How do you say, "You are our father." in Salish?
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In Puget Salish the paradigm that designates possession (among other things) has at some time in the past taken one of its forms, the first person plural, from a different series of person markers. In comparing Paradigm I with Paradigm II, it is seen that the form ʔad of the first person plural occurs in both while each of the other persons and numbers has contrasting forms between the two sets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm I</th>
<th>Paradigm II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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By comparing Paradigms II and III, it will also be observed that ćak actually consists of two elements, ć- designating an independent predication and -ak (with alternants -ák ~ -ať ~ -áť) marking first person plural. Nevertheless, at some level in the speakers' feeling for the language (and at some time in the past), the ćak was felt to be enough of a single unit that both its constituents were brought into the absolute paradigm.¹

However, the integration of this form to the absolute paradigm is not complete. Besides its shape, there are three places in the grammar where ćak betrays its different origin. One such place is the order of suffixes from the root. In Paradigm IV it is seen that the absolute suffixes -lap (~ -lāp) 'second person plural' and -s 'third person' occur before the aspectual suffix -ōxw (~ -ōxw ~ -āxw ~ -hāxw) 'change of condition' while ćak must follow it. This position of ćak is the same as that of the subject forms. Compare Paradigms IV and V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-lap</td>
<td>d'sāxa' kwi g'adsuuxwōxw  I want to go now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s</td>
<td>d'sāxa' kwi g'a(ə)adsuuxwōxw I want you to go now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ēj</td>
<td>d'sāxa' kwi g'as'uxwōxw  I want him to go now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ćak</td>
<td>d'sāxa' kwi g'as'uxwōxwćak I want us to go now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lap</td>
<td>d'sāxa' kwi g'as'uxwōxwlapōxw I want you (pl) to go now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Para=4m IV

¹ The term absolute is used in preference to possessive because the latter implies a narrower range of meaning and use than these affixes entail. The term is taken from Mattina (pp. 37-38, 100) who credits L. C. Thompson for suggesting it.
A more dramatic difference in patternning between -čox and the other absolutes is found in Paradigm VI. The expected form for 'You are our

adbad čad I am your father.  dabad čox You are my father.
báds čad I am his father.  básd čox You are his father.
bádlap čad I am the father of you (pl).  *bádcxt čox REJECTED

dbad (ti?it) He is my father.  dXòixotod čalap You are my brothers-in-law.
adbad (ti?it) He is your father.  Xòixotods čalap You are his brothers-in-law.
báds (ti?it) He is his father.  Xòixotodčxt čalap REJECTED
bádcxt (ti?it) He is our father.  Xòixotodčxt čalap REJECTED
bádlap (ti?it) He is the father of you (pl).  How about "we are your...?"

Paradigm VI

father.'  *bádcxt čox, does not occur. Rather one must resort to the independent pronominal series saying either básd čox ti dag' or dag'1 to básd čxt. (Both are glossed as 'You are our father.') Two members of the subject series cannot occur in the same predicate. Although functioning in the absolute paradigm, čox
is nevertheless perceived to be sufficiently a member of the subject set that the sequence -čək čəxʷ is not said.

It might be suspected that the ungrammaticality of this sequence is a special limitation on these two forms. (Such particular restrictions are reported in some Salish languages.) However, an examination of dependent clauses shows that the restriction is not thus limited but rather involves all logical sequences of -čək and subject forms. See Paradigm VII.

\[
\begin{align*}
g^{w}(o)\text{adəxətədəd} & \text{ If I am your brother-in-law.} \\
g^w\text{oxətədsax} & \text{ If you are my brother-in-law.} \\
g^w\text{oxətədsəx} & \text{ If you are your brother-in-law.} \\
*g^w\text{oxətədašəx} & \text{ REJECTED} \\
g^w\text{adəxətədə} & \text{ If he is my brother-in-law.} \\
g^{w}(o)\text{adəxəxətədəšəxii} & \text{ If we are your brothers-in-law.} \\
g^w\text{oxətədəxii} & \text{ If we are his brothers-in-law.} \\
*g^w\text{oxətədašəxii} & \text{ REJECTED} \\
g^w\text{oxətədəxii} & \text{ If we are the brothers-in-law of you (pl).} \\
g^w\text{adəxəxətədəlašəx} & \text{ If you are my brothers-in-law.} \\
g^w\text{oxətədəxii} & \text{ If you are his brothers-in-law.} \\
*g^w\text{oxətədašəxii} & \text{ REJECTED}
\end{align*}
\]

Paradigm VII

2 For example, in both Halkomelem and Squamish, a third person subject form and a second person suffix do not cooccur. (Suttles, Constructions; and Kuipers 1967 p.89)
In order to express 'If you are our brother-in-law', one must resort to a construction outside Paradigm VII, e.g., ?əbii ćaxʷ gʷəx̣əłəcəx̣ which entails two clauses with ćaxʷ in one and -čəx̣ in the other: ?əbii ćaxʷ 'Perhaps you' (independent clause) and gʷəx̣əłəcəx̣ '(if) our brother-in-law' (dependent clause).

Independent clauses have no overt form for third person in the subject series. Hence, a statement such as báčəx̣ 'He is our father.' is grammatical and appears to fit in Paradigm VI. However, dependent clauses do have a surface third person subject suffix; and again -čəx̣ and the subject suffix are mutually exclusive. One cannot say *gʷəbáčəx̣ but must instead say ?əbii gʷəbáčəx̣ 'Perhaps he (if) our father.', i.e., 'If he is our father.'

The same limitations prevent sequences of -čəx̣ plus either the dependent or independent forms of the second person plural -ałəp and čəałəp. See Paradigms VII and VI.

The fact that -čəx̣ is not well integrated into the absolute series suggests that this borrowing is relatively recent. However, comparative evidence points the other way, to a fairly old period when the adoption of -čəx̣ occurred. First, the dual role of the first person plural is found in such widely dispersed languages as Thompson and Tillamook. Those known to me are Thompson (Thompson and Thompson n.d. p. 51), Squamish (Kuipers pp. 85-87), Halkomelem (Suttles, Pronouns), Upper Chehalis (Kinkade pp. 32-33, 251-252), and Tillamook (Edel pp. 29, 43-44):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>absolute</th>
<th>subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>-ket</td>
<td>k-et (for indicative intransitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish</td>
<td>-č(a)t</td>
<td>č-(a)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halkomelem</td>
<td>-ct</td>
<td>c-(o)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget</td>
<td>-čəx̣</td>
<td>č-əx̣ (-ati)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, the source formation, i.e., the subject suffix plus the "stem" č-, k-, etc., has evolved into quite different distributions. For example, in Thompson the source, k-et, is limited to indicative predications which are intransitive (Thompson and Thompson n.d. pp. 22-51) while in Puget č- etc. is found in all independent clauses and in no dependent ones regardless of the transitivity of the predicate. Presumably this adoption of the first person plural from one class to another occurred before the diverse developments of the source formation. (Of course, parallel development, i.e. drift, may instead account for the similar adoptions of forms from one paradigm to another.)

Finally, at least two other Salish languages have similar restrictions on the co-occurrence of the first person plural absolute and the second person subject. These are Squamish and Spokane. In factual constructions of the former language both subject and possessive (i.e., absolute) forms are required except for the first person plural which has only the possessive. (Kuipers pp.87, 90-92) In Spokane the first person plural absolute is simply not marked so that kʷ sq̓e̓lɪxʷ means either 'You are our Indian.' or 'You are an Indian.' (Carlson pp. 128-129)

It would be interesting to know whether the other Salish languages that have a common first person plural form for absolute and subject also exhibit the limitations of co-occurrence discussed here. It would also be enlightening to know whether or not similar restrictions obtain for languages such as Clallam and Comox which have separate formations for these two classes. (Thompson and Thompson 1971, pp. 261, 286) The study of historical problems depends as much on answers to these sorts of questions as it does on phonological correspondences.
References Cited


