A REPORT ON SLIAMMON (MAINLAND COMOX) REDUPLICATION*

Honoré Watanabe Kyoto University

- O. Introduction
- 1. Plural
- 2. Diminutive
- 3. Diminutive Plural
- 4. Imperfective
- 5. ·VCz Reduplication
- 6. C. əR' Reduplication
- 7. C1aC2. Reduplication
- 8. C₁V?V. Reduplication
- 9. 'Volitional'?
- 10. Personal
- 11. Final Remarks
- O. INTRODUCTION. This paper treats the various types of reduplication in Sliammon (Mainland Comox). Previous works on Sliammon have already dealt with most of the processes treated below, but they sometimes are only mentioned in passing or not organized under one heading. Reduplication serves a major role in Sliammon morphology and surely merits an in-depth study. Because of the limitation of data, much more attention has been paid to the first two, plural (1) and diminutive (2). Imperfective (4) and $\cdot \text{VC}_z$ (5) have been treated in previous works, and little information can be added at this time, so they are treated only briefly. The remaining types are not well understood yet; the data are organized as lists of forms recorded thus far.
- 1. PLURAL. It seems most likely that number is obligatorily marked only for 1st and 2nd persons, 3rd person forms being unmarked as to number. There are three ways to clarify or insist upon plural reference, one of which involves reduplication (1.1). The non-reduplicative processes are also included (1.2) to better illustrate means of marking plurality in Sliammon.

1.1. REDUPLICATION.

- 1.1.2. MEANING and USES. Plural reduplication commonly refers to several persons or things, in which case it is translated to English by plural forms of noun. It can also suggest distribution over space or time. Such forms are accordingly translated to English by 'all around/all over the place', and 'always/all the time'. Plural is used

to refer also to several participants involved in the predication. Still others are found with the same processes but are lexicalized as such or idiosyncratic. The following examples are classified accordingly under 'plural', 'plural participant', and 'lexicalized/idiosyncratic'.(2)

Plural:

C10C2./
k*osk*usən 'stars' (k*usən)
t'ənt'in 'lots of barbecued fish' (t'in)
p'a?p'a?ac' 'fishing nets' (p'a?ac')(0>a/_?)
%'oi*x'ai=m 'lots of salt' (%'ai=m 'salt')
q'osq'osnay' 'shirts/dresses' (q'osnay' 'shirt/dress')
tək*tək*an'a //COC./tək*=an'a// 'both ears deaf' (PL.??=ear)
[túk*tuk*a?na] (tək*an'a 'deaf' [tûk*a?na])

Stems begining with C₁VR'...:

həmhum'hum 'blue grouses' [h/mhom?hom] (hum'hum 'blue grouse')
qənqin'qin 'ducks' (qin'qin 'duck' [q6?Enqen])
t'əmt'əm'x\squarta 'gooseberries' (t'əm'x\squarta 'gooseberry' [t'd?\squarta \text{mx}'])
təmtam'ustən '/CəC./təm'=us-tən/\squarta headbands' (PL.belt=headINS) (tam'ustən 'headband' [td?most+n])(\squarta \squarta /R'V)

Exception:

tem'tams 'belts' (tem' 'belt') (but see 'headband' above)

Stems taking C_1VC_2 . (V identical to the first vowel of the stem) as their reduplicated syllable:

kwiskwiskwis 'bluejays' (kwiskwis 'bluejay') kwumkwum't 'lots of kelp' (kwum't 'kelp')

Examples denoting distribution over space:

?əm?imas //CəC-/?imas// 'walking around' [?ʎm?ɛ·mos] (?imas 'walk')
?əq?aq'atas //CəC-/?aq'-a-t-as// 'He is chasing her all around.'
(PL·chase-Link-CTL.TR-3SBJ) (?aq'adi t@əm //?aq'-a-Bi t@əm// 'I
will chase you' chase-Link-CTL.TR+2sg.OBJ lsg.SBJ+FUT)

Those denoting distribution over time:

Plural Participant: plural reduplication of the predicate refers to plural number of the subject in intransitive forms and of the object in transitive forms. Thus,

Intransitive:

tagtag ta ?am?imin //CaC./tag ta CaC./?imin// 'All the doors are closed.' (PL·close DEM PL·door) cf. təq tə ?imin 'The door closed.' gaq'gaq' ta ?am?imin //CaC./gaq' ta CaC./?imin// 'All the doors are open.' (PL · open DEM PL · door)

cf. gag' to ?imin 'The door opened.'

təqtəqt čən səm tə ?əm?imin //CəC·/təq-t čən səm tə CəC·/?imin/ 'I will close all the doors.' (PL·close-CTL.TR 1sg.SBJ FUT DEM PL · door)

cf. tagt can sam to ?imin 'I will close the door.' gəq'gəq't tə ?əm?imin //CəC·/gəq'-t tə CəC·/?imin// '(to) open all the doors' (PL.open-CTL.TR DEM PL.door) cf. gag't can ta ?imin 'I opened the door.'

The above forms show plural reduplication on both the predicate and on the subject (in intransitive) or on the object (in transitive). The next example, in which only the predicate is reduplicated for plural, was rejected by MG.

*təqtəqt cən səm tə ?imin *//CəC./təq-t cən səm tə /?imin// "I will close the doors.' (PL·close-CTL.TR 1sg.SBJ FUT DEM door)

Examples from texts are too few to make any generalization, but it seems that this construction is very awkward, if not ungrammatical. It has plural number of objects overtly marked on the predicate by reduplication, stressing their plurality, and lacks any mark of plurality on the corresponding overt argument. See the next two examples for further illustration.

nəpnəpis teəm tə čəyčuy' ?ə tə k'waxwa ∥CəC•/nəp-is teəm tə cay. /cu.i' ?a ta /k'waxwa// 'I will put the kids in the box.' (PL.put.in-Vs 1sg.SBJ+FUT DEM PL.child OBL DEM box) (1')y'/C or #) *nəpnəpiš teəm tə čuy' ?ə tə k'waxwa

In the next example, plural reduplication is combined with 2sg.OBJ suffix (-mi) to indicate 2pl.OBJ.

nəpnəpimi teəm ?ə tə k'waxwa //CəC./nəp-i-mi teəm ?ə tə /k'waxwa// 'I will put you guys in the box.' (PL.put.in-Link-2sg.OBJ 1sg.SBJ +FUT OBL DEM box) cf. nəpis teəm tə Janx ?ə tə k'wax a 'I will put the fish in the box.' (put.in 1sg.SBJ+FUT DEM fish OBL DEM box)

This is the only example of a pronominal suffix for sg. person combined with plural reduplication to refer to pl. persons. It was elicited from MG, but DD and AD readily recognized it and gave the same English translation without hesitation.

The root nap- belongs to a class that takes the suffix -Vs (i.e. nəp-is), which can be inflected for pronominal object (cf. Kroeber 1989:112). The pronominal object suffixes for 1sg., 1pl., and 2sg. are the same ones used with noncontrol transitive and with causative (-ms

1sg., -muł 1pl., -mi 2sg.). Thus, nap-i-ms 'put me in', and nap-i-muł 'put us in', nəp-i-mi 'put thee in'.(4)

However, it was difficult to elicit the parallel form for 2pl.OBJ. Instead of the expected -anapi, used with the noncontrol and causative, my data shows nap-anami. This form was elicited with difficulty, and it may be the result of forced elicitation. Interestingly, Kroeber (1989: 112) encountered the same problem; he lists nap-i-(na)napi 'put you (pl.) in' but with a question mark, and remarks that the plural forms were rather hard to elicit.

Whatever the reason for this difficulty may be, the above example shows that plural reduplication serves as a ready means to indicate plurality.

Lexicalized / Idiosyncratic:

?əh?ahəm //CəC·/?ah-?əm// 'arthritis/aching' (PL·sore-INTR) (?ah 'sore')

?ay?aJu8əm //CVC./?aJ'u8əm// 'native Indian (i.e., Sliammon) language' $[?ay?a^{J}u^{\theta}M]$ (J>y/_C or #) cf. ?a,j'u8əmut ///a,j'u8əm-mut// 'He knows Indian language well.' (??-

very?) [?á?Ju-8əmot]

The next example peculiarly has a negative connotation with C₁ \(\text{C}_2\). reduplication where no such meaning is suggested in the corresponding simplex forms. It is difficult, at least for non-native speakers, to see the connection, if any, to plural.

gaxgaxnumut //CaC./gax-nu-mut// 'nightmare' (C1aC2.??-NCT.TR-RFL) (gaxnumut 'dream/He dreams.')

To specify the plurality of 'dreams', an analytical process using qax 'many' is employed (see 1.2.2 for further discussion on qax).

qəx t⁸ gəxnumutul s natul ///qəx t⁸ /gəx-nu-mut-?ul s /nat-ul/ 'I had lots of dreams last night,' (many 1sg.PSV ??-NCT.TR-RFL-PAST TIME night-PAST) [qAx tegAxnomotol snotol]

Some forms in C₁VC₂· reduplication occur as such without the corresponding simplexes.

kwiškwiš bluejay cf. kwiškwiškwiš bluejays mušmuš 'cow' cf. mušmušmuš ~ məšmušmuš [m(šmušmuš] 'cows'

1.2. NON-REDUPLICATIVE PROCESSES. There are two ways to specify plural reference other than the plural reduplication.(6)

1.2.1. PLURAL AFFIX. There is an affix to mark plurality: #Vg#. Often the reference is to 3rd person, and it may be better to treat this affix in terms of pronominal markers. It is found also, however, to occur with 1st and 2nd person plural pronominal subject clitics. It may be that collectiveness is stressed in the latter case.(e)

The position of this affix within a word is somewhat obscure. It can be attached right after the first syllable of the stem, thus appearing as an infix if the result is decomposition of what is otherwise unanalyzable. (7) In this position, the vowel of this affix is the same as that of the first vowel of the root.

?iiiwtən štəm //?iitən +[Vg] štəm// 'We will eat together.' (eat +[PL] 1pl.SBJ+FUT) (g>w/ C or #)

?i?imigas stəm //CV./?im-Vg-as stəm// We will be walking together.' (IMPF • walk?-PL-Vs 1pl.SBJ+FUT)

?u?ułuwowu tə qəyqaymixw //CV-/?ułqwu +[Vg] tə CəC-/qaymixw// 'People are digging clams.' (IMPF · dig.clams +[pl] DEM PL ·

t'ut'utugat č tə kwəskwastə //CV-/t'ut-Vg-a-t č tə CəC-/kwastə// 'I am putting the cups on the shelf.' (IMPF . put-PL-Link-CTL.TR 1sg.SBJ DEM PL · cup)

Jaq'aw tə Ja?Ji?əm //Jaq'-Vg tə Ja?Ji?əm// 'Lots of trees fell down.' (fall-PL DEM trees)(a)

?aqwagis ///?aqw-Vg-Vs// '(We are) going down the river.' (go.downstream-PL-Vs)

This position parallels that of cognate forms in Sechelt: -iw, -aw (Beaumont 1985:86). But in Sliammon it can also be attached at the end of a word. The data show the vowel of this affix in this position to be always i, regardless of the first vowel of the stem or the nearest vowel in the stem, except in one example.

717imašiw //CV-/7imaš-Vg// 'They are walking together.' (IMPF · walk-PL)

gəxnumutiw //gəx-nu-mut-Vg// 'They dreamt.' (??-NCT.TR-RFL-PL) [gkxanormortew]

məmk tasiw tə Janx // CV-/mək -t-as-Vg tə /Janx // 'They are eating fish.' (IMPF · eat-CTL.TR-3SBJ-PL DEM fish) Exception:

?u?uiqwu?uw tə čəyčuy' //CV-/?uiqwu-Vg tə CəC-/čuj'/ 'kids are digging clams.' (IMPF · dig.clams-PL DEM PL · child)

Unlike the plural reduplication, this affix can refer to the plurality of both subject and object in transitive predicate. Data are wanting to understand the pattern fully, but the reference of this affix, whether to the subject or to the object, is perhaps ambiguous out of context.(9) Thus.

səp'tiw čan səm ///səp'-t-Vg čan səm// 'I will club them all.' (club-CTL.TR-PL 1sg.SBJ FUT)

sap'atasiw to čoyčuy' //sap'-a-t-as-Vg to CoC·čuj'/ 'They are spanking the kids.' (spank-Link-CTL.TR-3SBJ-PL DEM PL·child) sap'agatas tə cəycuy' //sap'-Vg-a-t-as tə CəC./cu,j'/ 'He is spanking all the kids.' (spank-PL-Link-CTL.TR-3SBJ DEM PL·child)

It is very questionable if two #Vg# affixes can attach to the same predicate, to specify 'they...them', i.e.,

??/*sasap'agatasiw tə cəycuy' //CV-/sap'-Vg-a-t-as-Vg tə CəC-Jour' They are spanking the kids.' (IMPF-spank-PL-Link-CTL.TR-3SBJ-PL DEM PL·child) (tested with MG)

In one example, this affix was recorded with glottalization of the resonant immediately preceding the affix(10)

?iftan'iw //?iftan-Vg +[']// 'They are eating.'

Harris (1977) transcribed this affix as [aw? ~ ew?] in Island Comox. Glottal closure was rarely observed in Sliammon, in which case /w'/ is written (only one example):

ciłciłimiw' //CVC-/ciłim-Vg +[']// 'Lots of people are dancing.'

1.2.2. ANALYTICAL PLURAL. Plural reference can be stated analytically by juxtaposition of qax 'many'. Plural reduplication seems to have dwindled, and the use of qax is prevalent, at least in the speech of DD among my consultants, and more so among the younger speakers. (11) This is most likely an influence from English.

A few words do not, however, undergo plural reduplication, and for such words qax is the only means to specify plurality(12):

qex puqwpuqw 'lots of (wild) blueberries' (puqwpuqw '(wild) qaxmut hiwgin 'lots of swans' DD (-mut 'very', hiwgin 'swan') asxmut halug ten 'lots of barbecued seal' (halug ten 'barbecued qəx xa?a 'clams' (xa?a 'clam')

The reason for inhibition of these particular words from undergoing reduplication is not clear, but for the last word, 'clam', Blake (1992) states that the reduplicated form, [xá?xa] SB, means 'woman's genitals', and that is the reason why the reduplicated form is not used to refer to 'clams'.

With one word, gija 'dirt/ground/earth', qax conveys a different meaning from plural reduplication:

qax gija 'lots of dirt' gəygiJa //CəC·/giJa// '(to own) lands in different spots'

Such a difference between the two processes has not been attested with any other forms.

gax can also be expanded by a lexical suffix or be inflected:

qaxaya 'lots of people' (=aya person?) qəxigan 'liar' (=igan sentiment) qəxsx cax //qəx-sx cax // 'Get lots! / Pick lots (of berries)!' (many-CAU 2sg.SBJ) qəxsx ui can ?ut //qəx-sx -?ui can ?ut/ 'I picked/got real lots.' (many-CAU-PAST 1sg.SBJ ptc) [q\xsx\uicen?ot]

qax can function also as an oblique complement, e.g.:

?i?iłtən Mary ?ə tə qəxmut //CV./?iltən /Mary ?ə tə /qəx-mut// 'Mary is eating lots.' (IMPF eat Mary OBL DEM many-very) [?é?elten méle flomxyb eter

2. DIMINUTIVE. Diminutive formation is more complex than plural formation. Five morphological processes are involved: (1) reduplication of stem initial C₁V₂, (2) i insertion, (3) glottalization of resonants or attachment of a glottal stop to word-final vowel, (4) suffixing -u4, and (5)? insertion. C_1V - reduplication (1) is by far the most productive. C_1V - reduplication (1), suffixing of -u4 (4), and? insertion (5) can form diminutives by themselves alone. Diminutives formed with (4) or (5) alone are few in number, however, making (1) the only productive process. The other two processes (2 and 3) occur only with the others, namely (1) and (4). The five processes are discussed in detail below. The numbers in parentheses in this section correspond to the five processes. When two or three processes are combined, numbers are marked with '+' (e.g. 1+2, etc.).

The basic meaning is small(er) in size, amount, or force, but specialized meanings, or nuances, and lexicalized items are also found.

2.1. FORMAL PROCESSES.

(1) C_1V reduplication: Most roots lose their root vowel when they undergo diminutive C_1V reduplication. The vowel of the reduplicated syllable is the same as the root vowel if the root vowel is a full vowel. Most roots with ϑ take C_1i as their reduplicated syllable.

(2) i insertion: i is inserted in some forms undergoing C_xV - reduplication. It is inserted between the last two consonants of the word. If there is an underlying vowel between the last two consonant -- i.e. if the word does not end in a consonant cluster -- i replaces the vowel. (14)

(3) Glottalization of resonants or attachment of a glottal stop to word final vowel: this process may be largely due to phonological reasons. In many examples involving this process, the corresponding non-reduplicated forms have glottalized resonants, J', or g' as C_2 , e.g. C'ag'ay '(wooden) spoon' [$C't'^3g\wedge y$]. When these forms undergo C_1V -reduplication and lose the first vowel of their roots, the C_2 comes next to C_1 , thus, * $C'a\cdot C'g'ay$. However, the glottalized resonants, J', and g' lose glottalization when they follow another consonant, and when this loss of glottalization occurs, glottalization occurs at the wordfinal position, i.e. $C'a\cdot C'gay'$ [$C'E'C'g\wedge y$?]. Thus, at least on the surface, glottalization can be viewed as moving from one position to

another within the word, as if refusing to be simply lost. With other words, however, glottalization of resonants cannot be explained in a similar fashion (e.g. 'small barbecued deer', see below).

One diminutive form ('small bullfrog', see below) receives glottalization on a word-internal resonant. Analyzing the same process in Island Comox, Harris (1977:171) states that glottalization occurs on the "first resonant reading from right to left in the final syllable" [emphasis mine]. This analysis could likely be extended to Sliammon.(18)

The same reason can hold true for some of the words where a glottal stop is attached following the word-final vowel. Thus, the diminutive of men'a [mó?na] 'child' is: mi-men'a > mi-mna' > mi-mna? [mémna?]. With others, however, the added final glottal stop can not be explained similarly (e.g. 'small box', see below).

In the morphophonemic representation, added (or 'moved') glottalization and glottal stops are marked by ['].

(1+2+3)
sismin' #CV-/simən +[i]+[']# 'small boil' [sésmen?] (sim'ən 'boil'
[sé?əmə-n])
wawal'i8 #CV-/wal8 +[']+[i]# 'small bullfrog' [whwa?le8] (wal8
bullfrog' [wdi8])

k'''ak'''x''a? //CV-/k'''ax''a +[']// 'small box' (k'''ax''a 'box')

(4) Diminutive suffix -ut: this suffix may have been historically restricted in its use "especially for names of birds" (Hagège 1981) or "in words for the offspring of an animal" (Harris 1977). However, it seems to be quite productive, at least in MG's speech. This suffix is the only means to form diminutives of words already reduplicated in their singular forms.

kwiškwišuł 'small bluejay' (kwiškwiš 'bluejay')

(1+4)
mam@acuł // CV-/ma@ac-uł/ 'small black duck' (ma@ac 'black duck')
p'ip'hu?uł // Ci-/p'uhu-uł/ 'small raven' [p'ép'ho?oł] (p'uhu
'raven')
(See also the example cited in note 16.)

(1+2+4) λ'iλ'pigisuł //CV-/λ'ip=igs-uł +[i]// [λ'έλ'pegisoł] 'small underwear' (λ'ipiws //λ'ip=igs// 'underwear' (deep/under=body))

(5) ? insertion: there are only a few examples of this process. (See also the next section.)

sa?ttxw 'small woman, girl' (sattxw 'woman'; sasattixw also elicited as diminutive)

2.2. SPECIALIZED NUANCES. Some personal names were recorded in diminutive forms. These forms convey contempt:

lu?s '(You little) Rose!' [16?s] (properly, lus [16:s] or lusi [16:se]; DIM form is formed by ? insertion)
pa?p '(You little) Bobby!' [pá?ap] (properly, pap [pá:p]; also by ? insertion)

?a?knis '(You little) Agnes!' [?á?kynes] (properly, ?aknis [?á·kynes]; DIM form can be analyzed as C₁V· reduplication with loss of the first vowel of the stem, or as ? insertion.)

Another form probably belongs in this category:

čiču '(You little) Joel' [čí-ču-] (properly, ču [čú-])

Some forms carry a nuance of affection or endearment:

(5ə tθ) miman '(That's my) Dad' [mé·man] (5ə DEM, tθ 1PSV, man 'father')

(to to) titan '(That's my) Mom' [te ton] (to DEM, to 1PSV, tan 'mother')

nimut x'ix'əxx'axay' 'Us old people'(17) [némot x'é-x'əxx'a-xay?] (nimut 1pl. pronoun)

The next example probably can be used contemptuously or affectionately $^{\text{(10)}}$:

sasttx* //CV./sattx* +[i]// 'my little wife' [sá·sttex*] (sattx* 'woman')(19)

Some forms have specialized meanings or are lexicalized as such.

 $\lambda'a\lambda'xay'$ $\proon{'CV-}\lambda'axay + [']/'$ 'elderly person' ($\lambda'axay$ 'old'(20)) Ciciya? 'great-grandmother')

Still others are found in what may be diminutives, but their non-reduplicated simplex forms have not been attested. $^{(21)}$

t'eit'eik'W '(earth) worm'(22)

3. DIMINUTIVE PLURAL. Diminutive plurals are often difficult to elicit. It seems likely that such a process is no longer in use, though more research may reveal otherwise. Among my consultants, only MG gave diminutive plurals by means of reduplication and/or suffixation. Others usually used qax 'many' plus diminutives. Many forms obtained are

questionable, so it is difficult to generalize patterns from them. The following therefore is a tentative description based on forms that seem fairly reliable.

One of the two main processes of diminutive plural is double reduplication: the diminutive C_1i reduplication occurs in front of plural $C_1 \circ C_2 \cdot$ reduplication. As Harris (1977:108) describes this process, the plural formation precedes the diminutive formation. Just as described in 2.1, since the first vowel of the stem, i.e. the vowel of the plural reduplication, is ϑ , the vowel of the diminutive is i. This process can be formulated as $C_1 \cdot C_1 \ni C_2 \cdot J$. Contrary to the diminutive reduplication described above (2.1), neither the vowel of the root nor that of plural $C_1 \ni C_2 \cdot$ is lost.

C1i·C1=C2·/
q'iq'əsq'əsnay' //Ci·CəC·/q'əsnay'/ 'small shirts/dresses'
(q'əsnay' 'shirt/dress')
sisəpsupayu //Ci·CəC·/supayu/ 'small axes' [sísəpsoporyo]
(supayu 'ax' [sóporyo])
t'it'ətt'utat //Ci·CəC·/t'utat// 'small beds' [t'ét'^tt'otat]
(t'utat 'bed')

Interestingly, in some cases this double reduplication occurs with glottalization of resonants or attaching ? following the word-final vowel (one example only). The corresponding diminutive of these forms shows glottalization of the resonant and ? attachment. It is not clear if the glottalized resonant (if there is one) in C_2 position of the stem loses glottalization or not (see the first two examples). Note also that the first example has infixed i.

sisəmsimin' //Ci-CəC·/sim'ən +[i]+[']/ 'small boils'
[sé-sə-mse-əmen?] (sim'ən 'boil', sismin' 'small boil')
kwikwənkwan'ay' //Ci-CəC·/kwan'ay +[']/ 'small lids'
[kwikwənkwanay' //Ci-CəC·/təxəm'ay +[']/ 'small cedars'
[titxtxxmay] (təxəm'ay 'cedar', titxəmay' 'small cedar')
pipəcpəcu? //Ci-CəC·/pəcu +[']/ 'small cedar root baskets'
[pi-picpicyon'o] (pəcu 'cedar root basket', pipcu? 'small cedar root basket')

The other main process combines plural reduplication with diminutive suffix $-\mathbf{u}_1$.

There are a few examples with double reduplication occurring with the diminutive suffix. From a formal point of view, the diminutive is marked twice on these forms, i.e. by C_1i - reduplication and the suffix -u \dagger .

miməθmaθačuł //Ci·CəC·/maθač-uł// 'small black ducks'
[mém·ΛθmΛθα-čoł] (maθač 'black duck')
sisəmsam'ahuł //Ci·CəC·/sam'a(h)-uł// 'small mussels'
[sísəmsa?ama·hoł] (sam'a 'mussel')

Still obscure are some stems taking $C_1i?i$ reduplication to form a diminutive plural. Again, data are insufficient to confirm this point; moreover, the process is further obscured by the possible existence of $C_1V?V$ reduplication (see below in 8). Note that the first vowel of the stem is lost in the first three examples:

ti?itqiw "Ci?i-/tiqiw" 'small horses' [té?etqew] (tiqiw 'horse')
mi?im?in "Ci?i-/mi?in" 'small carrots' [mé?em?en] (mi?in 'carrot')
ti?itkwəti "Ci?i-/təkwti" 'small rabbits' [té?etkwute] (təkwti
'rabbit' [túkwte], titkwəti 'small rabbit' [tirkwute])(zə)
t'ei?it'eat'eikw "Ci?i-/t'eit'eik'w" 'small worms'
[t'ef?et'ea't'ekwyl'z²) (t'eit'eik'w '(earth) worm')
si?isattixw "Ci?i-/sattxw +|i|" 'small women' (sattxw 'woman')

4. IMPERFECTIVE. Imperfective (25) aspect is formed with almost all roots by initial C_1V reduplication. The vowel of the reduplicated syllable is identical to the first vowel of the root. The first vowel of the root is lost if it is a $/\partial/$, otherwise retained. Thus,

c'ic'! //CV-/c'e!// 'raining' [c'ic'!] (c'e! 'rain' [c'i!])

With a few forms, glottalization of word-final resonants was observed when a form underwent C_1V imperfective reduplication. (26)

tətgəqin' //CV-/təg=qin +[']// 'answering (back)' (IMPF·??=mouth) [tʎtgʌqɛn?] (təwqil cx // /təg=qin-8 cx // 'Answer me!' (??=mouth-CTL.TR+1sg.OBJ 2sg.SBJ) n>Ø/_8 [tú:qɛ8cx]) x wax way ay ay 'telling traditional story' [x wax way ay ay waw waw i' a m going to tell a story,' [q'wáq'waam?tem]

5. -VC $_{z}$ REDUPLICATION. Kroeber (1988) explores ·VC $_{z}$ reduplication very carefully. No further research has been done on this particular process either to add to or correct Kroeber's description. Some additional data are listed here.

 $\cdot VC_z$ reduplication repeats the second consonant of the root (i.e., C_z) and the vowel preceding it (i.e., the (first) vowel of the root) and places them directly following the second consonant of the root. Thus the reduplication appears as an infix when the stem is longer than a CVC root. Its occurrence is limited to roots which Kroeber (1988) classifies 'stative'. It carries inceptive meaning with intransitives. With transitives, the semantic contribution of the reduplication is not clear (hence glossed as $\cdot VC_z$).

?aJ'aJ'at čx ?ut //?əJ'.VC-a-t čx ?ut// '(You) make it better.'
(good.VC₂-Link-CTL.TR 2sg.SBJ ptc) [?á?ªJɛ?Jɛčx ?vt]
č'am'am'at čx //č'əm'.VC-a-t čx // 'You cool it off.' (cold.VC₂-Link-CTL.TR 2sg.SBJ) [č'ɛ́?əma?mačx //]

6. $C_1 \ni R^*$ - REDUPLICATION. Some roots with a resonant in C_2 position are found to undergo what looks like $C_1 \ni C_2$ - plural reduplication at first glance. However, the resonant in the reduplicated syllable receives glottalization; this is radically different from the plural reduplication analyzed above (1.1.1) where glottalized resonants in C_2 position lose their glottalization in the reduplicated syllable. The process in question here can be formulated as $C_1 \ni R^*$. None of the roots in the following examples, except one ('talk'), has been found unreduplicated or unaffixed so far.

The data are insufficient to determine what this process means. The first three examples are similar to what is called 'characteristic' or 'dispositional' aspect in other Salish languages (cf. for example Galloway 1993). (27)

Though doubly reduplicated, the following example probably belongs here.

nəy'nəynəy cx nəgi //cəR'·CəC?·/nəy cx nəgi//You always forget/always make mistakes.' (C₁əR'·C₁əC₂?·forget 2sg.SBJ 2sg.pronoun) MG, 'forgetful' DD [ni?¹ni:ni:cx nigi] cf. nəynumis nəgi //nəy-nu-mi-s nəgi//He forgot you.' (forget-NCT.TR-2sg.OBJ-3SBJ 2sg.pronoun) [ni:nomes nigi]

7. CaC REDUPLICATION. The examples of the reduplication discussed

here are still few in number, which may be due only to my belated realization of its potential productivity.

This reduplication copies the first CVC sequence of the stem (i.e., C_1VC_2) with the change of the vowel to a, hence the formula C_1aC_2 . Some forms attested with C1aC2. reduplication do not have corresponding C₁ = C₂ (plural) reduplication, in which case the former perhaps functions in place of the latter. In other examples, however, C1aC2. reduplication contrasts with C12C2 reduplication, with a slight difference in meaning. The meaning of this process is not entirely clear; it seems to involve some sort of aspect. Many more examples, with syntactic tests (such as the one carried out by Kroeber 1988), are necessary to determine what this reduplication means (or whether all of the following examples can be classified under one semantic category).

The following presents all the examples of this process in my data. Though perhaps tedious, all information and translations by different

consultants are given.(29)

?at?ittin c //CaC-/?ittən +[i] c// 'I am enjoying my meal, eating slowly, bit by bit.' (C1aC2 eat +[STV]? 1sg.SBJ) MG (spon), 'eating a little bit at a time' DD, 'snacking, sampling (food)' EP [?á-+?e-+ten]

cf. ?əi?iitən //CəC·/?iitən// 'always eating' (PL·eat) [?ʎi?ɛitən]

?at?utq\u //CaC.\?utq\u// 'enjoying digging clams' (C1aC2.dig.clams) MG [74-170-14"0]

cf. ?əi?uiqwu //CəC·/?uiqwu// 'always digging clams' (PL·dig.clams) [7K1701qwo]

Jax'Jəx' //CaC·/Jəx'// [Jέx'Jιx'] 'running around' (C₁aC₂·run) MG, DD, EP

. Iax'. Iax' //CaC./. Iax'// [Iix'. Iix'] 'running around to get ready to go out' (PL • run) MG <txt>(30), 'runner' DD, rejected by EP and AD

maxwməxwas c tə janxw //CaC·/məxw-Vs c tə /janxw// 'I am gathering the fish a little bit. / (Among different kinds of fish.) I am gathering the kind I want (in the middle).' (C1aC2 gather-V5 lsg.SBJ DEM fish) MG [máxwmuxwas]

cf. maxwas team ta janxw //maxw-Vs team ta janxw/ 'I will gather fish.' (gather-V5 1sg.SBJ+FUT DEM fish) [múxwaš tetm ta Ténx¥1

məx wməx was c //CəC·/məx w-Vs c// 'I am gathering.(?)'(PL·gather-Vs lsg.SBJ) [múxwmuxwaš](31)

łak' łuk' 'flying around/flying back and forth' (łuk' 'to fly')

pačpečuł č s natuł //CaC·/peč-?uł č s /nat-?uł// 'I kept waking up last night. / I was awake part of the time.' (C12C2 · awake-PAST 1sg.SBJ TIME night-PAST) MG, confirmed by EP. [páčpičołč snátoł] pəcpəcuł c //CəC·/pəc-?uł c// 'I was awake.' (PL·awake-PAST 1sg.SBJ) MG [píčpičołč]

cf. pəčəm ga //pəč-?əm ga// Wake up!' (awake-INTR IMP) [píčimg^]

sačsečem //CaC·/seč-?em// 'itchy all over' (CiaCi itch-INTR) MG səcsəcəm tə te cayis //CəC./səc-?əm tə te /cayis// 'My hand is always itchy in one spot.' (PL. Jitch-INTR DEM 1PSV hand) MG

(emphasis is MG's)(32)

c'aic'əi 'raining a little bit' MG (spon) [c'έθic'ιi] (c'əi

c'əic'əitəm //CəC·/c'əi-t-əm// 'It is raining on a lot of people' (PL·rain-CTL.TR-PASS) [č'íłč'iłtəm]

8. C₁V?V- REDUPLICATION. A few forms were recorded with C₁V?Vreduplication. Some seem to involve some sort of diminutive notion. They therefore may be better classified as diminutive plurals which take C.i?i. reduplication. It is difficult, however, to see any diminutive nuance with other examples. Unfortunately, the examples are too scarce (less than 10 examples) to explain this process at this time.(33) First, three forms which are translated with diminutive notion:

q'i?iq'a č ?ut //Ci?i./q'a č ?ut// 'I am a little bit hungry.' (Cilli-hungry? 1sg.SBJ ptc) [q'éle-q'a(l)c'ot] (q'aq'a cen 'I am hungry.')

01710qitas //Ci?i-/0iq-i-t-as// 'He is digging a little bit.' (C₁i?i· dig-Link-CTL.TR-3SBJ) [867e-8getas]

ti?itk'wat caxw //ci?i./tək'w-a-t caxw// '(You) pull it a little bit.' (C,i?i · pull-Link-CTL.TR 2sg.SBJ) [té-?etk**vccx*] (See also 'tug-of-war' below)

The remaining examples with C₁V?V· reduplication follow:

si?isp'a?am //Ci?i·/səp'-?əm//(34) 'baseball' (C.i?i·club-INTR) [sé?esp'a?am]

ti?itk'Watawł //Ci?i·/tək'w-a-t-awł// 'tug-of-war' (C1i?i·pull-Link-CTL.TR-RCP) [té?etk'wvtawi]

qwu?uqwutas tə kapi //CV?V./qwu-t-as tə /kapi// 'He is drinking coffee.' (C1V?V.drink?-CTL.TR-3SBJ DEM coffee) [q\6?0\q\000rd\0000rd\000rd\0000rd\000rd\000rd\000rd\0000rd\0000rd\0000rd\0000r\0000r\0000r\0000r\0000r kyápεl

qwu?uqwutəm ?ə John tə kapi //CV?V./qwu-t-əm ?ə /John tə /kapi/ 'John is drinking coffee.' (C1V?V.drink?-CTL.TR-PASS OBL John DEM coffee) [qw6?orqwortem ?e.16n te kyápe.]

From X'axay 'old (person?)', the following is formed by C₁V?Vreduplication:

*X'a?ax'xay' //CV?V-/X'axay +[']// 'lots of elderly people' [X'á?a-X'xay?]

Recall that 'elderly person' is itself a diminutive of X'axay 'old':

λ'aλ'xay' //CV·/λ'axay +[']// 'elderly person'

Thus, the above form with C₁V?V· may be classified as a diminutive plural. There is, in addition, another form that means 'lots of elderly people':

x'axx'axay //CVC./x'axay// 'lots of elderly people'

What may be of interest is that MG expressed that the people involved

in x'a?ax'xay' may be older in age than in x'axx'axay. Further checking is needed to see if there is such a difference in meaning; the possibility is just mentioned here. (35)

The next example is peculiar, perhaps idiosyncratic, in that the reduplication also involves the second consonant of the stem:

ma?ax'məx' //Ca?aC·/məx'/ 'calm spot all over the place'
[má?ax'mʌx']('30) (məx' '(water is) calm', ma?x'im 'calm spot in water')

9. 'VOLITIONAL'? Hagege (1981) claims that reduplication and prefixation of stem initial C_1V -, combined with -2a?m conveys 'volitional' meaning. He also states that the meaning conveyed by this process differs from constructions with juxtaposition of xax' 'want (to X)' in that the former conveys insistence or obstinacy. All examples listed in Hagege (1981:120) are cited here $^{(37)}$:

?i-?i?am-i\u00e3-?a?m CH 'He wants to hunt.'

ji:\u00e3'-?a?m CH 'He wants to run.' (< \u00e3-y\u00e3' < \u00e3-y\u00e3' < \u00e3-y\u00e3')

qa-qas\u00e3-?a?m-\u00e3-\u00e3-\u00e3 CH 'Do you want to play?'

\u00e3-\u00

It was quite difficult to elicit examples of this process, but MG and AD, at different occasions, uttered 'volitional' reduplication spontaneously (they are marked <spon> following the examples). Due to lack of sufficient data, much remains obscure. Detailed description must wait future research; just two problems concerning the formal process are pointed out here.

First, although it is difficult to state the exact phonemic shape of this suffix, it is probably -(?)am. The ? between a and m that Hagège writes was never heard; appearance and disappearance of the first ? remains also obscure (thus in parenthesis). (39)

Second, a few examples expressing 'volition' were elicited without reduplication, so that it is not certain whether -(7)am must be combined with C_1V - reduplication or not. For example, see the next contrasting pair, where the first one is not reduplicated, but the second one is. (40) No difference in the meaning, if there is any, could be elicited:

mək tamitas //mək -t-am-it-as// 'He wants to eat it.' (eat-CTL.TR-'volitional'-??-3SBJ) [mɔk tametas]
məmk tamitas //CV./mək -t-am-it-as// 'He wants to eat it.' (CV-eat-CTL.TR-'volitional'-??-3SBJ) [mʌmk tametas]
cf. mək tas 'He eats it.'

The existence of cases without reduplication leads one to speculate whether the suffix and reduplication may be two separate processes. C_1V - reduplication is perhaps indicating imperfective aspect, in which case, the translation of the above pair of examples should be *'he wants*

to eat it' and 'he wants to (be in the state of) eating it' respectively. No study has been carried out yet to confirm such speculation. Here are other examples without reduplication:

?i+tənam & 'I want to eat./I feel like eating.' [?i+tənəm&] cf. ?i+tən t0əm ?ə tə Janx ''I will eat the fish.' (eat 1sg.SBJ+FUT OBL DEM fish)

X'əčtam č 'I want to go to sleep.' <spon>MG [X'íčtamč] (X'əčt 'fall asleep')

On the other hand, one example was elicited with $C_1 \ni C_2 \cdot$ reduplication:

?əm?imaš?am č //CəC·/?imaš-(?)am č// 'I want to go for a walk.'
(CəC·walk-'volitional' 1sg.SBJ) [?ʎm?emrɑš?ʌmč] (?imaš 'walk')

It seems that this particular case is formed by attaching the suffix in question to a stem that has already undergone plural reduplication, i.e., ?am?imaš 'walking around'. This point is unclear because the same stem with C₁V· reduplication was also elicited:

?i?imaš?am č //CV-/?imaš-(?)am č// 'I want to go for a walk.'
[?t?temaš?amč]

Examples cited by Hagège were re-elicited as follow:

?i?a?masam //Ci-/?a?m-Vs-(?)am/ 'I want to go hunting.'
[?é-?a?ama-syem]
Jəyx'am tə cuy' //CV-/Jəx'-(?)am tə /cuj'/ 'The kid wants to run.'
(CV-run-'volitional' DEM child) [Jî:x'am tə cuy?]
qaqsimama cx* //CV?-/qsim?-(?)am-a cx*// 'Do you want to play?'
(CV?-play?-'volitional'-QN 2sg.SBJ) [qáqsema-macx*]
məmk*tamitas //CV-/mək*-t-(?)am-it-as// 'He wants to eat it.' (CV-eat-CTL.TR.?-'volitional'-??-3SBJ) [m/mk*ta-metas]
x*a? 8u8uhamas //x*a? CV-/8u(h)-(?)am-as// 'He doesn't want to go.'
(NEG C,V-go-'volitional'-3SBJ) [x*á? 8o*8o-hamas]**1)

10. Personal. Two numerals, 1 and 2, undergo C_1i - reduplication when counting persons:

pipa?a 'one person' [pépa?a] (pa?a 'one') sisa?a 'two persons' [sésa?a] (sa?a 'two')

With other numerals, =aya 'person?' is attached when counting persons, e.g. musaya 'four persons' (mus 'four').

11. Final Remarks. In this chapter ten types of reduplicative processes were discussed: plural, diminutive, diminutive plural, imperfective, $\cdot VC_2$, $C_1 \circ R' \cdot$, $C_1 \circ C_2 \cdot$, $C_1 \lor ? V \cdot V$, 'volitional'?, and personal. The present survey, however, is far from being exhaustive. There are still other types of reduplication yet to be studied $^{(42)}$, e.g.,

[Ji?i:X' ~ Ji?iyX'] 'running back and forth' MG, 'takes off suddenly, unexpectedly' EP cf. JəX' 'run' [JiX'], JəyX' 'running' [Ji:X']

[Jiʔi·Ji·Jix'] 'running around?'<spon> MG
[č'i·ʔi·c'i·c'i+] 'It's raining a little bit.' MG, EP
cf. c'ə+ 'rain' [c'i+], c'ic'+ 'raining' [c'ic'+]

There is a strong tendency, specially among the younger speakers, to use analytical means of expression rather than synthetic ones, such as reduplication. One cannot but feel that some, if not all, reduplicative processes will soon be irretrievably lost. There is no doubt, however, that reduplication plays an important role in Sliammon morphology, and that it needs to be studied before it is too late.

Notes

* This is an abridged version of my M.A. thesis (Watanabe 1994a). I am grateful to the following language consultants for sharing their knowledge with me: Mrs. Mary George, Mr. Dave Dominick, Mrs. Annie Dominick, and Mrs. Elsie Paul. They are refered to by their initials in this paper. For their comments on earlier versions of this work, I wish to thank Dr. Ronald C. Beaumont, Susan Blake, John Davis, Dr. Steve Egesdal, Dr. Brent Galloway, Dr. M. Dale Kinkade, Dr. Paul Kroeber, and Prof. Osahito Miyaoka; any shortcomings are of course my own responsibility. My research has been supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education (Monbusho), the International Scientific Research Program in the years 1990, 1992, and 1993. Fieldwork in the year 1991 was funded by the Jacobs Research Funds and the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society.

Abbreviations and symbols used in the present work are: [...] infix in morphophonemic representation (preceded by +), otherwise phonetic transcription; / root; · reduplication; = lexical suffix; CAU causative; CTL control; IMP imperative; INS instrumental; LIG ligature; Link link vowel; NCT noncontrol; NEG negative; NOM nominalizer; OBL oblique complement; PSV possessive; ptc particle; QN question marker; RCP reciprocal; RFL reflexive; STV stative; C any consonant; V any vowel; R any resonant. Other abbreviations and symbols are self-explanatory. Vowel length are indicated as [V-] half-long, and [V-] long. [-] is an indicator of raised articulation, [_] that of lowered.

The term Sliammon is used here as a cover term for the mainland dialect of Comox. All examples are elicited from MG unless indicated otherwise. Examples cited from other works on Sliammon or Island Comox are indicated by the researchers' initials.

- 1. The Sliammon phonemes are /p, (t0), t, (χ), c, (k), kw, q, qw ?, p', t'0, t', χ ', c', (k'), k'w, q', q'w, J, g, J'[7J], g'[7g], θ , s, t, s, xw, χ , χ w, h, m, n, (1), y, w, m', n', (1'), y', w', i, u, θ , a/. J' and g' are not ejectives; they realize as [7J] and [7g] respectively. The sequence [7J] and [7g], however, behave like single units. For discussions on postulating these two segments as phonemes see Watanabe (1994a. b).
- 2. It may be that the specific meaning of the plural reduplication is ambiguous, without any context, as to whether plural participants are involved or one participant is performing the action repetitively and/or distributionally.
- 3. I may have simply misheard the glottalization on č: the corre-

sponding non-reduplicated form is λ 'ačt 'fall asleep'. I cannot explain the change of the root vowel to a, but this may be yet another process. Cf. λ 'a λ 'ačtəm' 'falling asleep' [λ 'a λ 'ačtəm']

- 4. 3rd person object is not overtly marked, i.e., nap-is 'put it in'.
- There are at least two roots that may denote plurality of action by ablaut. If 'to spank s.o.' is understood (usually) to involve multiple slapping, then compare the following: sap't //sap'-t// 'to club / slap s.o.' (club-CTL.TR), sap'at //sap'-a-t// 'to spank s.o.' (spank-Link-CTL.TR). The other example: 8əxwtasut //8əxw-t-as-?ut// He stabbed him.' (stab-CTL.TR-3SBJ-PAST) [80x*tosot], 8ax*atas ///8əx*-a-t-as +[a]// 'He is stabbing it many times.' (stab-Link-CTL.TR-3SBJ +[a]) MG (spon). I mention this possibility because of parallel forms in Sechelt (another Coast Salish language) (Beaumont 1985): səp'ət 'slap (from one direction)', sap'at 'slap (back and forth)'. These are the only such examples found in Beaumont (1985). Ron Beaumont (p.c.), however, claims this process fairly productive in Sechelt, and kindly provided me with following additional examples: ts'áts'(V)q'ám 'punching', ts'áts'aq'əm 'punching all over the place'; x'áq'is 'sit (down)', x'áq'is 'all sit (down)(anywhere/all over the place)'; páx(V)t 'tear, rip s.t. (once)', paxat 'tear, rip up'; s-paxit 'has a rip / tear' (stative), s-páp(V)xit 'has tears / rips (all over)' (stative); qólom 'leak (canoe, roof, etc.)', qálqálam 'leaking everywhere' (pl. distributive).
- 6. John Davis (p.c.) reports that the word for 'native Indian' qaymix' has the distributive plural qayqaymix' or qayqaymix', and also the collective plural qayiwmix'. The third form seems to have infixed #Vg#.
- 7. Even where this affix is marked as an infix ([..]) in the following examples, further research may reveal that the stem can be analyzed so that the affix should be marked as a suffix.
- 8. Ja?Ji?əm is an irregular plural formed from JaJ'a 'tree'.
- 9. Sechelt -aw and -iw refer to the plurality of object in transitive and that of subject in intransitive (Beaumont 1985:86).
- 10. The English translation suggests that this glottalization may denote imperfective aspect. Glottalization of resonants is observed with a few forms which underwent C_1V imperfective reduplication (see 4). This example is the only one found so far in which glottalization alone may denote imperfective aspect.
- 11. I have not carried out systematic research on the speech of different generations. I can refer only to those few speakers under 50 years of age with whom I had chance to talk. But I believe younger speakers tend to employ analytical expressions.
- 12. DD rejected more reduplicated forms than MG did. It is difficult to say whether DD did not recognize them, or whether MG formed reduplication by analogy to words that may not have reduplicated forms.
- 13. Examples with an initial ?V sequence can be analyzed either as

undergoing C_1V reduplication with loss of the first vowel of the stem, or as showing ? insertion. E.g., ?a?ya 'small house' can be $/\!/\!CV$ -/?aya// or $/\!/\!/\!CV$ -?aya// I have analyzed such cases as undergoing C_1V -reduplication; this process is the most prevalent. There are only a few examples which can be analyzed only as showing ? insertion.

- 14. Stative aspect is marked on some words also by i insertion at the same position as in the diminutive, but that is likely to be an entirely different process.
- 15. However, 'small bullfrog' is the only example, found so far in Sliammon, of a word-internal resonant being glottalized in diminutive.
- 16. The following form was also recorded:

 *\hat{\text{X'i\text{X'a}}} \text{u} \text{u} \forall \text{Ci-\text{X'a\text{X'a}}} \text{u} \text{u} \forall \text{dog salmon.' [\text{X'\text{X'\text{V'\text{U'\text{Q'}}}}]} \text{ For the same word, Blake (1992:201) recorded \text{X'i\text{X'\text{V'\text{a}}}} \text{uyu\text{u'\text{ small dog salmon.}} \text{ Thus, it is not clear if the last consonant in 'dog salmon' is \text{ salmon'} \text{

//J// or //y//.

17. Apparently uttered by one of the Sliammon elders at a local soccer tournament in such a context as, "It's a nice day. Here we are, us old people, enjoying the soccer game." Later reported to me by MG.

This form is actually the diminutive plural reduplication discussed in the next section. For other forms meaning 'lots of elderly people', see 8. See also note 20.

- 18. MG said that it has negative connotation, but can also be said jokingly.
- 19. 'wife' is elicited as [sóttur ~ sóttur]. It is clearly related to $sattx^w$ 'woman', but as regards how is still unclear, though x^w and u alternate in certain positions (cf. Blake 1992).
- 20. $\lambda'a\chi ay$ most likely contains a lexical suffix #=ay# ('person'?) which may be the same as the one for 'tree'. Blake (1992) suggests that this suffix is perhaps better glossed as 'long or standing upright object'. This word is always translated as 'old', but corresponding $\cdot VC_z$ form is without the suffix: $\lambda'a\chi a\chi'$ 'get old' (see 5).
- 21. Perhaps the word for 'cat' can be analyzed also as a diminutive of non-occurring simplex form:

 mimaw' ??//Ci-/maw +[']// 'cat'
- 22. Non-reduplicated cognate forms are found in other Coast Salish languages, e.g.,
 Squamish: c'ək'\(^\mu\) 'worm' (Kuipers 1967)
 Halkomelem: t'\(^\mu\) 'worm' (Galloway p.c.)
- 23. 'small rabbits' was also elicited with $C_1i \cdot C_1 \ni C_2 \cdot$ reduplication: $tft \ni k^{\Psi}t \ni k^{\Psi}ti$
- 24. The change of the vowel quality cannot be explained.
- Hagège called it 'progressive'. The term 'imperfective' is used

following Davis (1970, etc.) and Kroeber (1988).

- $26.\ \ Non-reduplicated$ forms of the second and third example have not been recorded.
- 27. 'Characteristic or dispositional' is explained as follows in Galloway (1993: 297): "The aspect in Halkomelem indicates that an action is characteristic or habitual of the actor or that the actor has the disposition of doing the action repeatedly."
- 29. In the following examples, <spon> indicates that the Sliammon form was uttered spontaneously, and <txt> indicates that the form was attested in texts.
- 30. MG claimed that the C_1aC_2 reduplication is the "old way" of saying 'running around', the $C_1 \circ C_2$ reduplication "new way". It may be that $C_1 \circ C_2$ reduplication is formed by analogy with the plural reduplication.
- 31. This example with $C_1 \circ C_2$ reduplication was not well attested; its meaning is not clear. This is possibly the result of forced elicitation.
- 32. I checked the two forms involving 'itch' with EP. It seemed that the latter form (with $C_{1} \ni C_{2} \cdot$) could also mean 'itchy all over'. The difference between the two forms was not clear to me, however.
- 33. Paul Kroeber (p.c.) recorded a fair number of CV?V- reduplication, e.g., $/qi?i-qk^w-am/$ 'go and stop, go and stop' (from $/qak^wam/$ 'stop').
- 34. INTR #-?əm# has an allomorph /-a?am/ after roots that have lost their vowel.
- 35. See also $C_1i \cdot C_1 \ni C_2 \cdot$ reduplication of χ' axay in 2.2.
- 36. It is often difficult to determine if the vowel following ? is only an echo vowel or exists underlyingly. In this example, however, a following ? is fairly strong and long, and I believe it to exist underlyingly.
- 37. I have slightly converted Hagège's phonemic transcription to minimize differences from my own: e (CH) > i (HW), o > u. I also will not follow Hagège's elaborate juncture markers (+ for boundary between root and reduplication, etc.). His phonemic long vowels have been left as they are (thus, i: in two of the examples). 2sg.OBJ marker, which he writes $\theta\varepsilon$, has been converted to my transcription, θ i. (See Kroeber [1989] for problems in Hagège's transcriptions.) Translation from French is my own.
- 38. 'Spontaneous' means here the first (and immediate) answer to my

asking how to say 'I want to X'. My consultants usually recoursed to using xax', and they could form the process in question only after pondering for a while. When I read examples from Hagège, at least MG, DD, and AD recognized them immediately (and corrected my pronunciation), giving the same translation Hagège gave.

- 39. In Squamish, there is a suffix meaning 'to want': /-ai?/ usually followed by INTR /-m/ (Kuipers 1967:127). I do not know if this suffix is cognate with the Sliammon suffix in question. None of the ten examples with this suffix in Kuipers (ibid.) have reduplication.
- 40. Paul Kroeber (p.c.) also recorded relevant data without reduplication, e.g., /Ju?-am/ 'want to go home' PK (/Ju?/ 'go home').
- 41. Beaumont (1985:301) cites 'want to go (somewhere)' as tsútsá?əm in Sechelt. This is the only form found in Beaumont (1985) that may be of relevance to the 'volitional' reduplication discussed here. Ron Beaumont (p.c.), however, has found quite a few regular examples of this process: ?áqan-ám-čən 'I need / want to urinate.'

 t'ít'ilim-ám-čən 'I feel like singing.'
 c'ác'(V)x'am-ám-čən 'I want / intend to go hunting.' (c'áx'am 'hunt. sneak': c'ác'(V)x'am 'hunt (short trip)')
- 42. Furthermore, Davis (1971) reported the following examples that seem to have undergone C_1V reduplication. (I was unable to check these forms with my consultants.):

Juyxwet 'trying to vomit', Juxwet 'to vomit' JD Juy8et 'trying to push (it)', Ju8et 'to push (it)' JD Paul Kroeber (p.c.) has found a few forms with C12- reduplication: p'ap'8 'lots of dirty things' PK (p'e8 'dirty/black')

REFERENCES.

- Beaumont, Ronald, C. (1985): She Shashishalhem The Sechelt Language (Theytus Books, Penticton)
- Blake, Susan J. (1992): "Two Aspects of Sliammon (+6?aminqən) Phonology: Glide/Obstruent Alternation and Vowel Length", MA Thesis, The University of British Columbia
- Davis, John H. (1970a): "Some Phonological Rules in Mainland Comox", MA Thesis, University of Victoria
- ---- (1970b): "Notes on Mainland Comox Phonology", 5th ICSL
- ---- (1971): "Notes on Mainland Comox Phonology", Studies in Northwest Indian Languages, Publication of the Sacramento Anthropological Society 11 (12-31)
- Galloway, Brent (1993): A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem, University of California Publications in Linguistics 96 (University of California Press)
- Haeberlin, Herman K. (1918): "Types of Reduplication in the Salish Dialects", IJAL 1 (154-74)
- Hagège, Claude (1981): Le comox lhaamen de Colombie britannique: présentation d'une langue amérindienne (Amerindia, revue d'ethnolinguistique amérindienne, numéro spécial 2, Paris)
 Harris Harbert R. (1977): "A Grammatical Sketch of Comox" Ph D.
- Harris, Herbert R. (1977): "A Grammatical Sketch of Comox", Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Kansas
- Hess, Thomas M. (1966): "Snohomish Chameleon Morphology", IJAL 32 (350-6)

- Kroeber, Paul D. (1985): "Inchoatives in Mainland Comox", 20th ICSL ---- (1988): "Inceptive Reduplication in Comox and Interior Salishan", IJAL 54 (141-167)
- ---- (1989): Review of Hagège (1981), IJAL 55 (106-116)
- Sapir, Edward (1915): Noun Reduplication in Comox, a Salish Language of Vancouver Island (Canada Department of Mines, Geological Survey, Memoir 63, Government Printing Bureau, Ottawa)
- Thompson, Laurence C. (1979): "Salishan and the Northwest", in L. Campbell and M. Mithun (eds.), The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment (692-765) (University of Texas Press, Austin/London)
- ---- and M. Terry Thompson (1971): "Clallam: A Preview", in Jesse Sawyer (ed.), Studies in American Indian Languages, UCPL 65 (251-94)
- Watanabe, Honoré (1994a): "A Report on Sliammon Phonology and Reduplication", M.A. thesis, Hokkaido University
- --- (1994b): "A Report on Sliammon Phonology and Reduplication", in Osahito Miyaoka (ed.), Languages of the North Pacific Rim, Hokkaido University Publications in Linguistics 7 (Sapporo)