawn largely from published text collections: the texts collected by Boas (1894) in Lower Chinook, and those published by Leo Frachtenberg in Alsea (1917, abbreviated as "J"; 1920, abbreviated as "ATM"), Siuslawan (1914), and Coos (1913). Tillamook data come largely from manuscript sources: in particular, the dictionary that is being prepared by M. Terry Thompson (n.d., abbreviated as "TillD"), and the text files of May Edel (in the University of Washington archives; these include some texts collected by Franz Boas). (Lexical and grammatical files on Alsea and Tillamook collected by Melville Jacobs, both in the University of Washington archives, have also been consulted to some extent but are not cited here; the recent paper on Tillamook by Egesdal and Thompson (forthcoming) has been very helpful.) Much of my work on Alsea and Tillamook was supported by a postdoctoral fellowship at the Smithsonian Institution. Work on Alsea has also been assisted by discussions with Gene Buckley and especially by his making available to me a database version of most of Frachtenberg's Alsea texts.

For all the languages discussed here, the grammatical analyses that I present in the main text or in morpheme glosses are often tentative; I'd appreciate the pointing out of infelicities or errors, though I hope to have avoided problems that will affect the main points under discussion in this paper.

or else in some kind of sentential second position, after the first phonological word or phrase of the sentence), but this is less common for wh-questions. I have not conducted a systematic survey, but as best I can tell at present, languages that mark polarity questions by a particle (glossed "Q" below) typically do one of two things in wh-questions: (i) they may use the same particle to mark wh-questions; or (ii) wh-questions may simply be left without a particle, like declarative sentences. (Ultan [1978: 228] reports both types as about equally frequent, but does not specify whether the question particle in wh-questions is the same as the particle in polarity questions. Sadock and Zwicky [1985] do not examine this particular parameter either.)

The first is the pattern followed by Takelma, where both kinds of questions are marked by a particle =di, enclitic in sentential second position (Sapir 1912: 254f., 277f.); it is found in various other languages too (e.g., Maricopa [Gordon 1986: 61-65], Lakota [Van Valin 1993: 97f.]).²

Takelma

1) Polarity question

- a. ginig-a't=idi
go.Aorist-2sAorist=Q
"Did you go?" (Sapir 1912: 66)
- b. giⁱ di hāmi-^t'ban dō^m-k'a^e
1s Q father-2pPo kill-1sInfer
"Was it I that killed your father?" (Sapir 1909: 158, lines 2f.)

2) Wh-question

- nek'=di gu^x-dèk' lohō-n
who=Q wife-1sPo die-Caus
"Who caused my wife to die?" (Sapir 1909: 142, line 9)

² I have in general retained the transcriptions of my sources; most of these are in one or another version of the older Americanist transcriptional system where <c> = [š], <e> = [ə], <l> = [tɬ], and so on. Morphological analysis, use of hyphenation and other punctuation, and glossing often differ from that of the sources, however. (Note that I use the double hyphen = to connect clitics with their hosts.)

I use the following grammatical abbreviations in morpheme glosses: 1, 2, 3 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; s, d, p = singular, dual, plural; Art = article; Asp = aspect; Caus = causative; Cpl = completive; Ctn = continuative; Decl = declarative; Dem = demonstrative; Det = determiner; Dim = diminutive; Dirnl = directional; Erg = ergative; Fem = feminine; Fut = future; Incho = inchoative; Indef = indefinite; Indep = independent pronoun; Inf = infinitive; Infer = inferential; Intr = intransitive; Irr = irrealis; Loc = locative; Masc = masculine; MP = mediopassive; Nz = nominalizer; Ob = object; Perf = perfect; Po = possessive; Pref = prefix; Ptc = particle; Q = polarity question (or any sort of question); Quot = quotative; Su = subject; Tr = transitive; Usit = usitative; WhQ = wh-question particle.

The second pattern, in which wh-questions are left without a particle, is followed by most Salish languages.

Thompson River Salish (Nteʔkepmxcín)

3) *Polarity question*

xʷüy' kʷ n' nés
Fut 2sSu Q go

"Will you go?" (Thompson & Thompson 1992: 143)

4) *Wh-question*

swét e nés
who Art go

"Who went?" (fieldnotes)

But there are occasional languages in which wh-questions are marked by a particle different from the one that marks polarity questions. A clear case is Copala Trique as described by Hollenbach (1992). Declarative sentences are marked with clause-final *a*³² or one of various other particles; polarity questions by clause-final *nah*³ or *zhah*²; and wh-questions by clause-final *ga*² or *onx*³², which I will gloss "WhQ" (237; superscript numerals represent tones). The wh-word itself is fronted to clause-initial focus position (226). (Somewhat surprisingly for a language with sentence-final particles, Trique evidently has rigid verb-initial word order except that fronting of a single nonverb constituent is allowed.)

Copala Trique

5) *Declarative*

nawix³ kune-x³ sinduh³ yanx⁵ tuhwa³ shna-x³ a³²
Cpl.finish Cpl.seat-1s doll wax mouth cornfield(Possessed)-1s Decl
"I've finished placing the wax dolls at the edge of my cornfield" (Hollenbach 1992: 418)

6) *Polarity question*

narih⁴ zoh¹ ree⁵ zoh¹ nah³
Cpl.find 2s father 2s Q

"Did you find your father?" (Hollenbach 1992: 225)

7) *Wh-question*

me³ ze³² kirax⁵ gwaa⁴ ga²
which it Cpl.buy John WhQ

"What did John buy?" (Hollenbach 1992: 226)
(*me*³ *ze*³² is a phrase translatable as "what")

On the southern Northwest Coast, Alsea and its immediate northern neighbor Tillamook approximate to this type.

2. ALSEA

In Alsea, polarity questions are marked by a particle *ā'*, usually in some sort of sentential second position.

8) qalī'x-al-tx=apst ā'
shout-Ctn-Intr=2d Q

"Do you two always shout?" (ATM 130.12)

But wh-questions are marked by a different particle, *ē'n* (here glossed "WhQ"), which is also typically in some sort of sentential second position. (Both question particles likely are enclitics, since they must be preceded by something, and indeed Frachtenberg often connects them to the preceding word by a hyphen, even though they frequently bear their own stress. I write them here as separate words, however.)

9) a) sqā'tit=ipst ē'n qau'wīs kū'w-al-txa
which=2d WhQ first embark-Ctn-Intr
"Which of you two enters the canoe first?" (ATM 130.13)

b) k=nā'k'-s en ts=k'a'ltū=k' pits-ūstlx-auw-a'ln
Fut=where-to WhQ 3Po=heart=3Po distribute-(?)Ctn-Passive
"Where shall his heart be scattered?" (ATM 66.7f.)

In the above examples, the WhQ particle is postposed to the interrogative pronoun; other enclitics, in particular the subject pronominals, intervene between the two as in (9a). However, the WhQ particle may alternatively be postposed to some other sentence-initial host (perhaps only *k-* Future or *tem* "then"), while the interrogative pronoun follows later in the clause; this seems to be most frequent when the "pronoun" is an interrogative pro-verb (10a), but is also sometimes attested with other interrogatives (10b-d).

10) a) k'=ip ē'n ta'xti
Fut=2p WhQ do.what
"What are you going to do?" (ATM 22.4)

b) tem ē'n mu^a'hū qa-ū'k'eai L-halā'sn-al-x ...
then WhQ now Erg-who Pref-look.after-Ctn-Cpl
"And who looks after it usually ...?" (ATM 140.38)

c) te'm=ipst ē'n mu^a'hū lā^a k'lilī'w-al-txa
then=2d WhQ now how enter-Ctn-Intr
"Then how do you two get in?" (ATM 130.15f.)

d) k=in ē'n tsa'ti nā'k'eai iltq-a'a
Fut=1s WhQ Anger where do.what-TrFut
"Where, then, am I going to put it?" (ATM 132.1)

In this second pattern, the WhQ particle is clearly a sentence-level particle, not a morphological part of the interrogative pronoun itself. Indeed, in available examples in which the WhQ particle

is postposed to an interrogative pronoun, the latter either is sentence-initial or else is preceded within the sentence just by a possibly proclitic particle (as far as the evidence goes, only *k-* Future or *tem* "then", plus any pronominal or other enclitics): so it may be possible to argue that all instances of the WhQ particle immediately follow the first phonological word of the clause, and thus that it is always a sentence-level (second-position) particle.

Most of the Alsea interrogative pronouns also function as indefinites in non-interrogative sentences. (This is of course fairly common cross-linguistically [Haspelmath 1997: 170-79]; it is true of all the languages discussed in the present paper. Haspelmath, usefully, distinguishes various subtypes of indefinite pronoun—specific known or unknown, irrealis, free-choice, negated, and so on—which may be coded differently in a given language, but I will not try to explore such distinctions here.)

- 11) a) *i_L=an=iya^e nā'k-s yā'x-au*
not=1s=not where-to go-Ctn
"I am not going anywhere" (ATM 78.12)
- b) *hū^etsk qa-ū'k'eai qaiⁿkw-a'y-ū*
maybe Erg-who harm-Incho-2sOb
"perchance somebody will hurt thee" (J 67.5)
- c) *k=in ay-aī-m L-x'i'ld-ū-t is hī'tslēm nā'k-s*
Fut=1s go-Incho-Fut Pref-seek-(?)-Inf Prep people where-to
"I will go to look for people somewhere" (ATM 66.21)

Scanty evidence (essentially consisting just of the examples cited below) suggests that in a clause containing both the polarity question particle *ā'* and an interrogative pronoun, the latter must or may be interpreted as indefinite rather than as interrogative.³

- 12) a) *ā'a, k=in=uk^u ā' tsa^etī nā'k-s ay-ā'-sal-tx-am*
yes Fut=1s=away Q Anger where-to go-(?)-Perf-Intr-Fut
"Indeed, (for what cause) should I have gone away anywhere?" (ATM 64.9)
[The translation is Frachtenberg's, but a better one would probably be "Should I have gone away anywhere?". Context shows this to be a rhetorical question, equivalent to "I didn't go anywhere".]
- b) *k=_Liya^e hī'k'e lā^a ā' iltq-a'ln*
Fut=not just what Q do.what-Passive
"Is not anything going to be done to him?" (ATM 152.36)

³ Compare Lakhota and Maricopa, where interrogative/indefinite pronouns are interpreted as indefinite if there is no sentence-final interrogative particle or suffix, but are ambiguous when there is a sentence-final interrogative particle: they may be interpreted as interrogative pronouns, and the sentence as a wh-question, or they may be interpreted as indefinites, and the sentence as a polarity question (Gordon 1986: 61; Van Valin 1993: 98.).

Certain sorts of wh-questions in Alsea regularly lack the WhQ particle. Embedded questions normally do without the particle:

- 13) a) *mēlā'n-x muⁿhū [k=_Llā^a mē-hilkw-aī's-ī q-as nū'ns]*
know-Cpl now Fut=what Pref-do-Incho-TrFut Erg-Det elk
"He knew now what the elk was going to do" (ATM 176.24)
- b) *aili'k-i=n mēlā'n-x [qa-ū'k'eai q-as lxamn-aī'-n-x]*
already=1s know-Cpl Erg-who Erg-Det kill-Incho-Tr-Cpl
"I knew already who killed him" (ATM 220.28)

However, one example suggests that embedded questions that are complements of *pxēltsūs*- "ask" may retain the WhQ particle:

- 14) *tem=aux muⁿhū pxēltsūs-a'ln-x, [qā'tit=aux ē'n muⁿhū*
then-3d now ask-Passive-Cpl which=3d WhQ now
qā'^atse pīⁿtq-ax kwas k-i'lū]
long.time lie.face.down-Cpl Det water
"Then they_i two were asked which one of them_i two lay with his face down in the water for a longer period" (ATM 74.36-76.1)

(Note that the embedded clause in (14) cannot be direct discourse: its subject is coreferential with the patient (ask-ee) of the matrix clause, which means that if the question clause were direct discourse, that subject should be second person rather than third person.) "Ask" differs semantically from *mēlān*- "know", the predicate most frequently attested with an embedded question as complement (13). "Know" implies that its subject already knows the answer to the embedded question, so that (13b) comes close to being paraphrasable as "I knew that a certain person had killed him". "Ask", on the other hand, carries no such implication and indeed rather strongly implies that its subject does not know the answer to the embedded question; the embedded clause of (14) cannot plausibly be paraphrased by substituting "a certain one of them" for "which one of them". It would therefore not be too surprising to find the two kinds of embedded questions being given different formal treatments, the complement of "ask" being treated more like a main-clause question than the complement of "know".⁴ But available data are too scanty to show for certain whether this is really the case or whether (14) is simply a glitch of some sort.

If Frachtenberg's translations are to be trusted, there is also a type of main-clause question that contains no interrogative particle. For lack of a better term, I label it the "quasi-rhetorical (wh-)question". By this I mean a question that does not seriously expect an answer

⁴ Compare Munsat's (1986) observation that in English some of the grammatical properties of embedded question complements of *ask*, *wonder*, and so on are different from, and more question-like than, the properties of embedded question complements of *know*, *realize*, and similar predicates.

from anyone, and to which neither the speaker nor anyone else knows answer at the time the question is asked (the latter property distinguishes this variety of question from rhetorical questions proper, to which the speaker assumes that the answer is obvious): a question expressing the speaker's puzzlement or indecision. In the texts published by Frachtenberg, such questions either are addressed by the speaker to himself (or herself) and are answered by the same speaker, or else lack any reply and are not clearly addressed to anybody; translations such as "I wonder what/where/..." generally seem appropriate. All examples of quasi-rhetorical questions I have noted so far in the Alsea data are wh-questions; in principle, one would expect quasi-rhetorical polarity questions to be possible too, and I presume that their rarity or absence is simply an accident of the data.⁵

- 15) a) k=i'n=aux hī'te mu'n'hū lā k'lwa-y-a'a
Fut=1s=3d Surprise now how trick-Incho-TrFut
"I wonder in what way I can fool those two?" (J 75.15f.)
[Same speaker continues: "Yes, (disguised) as a child I will float in a canoe"]
- b) k=qa^e nā'k-s ay-ai'm tas xa'mnī
Fut=Uncertain where-to go-Incho-IntrFut Det seal
"I wonder where the seal is going to go?" (ATM 168.22)
[No clear addressee; no reply]

In contrast to quasi-rhetorical questions like those of (15), the true wh-questions of (9) and (10), with the wh-question particle, all immediately receive an answer from someone other than whoever uttered the question. Thus to (9a) "Which of you enters the canoe first?", the addressee immediately responds "Oh! my elder sister usually embarks first" (ATM 130), and to (9b) "Where shall his heart be scattered?", the addressee responds "To the south and also to the east" (ATM 66). The particle *ɛ'n* thus is largely restricted to sentences that have full interrogative interactional force, requiring an answer from some addressee.

Quasi-rhetorical questions constitute a sort of transition between the genuinely interrogative use of interrogative pronouns in true wh-questions and their use as indefinites. An indefinite, like an interrogative pronoun used in a quasi-rhetorical question, requires no response from the audience. On the other hand, presumably the propositional content of a sentence containing a true indefinite, such as (11b) ("Perchance someone will hurt thee"), is expected to be informative to its addressee; but a quasi-rhetorical question such as (15b) would not be informative if the interrogative pronoun were interpreted as an indefinite ("The seal is going somewhere"): in the narrative context at this point, the characters must already know that the seal towing the canoe is going somewhere or other. (It is considerations like this that give me some confidence in Frachtenberg's translations of quasi-rhetorical questions as questions—more exactly, as questions embedded under "I wonder"—rather than as declarative sentences with an indefinite pronoun, though certainly ambiguity is sometimes possible.)

⁵ The quasi-rhetorical question is possibly a minor sentence type or subtype that ought to be added to Sadock and Zwicky's (1985) inventory.

Occasional exceptions to the above generalizations for the use of the question particles have turned up in the Alsea texts: isolated examples of an apparent wh-question marked by the polarity question particle *ā'*, of a polarity question marked by the WhQ particle *ɛ'n*, of a wh-question marked by both together, and so on. One exceptional pattern is frequently enough attested that it is likely to be a legitimate alternative construction (though very much in the minority) rather than just a performance error, namely a true wh-question without the wh-question particle.

- 16) tem=i'lx nā'k-eai tē=ha'm hā't!-ō=lx
then=3p where Det=2sPo brother-Pl=3p
"And where are thy brothers?" (ATM 30.17)
[Next speaker replies: "Alas, the house suddenly closed on them"]
(Cf. also ATM 108.11f., J 67.36f.)

The wh-question particle is evidently not absolutely obligatory in true wh-questions.

3. TILLAMOOK

In Tillamook, immediately to the north of Alsea, polarity questions and wh-questions are likewise marked by different particles in sentential second position. The polarity question particle is *hi*; the wh-question particle is *ki* (sometimes transcribed *k'i* by Edel).⁶

- 17) a) lē c-həwəčəʔ-əw-š (h)i
Fem Asp-hungry-M-2sSu Q
"Are you hungry?" (TillD s.v. (h)i)
- b) ʔu... lə ʔitxwálet hi (də) cu kʷən-én-š
oh Fem young.woman Q (Art) ptc get-Tr-2sSu
"Oh, did you get a young woman?" (TillD s.v. (h)i)
- c) (e) gohandzá'xel hi
/ʔi gʷ-u-hən-céx-il hi/
and(?) Irr-go-Time-wind-Incho Q
"Is it going to blow?" (Edel text files, *The Lucky Bones* 4)
- 18) a) n(ə) čé(n)s ki de= š-yit-én-š
at where WhQ Masc (?)-find-Tr-2sSu
"Where did you find it?" (TillD s.v. čéns)
- b) gʷātu ki c-watákʷ-u
who WhQ Asp-pass-Intr

⁶ The Tillamook examples are in two different orthographies, depending on source; for examples drawn from Edel's unpublished texts, I have provided both her spelling and a tentative retranscription into the orthography of Egesdal and Thompson (forthcoming) and Thompson (n.d.), the latter within slash brackets.

- c) "Who's passing by?" (TillD s.v. g^wátu)
 daga'ta'uc ki
 /da=g^wataw-š ki/
 Masc=who-2sSu WhQ
 "Who are you?" (Edel text files, *Panther and Flint Man* 12)

It is hard to tell from the data whether the WhQ particle must be postposed to the interrogative pronoun or whether it is a second-position particle that happens to be preceded by an interrogative pronoun in attested instances that I have observed so far; Tillamook evidently requires more rigidly than does Alsea that interrogative pronouns be clause-initial.

(I ignore here some complications which will eventually have to be faced. Thompson (n.d., s.v. *k-i*) cites a few examples of the wh-question particle that are evidently not in wh-questions, e.g. *wetáhaŋ ki* [all WhQ] "all of them?", apparently a polarity question. There may also be examples in Edel's texts of *ki*, or a homophonous particle, in non-interrogative contexts with some sort of modal sense. The complete range of functions of this particle remain to be determined; but it is the case both that *ki* occurs most frequently by far in wh-questions and that true wh-questions in main clauses regularly contain *ki*.)

Interrogative pronouns in other contexts than main-clause wh-questions (e.g., in embedded questions or when functioning as indefinites) are not accompanied by the WhQ particle *ki* (though there may well be sporadic exceptions). (Evidence on embedded polarity questions in Tillamook is not clear at this point.)

19) Embedded questions

- a) qeʔš qè nš-ʔes-nəx^w-i n [čéns
 not ptc Pref-know-Tr-1sSu P where
 ʔe čí č is-sná(?)win]
 Det Dem ptc 2sPo-house
 "I don't know where your house was" (TillD s.v. ʔes¹)
- b) q'á(ə)c qāncá'sənuX [tcans dzaneʔ]
 /qeʔš qe nš-ʔes-nəx^w čens cənɪ/
 not Ptc Pref-know-Tr where 3sIndep
 "He didn't know where he was" (Edel text files, *Nothing but Women* 27)

20) Indefinites

- a) g^wə=ʔx^wáŋ-i nə čéns
 Irr=go-1sSu to where
 "I'm going somewhere" (TillD s.v. čéns)
- b) ʔə=naʔcí-stx^w-in g^wátu
 Fem=enter-house-(?) who
 "Someone has come into the house" (TillD s.v. g^wátu)

One or two examples have turned up which might be considered quasi-rhetorical wh-questions, too (though I am not entirely certain of their proper analysis); *ki* does not occur in these

examples.

- 21) ʔa=ts-xtca'n-o awul
 Pl=Asp-do.what(?)=Middle then(?)
 "What are they doing then?" (self-directed; no verbal answer expected) (Edel text files, *The Boy Stolen By Thunder* 31)

Interrogative pronouns in their indefinite use can (and normally do?) follow the main predicate of their clause, while as interrogatives (in main-clause or embedded questions) they are normally clause-initial.

4. OTHER SALISH LANGUAGES

Most other Salish languages use no interrogative particle in wh-questions—that is, they resemble Thompson (4) rather than Tillamook. The only clear exception of which I am aware is Bella Coola, geographically and genetically distant from Tillamook. Nater (1984: 116f., 128) reports that interrogative wh-words host an enclitic sequence =ʔi=ks, =ʔl=ks, =ks, distinct from the polarity question enclitic =(y)a.

Bella Coola

- 22) a) ti=ka=ks ti=ʔay-uc-m-it ac ʔal=ʔmɪt
 Art=which=WhQ Art=do-mouth-MP-3sOb:3pSu those Prep=us
 "Which one of us is it they are talking about?" (Davis & Saunders 1980: 45f., sentence 28)
- b) kā=ks si-k^wt-us-m-s
 where=WhQ Nz-(?)=face-MP-3sSu
 "Where did he get down on his hands and knees?" (Davis & Saunders 1980: 46, sentence 35)

Wh-words lack these enclitics when they have an indefinite sense (23) (in which case they are usually preceded by an article) and in embedded questions (24).

Bella Coola

- 23) ʔaX=k^w ti=ka-ʔaŋ-t'q-i ti=ka-stam ʔaŋ=ta=as-tx^w-s
 not=Quot Art=Irr=Asp=stuck=Dim Art=Irr-what at=Art=Loc-inside-3Po
 ta=suŋ=tX^w
 Art=house=Dem
 "There was nothing at all on the walls inside the house" (Davis & Saunders 1980: 105, s. 99)
- 24) ʔixlq'tX [(s-)stam-s ti=ʔaŋ-ip'-ic=t'ayx]
 guess (Nz-)what-3sSu Art=Asp-hold-3sOb:1sSu=Dem
 "Guess what I am holding!" (Nater 1984: 117)

Though the Bella Coola enclitic sequences $=ʔi=ks$, $=ʔl=ks$ are similar in their distribution to the Tillamook and Alsea WhQ particles, they do not appear to be cognate with Tillamook *ki*: I would normally expect Bella Coola (and Proto-Salish) *k* to correspond to Tillamook $\dot{c}$; Tillamook *k* should reflect rather Proto-Salish $*k^w$ or possibly $*w$. (The Bella Coola element $=ks$, moreover, is not confined to questions; it occurs in other enclitic strings as well [Nater 1984: 128].) It is quite likely, therefore, that the WhQ particle of Tillamook is an independent development, not an inheritance from Proto-Salish.

As of this writing, it is not clear to me whether Upper Chehalis can be said to have a distinctive wh-question particle; further study of this language is required. In texts that I have seen (e.g., Kinkade 1987), interrogative pronouns in wh-questions are often followed by particles such as $(ʔ)uk^w a$ "I suppose", $((ʔ)a)na$ "interrogative", but as far as I can tell at present these particles seem not to be limited to wh-questions (see the entries for $ʔuk^w a$ and *na* in Kinkade 1991) nor do wh-questions invariably contain them.⁷

5. OTHER LANGUAGES OF THE SOUTHERN NORTHWEST COAST

Of the non-Salish languages in the neighborhood of Tillamook and Alsea, only Coos, on the Oregon coast south of Alsea and Siuslawan, appears to have something like a WhQ particle. (I have investigated only Hanis Coos so far, not Miluk.) The interrogative pronouns *wit* "who", *dīl* "what", *tcitc* "how" (also *mīlātc* "when", and possibly *qantc* "where", but apparently not *wictce* "which") take a suffix $-ū$ in main-clause wh-questions, but not when they are used as indefinites "someone/anyone", "something/anything", "somehow/anyhow" (Frachtenberg 1922a: 407f., 411); nor, apparently, do they take this suffix in embedded wh-questions. The suffix $-ū$ is distinct from the polarity question particle *ī* (often sentence-final) (394).

Coos

25) Main-clause wh-question

- a) $x-tci'tc-ū$ $e^c-xa'l-al$
Manner-how-WhQ 2s-do-Durative(?)
"What are you doing?" (Frachtenberg 1913: 36.13)
- b) $dī'l-ū$ he $tə$ $e^c-wīl-ō^w-wat$
what-WhQ Frequent that 2s-look.for-Frequentative
"What are you continually looking for?" (Frachtenberg 1922a: 408)

26) Indefinite

- $ī$ $dī'l$ $īl$ $lōw-ēi'wat$ $ēit$
when what 3p eat-Frequentative intend

⁷ It would also be interesting to know whether any Salish languages distinguish a formal category of quasi-rhetorical question, like Alsea and (possibly) Tillamook, but I lack evidence at this point. I have the impression that the Thompson Salish evidential enclitic *nke* Conjectural sometimes attaches to interrogative words with somewhat the effect of a quasi-rhetorical question, but am not at all certain of this.

"Whenever they wanted to eat (something)" (Frachtenberg 1922a: 422)

27) Embedded question

- $kwāā'n-iyā$ [$x-tci'tc$ $hanl$ le $its-ēm$]
know-3Ob Manner-how Future Art happen-IndefSu
"He knew what was going to happen" (Frachtenberg 1913: 26.19f.)

It is hard to be perfectly certain how questions and indefinites were treated in Siuslawan, on the coast between Coos and Alsea, owing to the limited and imperfect nature of the text material that Frachtenberg was able to obtain. But it appears that there is no equivalent of a WhQ particle and that interrogative pronouns take the same form in wh-questions and when used as indefinites (Frachtenberg 1922b: 584f.). There is a polarity question particle *nā* (599), perhaps in sentential second position.

Siuslawan

28) a) Polarity question

- $pīn-a^i$ $nā$
sick-Verbalizer Q
"Is he sick?" (Frachtenberg 1922b: 599)

b) Wh-question

- $tcī'nta^u=nx$ $sī'nīxy-ūn$
which=2s want-3Ob
"Which one do you want?" (Frachtenberg 1922b: 585)

c) Indefinite

- $wāt c xa'īn-tūx$
who climb-Fut
"Somebody will climb up" (Frachtenberg 1922b: 584)

In Lower Chinook, immediately to the north of Tillamook (though available texts are from north of the Columbia, not the south side), the situation is clearer. Polarity questions are marked by a second-position particle *nā*, and wh-questions are not marked by a particle. (The wh-question cited below, like various other examples to be found in Boas's texts, is clearly a true wh-question, not a quasi-rhetorical one.) Interrogative pronouns are normally clause-initial in wh-questions; they are also used without change as indefinite pronouns.

Lower Chinook

29) a) Polarity question

- $mā'mkXa$ na $m-l-ā'-qxamt$
you.alone Q 2s-3sNeuter-Dirnl-look
"Do you alone see it?" (Boas 1894: 185.16)

b) Wh-question

- $qā'xēwa$ $a-m-t-ē'-mam$
where Aorist-2s-hither-go-arrive

"Where did you come from?" (Boas 1894: 161.14)

c) *Indefinite*

a'lta	ka'nauwē	qā'xēwa	a-y-ō'-yi-x
now	all	where	Aorist-3sMasc-Dirnl-go-Usit
	k'jinta'-y	u-yā'-xk'un	
	after-Link	FemSg-3sMascPo-older.sibling	

"Now he went everywhere after his elder sister" (Boas 1894: 186.12f.)

It would also be a good idea to investigate the treatment of wh-questions in Kalapuya, to the east of the Tillamook and Alsea, but as of this writing I have yet to do so. At any rate, it is clear that Tillamook shares the trait of a wh-question particle with Alsea but not with Chinookan.

There are certainly various other morphosyntactic properties which link Tillamook with Chinookan, or with Chinookan and the languages to the south. Alsea, for example, along with Siuslawan, has frequent second-position enclitics of various sorts (especially pronominal); Tillamook (rather exceptionally for a Salish language of the coast) and Chinook on the whole do not. And Chinook, Tillamook (again somewhat atypically for a coastal Salish language), and Alsea, though basically verb-initial, all rather readily allow fronting of arguments to a position before the verb without requiring any special morphosyntactic treatment of the verb (cf. Kroeber [1991: 342-346]; the remarks about Alsea there turn out to be unnecessarily tentative). (For some additional suggestions as to shared features, see Silverstein [1974: S67ff.], Thompson and Kinkade 1990.) And ethnohistorically, relations between Lower Chinookans and Tillamook were evidently close enough that some Clatsop and Nehelim Tillamook were intermarrying in historical times, to the point that Clatsop was replaced by Tillamook [Boas 1894: 5; Silverstein 1990: 535; Seaburg and Miller 1990: 560].

Nonetheless, the wh-question particle appears to be a trait that Tillamook shares with Alsea and not with Chinookan. It is not easy to prove that this grammatical feature has diffused from Alsea to Tillamook (or vice versa), since no actual morphemic material has been borrowed. Any case for diffusion will rest on indirect arguments: the cross-linguistic infrequency of a wh-question particle, which makes its independent innovation in two adjacent languages less likely; and evidence for diffusion of other traits between the languages in question. It is perhaps suggestive that Kinkade (1979?) has noted similarities between the enclitic pronominals of Alsea (and, to a lesser extent, Siuslawan) and the subject suffixes of Salish (e.g., 2nd person singular Alsea =x, Proto-Salish *-ax; 1st person plural Alsea =l, Lushootseed -əli, Tillamook -yəl, Saanich -ətte, Bella Coola -il) which are striking enough that they might be due to diffusion (perhaps from rather than to Salish). If this be accepted, that would make it somewhat more likely that resemblances in the treatment of wh-questions in Tillamook and Alsea might also be due to diffusion rather than simple coincidence. On the other hand, lexical resemblances between Tillamook and Alsea (or other non-Salish languages in the area) do not seem particularly impressive, as far as I can tell at present (further study of the lexicons of most of the languages is needed, though); one might expect significant grammatical borrowing to be accompanied by significant lexical borrowing. I will therefore leave the diachronic issue undecided for the time being.

REFERENCES

- ATM: Abbreviation for Frachtenberg 1920.
 Boas, Franz. 1894. *Chinook texts*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 20. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
 Davis, Philip W., and Ross Saunders. 1980. *Bella Coola texts*. British Columbia Provincial Museum Heritage Record no. 10. Victoria, B.C.
 Edell, May M. 1939. The Tillamook language. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 10, pp. 1-57.
 Egesdal, Steven M., and M. Terry Thompson. Forthcoming. A fresh look at Tillamook inflectional morphology. *in Kinkade and Czaykowski*
 Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1913. *Coos texts*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 1. New York: Columbia University Press.
 Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1914. *Lower Umpqua texts*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 4. New York: Columbia University Press.
 Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1917. Myths of the Alsea Indians of northwestern Oregon. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1, pp. 64-75.
 Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1920. *Alsea texts and myths*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 67 (1920). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
 Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1922a. Coos. In Franz Boas, ed., *Handbook of American Indian languages, part 2* (BAE-B 40, part 2), pp. 297-429. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
 Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1922b. Siuslawan (Lower Umpqua). In Franz Boas, ed., *Handbook of American Indian languages, part 2* (BAE-B 40, part 2), pp. 431-629. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
 Gordon, Lynn. 1986. *Maricopa morphology and syntax*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 108. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
 Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 Hollenbach, Barbara E. 1992. A syntactic sketch of Copala Trique. C. Henry Bradley and Barbara E. Hollenbach, ed., *Studies in the syntax of Mixtecan languages, vol. 4* (Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics 111), pp. 174-431.
 J: Abbreviation for Frachtenberg 1917.
 Kinkade, M. Dale. 1979?. [Paper on pronominals in Alsea and Salish. Reference not at hand at the moment.] *1978 Conference on American Indian Languages*
 Kinkade, M. Dale. 1987. Bluejay and his sister. Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat, eds., *Recovering the word: essays on Native American literature*, pp. 255-96. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 Kinkade, M. Dale. 1991. *Upper Chehalis dictionary*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 7. Missoula, Montana: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
 Kroeber, Paul D. 1991. *Comparative syntax of subordination in Salish*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
 Munsat, Stanley. 1986. Wh-complementizers. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9, pp. 191-217.
 Nater, H. F. 1984. *The Bella Coola language*. National Museum of Man Mercury Series,

- Canadian Ethnology Service Paper 92. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.
- Sadock, Jerrold M., and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. I: Clause structure*. Cambridge, London, and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sapir, Edward. 1909. *Takelma texts*. University of Pennsylvania Anthropological Publications 2, pp. 1-263.
- Sapir, Edward. 1912. *The Takelma language of southwestern Oregon*. Extract from Franz Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian languages, part 2* (Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40), pp. 1-296. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Seaburg, William R., and Jay Miller. 1990. Tillamook. Wayne Suttles, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 7: Northwest Coast*, pp. 560-67. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1974. Dialectal developments in Chinookan tense-aspect systems: an areal-historical analysis. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Memoir 29 (vol. 40, no. 4, part 2).
- Silverstein, Michael. 1990. Chinookans of the lower Columbia. Wayne Suttles, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 7: Northwest Coast*, pp. 533-46.
- Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Dale Kinkade. 1990. Languages. Wayne Suttles, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 7: Northwest Coast*, pp. 30-51.
- Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. *The Thompson language*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8. Missoula, Montana: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Thompson, M. Terry. n.d. *Tillamook-English dictionary with English-Tillamook glossary*. Ms., Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii.
- TillD: Abbreviation for Thompson n.d.
- Ultan, Russell. 1978. Some general characteristics of interrogative systems. Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of human language, vol. 4: Syntax*, pp. 211-48. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1993. A synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. Robert D. Van Valin, ed., *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, pp. 1-164. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.