Proto-Salish irrealis

M. Dale Kinkade
University of British Columbia

Abstract. Reconstruction of a Proto-Salish morpheme for 'irrealis' may appear simple and obvious; however, such a reconstruction depends on what subset of languages is used as the basis for reconstruction. The proposed reconstruction offered here is *qa-ɬ-. Reasons why an initial *k* might be considered are also explored, as is the question of whether or not Proto-Salish 'irrealis' may have been bimorphemic.

r

1 Introduction

A morpheme for 'irrealis' has not heretofore been convincingly reconstructed for Salish. There are two primary reasons for this. One has to do with terminology. Reflexes of the morpheme that will be reconstructed here as 'irrealis' have been labeled as a variety of things, few descriptions actually using the gloss 'irrealis'. This is not surprising; linguistic literature has used this term in a variety of ways, often referring to very different phenomena (see the vol. 40, no. 2 issue of *Anthropological Linguistics*, devoted to papers on irrealis from a symposium on the subject held in 1995; these papers clearly do not reflect a single notion of irrealis). Here it will be considered a modal concept — one referring to an event which has not actually occurred or is hypothetical. As such, it is often translated into English as a modal auxiliary, particularly 'could', 'should', or 'would'. It often follows a negative predicate or an interrogative (both unreal situations by definition); other environments are also common.[1]

The other reason an irrealis morpheme has not been reconstructed is the spotty distribution of clear cognates. In some languages, it seems to be a marginal morpheme (at least in recent times), such that very few examples of it have been encountered by linguists. Recognizing what it is through this paper may help to find more examples, or

---

[1]
 Throughout this paper transcriptions have been modified toward uniformity in the selection of phonetic/phonemic characters. Glosses have also occasionally been modified somewhat. Symbols used are: / to indicate the beginning of a root, = to set off a lexical suffix, and [ ] to indicate an infix. Abbreviations (not always exactly the same as in my sources) are: APPL = applicative, CAUS = causative, CJR = conjectural, CONDIT = conditional, CONT = continuative, CONTEMP = contemporaneous, DET = determiner (of any kind), DIR = direct complement, DRV = derivational, EPEN = epenthetic, FB = Franz Boas (as the source of some Upper Chehalis examples), FOC = focus, FUT = future, IMPER = imperative, IMPF = imperfective, IRR = irrealis, LCL = localizer, LOC = locative, MDL = middle voice, MUT = mutative, NCTRL = noncontrol, NEG = negative, NOM = nominalizer, NTR = noncontrol transitive, OBJ = object, OBL = oblique, PERF = perfective, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, Q = question, QN = question marker, REFL = reflexive, REL = relational, S = s-prefix (multiple or unclear functions), SG = singular, ST = stative, STRUC = structured activity, SUB = subordinate, SUBJ = subject, TR = transitive, UNR = unrealized.

to recognize rare instances of it in languages for which I find no examples in Salishan literature and language descriptions.

As will shortly become clear, cognacy in several languages is actually quite obvious, as is even the basic shape of the morpheme. However, there remain questions about it; these questions will be discussed in sections **3** and **4** below. It is necessary to remember that the meaning, usage, and even position of an irrealis marker can change through time, often making it difficult to determine which forms are cognate.

It also needs to be pointed out that my use of the term 'irrealis' does not necessarily accord with its use in Kroeber (1999), nor will I agree with Kroeber's reconstruction (1999:70). He reconstructs an initial *k* where I will reconstruct *q*, and says that Kalispel has an "unexplained *q*" (1999:70). Others of us had also thought the Kalispel *q* was unexplained; however, I now think that that is the correct consonant, and it is the *k* in other languages that is unexplained — if cognate. Anyone interested in the syntactic use of irrealis constructions should consult Kroeber, and I will not repeat any of his discussion on that issue here.

2 Cognates and reconstruction

The Proto-Salish morpheme is clearly *qa-ɬ* (the reason for the hyphen will become clear later). Examples are abundant only in Kalispel, Squamish, Upper Chehalis, and possibly Tillamook and Bella Coola (where cognates are probable; the Tillamook cognate has to be inferred because of its description heretofore, and the Bella Coola cognate does not have the expected initial consonant). Other Interior Salishan languages may also have cognates, although, as in Bella Coola, the initial consonant there is not the expected *q*, and syntactic and semantic differences make it less clear that the same morpheme is involved. Examples have also been found in Sliammon, Sechelt, and Saanich, although researchers on those languages have turned up only two or three occurrences. This may be because the morpheme has become obsolescent, or because texts are the best place to find it, and it has been possible to collect only a limited number of texts in these languages. It is also found in Cowlitz, although its presence there can be observed largely because of the similarity of Cowlitz to Upper Chehalis, where it is abundant (primarily in texts); very limited textual material could be collected in Cowlitz. Cognates may well have existed in other Salishan languages, particularly those in the Central Salish branch. The limited data available in Pentlatch, Nooksack, Lower Chehalis, and Quinault, in particular, may simply not be adequate to have yielded instances.

Sliammon. Watanabe (2000) cites only two examples of *qəɬ*, saying only that "this clitic is not well identified" (2000:336); no gloss is given. The two examples are (1) and (2).

(1)   xʷaʔ a čxʷ qəɬ /ha-h-axʷ
       NEG QN 2SG.SBJ — /go-EPEN-2SG.SBJ
       Have you ever gone there?

(2)　　qəɬ č'a /k'ʷəɬ-əxʷ
　　　— CJR /spill-NTR
　　　It almost spilled, he almost spilled it.

Sechelt. Occurrences of a form nearly identical to the one in Sliammon are also reported for Sechelt (R. C. Beaumont, p.c.), and again, only two examples have turned up. Both can be seen as being in irrealis contexts.

Squamish. Kuipers states that *qa-ɬ* occurs in negative sentences only (1967:194-195), although *q* occurs in other environments, many of which can be considered irrealis. For the moment, only *qa-ɬ* will be considered (and I will label it 'irrealis'). (I modify Kuipers's transcriptions slightly in omitting clitic attachment markers and the hyphen in subject clitics). See (3) to (5).

(3)　　háw čap qa-ɬ /c'ic'áp'
　　　not 2PL.SUBJ IRR /work
　　　you (pl.) don't work

(4)　　háw čn qa-ɬ /xʷəkʷ-s ta /šúkʷa
　　　not 1SG.SUBJ IRR /use-CAUS DET /sugar
　　　I don't use sugar.

(5)　　háw qa-ɬ /ɬq'íʔst-as
　　　not IRR /know-3SG.SUBJ
　　　He didn't know it.

Saanich. Montler (1986:209-210) lists a morpheme *q* 'conditional', and says of it that it "appears too infrequently in the corpus to determine its status. It appears in only a few sentences all having the same general structure" as example (6).

(6)　　/háʔ q ləʔ sən č/télə, nə-s-əw' /ʔəlq-əláʔ ʔə kʷs /ʔél'əŋ
　　　/if CONDIT PAST 1SG.SUBJ HAVE/money, 1SG.POS-S-CONTEMP /buy-STRUC OBL
　　　　DET /house
　　　If I had money, I'd buy a house.

Tillamook. Kroeber identifies a proclitic *gʷ(əʔ)* as 'irrealis' or 'future' in Tillamook (1999:143); however, the comparative evidence presented here suggests that another morpheme may rather be 'irrealis', or may have been that at an earlier time. In a draft of a Tillamook dictionary (Thompson 1992), a particle *q-e* is identified as the "second element of negative" (1992:80), and *qe(ʔ)* as a "temporal particle, future?" (1992:80). Both are situations where irrealis commonly occurs in Salish, as can be seen in examples from other languages. The morpheme is illustrated here in (7) and (8).

(7) qe[ʔ]š qè nš/ʔes-nə́xʷ-i
      not — LOC/know-NCTRL-1SG.SUBJ
      I can't remember; I don't know

(8) qe[ʔ]š qe /səsqʼʷ-ə́wʼ-ə
      not — jump-MDL-IMPER.SG
      Don't jump! (e.g., talking to a little boy)

Edel (1939) gives this particle in all of her citations of negative sentences, and also cites a particle *qa*, about which she says that it "is perhaps an affix rather than an independent word. It is a sort of generalized exclamation, and usually occurs at the end of a verb complex. However, such forms as these may occur":

(9) qə́ s-/cíy-i
      — ST/come-1SG.SUBJ
      I think he is coming. (Edel 1939:51; transcription revised to match Thompson 1992)

(10) qə́ gʷ /əh-ə́wi-n-i ga
       — FUT /bring-REL-DRV-1SG.SUBJ ?
       I'll try to bring it. (Edel 1939:51; transcription revised to match Thompson 1992)

Both these sentences have the notion of irrealis in their meaning.

Upper Chehalis. For some reason, the Upper Chehalis cognate has changed the initial *q* into an ejective *qʼ*. It might be supposed that this change is by analogy with the realis morpheme *qʼi-*; however, the Cowlitz cognate for this realis is *qi-*, even though Cowlitz irrealis is *qʼaɬ*, suggesting any analogical change went the other direction, from irrealis to realis. Upper Chehalis *qʼaɬ* occurs very commonly in texts, and was not unusual in elicited data. See (11) to (14).

(11) néɬ u qʼaɬ s/qíwɬ=či t /ɬáčiw-m. (FB)
       be.like yet IRR NOM/stink=water DET /down.below-MDL
       It's like there could be ocean down below.

(12) "ʔam u qʼaɬ tit /čáɬ-tuxʷt čn tit n/qéˑq, wi qʼaɬ ta /cʼə́č-s tan." (FB)
       if yet IRR DET /give-APPL 1SG.SUBJ DET 1SG.POSS/camas, and IRR PAST
           /all.gone-3POSS now
       "If I were to give him my camas, it might be gone now."

(13) /cə́ni wi ʔac/qín-m-c n-qʼaɬ s/yap-álʼ=x̣aš-n.
       /he FOC ST/want-REL-1SG.OBJ 1SG.POSS-IRR SUB/walk-LINK=house-IMPF.3SG.SUBJ
       He wants me to visit him.

(14) /mí+ta t q'a+ s-tx^w/ƛ'ə́l-ciš-s.
/not DET IRR S-MUT/hold.still-REFL-3POSS
He couldn't hold still.

Upper Chehalis 'irrealis' is discussed at length in Kinkade (1998).

Cowlitz. The Cowlitz cognate is identical to the form in Upper Chehalis. However, because of the lack of adequate textual material, examples can be found only in a few expressions, some or all of which may be lexicalized. All end in the unidentified suffix -n'+ (perhaps some sort of adjectival marker). The examples are in (15).

(15) q'a+ láʔx^w-n'+ 'funny', q'a+ č'áš -n'+ 'dangerous', q'a+ ʔúšm-n'+ 'poor',
q'a+ qát-n'+ 'nice, kind', q'a+ q'^wáx̣-n'+a-t-i 'his getting mad'

Kalispel. Kalispel and Spokane have a particle q+ identified as 'subjunctive' by Vogt (1940:27) and 'unreal' by Carlson (1972:119). It reduces to q before s- and *hec*- (according to Carlson 1972:119); Vogt gives *qe*- as another variant (1940:41). Carlson notes that the particle can usually be translated as 'going to', as in (16) and (17).

(16) či q s/x^wí-st-i
1SG.SUBJ IRR S/go-CAUS-IMPF
I'm going to walk. (Carlson 1972:119)

(17) či q ec/x^wúy
1SG.SUBJ IRR ACTUAL/go
I'm going to go. (Carlson 1972:119)

Furthermore, it "can refer to something unrealized in the past as well" (1972:119), as in (18) and (19).

(18) ta q sə/wíč-ən + uʔ s/tém'
not IRR S/see-1SG.SUBJ SECONDARY PARTICULAR S/what
I couldn't see a thing. (Carlson 1972:119)

(19) ta k^wo q s/x̣^wél-i
not 1SG.OBJ IRR S/leave-IMPF
He wouldn't leave me. (Carlson 1972:119)

Because the particle occurs so frequently before s- or hec-, full sentences with q+ are not cited frequently by either Carlson or Vogt. However, Vogt gives a few subjunctives of nominals, as in (20).

(20) či q+ /ilmíx^wəm
1SG.SUBJ IRR /chief
I am going to be chief. (Vogt 1940:27)

3. *q or *k?

All the languages cited above have the initial consonant of the irrealis morpheme as *q*. However, *k* is found in what would appear to be cognates in several other languages.

Bella Coola. Nater (1983:161-163) identifies a proclitic *ka* as 'hypothetical, irrealis, future', noting that it occurs with both nouns and verbs. He gives a number of examples, among them those in (21) to (24).

(21) ʔax̣ʷ ti ka /suɬ-c
NEG DET any /house-1SG.POSS
I have no house = "there is not any house of mine"

(22) ci ka /xnas-c
DET FUT /wife-1SG.POSS
my future wife

(23) ka /ƛ'ap-ɬ-c
would /go-PERF-1SG.SUBJ
I would go

(24) /ʔakʷa-t-x̣ ka /ya-s
/buy-TR-SG.IMPER if /good-3POSS
buy it if it is good

Each of the three Northern Interior Salishan languages has one or more morphemes beginning with *k* with an irrealis component of its meaning, although neither the Shuswap nor the Lillooet form is described in those terms.

Shuswap. The relevant Shuswap morpheme is *k*. Kuipers treats this morpheme as part of the system of articles (1974:57), and has it as a "hypothetical-indeterminate" article opposed to "actual-determinate" articles. As an absolutive, it contrasts with present and absent actual-determinate articles (*y* and *l*, respectively), and it combines with the relative t/ƛ' as tk/ƛ'k. Kuipers says of *k* that "(h)ypothetical articles are found especially in interrogative, imperative and conditional sentences, in negative sentences, and in sentences referring to the future" (1974:57), all irrealis concepts. He gives only one example (although others can be found in the texts in the volume):

(25) /nk'ʷúʔ ƛ'k-s/yíst
/one DET-s/camp.overnight
one (more) night of camping (and we'll see caribou)

Thompson also has a particle *k*, glossed by Thompson and Thompson as 'unrealized'. This term is selected because it

194

"marks adjuncts referring to matters that are unknown, unreal, or contrary-to-fact — occasionally simply indefinite — to be established in the future, if at all. (Note that the range is broader than that usually designated by the term *irrealis*; UNREALIZED conveys the meaning more accurately" (1992:150).

Nevertheless, this morpheme is often used to express the sorts of irrealis notions illustrated for other Salishan languages above. Examples are (26) and (27).

(26)   /k'i?k'e?t k s-n/ʕʷɫóqʷ-s
         /near UNR NOM-LCL/boil-3POSS
         it is close to boiling (Thompson and Thompson 1992:150)

(27)   təté? k es/té?-s
         not UNR DIR.NOM/something-3POSS
         they did not have anything (Thompson and Thompson 1992:150)

Lillooet apparently has no prefix or proclitic that fits here; however, van Eijk lists two or three enclitics that begin with k and have meanings that are compatible with notions encompassed by 'irrealis'. These are *ka* 'obligation, expectancy', *kəɫ* 'remote future, possibility', and (given the Upper Chehalis 'irrealis' beginning with an ejective) *k'a* 'possibility, surmise' (van Eijk 1997:201-202). (I refrain from citing examples here because of my uncertainty of making correct morpheme divisions and glosses; the interested reader can find example sentences in van Eijk 1997.) For any of these to be cognate with other morphemes discussed in this article, an explanation of the shift from proclitic (or prefix) to enclitic position would need to be provided; such shifts of position are not unknown in languages, but there should be an explanation.

All the Southern Interior Salishan languages except Kalispel also have morphemes with *k* that can be seen to have an irrealis component in their meanings. Okanagan, Columbian, and Coeur d'Alene have morphemes that appear to be used very much like Kalispel *qɫ*, although there are important differences. Mattina (1996) deals with this very topic, and I will not repeat or review his discussion here, except to add some Moses-Columbian forms (which Mattina did not have in time to include in his article). He also reviews possible cognate forms in the three Northern Interior Salishan languages.

Moses-Columbian has several prefixes or proclitics that have *k* in them. Some of these are positional prefixes, and are irrelevant to this discussion. One is a resultative prefix *ks-* (see Kinkade 1999), which looks like some of the other morphemes that are involved in the irrealis discussion, although it has such a different semantic content that it, too, must be set aside as irrelevant. However, like Okanagan and Coeur d'Alene (which has shifted the *k* to *č* by regular sound change), Moses-Columbian has at least one morpheme that behaves in many ways like Kalispel *qɫ*. In general terms, it appears to

form future nouns as *kaɬ-*, and future verbs as *kas-* (or more properly as *ka-* before a verb — or noun — beginning with *s* or any other coronal). The usual meaning of forms with this prefix is 'future', which, of course, is an unreal time. See (28) and (29).

(28) máxʷ naʔ kn kaɬ/yəlmíxʷm
      maybe FUT 1SG.SUBJ —/chief
      I'm going to be chief

(29) ka-s/taʔuʔ-míx
      —IMPF/rain-IMPF
      it's going to rain

A heretofore unremarked parallel to Kalispel *qɬ* is the prefix that forms ordinals. Vogt simply says that these "are the subjunctive forms of the cardinal numbers" (1940:44):

(30) q-s-/čeʔɬé(s) 'third'

This is probably *not* the same morpheme being discussed, however, because the Moses-Columbian equivalent is *kɬ*; if the morphemes were the same, a vowel would be expected in the Moses-Columbian form (31):

(31) kɬ-/kaʔɬás 'third'

It is certainly noteworthy, however, that Kalispel has *q* in this prefix, while Moses-Columbian has *k*. (I find no record of ordinals in the other Southern Interior languages.)

Okanagan and **Coeur d'Alene** have prefixes similar to those in Moses-Columbian. As noted, these are discussed in Mattina (1996), and will not be dealt with further here, except to emphasize that Okanagan has *k* in the equivalent morphemes, and Coeur d'Alene has *č*. Mattina deduces that more than one morpheme is involved in the Southern Interior languages. I will not argue against that position, as it is mostly not germane to my interest here in reconstruction; the analysis of these morphemes still needs much investigation.

So what *should* be reconstructed for a Proto-Salish 'irrealis'? Simply counting languages (and accepting my classifications as to what is or might be 'irrealis'), the score is *q* 8 (Kalispel, Sliammon, Sechelt, Squamish, Saanich, Upper Chehalis, Cowlitz, Tillamook), *k* 7 (Bella Coola, Lillooet, Thompson, Shuswap, Okanagan, Moses-Columbian, Coeur d'Alene), something else entirely 2 (Halkomelem, Lushootseed), and unknown 6 (Pentlatch, Nooksack, Klallam, Twana, Lower Chehalis, Quinault). However, that isn't how such things are decided. Note that of the eight *k*-languages, seven are Interior and contiguous, and that more than one morpheme appears to be involved in what might be compared, suggesting that there may have been some analogical reshaping there. The *q*-languages are distributed in an interesting way, however: one language far to the

east in Interior Salish, four languages along the Strait of Georgia in Central Salish, two languages well to the south in Tsamosan Salish, and one in Tillamook. That makes four islands well separated from each other with q. This separation leads me to prefer a reconstruction with *q, and the whole morpheme as *qa-ɬ. A low vowel is more widespread (in ten languages), so that too seems likely. But how did the forms with k come about? I cannot answer this, unless the Interior Salish language forms (a) are simply unrelated to *qa-ɬ, or (b) have changed the initial q to k by analogy with other prefixes and clitics.

4 One morpheme or two?

Whether one morpheme or two are involved is perhaps more difficult to decide. There is no way to tell from Sliammon or Sechelt because of the paucity of examples of the morpheme, and only forms with a final ɬ occur there. The Saanich cognate and the potential Tillamook cognate lack the final lateral fricative entirely, suggesting either that these languages lost this part of the morpheme, or that it was a second morpheme that was dispensed with in these two languages.

The question of whether one or two morphemes are involved arises initially, however, from Kuipers's analysis of the situation. He identifies, and gives lengthy discussion of, a clitic q (1967:189-195) which he finds in various types of clauses, only one of which occurs with an attached ɬ. This last occurs in negative sentences only (1967:194), although there are also negative sentences without it. It is also the only context in which a vowel is present, leading one to question its identity with the other occurrences of q. Most sentences with q cited by Kuipers can be seen as having some irrealis intent (though not all). It occurs in four types of clauses: Type I is used in subordinate clauses only (1967:189-190); Type II for past unreal conditions (among others; 1967:191-192), Type III in subordinate clauses only (1967:192-194); and Type IV in negative sentences (1967:194-195). A fifth type has q suffixed to the negative, rather than being proclitic to what follows (1967:195). Type IV is the only one that takes the form qa-ɬ. The clitic ɬ is used by itself in clauses that "correspond to English subordinate clauses introduced by a relative adverb (why, where, when, how) or by a relative pronoun which is not the subject or object of the clause" (1967:196), and is not by itself irrealis. The fact that the combination qa-ɬ is the only context in which the clitic q occurs with a vowel, and that it is found in negative sentences only might suggest that it is a unitary particle or clitic separate from q; however, then the use of q without ɬ in some negative clauses would require further explanation. I leave it as uncertain if Squamish answers the question about whether the irrealis marker consists of one or two morphemes.

The Kalispel irrealis morpheme has two variants, according to Vogt: qɬ and qe (1940:41). I cannot tell if the second of these is phonologically conditioned; only the second form is used before ʔeɬ 'translocative' or 'iterative'. Vogt says of the two variants that they are used "without appreciable difference of meaning" (1940:41), and gives both:

(32) či q-s/kʷúp-i *and* či qe-ʔes/kʷúp-i
      1SG.SUBJ IRR-CONT/push-IMPF
      I am pushing.

There may be other facts about these variants that I am unable to deduce from Vogt's description of them. As it stands, however, if they are not phonologically conditioned variants, then they suggest that q ɬ is bimorphemic, although possibly in the process of collapsing into a single morpheme, and there is no clue what the ɬ is or was. (For further speculation, see Mattina 1996.)

The Upper Chehalis irrealis morpheme q 'aɬ does seem to be unitary. Note, however, that when a second person singular possessive proclitic occurs with it, the latter is infixed into 'irrealis', as in (33) and (34).

(33) ʔac'í t q'alaɬ t s/íɬn ʔama q'aɬ txʷ/ʔíɬn č
      ST-Q DET IRR+2SG.POSS DET S/eat if IRR MUT/eat 2SG.SUBJ
      Would you eat if you could?

(34) ʔóˑ q'aɬ t /sáʔ-n-š t /nuɬtámš; ʔéy u q'alaɬ s/móˑlʔukʷ-n yawmš
      oh IRR DET make-3OBJ-2SG.SUBJ DET /person, just yet IRR+2SG.POSS s/cheat-
      3OBJ 3PL
      "Oh, you could make a person; you can just fool them." (FB)

Infixes are not common in languages, and therefore one might prefer an analysis where the Upper Chehalis 'irrealis' could be divided into 'irrealis' plus 'second person singular possessive' plus something else. The only thing this "something else" could be is a future aspect prefix. This prefix is mutually exclusive with s- 'imperfective in quoted speech', just the prefix seen on the word for 'cheat, fool' in the preceding sentence, meaning that q 'aɬ is indeed indivisible. Cowlitz data on the issue are unavailable; however, this language is so similar to Upper Chehalis that its irrealis marker can be expected to behave in the same way.

The only other languages that have bearing on the subject, as far as I know, are the Southern Interior languages Okanagan, Moses-Columbian, and Coeur d'Alene, where the morpheme to be compared has *k* rather than *q*. In these languages morpheme divisions are not clear, as discussed by Mattina (1996). However, note that if, for example, Moses-Columbian *kaɬ* is a single morpheme, then first and second person possessive proclitics (which have collapsed in this language into a single proclitic ʔin-) are infixed, just as in Upper Chehalis; see (35).

(35) t'íl' mət kiɬ/nóx̣ʷnox̣ʷ
      indeed maybe IRR+1SG.POSS/wife
      I guess she's going to be my wife.

(The initial glottal stop is lost in the possessive morpheme here; *n* is regularly lost before *s* and ɬ.)

My conclusion is that Kalispel provides the best evidence as to whether or not

my reconstructed form is bimorphemic, even though the function of the lateral fricative is unknown there. Squamish, then, is strong support of this position. However, it appears to have become a unitary morpheme in Upper Chehalis, and probably in Sliammon and Sechelt. This also makes it easier to explain the Saanich and Tillamook forms, which lack the final consonant: it would mean that a morpheme is not used in these languages, rather than that a consonant of a morpheme has been lost.

5 Conclusions

What had appeared to me to be a rather straightforward reconstruction of an irrealis morpheme in Salish turns out to have some rather messy loose ends. The quite separate island-like distribution of *q*-forms makes them the best basis for reconstruction. Nevertheless, an explanation for the *k*-forms still needs to be produced, assuming that they are cognate. Merely saying that the two are doublets explains nothing, and the distribution of *k*-forms in a continuous string of languages (plus Bella Coola) suggests that the innovation was there. It also remains unclear to me if **qa-ɬ* was one morpheme or two. If it was two, the role of the ɬ is unclear; it requires further study, as does the question of how many morphemes are involved in Southern Interior Salish — that is, whether there is more than one of either *k* or ɬ there.

References

Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A Grammar of Spokan: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. Honolulu.

Edel, May M. 1939. The Tillamook Language. International Journal of American Linguistics 10(1):1-57.

Eijk, Jan van. 1997. The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1998. Is irrealis a grammatical category in Upper Chehalis. Anthropological Linguistics 40(2):234-244.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1999. Positional prefixes and variant prefix order in Moses-Columbian Salish. Paper presented at the 34th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages. Kamloops, B.C.: Secwepemc Cultural Education Society.

Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. The Squamish Language: Grammar Texts, Dictionary. (Janua Linguarum Series Practica 73.) The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary. (Janua Linguarum Series Practica 225.) The Hague: Mouton.

Mattina, Anthony. 1996. Interior Salish *to-be* and *intentional* forms — a working paper. Paper presented at the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Montler, Timothy. 1986. An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4. Missoula.

Nater, H. F. 1983. A Grammar of the Bella Coola Language. Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, Riiksuniversiteit te Leiden.

Symposium on Irrealis. 1998. Anthropological Linguistics 40(2).

Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. The Thompson Language. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8. Missoula.

Thompson, M. Terry, comp. 1992. Tillamook-English Dictionary with English-Tillamook Glossary. Ms.

Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel Language: An Outline of the Grammar with Texts, Translations, and Dictionary. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo.

Watanabe, Honoré. 2000. A Morphological Description of Sliammon, Mainland Comox Salish. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, Kyoto University.