A NOTE ON "PSYCH" NOUNS IN LUMMI

Eloise Jelinek and Richard A. Demers
The University of Arizona

In this paper we retract our earlier claim as to the absence of a noun/verb distinction in Lummi. We side with Hess and van Eijk (1985), who pointed out that the occurrence of Possessor affixes with certain bare roots in Salish establishes the contrast. We find the Distributed Morphology framework (Halle and Marantz 1993) ideal for the analysis of Lummi Roots and Functional Projections. We close with some observations on "psych" nouns in Lummi, which take Possessor arguments, and add some notes their occurrence in other Salishan languages.

1 **Noun and Verb.** Beginning with Boas and Sapir, scholars working on the languages of the Northwest Coast area have questioned whether they show a contrast between *noun* and *verb* as lexical categories, or perhaps have only a "weak" contrast of this kind (Kuipers, 1967; Hukari 1976; Kinkade 1983; Jelinek and Demers 1982; Davis and Saunders 1984; Bach, 1988). Others have argued against the view that these languages lack a clear noun/verb contrast (see Jacobsen 1976 for a review of earlier discussion of this question; and Hess and Van Eijk, 1985).

In Jelinek and Demers (1994) we argued against a distinction between *noun* and *verb* as lexical categories in Lummi. In the present work we retract that claim and argue that such a distinction is present; we side with Hess and Van Eijk in their claim that the occurrence of Possessive affixes with the class of "bare" nouns is the key distinguishing feature between the two basic categories. We were led to this change in position and to a better understanding of Lummi grammar as a result of exposure to the Distributed Morphology framework (Halle and Marantz 1993; Harley and Noyer 1999). Within this framework, only two syntactic primitives are recognized, Roots vs. Functional Projections. Harley and Noyer note that this split corresponds roughly to the familiar open class - closed class distinction. Roots are acategorial, and supply "lexical" content, while Functional Projections, the grammatical operators, derive higher levels of structure. In this framework, bare roots are abstractions that are neither noun nor verb; Functional Projections derive N and V from roots. In universal grammar, the Functional Projection "Determiner" provides the environment NP, in which a Root is identified as a Noun. The Functional Projection "little v" (light verb) provides the environment, vP, in which a Root is identified as a Verb. Light verbs include projections marking Tense and Voice. Sentences are derived from vPs and NPs by other higher order Functional Projections.

The Distributed Morphology framework appears to provide an insightful view of Lummi syntax. Let us consider first the derivation of the V and VP. There is a small, closed class of elements that mark the valence of the verb. We designate these Functional Projections "little v". These light or auxiliary verbs comprise various Transitivizers and Intransitivers, including the Causatives, the Passive,

Anti-Passive, and Middle. A little v derives a vP from a Root; this vP contains a Verb that is transitive or intransitive. If the particular little v marks the Verb as transitive, then it entails one of a closed set of object pronouns, including the null or ZERO third person Absolutive. An Intransitivizer excludes an object pronoun. One member of the set of intransitivizers is phonologically null, a ZERO. These light verbs may occur with (almost) any Root, as well as with members of the category Noun, to derive a VP. Examples:

1) a. c'sə-t "hit it"
   b. 'əy'-t "improve it"
   c. smonəč-t "apply pitch to it"

Now let us consider the functional projections that derive members of the category Noun. Our rough estimate is that something approaching 39% of Lummi nouns show the nominalizing prefix *s-*, a Functional Projection which we designate "little n", that derives a word of the category N from a Root.

2) a. s-wəy'qə' "man"
   b. s-məyəs "deer"
   c. s-nəxʷɬ "canoe"

Words beginning with the *s-* prefix (little n) may occur with Possessive affixes to derive a Possessed noun, an NP.

3) Examples a. nə-s-wəy'qə' "my husband"
   b. 'ən-s-məyəs "your deer"
   c. s-nəxʷɬ-s "his canoe"

However, there remains the other approximately 61% of Lummi nouns which do not require the nominalizing *s-* to derive a word of the category N, defined as an element that may occur with a Possessive affix. These "bare" Ns include the words for "father", "mother", various natural kind terms, and the like.

4) Examples a. men "father"
   b. ten "mother"
   c. pušpuš "cat"

We assume that these "bare" nouns belong to the category N despite the lack of an overt nominalizing prefix, since they also may occur with a Possessive affix. We assume a null nominalizing affix (little n) to derive a so-called "bare" noun. This is parallel to the null intransitivizer that completes the set of little v.

5) Examples a. nə-men "my father"

b. ‘ən-ten “your mother”
c. pušpuš-s “his cat”

To derive a member of the category DET P, a member of the set of Functional Projections identified as Determiners precedes some lower-level formative. This includes proper names, the emphatic "pronouns" or demonstratives, NPs, VPs, etc. In other words, all DET P include an overt Determiner.

6)Examples a. cə sk^{w}to’ “Raven”
b. cə ‘əs “I”
c. cə ye’ “the (one that) goes/went”

The Lummi sentence has an initial VP followed by a second position clitic string containing various INFL elements, Functional Projections that mark the categories of Mood, Tense/Aspect, and the Subject pronoun. Thus, the vP plus the INFL clitic string constitute a complete predicate/argument complex.

7) Examples a. t’iləm=lə=sx^{w} “You sang”
sing=past=you
b. si’em=lə=sx^{w} “You were a chief”
noble=past=you
c. səy’si’=lə=sx^{w} “You were afraid”
afraid=past-you

Crucial features of Lummi syntax, then, are that the Determiner operators suffice to derive a DET P from any lower level constituent (N, V and their derivations), while the Valence operators suffice to derive a vP from any lower level constituent (N, V, and their derivations.) We also recognize a class of adjectives here. They may occur alone with a Determiner to derive an NP, or with a little v to derive a vP.

At the level of the DET P and the vP, the category membership of the lower level constituents derived from the underlying acategorial Root appears to play no role. Within the Distributed Morphology framework it is claimed that this flexibility of "lexical" roots, and the key role of the Functional Projections in syntax is a language universal. Lummi appears to show that these largely abstract features of universal grammar may be overtly present. There *are* nouns and verbs, in particular syntactic environments derived by Functional Projections, but any Root may appear as the formative upon which either a DET P or a vP can be built.

An important feature of Lummi grammar that provides for the overt expression of this syntactic flexibility of Roots is the complete absence of another light verb, the copula, from any paradigm in Lummi. Across languages, the copula serves to derive a finite predicate from non-finite terms such as nouns and

adjectives. In Lummi, Tense/Aspect is a feature marked at a Functional Projection in the second position clitic string, and does not require a copula.

Note that any vP may occur under the scope of a Determiner to derive a Determiner Phrase.

8) a. cə t'iləm=lə "the (one who) sang"
DET sing=past
b. cə si'em=lə "The (one who was a) chief"
DET noble=past
c. cə səy'si'=lə "The (one who) was afraid"
DET afraid=past

Clitics are unstressed; the Determiners are typically procliticized to the following Root. Note that the expressions in (8) are Determiner Phrases, or Relative Clauses (Derived nominals) rather than finite sentences.

The Distributed Morphology framework is assumed to apply universally; the bottom line is that Roots are acategorial in all languages and that Functional Projections provide the environments in which 'nouns' and 'verbs' are to be recognized. We turn now to the discussion of an interesting subclass of nouns in Lummi, the "psych" nouns.

2 **"Psych" nouns in Lummi.** Montler (1996) drew attention to the presence of constructions of this kind in Klallam. He termed these constructions "genitive inversions" in line with terminology previously used in the analysis of parallel constructions in Romance and Georgian (Montler p.c.). Some French examples:

9) a. J'ai envie de... "I would like to..."
b. J'ai peur que... "I fear that..."

The Possessor or genitive argument with these "psych" nouns is translated as the subject. Compare the Lummi example in (10). Here we see the root *λ'i'* plus the Nominalizing prefix *s-*, preceded by a Possessor affix. This root also occurs without the Nominalizer prefix with the meaning "dear", or "valuable".

10) nə-s-λ'i'=sx^{w} "I like you"
1sgPOSS-NOM-liking=2sgNOM

On our analysis, the AUX clitic =*sx*^{w} is the syntactic subject of this equational sentence, and a better gloss would be something like "You are my dear (one)", "You are the one I hold dear." Now compare (11).

11) cə nə-s-λ'i' "the one I like, hold dear"
DET 1sgPOSS-NOM-liking

Ex. (11) is a complex nominal derived from the Root + Nominalizer + Possessor Affix under the scope of a Determiner. We have been able to find only one more "psych" noun in Lummi:

12) 'ən-s-x^{w}ətin'=sən "You dislike me (I am what you dislike)."
2sPOSS-NOM-dislike=1sNOM

The following form was given by Victor Underwood, who spoke several Straits Salish languages, and we are not sure which one it represents.

13) nə-s-ləl=lə=Ø k^{w} ye'-ən "It was my intention to go"
1sPOSS-NOM -intend=PERF=3ABS DET go-1sSUBORDINATE

There is an alternative means of expressing a wish or desire in Lummi that we suspect is widespread in the Salishan language family. This is the use of a Desiderative suffix, which occupies a Functional Projection in the second position clitic string.

14) s-nəx^{w}ɬ-'elŋən=sən "I want a canoe, or I want to build a canoe"
NOM-canoe-DESIDERATIVE=1sNOM

It is our impression that the Possessive "psych" noun constructions occur across the Salishan language family, but reports on them are sporadic. Their scarcity should not surprise us, since they are a minor predication type. They are atypical in that they have two arguments, but are syntactically intransitive. This is in keeping with the fact that the Experiencer is not an Agent . There is no presupposition that the Experiencer affects the "Source" -- that is, the syntactic subject, the Nominative argument. McGinnis (2000) analyzes "psych" constructions universally as containing an abstract Causative projection, since the Source causes a response on the part of the Experiencer.

Montler identifies in Klallam roots cognate to the "like" and "dislike" roots in Lummi, but not the "intend" root. He lists three additional roots:

15) x̣e'c'i "shame"
haq'^{w} "remember"
miməy'əq "forget"

These same roots occur in Lummi, but not in the Possessive "psych" noun construction. Montler (p.c.) comments that Ivy Doak finds a "psych" noun construction in Coeur d'Alene, and that Tony Mattina finds it in Okanagan.

Van Eijk (p.c.) informs us that his preliminary impression is that the Possessive "psych" noun construction is not present in Lillooet (St'at'imcets).

The root s-λi' "like/hold dear" is by far the most commonly used. We find it attested in Halkomelem (1980), where it is frequently used in speaking of food preferences; in Squamish (Kuipers 1967); in Saanich (Montler 1986); and in Thompson (Thompson, 1996). Interestingly, Lushootseed has a construction that is syntactically completely parallel, but uses a different root, which does not look like a cognate (ǩaλ') (Hess 1976).

(16) də-s-ǩaλ' tə biac "I like meat"
1sPOSS-NOM-be dear DET meat

Note that this example, as in the most frequent Halkomelem usage, refers to a food preference. We suspect that a few more constructions of the "psych" noun type will turn up once a thorough survey is undertaken, and we would appreciate any information of this kind that our Salishan colleagues can provide.

REFERENCES

Bach,Emmon.1988. Quantification in North Wakashon. Ms.,University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Bobb, Edna et al, eds.1980. *To:Lmels Ye Siyelyelexwa, "Wisdom of the Elders".* Coqualeetza Training Center.

Davis, P. and R. Saunders. 1981. The s- and si- prefixes in Bella Coola. Working Papers of the 16th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages. Missoula, MT: University of Montana.

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. *The View from Building 20.* Edited by Kenneth Hale and S. Jay Keyser. Pp 11-176. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Harley, Heidi and Rolf Noyer. 1999. State-of-the-Article: Distributed Morphology. *GLOT* 4.4, pp. 3- 9.

Hess, T. 1976. *Dictionary of Puget Salish.* University of Washington Press, Seattle and London.

Hess, T. and Jan van Eijk. 1985. Noun and Verb in Salishan. Working Papers of the 20th ICSNL. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia. Pp. 97-104. A later version appeared in *Lingua* 69:319-331; 1986

Hukari, T. 1976. Person in a Coast Salish Language. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 42.4, 305-318.

Jacobsen, W. H., Jr. 1976. Noun and Verb in Nootkan. *Proceedings of the Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages.* Victoria, BC: British Columbia Provincial Museum . pp. 83-153.

Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers. 1982. Adjoined Clauses in Lummi. Papers from the 17th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers. 1994. Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in

Straits Salish. *Language* 70.4, pp. 697-736.
Kinkade, M. Dale. 1983. Salish Evidence Against the Universality of "Noun" and "Verb". *Lingua* 60.25-40.
Kuipers, Aert. 1967. *The Squamish Language*. Series Practica 78. Mouton, The Hague.
Kuipers, Aert. 1968. The Categories Verb-Noun and Transitive- Intransitive in English and Squamish. *Lingua* 21:610-626.
McGinnis, Martha. 2000. Current Work in Linguistics. Alexander Williams and Elsi Keyser, eds. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 6.3, pp. 107-144.
Montler, Timothy. 1986. An Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. Missoula, MT: *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics.*
Montler, Timothy. 1991. Saanich, North Straits Salish. Classified Word List. Hull, Quebec: *Canadian Ethnology Series* #19, Canadian Museum of Civilization.
Montler, Timothy. 1996. Some Klallam Paradigms. Papers from the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages.
Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. The control system: a major category in the grammar of Salishan Languages. *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages*, B. S. Efrat, ed., Victoria, B.C: British Columbia Provincial Museum Heritage Record No. 4, 156-176.
Thompson, Laurence C. and M. T. Thompson, eds. *Thompson River Salish Dictionary. University* of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 12.