

Notes on the syntax of clause chaining in Thompson River Salish

Paul Kroeber

In a belt of languages running east to west across the Salish family, including all the languages of the Northern Interior subbranch (Shuswap, Thompson, Lillooet) and several of the Coast Salish languages (Sechelt, Squamish, Halkomelem, and Straits), a nominalized construction is used as a means of expressing sequential events; hereafter, I label this the "sequential" construction. I offer some preliminary observations here on the Thompson Salish (*niɛʔkɛpɔxɔ In*) sequential, concentrating on its syntactic rather than discourse properties -- especially interaction with clausal operators (tense, mood, negation) and with extraction. The topics discussed are somewhat miscellaneous, and conclusions are incomplete and tentative at best and may well be subject to change if and when I acquire further data; but the interim findings seem worth presenting by way of provoking discussion.

In Thompson, the noninitial clause in the sequential construction is introduced by a sort of deictic predicate, *ʔe* 'Introducer', which is also used to introduce the focus of cleft constructions.

- 1) *ʔe* *ɪ* s-məʔ-moʔɛc [ɪɪ e [ɪ k'ex-m]]
Int Art Nz-Pl-woman Art dry-Intr
"It's the ladies that dry (the meat)" [5.33]

In the sequential construction, the predicate following the Introducer is nominalized, taking prefix *s-* and replacing intransitive subject enclitics by possessive affixes. (Transitive verbs retain their usual subject and object suffixation, as is usual in nominalizations in Interior Salish.)

- 2) *ʔe* tuʔ xeʔ e s-puʔ-m-s.
Int from Dem Art Nz-exit-Intr-3Po
ʔe s-kic-e-s e k'wmi'·ʔmeʔ tə s'istkn.
Int Nz-arrive-Tr-3TSu Art small Obl+Art winter.house
"(And then) he went away from there. (Then) he got to a very small winter-house." (TL 214)

A variant of the construction, common in narrative, is introduced by the particle sequence *ʔu(?) ʔe* [Persistent Introducer].

- 3) *ʔu(?) ʔe* s-wik-c teʔe *ɪ* ce-citx* ...
Per Int Nz-see-Tr+3TSu Deic Art Pl-house
"and he saw there houses" (TL 204)

(The cleft introducer *c'e*, from *c-ʔe*, is not used as a mark of the sequential.)

The other Interior languages with a sequential construction also introduce it by a deictic, usually one that is also used as a cleft introducer, as with Lillooet *niɪ*. In Shuswap the sequential is introduced by a deictic, *yɪiʔ* or *ye*, but I am not sure that the former is used as a cleft introducer. In Squamish (Kuipers 1967: 210), deictic *niɪ* (a cleft introducer) is routinely omitted from the sequential construction -- though not obligatorily so -- leaving nominalization alone as the mark of the sequential. In Halkomelem and Straits, the cleft introducer never seems to appear; the sequential is marked by Nominalizer *s-* plus the Link proclitic (*ʔəwʔ-* (Halkomelem, Straits), or particle *ʔum* "then" (Sechelt) (Suttles, n.d., chapter 4, pp. 69-84; Beaumont 1985: 148; Montler 1986: 197).

In that the sequential clause (to be exact, what follows Introducer *ʔe*) bears formal marks of subordination although the semantics of the linkage seems more like coordination, the Salish construction is vaguely reminiscent of clause chaining constructions in (e.g.) Papuan languages. Unlike the SOV Papuan languages, to be sure, the apparently-subordinate clause is placed to the right of the main clause, not to the left. Also, no switch-reference system seems to be implicated, unlike typical Papuan clause chaining.

As we begin to consider interactions of the sequential with tense and related categories, with negation, with illocutionary force, and with extraction, it will be seen below that, at least some of the time, other interpretations of sequential constructions are available besides the "and (then)" sort of reading exemplified above. These other readings suggest that one or the other of the linked clauses is subordinate to the other (a: protasis in a conditional construction, as result or purpose clause). But I am not sure yet to what extent these different readings correspond to grammatically and structurally different constructions.

Form of the nominalized clause

The preliminary description of the sequential that I gave above should be revised in one respect. The nominalized clause that follows Introducer *ʔe* in its underlying form almost certainly begins with an article. When the sequence of clauses is realis (present or past tense, usually unmarked), the article is evidently Specific (*h*); the fact that usually no article is audible simply reflects the fact that (*h*)e is frequently reduced to zero, or at least hard to hear, when it follows a vowel (TL 145f.). That is to say, *ʔe s-q'ciyx-s* in the following example might really be have the structure in (4').

- 4) k'en-ks-ne *ɪ* n-sʔmkeyt cʔeyʔ l k siʔq't
take-hand-1sTSu Art 1sPo-niece now Obl Art day
ʔe s-q'ciyx-s
Int Nz-leave-3Po
"I shook hands with my niece today and she left" (spont.) [4.86KY]

- 4') [ʔe [ɪ (he) s-q'ciyx-s]
Art

This claim is supported by occasional instances in which an article is in fact audible. Though my data on the point is not extensive, it seems that this is likely to be the case when a constituent of some sort -- predicate enclitics, or a preposed deictic -- intervenes between Introducer *ʔe* and the nominalized clause, particularly a constituent not ending in a vowel. (Questions I will not investigate here are what elements may intervene between the Introducer and the nominalized clause, and when.)

- 5) nes *ɪ* Alice u ʔe ntewmn *ʔe* ʔeɪ ʔuʔe
go Art A. to Art store Int also Per Art
s-p'en't-s
Nz-return-3Po
"Alice went to the store and came back" <pr> [11.83DU]
- 6) *ʔu(?) ʔe* tuʔ xeʔe he s-puʔ-m-s tu *ɪ* citx*
Per Int from Deic Art Nz-exit-Intr-3Po from Art house
"and then he went out of the house" (TL 208 s.91)

Further evidence that an article introduces the nominalized clause emerges in irrealis contexts; see the next section.

If one accepts that the nominalized clause of the sequential construction is indeed introduced by an article, one might regard the nominalized clause as a complement clause -- complement clauses typically being introduced by articles in Thompson -- and the Introducer ?e as a sort of degenerate complement-taking predicate. (I will however continue to speak of ?e plus the following nominalized construction as a single clause.)

Effects of tense and modality (realis/irrealis, etc.) on the marking of sequential

When the sequence of clauses is interpreted as irrealis -- when, for example, the first clause is marked by the Future auxiliary x'u'y' -- an article, namely the Unrealized article k, does clearly intervene between Introducer ?e and the nominalized clause. (k is the article used on NPs in intensional contexts, etc.).

- 7) x'u'y' xe? k'en-s e Xzum ?e k
 Fut Deic take(-Tr)-3TSu Art big Int Art
 s-ne?e-s-c e k'mi?me?
 Nz-there-Tr-3TSu Art small
 "S/he will take the big one and leave the small one" [6.12KY]

This helps support the claim that there might be a concealed Specific article (h)e lurking after ?e in realis sequential constructions. An alternation between Specific (h)e (this time overt) in realis contexts and Unrealized k in irrealis contexts appears elsewhere in the language, for example in prepositional phrases expressing adverbial notions of manner, number of repetitions, etc.:

- 8) a. q'azix kn t e mus
 jump lsISu Obl Art four
 "I jumped four times" [9.23MJ]
 b. x'u'y' kn q'azix t k mus
 Fut lsISu jump Obl Art four
 "I'm going to jump four times" [9.23MJ]

Further examples of Future sequential:

- 9) a. x'u'y' n'em'ix n i nx?iyxtn ?e k s-x'əst-s
 Fut get.in in Art airplane Int Art Nz-go.home-3Po
 "She is going to get in an airplane and go home" [4.86KY]
 b. x'u'y' kn siq'-sip' ?e k s-q'əz-t-ene
 Fut lsISu chop-wood Int Art Nz-use-Tr-lsTSu
 iə q'wisqn
 Art axe
 "I'm going to chop wood and I'll use an axe, -- I'll use the axe to chop wood" <spont.> [7.152KY]

Another sort of irrealis context is that in which the whole construction is introduced by (?e) Anticipatory (occasionally he for some speakers), denoting a possible future event rather than a certain or definitely intended one.

- 10) ?e q9'əp kn we? e k n-s-Xan'i
 Ant slip lsISu Deic Int Art lsPo-Nz-hurt
 "I might slip and get hurt" [4.164KY]

Sequentials with apparently subordinative interpretation: conditional

Sequential constructions beginning with the Anticipatory particle often translate conditionals ("if X happens, then Y will happen"); the first "conjunct" may also be translated as a future time clause.

- 11) a. ?e tətə? k s-tekli-c (?e k n-s-x'wesit
 Ant not Art Nz-rain-3Po Int Art lsPo-Nz-walk
 "If it doesn't rain, I'll walk" [4.147KY]
 b. e mem?əi kn ?e k n-s-q'ciyx u
 Ant rest lsISu Int Art lsPo-Nz-leave to
 e ?s-txiie wn
 Art Stv-lively lsCj
 "When I'm rested I'm going to (get up and) go be lively (lit. go where I'm lively)" <spont.> [4.170KY]

But sequentials with this form do not always have a conditional interpretation (see (10)). It seems possible, therefore, that the conditional interpretation is some sort of implicature, and that what a sequential construction beginning with the Anticipatory really conveys semantically is simply two sequenced situations under the same future possibility operator: "it might be the case that (i) it won't rain and (ii) I'll walk".

The full range of construction types that allow or require interpretation as noncounterfactual conditionals seems to be as follows. The protasis is always marked by (?e) Anticipatory (which is not limited to conditionals, however). If the protasis precedes the apodosis, the protasis may be Indicative (1st person sing. intransitive subject enclitic kn, 3rd person ŋ, etc.) or Conjunctive (1st person sing. intransitive subject enclitic wn, 3rd person us, etc.), and the second clause is usually a sequential nominalization introduced by ?e k. I detect no meaning difference between indicative and conjunctive conditionals; the difference is that the conjunctive in the first clause of a sequential construction seems to force interpretation as a conditional (rather than "and then"). (That suggests that the sequential with conjunctive first clause might be a different construction from the ordinary sequential.)

- 12) a. ?e tekli us ?e k n-s-?uix'
 Ant rain 3Cj Int Art lsPo-Nz-enter
 "If it rains I'll go inside" [11.62DU]
 b. ?e tekli ?e k n-s-?uix'
 Ant rain Int Art lsPo-Nz-enter
 "(ditto)" <pr> [11.62f.DU]
 13) ?e cu-nwé-n'-ne ws xe?e ?e k s-cu-t-éne
 Ant do-NC-Tr-lsTSu Cj Deic Int Art Nz-do-Tr-lsTSu
 "If I can (know how), I'll fix it" [8.163KY]

Occasional indicative apodoses occur. (I do not know whether the protasis must be conjunctive in that case.)

- 14) ?e tekʔ us xʷuy' kn ?uixʷ
 Ant rain 3Cj Fut 1s1Su enter
 "If it rains, I'll go inside" <pr> [11.63DU]

The (nominalized) apodosis may be interpreted as something like an imperative.

- 15) ?e qʔaz uxʷ e k eʔ-s-cútx
 Ant tired 2sCj Int Art 2sPo-Nz-11e.down
 "Go lie down if you're tired" [7.61KY]

If the protasis follows the apodosis, the protasis is always in conjunctive form and the apodosis is indicative, not a nominalization.

- 16) a. xʷuy' kn ?uixʷ ?e/he lekʔ us
 Fut 1s1Su enter Ant rain 3Cj
 "I'm going inside if it rains" [11.63DU]
- b. xʷuy' cu-t-énc ?e cu-nwé-n'-ne ws
 Fut do-Tr-1sTSu Ant do-NC-Tr-1sTSu 3Cj
 "If I can (know how), I'll fix it" <pr> [8.163KY]
- c. ?e nes kʷ 9ʷuy't ?e qʔaz uxʷ
 Ant go 2s1Su sleep Ant tired 2sCj
 "Go sleep if you're tired" [7.61KY]

Sequentials with apparently subordinative interpretation: purpose/result

In the examples of irrealis sequentials above (whether interpreted as conditionals or not), both clauses evidently have the same time reference. But it is also possible for first and second clauses to differ in time reference: specifically, it is possible to have a realis first clause (not Future, not Anticipatory, etc.) followed by a second clause which is marked as irrealis by the Unrealized article *k*. In such constructions, the second clause evidently means something like "with the probable future result that ...". (I suspect purpose interpretations are possible too, but find I have no unambiguous data on the point.)

- 17) a. zuc't xeʔe tə k xʷeʔpft e k s-c9ap-s
 tight Deic Att Art clothes Int Art Nz-rip-3Po
 "The clothes are tight and they'll rip" <spont.> [13.143KY]
- b. cuném'e-cm-s xeʔe ?e k s-cu-nwé-n'-ne k'ətk'ətnim'
 show-1sOb-3TSu Deic Int Art Nz-do-NC-Tr-1sTSu catch.fish
 "He showed me so that I know how to catch fish" [4.51KY]
- c. ɛp-ne k n-s-txʷəp tə k siaʔXáns
 forget-1sTSu Art 1sPo-Nz-buy Obl Art food
 ?e k n-s-zoqʷXn
 Int Art 1sPo-Nz-starve
 "I forgot to get food and I'll starve" <semi-spont.> [6.62KY]

Of course, a purpose interpretation may also be plausible in many cases where the first clause is marked as irrealis by the Future auxiliary or Anticipatory particle; and a result interpretation is plausible for many completely realis sequentials. (However, in most of the examples cited earlier where both first and second clauses are irrealis (7, 9-11), it does

not seem too plausible to attribute a result or purpose interpretation to the second clause.)

At present I cannot say for certain whether the differences of interpretation among sequential constructions ("and (then)", conditional, result/purpose) correspond to structural differences of some sort. One might guess that ordinary "and then" sequentials have a sort of conjoined structure, while in purpose/result sequentials the second clause is subordinated to the first, but I cannot prove this.

Negation

The negator *təteʔ* (*təm(e)* .. *teʔ* or *te* .. *teʔ* when hosting enclitics or affixes) acts as a complement-taking predicate; it is followed by a nominalized complement clause introduced by the Unrealized article *k*. I have collected few examples of negation in sequential constructions; but what evidence there is shows the negator with varied scope relations. One example suggests that it is possible for both first and second clauses of a sequential construction to be under the scope of a single negator.

- 18) təteʔ k s-c'ew'-e-s tə k y'e ?e k
 not Art Nz-wash-Tr-3TSu Obl Art good Int Art
 s-kiəp-s xeʔ e c'ew'stn
 Nz-come.off-3Po Deic Art soap
 "She didn't wash (the plates) well and get the soap off (so the soap came off)" <spont.> [13.17KY]

One might wish to interpret the second clause as a result clause ("... so that the soap came off"), rather than as analogous to a conjoined clause; but in either case, it is implied that the soap wasn't gotten off (the next sentence in the discourse was "I might get poisoned!"). Though this example seems clear enough in its interpretation, it would be desirable to collect more such examples.

However, it is also clearly possible for the negator to take only one clause of the sequential construction in its scope. This is obvious when the negator is in the second clause, as in the following rephrasing of the previous example.

- 19) n-c'ew'-e-s xeʔ neʔ ɛ n-ʔimc e szelt
 Loc-wash-Tr-3TSu Deic Deic Art 1sPo-grandchild Art dish
 e s-tem-s teʔ k s-c'ew'-e-s e
 Int Nz-not-3Po Ptc Art Nz-wash-Tr-3TSu Art
 c'ew'stn lu weʔ tə k c'Xəp
 soap from Deic Obl Art clean
 "My granddaughter washed the dishes and then didn't rinse the soap of: good" [7.68KY]

There are also cases where a negator before the first clause clearly does not take the second clause of the sequential in its scope. (Many examples of this I have noted have the second clause introduced by *ʔuʔ* (*?e*) instead of just *?e*. I do not know yet whether that fact has anything to do with the interpretation of the negation.)

- 20) təteʔ k s-k'wen'-s-c ʔuʔ s-Xətg-et-és
 not Art Nz-watch-Tr-3TSu Per Nz-hole-Tr-3TSu
 ɛ smʔic'eʔ
 Art cloth
 "S/he wasn't watching what s/he was doing, and made a hole in the

cloth" [5.1MJ]

Here the second clause is not negated; it is clearly implied that a hole was made.

- 21) (tə)te? k əs-ʔək-st-es le? k ste?
not Art (Nz-)Stv-know-Tr-3TSu Ptc Art what
ʔ'u? e s-pʔ'eɪ-cɪn-s
Per Int Nz-foolish-mouth-3Po
"S/he didn't know anything and s/he said something foolish." [6.31KY]

(Compare also one of the conditional examples cited earlier [1a].)

Illocutionary force

It seems to be possible for both first and second clauses to be within the scope of an illocutionary force operator such as the Imperative or the Interrogative. In such cases, the overt marking of the operator is on the first clause, while the second clause is irrealis in form (i.e. introduced by ʔe k); moreover, the truth of the second clause is fairly clearly not presupposed. It must be admitted, however, that my examples are not such as to conclusively rule out a result or purpose interpretation for the second clause.

- 22) a. n-xʔes-et-e xʔe e k eʔ-s-n-k'ɪʔ-m ne?
Loc-grease-Tr-2sImv Deic Int Art 2sPo-Nz-Loc-fry-Intr Deic
"Grease (the pan) to fry in it" [4.129KY]
- b. sexʔm-xe ʔe k eʔ-s-méɪx
bathe-2sImv Int Art 2sPo-Nz-rest
"Take a bath and rest" [7.38MJ]
- 23) cke? k eʔ-[s-]səxʔm e k eʔ-s-méɪx
Q Art 2sPo-Nz-bathe Int Art 2sPo-Nz-rest
"Did you take a bath and rest?" [7.67KY]

I have not noted examples in which the illocutionary force operator clearly applies to only one of the clauses in a sequential construction: behavior contrasting with that of negation.

Another irrealis context

The Quotative particle ekʔu, if it encliticizes to the Introducer, seems to induce the Unrealized article k. (The Quotative may encliticize to the following nominalized predicate, in which case there is no k.)

- 24) ʔ'u(?) ʔ(e) ekʔu k s-cut-s
Per Int Quot Art Nz-say-3Po
"And they say he said to himself" (TL 218 s.214)

Extraction from sequential constructions

One would like to know whether the sequential construction or the clauses that make it up constitute islands for the purposes of extraction (wh-movement). It does seem to be the case that elements can be extracted

from the first clause of a sequential construction, although as the evidence stands it is not quite clear how to interpret this fact. My data at the moment is limited to cleftlike constructions with an initial focused element; I have no examples of extraction from sequential constructions in more relative-clause-like environments.

(Note: I assume that in cleft constructions and similar focusing constructions, the focus is base-generated in sentence-initial position and is in fact a predicate. What follows the focus is a headless relative clause; wh-movement (if you believe in that) is wh-movement of a null operator within the subordinate clause only (the subordinate clause then being related by predication to the focus), not movement of the focus itself.)

First, examples of extraction of an object from the first clause.

- 25) a. ste? tə k mɪɪm k ʔuqʔeʔ-n-xʔ ʔe
what Att Art medicine Art drink-Tr-2sTSu Int
ʔ-s-y'e-wɪʔx
2sPo-Nz-good-Dvl
"What kind of medicine did you drink to get better?" [13.185KY]
- b. y'e tə k mɪɪm e ʔuqʔeʔ-ne ʔe
good Att Art medicine Art drink 1sTSu Int
n-s-y'e-wɪʔx
1sPo-Nz-good-Dvl
"I drank a good medicine and got better" <spont> [13.186KY]
- c. ste? (xeʔe) tə k sɪəʔxɪns k ʔuʔi-n-xʔ
what (Deic) Att Art food Art eat-Tr-2sTSu
e s-qʔnoʔxʔ-e-e
Int Nz-sick-Tr-2sOb+3TSu
"What kind of food did you eat and it made you sick?" <pr>
[15.37KY]

Nominalization of the second clause is evidently not an effect of extraction. What data I have suggests that when mɪɪm "medicine" acts as a causal oblique modifier of y(')e-wɪʔx "get better", it seems to require the locative preposition tu(?) "from", not the general Oblique preposition t (as far as my data now extend, anyway).

- 26) a. ye-wɪʔx kn tuw e mɪɪm
good-Dvl 1s1Su from Art medicine
"I got better from the medicine" [14.47f.DU]
- b. *ye-wɪʔx kn t e mɪɪm
good-Dvl 1s1Su Obl Art medicine
[14.47f.DU]

And when the oblique is extracted from such a clause, it induces Conjunctive marking on the governing predicate (here marked by the 2nd person singular Conjunctive enclitic uxʔ). (Use of the Conjunctive is typical for extractions of locative-type obliques, while extraction of a t oblique would induce nominalization. Positioning of the locative preposition variably before the focus or before the headless relative clause is expectable in locative focusing constructions.)

- 27) a. tu k ste? k ye-wɪʔx uxʔ
from Art what Art good-Dvl 2sCj

"What did you get better from? (what medicine, not what disease)"
<pr> [14.48DU]

- b. ste? tə k mlamn tə k ye-wf?x uxw
what Att Art medicine from Art good-Dvl 2sCj
"What medicine did you get better from?" <semi-pr> [14.48DU]
- c. *ste? k e?-s-ye-wf?x
what Art 2sPo-Nz-good-Dvl
[14.48DU]

In short, it seems to be the case that extraction in (25) really affects the first clause of the construction; there is no reason to suppose that across-the-board extraction is involved. It is not perfectly clear, however, whether the extraction is entirely within the first clause --

[[ste? tə k mlamn k ?uqwe?-n-xw] [e ?e ?-s-y'e-wf?x]]

-- or whether the focus might be outside the entire sequential construction:

[ste? tə k mlamn [[k ?uqwe?-n-xw] [e ?e ?-s-y'e-wf?x]]]

The second structure (or some variant of it) seems to allow better for the implication that the event described by the last clause is the result of the event described by the preceding clause. (See also remarks on locative extraction from sequential, below.) It might seem likely too that the availability of a result interpretation for the second clause (and thereby a subordinate rather than coordinate status for that clause?) facilitates extraction from the first; but a result interpretation is not readily available for the second clause of at least the following example:

- 28) ste? k p'en't-st-xw u ʔ ntewmn ʔe ?-s-xwəst
what Art return-Tr-2sTSu to Art store Int 2sPo-Nz-go.home
"What did you take back to the store and then come home?" <pr>
[14.65DU]

(This point requires further checking, however.)

A little evidence is available suggesting that it is not permissible to extract from a true conditional clause -- one in postposed position.

- 29) ?*ste? tə k mlamn k x'uy' kw y'e-wf?x
what Att Art medicine Art Fut 2sISu good-Dvl
e ?uqwe?-n-xw us
Ant drink-Tr-2sTSu Cj
("What medicine will you get better if you drink (it)??") [13.186KY]

But I do not know yet whether conditional interpretations are ruled out in case of extraction from the first sentence of a sequential construction.

I have recorded a single example of extraction of a nonlocative oblique (one of the type that would be introduced by t) from a sequential construction -- specifically, an instrument. As expected in extractions of nonlocative obliques, the first sentence is nominalized.

- 30) ste? xe?e ne?e k s meλ'-n-xw e sq'wyt e
what Deic Deic Art Nz-mix-Tr-2sTSu Art berry Int
s-k'qap-s
Nz-get.thick-3Po

"With what did you mix the berries and/so that they set (got thick)?"
[15.38KY]

It also seems to be possible to extract a locative from the first part of sequential, which then takes Conjunctive form (the normal form when locatives are extracted).

- 31) n hen' e xwi? ut laqix e k s-wik-m-kt
at where Art Fut lpCj sit Int Art Nz-see-1pPo
tə k y'e
Obl Art good
"Where shall we sit so we can see well?" [15.06KI]

(Note that in this example the last clause of the sequential construction is fairly clearly within the scope of interrogative illocutionary force: the sentence does not imply that we will see well regardless of where we sit; rather it implies that whether we see well or not depends on where we choose to sit.)

All examples so far have been of extraction from the first clause of sequential constructions. I do not know yet whether extraction from noninitial clauses of the sequential is possible. Preliminary evidence suggests that there might be a ban on across-the-board extraction from all clauses of a sequential construction at once.

- 32) ?*ste? k ʔaz-n-xw e s-q'əz-t-əxw
what Art buy-Tr-2sTSu Int Nz-use-Tr-2sTSu
("What did you buy and use?") [15.39KY]

If this is really the case, it indicates that even sequential construction with coordination-like semantics do not involve coordination in syntactic structure.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

1,2,3 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; Ant = anticipatory; Article = article; Att = attributive; Cj = conjunctive; Deic = deictic; Dvl = developmental; Fut = future; Imv = imperative; Indir = indirective; Int = introducer; Intr = intransitivizer; ISu = subject of intransitive; NC = noncontrol; Nz = nominalizer; Ob = object; Obl = oblique; p = plural; Po = possessive; Prog = progressive; Ptc = particle; Q = yes/no question; Quot = quotative; Rdp = reduplication; Rln = relational transitivizer; s = singular; Stv = stative; Tr = transitivizer; TSu = subject of transitive. Morphemes that are reduced to zero by phonological processes will often not be indicated in transcription or morpheme glosses unless their underlying presence is relevant to the discussion (in which case they will be indicated in the transcription by 0).

Examples taken from Thompson and Thompson 1992 are followed by TL plus a page number; I have sometimes modified morpheme divisions, translations, and morpheme glosses of these either to bring them into accord with my usage in the rest of this paper or to omit indications of structure that is irrelevant to the subject of discussion. Other examples are from my field notes. The notation <pr> means that the example sentence was prompted by me; <spont.> means that the example was volunteered by the consultant (not as a translation of an English sentence). /ʔ/ = voiced pharyngeal resonant. My transcription omits marking of stress that falls on the leftmost nonschwa vowel of a word.

REFERENCES

- Beaumont, Ronald C. *The shashishalhem: The Sechelt language*. Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books.
- Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. *The Squamish language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. *The Shuswap language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Montler, Timothy. 1986. *An outline of the morphology and phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Suttles, Wayne. n.d. (ms.) *Musqueam grammar*.
- Thompson, Laurence C., & M. Terry Thompson. 1992. *The Thompson language*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- TL = Thompson & Thompson 1992.
- van Eijk, Jan. 1985. *The Lillooet language*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.