## INTERIOR SALISHAN PARTICLES

## M. Dale Kinkade University of British Columbia

0. Particles are usually defined as words which may not be inflected and, in Salishan languages, may not be predicative. For the most part, they tend to be difficult to define, and harder to classify, yet they are essential to fluent and colloquial use of a language.<sup>1</sup> Nor is it even easy to distinguish between affix, clitic, particle, and predicate. Particles have been variously treated (defined, classified) by people writing on Interior Salishan languages, and at first do not appear to be particularly comparable. But in spite of different treatments, a certain amount of comparison is possible, both semantically and functionally, and it is my hope that what follows will be useful in further understanding the role of particles in Salishan, and may be an aid in search for and identification of additional particles. I exclude here any consideration of pronominal and deictic particles; these constitute selfcontained sets that require individual treatment.

No one has pretended to list and explain all the particles in any Interior Salishan language, but all seven sources identify over 40: 50 in Th, 45 in NSh, 52 in SSh, 50 in Cv, 73 in Sp/Ka, 71 in Cr, and 74 in Cm. Different classification schemes are used:

some use traditional terminology, such as 'prepositions', 'conjunctions', 'interrogatives', 'adverbs', or 'interjections' (Kuipers, Reichard, Vogt); the Thompson school speaks of 'predicative particles', 'complement particles', 'adjunct particles', and 'clause particles', and specifies whether they are prepositive or postpositive (Thompson, Carlson, Gibson, Mattina). But the particles which occur in these categories are not necessarily cognate or semantically the same. I will not be directly concerned with these classification schemes, but will use my own vague semantic scheme (which will say nothing about the position particles take in sentences). The distinction of whether particles are preposed or postposed is not particularly useful for comparison, because nearly all particles here considered are preposed; but there is a small group of particles in Th and Sh which are postposed, and these tend to be the same (i.e., cognate) particles (cf. section 11). Differences in position should be considered together with the location of pronominal and deictic particles for an understanding of historical movements of particles in general.

I will discuss particles according to the following categories (which are obviously based on English function and semantics, not Salishan): prepositions, conjunctions, temporals (vaguely), modals, assertives, aspectoidals, adverbials, interrogatives, and miscellaneous. A few items will be considered which are most likely predicative (e.g., some of the interrogatives and some of the aspectoidals), at least in some of the languages, but which have been

2

classed as particles by one or another author; a thorough search for cognates for such forms was not undertaken, except in Cm and NSh. For each category, a table of semantically similar forms will be given (with a rough English gloss for each item), then glosses of all these forms as given in the sources. Then cognates will be noted, and reconstructions of cognate sets offered (even if based on only two languages); glosses are not automatically suggested for reconstructions, but are assumed to be something like the key word given for each numbered item on the tables. Finally, additional, semantically unrelatable forms in each category are listed; this will provide a complete catalogue of particles cited in the available sources.

1. <u>Prepositions</u>. Four prepositional concepts seem to be semantically comparable, although more bases than that can be identified. The meanings of these forms do not match English prepositions well, but the notions of 'toward the referent', 'away from the referent', and 'location at' seem to be general.

	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm	
1. to	//wə//	tk-(t-)n-	//tktn//	k1, k	3 C-	teč	k1	
2. from		t1-		tl	tə <b>l-</b>	tel	tİ	
3. from	//təw//		t	t	t-		tu	
4. at	//nə//	n-	n	1	1-		1	
Table 1. Prepositions								

Glosses for these particles as given in the sources are 1. Th //wa//'to, toward', NSh tk-n-, tk-t-n- 'by way of, in the direction of', SSh //tktn// tkn 'toward (not having arrived at destination', Ok kl 'motion to/into', Ok k 'motion or direction towards', Ka č- 'to, in', Cr teč 'to, toward', Cm k1 'to, into'; 2. NSh t1- 'from', Ok tl 'ablative, motion from, causal, comparative', Ka təl- 'from', Cr tel 'from, comparative degree, about, on account of', Cm tl 'from, off, than'; 3. Th //təw// 'from', SSh t 'from', Ok t 'point of departure, source of action, point of view', Ka t- 'point of reference, by', Cm tu 'from'; 4. Th //nə// 'at, to, in(to), on(to), with', NSh n- 'on(to), in(to)', SSh n 'in, on, at', Ok 1 'location, point of time or place at which, point of reference in time or place', Ka 1- 'at, in', Cm 1 'in'. Further segmentation may be possible for some of these forms: the t of 3 is surely related to the t of 2, and the 1's in 1, 2, and 4 may be the same. But several forms are reconstructible, at least for limited groups of languages: \*kəl (Ok, Ka, Cm), \*tək- (Sh, Cr), \*təl (Sh, Ok, Ka, Cr, Cm), \*təw/tu (Th, Sh, Ok, Ka, Cm), \*n(ə) (Th, Sh), and \*1 (Ok, Ka, Cm). These last two could also be related to each other. Only Th //wə// corresponds to nothing else in an obvious way.

Besides these four sets, additional prepositional concepts occur isolated in the various languages: Th //təw// 'from' (derived from //təw//); NSh  $\lambda$ -,  $\lambda$ k-,  $\lambda$ l- 'at, by, to, as'; SSh  $\lambda$  'to, at, about, around (having arrived at destination), with, by means of, in connection with'; Ka x<sup>w</sup>əl 'for, during'; Cr pene? 'as far as',

twe 'be with, at, alongside in the sense of accompaniment' (to 3 above?), mel 'on, near, touching, in addition to'; Cm kl 'for' (?), tał 'for', ?āłm 'instead'.

2. <u>Conjunctions</u>. There are eight sets of conjunctions, with the same limitations as for prepositions.

		Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm
5.	and	//?e <del>1</del> //	?eŧ	?e <b>1</b>	<sup>?ul</sup> /?uli?	u	hrł, ł	k <sup>₩</sup> a?, n
6.	with/and		mi-/mt-, miu <del>1</del>	//mex//	1a? <b>1</b>			kal
7.	and (then)	)				k <sup>w</sup> ent, k <sup>w</sup> emt	k <sup>w</sup> um	k <sup>w</sup> am
8.	because			<sup>?</sup> iye	?ali?	neti?	?eyni₁	?a <b>ł</b> i
9 <b>.</b> ′	if	//?è//	°e	°e	ł	ne	ne?	na?
10.	when				<del>l</del> a?			łu?
11.	so that	// <del>x</del> u?//						tu?,tuwa?
12.	until		wl	wul		we		
				Conjunct	ti an a			

Table 2. Conjunctions

Glosses are given as follows: 5. Th //?eł// 'and, but', NSh ?eł 'and', SSh ?eł 'additive, also, in addition, and, while, and then, before', Ok ?uł/?ūłi? 'additive, and, so', Ka u 'and', Cr hrł, ł 'and, yet, but, general connective', Cm k<sup>w</sup>a? 'and', Cm n 'and'; 6. NSh mネ-/mt-, mネuł '(together) with', SSh //meネ// məネ 'be combined, associated, mixed, with, and', Ok 1a?ł 'comitative, with', Cm kal 'and, with'; 7. Sp k<sup>w</sup>ent 'then', Ka k<sup>w</sup>emt 'and, and then', Cr k<sup>w</sup>um 'and', Cm k<sup>w</sup>am 'and, (where)'; 8. SSh ?iye 'because', Ok

124

?ałi? 'causal, because', Ka néłi? 'because, therefore', Cr ?eỳnił 'because', Cm ?ałi 'because'; 9. Th //?è// 'advance notice, future, if, perhaps', NSh ?e 'if, when', SSh ?e 'conditional, might, if', Ok ł 'sequential, if, that', Ka ne 'conditional, dependent, if, then', Cr ne? 'doubt, uncertainty, prediction, imperative', Cm na? 'future, inceptive, intend, if, then'; 10. Ok ła? 'temporal sequence, when, after', Cm łu? 'when, as'; 11. Th //Åu?// 'until, so (that)', Cm łu? 'only, but', Cm łuŵa? 'so that'; 12. NSh wl 'until', SSh wúl 'in spite of, even, until, and then', Ka we 'in spite of, slight contrast'.

There are obvious cognates among these sets, but reconstructions are problematical. For 5, \*?ał is suggested by Th and Sh, but the variable laryngeal in Cr may reflect \*ał instead, with laryngeal initials excrescent in all three languages. The <u>u</u> of the Ok forms suggests that they are not cognate with \*ał (although contamination or contraction may be involved), but must be related to Ka <u>u</u>; a further connection with the expanded NSh form in 6, mÅuł, seems likely. The final -i? of the alternate Ok form is identified by Mattina as an infrequent suffix attached to this and a few other particles to indicate past time; this will be dealt with in section 3 below, and will assist in the analysis and reconstruction of item 8 'because'. The Cm forms in 5 are isolated, as are the forms in all three languages in 6. 7 is reconstructible as \*k<sup>w</sup>am, with a -<u>t</u> suffix in Ka-Sp, assimilation of the nasal to this -t in Sp, and a reduced vowel (becoming u between labials)

6

in Cr. 8 is a puzzler, and the SSh form may not be related. Assuming known historical sound changes and morphophonemic changes in these languages (i.e., \*a to Cr i, Ka e--but the retention here of <u>a</u> in Ok is problematical--and  $*_{\underline{\partial}}$  to Cr <u>e</u>; <u>y</u> to <u>i</u> and <u>y</u> to <u>i</u>? are automatic in all these languages between consonants or between the beginning or end of a word and another consonant), the following intermediate forms can be reconstructed: Pre-Ok \*?ały, Pre-Ka \*náłý, Pre-Cr \*?əýnáł, Pre-Cm \*?ały. The complementarity of the position of  $y/\dot{y}$  is obvious, and suggests that it is (part of) a separate morpheme compounded in different orders with a base PIS \*nal. I would relate this y/y with item 13 'past', below, with appropriate reductions of the vowel: a vowel (reduced to ə) is retained in pretonic position, but deleted in posttonic position, both usual processes in IS. The glottalization is somewhat problematical, but may be excrescent, since in Cm, the only language where this particle is used as such, its glottalization is determined by phrasal margins (see below). The base \*nat may be further related to \*a1 'and' (or could even be a further compound), and would corroborate the reconstruction of the latter without an initial ?. SSh ?iye is not clearly related, but it seems likely that it is: the initial  $^{9}$ iy- may be the same as Cr  $^{9}$ ey-, with i automatic before <u>y</u> from either  $\underline{a}$  or  $\emptyset$ ; -<u>e</u> may represent the vowel of \*nal, with both consonants lost--e frequently derives from  $\underline{n}$  in Sh, but in this position it should be retained, or develop to i after y, if \*-at had fallen away. The semantic make-up of this

reconstruction of 'because' also seems reasonable, since the use of 'because' (in any language) requires that one clause refer to a time prior to the other. Two forms are reconstructible in 9: \*?a for Th and Sh, and \*na? for Ka, Cr, and Cm. These two may be related, but just how to connect them is not clear. The  $\underline{1}$  in Ok is likely connected with  $\underline{1}a$ ? in 10, and these in turn with Cm  $\underline{1}u$ ? in 10, but it is unclear how to account for the vocalic differences. 11 is reconstructible as \*tu?. I cannot explain the expanded Cm form, which is semantically more like the Th form; it may be merely a reduplication of the ?, with <u>a</u> automatic as the unstressed vowel before it (if this is the case, the underlying Cm form would be \*tu?-?). In 12, the Sh and Ka forms are surely related, but not reconstructible without further evidence.

A number of other conjunction-like elements occur isolated in the various languages. These frequently have adverbial qualities, and might better be included in that category; likewise some particles classified as adverbials might have been included here. These additional conjunctions are: Th //wex// 'that's why', //?ił// 'before, (and) then'; NSh pe 'and, but', xiwl 'however, but, on the other hand' (Kuipers classes this as an adverb); Ok km 'alternative, or', mł/məłi? 'additive, then next' (-i? 'past'), ki? 'relative; (it was there) that . . .', nàxmł 'contrastive, but, however', xl 'causal, the reason(s) for a certain state/action/ feeling'; Ka hoy 'finally, then' (there is also a hoy in the Cr grammar, but I do not find a gloss for it; cognates for this form

do occur elsewhere, but were not cited in the sources), še 'then', še? 'then, look!', x<sup>w</sup>əl 'because, so that', k<sup>w</sup>łú? 'hypothetical, contrary to fact', k<sup>w</sup>unë u 'what would happen if the hypothesis proved true', nëm 'future' (this form is from Vogt, who suggests that it is a combination of ne 'conditional' [cf. 9 above] and <u>m</u> 'future' [cf. 14 below]); Cr cut 'although', tg<sup>w</sup>el 'that is the reason', łoq<sup>w</sup> 'and, also'; Cm k<sup>w</sup>l 'and when', ?i 'and so', k<sup>w</sup>tas 'in order to', wana? 'even if', ya 'or'.

3. <u>Temporals</u>. Only three sets occur in this category. Although future and unrealized are probably properly aspectoidal concepts, they are both included here because of a tendency to consider 'future' temporal.

	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm
13. past	// <del>1</del> ə//	m		-i?			?ay
14. future	//meł//	me(?)	me?	mi	m,ném	k <sup>w</sup> ne?	na?(sū́?)
	//kə//			k <del>1</del> -	q <b>1-</b>	če <del>l</del>	ka <del>l</del> -
ized		Table 3	. Tempo	orals			

Glosses are given as follows: 13. Th //łə// 'established in past', "Sh m 'past', Ok -i? 'past', Cm ?aŷ 'past'; 14. Th //meł// 'imminent', NSh me(?), m 'intention, expectation', SSh me? 'intention, will', Ok mi 'future', Ka m, ném 'future', Cr k<sup>w</sup>ne? 'future', Cm na? 'future, inceptive, intend, if, then' (cf. 9 above), Cm na?sú?, nasu 'future, when'; 15. Th //kə// 'unrealized', Ok kł- 'unreal', Ka qł- 'unreal', Cr čeł 'immediate or continuing future', Cm kał- 'unrealized'.

129

In 13, Ok -i? and Cm ?ay are clearly cognate, but a reconstruction is not as straightforward as it looks. I suggest \*ay or \*ay. I consider the initial ? in Cm as excrescent, and the final glottalization has some tendency to be so too; in Cm, an initial ? occurs only when the particle is phrase-initial, and final glottalization tends to occur only when it is phrase-final (this particle does not occupy a fixed position in Cm, but may either precede or follow the predicate head). Further corroboration of this reconstruction is provided by the reconstruction offered above for 'because' (item 8); the lack of ? before the y or y in Cm, Ka, and Cv supports the reconstruction of 'past' given above. A reconstruction \*ma is suggested for 'future' from Th, Sh, Ok, and Ka; the final -1 in Th is unexplained. The neof Ka nem and Cm na? are from set 9 'if', above, but the final -su? in Cm na<sup>2</sup>su<sup>2</sup> is unexplained. Cr k<sup>4</sup>me<sup>2</sup> is isolated. 'Unrealized' is reconstructible as \*kal-, although the Cm vowel reflex and the q in Ka are unexplained; most sources treat this element as a prefix.

The only additional forms in this category are two Cr expansions of 'unrealized': čełšił 'past future' and ?učeł 'just as, preparatory to'. šił is probably identical with šił 'be fitting, exacting, sharp (as prompt)', treated in part 7; ?u- is 'just, emphasis'.

4. <u>Modals</u>. There are five sets of forms which can be linked semantically, but among these there are only four pairs of cognates.

	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ka	Cr	Cm
16. maybe		heqn	cəxeke	mt			mət, max <sup>₩</sup>
17. might						xi <del>l</del>	sləpas
18. perhaps	we				k <sup>w</sup> unta		k <sup>w</sup> n
19. should	ske, <b>se</b> ?	-s-ke,-c	:-ke	cak <sup>w</sup>		če?	sa(?)k
20. can't //1	tem//		tm				
		Tab1	e 4. Moda	ls			

130

Glosses are given as follows: 16. NSh heqn 'maybe', SSh cəxéke 'be a possible event, maybe', Ok mt 'conjectural', Cm mət 'maybe, could be, wonder if', Cm max<sup>W</sup> 'maybe, might be'; 17. Cr xił 'might, ordinary possibility; used in sense of possibility of any kind', Cm slə́pas 'might'; 18. Th we 'dubitative, perhaps, in vain', Ka k<sup>w</sup>untā 'perhaps (?)', Cm k<sup>w</sup>ň 'I guess'; 19. Th ske 'presumptive, ought, should', NSh -s-ke, -c-ke 'conditional', Ok cak<sup>W</sup> 'conditional, should, would, wish, if . . . then', Cr če? 'ought, sense of obligation', Cm sak, sā<sup>?</sup>k 'can, will, should'; 20. Th //tem// 'lack', SSh tm 'not to be able to'.

The Sh forms of 16 are not obviously cognate, unless one or the other has been transcribed erroneously: heqn and -xéke look suspiciously similar. Cm max<sup>w</sup> is isolated, but \*mt can be reconstructed for forms in Ok and Cm. 17 allows of no reconstructions. In 18, \*k<sup>w</sup>n can be reconstructed from Ka and Cm, leaving an unidentified -ta in Ka, and an isolated we in Th. 19 suggests PIS \*s-ka(?), from Th, Sh, Cr, and Cm, with metathesis in Cm; Ok cak<sup>w</sup> is not

obviously related to these. 20 can be reconstructed as \*tem for Th and Sh.

131

There are only a few additional modal-like particles: Ok cm 'probable', ninewi? 'contingency, if and when, may, probably'; Ka xwa 'possibly, indetermination'; Cr xeli?, xele? 'might, in sense of threatening, "it might but you don't want it to", or evidential "there is evidence that . . ."; used in sense of expecting something unfavorable' (these forms are likely derived from xił, given in 17 above), ne? ci? 'condition of doubt'; Cm ?am 'couldn't'.

5. <u>Assertives</u>. This is a rather mixed group of particles indicating attitude toward a statement: agreement, disagreement, or indication that it is not first-hand information. Seven sets of forms occur.

	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm
21. negative	//të́?//	tā?a	te <sup>?</sup>	lút	ta(m)	lu(t)	lut
22. yes	?1	mē?e	mē?e	way	?ā, ?ē.		?a•
23. indeed	wi?						til
24. eviden- tial	nuk <sup>w</sup> ?	nuk <sup>w</sup> (1)	nuk <sup>w</sup>	<b>t</b> i	κ <sup>w</sup>	; ti?	? ťi?
25. eviden- tial	//nke//	-nke	nkə	txw			
26. quotative	//ek <sup>w</sup> ù//		uk <sup>w</sup>				
27. descrip- tive	//tək//	təkə(me?)					
		Table 5.	Assertives				

Glosses are given as follows: 21. Th //té?// 'there is not', NSh tá?a 'no', SSh te? 'negative', Ok lút 'it is not', Ka ta, tam 'not', Cr lut, lu 'negative', Cm lút 'negative'; 22. Th ?í 'yes', NSh mé?e 'yes', SSh mé?e 'affirmative, indeed, really', Ok wáỷ 'assertive, yes, sure, well', Ka ?á 'yes, hallo', Ka ?é 'yes', Cm ?á 'yes'; 23. Th wi? 'indeed', Cm tíl 'indeed, yes, already'; 24. Th nuk<sup>W</sup> 'observational', SSh nuk<sup>W</sup> 'evidential, it appears', Ok tí 'evidential, as it appears, as one can see', Ka k<sup>W</sup> 'evidently', Cr tí? 'already, surely, absolutely, quite' (glosses are not provided for the NSh and Cm forms in 24, but their cognacy seems certain); 25. Th //nkè// 'conjectural', NSh -nke 'evidential, must be, is apparently', SSh nkə 'speculative, must have', Ok tx<sup>W</sup> 'evidential, apparently'; 26. Th //ek<sup>W</sup>u// 'heresay', SSh uk<sup>W</sup> 'reported but not observed, it is said'; 27. Th //tèk// 'descriptive', NSh təkə, təkəmé? 'you see, and so, that is to say'.

Several reconstructions are possible among the assertives. For the negative, there are \*tá?, based on Th, Sh, and Ka, and \*lút, based on Ok, Cr, and Cm. Only two languages provide a basis for reconstructing an affirmative: \*?á, from Ka and Cm; the forms in the other three languages are isolated. Neither form in 23 is reconstructible, although Cm til may be related somehow to \*ti(?) (based on Ok, Cr, and Cm) in 24. Also in 24, Th and Sh suggest \*nuk<sup>w</sup>. Ka k<sup>w</sup> is isolated. The Th and Sh forms in 25 suggest \*nke, but Ok tx<sup>w</sup> is not connected. 26 can be reconstructed as \*ak<sup>w</sup>u, with either metathesis or contamination of the a by the following

<u>u</u> in Sh. 27 is reconstructible as \*tək, with an unidentified suffix -me<sup>?</sup> in Sh; the second  $\exists$  in Sh is probably epenthetic.

133

There are only five additional, isolated assertives: Ka k<sup>w</sup>u and pan 'opposition, contrary to preceding statement', <sup>?</sup>unéx<sup>w</sup> 'affirmation' (a predicate, cognate with NSh wnex<sup>w</sup>-m 'really, Cr g<sup>w</sup>unix<sup>w</sup> 'be true', Cm wanáx<sup>w</sup> 'right, correct, true, real'); Cr waxam 'I told you so', x<sup>w</sup>umút 'of course'.

6. <u>Aspectoidals</u>. Salishan languages contain a large number of particles with aspectual meanings. These are optional elements, and may co-occur with obligatory aspectual categories, hence the distinction in terminology, which follows Friedrich.<sup>2</sup>

•	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm
28. always				×		pin(t)č	ciłu
29. forever				nəyçip	ni?áp	yem-p	nišap
30. long time		q?es		qəs <b>a</b> pi?	qasip	desp	qəsp
31. still,yet	//uỷ//	<sup>?</sup> ey	۶ <sub>ey</sub>		če	·	putay
32. again	x <sup>w</sup> uyce?	x <sup>₩</sup> u <sup>2</sup> °cm	x <sup>₩</sup> u <sup></sup> ?ce				ciyust
33. again		°ux₩	°ux₩				
34. just now		1		۶apna?			cmai
35. now,today	aux,7.1.3.				yetə <b>l</b> x <sup>w</sup> a	?axi₩1	
36. now, only	н. <sub>1</sub>	kémął, kékme?ł	kemə1	km		čam	kam
37. almost	//wexe// aux.7.1.3.	wt?e, wte	•		xiləne	x <sup>₩</sup> a?a <del>1</del>	k <sup>w</sup> asa
38. almost		stetme				wim	
39. incipient	//nes// redsaux 7.1/3 ·	nes			<sup>?</sup> enes		

40. just	put	püt	put	put		put
41. just then // ham//						, Jəm
42. right then			sic	sic	sıc,šıc	
43. finally	?éycə <del>1</del>			<sup>?</sup> axi		· ·
	Table 6	. Aspectoi	dals			

Glosses are given as follows: 28. Cr pinč, pintč 'always', Cm ciłu 'always': 29. Ok nay ip 'continuously, forever, always', Ka ni ap 'still, yet', Cr yem-p 'forever', Cm ni ap 'forever, always'; 30. NSh d'es 'to take a long time, be of long duration', Ok desapi? 'for a long time it used to be that . . . , it has been a long time since . . .', Ka dasip 'late', Cr desp 'be long time, long ago', Cm qəsp 'long time, old, past'; 31. Th //uý// <sup>?</sup>i 'still, yet', NSh <sup>?</sup>ey 'yet, still', SSh <sup>?</sup>ey 'incomplete, still, while', Ka ce 'still, yet', Cm putay 'still is'; 32. Th x uyce? 'again', NSh x u'cm 'again', SSh x<sup>w</sup>u<sup>?</sup>ce 'again, additional', Cm ciyust 'again'; 33. NSh <sup>?</sup>ux<sup>w</sup> 'again', SSh <sup>?</sup>ux<sup>w</sup> 'repetition, again'; 34. Th //yəčux<sup>w</sup>// ycox 'just now, immediate past', Ok Sapna? 'it is now that . . .', Cm cmai 'just now, just beginning'; 35. Ka yetəłx"a 'today, now', Cr ?axiwi 'now, today'; 36. NSh keməi 'but, only', kekme?i 'almost', SSh keməl 'in addition, more, while, and', Ok km 'contrastive, except, all but', Cr čam 'just', Cm kam 'now, only, any more, almost'; 37. Th //were// 'almost', NSh wt?e, wte, wi 'almost', Ka xilené 'almost', Cr x<sup>w</sup>a<sup>?</sup>al 'almost', Cm k<sup>w</sup>asa 'almost'; 38. NSh stetme 'almost', Cr wim 'very nearly, almost'; 39. Th //nes// 'go

15

toward; incipient', NSh nes 'to go, to go/come along, to almost do something', Ka ?enés 'to be on one's way going someplace'; 40. NSh put 'just', SSh pút 'be necessary, must', Ok pút 'it is just/ enough', Ka pút 'just, exactly the measure', Cm put 'just'; 41. Th //Åəm// 'completed', Cm Åəm 'just as, just then'; 42. Ok sic 'new, just', Ka sic 'right then', Cr sıc, šıc 'then finally'; 43. NSh ?éycəł 'finally, at last', Ka ?axi 'finally'.

135

Several cognate sets occur among these forms, and allow some reconstructions. Cr pin(t)č (28) has cognates referring to time, e.g., Cm pan- 'time', but these are normally predicates. In 29, Ok, Ka, and Cm derive from \*ny ap; this form can be analyzed into a prefix, root, and suffix (the analysis is also possible synchronically), \*n- 'locative, on, in', \*ya'- 'gather', \*-ap 'base'. The Cr form in 29 is again probably predicative, and cognate with Cm yem- 'old', inter alia. The Ok, Ka, Cr, and Cm forms in 30 have a suffixed -p 'non-control', which causes metathesis of the root vowel and the second consonant of the root in Ok and Ka; the form can be reconstructed as \*qas-, but the extra ? in Sh is not accounted for. The Ok form has a suffix -i? 'past'. In 31, the Cm form is based on put 'just' (set 40), with (probably) the clitic 'ay' 'past'. Whether the Th and Sh forms in 31 are cognate or not is unclear--Th u and Sh e would not normally correspond, but they might both derive from a longer original (something like \*u?ay ?). At least the Sh form may be cognate with \*ay 'past', discussed above as item Although the Th and Sh forms in 32 are clearly cognate, I do 13.

not see what the reconstruction should be. Cn cmai (in 34) may be cognate with Sh 1-ciməł-əs 'in the beginning (of time)', but I would like to find forms in other languages before asserting this. Item 36 reconstructs as \*kam or \*kam, with an unidentified suffix -ł in Sh. The Th and Sh forms in 37 may derive from \*weże, but the Sh variants need explaining. 39 derives from either \*nés or \*enés. 40 clearly and simply reconstructs as \*put, and 42 as \*sic (presumable the  $\underline{s}$  of Cr šıc is due to assimilation to the following front vowel). 41 is simply reconstructible as \*Åəm, and could be connected with the Sh forms in 6 (mÅ-, meÅ) by metathesis if a semantic connection could be made. None of the other aspectoidal forms have cognates in the table, and are not reconstructible.

As can be expected from the large number of aspectoidal sets given above, there are several additional, isolated forms in the various languages: Th // $\lambda$ u<sup>?</sup>// 'persistent', //nə-wen// 'old; perfective', cəs<sup>?</sup>eył 'now'; NSh x"əłye? 'soon', cem 'first, before', pyin 'now', k"mt-us 'always (cf.? Cm q"əm 'a long time'), m- 'aspect particle'; SSh m 'perfective' (this is the same as the last cited NSh form), c 'action completed prior to the time of speaking or in relation to another event, on the way through', ?es 'unrealized state'; Ok k"mił 'it was suddenly/unexpectedly that . . .', q"um 'it was at a particular moment long ago that . . .' (this is probably predicative, and is cognate with Cm q"əm 'a long time'); Ka  $\lambda$ e 'already, now, then',  $\lambda$ əm 'customarily', ?i 'as soon as, immediately after', ?iłttšene 'after a short while'; Cr cmi? 'used

7.1.3.

136

to . . . but is not now, had the intention but did not carry it out; it was to be but is not', k"mil 'immediately', k"uk"niye? 'in a short while', k"uk"i?l 'in a short time'; Cm cimix 'whenever', tilx" 'already', wiya?s 'just got through doing' (?), xəlu and xəlu 'just', x"əla 'all over, done', nnawiya? 'after a while' (this looks as if it could be cognate with Cv ninəwi? 'contingency, if and when, may, probably', cited at the end of section 4, but I cannot make a semantic connection).

7. <u>Adverbials</u>. In spite of the fairly large number of adverbials cited in the sources, few seem semantically similar, and only three general sets are presented, plus two for forms that match only in the two Shuswap dialects.

		Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm
44.	too		meł	m <del>l</del>	məy <b>ā</b> ł	m <b>i</b> ł	miye <del>l</del>	mya1
45.	also,too	néx <sup>w</sup> əm		•	nix <sup>w</sup>	nex <sup>w</sup>	xe1	? na?x <sup>₩</sup>
46.	only		cuk <sup>w</sup>	cukw	kmíx, kmáx	čəmīš	təmiš	kməx
47.	just		<i>i</i> ux <sup>₩</sup>	<i>i</i> ux™				
48.	even		yuməl	//yum1//				
			Table 7	. Adverbi	als			

Glosses are given as follows: 44 NSh meł 'already', SSh mł 'previous, already', Ok məyáł 'it is too much', Ka míł 'very, too, much', Cr miyeł 'too, very', Cm myáł 'too'; 45. Th néx<sup>w</sup>əm 'exceed', Ok nix<sup>w</sup> 'additional, also, too, even, again', Ka nex<sup>w</sup> 'also, too', Cr xel 'also, likewise', Cm na<sup>7</sup>x<sup>w</sup> (uncertain meaning, but seems a reasonable cognate to Th, Ok, and Ka); 46. NSh cuk<sup>w</sup> 'to be all there is (left)', SSh cuk<sup>w</sup> 'exclusively, only', Ok kmix, kmax 'it is only . . .' (kmax is a northern Ok form, kmix southern), Ka čəmiš 'only', Cr təmiš 'just, only', Cm kməx 'only, alone'; 47. NSh kux<sup>w</sup> 'only, just, as soon as', SSh kux<sup>w</sup> 'just, merely'; 48. NSh yuməł 'anyway, even so, even that', SSh //yumł// yuməł 'but (in spite of it), even'.

Three forms can be reconstructed from these sets. 44 must go back to \*my51; Ok and Cr have an epenthetic vowel before the y, and the  $\frac{1}{2}$  has been changed to  $\frac{1}{2}$  in Cm for some reason. Ka has deleted the vowel entirely, then vocalized the  $\underline{y}$  to  $\underline{i}$  (or deleted the y and retained the vowel \*2, which regularly becomes i in Ka); NSh has lost the  $\underline{y}$ , and SSh the  $\underline{y}$  and the  $\underline{5}$ . The Th, Ok, Ka, and Cm forms in 45 are regularly derived from \*nax"; if the Cm na $^7x^{\tt w}$ is indeed cognate, I assume that the ? has been added, and may be 'inchoative'. Two reconstructions are necessary for the Ok, Ka, Cr, and Cm forms in 46: \*kmax and either \*kmax or \*kmix. Cm kmax and Ok kmax must derive from \*kmax, but Ok kmix and the Cr form must derive from something with either  $*\underline{a}$  or  $*\underline{i}$  (further evidence is needed to determine which); Ka čəmiš can derive from either \*kməx or \*kmix. Cr also has an unexplained, and highly unusual, shift of the initial consonant from \*k to t. The other adverbials are isolated and not reconstructible.

Several other adverbials occur isolated in each language:

Th //x=1// 'readied', //?e1// 'also, along with', //cu?// 'in limited fashion, somewhat', tekm 'all'; NSh pewl 'nevertheless, after all', we? 'however (big, small, etc.), at least, if only', x<sup>w</sup>um 'reinforcing particle'; SSh n<del>l</del> 'unanticipated', //yexml// yexamal 'but (for some time)'; Ok ?iwa? 'unsuccessful, even, even . . . but to no avail', tali? 'it is very much'; Ka  $\lambda \partial x^W$  'very well, then', 'em 'in vain' (related to Cm 'ann' 'couldn't', cited above at the end of section 4?), 'ecaxi 'similarly, like' (cognate with the Cm predicate ?acxil 'same, like that'; cf. NSh xil-m 'act thus', xil-t-s 'to do something thus', Ka ?axil- 'to behave in this way, that way', Cr <sup>?</sup>axil 'do thus'); Cr šił 'be fitting, exacting, sharp (as prompt)', <sup>?</sup>ušil 'just at the moment, he was just to . . . but he did not', <sup>?</sup>uc-axi1 'suddenly, in vain, to no purpose, without explanation', junal 'at least', wemnus 'in vain, useless', de?e1 'exceptionally, surprisingly', ši?miš 'anywhere, at random'; Cm wa<sup>?</sup>x 'too much', num, numas 'any more, also', q<sup>w</sup>ay '[not] much of anything', təł 'straight, right', ti<sup>?</sup>x<sup>w</sup>ał 'another', x<sup>w</sup>1 'about'.

8. <u>Interrogatives</u>. There are few interrogative particles, but some sources list various wh-words in this category, and so I include them here, although it seems more likely that these are predicative everywhere.

	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ka	Cr	Cm
49. interrog.	//en//	-n	n	hā?	ha	ni / čə'n	sa?
50. dubitativ				?uc	<sup>9</sup> uc		
interrog 51. happen	//?ken-jr	ne// čken-m		//?kin//			čkan-
52. what	//s-te?/	/ stem	stem	stim	stêm	tim	stam
53. who	//s-wet/,	/ swet	suwet	swit	səwet	ség <sup>w</sup> et	swat
54. how many	//k <sup>w</sup> inex	// k <sup>w</sup> inx	k winx		k <sup>₩</sup> inš	<i>k</i> winš	k"in-
55. where	//ke?(e)	// ken-		-kin	čen	hiče?	-ka?
56. what say	?inut					?ing <sup>w</sup> et	

Table 8. Interrogatives

Glosses are given as follows: 49. Th //eň// ň 'interrogative', NSh -n 'interrogative', SSh n 'dubitative, interrogative', Ok há? 'simple interrogative', Ka ha 'interrogative' (Vogt offers Latin ne as a gloss), Cr ni and čeň 'interrogative', Cm sá? 'interrogative, I wonder'; 50. Ok ?úc 'dubitative interrogative', Ka ?uc 'question of possibility, dubitative question'; 51. Th //?kén-ěme// 'what happened, what's the matter, why?', NSh čken-m 'to be how (many), how about . . .', Ok //?kín// 'happen', Cm čkán- 'how, what sort of'; 52. Th //s-té?// 'what?', NSh stem 'what, something', SSh stém 'indefinite object, what', Ok stím 'what', Ok stém 'what', Cr tim 'what', Cm stám 'what, something'; 53. Th //s-wét// 'who?', NSh swet 'who, somebody', SSh suwét 'indefinite person, who', Ok swít 'who', Ka sewét 'who', Cr ség″et 'who', Cm swát, 'who'; 54. Th

//k"inex// 'how many?', NSh k"inx 'how many (objects), several', SSh k"inx 'indefinite number, how many', Ka k"inš 'how many', Cr k"inš 'how many?', Cm k"in- 'how many'; 55. Th //ke?(e)// 'which?, is it (that) . . . ?', NSh ken- 'to do, to be where', Ok -kin 'where', Ka čeň 'how, where', Cr hiče? 'where (at)', Cm -ka? 'where'; 56. Th ?inut 'what did (he) say?', Cr ?ing"et 'what was it?'.

Several forms can be reconstructed. For 49, Th and Sh suggest \*an, and Cr ni may be a metathesis of this; glottalization in Th is unexplained. Ok and Ka suggest \*ha, but Cr čeň and Cm sá? appear isolated. On the basis of the only two forms in 50, \*?uc can be reconstructed. 51 derives from \*?kán-; the <u>c</u> in Sh and Cm is a prefix, and the merger of this prefix and the initial <u>?</u> of the root is automatic. All the forms in 52 can be derived from \*s-tám, where s- is the absolutive prefix. The forms in 53 derive from \*s-vát; the first vowel in the SSh, Ka, and Cr forms is epenthetic, and Cr has shifted stress back to this epenthetic vowel, reducing the root vowel to \*<u>a</u>, which regularly becomes <u>e</u>. The forms in 54 may be reconstructed as \*k<sup>w</sup>inax. The best reconstruction for 55 may be \*kán, with loss of the <u>n</u> in Th, Cr, and Cm, and shift of stress back to a prefix in Cr (with vowel reduction as in 'who'). Item 56 may be reconstructed as \*?ĭnwat.

Only three other isolated interrogative particles occur: NSh -he?n, -he?e, -hen 'which (interrogative, indefinite, relative)', SSh //hen-// he?e 'indefinite time or place, where'; Ka təma

141

'rhetorical interrogative' (glossed by Vogt as Latin nonne); Cr ni k<sup>w</sup>um 'interrogative expecting the answer ''no'''.

9. <u>Miscellaneous</u>. There are various other miscellaneous particles, seven of which are tabulated into sets below.

	Th	NSh	SSh	Ok	Ка	Cr	Cm
57. collectiv		wł-	?u <del>1</del>	hə <b>1-</b>	?u <b>1</b> -	g <sup>w</sup> uł	wə1
58. located	//(we)?ex	(w)?ex	(?u)?ə́x				
<b>59. let it be</b>	e //x wuy//	x <sup>w</sup> uỳ, x <sup>w</sup> əx <sup>w</sup> uỳ	xwuy				
60. subject	//è//	Y	γ		×	•	
61. object	//te//	t/Å			t		t.
62. each						g <sup>w</sup> ulc-	pulus
63. have	//pe <del>1</del> //	pə( <b>1</b> )			ep <del>1</del> -	ep <del>1</del> -	ta?
		Table 9.	Miscella	neous			

Glosses are given as follows: 57. NSh wł- 'group of people', SSh 'uł 'collective plural', Ok həł- 'homogeneous group', Ka 'uł- 'collective', Cr g<sup>w</sup>uł 'verbalizing or demonstrative pluralizing element', Cm wəl 'collective'; 58. Th //we'ex//, //'ex// 'exist, be located, reside, stay; persistent, progressive, actual', NSh w'ex, 'ex 'to be there, to be present, to stay', SSh 'u'əx, 'əx 'be present'; 59. Th //x<sup>w</sup>uỳ// 'go; future', NSh x<sup>w</sup>uỳ, x<sup>w</sup>əx<sup>w</sup>uỳ 'well!', SSh x<sup>w</sup>uỳ 'let it be thus, let's . . ., come on, go on'; 60. Th //è// 'direct complement, subject', NSh  $\gamma$ - 'absolutive case, subject', SSh  $\gamma$  'present, specified'; 61. Th //te// 'oblique complement,

142

, Ka t'obligue; Cm t'obligue (?)';

143

object', NSh t/Å 'relative case, object'; 62. Cr g<sup>w</sup>ulc- 'each', Cm p̃ulus 'each'; 63. Th //peł// 'inherent', NSh pəł-, pə- 'having, possessing, owner of', Ka epł- 'possession, there is', Cr epł-'there is, have', Cm ta<sup>?</sup> 'have'.

Only four reconstructions seem to be possible. 57 derives from \*wl, with vowels epenthetic and/or derived from the  $\underline{w}$ , and final devoicing of <u>1</u>, usual in all these languages except Cm. Cv has further reduced <u>u</u> from \*<u>w</u> to <u>a</u>, then added an excrescent <u>h</u>. The reconstruction of 58 is not clear, but may be something like \*w?ex. 59 derives from \*x<sup>w</sup>uŷ. The Th and Sh forms in 60 are not obviously related; those in 61 are, but a reconstruction is unclear because of the alternative Sh form <u>Å</u>. 63 would derive from either \*pał or \*apł, with metathesis in two languages and vowel reduction in Sh and Cr.

Several other isolated miscellaneous particles occur: Th //ex// 'co-referential', //?e// 'there is . . . , it is (that) . . . , that is . . .'; NSh ym '(it is) so', nux<sup>w</sup>m 'isn't that right, ain't it?'; SSh pe? 'wish for, hope for', pl 'comitative (a secondary involvement in an act)', //sn// sən 'intensified; superlative', ?i 'demonstrative'; Ka x<sup>w</sup>əmi and k<sup>w</sup>umi? 'please, desire', <del>1</del> 'secondary in importance', u? 'particular', hi 'specially noted', xi 'desire to prevent something', Xemi 'please!'; Cr ul- 'belonging to', čit- 'offspring, child of', tu? 'answer', wihu? 'short distance', nemnus 'I don't know'; Cm miyas 'comparative degree', sāw 'so-and-so', tiyas 'be without', wa? 'specifier'.

A few other particles are cited, but without glosses; this is

not surprising, as many particles can only be given vague glosses. Unglossed particles are simply listed here: Ka xił, čitəłx<sup>w</sup>a; Cr hoy; Cm ?ani, ci, k<sup>w</sup>ał, łu?, t<sup>A</sup>, təx<sup>w</sup>.

144

Interjections. Interjections are also usually cited as 10. types of particles, but these proved to be comparable only rarely, and were seldom listed (elicited?) systematically. Although it does not seem unlikely that cognates occur among them, lack of sufficient data makes it impractical to do more here than list those interjections that are cited in the sources: Th <sup>9</sup>ú 'anticipation', teye 'calling attention', x<sup>w</sup>st, x<sup>w</sup>st, x<sup>w</sup>st 'expression of affection, used by old people'; NSh ?əx<sup>w</sup>q<sup>w</sup>icw (used when one suddenly remembers one has to do something), <sup>?</sup>a, <sup>?</sup>o, wo (contempt), <sup>?</sup>e, <sup>?</sup>ek, <sup>?</sup>ex, wex (indicates duration, in stories), <sup>?</sup>u, <sup>?</sup>ox, x<sup>w</sup>ux<sup>w</sup>, x<sup>w</sup>ox<sup>w</sup> (emphasis, astonishment, etc.), <sup>?</sup>y<sup>?</sup>ey (interjected by listener to a story, to show interest); SSh ?axtek 'it is/will be thus, all right', x'u 'surprise, awe', <sup>?</sup>ú 'ah' (to emphasize and heighten interest), //?ey?ey// 'continued interest', //?ene// 'fright and shock'; Ok məsan 'surprise!', kmatəm 'that's right!', nəta? 'good!', nikxna? 'my goodness!', ?amsəm 'poor thing!', ?ax 'disgusting!', nak "əm 'indeed!'; Ka ti? 'surprise', ?ah 'well!', hayo 'recognition, cry of startle, reproof', kwə 'voila!', 'eni 'cry of startle, reproof', mā 'look!', x<sup>w</sup>ū 'approval, agreement, yes, all right, good', yõ 'surprise', yom 'surprise, startle', ?ay, ?ex", ha, he, ?o (all from Vogt and unglossed); Cr ?a··· (with rising intonation) 'oh!', ?a... (with level intonation) 'disapproval', ca?xalput 'what's the

use! (a very mean word)', x<sup>w</sup>ısči 'interjection of admiration "how nice it is"', xéme?č 'just you dare!'; Cm ?ána 'I wonder', ?aná· 'ouch!', ?ánacx<sup>w</sup> 'oh my!, oh dear!', ?áw 'well . . .', ha?ám· 'oh my!'.

11. As noted at the beginning of this paper, most particles are preposed. But ten Th particles and seven Sh particles (according to Gibson; Kuipers does not usually note the position of particles) are noted as being postposed; these tend to be comparable. These postpositions were assigned to various categories above, and four Th forms and four SSh forms occurred in the same tables (Th nuk" 'observational' and SSh nuk" 'evidential, it appears' as item 24; Th //nke// 'conjectural' and SSh nka 'speculative, must have' as item 25; Th //ek<sup>w</sup>u// 'heresay' and SSh uk<sup>w</sup> 'reported but not observed, it is said' as item 26; Th //en// 'interrogative' and SSh n 'dubitative, interrogative' as item 49). Th //meł// 'imminent' occurred as item 14, and SSh ma 'previous, already' occurred as item 44; the Th form agrees fully with the reconstruction offered for item 44, although it does not fit there as well semantically. Because both this Th form and the Sh form are postpositions, I suggest that the Th form does indeed belong at item 44. Other postpositions were not comparable (Th  $//3^{1}//$  'readied' at the end of section 7, //xam// 'completed' at item 41, //uỷ// ?i 'still, yet' at item 31, //?eł// 'also, along with' at the end of section 7, //xu?// 'persistent' at the end of section 6; SSh n1 'unanticipated' at the end of section 7, <sup>?</sup>ux<sup>w</sup> 'repetition, again' at item 33).

26

Thus position, although generally not useful in comparisons of particles, allows a reassignment of one Th form.

12. Additional particles most probably occur in all these languages; some are infrequent, and many are semantically elusive, and hence difficult to discuss in a grammar. On the other hand, some of the words discussed here will turn out to be predicates, perhaps restricted in some way in their usage. It is hoped that this compendium will assist others in searching for, identifying, and classifying particles, not only in IS, but in all Salishan languages.

I have deliberately avoided any reference to particles in other branches of Salish. For the most part, sufficient data are not available on particles in these languages, and the addition of any of them would have complicated the comparisons offered. IS languages form a distinct subset of Salishan languages (only Lillooet is not included in these comparisons), and this compilation may serve *en bloc* for wider comparisons.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Sources used in this paper are as follows: Thompson, Thompson and Thompson (1975), Northern Shuswap, Kuipers (1974), Southern Shuswap, Gibson (1973), Okanagan, Mattina (1973; Colville dialect), Spokane, Carlson (1972), Kalispel, Vogt (1940), Coeur d'Alene, Reichard (1938, 1939), Columbian, Kinkade field notes. Abbreviations used are Cm Columbian, Cr Coeur d'Alene, Ka Kalispel, Ok Okanagan, NSh Northern Shuswap, SSh Southern Shuswap, Sp Spokane, Th Thompson, IS Interior Salishan, PIS Proto-Interior Salishan. Research on Columbian Salish has been made possible by grants from the National Science Foundation, the American Philosophical Society Library, and the University of Kansas. On the Source Sources is

metrianscribed for uniformity.

2.

## REFERENCES

Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A Grammar of Spokan: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. [UH-WPL 4.4, June 1972]

Gibson, James A. 1973. Shuswap Grammatical Structure. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. [UH-WPL 5.5, May 1973]

Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. The Shuswap Language. The Hague: Mouton.

- Mattina, Anthony. 1973. Colville Grammatical Structure. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. [UH-WPL 5.4, April 1973]
- Reichard, Gladys A. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. Handbook of American Indian Languages III:521-707. New York: J. J. Augustin.

Reichard, Gladys A. 1939. Stem-list of the Coeur d'Alene language. IJAL 10:92-108.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1975. Thompson. ms.

Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel Language. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.