

Interior Salish Reduplication in a Diachronic Perspective

Author(s): Gregory D. S. Anderson

Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on Historical Issues in Native American Languages (1996), pp. 11-24

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Interior Salish Reduplication in a Diachronic Perspective

Gregory D.S. Anderson
University of Chicago

0. Introduction

As has been noted repeatedly throughout this century (Hill-Tout 1902, Haerberlin 1918, Reichard 1959, Sherzer 1976, van Eijk 1990), reduplication is a salient feature of the Interior Salish [IS] languages.¹ From a formal standpoint, IS reduplication falls into three basic types: *CVC-, *CV- and *-VC. As a process of affixation, IS reduplication interacts with the complex systems of morpholexical stress assignment characteristic of the IS languages. In addition to expressing such common categories as distributive, plural, repetitive/intensive, or diminutive, IS reduplication may also express a first singular referent (in SWP), special counting forms for 'people' and 'animals' (see 6 below), or the highly unusual notion 'out-of-control' (Carlson & Thompson 1982, see section 3 below). Finally, certain affixes obligatorily require a particular reduplication pattern throughout the various IS languages.

1. *CVC- Reduplication in Interior Salish

All Interior Salish languages possess a productive use of *CVC-reduplication. This generally conveys a distributive, repetitive/intensive or plural meaning. In most IS languages this is a weak (unstressed) affix, with the vowel reduced or lost in the reduplicated syllable, unless C₂ is a glottal obstruent. In many IS languages, glides syllabify to homorganic high vowels in reduplicated syllables. Also, in some instances glottalized obstruents deglottalize in reduplicated syllables. Note that prefixes are outside the domain of reduplication in IS, i.e. they never count as C₁.

In the KAL-SPK and CLV-OKN dialects of Interior Salish, the productive *CVC- reduplication was metrically weak; only certain lexicalized forms exhibit a stressed *CVC- copy, e.g. CLV XW_a@tXWt 'duck(s)', na@xW'nxW 'wife/wives' or sXa@?Xa? 'father(s)-in-law'. In CA, virtually all examples have a stressed CVC-prefix; in the pre-CA dialect of PIS, a variable *CVC- reduplicative prefix began to be reinterpreted as a strong affix, leaving only very limited lexical residue of stems with unstressed CVC- reduplicated syllables.

(1)

CLV ²	tən-t'ina?	'ears'
	ca?-ca?ám	'he hits repeatedly'
	s-tt-táʔəm	'boats'
OKN	ʔ'əχ-ʔ'χáp	'elders'
	kəl-t'u?-t'wáq	'buttons broke off'
KAL ³	s-up-upulex ^w	'grasses'
	q ^w əc-q ^w ácqən	'hats'
	ti-teye?	'they are bad'

SPK	su-sewɪk^w	'rivers'
	nəč-ənɪčəntx^w	'you cut them'
	s-χəl-χált	'days'
CA	g^wál-g^wəlp	'it blazed here and there'
	u-čəp-číp	'they are soft'

In THM and SWP, the productive *CVC- reduplication is weak (again with some lexically specified exceptions that exhibit stressed *CVC- syllables (e.g. THM **kéy^wkix** 'hands, arms' or **sk^w'ózk^w'əz** 'aunts'). In LIL the prefix is metrically variable, but the metrical class of the stems is determined by the phonological shape, not arbitrary morpholexical specification: stems with [ə] or whose C₂ is [ʔ] are weak and thus the reduplicated syllable bears the stress; with other stems, the *CVC-copy is unstressed. However, forms like LIL **sqáyyqyax^w** 'men' (< **sqayx^w** 'man') attest to an earlier variably stressed affix in the usual IS sense.

(2)

THM ⁴	ʔes-χəp-χəp	'things piled up here & there'
	n-ki-keym	'keep following'
SWP	kəc-kicx	'DIST/PL arrive'
	s-pl-plt'n	'lair'
LIL ⁵	ciʔcʔiʔ^w	'bleed all over'
	sməlmúlac	'women'

In addition to the productive use of *CVC- reduplication, there was at least one other use of a *CVC- reduplicative prefix in Proto-Interior Salish. This formed a variety of qualitative adjectives, frequently in conjunction with the affix -t.

(3)

CA	pás-past	'causes amazement'
	lúp-lupt	'it keeps dry'
OKN	pχ-páχt	'smart'
	kəc-káct	'willing'
KAL ⁶	q^wən'-q^wínt	'poor'
SPK	q^wx^w-q^wex^wt	'conceited'
LIL	ʔəlʔəl	'strong'
	nəq^w-núq^w	'warm'
SWP	tək^w-túk^wt	'silent'
	qíx^w-qəx^wt	'shy'
THM	zəw'-zuʔt	'tiresome'
	míʔ-míʔt⁷	'it's very contagious'

Both of these *CVC- prefixes are treated as metrically identical in most of the IS languages. In CA all forms are strong (stressed), while in KAL-SPK and CLV-OKN these are both metrically weak.⁸ Also, in LIL these are both metrically variable, subject to the phonological conditioning mentioned above. In SWP and THM however these two *CVC- reduplicative formations are metrically distinct: 'distributive/plural' *CVC- is weak, while 'attributive' *CVC- is variable (SWP) or

strong (THM). Coast Salish evidence suggests that THM and SWP may be archaic in preserving these constructions as metrically distinct; for example, in Saanich, where productive *CVC- ('augmentative') reduplication is weak, but *CVC- 'attributive' reduplication is strong: **słənləniʔ** 'women' vs. **qʷəlqʷəl** 'talkative'. Due to the presence of two *CVC- reduplication types in PIS, there may have been a mutually-influencing effect on the metrical class of the reduplicative prefixes in a given PIS dialect. The two originally distinct constructions collapsed historically into one in most dialects, the metrical outcome specific to each group: strong in pre-CA, weak in KAL-OKN, and variable in (pre-)LIL (where the metrical class of the stem can be determined by its phonological shape).

2. *CV- Reduplication in Interior Salish

All IS languages exhibit a reduplicative affix whose historical origin is a *CV- prefix. These forms generally convey a diminutive meaning, with a few unpredictable lexicalizations. Throughout the IS languages, resonants tend to become glottalized in diminutive reduplicated syllables, sometimes spreading to all relevant segments in the word; the sound/symbolic association of glottalization with diminutives is a characteristic trait of the western Plateau region (Nichols 1971).

In the Southern IS languages, the productive affix is generally weak in CA and KAL (usually accompanied by a diminutive prefix in the latter language); in CLV-OKN most examples show a weak prefix, but a number of lexicalized forms exist with a stressed reduplicative prefix.⁹ The SPK system is highly archaic: strong stems have strong prefixes, but weak stems with strong stem-suffixes have weak *CV- prefixes.

(4)

CLV	kə-kwápaʔ	'dog'
	s-tə-taʔm	'little boat'
KAL	sʔ-kʷ-kʷʔus	'little face'
	ʔ-pu-ps	'kitten'
	ʔ-xʷ-xʷist	'little one walks; he walks w/ little steps'
SPK ¹⁰	χ-χʔ'əcin	'dog'
	ʔ'úl'əkʷ	'small stick of wood'
CA ¹¹	hin-q'u-q'ušəm'íçn'šən'	'dog'
	šə-šəl'úl'um'xʷn'	'hoe'

The Northern Interior Salish languages present a slightly different picture. In all three languages, the synchronic process is one of infixation, copying the consonant preceding the stressed vowel following that vowel, sometimes with a copy of the vowel as well, i.e. *C_αV'C_α(V)C_β-. In strong stems this is C₁, but it may be any consonant preceding the stressed vowel in longer bases with stressed suffixes.¹²

(5)

THM	wi-w'-km	'(baby) sees something'
	q^wintwa-w'-x	'talk w/ each other a little'
LIL	k^w-ak^w-əʔt	'little plate'
	sqə-qə-yux	'boy'
SWP ¹³	sqə-qa-ləmux^w	'boy'
	c'ilá-l'-a	'little basket'

Diminutive reduplication was a *CV- prefix in Proto-IS. SPK forms like **l'úl'ək^w** 'little stick of wood' with stressed *CV- are reminiscent of the stress-targeting infixal copy process characteristic of the NIS languages. In Proto-NIS (pre-LIL and THM-SWP), the copying of a stressed prefix became reinterpreted as a stress-targeting infix copy, i.e. *C₁V'C₁(V)C₂ > *(-)C_αV'C_α(V)C_β. In PIS, and (pre-)SPK, the *CV- prefix was strong, and thus attracted stress with strong roots (and frequently causing vowel reduction in the stem-syllable), but with weak roots possessing strong suffixes, suffixal stress-attraction wins out (with vowel reduction in the reduplicated syllables). The presence of this kind of variation may have led to the majority of reinterpretations of this affix as (first variable and then) weak metrically in the SIS languages.

(6) Stress assignment in PIS and SPK *CV- Reduplication

<i>strong-√</i>	*CV-	√	(X)	<i>weak-√</i>	*C(V)-	√	X
	*	*	-		*	-	*
	*	-	-		-	-	*

Coast Salish evidence is suggestive of a strong or variable reduplicative prefix. Diminutive reduplication (like all patterns) is highly varied throughout the Coast Salish and 'other' Salish languages. There seem to have been two options *CV- prefix or *Cí-, for example Halkomelem **s-k^wi-k^wəl** 'waterfall', Sechelt **s-tó-təlo** 'rivulet', Snoqualmie-Duwamish **u-χá-χal** 'he is writing little notes', Snohomish **sosəpqs** 'small seal', **k^w'ík^w'lu** 'little skin' (< **k^w'alu**), or Squamish **sq'íq'íml** 'paddle' (< **sq'əml**). Note also the following forms in the highly divergent Bella Coola: **syu:t-i** 'little song' (< **syut**), **q^wu:q^wlun-i** 'little beaver' (< **q^wulum**), **xí-xna:s-i** 'little woman' (< **xnas**), all with suffixed -i, length(-shift) and [\pm reduplication]. Lexicalized stressed *Cí- can be found in IS languages as well, for example OKN **xí-xu?təm** 'girl' (OCB 1993: 17) or LIL **χíχutc** 'small plate'.¹⁴

3. *-VC Reduplication in Interior Salish

In contrast with *CVC- 'distributive/plural/repetitive' and *CV- 'diminutive' reduplication, which are both fairly common formal and functional types, Proto-Interior Salish also possessed another productive reduplicative formation that is somewhat more marked cross-linguistically. This is *-VC reduplication, which conveys two basic notions: a continuative-telic aspect, and more interestingly the highly unusual notion 'out-of-control'. This signifies an action was done or state brought about accidentally or otherwise without the control or volition of the

subject/referent.¹⁵ In some Salish languages, one or the other of these meanings has been extended and the remaining one basically lost; *-VC reduplication is found throughout the family, but is most characteristic of the IS languages.

In Proto-IS, *-VC reduplication was a variably stressed affix. This is preserved in KAL-SPK and CLV-OKN. In CA and CMB this has become a weak suffix. As with other reduplication patterns, glides syllabify to homorganic (high) vowels; sporadic glottalization of resonants is also encountered.¹⁶ Finally, *-VC reduplication is obligatory with certain affixes (see 5 below).

(7)

CA	yáʃ-áʃ	'they assembled'
	pen'-ən'	'it has come to be bent'
	čél-əl-x^w	'hollow object came to upside down position'
CLV ¹⁷	ʒ'ə-ál	'dead'
	sq^wim'-m'	'scared'
	k^wul'-l'	'be born'
	xw'-aw'	'it has been dried'
OKN ¹⁸	pʒ'-aʒ'	'(house) collapsed'
	m^wq^w-aq^w	'became lumpy'
KAL	t'ix^w-x^w-ələm	'gets changed, becomes different'
	k'ull	'is made/born'
	tk^wuk^w	'lies/falls down'
SPK ¹⁹	nič-əč	'got cut'
	x^wk^w-uk^w	'got clean'
	q^waw-u	'drunk'
	p'ex^w-x^w	'got bright all of a sudden'
CMB ²⁰	q^waʃ^w-ʃ^w	'drunk'
	x^wuy'-iʔ	'got dressed, packed up'
	məl'-l'x^w	'was/got crooked'
	napəx^wúx^w	'bloated'

In SWP, there are only a limited number of lexicalized forms with *-VC reduplication, all with stressed affixes, suggesting a variable or strong suffix. In LIL, the affix is variable, while Thompson and Thompson (1992) consider the THM affix to be metrically weak, despite the presence in this language (and LIL too) of -VC reduplicated forms that appear to be stress-targeting copies similar to the diminutive.

(8)

THM ²¹	q'iw'-uʔ	'bones accidentally broken'
	nmiʔ-iʔ	'it got loose by itself'
	siʃ^w-ʃ^w	'distributed by someone'
	cw-uw	'grow up'
	q^wc-əc	'tremble'
	pəzq^wóq^w	'someone chipped a piece off it'
	nk'ʔétətk^wu	'he fell in the water'

LIL ²²	pút-ət	'(be) boil(ing)'
	qáx^w-əx^w	'break'
	p'liχ^w-əχ^w	'boil/flow over'
	pł-uł	'thick'
	qł-il	'angry'
SWP	χ'q^wáw'-w'əs	'get together'
	q'f-eƒ	'move heavily'
	xw-ew	'dry up'
	pəx^w-úx^w	'swell up'
	puk^w-úk^w	'be spilled'

While most salient in the IS languages, *-VC reduplication has various reflexes in other languages of the family, e.g. Comox (Kroeber (1988)'s 'inceptive' reduplication) **pəs-əs** 'get numb' or **č'əp-əp-χ** 'get dirty', Upper Chehalis (Kinkade (1964)'s 'slow' reduplication) **?et yəppł** 'walks slowly back and forth' or **məccq^wtn** 'keeps on grinding it slowly', or lexicalized stems in Twana (Drachmann 1969) **k^wətət** 'spill' or **fiq'aq'** 'slip' and Snohomish (Haeblerlin 1918) **?ux^wux^w** 'go about in a dither accomplishing nothing' or **saq^waq^w** 'fly slowly in circles'. Many of these have stressed reduplicated syllables, but others do not, and thus either strong or variable seems to have been the metrical class of the *-VC affix in Proto-Salish.²³

4. Multiple Reduplication in Interior Salish

Multiple reduplication in the Interior Salish languages falls into several basic types: lexicalized simplicia and onomatopoeia (9), 'emphatics', 'intensives' or 'expressives' of various types (10), and combinations of the productive means (including plurals of lexicalized reduplicated simplicia).

(9) lexicalized simplicia and onomatopoeia

SPK	n'q^wq^wm'q^wum	'hot dog, sausage'
CLV	t'q^wq^wiq^w	'explosion'
CMB	cmk^wk^wuk^w	'be crawling from under'
	c'it^wit^w	'spear hitting rock after missing fish'
	waxχax	'snake rattles'
LIL	p'ac'əcəc	'obscene noise'
	k^wət^wət^wətax^wac	'heart is beating, pounding'
SWP	tək^wəkWikW	'throw off sparks' [Deadman's Creek]

(10) 'emphatics', 'intensives', 'expressives'

CLV	q'yx^wx^wax^w	'to stink'
CMB	cipálələlələl	'leaves are shaking and shaking'
LIL	łələlil	'keeps sprinkling'
	p'liχ^wiχ^wiχ^w	'keep boiling over'
	x^wəmaməm	'hurry up'

zuq^wəq^wúq^w

'struggle through'

Combinations of the productive IS reduplicative constructions also occur. As follows logically from the formal realizations of *CVC- 'plural' and *CV- 'diminutive', in the SIS languages this is a sequence of reduplicated prefixes, while in the NIS languages, the stress-targeting nature of the *-C(V) copy sometimes results in a prefix plus infix combination.²⁴

(11) diminutive plurals, etc.

SPK	p'p'nɸ'in	'small long objects lying on the ground'
CLV	stət'tátəm	'boat.DIM.PL'
THM	scəw'cəcəw'	'DIM.PL.work'
	st'əmt'əmámalt	'cow.DIM.PL'
SWP	c'ílclal'a	'basket.DIM.PL'
	sqalqaqaləmux ^w	'boy.PL'

In SWP, the multiply reduplicated pattern C₁VC₁VC₁C₂ (i.e. double *CV-reduplication) has been grammaticalized as the productive means of forming the comparative degree of adjectives.

(12)	q ^w əq ^w eq ^w c	'warmer'	√q ^w ec
	tətət'xt	'taller'	√t'ex-t
	q ^w əq ^w uq ^w ct	'fatter'	√q ^w uc-t

5. Affix-triggered reduplication and 'Affix-Duplication' in IS

A variety of affixes seem to be obligatorily associated with particular reduplicative patterns throughout the IS languages.²⁵ An affix attested in both branches of IS associated with *CVC- reduplication is *-uɬ 'one who Xes'. Note the regular shift of stress to the strong suffix in these forms.

(13) *-uɬ/-oɬ (*CVC-)

LIL	nuq ^w naq ^w óɬ	'robber'
KAL ²⁶	nlkalkalsúɬ	'prostitute'
	kaikaimúɬ	'one who writes too much'
SPK	q ^w l'q ^w lúɬ	'he talks a lot'
OKN	q ^w əlq ^w lúɬ	'good berry-picker'
	txət'xt'úɬ	'good care-taker'

In SWP, *CV- (diminutive) reduplication (stress-targeting *-C(V)-) is obligatory when there is a [1SG] referent; forms like 'you're squeezing me' (which lack [n]) suggest that the reduplication is triggered by the category [1SG], not a particular affix.

(14)

yñci-c-tx^w	'my house'
cf. y?ci^w	'your house'
pi-p-c'n	'I'm squeezing it'
pi-p-c'cmx	'you're squeezing me'
cu-c-tkn ?ns?i-?-λn	'I want to eat'
cf. cut ?s?iλns	'he wants to eat'

*-VC reduplication has become obligatory with various affixes of 'low transitivity' appropriate with an 'out-of-control' reading throughout the IS languages. Although there is some agreement among the languages with respect to the particular affixes that are associated with *-VC reduplication, these may be parallel innovations rather than retentions from various proto-systems. For example, the affix **-nun** meaning 'succeed in Xing' in CA and 'accidentally/manage to X' in CMB²⁷ both require -VC reduplication, but the corresponding affix in SPK does not.²⁸

(15) **-nun** [-Control] (*-VC)

CA	šət'ət'núnən	'I succeeded in beating him'
	χəsestnunən	'I succeeded in making it well'
CMB	cəkknunn	'I accidentally/managed to hit it'
But note SPK	k^wul'núnten	'I managed to do it'

Finally, some affixes themselves seem to be 'duplicated' or copied in various constructions. As the first CA example shows, more than one Coda-consonant can be copied in an 'affix-duplication', while this is never true of *CVC- or *-VC reduplication in IS languages.

(16) 'affix-duplication'

CA	icxum'umíltelt	'she came to miss her child'
	c'el'əlísəš	'he came to a standing position'
	caqcaqəqəlípəp	'he fell on his back'
CLV	x^wrrapp	'he is anxious'

6. Reduplicated Numerals in the IS languages

Reduplication is found in a variety of numeral forms throughout the IS languages. This is generally one of three types: reduplicated simplicia, counting forms for 'people' (*CV(C)-) and counting forms for animals (*CV-). Examples of the first type include '7', '9', and multiples of '100'.

(17) lexicalized simplicia

SWP	səséle	'2'
	cúctkeʔ	'7'
	tmʔnk^wúk^wʔe	'9'
CA	χəpqiɣnkst	'100'
	m'əm'əsqən'	'400'
	cucən'txtm'qən	'700'
CMB ²⁹	musəs	'4'
	xəccakst	'100'
SPK	sisp'əl	'7'
KAL	χχan'út	'9'

The 'people' counting forms appear with a stressed *CVC- prefix and a deictic clitic in CLV-OKN and SWP, but lacking one in THM.

(18) 'people' counting forms

THM ³⁰	mōsmas	'4 people'
CLV	k-musəms	'(they are) 4 people'
	k-cilcəlkst	'(they are) 5 people'
OKN	k-mōsməs	'4 people'
SWP ³¹	t-musməs	'4 people'
	tk-cilclkst	'5 people'

The reduplicated counting forms for 'animals' are found only in the NIS languages. These are historically diminutive *CV- reduplicated forms.

(19) 'animal' counting forms

THM	moms	'4 animals'
SWP ³²	mums	'4 animals'
	ʔúʔpəkst	'10 animals'
LIL	pəpála	'1 animal' not **páp(ə)la

Reduplicated numerals expressing reference to people (*CVC-) and animals (*CV- are also attested in some Coast Salish languages, e.g. Squamish **c'ic's** '9 animals' (< c'əs), **t'a-t'q'ač** '6 animals' (< t'aq'ač), **t'əq-t'aq'ač** '6 people' or Tillamook **čən-čanat** '3 people'.³³

7 Conclusions

There were three (mostly) productive reduplicative constructions in Proto-Interior Salish, *CVC- 'distributive' (weak), *CV- 'diminutive' (strong), and *-VC 'out-of-control' (variable). In addition, there was at least one other (metrically distinct) *CVC- reduplication pattern used in the formation of many attributives;

this latter may be the *CVC- reduplication pattern that was obligatory with the Proto-Interior Salish affix *-úʔ 'one who Xes (a lot/well)'. Also, speakers of the Interior Salish proto-language utilized *CVC- and *CV- reduplication to create counting forms for 'people' and 'animals', respectively. Finally, glide syllabification in reduplication is probably quite old, being found in Coast Salish as well, e.g. Clallam (Thompson & Thompson 1971) **xi-xəyək^w's** 'raccoon.PL' and **t'u-tawi?** 'arm.PL' or Twana (Drachmann 1969) **t'o?-t'aw'** 'mussel.PL' and **k^we?-k^woy** 'bend.PL'.

¹ The IS languages are spoken by a few middle aged and elderly speakers in communities throughout the northwestern part of America and adjacent parts of Canada. The Southern IS languages are Coeur d'Alene [CA], Columbia-Wenatchi [CMB], Colville [CLV], Kalispel [KAL], Okanagan [OKN], and Spokane [SPK], while Lillooet [LIL], Shuswap [SWP], and Thompson River Salish [THM] constitute the Northern IS group. Only a small number of speakers remain and some languages are near extinction. Preservation efforts are active among the OKN of British Columbia however.

² Initial **ʔ** never deglottalizes in CLV, but in non-initial position the reduplicated copy is frequently [t], e.g. **sk^wtk^wλ^wus** 'eyes' vs. **ʔ^wəʔ^wáxəx** 'elders'.

³ Some CV roots in KAL reduplicate only CV (**npupusnug** 'worthy of love', √**pu**), while with others an affixal consonant (particularly those of certain 'lexical' suffixes) may serve as C₂, e.g. **pčpečstəm** 'he takes on gloves' (-čst 'hand'); similar boundary crossing with a lexical suffix can be found in Coast Salish Comox **ʒidʒidis** 'teeth' (-dis 'tooth').

⁴ In THM, unlike KAL-SPK, glides syllabify to homorganic short high vowels.

⁵ Unlike most other IS languages, in LIL CVC- reduplication generally does not convey a 'many participants' meaning; rather, 'repetitive/intensive' meanings are typical.

⁶ While resonant glottalization is characteristic of IS diminutive reduplication, one finds an idiolectal/register preference for optionally extending this to any reduplicative construction, as in this KAL form.

⁷ The stem is √**miy** 'spread around, distribute', cf. **mi?t** 'he's infected'. The reduplicated form must be derived from the form with glottal stop, itself derived from syllabification of the glottalized **y** (> **i?**).

⁸ The one SPK exception in Carlson (et al. 1989) is clearly a lexicalized doubly-reduplicated form with both *CV- and *CVC- reduplication: **q^wq^wámq^wmt** 'adorable'.

⁹ For example, **sxáxpa?** 'paternal grandfather', **qáqna?** 'paternal grandmother', or **n'in'k'mən** 'knife'.

¹⁰ Note the SPK lexicalized simplicia **ččəyé?** 'grandchild' and **ttəw'it** 'boy' and their PL forms **čičəyé?** 'grandchildren' and **titəw'it** 'boys'.

¹¹ Most of the diminutive forms in CA published materials are lexicalized forms like these, which mean respectively 'one with small wrinkles on its feet' and 'one which gives the ground little chops'. Other diminutive *CV- reduplicated forms are attested, e.g. **čn'ə-n'a?n'a?**'s 'little ones getting wet', with infixes -ʔ- serving as C₂ in the CVC- reduplication in this form. Note the spread of resonant glottalization in the CA diminutive forms; the prefix [**hin-**] is specified as [-glottalization].

¹² Various lexicalized forms attest to the presence of a *CV- prefix as the historical origin of the diminutive reduplicative construction, e.g. THM **ʔə-ʔiʔ's?** 'scattered' (not ****iʔ(ə)ʔ's?**); this is considered by Thompson & Thompson (1981) to be 'affective' reduplication in THM, albeit a pattern historically derived from the *CV- diminutive.

¹³ As is apparent from the SWP and LIL forms meaning 'boy', a copy of the stem vowel may appear following the infixes reduplicated consonant; this is highly suggestive that a prefix is the historical origin of the construction, as only glottal (or 'laryngeal') consonants would allow an 'echo'-vowel in infixing processes in the IS languages.

¹⁴ It should be mentioned that cross-linguistically, the association of [i] with diminutives is quite common, in both reduplicated and unreduplicated forms, cf. English *teeny-weeny* or *Tommy*.

¹⁵ The meanings of these constructions range in the literature from '(a state that has) come to be without effort on its own part' for CA (van Eijk 1990: 244-5), a 'resultative' for CLV, 'a completed process' (in contrast with interior glottalization) for OKN, a 'verbal process (which) develops gradually and comes to an end' for KAL (Vogt 1940: 62), 'get Xed' for SPK (Carlson 1972), or 'an ongoing process, usually one that is bound to lead to an expected result' for LIL (van Eijk 1990: 241).

¹⁶ Thus, the originally diminutive sound symbolism characteristic of the region (Nichols 1971) has become reinterpreted as a kind of 'affective' sound symbolism associated (by a particular speaker of a given IS language) with any reduplicative construction. As mentioned above, deglottalization of obstruents is also seen sporadically throughout the IS languages in reduplicated syllables. Therefore, a two-fold sound symbolism has become available for IS speakers for use in conjunction with reduplication.

¹⁷ Note the following C₃ reduplicated forms in CLV: **lipx^wx^w** 'be crawling from under' and **tyxxmanq^s** 'stumble'.

¹⁸ Note the unusual PL formations **ʔixəχpt** 'adults, elders' and **kəkəw^wap** 'dogs'. The former might be an example of 'truncated CVC-' reduplication, but the latter is simply an unusual use of -VC reduplication to mark the category [PL] with this lexicalized reduplicated simplex stem.

¹⁹ In SPK -VC reduplication adds a [-Control] [+Emphatic] meaning, except with a few lexically specified [+Control] roots; note that transitivizing affixes in SPK generally add a [+Control] meaning, as is in line with the volitional or control nature of 'transitivity' cross-linguistically, unless the stem is marked [-Control] [+Emphatic] by -VC reduplication (Carlson 1972, et al. 1989).

²⁰ There are a few less common uses of -VC reduplication in CMB, e.g. lexicalized simplicia **ppál'a^a?** 'bony fish sp.', irregular PL formations (possibly 'truncated *CVC-) **ʔasəsq^{sa}?** 'sons' (< **ʔasq^{sa}?**), or even an example of a stress-targeting copy: **kɪnk'hápp** 'door opened by itself'. Note that the root of the form 'got dressed' is **vx^wuy** and thus the resonant glottalization must have preceded the syllabification of the glide; 'glottalization stability' is maintained as usual in Coda-position, realized segmentally as [ʔ].

²¹ Use of -VC reduplicated forms in THM is more extensive than in LIL and especially SWP. In addition to the by now familiar 'out-of-control' or otherwise 'low transitivity' connotations of the formation, -VC reduplication is used to express a variety of detransitive nuances, e.g. **tew-u kn** 'I am sold s.thg.' (vs. **tew kn** 'I sell s.thg.'). Also, according to Thompson and Thompson (1992: 99), -VC reduplication is used in THM when 'the action is accomplished by a person or other agency that is not in focus'. Not only is -VC reduplication moving into a stressed-targeting copy process, but in stems lacking (lexical) suffixes, the metrical class is determined by LIL-type phonological factors: stems whose vowel is [ə] or whose C₂ is glottal are weak and thus shift stress to the reduplicated syllable, but other simple stems retain the stress, and the reduplicated syllable is reduced.

²² In LIL, all three common reduplicative patterns have been reinterpreted as having a phonological conditioning for the copy. Some SIS languages also exhibit a tendency to reorganize the metrical class of stems according to phonological shape; for example in CLV 2/3 of all CVC roots have stress on the reduplicated syllable, while 'heavy' stems of the CVCX-shape overwhelmingly keep stress on the stem vowel and thus have weak, reduced reduplicated syllables.

²³ Note that van Eijk (1990:237) considers Lushootseed to represent a state that is closest to the ancestral system.

²⁴ The formation of diminutive plurals in the IS languages garnered some interest in the theoretical literature in the recent past (Marantz 1982; Broselow 1983). Broselow argues for a 'Morphological Subjacency', with the attendant crossing violations of bounding nodes. Her analysis views NIS diminutive reduplication not as a morphological stem-forming process, but rather as some kind of quasi-phonological process, in order to preserve her notion of 'Subjacency'. As is well known, infixation processes are not elegantly handled in most theoretical frameworks of morphology. However, it is not clear why NIS diminutive reduplication should be thought of as so radically

different from the SIS systems, where the 'stem-forming' properties of the reduplicative construction are maintained. The diminutive reduplication process simply extended the scope of its application from [stem] to [word], i.e. from the (morpho)lexical to the (morpho)synactic (or 'post-lexical') level during the development of the NIS languages.

²⁵ As discussed in 1 above, so-called 'attributive' *CVC- reduplication is frequently seen with the common affix -t in both NIS and SIS languages, e.g. OKN **pχ-páχt** 'smart' or SWP **qix^wqəx^wt** 'shy'; this can be found without reduplication however.

²⁶ In early sources on KAL (e.g. Haeblerlin 1918), several affixes are said to require *CVC- reduplication, including -(s)**nug** 'worthy of' and -**nuég** 'RECIP'. **nɔpɔpusnug** 'worth loving' and **kaesngalgalnuegui** 'we frighten each other'. The diminutive affix **lʌ** may be used without diminutive reduplication, therefore the affix does not trigger the reduplication, but rather 'hypericonically' indexes the category 'diminutive' in the reduplicated forms.

²⁷ In CMB -m the 'middle voice' marker likewise requires *-VC reduplication: **nkən'n'cinm** 'he got poisoned'. Similarly, the cognate affix in Coast Salish Twana is found frequently with *-VC reduplicated forms: **q^wəl'alab** 'sinking, begins to sink' (-(a)b 'intrans').

²⁸ Various affixes or particles seem to have required -VC reduplication in KAL, including -**utem** 'able to be Xed' and the NEG particle **tas: elchchutem** 'able to be bound' or **tas kupp** 'does not move'; both of these are in line with the 'out-of-control' or 'low-transitivity' connotation of *-VC reduplication in IS languages.

²⁹ Note that the reduplicated numerals in CMB are of the *-VC type, but of the *CV- type in all the other IS languages.

³⁰ The THM forms for numerals of the shape CVy- have the following formal realization **səséye** '2 people' and **papáia** '1 person'.

³¹ The SWP 'people' counting forms are highly complicated. '8' and '9' lack these counting forms altogether, while '7' merely adds the deictic clitic to the base form. '2 people' is unreduplicated, effectively "undoing" the reduplication found in the corresponding simplex (**tkʔsele** or **tk'sele**). The form for '6 people' shows a *CV- stress-targeting reduplication **təq'mémkst**.

³² Note SWP **k^wik^wnx** 'how many animals' and its striking parallel in Coast Salish Squamish **k^wik^win** 'how many animals', both with stressed *CV- reduplicated prefixes.

³³ As in IS languages, other patterns can be found expressing reference to 'people' with numerals in Coast Salish languages, e.g. Snohomish **bəbuus** '4 people' and **hix^wix^w** '3 people'. Note also Sooke **ʔəpəpnik^ws** '10 animals', with -VC or 'truncated CVC- reduplication and a lexical suffix meaning 'animal'.

References

- Carlson, Barry . 1972. Grammar of Spokane. *UH WPIL* 4/4.
- _____. 1989. Reduplication and stress in Spokane. *IJAL* 55: 204-13.
- _____. et al. 1989. *Spokane Dictionary. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6. Missoula.
- _____, and L. Thompson. 1982. Out-of-control in two (maybe more) Salish languages. *AL* 24.
- Drachmann, G. 1969. *Twana Phonology. Ohio State University WPIL* 5. Columbus.
- Efrat, B. 1969. *A Grammar of Non-Particles in Sooke, a Dialect of Straits Salish.* University of Pennsylvania dissertation (UMI reprint 1978, Ann Arbor).
- Elmendorff, W. 1965. Linguistic and geographic relations in the Northern Plateau area. *SWJA* 21/1: 63-78.
- Galloway, B. D. *A Grammar of Chilliwack Halkomelem.* University of California, Berkeley, dissertation.
- Gibson, James. 1973. Shuswap grammatical structure. *UH WPIL* 5/5
- Haerberlin, Hermann. 1918. Types of reduplication in the Salish dialects. *IJAL* 1: 239-53.
- Hess, T. 1966. Snohomish chameleon morphology. *IJAL* 32: 350-6.
- Hill-Tout, Charles. 1978 (1902). *Linguistics Appendices to the Salish People.* Cultus Lake, B.C.: Ralph Maud Press.
- Kinkade, M. D. 1964. Phonology and morphology of Upper Chehalis. *IJAL* 30: 251-60.
- _____. 1982. Columbian (Salish) -C2 reduplication. *AL* 24.
- Kroeber, Paul. 1988. -VC2 Inceptive reduplication in Comox and Interior Salish. *IJAL* 54:141-66.
- Kuipers, Aert. 1967. *The Squamish language.* Janua Linguarum Seria Practica 73. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1974. *The Shuswap Language.* Janua Linguarum Seria Practica 225. The Hague: Mouton.
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. Re:Reduplication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 435-82.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1973. Colville grammatical structure. *UH WPIL* 5/4.
- Montler, T. 1986. *An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish.. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 4.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Reduplicative constructions. In J. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language, Vol. 3: Word Structure.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Newman, S. 1971. Bella Coola reduplication. *IJAL* 37: 34-8.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1971. Diminutive consonant symbolism in Western North America. *Language* 47/4.
- Reichard, Gladys. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. *HAIL* 3: 517-707.
- _____. 1959. Comparison of five Salish languages. *IJAL* 25: 239-53.
- _____. *suknaqnix i? s' a?ac' i? q'ay'ikst* [Okanagan Colouring Book]. 1993. Penticton, BC: En'owkin Centre.
- Thompson, Laurence C. 1976. The control system: a major category in the grammar of the Salishan languages. *Victoria Conference on NW Languages: Heritage Record 4.* Victoria: Provincial Museum Press.
- _____, and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: A preview. In W. Shipley & J. Sawyer (eds.), *Studies in American Indian Languages.* University of California

Publications in Linguistics. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

_____. 1981. Affective derivatives in Thompson River Salish. *UH WPIL* 13/3: 119-27.

_____. 1992. *The Thompson Language*. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 8. Missoula: University of Montana.

Tweddell, C. E. 1950. *Snoqualmie-Duwamish Dialects of Puget Sound Coast Salish*. *UWPA* 12.

Van Eijk, Jan. 1990. -VC reduplication in Salish. *AL* 32 3/4: 228-62.

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