Lexical suffixes and incorporation in Mainland Comox[1]

Claude Hagège
University of Poitiers (France)

1. In his well-known article on noun incorporation[2], E. Sapir mentions Salish among the American linguistic stocks in which this process is "entirely absent": Athabascan, Chinookan, Yokuts, Siouan and Eskimo. He adds, in a footnote[3], that

---

1. Fieldwork on Mainland Comox (Sliammon dialect, spoken in the Sliammon Reserve, near Powell River, B.C., Canada) was done in summer and fall 1975, thanks to an award from the Mutual Educational Exchange Program, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. I wish to thank my informants, Liz Harry, Mary George, Ron Galligos and Marion Harry,for their (patient) help.

2. "The problem of noun incorporation in American languages", American Anthropologist, vol.13, 1911, p.281-282. At the same time, F. Boas noted in his Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian languages that "a more thorough knowledge of the structure of many American languages shows that the general designation of all these languages as polysynthetic and incorporating is not tenable...The Chinook may be given as an example of lack of polysynthesis...The Athapascan and the Haida and Tlingit..., though polysynthetic,...do not readily incorporate the object...The Iroquois alone has so strong a tendency to incorporate the nominal object into the verb" (ed. by P.Holder, Lincoln,Nebraska,1966,p.71). I will not limit myself here to Amerindian languages, since languages belonging to other stocks also exhibit features characteristic of incorporation.

3. Ib., p.282.

"the "substantivals" of Salish and Kwakiutl...are not instances of true noun incorporation." It is the purpose of the present paper to show that, on the one hand, lexical suffixes and noun incorporation are indeed best considered to be distinct processes, on the other hand the Sliammon dialect of Mainland Comox, a Salishan language (North Georgia branch of the Coast division), does present both processes.

2.1 . Noun incorporation, in the broadest sense, consists in a tight association of a noun with a verb, with marks of various types, in form and/or position. The incorporated noun sometimes keeps the same form as in the absolute use, but in many languages, it loses its nominal marker, or certain initial and/or final elements, or replaces them by others. Moreover, the incorporated noun is suffixed or prefixed to the verbal stem, according as the language is or is not verb-initial. In some languages, it is infixed. All these possibilities are represented in the following examples:

(1) Takelma: gwen-waya-sgut?úsgat-hi

(neck-knife-cut (aor., distr. with redupl.)-instr. suff.)

With his knife, he cut their necks (Sapir, op. cit., p.274)

(2) Nahuatl: ni-k-tle-watsa / in-nakatl

(I-it-fire (absolute form: tle-tl)-roast / the-meat)

I roast the meat (ib., p.260-261)

(3) Oneida: je-yad-ó-da^n

(again she (z again + ye she)-body (absolute form: o-yada)-verb class vowel-be thus)

Again she seemed (ib., p.277)

(4) Soːra: ɲam-joː-ten

(catch-fish (absolute form: ɔ'joːn)-does)

He is fish-catching[4]

---

4. G.V. Ramamurti, A Manual of the Soːra (or Savara) language. Printed by the Superintendent, Government Press, Madras, 1931.

(5) Yana: kʔut-xái-si-ndja

    (want-water (absolute form: xána)-present-I)

    <u>I am thirsty</u> (Sapir, op. cit., p.268)

(6) Ojibwa: pági-nindž-i

    (nindž: hand; pagiʃi: it is swollen)

    <u>He has a swollen hand</u> (ib., p.281).

    2.2.1. The noun which undergoes incorporation can represent the patient (or experiencer), the goal, the location or the instrument. Since the function markers, when they occur, are deleted by the very process of incorporation, it is not always obvious which of these types of complements the incorporated noun stands for[5]. The only clear fact is the combination of a noun with a verb, yielding a complex word with its internal syntax and its own stress, as opposed to the structure in which the noun, along with its determining elements, is formally and positionally independent from the verb. If we nevertheless try to restitute the syntactic and semantic relationships which are obliterated by the operation, we can suppose that, in the above given examples, the incorporated noun represents the experiencer((3)),the goal ((1), (4) and (5)), the location (or experiencer?) ((6)) or the instrument ((1) and (2))[6]. Furthermore, within one and the same

---

5. It is worth mentioning, however, that in some ergative languages such as Nass-Gitksan (Tsimshian language of northern British Columbia; see Bruce Rigsby, "Nass-Gitksan: an analytic ergative syntax", <u>IJAL</u>, 41,4, 1975, p.346-354),Yana, Southern Paiute (see Sapir, op.cit., p.269 fn.2) or Dyirbal (North Queensland), the same process applies to the incorporation of the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive. This might put into question the claim that "most ...morphologically ergative languages are ergative only superficially: in syntactic terms, they are accusative" (S.R.Anderson, "On the notion of subject in ergative languages",<u>Symposium on subject and topic</u>, USCB, 1975, p.11).

6. The incorporation of a noun as an instrument is an important trait of Takelma. It even happens, as is stated by Sapir (Takelma, in <u>Hanbook of American Indian languages</u>,Oosterhout,The Netherlands,1969,repr. after the ed. of 1922,p. 69),"that a verb form has two instrumentals, one, generally <u>ĭ-</u> WITH THE HAND,expressing indefinite or remote instrumentality, the second, a noun or demonstrative,expressing the actual instrument by means of which the action was accomplished."[7] Example (1) above contains an instrumental suffix -hi, in addition to the incorporated noun waya <u>knife</u>.

language, the incorporated noun does not necessarily appear
with   the same syntactic value in all instances. In
Nahuatl, for example, it can stand for the instrument, as in
sentence (2) above, but also for goal (sentence.(14)below),
location or experiencer. In Yana, sentence (5) above shows an
incorporated nominal form <u>xai</u> which stands for the goal, but
several other types are represented, including a variant of
the experiencer resembling the <u>bahuvrīhi</u> type of compound
nouns (in which the second term refers to something being pos-
sessed by someone or by something, as in Skr. bahu-vrīhi,much-
rice, which means <u>having much rice</u>):

(7) û?-wai-si

    (be two-deer (absolute form: bána)-present)

    <u>He has two deer</u> or <u>He is two-deered</u> (Sapir,op.cit.p.271).

    2.2.2. When incorporation occurs, the verb usually beco-
mes intransitive. If it was already so, then it sometimes in-
dicates what happens to the patient. Thus, in Malagasy, ins-
tead of

(8) màti / ni-vàdi-ni

    (died / the-wife-of him)

    <u>His wife died</u>,

one may say

(9) màti-vàdi / izi

    (died-wife / he)

    <u>He was widowed</u>[7]

If the verb was transitive before incorporation, its relation-
ship with the complements becomes formally identical with the
one which characterizes the intransitive verb. For example, in
Fidjian, the transitive and agreement markers are both deleted
in case of noun incorporation; in Nahuatl, the objective pro-
nominal element cannot coexist with an incorporated object
(sentence (13) below ; in sentence (2) above, tle stands for
the instrument); in Chukchee, an ergative language, the same

7.Galust Mardirussian, "Noun incorporation in universal
grammar", in <u>Papers from the Eleventh Regional Meeting</u> of
the Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, 1975, p.386.

marker occurs on the intransitive verb and on the verb with an incorporated object: compare

(10) tumg-ʔt / jegtel-gʔet

    (friends-nomin. / escape-asp.m.)

    <u>The friends escaped</u> (Mardirussian, op. cit., p.385)

and

(11) tumg-ʔt / kopra-ntɔwat-gʔat

    (friends-nomin. / net-set-asp.m.)

    <u>The friends set nets</u> (ib.)[8].

2.2.3. Consistent with the foregoing is the fact that the incorporated noun cannot as a rule take determiners, such as articles, deictics, pluralizers, adjectives and the like. Thus, in Turkish, a cognate object in the shape of a noun from the same root is generally supplied when a normally transitive verb is used without a specific direct object. This cognate object cannot take determiners:

(12) kar-ɯm / dikiş-diki-yor

    (wife-my / sewing-sew-cont.)

    <u>My wife is sewing</u>

There is, therefore, a strong tendency towards using incorporation, preferably, for non referential or generic situations, and avoiding it (in that case having recourse to independent constructions of the noun along with its determiners) for proper nouns or specific nouns whose association with the verb refers to single activities[9]. However, "generic" does not necessa-

---

8. In an attempt at a cross-linguistic characterization of noun incorporation, it does not seem tenable to reduce it to object incorporation. In doing so (see, for example, Mardirussian op. cit., p.383, who speaks of "object incorporation, or, in more general terms, noun incorporation), one might seem to privilege one among various possibilities.

9. The same holds true in respect of certain constructions found in European languages, which, however, are not cases of incorporation, because they contain, not a verb, but a nominalized form of a verb. In Dutch, for example, de leraar, <u>the teacher</u>, cannot be inserted between aan het <u>at it</u> and plagen, <u>tease</u> (i.e. within the Dutch equivalent of the English progressive form). One can only say Karel/is/de-leraar/aan-het-plagen, <u>Charles is teasing the teacher</u>. If the noun is inserted, it is generic and does not take determiners: Grace/is/aan-het-rijst-koken, <u>Grace is cooking rice</u> (Jan Koster,"Dutch as an SOV language",<u>Linguistic Analysis</u>,1,2,1975,p.123-124. Incidentally, the author speaks here of incorporation, but does not strive to justify the term).

rily mean that the activity referred to is not particular, and in fact, in most incorporating languages, many instances can be found referring to particular acts or situations. After giving several examples of that sort in Southern Paiute, Sapir writes: "Inasmuch as Paiute can express, and generally does express, the object of the verb by providing the unincorporated noun with the accusative ending _-a_ or _-ya_, the problem presents itself of when noun incorporation and when the syntactic method is used to express the object. This cannot be satisfactorily answered at the present time; it can only be suggested that what may be called typical or characteristic activities, that is, those in which activity and object are found regularly conjoined in experience (e.g. rabbit-killing, looking for a trail, setting a net), tend to be expressed by verbs with incorporated objects, whereas "accidental" or indifferent activities (e.g. seeing a house, finding a stone) are rendered by verbs with independent, syntactically determined nouns"(op. cit., p.264). But Sapir adds immediately after:"It must be admitted, however, that a hard and fast line between "characteristic" and "accidental" activities would be difficult to draw." Further below, he states that in Nahuatl as well as in Paiute (their genetic relationship within Uto-Aztecan being often urged), noun incorporation is "but a particular form of modifying the primary meaning of the verb by prefixing another stem to that of the verb; and in both languages, the objective relation is more often expressed by syntactic means than by noun incorporation"(ib., p.267). This would seem to imply that "accidental" events involving an action and a goal are more often spoken of than "characteristic" events. There is no way to control such an assertion. Be that as it may, as far as the objective relation is concerned, a clear difference is found to exist, in numerous cases, between the two formulas. For example, the well-known structure which Nahuatl shares with Chinook and many other languages, and which has incorrectly been termed "objec-

tive pronominal incorporation"[10],i.e. the apposition of a
noun to an objective pronominal element,ordinarily refers to
an accidental state of affairs, as opposed to noun incorpo-
ration: compare

(13) ni-k-qua / in-nakatl

(I-it-eat / the-meat)

<u>I eat the meat</u>

and

(14) ni-nika-qua

(I-meat (incorporated form)-eat)

<u>I am a flesh-eater</u> (Sapir, op. cit., p.260).

As a consequence of this tendency of incorporated nouns
to be generic in meaning, they don't seem to be able to trig-
ger transformations which imply specific reference:————
———— conjunction reduction, Equi-NP deletion, passivi-
zation, relativization. Likewise, the associations of verbs
with incorporated nouns tend to become idiomatic. In Malaga-
sy, for example,

(15) làva / ni-tongo-nd-rakoto

long / the-foot~feet-of-Rakoto)

means "Rakoto's feet are long",

whereas

(16) làva-tongo-tra / rakoto

(long-foot~feet-experiencer m. / Rakoto)

means "Rakoto walks a lot" (Mardiroussian, op. cit.,p.386-387).

2.3. If we try to define the linguistic status of noun in-
corporation such as it is exemplified in the various languages
we have mentioned, it looks as though it had the features of
composition rather than those of derivation. English compounds
like those cited by Sapir (op.cit., p.255-256) for example, i.
e. <u>steam-engine</u>, <u>concert-singer</u> and <u>song-writer</u>, are identical
with regard to their formation, yet the first noun represents
an instrument in one case, a location in the second one and a

---

10 . Sapir (ib., p.260) takes over this terminology without
explicitly pointing out the contradiction it implies: the so-
called "pronominal incorporation" is precisely the formula
which, formally as well as semantically, stands in contrast
to noun incorporation.

goal in the third one. It so happens, however, that while English does possess the corresponding compound verbs, to steam-run, to concert-sing and to song-write, such verbs are not readily formed ,even though "there is not the slightest theoretical reason" (ib., p.256) against their existence[11].As far as the composition of an instrumental substantive is concerned, it seems that English tends to prefer it in nominalized forms of the verb such as participles: we have man-made or hand-woven, but not to man-make or to hand-weave. The same holds true in respect of objective substantives and the bahu-vrīhi type: beach-combing, clam-digging and one-legged are usual, but the corresponding verbs don't seem to exist.

Even if compounds of the concert-sing type were quite natural and numerous, it would remain that they differ from the above mentioned cases of noun incorporation in at least two significant respects: first, the noun does not undergo formal changes as is the case in most incorporating languages; second, while the position of the incorporated noun with reference to the verb depends on what type of sequence is usual on the level of the complete sentence, the noun in the English compounds is always preposed, even though English is an SVO language. Incorporation is therefore an original process, at least if compared with composition in English. However, it is closer to composition than to derivation.

It is worth noting that another European language,French, presents a vestigial type of compound verbs which comes close to the Paiute or Takelma data. As mentioned by E. Benveniste[12], maintenir contains a noun in instrumental use (main) preceding a verb which is normally inflected (tenir). But this is a non-productive process and the speakers do not analyze that kind of verbs into their constitutive elements. Note that the whole compound has been borrowed by English, where it is even less

---

11. As Sapir himself recognizes (ib., p.256 fn. 1), "verbs like "to typewrite" are of course only apparent exceptions; they are only secondarily verbal in character, being denominative derivatives from already existing compound nouns."

12. "Convergences typologiques",L'Homme, Mouton, VI, 1966, n°2, p.5-12.

analyzable than in French, since English has <u>hand</u> and <u>keep</u>
instead of <u>ma<u>in</u></u> and <u>tcnir</u>. As for French compounds such as
<u>prendre plaisir</u> (<u>take pleasure</u>), the absence of the article
and the position of the nominal element would indicate that
they are similar enough to cases of incorporation, were it
not that the relation is always predicate-object and conse-
quently does not present the variety and looseness that we have
observed in incorporating languages.

3. If compared with what has been said of incorpora-
tion, lexical suffixes, at least such as they appear in
Mainland Comox, present very specific features. These will
now be studied.

3.1. Far from being incorporated copies or reduced or
altered forms of independent lexical items, the overwhel-
ming majority of these suffixes are not related to any free-
ly occurring lexical elements. On the contrary, most items
with a   semantic content comparable to that of a
given lexical suffix turn out to be complex associations
in which the lexical suffix itself is an integral part, as
is also the case in Squamish, Upper Chehalis, Tillamook, etc.
These associations, when used with distal or proximal arti-
cles or with possessives, can function as subjects, corres-
ponding to the agent, to the patient or to the experiencer.
In that use, we may call them nouns, though keeping in mind
that they can, if combined with other elements, function as
predicates. Since there is a semantic relationship between
this kind of nouns and certain suffixes in the Salishan[13] lan-
guages and since, more importantly, these suffixes refer to
notions generally considered lexical (objects, shapes/body parts, temporal,
spatial and natural concepts), they have been variously ter-
med "substantival" by Kroeber (1909) and Sapir (1911), "nominal"
by Gladys Reichard (1938), "etymological" by May Edel (1939),
"field" by H.Vogt (1940) and "lexical" by D. Kinkade (1963),
whose terminology has generally been accepted among Salishanists.

---

13. The same phenomenon exists in Kwakiutl as well as in Che-
makum. It has also been observed in Siouan languages such as
Ponka (where the bound elements are prefixes).

But this does not imply that the lexical suffixes are _derived_
from noun roots, "nor is their historical source to be sought
in any class of root morphemes. The evidence indicates that
these suffixes have been, as they are now, a coherent set of
non-nuclear morphemes, with their own viability for change
and productiveness."[14].To give a more precise illustration of
this fundamental difference between the lexical suffixes in Comox and the incorpora-
ted nouns of other languages,I propose a list[15]   in which I present the
independant nouns having a semantic content related to that of
a suffix. I reduce it, for lack of space, to a number of items
which is very small in proportion to the one a "complete" list
should contain. Several terms in the list refer to body parts.
There is no formal reason to assign a specific status to these
particular suffixes, whose Squamish counterparts have been
termed "somatic" by A. Kuipers. They function in exactly the
same way as other non-somatic suffixes, just as in Southern
Paiute the incorporation of certain forms of nouns designating
body parts does not have a separate status[16].It is on another
level that they may be grouped together, i.e. semantically, sin-
ce they constitute a coherent class from that point of view.
Furthermore,_____body part lexical suffi-
xes reflect not a portion   but the entire semantic content
of corresponding lexical items[17].However,the reciprocal statement is false:ma-
ny of them ha- meanings which are to be not found in the nouns[18].This is one of the rea-
ve a variety of sons why they cannot be assimilated to English prefixes such
as _chiro-_ (=_hand_), _gastro-_ (=_stomach_)[19], etc., let alone the fact
that the latter belong to the"scientific" vocabulary, which is not
the case with the lexical suffixes.

---

14. Stanley Newman, "A comparative study of Salish lexical
suffixes", A work paper for the 3rd ICSL,1968, p.27 (mimeo).
15. This list does not contain the items given by Herman
Haeberlin("Distribution of the Salish substantival [lexical]
suffixes",ed. by M.Terry Thompson,_Anthropological linguistics_,
16,6, 1974, p.340)as appearing only in Comox. I have not found
them in the Sliammon dialect. -iq, given for nose by Haeberlin
(p.253 which also cites an -iqʷ variant),is -ʔeqʷ in my data.
16. In Takelma, however, according to Sapir (op.cit.,p.272-
273), the behavior of the corresponding forms gives them "more
decidedly the appearance of being incorporated than other nouns."
17. This is the case in Bella Coola,according to R.Saunders and
Philip Davis,"The internal syntax of lexical suffixes in Bella
Coola", IJAL, 41,2,1975,p.106.
18 Only a few nouns have meanings some of which are not found in
the suffix (see below for túmiʃ and moʔ-os).
19. The same is true of other prefixes,such as _pyro-_(=_fire_)or _hydro-_
(=_water_).

A	B	C
suffixes[21]	nouns	gloss[20]
1 -éyos(-) ,-om(-)		berry, food, edible thing
2 -mex^w(-)		floor, bottom, lower part
3 -nečʸ(-)		rear, root, base, hidden part, anus, tail
4 -áye(-)	túmiʃ	person, human being
5 -qáλ-ʔay(-)	mók^w-mən	gullet, gap, hole, pipe
6 -ʔéq^wa(-)	móʔ-os	top of the head
7 -áw-k^wə p(-)	q^weyx̱	fire
8 -ʔó:ǰe(-)	céy-iʃ	hand, arm, finger, hold
9 -awtx^w(-)	ʔáʔye	house, sheltered or roofed place
10 -ʔay(÷)	ǰéʔǰe	tree, wood, plant, long round object, bush
11 -ʔeq^w(-)	máqsən	nose, promontory, long object
12 -láwe(-)	k^wáʔwa	belly, inside
13 -ayčʸ(-)	x̱áǰum	stomach, breast, heart
14 -ʔáʔg-ičʸ(-)	éye-č-in	back, spine
15 -ég-eł(-)	núx^w-eł	canoe, bowels, container, side, flesh
16 -áy-ep(-)	qám-ap	thigh
17 -éw-os(-)	qáʔwum	eye
18 -éga(-)	sáy-ēg-ən	waist, side
19 -áʔna(-)	sáy-āʔna	neck, ear
20 -qen(-)	sáy-qen	mouth, voice, language
21 -łał(-)	sáy-łał	throat
22 -aq'(-)	xál-aq'	penis, sexual organs, stick
23 -ʃin(-)	ǰé-ʃin	foot, leg
24 -ʔews(-)	gí:ʔews	body
25 -os(-)	mó-ʔos	face
26 -nəs(-)	ǰé-nəs	tooth, sharp edge
27 -áʔǰe(-)	ta:t-áʔǰe	cheek
28 -ʔáy-ex̱(-)	x^wót'x̱^w-ʔāy-ex̱(-)	elbow
29 -áʔǰe-t-eq(-)	⅄'ép-āʔǰeteq	chin

20. Only the first given meaning is common to the lexical suffix and the noun.

21. The sign "(-)" indicates that the lexical suffix can be followed by other suffixes in verb phrases. In the nouns in column B (19 through 29'), it is the last suffix.

For items 1, 2 and 3, as yet no corresponding nouns ha-
been found. Items 4, 5 and 6 do not bear any resemblance to
the nouns in column B. Furthermore, túmiʃ (probably analyz-
able, itself, as tú-miʃ) means person, but also man ,
hunter or hero , while -áye(-) refers to human beings of
any sex; mókʷ-mɔn is formed by addition of mokʷ swallow and
-mɔn, a suffix referring to persons or things working as per-
formers or instruments for certain activities; -ʔéqʷa(-)
means top of the head, but moʔ-os has both this sense and
the sense of face, for which the lexical suffix is -os(-).
Items 7 through 18 are ordered (more or less arbitrarily, of
course), according to a growing formal resemblance between
suffix and noun. Let us recall that there are morpho-
phonemic alternations in Comox between ɉ and y on the one
hand, g and w on the other hand. I have used hyphens for the nouns
that are probably or very likely analyzable into smaller
elements. Items 19 through 29 correspond to cases of lexical
suffixes appearing as integral parts of the nouns. The say-
in four nouns of the list is a very widely used stem:it ge-
nerally refers to any part of a set[22]. The ɉé- in items 23
and 26 of column B is probably a reduced form of ɉéʔje tree ,
metaphorically applied to body parts.

The lexical suffixes are not all morphological primes.
I have hypothesized that items 5   and 15   , are further
analyzable and I have tentatively written   hyphens. -éw-os(-) eye
probably contains -os(-) face; -áʔje-t-eq chin contains
-áʔje(-) cheek and -eq, which might be related to Squamish
-q bottom[23].-kʷəp(-)(7) , -ič(-) (14),   -ep(-) (16) and
-ex(-) (28) are variants of pan-Salish suffixes respectively
meaning fire, back, bottom and arm (Haeberlin, op. cit., p.
230) , so that 16 thigh would be tree-bottom and 28 elbow would be tree-
arm; the final -n in -qen(-) mouth and -ʃin(-) foot might re-
present an old instrumental suffix, which also shows up as
a part of the two productive instrumental suffixes -mɔn (al-

_____

22. say- might be related to the pan-Coast-Salish suffix
-al(a) place of (Haeberlin, op. cit., p.231), with change
of l to y (common in Sliammon) and prefix s- (nominalizer?)
dating back to a time when the syllablic structure of Comox
still allowed prefixation.

23. Aert Kuipers, The Squamish language, Mouton,1967,p.121.

so used for human beings working as performers of certain activities) and ‑tɔnₒ

It is evident from the foregoing that the lexical suffixes constitute an archaic system which is characterized by its coherence and its autonomy with regard to the nouns with meanings related to theirs. This alone would suffice to show   the difference between these suffixes and the incorporated nouns in languages such as Nahuatl, Southern Paiute, Yana, etcₒ Moreover the lexical suffixes are tightly attached to the stems with which they appear in sentences. They never show up as independent nouns with articles, deictics or possessivesₒ They have no pluralₒ They therefore behave as derivational, not compositional elements, and in that respect they are again very different from incorporated nounsₒ

The Mainland Comox lexical suffixes are immediately attached to the stem, preceding all other suffixes. The stem is either verb–like or noun–like: this fact, in Comox as well as in other Salishan languages, justifies a distinction between lexical and all other suffixesₒ Still another distinction is provided by their stress patternₒ While all other suffixes are unstressed in Comox, the lexical suffixes having more than one syllable always bear a secondary stress on their first syllable, despite their tight association with the stemₒ In some cases (see item 27 above), this syllable even has the primary stress[24].

3.2ₒ In consequence of these characteristics, it may seem artificial to try to state the kind of relationship the lexical suffixes bear to the stem with which they are used, as though they were derivable from nouns by a copying transformationₒ We have seen that diachronically they are notₒ It is however possible to conceive of the morphology of the complex "word" to which they belong, as an internal syntax in the sense applied to Nootka by Swadesh

---

24. Certain monosyllabic lexical suffixes also have a secondary stress when the stem has more than two syllables (example (25) below).

I have not found any cases of sequences of two lexical suf-
fixes juxtaposed within a single word and reflecting two dif-
ferent syntactical relations. Such cases have been observed
in other Salishan languages (for Bella Coola, see Ross and
Saunders, op. cit.). I have found very few cases of instrumental
meanings. Here are examples of some of the usual types of
associations that are represented in Comox:

(17) X'áp'-ʃin-ɔ-čxᵂ-oɬ

    (break-lex.suf.leg-quest.-2 p. neutral-anteriority m.)

    <u>Did you break your leg?</u>

(18) X'áp'-ʃin-θe-s-ɔm

    (break-lex.suf.leg-2 p. patient- 3 p. agent-posteriority m.)

    <u>It will break your leg</u>

(19) ƛás-qen-e-čxᵂ / sáyqen-s

    (hit-lex.suf.mouth-imp.m.-2 p. agent / mouth-of him)

    <u>Hit him right in the mouth!</u>

(20) t'át't͡θ'-áʔna-m-čxᵂ

    (bleed(red.progr.)-lex.suf.ear-mediopass.m.-2 p. neutral)

    <u>Your ear is bleeding</u>

(21) ʔáx-ɬaɬ-c

    (hurt-lex.suf.throat-1 p. neutral)

    <u>I have a sore throat</u>

(22) qóp-ʃin-∅

    (hair-lex.suf.leg-3 p. neutral)

    <u>He has hairy legs</u>

(23) pált-ʔóqᵂa-ǰip

    (thick-lex.suf.top of the head-2 p.pl. neutral)

    <u>You people are narrow-minded</u>

(24) xᵂɔ -ɔ-čxᵂ/ ɬáx-ēwos-oxᵂ

    (not be-quest.-2 p. neutral / bad-lex.suf.eye-2 p. infin.)

    <u>Aren't you short-sighted?</u>

(25) mámaɬa-qēn-ɔ-m-∅-a

    (white man-lex.suf.language-link.vowel-mediopass.m.-3 p.

    neutral-quest.)

Does he speak English?

(26) tám-ɐgeł / k^W-θ-núx^{W}eł

    (be what-lex.suf.canoe / dist.-2 p.poss.-canoe)

What kind of canoe do you have?

    Instead of the formal unity of the process of suffixation, the corresponding sentences without lexical suffixes would contain nouns in various functions. In this respect, the phenomenon may be compared with the difference between incorporation and non-incorporation of the noun in incorporating languages. But from the semantic point of view, the comparison is no more tenable. To illustrate this, let us replace example (21) by

(27) ʔáx / tɒ-tθ-sáyłał

    (hurt / prox.-1 p.poss.-throat)

Here emphasis is laid on the painful aspect of the affection, while the formula with a lexical suffix is not so marked. Consequently, the difference between the use of lexical suffixes and the syntactic solution in Comox is not one of characteristic towards accidental implications (see 2.2.3. above), but rather of ordinary towards emphatic ones . Moreover, the syntactic solution is statistically less frequent than the synthetic one, in contradistinction to what Sapir writes about Nahuatl and Paiute (p.   above).

    4. Although I have not gone into much detail, it clearly appears from the foregoing that lexical suffixation in Comox is a process which cannot be treated as a particular case of noun incorporation. It so happens that Comox, while widely using lexical suffixes, also presents cases of noun incorporation, though on a limited scale. Here are first some illustrations:

(28) ʔí:-tūmiʃ-č

    (good-hunter-1 p. neutral)

I am a good hunter

(29) x^{W}ɒ-č / łáx-sāłtx^W-ɒn

    (not be-1 p. neutral / bad-wife-1 p. infin.)

I am not a bad wife

(30) mámała-nām-ʔ-ɔ́x^W

(white man-be so-link.vowel-2 p. neutral)

<u>You act like a white man</u>.

túmiʃ, sałtx^W and mámała, respectively <u>hunter</u>, <u>wife</u> and <u>white man</u>, are nouns which can freely occur in other environments. When they are preposed((30))or postposed((28)and(29)) , their form does not undergo any change. Furthermore, two kinds of relationships to the verb can be stated: (28) and (29) illustrate the experiencer, and (30) the predicate subjective use of the incorporated noun. Another construction may also be used instead of (28) and (29), the meanings being roughly the same:

(31) ʔíː-čin-túmiʃ

(good-1 p. intr.-hunter)

(32) x^{W}ɔ-č́ / łáx-ɔn-sāłtx^W

(not be-1 p. neutral / bad-1 p. infin.-wife).

With this construction, a personal pronoun belonging to the intransitive paradigm must be used if the stem has a static meaning, like ʔiː <u>good</u> (the negative auxiliary verb x^{W}ɔ,which requires a pronoun of the infinitival paradigm,is not the stem with which the noun is incorporated:example (32)). The noun, in this construction, is the last postposed element, but it is still a case of incorporation, since 1) the noun is not accompanied by determiners 2) it has no function on the level of the whole sentence 3) it is associated to a stem which has a static sense,and this association expresses a characterization, not an accidental event .

With regard to sentence (30), it is clear that mámała is an incorporated noun, since nam <u>be so</u>, <u>behave as</u>, is a verb-like element. mámała, as seen in example (25) above,can also serve as a noun-like stem, followed by a lexical suffix such as -qen(-) <u>language</u>, the whole complex meaning <u>to speak English</u>. In this same function, it can be followed by a non-lexical suffix[25],as in example (33):

---

25. This process can be compared with the one observed in Paiute qani-ntcu <u>to build a house</u> or Yana hauyauba?-inigui?a <u>to contain nothing but deer fat</u>. Sapir(op.cit.,p.254)writes that qani <u>house</u> and hauyauba <u>deer fat</u> "can not be considered as incorporated,for the verbal elements -ntcu...and -inigui?a are not verb stems but verb-forming affixes morphologically comparable to English <u>-ize</u> in verbs of the type <u>materialize</u>, <u>pauperize</u>."

(33) mámała-st-omʃ-ʔ-čxʷ

(white man-judgment factitive (strong)-1 p. patient-
question-2 p. neutral)

Do you consider me as a White?

To sum up, noun-like stems are equivalent to verbs when
followed by lexical or factitive suffixes, etc., and personal
pronouns   . But when they precede or follow verb-like
elements, they illustrate a case of noun incorporation. Despite
the looseness of the noun-verb distinction in Comox from a for-
mal viewpoint, functional criteria based on types of combina-
tions and on the resulting meaning allow one to speak without
circularity of noun incorporation as a process comparable to
the one studied in 2 above.

5. As H. Woodbury has remarked[26],"given that noun incor-
poration is relatively widespread among American Indian lan-
guages, and that it was recognized at least as early as 1819[27],
it is surprising that it has been given as little attention as
it has. Since Sapir's dispute with Kroeber concerning its exis-
tence, little has been done to follow through on Sapir's gene-
ral conclusions concerning the grammatical functions of this
process." Even following through on them, it is necessary to
make some reserves,if only to show that ,while lexical suffixes
and noun incorporation must be considered two distinct processes,
there exists at least one Salishan language in which they turn
out to be both represented[28].It is hoped that further studies
will make it possible to confirm or invalidate the claim that this
linguistic family does, to some extent, belong to the group of in-
corporating languages, despite the fact that the lexical suffixes,
a feature highly characteristic of Salish and other north-west Pa-
cific languages[29] ,are not a case of noun incorporation.

26 . Hanni Woodbury,"Onondaga noun incorporation: some notes on
the interdependence of syntax and semantics",IJAL,41,1,1975,p.10.
27.. Woodbury mentions (ib.) P.S. Du Ponceau,"Reports of the Cor-
responding Secretary"Transactions of the American Philosophical
Society,1,1819, and Mémoire sur le système grammatical de quelques
nations indiennes de l'Amérique du nord, Paris, 1838.
28 . This is not an isolated case among American languages. Concer-
ning Takelma, see fn.   on p.
29. Mainland Comox, to which this study is restricted,is probably
not, being a Coast language, one of the richest in lexical suffixes.