

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON SALISH LANGUAGES
August 28-29, 1967
Seattle, Washington

DEICTICS IN COLUMBIAN: A WORK PAPER¹

M. Dale Kinkade

The University of Kansas

- 0. Introduction
- 1. Columbian
 - 2.1. Kalispel
 - 2.2. Coeur d'Alene
- 3. Conclusions

0. The deictics, or demonstratives, of Interior Salish (IS) languages consist basically of a three-way system indicating position near the speaker, position somewhat removed from the speaker, and position remote from the speaker. The base morphemes for the three positions are usually cognate in IS languages (as will be indicated later), but the possibilities of development and expansion of the basic system, and the affixed elements used to expand the system, differ in the individual languages. These various expansions create an elaborate and complex system of deictics which allow much finer and more precise indications of position than is possible in English; many of the distinctions are quite difficult to translate into English, and informants usually simply say that certain terms mean the same thing. Distinctions corresponding to English adjectival (this, that) and adverbial (here, there) demonstratives may be made by differing expansions of the same base morphemes; in fact, these distinctions are not always or clearly made.

The main system to be discussed here is that found in Columbian (Cm). Pre-

cise translation of terms will not always be possible, but differences and contrasts can nevertheless be observed. The system presented is almost certainly not complete, as indicated by certain paradigmatic lacunae, and by comparison with developmental possibilities in closely related languages. Comparison will be made with these other languages (specifically Kalispel (Ka) and Coeur d'Alene (Cr)), and additional types of development noted.

1. The base morphemes in Cm are *xa? near the speaker, *ci? away from the speaker, and *tuw' remote from the speaker. These do not occur alone, but are always accompanied by at least one incremental element. The initial consonants of these forms remain constant, but the vowels sometimes change, either as a reduction to /ə/ resulting from a shift of stress (this reduction does not always occur), or to another vowel by analogy with related forms. The simplest occurring forms are those with a prefixed ?a- or l-; those with ?i'-also regularize the base vowels to /a/.

The forms with ?a- were usually translated as this or that: ?axá? this, ?ací that, ?aúw' that. Examples in context are: ?incúl ?axá? this is mine, na?wéxənálq^w +u'xəxpás ?axá? ttu'wít this boy will be tall when he grows (na?-future, wéxənálq^w tall, +u- when, xəxp- grow, ttu'wít boy); swát ?ací? sqəltəmíx^w who is that (or this) man (with you)? (literally, who that man), nle'wálq^wpcx^wta? ?acíx'cín bridle me that horse! (-cx^w you, subj.-me, obj., -ta? imperative sg., xə'cín horse); swát ?aúw' sqəltəmíx^w who is that man?, kəla?ká ?atuw' skínt where is that Indian from? (skínt Indian), xə'cín ani hamp ?atuw' ttu'wít the horse threw the boy. The emphasis in these examples is on elements other than the demonstratives. These forms with ?a- are probably the weakest demonstrative forms; sometimes the demonstrative was not translated as such (or at all), indicating a use approximating a definite

article--the closest Cm comes to having an article. Examples of even weaker use than the above are: kṗáxənta? ʔaci? máciš strike a match! (páx- scratch); ǰwá+stəmsta? ʔaci? ʔinǰw+tax'cínṭən pack your pack-horse!; ciṗápep ʔaci? ǰiýmíntən paper rustling (ǰiýmíntən paper from ǰiý- write).

The forms with ʔí- are the emphatic demonstratives: ʔíxa? here! (as when handing someone something), ʔíca? right there! (pointing), ʔíta? there! (more remote). They may also be translated as this or that. Their force may be diminished somewhat, but is still emphatic, when used with a noun or verb: ʔíxa? stxwú! this house, stám ʔíxa? what's this?; ǰiílx ʔíca? or tiyáx ʔíca? they (fish) are swimming upstream (there); ʔíta? ʔacwáxwàx stxwú! that bunch (camp) of houses, those houses. Greater emphasis can be achieved by adding other derivatives of the same base: kəntúw ʔíta? or kəntúwát ʔíta? way over there!

Forms with l-, kəl-, kən-, and -át are more difficult to distinguish from one another. Several of these are often said to have the same meaning, as when kəlci?, ltuw, ltuwát, kəntúw, and kəntúwát were given one day as being equivalent forms all meaning over there. Much of the difficulty in giving adequate translations for these is a result of having insufficient examples of them in context; I have some only as isolated forms. But their structures indicate a difference, and the already indicated distinction between *ci? and *tuw further helps to separate forms given the same English translation.

Most of these incremental elements (l-, kəl-, kən-, -át) are not clearly relatable to other elements in the language. There is a prefix l- which can occur with various verbs, but the meaning of which is unclear; it may indicate permanence (in which case it would contrast nicely with kəl-, which indicates motion): lckícx he came back home (to stay) (from kíc- arrive, sq., c-

toward speaker; the only difference between $ckícx$ and $lckícx$ seems to be that the latter return is specified as permanent), $lkwííx$ leave, go away (from $kwííx$ get away), $lkwá-$ take something back (from $kwán-$ take, hold). There is also a particle (preposition) l , usually best translated by in. The two may be related, but the $l-$ with deictics seems to be more in accord with the prefix $l-$ than with the particle: $qésPAY? lXá? ?astáqíx$ he used to stay here ($qésp$ old, the past, $-ay?$ past tense, $táq-$ sit, sq.), $hámP lXá? kwá? kántúw'$ it dropped here and there; $lCí? ?acwáx$ he lives over there. $lúw'$ (and $lúwát'$) seems to be less commonly used than $lXá?$ and $lCí?$; in its place, one gets $kántúw'$ (and $kántúwát'$), as in the example above where $lXá?$ and $kántúw'$ would not appear to be exactly parallel. $lúw'$ and $lúwát'$ were suggested to informants on the analogy of $lXá?$, $lXá?át'$, $lCí?$, and $lCí?át'$, and they were readily accepted (and translated as over there), but have not appeared as regularly volunteered forms (in or out of context).

$kán-$ cannot be associated with any other known element in the language. It occurs only prefixed to $*túw'$. Analogical forms with $*xa?$ and $*ci?$ ($*kánXá?$, $*kánXá?át'$, $*kánCí?$, $*kánCí?át'$) were suggested to informants, but were rejected. There may be a tendency to replace $lúw'$ and $lúwát'$ with $kántúw'$ and $kántúwát'$, whatever the origin of the latter forms may be, and in spite of the lack of symmetry with the forms with $l-$. Another unique characteristic of $kántúw'$ and $kántúwát'$ is their cooccurrence with other deictics-- i.e., if two deictics occur together, one must be a form with $kán-$: $kántúw' ?íta?$ or $kántúwát' ?íta?$ way over there. Other examples of $kántúw'$ are: $kántúw' ?acwáx$ he lives over there (presumably further away than $lCí? ?acwáx$, although both were translated the same), $scéŋwalwísux^w kántúw'$ he's visiting there (at so-and-so's).

¹kəl- as a prefix to a deictic element always indicates motion to or toward a position, and is a bound form of the particle (preposition) ¹kəl to, into. Examples of its occurrence are: ¹kəlxaʔ kasckícxux^w it's coming here (kas- future); ¹kəlciʔ kənkasnúx^wtux^w I'm going there (kən- I); ¹kəltúw¹ was translated simply as over there.

The suffix -áʔ can be added to any of the forms with one of the three prefixes l-, kən-, and ¹kəl-, but no difference in meaning from forms without it has been ascertained. This suffix has been found nowhere else. Examples of its occurrence are: lxaʔáʔ here; tət ǰésp kənlciʔáʔ or q^wémʔ kənlciʔáʔ stay in one place (there) a long time (tət straight, right, ǰésp old, the past, q^wémʔ a long time or distance; kən- is probably I, although the phrases were not translated as though this were the case), lciʔáʔ or lciʔáʔayʔ the same place (-ayʔ past tense); ltuwáʔ over there, kəntuwáʔ ʔítaʔ over there!, kəntuwáʔ kasckícxux^w it's going there; kəlxaʔáʔ over here; scəʔwalwísux^w kənlciʔáʔ he's visiting there (at so-and-so's); kəltuwáʔ over there.

As can be seen from various examples given, these demonstratives are usually used adverbially. But they may also be verbal, as was hinted at by the suggestion that the kən- in the phrases tət ǰésp kənlciʔáʔ and q^wémʔ kənlciʔáʔ is a personal subject marker. Another verbal usage is created by prefixing s- and suffixing -¹vənəm to the base. The stressed vowel of the suffix is a repetition of the base vowel. The forms thus created indicate general direction (rather than location or specific direction, as in all forms given above): scxaʔánəm this way (c- toward the speaker), sciʔínəm that way, stúʔúnəm that way. These may be further expanded by the additional suffix -ákst (*sciʔínəmákst was not obtained, but its absence was not noted in time to try to elicit it; there is no reason to doubt its existence), but no dif-

ference in meaning could be found. Two other -ákst suffixes are known to occur, but are of no help in explaining this usage; one is a lexical suffix meaning hand, arm, and the other is of uncertain meaning. Instances of the occurrence of these forms are: scxa?ánəm (or scxa?ànəmákst) stasnúx^wtux^w coming this way; sci?ínəm kənkasnúx^wtux^w I'm going there (that way), sci?ínəm ?ascúq^wəm he's pointing that way; stu?únəm (or sktu?ùnəmákst) stasnúx^wtux^w going that way.

One other systematic type of expansion of a deictic base has been found, but only with *xa? and *ci?: ?a?íxa soon, hurry, and ?a?íca fresh, new, recent; a suggested *?a?íta was rejected. The meanings here appear to be radically changed, but can be explained as a transference of the usual spatial usage to a temporal sense: near the speaker in time, away from the speaker in time (but not remotely). Examples of their usage are: ?a?íxa?kascyá pmíx they are coming soon (kas- future, c- toward the speaker, yá?p- come, pl.), ?a?íxata? hurry up! (-ta? imperative sg.); ?a?íca snanúx^wtən fresh tracks.

A paradigmatic arrangement of the forms given so far yields the following:

*xa?	*ci?	*tu ^w
?axá? <u>this</u>	?ací <u>that person</u>	?atú ^w <u>that person</u>
?íxa? <u>here!, this</u>	?íca? <u>there!, that</u>	?íta? <u>(over) there!, that</u>
!xá? <u>here</u>	!cí? <u>there</u>	!tú ^w <u>over there</u>
!xa?át <u>here</u>	!ci?át <u>there</u>	!tuwát <u>over there</u>
--	--	!kəntú ^w <u>over there!</u>
--	--	!kəntuwát <u>over there!</u>
!kəlxá? <u>(to) here</u>	!kəlcí? <u>(to) there</u>	!kəltú ^w <u>over there</u>
!kəlxá?át <u>over here</u>	!kəlcí?át <u>there</u>	!kəltuwát <u>over there</u>

scxaʔánəm	<u>this way</u>	sciʔínəm	<u>there, that way</u>	stuʔúnəm	<u>that way</u>
scxaʔanmákst	<u>this way</u>			sktuʔunmákst	<u>that way</u>
ʔaʔíxa	<u>soon, hurry</u>	ʔaʔíca	<u>fresh, new</u>	--	

1.1. There are a number of other forms unsystematically derived from the deictic bases. These are rather different sorts of derivatives, and mainly employ lexical suffixes. kəntaʔ- is the commonest stem used in these derivatives, and indicates the side of some natural feature or obstacle opposite the speaker. These forms are: sxaʔámux^w I'm local (-ámx people, -ux^w resident), nxaʔámxcín the local language or people (= Columbian, their name for themselves and their language; -cín mouth, language); páñací the same time (pan- time); tkəl+aʔ+niwt on the other side (-a)+niwt alongside); tkəntaʔ+niwt on the other side; kəntaʔáp other side (-áp foot, lower end); kəntaʔíken the other side of a ridge (-íken back); tkəntaʔíken on the other side; tkəntaʔqín the other side of a hill (-qín head); nkəntəʔús the other side of a road (-ús road); stkəntəʔálq^wux^w Canadian: "other side of the line" (-álq^w something long); nkəntaʔúlux^w and sklnkəna+úw across the canyon (-úlux^w soil, earth); kənkəna+úw across a river. The last two examples do not involve lexical suffixes, but use various prefixes. (s-, t-, and n- are all rather general and very common derivational prefixes.) One more form seems to belong to this list, but is temporal rather than spatial: kəntəʔásqt the day after (-ásqt day), as in ʔáyʔkwást | kəntəʔásqt day after tomorrow (ʔáyʔkwást tomorrow).

1.2. The interrogative (or indefinite) deictic base is *-káʔ. It is not found with the paradigmatic developments of the other deictics, and is included here only for the sake of completeness. It has three forms: làʔkáʔ where? (independently, and in lút làʔkáʔ nowhere and yaʔtú làʔkáʔ anywhere), kəlaʔkáʔ to where (kəl to), and pənkáʔ when? (pan- time).

2. Comparison with other IS languages shows considerable uniformity in the form of the base morphemes. Some different affixes are used, however, and other developments occur (especially in Cr) which have not been found in Cm (although they may well occur there; no attempt has been made to elicit them). Also notable may be a more general tendency to use certain forms of the deictics more or less as articles; this also occurs in Cm, but seems to be less common than in Ka or Cr. Comparison will be made with Ka, using Vogt,² and with Cr, using Reichard.³ Only two or three Colville forms are available to me.

2.1. Vogt gives three demonstratives for Ka: *yé*, *cí*, and *tu?*. In addition, he cites a form *šé?i*, which "refers to object, time or space, and seems to correspond to all the adjectival pronouns *yé?* this, *cí* that, *tu?* the etc." (p. 28). This form is probably cognate with Cm **xa?*, but has been generalized for a somewhat different function (assuming Cr *x^{wi}?* is also cognate; if not, it might be possible to consider the Cm usage as a restriction of earlier, more general usage; Cr does not appear to have this extra, general form either, however). Vogt says little about this form, but does cite an expanded form with *i-*, which "emphasizes the identity: *išé?i* that very one"; this corresponds to Cm emphatic use of *?í-*: *?íxa?*, *?íca?*, *?íta?*.

Various expansions of the Ka bases *yé* and *cí* are possible, especially by the prefixation of prepositions, but *tu?* does not commonly seem to share these developmental possibilities, possibly because of its more general (extended) use for other purposes (determiner, subject marker, subordination, article). *tu?* can be expanded by a preposition, but Vogt gives only one example. He gives the following forms (Cm equivalents of the prefixes are given at the right):

yé	<u>this</u>	cí	<u>this, that</u>	+u?	
čəʔé	<u>to this place</u>	čəcíʔ	<u>to there</u>	čə+úʔ	<u>over there</u> kəl- <u>to</u>
lʔé	<u>here</u>	lciʔ	<u>there</u>		l- <u>at, in</u>
təʔé	<u>from this place</u>	təʔciʔ	<u>from there</u>		
təʔé	<u>passing by here</u>				
iʔé	<u>this here</u>	eʔci			ʔí-
yeʔé					
+iʔé					

Ka cí and +u? are, obviously, cognate with Cm *ciʔ and *+uʔ. The use of other prepositions in Ka indicates further possibilities for Cm which have not been elicited.

2.2. The Cr demonstratives also seem to be cognate with the Cm forms, with the here form again raising problems (it has a rounded front velar, where the equivalent sound in Cm and Ka is unrounded). Reichard gives x^wiʔ here, ciʔ there, and +uʔ there (remote). She gives several expansions of these, but only one or two correspond to Cm expansion types. Her -n forms, creating what she calls "demonstrative verb active", correspond to the Cm forms with -Vnem, both indicating motion. Her -+ does not seem to correspond to Cm -á+, especially if her analysis of -+ is correct: "The demonstratives with -+ are almost certainly compounds of the adverb with the conjunction + and are used when an explanation or subordinating meaning is desired" (p. 656). She only gives one preposition-demonstrative compound: təʔciʔ from there (p. 671). This type of compound may not be usual in Cr, because in Cr "the preposition always stands between the article and the noun, never before the article" (p. 679). She does cite one exception to this order, tæç x^wiʔ toward here, in this direction (p. 671), but even this is not given as a compound. Reichard

gives eight sets of demonstratives:

x ^w i? <u>here</u>	ci? <u>there near thee</u>	tu? <u>there (remote)</u>
x ^w i ['] yæ <u>this</u>	ci ['] yæ <u>that near thee</u>	tu ['] wæ <u>that</u>
xux ^w i? <u>this here</u>	c _i ci? <u>that there near thee</u>	tətu? <u>that there</u>
xux ^w i ['] yæ <u>this very one</u>	c _i ci ['] yæ <u>that very one near</u> <u>thee</u>	tu ['] uwæ <u>that very one</u>
x ^w i?+ <u>here is where</u>	ci?+ <u>that near thee is</u> <u>where</u>	tu?+ <u>that is where</u>
æntx ^w i? <u>it is here</u>	ænci? <u>it is there near thee</u>	æntu? <u>it is there</u>
x ^w i?n <u>motion hither</u>	ci?l <u>motion to thee</u>	ti?n <u>motion thither</u>
x ^w æ <u>the here</u>	æ <u>the near thee</u>	tæ <u>the there</u>

The last three forms (x^wæ, æ, tæ) are considered to be definite articles.

The reduplicated forms suggest additional possibilities (as yet unattested) for Cm and Ka.

The Ka and Cr interrogative deictics are cognate with Cm *-ká?. Vogt gives Ka čén' where, how (and tá lčén' nowhere, te?čén' somewhere) (p. 28), Reichard gives hičæ? where (p. 676).

2.3. One of my Cm informants also knew Colville, and sometimes volunteered Colville forms. Since these instances were random, and I made no attempt to obtain any Colville material systematically, I have no sets of deictics from that language comparable to those I have for Cm. In fact, I have only three forms, given as equivalents to certain Cm forms: ?axá? here! (= Cm ?íxa?), ?alá? here (= Cm lxa?á+), kəl'é? there (= Cm kəl'cí?). If the correspondences are correct, a slightly different system is suggested for Colville, with possibly even different base elements.

3. An examination and comparison indicates that the use of deictics in
is
IS/very intricate and complex, and that no thorough study of them is available. Available data on the three languages examined here indicate that much

more (and more careful) study of deictics is needed. Occurrences in each of the three languages suggest further possibilities in the others. Obtaining the necessary information is made more difficult by the lack of development of comparable deictics in English; this lack makes translation difficult and ambiguous. A paradigmatic arrangement of forms within a language and comparison with forms occurring in the other languages should make the study of deictics somewhat easier. A paradigmatic arrangement of Cm forms made possible the elicitation of additional forms. Comparison with Ka and Cr indicates further possibilities which should be followed up.

FOOTNOTES

1. I am indebted to The University of Kansas and to the American Philosophical Society Library for grants which made field work on Columbian possible. I wish to thank Geoffrey N. O'Grady for reading a preliminary draft of this paper, and for his comments and suggestions on it.
2. Hans Vogt, The Kalispel Language (Oslo, 1940). See especially pp. 68-70.
3. Gladys A. Reichard, Coeur d'Alene, Handbook of American Indian Languages, Vol. 3, pp. 517-707 (New York, 1938). See especially p. 656.