

Irrealis Morphology in Montana Salish

**An Honors Thesis
Submitted as partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Honors Scholar Program
Concentration in Linguistics**

by

Nicholas Baier

**University of Michigan
August 2010**

Abstract

This thesis investigates the form and function of irrealis morphology in Montana Salish. The category IRREALIS, which is marked with a prefix on both nouns and verbs, indicates that the word it marks belongs to an ‘unreal’ world, generally expressing future or hypothetical meanings. While the irrealis prefix was previously thought to have two allomorphs, *ql-* and *q-*, this thesis aims to show that there are in fact three allomorphs, *ql-*, *qs-*, and *q-*. The first two allomorphs are lexically conditioned: nouns are prefixed with *ql-* and verbs are prefixed with *qs-*. Both may appear as *q-* in certain morphological contexts. A second aim is to explore the interaction of the irrealis with aspectual morphology (called ‘marked irrealis’ here). The irrealis prefix may combine with what appears at first to be continuative suffixes, *-mi/-i* (for intransitives) or *-m* (for transitives), yet these forms do not seem to mark continuative aspect. This brings into question the role of the ‘continuative’ suffixes in those irrealis forms which have them. I demonstrate that there is a syntactic, not a semantic, difference between those irrealis forms which have the ‘continuative’ suffixes and those that do not. Taking this fact into account, I offer an approach to the historical development of the marked irrealis which differs from that offered by Kroeber (1999), and show that this approach better explains the synchronic distribution and use of the marked irrealis in Montana Salish.

Acknowledgements

I would first and foremost like to thank my advisor for this thesis, Prof. Sally Thomason for her willingness to make available her Montana Salish field notes and texts, and for her guidance and advice during the analysis and writing of the thesis itself. Without her help, the document before you would not have been possible. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Montana Salish elders who have shared their knowledge with Prof. Thomason over the past three decades and more, as all the data analyzed here ultimately comes from them. Finally, I extend thanks to all those who have given me feedback on ideas, nodded their heads sympathetically when I was frustrated, and in general helped me through the entire experience.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Abbreviations	vi
List of Tables	vii
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Morphosyntactic Preliminaries	2
1.2.1. Prefixation	2
1.2.2. Person marking	3
1.2.3. Transitivity	5
1.2.4. Properties of nouns and verbs	8
1.3. A Road Map	11
2. Irrealis as a Grammatical Category in Montana Salish	12
2.1. Introduction	12
2.2. Irrealis Constructions	13
2.3. Other ways of expressing unreality in Montana Salish	19
2.3.1. Negation	19
2.3.2. Yes/ no questions	21
2.3.3. Imperatives	21
2.3.4. Conditional constructions	22
2.4. Summary	24
3. Allomorphy of the Irrealis Prefix	26
3.1. Introduction	26
3.2. Allomorphy triggered by irrealis forms	27
3.3. Distribution of irrealis forms	28
3.3.1. Nouns with <i>qʌ-</i>	29
3.3.2. Nouns with <i>q-s-</i>	30
3.3.3. Verbs with <i>qs-</i>	31
3.3.4. Irrealis forms with <i>q-</i>	33
3.4. Summary	35
4. A tale of Two Irrealises	37
4.1. Introduction	37
4.2. Distribution of marked and unmarked irrealis forms	41

4.3. Historical development of the marked/unmarked distinction	45
4.3.1. Kroeber's (1999) account	47
4.3.2. An Alternative approach	50
4.4. The suffixes <i>-mi/i</i> and <i>-m</i>	52
5. Cognate morphemes in Southern Interior Salish	57
5.1. Introduction	57
5.2. Kalispel and Spokane	58
5.3. Okanagan	60
5.4. Coeur d'Alene	62
5.5. Columbian	63
5.6. Discussion	64
6. Conclusion	66
References	68

List of Abbreviations

-	non-lexical affix boundary
=	lexical affix boundary
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
2NDRY	secondary particle
ANTIP	antipassive
ASP	aspect
CONT	continuative
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
IMPF	imperfective
INSTR	instrumental
INT	intentional
INTR	intransitive
INCH	inchoative
IRR	irrealis
NEG	negative
NOM	nominalizer
OBJ	object
OBL	oblique
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
Q	question
REDUP	reduplication
REFL	reflexive
REL	relational transitive suffix
RES	result prefix
SBJ	subject
SG	singular
STAT	stative
TR	transitive

List of Tables / Figures

Table 1	Prefixes in the Montana Salish word	3
Table 2	Possessive marking	3
Table 3	Intransitive subject	4
Table 4	Transitive inflection	4
Table 5	Mixed transitive inflection	5
Table 6	Prefixes in the Montana Salish word	35
Table 7	Mixed transitive inflection	37
Table 8	Distribution of marked / unmarked irrealis	44
Table 9	Reflexes of Proto-Salish * <i>qat</i> in S. Interior Salish	63

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Background

Montana Salish¹ is a member of the Southern Interior branch of the Salish language family, whose members are spread out along the Pacific Coast in Washington, Oregon and British Columbia, and inland to the interior of British Columbia, Idaho, and Montana (Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade 1998:1). Montana Salish itself is a member of a dialect continuum with two other closely related members, Kalispel and Spokane. This thesis investigates irrealis morphology in the language. While it was previously thought that the irrealis prefix had two phonologically conditioned allomorphs, *ql-* and *q-*, I show that there are in fact three allomorphs: *ql-*, *qs-*, and *q-*. The first two are lexically conditioned: nouns are prefixed with *ql-* and verbs are prefixed with *qs-*. Certain other prefixes obscure this distribution when they follow the irrealis prefix. In these cases, both allomorphs surface as the allomorph *q-*.

I show that all uses of the prefix *ql-/qs-* conform to what Mithun (1999:173) has termed “irrealis,” in that this morpheme portrays situations and entities as “within the realm of thought knowable only through the imagination.” Thus, the Montana Salish irrealis marks what Kinkade (1998:234) calls “grammatical unreality.” Although not all constructions that construe a situation as “logically unreal” (Kinkade 1998:234), such as negatives, questions, or conditions, are obligatorily marked for irrealis, the morpheme still asserts that the situation it refers to is not actually in the ‘real’ world.

A second goal of the paper is to examine the way in which irrealis constructions interact with what appears at first to be aspectual morphology. There are certain irrealis forms that appear

¹ The data for this work is drawn from field notes and texts generously provided by Prof. S. Thomason.

with the same set of suffixes that occur in the continuative aspect, intransitive *-mí/-i*² and transitive *-m*. These suffixes appear not to have an aspectual function in irrealis verbs, and that irrealis forms with these suffixes contrast with those irrealis forms that do not contain the suffixes in a syntactic, rather than a semantic, way. I argue that, while the ‘intransitive continuative’ suffix *-mí* can be united with its counterpart found in irrealis forms as a single morpheme, the *-m* found in irrealis forms must be split off from transitive continuative *-m* as a separate morpheme.

1.2. Morphosyntactic preliminaries

This section offers a brief overview of morphosyntactic features of Montana Salish that are pertinent to the analysis presented here. In section 1.2.1, I examine morphological contexts in which irrealis marking is found, giving an overview of the various prefixes present in a Montana Salish word. I illustrate the different sets of morphemes used to mark person and number in the language in section 1.2.2. In section 1.2.3, I discuss transitivity, a key feature of Montana Salish grammar, and outline the formation of continuatives. Finally, in section 1.2.4, I take up the issue of word classes in Montana Salish, discussing the criteria that I use for distinguishing nouns from verbs.

1.2.1. Prefixation

Like all Salish languages, Montana Salish has a very rich morphology, relying on prefixation, suffixation, and various kinds of reduplication to mark grammatical categories. The language possesses a large number of lexical suffixes- suffixes that refer to lexical rather than grammatical notions. The majority of inflection involves suffixes. As this system is not directly related to the investigation of irrealis morphology, it will not be dealt with here.

² The form *-mí* appears when the suffix is stressed, the form *-i* when the suffix is unstressed. For the remainder of the thesis, I will refer to both allomorphs as *-mí*, unless specifically speaking of *-i*.

Irrealis is marked by a prefix located towards the left edge of the word. The only prefixes that potentially precede the irrealis prefix are the possessive prefixes *in-* 1SG.POSS and *an-* 2SG.POSS. Following it are several aspectual and derivational prefixes, locative prefixes, lexical prefixes, and other, miscellaneous prefixes. The root follows this group of miscellaneous prefixes:

Table 1 Prefixes in the MSa word (adapted from Thomason 1992)

Possessive	Irrealis	Pre-locative		Locative	Lexical	Misc.	Root
<i>in-</i> 1SG.POSS <i>an-</i> 2SG.POSS	<i>ql-/qs-</i>	<i>el-</i> ‘back/again’ <i>epl-</i> ‘have’	<i>s-</i> NOM <i>es-</i> ASP <i>sc-</i> RESULT	<i>c-</i> ‘here’ <i>č-</i> ‘on/at/to’ <i>l-</i> ‘in/to’ ...	<i>puʔ-</i> ‘spouse’ <i>qeʔl-</i> ‘child’	<i>č-</i> ‘person’ <i>čs-</i> ‘want to’	

I call the two groups of prefixes directly following the irrealis prefix ‘pre-locative’ even though they do not transparently form a natural class. This label is in part one of convenience, as both groups precede the locative prefixes. It will be shown in Chapter 3, however, that the five prefixes interact with the irrealis prefix in the same way.

1.2.2. Person marking

Montana Salish marks person and number of possessors, subject of intransitive predicates, and subject and object of transitive predicates through the use of affixes and particles. Although each of these paradigms is distinct, the number of morphemes employed is small; multiple morphemes may appear in different paradigms. The possessive paradigm is shown below in table 2.

Table 2 Possessive marking

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	<i>in-</i>	<i>qe</i>
2	<i>an-</i>	<i>-mp</i>
3		<i>-s</i>

The 3rd person possessive suffix does not distinguish number. Intransitive predicates mark the person and number of the subject by using a set of preposed particles:

Table 3 Intransitive subject

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	<i>čn</i>	<i>qe</i>
2	<i>k^w</i>	<i>p</i>
3	<i>∅</i>	

The intransitive subject particles are used both for intransitive verbal predicates and for predicates headed by nouns. In both, 3rd person is unmarked.

Transitive verbal predicates mark person and number of both subject and object. Subjects are marked by suffixes, while objects are marked by suffixes and/or particles. Object suffixes precede subject suffixes:

Table 4 Transitive inflection

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	<i>k^wu ~ q^wo</i>	<i>qe...-húl-l</i>
2	<i>-sí-</i>	<i>-(ú)m-</i>
3	<i>∅</i>	

PATIENT/OBJECT

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	<i>-(é)n</i>	<i>qe...-(é)m</i>
2	<i>-(é)x^w</i>	<i>-(é)p</i>
3	<i>∅</i>	

AGENT/SUBJECT

In addition to the transitive suffix paradigm, there is a second type of transitive inflection. In this thesis I will refer to this type of person marking as ‘mixed transitive inflection’, as it draws upon several different groups of person morphemes. The paradigm is shown in table 5.

Table 5 Mixed transitive inflection

	SINGULAR	PLURAL		SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	<i>k^wu ~ q^wo</i>	<i>qe...-l^{ul}-l³</i>	1	<i>in-</i>	<i>qe</i>
2	<i>k^w</i>	<i>p</i>	2	<i>an-</i>	<i>-mp</i>
3		<i>∅</i>	3		<i>-s</i>
	PATIENT/OBJECT			AGENT/SUBJECT	

In the mixed transitive paradigm, subjects are marked by possessive morphemes. Third-person objects are left unmarked, while 2nd person objects are marked with the particles that otherwise function as intransitive subject particles. The 1st person objects are marked as they are in the normal transitive paradigm. ‘Mixed’ transitive inflection is used with transitive continuative verbs and transitive verbs that have continuative-like morphology.⁴

1.2.3. Transitivity

In Montana Salish, all roots are inherently intransitive, regardless of whether they are monovalent, having one semantic argument, or bivalent, having two semantic arguments (L. Thomason 1995:4). When a bare root is used as a predicate, it is inflected for a single syntactic argument with the intransitive subject particles. When the subject is also represented by a full NP, it appears unmarked or preceded by the ‘secondary’ particle *lu*:

- (1) *tiyéš* (*lu*) Čoní
 crawl 2NDRY Johnny
 ‘Johnny crawled.’

If the root has two semantic arguments, the second may also be present as a full NP in an intransitive construction. If it is present, it is marked by the oblique particle *t*:

³ In the 3PL object forms, the suffixes *-l^{ul}-t-* replace the transitive suffix *-nt* or *-st* present in other transitive forms.

⁴ For more on these irrealis verbs, see Chapter 4.

- (2) čĥip (ĥu) Čoní t sne
 hunt 2NDRY Johnny OBL cow.elk
 ‘Johnny hunted the cow elk.’

In order to be morphologically transitive, roots (and stems) must take a transitivity suffix, *-nt* or *-st*. The verb is then inflected for two syntactic arguments using the ‘normal’ transitive paradigm. The combination of transitive suffix and subject and object suffixes is called the “transitive apparatus” (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:3). When full NPs referencing subject and object are present, the object is left unmarked (or preceded by *lu*) and the subject is marked as oblique:

- (3) čĥip-nt-és (ĥu) sne t Čoní
 hunt-TR-3.TR.SBJ 2NDRY cow.elk OBL Johnny
 ‘Johnny hunted the cow elk.’

There is also a ditransitive construction in which one of the ‘relational’ transitive suffixes *-lt* or *-šit* replaces the normal transitive *-nt/-st*. This construction adds a third syntactic argument, a recipient, to the verb. When the recipient is 1st or 2nd person, it is marked by object inflection on the verb. When NPs appear referring to the arguments, the recipient is optionally preceded by *lu*, the patient is preceded by *t* and the agent is preceded by *t* or the preposition *tl’* ‘from’:

- (4) x^wíč-šit-es lu Malí t pus t Čoní
 give-REL.TR-3TR.SBJ 2NDRY Mary OBL cat OBL Johnny
 ‘Johnny gave the cat to Mary.’ (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:6)

There are several constructions used to derive more complex forms. These are reflexives and reciprocals, formed with the suffixes *-cút* and *-wéx^w*, derived transitives, antipassives, backgrounded agent constructions, and the transitive continuative construction. The last three

constructions are all formed using the suffix *-(é)m* (from here on *-m*), which signals a reduction (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:19).

The antipassive is formed by adding *-m* to a stem. The resulting construction is intransitive, but any semantic object is made indefinite and backgrounded (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:8). If NPs are present the subject is marked by optional *lu*, while the object is marked by *t*. In the backgrounded agent construction, the suffix *-m* is added to a transitive suffix in lieu of ordinary 3rd person subject marking. As its name implies, this construction's function is to shift focus from the agent to the patient. It also indicates that the agent of the clause is indefinite. The marking of NPs in the backgrounded agent construction remains the same as in normal transitive forms: the object is marked by *lu*, the subject *t* (1993:10).

The transitive continuative construction is the most complex of the constructions with *-m*. The entire transitive apparatus is replaced by the suffix *-m*, and the verb takes the aspectual prefix *es-*. Instead of the normal transitive inflection for subject and object, the 'mixed' transitive paradigm (see table 5, above) is used. The verb is still transitive, having two syntactic arguments; object NPs take optional *lu*, subject NPs take *t* (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:13):

- (5) a. k^w iscuʔúm.
 k^w in-es-cuʔú-m
 2SG.INTR.SBJ 1SG.POSS-IRR-hit-TR.CONT
 'I'm hitting you.'
- b. $esx^w epms$ lu $síčm$ t $isq^w séʔ$
 $es-x^w ép-em-s$ lu $síčm$ t $in-s-q^w séʔ$
 ASP-spread-TR.CONT-3POSS 2NDRY blanket OBL 1SG.POSS-NOM-son
 'My son is spreading the blanket.' (S. Thomason and Everett 1993:14)

In ditransitive continuative forms, the transitive suffix reappears, after the relational suffix *-l* or *-š*, as *-lt* or *-št*. Even though the subject of the transitive continuative is marked by possessive

morphology, these forms are verbs. Apparently they were original nominalizations, and that accounts for the use of possessive affixes to mark the agent (Kroeber 1999:351). The use of 2nd person subject particles to mark the patient in transitive continuatives (as in 5a) can be explained by the fact that they are the only person-marking morphemes available to use for the purpose (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:16).

Intransitive verbs may also form continuatives, but these forms do not involve the suffix *-m*. Instead, an intransitive verb takes the aspectual prefix *es-* and a specialized intransitive continuative suffix *-mí*. These verbs are inflected with the same subject particles that non-continuative intransitive forms are.

The formation of continuatives is important to the discussion of irrealis morphology, as there are irrealis forms that appear to have continuative morphology, except that the aspectual prefix *es-* is replaced by the irrealis prefix *qs-*. For intransitive verbs of this type, the verb stem is flanked by *qs-...-mí*. For transitive verbs of this type, the verb takes the irrealis prefix and the transitive apparatus is replaced by the suffix *-m*. The mixed transitive paradigm is used to mark subjects and objects, just as in transitive continuatives. These forms pose a problem in that they are not semantically continuative, yet they bear what has previously been analyzed as continuative morphology. This issue will be dealt with in detail in Chapter 4. I will continue to gloss the suffixes *-m* and *-mí* as ‘continuative’ in irrealis forms, even if it is not entirely clear what their meaning is in those forms.

1.2.4. Properties of nouns and verbs

It has long been debated whether there is a distinction between the word classes ‘noun’ and ‘verb’ in Salish languages. While some authors such as Kinkade (1983) and Jelinek and Demers (1994) argue that there is only one word class, others, such as Van Eijk and Hess (1986) and N. Mattina

(1996), have argued that there is a distinction between noun and verb. The question is both lexical and syntactic: can the lexicon of Salish languages be separated into classes that correspond, roughly, to what can be identified as ‘noun’ and ‘verb’ cross-linguistically, and if it can, what are the syntactic consequences of this partitioning? (Kroeber 1999:33)

In this thesis, I will assume that ‘noun’ and ‘verb’ are distinct lexical classes in Montana Salish. I follow, loosely, the criteria set out by N. Mattina (1996) for Okanagan. The most straightforward diagnostic for distinguishing nouns from other word classes is that nouns are the only words in the language that can take possessive affixes:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------------------|----|-----------------------|
| (6) | a. | citx ^w | b. | in-citx ^w |
| | | ‘house’ | | 1SG.POSS-house |
| | | | | ‘my house’ |
| | c. | x ^w uy | c. | *in-x ^w uy |
| | | ‘he/she goes’ | | 1SG.POSS-go |

While transitive continuative verbs take possessive affixes, this is because of their origin as nominalized forms. Also, in these forms, a possessive affix indicates an agent, and not a possessor.

A second morphological criterion separating nouns from verbs is that nouns may take the derivational prefix *epł-* ‘have’, while verbs may not:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------|----|------------------------|
| (7) | a. | epł-citx ^w | b. | *epł-x ^w uy |
| | | have-house | | have-go |
| | | ‘He has a house’ | | |

The forms derived by the prefix *epł-* are intransitive verbs. The status of the derived form as a verb is confirmed by the fact that an *epł-* stem cannot take possessive affixes: **in-*

epl-citx^w.⁵

Syntactically, nouns may occur after the oblique particle *t*. When used as arguments,⁶ some nouns are preceded by *t*. Which argument is marked by *t* depends on the transitivity of the verb. When the verb is intransitive, *t* marks objects (8a); when the verb is transitive, *t* marks subjects (8b). The particle is also used to mark patients in ditransitive clauses (8c):

- (8) a. člip t sne
'He hunted cow elk.'
- b. esk^weʔéms t smɣe
'He's getting bitten by a grizzly bear.'
- c. q^wo tk^wešt^w t iqsmén^wx^w
'Go get me some tobacco.'

The particle has other functions as well, forming locative (9a) and temporal (9b) adverbials:

- (9) a. nk^wwúʔ sšen^wš čx^wéct ci t nšné
'One of the stones went right through the window.'
- b. čχ^wóyqn t spisc^wé.
'I piled it up yesterday.'

This particle is not completely understood, and deserves more attention in the future. However, it is clear that the particle is only used with nouns, and that it cannot be used with verbs.

Verb stems are distinguished from nouns morphologically by their ability to take transitive morphology directly (seen in 10), and by their ability to form the continuative aspect (seen in 11). In both cases, nominals cannot form these categories:

⁵ There are a few examples of *epl-* verbs with the possessive prefix *in-*, which in these cases appears as *y-*: *ta yepsec'í* 'I have nothing to say'. The nature of such examples is not clear, and, since they are rare, I will not deal with them here.

⁶ Here I use the term 'argument' to mean 'semantic argument'. Deciding whether these phrases actually occupy syntactic argument positions is not within the scope of this thesis.

- | | | | |
|------|--|----|--|
| (10) | čłp-nt-én
hunt-TR-1SG.TR.SBJ
'I hunted it.' | b. | *cítx ^w -nt-én
house-TR-1SG.TR.SBJ |
| (11) | es-x ^w úy-i
ASP-go-INTR.CONT
'He's going' | b. | *es-cítx ^w -i
ASP-house-INTR.CONT |

While it is clear that both these features separate verbs from nouns morphologically, the entire issue of word classes in Montana Salish has not been fully analyzed, and deserves more attention. For the remainder of this thesis, however, it will be assumed that there is a distinction in Montana Salish between the two classes.

1.3. Road Map

The remainder of the thesis is structured as follows. In Chapter 2 I give theoretical background on the irrealis as a grammatical category, and show that it can be considered one in Montana Salish. In Chapter 3 I examine the allomorphy of the irrealis prefix itself, showing that there are three allomorphs, *ql-*, *qs-*, and *q-*. The distribution of the first two, *ql-* and *qs-*, is conditioned by the type of word to which the irrealis prefix attaches. Nouns receive the allomorph *ql-*, and verbs receive the allomorph *qs-*. When the irrealis prefix is followed by any 'pre-locative' prefix, both irrealis allomorphs appear as *q-*. I then discuss the distinction between irrealis forms marked with 'continuative' suffixes and those that do not have such suffixes, in Chapter 4. These forms correspond to what Kroeber (1999) calls 'irrealis-II' and 'irrealis-I', respectively. Finally, I turn my attention to the other languages of the Southern Interior branch in Chapter 5, showing that they all have prefixes cognate to Montana Salish *ql-/qs-*, and that these prefixes pattern in a similar distribution.

Chapter 2

Irrealis as a Grammatical Category in Montana Salish

2.1. Introduction

One does not find a single definition of the term “irrealis” in the literature. This is a consequence of the large number of uses the label has had throughout its history. Generally, the term irrealis is said to categorize a situation as “purely within the realm of thought, knowable only through imagination” (Mithun 1999:173). It contrasts with “realis,” which is said to portray situations as “having occurred or actually occurring, knowable through direct perception” (1999:173). Many authors have described a grammatical distinction between those situations which are viewed as real and those which are viewed as unreal in the individual languages they study, be it with the terms realis and irrealis or with other terms, such as “factive” or “non-factive” (Elliot 2000: 56). However, in many cases, the details and uses of the terms are not well explained or made precise. This has led some authors, such as Bybee et. al. (1994), to question the validity of a realis/irrealis distinction cross-linguistically. The variation seen across realis/irrealis systems, they argue, means that the systems do not have a single semantic element in common. This precludes the distinction from being considered a universal grammatical category. (Bybee *et al.* 1994:239).

Whether or not there is a universal category that contrasts realis and irrealis in the world’s languages is not an issue in this thesis. I will argue, however, that there is a set of constructions in Montana Salish, found with both nouns and verbs, that can all be analyzed as “irrealis”. The individual semantics of each construction varies, but there is a common semantic thread of unreality running through all of them. The conclusion that each of these constructions is part of a wider, unified category is supported by the fact that the apparently different prefixes involved in marking them can all be united under a single morpheme with morphologically conditioned

allomorphs, as will be shown in Chapter 3. I label this category the IRREALIS, as the semantics of the category conform to Mithun’s definition of portraying an event or entity in “the realm of thought” (1999:173). In section 2.2 I examine different constructions formed with the prefix *qł-*/*qs-*/*q-*, and show that they can be united by a single semantic element. In section 2.3 I then discuss constructions that logically construe the unreality of a proposition, yet are not obligatorily marked for irrealis as one might expect. These constructions are negatives, questions, imperatives, and conditional expressions.

2.2. Irrealis constructions

There is a group of related constructions in Montana Salish that are all marked by a prefix with the shapes *qs-*, *qł-* and *q-*. This prefix appears on both nouns and verbs. It will be shown in Chapter 3 that all three forms of the prefix can all be analyzed as allomorphs of the same underlying morpheme on the grounds of their distribution and morphophonological behavior. In this section I argue that all the constructions can be related back to a single semantic element, the assertion that the word is unreal, non-actual, or not yet occurring. I will call this morpheme the IRREALIS prefix.

Nouns may be marked for irrealis in any position. Predicate nominals that are marked for irrealis are exemplified in 12, while nouns referencing arguments of verbs or appearing after a preposition are illustrated in 13. The irrealis nouns are underlined:

- (12) a. qł-ʕacm’iʔ-s Lwí.
 IRR-trap-3POSS Louis
 ‘It will be Louis’ trap.’
- b. qł-cítx^w-s.
 IRR-house-3.POSS
 ‘It’s going to be his house.’
- c. i-q-s-χélwi

1SG.POSS-IRR-NOM-husband
‘My husband-to-be’

- d. čn esnté či qł-ilmíx^wm.
1SG.INTR.SBJ want 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-chief
‘I want to be chief.’
- (13) a. q^wo x^wíc’št t qł-č-tux^w=cín=tn.
1OBJ give OBL IRR-ON-add=mouth=INSTR
‘Give me something to add.’
- b. k^w i-qs-λ’ ešítm t a-qłmalyé
1SG.INTR.SBJ 1SG.POSS-IRR-look.for.TR.CONT OBL 2SG.POSS-IRR-medicine
‘I’m going to look for medicine for you.’
- c. čn esk^włuyscúti χ^wl’ i-qł-sc-λ’íl
1SG.INTR.SBJ be.prepared.INTR.CONT for 1SG.POSS-IRR-RES-die
‘I’m all prepared for my death.’

Nouns with irrealis marking are interpreted as future or hypothetical. The future reading can be seen in 12a-c. The sentence in 12a asserts that the trap is not yet Louis’, but in the future it will be. Hypothetical readings can be seen in examples 12d and in 13a-c. The embedded predicate irrealis predicate nominal *či qłilmix^wm* ‘1INTR.SBJ chief.IRR’ in 12d does not assert that the subject will be chief, but hypothetically will be. The line between hypothetical and future readings is a fuzzy one. For example, in 13c, the referent of *aqłmalyé* ‘your medicine-to-be’ may be in fact real, simply asserted not to be in the hands of the possessor yet, and thus unreal conceptually. It may be the case, however, that the speaker is not asserting the existence of the medicine, simply that he or she is looking for some medicine, in which case the reading is hypothetical. The readings of the irrealis nouns in 13a and 13c may be either future or hypothetical for similar reasons.

The ambiguity between future and hypothetical readings in such cases as 13c and 13d arises from the presence of possessive affixes. It seems that the irrealis may take scope over

either the possessive prefix, in which case the only the unreality of the possessor is asserted, or over both the possessive prefix and the noun itself, in which case unreality of both is asserted. Future readings of such nouns arise when only the possessive prefix is in scope, i.e., *aqlmalyé* asserts only that the possessor is unreal. Hypothetical readings arise when both possessive prefix and noun are in scope, i.e. *aqlmalyé* asserts that both the possessor and medicine are unreal.

Verbs marked with the irrealis prefix have a range of meanings similar to that of nouns marked with the prefix. When used as the main predicate of a clause, irrealis verbs are most often translated as futures (irrealis forms are again underlined):

- (14) a. qe qs-eł-c-ʔimʔši.
1PL IRR-back-here-move.camp.INTR.CONT
'We'll move back here.'
- b. či qs-x^wúyi č' uté
1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-go.INTR.CONT to downstream
'I'm going to go downstream (to visit another tribe).'
- c. k^w i-qs-k^wúp^m
2SG.INTR.SBJ 1SG.POSS-IRR-push.TR.CONT
'I'm going to push you.'
- d. či qs-q^wóm'i.
1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-take.PL.INTR.CONT
'I'll take more than one.'

In some cases, irrealis verb forms may indicate desire. This reading is common with verbs that have stative semantics, as in 15:

- (15) a. i či qs-čfn'á
STAT 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-alone
'I want to be alone.'
- b. či qs-k^wtún-t-i
1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-big-STAT-INTR.CONT
'I want to be big.'

Irrealis verbs may also be found as the predicate of a subordinate clause. Some examples of this kind of construction are shown in 16:

- (16) a. čn esnté či qs-k^wúl'm.
 1SG.INTR.SBJ want 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-do
 'I want to do something.'
- b. yoʔnúnt k^w qs-nč'alí!
 learn 2SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-swim
 'Learn how to swim!'
- c. čn c'χ^wóm čn qs-x^wu č' nɪʔay
 1SG.INTR.SBJ plan 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-go to Missoula
 'I made plans to go to Missoula.'
- d. k^w nté či qs-x^wúy.
 2SG.INTR.SBJ think 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-go
 'You thought I was going.'

When used in this position, the meaning of irrealis verbs varies between future and hypothetical. In 16a and 16b the irrealis asserts that the event in question is hypothetical. In example 16c, the assertion of the irrealis predicate *či qsx^wu* 'I go.IRR' is that the event has not happened yet, i.e. there is a future reading. Again, however, there is an ambiguity in this example between future and hypothetical readings. In this case, the ambiguity arises from the higher clause and its possible contexts. If one were talking about plans that are obviously going to happen, then the reading is future. If one were talking about plans that may or may not happen, the reading is more hypothetical. In 16d, irrealis marking asserts that the event was unreal in the past, producing a contradictory reading.

It would be illogical to split these varying uses of the irrealis prefix due to their different morphosyntactic contexts and differences in meaning. The variation observed between individual

constructions arises because of the specifics of the morphosyntactic, semantic, and pragmatic environments of that construction. The interpretation and morphosyntactic particulars of irrealis nouns differ from the interpretation and morphosyntactic particulars of irrealis verbs because of the inherent differences present between the category noun and verb.

This analysis differs from analyses offered by other authors for prefixes cognate to the Montana Salish irrealis prefix in the Southern Interior branch of the Salish family. While the systems observed in these closely related languages will be dealt with in more detail in chapter 6, a short discussion of one differing analysis, that of Okanagan's cognate prefixes by A. Mattina (1996), is useful here. Okanagan has a set of prefixes equivalent to the Montana Salish irrealis prefix, a nominal prefix *kt-*, cognate with Montana Salish *qt-*, and a verbal prefix *ks-*, cognate with Montana Salish *qs-*. When found on possessed nouns, *kt-* indicates a "likely-to-be" meaning, and when found on predicate nominals, it indicates a future meaning (1996:1). The prefix *ks-* indicates future on verbs (1996:1-2). Mattina analyzes these prefixes as different morphemes, saying that "they are in complementary distribution, but their functions and morphosyntax are different" (1996:3). While it is true that the semantics of these prefixes differ on the surface, there is a common thread running through them all: the assertion that the proposition made about them does not (yet) hold. Their differing surface semantics and morphosyntax can be explained by taking into account the different constructions they enter into. The morphosyntax of nouns differs from the morphosyntax of verbs, and therefore the constructions the prefixes enter into with those two categories will naturally differ. By ignoring the common semantic thread that runs through all the uses of these prefixes in Okanagan, Mattina misses an important generalization that can be made about that prefix.

The use of the term “irrealis” to categorize generalized morphemes of the type found in Montana Salish has been criticized by Bybee (1998). She argues that in such cases, there is no single meaning that can characterize all the constructions that that morpheme enters into. She writes, “it appears that the term ‘irrealis’ is simply too general to be useful, except as a pointer to a very broad domain.” (1998: 269) I reject this notion in this thesis on the grounds outlined above. While it is true that the morpheme used to mark IRREALIS does obtain more specific meanings when in specific constructions, all of these constructions are characterized by the indicates that the phrase or proposition marked by irrealis is unreal-- either hypothetical or not yet realized. Therefore, there is a common semantic thread connecting the all the uses of the irrealis morpheme. While the use of “irrealis” as a general descriptive term may be controversial, it still seems the most appropriate term to use for the morpheme found in Montana Salish.

2.3. Other ways of expressing unreality in Montana Salish

By definition, negative expressions, questions, imperatives, and certain types of conditional constructions assert that the proposition they accompany is unreal. In Montana Salish, these types of constructions do not require irrealis marking in the clause they occur in. In fact, one of them, the imperative, does not occur at all in the data with irrealis marking. Negatives, questions, and conditional expressions may, but need not, co-occur with irrealis marking, but need not. Here, I examine the meaning of these constructions on their own, and how they interact with irrealis marking when it is present.

2.3.1. Negation

There are two negative particles in Montana Salish, *ta* and *tam*. The negative *ta* is used to negate only verbal predicates, while the negative *tam* is used to negate all nouns and to negate

continuative verbal predicates (Baier & Wdzcency 2009). When used without the irrealis, the negative particles simply indicate the negation of the proposition.

- (17) a. ta sk^wlstnun
 ‘He refused to go.’ (lit. ‘I didn’t succeed in sending him’)
- b. tam sqélix^w
 ‘He’s not an Indian.’
- c. λ’e tam p esntélsmm
 ‘We don’t want you.’

The negative particle *tam* may be used with irrealis predicate nominals. In this case, the assertion of the future or hypothetical usually seen with predicate nominals in the irrealis is also found, except that the sentence is negative:

- (18) tam iqsxélwi
 ‘He’s not my husband-to-be.’

Irrealis verbs are negated only by *ta*, never *tam*.⁷ When used in conjunction with the irrealis, a negative verbal predicate may be translated as negative imperative, as in 19:

- (19) a. ta qsnt’éq^wntx^w!
 ‘Don’t muddy the water!’
- b. ta qsme?cínmntx^w!
 ‘Don’t bother him!’
- c. ta k^w qsx^wúsmi!
 ‘Don’t stay awake!’

The above examples illustrate that when occurring with a second person form, intransitive (as in 19c) or transitive (as in 19a-b), negative irrealis verbs are usually interpreted as negative

⁷ See section 4.2 for further discussion.

imperatives. Such constructions are not imperatives formally, as they do not have the normal imperative morphology (see section 2.3.3, below). It seems that this construction is simply a negative future that has come to be used as a negative imperative.⁸ The negative future meaning is the only one found with negated irrealis verbs with 1st and 3rd person subjects, as in 20a-b and 20c, respectively:

- (20) a. ta čǐ qšč'úw.
'I won't be gone.'
- b. ta qsk^wúpncn.
'I'm not going to push you.'
- c. ta u lé qe? qščn?awqisqáxejmlls.
'He won't sick his dogs on us again.'

Rarely, a negative irrealis verb will be interpreted as showing inability of the subject to perform the action portrayed in the verb, as in 21:

- (21) a. ta iqsk^wúl'm
'I can't work.'
- b. ta qs-šiw?
'He can't move.'

All the interpretations of negative irrealis predicates are in line with the normal meaning of affirmative irrealis predicates.

2.3.2. Yes/no questions

Yes/no questions are formed with a particle *ha*. Like the negative particles, *ha* need not be used in conjunction with an irrealis form, as seen in 22:

⁸ Compare the use of negative futures as imperatives in English, such as “You *will not* go there!”

- (22) $ha\ k^w\ esx^w\ lx^w\ ilt?$
 ‘Are you alive?’

When *ha* is used with an irrealis verb form, there is no special interpretation. Thus, the regular irrealis reading simply comes out questioned:

- (23) a. $ha\ k^w\ qsxyilši?$
 ‘Are you going on a raid?’
 b. $ha\ k^w\ qsč'owi?$
 ‘Will you be gone?’
 c. $ha\ k^w\ iqsk^w\ úpm?$
 ‘Can I give you a push (in your car)?’

In the above examples, the assertion of unreality made by the irrealis is not interpreted differently than when an irrealis form is used without the particle *ha*. The verbal predicates in 23a and 23b are futures, while the irrealis verbal predicate 23c expresses permission (‘can’) made into a question by the particle *ha*.

2.3.3. Imperatives

Another construction that naturally encodes the unreality of a situation is the imperative. In Montana Salish, the imperative is formed with a suffix attached to a verb. These suffixes differ for intransitive and transitive verbs:

- (24) a. $ł'ékws!$
 ‘Get out of here!’
 b. $k^w:isyútmk^w$
 ‘Go clean it!’
 c. $łáqqwi$
 ‘Sit down, all of you!’

- d. ʔém'tnt asčx^wúy, asl'áxt.
 'Feed your visitors, your friends!'

There are four imperative suffixes. The intransitive singular imperative suffix $-\check{s}$ is seen in 24a, the transitive singular imperative suffix $-sk^w$ is seen in 24b, the plural imperative suffix $-wi$ is seen in 24c, and the imperative suffix $-\emptyset$, found only with $-nt$ transitives, is seen in 24d. Unlike the other types of constructions discussed in this section, the imperative suffixes do not combine with irrealis marking. It is not clear why this is the case.

2.3.4. Conditional constructions

A conditional construction is composed of a “condition clause”, the protasis, and an “event clause”, the apodosis (Elliot 2000:71). The protasis is the condition upon which the event is contingent. Thompson & Longacre (1985:190) distinguish two types of conditional clauses, real and unreal conditionals. Real conditionals are those situations which refer to “‘real’ present, ‘habitual’, or past situations,” while unreal conditionals are those which refer to “unreal situations” (1985:190). Unreal conditions are further divided into two types, “imaginative” and “predictive”. Imaginative conditionals are those in which the speaker imagines “what might be or what might have been,” while predictive conditionals are those in which the speaker “predicts what will be” (1985:190-191).

In Montana Salish, the conditional construction involves the framing of the protasis and apodosis with two particles, drawn from the set $n'e$ ‘if/when’, m FUT(URE), and $n'em$, a combination of the first two particles. The protasis is preceded by $n'e$ and the apodosis is preceded either the particle m or the particle $n'em$. The two clauses may be in any order relative to one another. Examples of conditional constructions are seen in 25, with the protasis and apodosis bracketed:

- (25) a. [n'e qe wisk'wúl'ɬx^w]_{PRO} [m l čey' m qe lci?]_{APO}
 'When we finish building the house, we'll live in it.'
- b. [n'e ta k^w esséwne?]_{PRO} [n'em ye l ʔe m nililmnúlex^wncn]_{APO}
 If you don't listen, I'll turn you upside down (pound your head on the ground)!
- c. [n'em ɬcncín]_{APO} [n'e i k^w q^wéw]_{PRO}
 'I'll spank you if you're bad.'
- d. [n'e xéym u wíčis Tolutí]_{PRO} [n'em xménčis.]_{APO}
 'If he ever sees Dorothy, he'll love her.'

To judge from the above examples, it seems that whether the apodosis is preceded by the *m* or *n'em* depends on whether the conditional is real or unreal. The conditional in 25a is real, and the apodosis is preceded by the particle *m* FUT. In 25b-d, the apodoses of three unreal conditionals are preceded by the particle *n'em*.

As implied by their name, unreal conditionals inherently portray a situation that is unreal, and thus we would perhaps expect them to attract irrealis marking. In fact, it is imaginative conditionals like that in 25d that attract irrealis marking (Elliot 2000:70), and yet in 25d there is no irrealis marking. If these examples are truly representative, it may indicate that in Montana Salish, the use of irrealis marking is not obligatory in any conditional construction, as in the other constructions examined in this section. There are examples of irrealis predicates occurring in conditional constructions, however. Some such examples are shown in 26, again with protasis and apodosis bracketed:

- (26) a. [n'e p esnɣéli t smɣe]_{PRO} [m še ta p qsčšin.]_{APO}
 'If you're afraid of grizzlies, then don't come along.'
- b. [n'e k^w qsk^wl'sncú]_{PRO} [m nt'púsnt.]_{APO}
 'When you are going to cook, boil it.'

- c. [n'e ta sk'wissust t kapi]PRO [m ta qsqwlqwé.]APO
 'If he doesn't drink coffee, he can't talk.'

In all three of the above examples, the irrealis is used in what we expect to be real conditionals, and seem to be from their semantics. In 26a and 26b, the irrealis is combined with the negative particle *ta* to form a negative future in the apodosis. In 26b, the irrealis forms a future in the protasis. There are less than a dozen conditional constructions that I have been able to find which also contain the irrealis, and it is not clear why the irrealis has such a distribution in conditional clauses. Indeed, more investigation is necessary to determine the exact morphosyntax of conditional clauses and the way that the irrealis interacts with them.

2.4. Summary

As was shown in section 2.2, the meaning of the irrealis prefix may vary in the context of different constructions, yet all these meanings can be accounted for by a single semantic element: the assertion that the word the irrealis marks is unreal. The semantics of each construction may vary from future to hypothetical, from desire to ability, yet all show that the situation or entity is not a part of the world of reality. The different morphosyntax of each construction is accounted for by the differences in morphosyntax of the lexical categories that the irrealis prefix can be attached to, noun or verb. Because of these facts, it seems unproductive to split up the different usages of the irrealis prefix into completely different morphemes.

As shown in section 2.3, however, the irrealis is not always required in constructions that inherently assert the unreality of the proposition they occur in. Negative expressions, questions, imperatives, and unreal conditional expressions all mark their proposition as not belonging to the real world. Yet, in the case of all these constructions, the use of irrealis marking in conjunction with their other formatives is not obligatory, indeed in the case of the imperative even

ungrammatical. When they do co-occur with irrealis marking, these constructions shape the semantic detail of the irrealis prefix, just as it is shaped in other types of constructions. For example, negative irrealis predicates are interpreted most usually as negative futures. Sometimes, however, negative irrealis verbs may show that the subject lacks the ability to perform the action embodied in the verb.

It is therefore clear that Montana Salish has a grammatical category encoding whether or not the situation is construed as a part of a ‘real’ or ‘imaginary’ world. This is the IRREALIS category. In the following chapter it will be shown that all surface manifestations of the irrealis prefix are allomorphs of the same underlying morpheme, and that the distribution of these allomorphs can be predicted by the type of word to which they attach: nouns receive one allomorph, verbs the other.

Chapter 3

Allomorphy of the Irrealis Prefix

3.1. Introduction

It was shown in the previous chapter that irrealis is a grammatical category in Montana Salish. It is marked by a prefix whose surface shape varies between *ql-*, *qs-*, and *q-*. These variants can be seen in 27a, 27b and 27c, and 27d, respectively.

- (27) a. *qlcítx^ws.*
 ‘It’s going to be his house.’
- b. *iqsxélwi*
 ‘My husband-to-be’
- c. *či qsq^wóm’i*
 ‘I’ll take more than one.’
- d. *ta k^w qesx^wmqncú*
 ‘Don’t feel safe!’

It was previously thought that the irrealis prefix had one underlying shape, *ql-*, and that when *ql-* did not appear in irrealis forms, that this arose through the deletion of /l/ before another prefix. Under this analysis, the forms in 27b and 27c arose because the irrealis prefix *ql-* was followed by the nominalizer *s-*, and the aspectual prefix *es-* in 27d.

I will show in this chapter that there are actually three allomorphs of the irrealis prefix. I will show in this chapter that there are actually two allomorphs of the irrealis prefix, *ql-*, *qs-*, and *q-*. The distribution of the first two allomorphs, *ql-* and *qs-*, is lexically conditioned by the type of stem to which they attach: irrealis nouns receive *ql-* and irrealis verbs receive *qs-*. In cases where a noun shows the surface sequence *qs-*, as in 27b, this derives from the underlying sequence *ql-s-*, the irrealis prefix followed by the nominalizer *s-*. Thus, the sequence is actually

q-s-. On the other hand, when *qs-* is found with verbs, there is no motivation for segmenting the nominalizer from the irrealis prefix, and *qs-* must be treated as an indivisible morphological unit. The third allomorph, *q-* (27d), is a morphologically conditioned variant of the other two allomorphs. It appears before a group of prefixes that are located between the irrealis prefix and the locative prefixes, called here ‘pre-locative prefixes’. This group of pre-locatives prefixes is composed of the nominalizer *s-*, the aspectual prefix *es-*, and the prefixes *sc-* RESULT, *el-* ‘back/again’, and *epl-* ‘have’. This alternation that leads to the ambiguity between irrealis nouns with *q-s-* and irrealis verbs with *qs-*

In section 3.2 I argue that irrealis marking on both nouns and verbs triggers the same type of allomorphy in preceding morphemes. In section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 I show that the surface sequence *ql-* is limited to nouns, and that nouns exhibiting surface *qs-* may be derived from underlying *ql-s-*. In section 3.3.3 and section 3.3.4, I demonstrate that verbs conditioned the allomorph *qs-*, but that sometimes this prefix surfaces as *q-*. I extend the allomorph process that conditions the *ql- ~ q-* alternation to this type of example as well.

3.2. Allomorphy triggered by irrealis forms

The presence of irrealis marking triggers two types of allomorphy in preceding person morphemes. The first type occurs in the 1PL particle *qe(?)*, which sometimes appears as *qa(?)* before irrealis forms. This vowel lowering is phonologically motivated by the presence of /q/ in the irrealis prefix. This can be seen in the particle’s second appearance before the irrealis noun *qlimix^wm* in 28a, and before the irrealis verb in 28b:

- (28) a. *qe esnté qa qlilmix^wm.*
 ‘We both want to be chief.’
- b. *qa qs?ímši*
 ‘We’re going to move camp.’

The second type of allomorphy involves the deletion of /n/ or the change on /n/ > [i], and can be termed ‘*n*-change’. Before irrealis forms, ‘*n*-change’ occurs in the possessive prefixes *in-* 1SG.POSS and *an-* 2SG.POSS, and in the particle *čn* 1SG.INTR.SBJ. Underlying /n/ is deleted yielding the possessive prefixes *i-* and *a-*, as in 29a and 29b, respectively. Similarly, the particle *čn* becomes *či* before an irrealis form, as in 29c:

- (29) a. iqsčχ^wóyqnmc.
 ‘I’m to going to pile it up’
- b. aqlnóχ^wnχ^w
 ‘Your wife-to-be’
- c. či qsšál'u.
 ‘I will go up.’

The changes encompassed under the *n*-change rule are quite productive in the language, and can be stated as follows: $Vn \rightarrow V$, $Cn \rightarrow Ci / _s-$. Or, written out, ‘the sequence *Vn* becomes *V* and the sequence *Cn* becomes *Ci* when before a morpheme boundary followed by /s/'. However, as can be seen from example 29, this rule does not account for cases when there is no /s/ in the triggering morpheme, as in 29b, or if there is another phoneme between the /s/ and the /n/, as in 29a and 29c. The rule has become high grammaticalized.

3.3. Distribution of irrealis forms

The irrealis prefix varies between *ql-*, *qs-*, and *q-*. In this section, I show that the form *ql-* is limited to nouns, while *qs-* is limited to verbs. Apparent examples of *qs-* with nouns actually involve two morphemes, the irrealis prefix in the form *ql-* and the nominalizer *s-*. The sequence then reduces to *q-s-*. I take this complementary distribution and the functional identity of the

forms *ql-* and *qs-* to indicate that they are allomorphs of the same morpheme. The form *q-* is a conditioned variant of both allomorphs before a certain class of prefixes.

3.3.1. Nouns with *ql-*

The irrealis prefix only takes the form *ql-* when appearing with a noun:

- (30) a. t esél lu iqłpspús. 'two cats'
 b. qłp'ip'úyšis 'his car-to-be'
 c. aqłšlmín 'your axe-to-be'
 d. qe esč'sélm qa qłilmíx^wm. 'We both want to be chief.'
 e. k^w iqsł'ešítm t aqłmalyé 'I'm going to look for medicine for you.'

There are a few examples of *ql-* appearing with words that do not fit the above criteria exactly.

Consider the forms shown in 31:

- (31) a. ta k^w qłχ^wópt! 'Don't be lazy!'
 b. či qłχ^wópt. 'I'm going to be lazy.'
 c. še qłχayílši 'They're going to go out raiding.'

It is not immediately clear how the forms in 31a-c are to be analyzed, as the evidence seems to point to them being verbal. The irrealis form in 31a, *qłχ^wópt*, is negated by the negative particle *ta*, which negates most verbs (Baier & Wdzenczny 2009). The second appearance of the form *qłχ^wópt* in 31b does not clear up the question, appears to be an intransitive verbal predicate. The form *qłχayílši* in 31c looks much like an intransitive continuative verb, and it is not clear why such a form would take *ql-*. These examples will be treated as irregularities.

3.3.2. Nouns with *q-s-*

Not all examples of *q-s-* derive from the same source. Consider the underlined irrealis words in example 32 below:

- (32) a. esiyá iqst'm'á
 ‘They’re all going to be my cows.’
- b. tam iqsxélwi
 ‘He’s not my husband-to-be.’
- c. k^w iqstumístm t aqsc?íln
 ‘I’m going to buy food for you.’

The fact that the underlined irrealis words are nouns is supported by the same criteria used to establish the nouns in example 5 as nouns. All three underlined examples have possessive prefixes. 32b the predicate is negated by the negative particle *tam*, the only negative particle that negates nouns. In example 32c, there are two irrealis forms. The first, *k^w iqstumístm* ‘I’m going to buy you it’ is an example of a transitive verb inflected for the marked irrealis,⁹ and has the verbal irrealis allomorph, *q-s-* (see section 3.3.3, below). The second, *aqsc?íln* ‘your food.IRR’ is found after the oblique particle *t*.

All the underlined irrealis forms above are nouns that are lexically bound to the nominalizer *s-*. This means that it is possible to segment the *s-* in *q-s-* from the irrealis prefix itself. Since it has already been shown that the irrealis takes the form *qł-* with all nouns, it is perfectly reasonable to posit that this is the underlying form of the prefix in those nouns that show a surface *q-s-*. This analysis explains every example of nouns found with *q-s-*.

The deletion of /ł/ from *qł-* before *s-* is paralleled by the deletion of /ł/ from the prefix *epl-* ‘have’. When that prefix appears before the nominalizer *s-*, the /ł/ does not appear, as can be seen in 33a. When the prefix does not occur before the nominalizer, as in 33b, the /ł/ surfaces:

⁹ The ‘marked’ irrealis will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

- (33) a. ha k^w epst'šá?
'Do you have huckleberries?'
b. čn epłkepú
'I have a coat.'

In 33a, *epł-* appears before the non *st'šá* 'huckleberry', which forces the prefix to appear as *ep-*. This is not the case in 33b, where the prefix appears as *epł-* before the noun *łkepú* 'coat'. Both cases of /ł/ deletion are morphological; the sequence *łs* is a perfectly valid sequence in the language, even across other morpheme boundaries, as in *ulsc?á* 'several cows' or *melstúmn* 'I cured you'. It may be that the /ł/ in the prefix *qł-* is historically related to the /ł/ in *epł-*, perhaps serving as a linking element (S. Thomason, p.c. 2009), but there is not enough evidence for or against this hypothesis to make a conclusive decision.

3.3.3. Verbs with *qs-*

Most irrealis verbs appear with surface *qs-*. Consider the examples of verbs with *qs-* in 34:

- (34) a. či qs-q^wóm'i.
1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-take.several.INTR.CONT
'I'll take more than one.'
b. k^w qs-łéx^włsi.
2SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-rest.INTR.CONT
'You're going to rest.'
c. i-qs-čšłčmínm
1SG.POSS-IRR-turn.around.TR.CONT
'I'm going (to go) around it.'
d. ta k^w qs-x^wú č' táwn!
NEG 2SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-go to town
'Don't go to town!'
e. ta qs-xménčstn Malí.
NEG IRR-love.1SG.TR.SBJ Mary
'I won't love Mary.'

- f. ha k^w qs-č'úwi
 Q 2SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-gone.INTR.CONT
 ‘Are you going to be gone?’

Unlike in example 32, above, there is no obvious motivation for segmenting the nominalizer *s-* from the irrealis prefix in 34. Verbs only take the nominalizer when required to by a particle or by the predicate of a higher clause. In those cases, the nominalizer is a vestige of what Kroeber (1999:250) calls ‘propositional nominalization’, which was found on some subordinate clauses in Proto-Salish.¹⁰ The only examples of such propositional nominalization in 34 are the negated irrealis verbs in 34d and 34e, where the presence of the negative particle *ta* would explain the presence of *s-*. However, in the other examples in 34, there is no negative *ta*; all of those examples are independent clauses, and are not subordinated. Why, then, would there be synchronic nominalization on those predicates in 34a-c, and 34f? It seems prudent to posit that in all the examples in 34, *qs-* is a single morphological unit. This analysis accounts for all verbs that have surface *qs-*.

The two forms of irrealis marking *ql-* and *qs-* are in complementary distribution. The form *ql-* appears with nouns, and the form *qs-* with verbs. They are functionally identical, both marking the category of irrealis. They are therefore both allomorphs of the same irrealis morpheme. Strengthening this analysis is the fact that both forms also trigger the same type of allomorphy in preceding morphemes, as discussed above: *n*-change and lowering of *qe(?)* to *qa(?)*. In the next section I show that the alternation of *ql-* with *q-* can also be observed for the verbal irrealis allomorph *qs-*, and that this alteration can be explained in a rather straightforward rule.

¹⁰ This topic will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 4.

3.3.4. Irrealis forms with *q-*

Some irrealis forms do not exhibit either *ql-* or *qs-*, but instead have just *q-*. In all these cases, the irrealis prefix is followed by another prefix. Consider underlined forms in 35:

- (35) a. i qesiyayáʔi m ełnk^wspéntč
 i qs-es-iyáʔ-yáʔ-i m eł-nk^wuʔ-s-pén=tč
 STAT IRR-ASP-all-REDUP-STAT FUT again-one-NOM-year=time
 ‘For one year they’d all be together again’
- b. ta q^wo qełwíčtx^w.
 ta q^wo qs-eł-wíč-st-x^w
 NEG 1OBJ IRR-again-see-TR-2SG.TR.SBJ
 ‘You won’t see me again’
- c. ta qepscmeyyéʔ ł i ʔe sic esp^wox^wtíl^wši.
 ta qs-epł-sc-meyyéʔ łu i ʔe sic es-p^wox^wtíl^wš-i
 NEG IRR-have-RES-tell 2NDRY STAT this new ASP-grow.up-INTR.CONT
 ‘Those growing up right now won’t have this knowledge.’
- d. tam esnté qełesx^wstú.
 tam esnté qs-eł-es-x^wstú.
 NEG want IRR-back-ASP-walk
 ‘He didn’t want to walk back.’
- e. čn esk^włuyscúti
 čn es-k^wł-wiʔ-s-cút-i
 1SG.INTR.SBJ ASP-under-finish-TR-REFL-INTR.CONT
 χ^wl’ iqscł’íl
 χ^wl’ in-qł-sc-ł’íl
 for 1SG.POSS-IRR-NOM-here-die
 ‘I’m all prepared for my death.’

In 35a, the irrealis prefix is followed by the aspectual prefix *es-*; in 35b by the prefix *eł-* ‘back/again’; in 35c by *epł-* ‘have’; in 35d by both *eł-* and *es-*, and in 35e *sc-* RESULT. These prefixes cannot be said to be part of the irrealis prefix, as they are all well established as independent prefixes in the language. Before all these prefixes, the irrealis appears as *q-*, paralleling the alternation of *ql-* with *q-* before the nominalizer *s-*. However, only in 35e before

the prefix *sc-* is the underlying prefix *qł-*; in all the others, the irrealis form in question is a verb, and therefore the underlying prefix should have the shape *qs-*. Therefore, it seems that the rule governing the appearance of the irrealis prefix as *q-* applies to both allomorphs of the prefix, *qł-* and *qs-*.

The nominalizer prefix *s-*, the aspectual prefix *es-*, and the prefixes *sc-* RESULT, *el-* ‘back/again’, and *epł-* ‘have’ are the only prefixes that trigger such an alternation in the form of irrealis marking. When followed by a locative prefix, the irrealis prefix takes the form predicted by the noun/verb split:

- (36) a. *či* *qsnmúli*.
 čn *qs-n-múl-i*
 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-in-dip-INTR.CONT
 ‘I’ll get some water.’
- b. *qwo x^wíc’št* *t* *qłčtx^wcíntn*.
 qwo x^wíc’-ši-t *t* *qł-č-tux^w=cín=tn*
 1OBJ give-REL-TR OBL IRR-on-add=mouth=INSTR
 ‘Give me something to add.’

As can be seen in 36, when followed by a locative prefix, the irrealis prefix takes either the shape *qł-* or *qs-*, determined by the normal distribution, namely, *qł-* with nouns and *qs-* with verbs.

The prefixes which trigger the *qł-/qs-* → *q-* change fall into two morphological ‘slots’ between the irrealis prefix and the locative prefixes, as shown in table 6, repeated here from section 1.2.1:

Table 6 Prefixes in the MSa word (adapted from Thomason 1992)

Possessive	Irrealis	Pre-locative		Locative	Lexical	Misc.	Root
<i>in-</i> 1SG.POSS <i>an-</i> 2SG.POSS	<i>qł-/qs-</i>	<i>eł-</i> ‘back/again’ <i>epl-</i> ‘have’	<i>s-</i> NOM <i>es-</i> ASP <i>sc-</i> RESULT	<i>c-</i> ‘here’ <i>č-</i> ‘on/at/to’ <i>l-</i> ‘in/to’ ...	<i>puʔ-</i> ‘spouse’ <i>qeʔł-</i> ‘child’	<i>č-</i> ‘person’ <i>čs-</i> ‘want to’	

Some of these prefixes may co-occur, and when they are found to do so in irrealis forms, the alternation is *qł-/qs-* still triggered. This can be seen in examples above: 35c, where irrealis is followed by *epl-* and *s-*, and 35d, where the irrealis is followed by *eł-* and *es-*.

Because the prefixes in question do not share a morphological slot and do not have semantic commonalities, they cannot be said to form a natural class. The only commonality found between them is the fact that they all fall between the irrealis prefix and the locative prefixes. For this reason, I refer to them as ‘pre-locative’ prefixes. This allows for a simple rule governing the surface form of the irrealis allomorphs before these prefixes:

- (37) When followed by a pre-locative prefix, the irrealis allomorphs *qs-* and *qł-* both become *q-*.

All the forms of the irrealis prefix are morphologically conditioned. However, the condition that predicts the *q-* instead of *qs-/qł-* is different than the condition that predicts *qs-* vs. *qł-*. In the latter case, it is whether the prefix attaches to a noun or a verb; in the former case, it is the presence or absence of a pre-locative prefix.

3.4. Summary

The irrealis prefix attaches to a stem, following any possessive prefixes. The prefix has two lexically conditioned allomorphs, *qł-* and *qs-*. The allomorph *qs-* attaches to verbs and the allomorph *qł-* attaches to nouns. Such a distribution is not always apparent on the surface, however. When the irrealis prefix is followed by a pre-locative prefix, both lexically conditioned

irrealis allomorphs surface as *q-*. The group of pre-locative prefixes is composed of aspectual *es-*, the nominalizer *s-*, *sc-* RESULT, *el-* ‘back/again’, and the prefix *epl-* ‘have’.

Even though the difference between *ql-* and *qs-* is not apparent on the surface when a pre-locative prefix follows it, the basic distribution of the irrealis allomorphs is maintained. For example, a noun with a pre-locative irrealis prefix has the underlying shape *ql-*, not simply *q-*. These facts can be represented schematically in 38:

- (38) a. Allomorphy of the irrealis before a word without a pre-locative prefix:
 qs-Ø-V
 ql-Ø-N
- b. Allomorphy of the irrealis before a word with a pre-locative prefix:
 ql-pre-LOC-N → *q-pre-LOC-N*
 qs-pre-LOC-V → *q-pre-LOC-V*

As this schema represents, the irrealis prefix in words with a pre-locative prefix does not start as *q-*. Instead, this surface form is derived through the deletion of /*l*/ in nouns and /*s*/ in verbs from the underlying irrealis prefix. Like the sequence *ls* (see section 3.3.2, above), the sequences *se*, *le* and *ss* are phonologically well-formed, as the forms *isq^wséʔ* ‘my son’, *cp^léy* ‘eyebrow’, and *čn eskwssúsm* demonstrate. Therefore, the alternation of *ql-/qs-* with *q-* before the pre-locative prefixes is morphologically, and not phonologically, conditioned.

The distribution of irrealis allomorphs further reinforces the position that there are distinct classes of ‘noun’ and ‘verb’ in Montana Salish. Because it is not a single morpheme within a stem that conditions the allomorph of the irrealis prefix, but the class identity of the stem as a whole, it follows that there are distinct lexical classes that condition this distribution.

Chapter 4

A tale of Two Irrealises

4.1 Introduction

Verbs may be marked for the continuative aspect, expressing duration or ongoing activity.

Transitive and intransitive verbs form continuative aspect differently. Intransitive verbs take the aspectual prefix *es-* and the intransitive continuative suffix *-mí* (unstressed *-i*). Person inflection is the same for continuative and non-continuative intransitive predicates; both use the intransitive subject particles.

For transitive verbs, there is a significant difference between non-continuative and continuative forms. Non-continuative transitive constructions contain a transitive suffix followed by object and subject inflection. Monotransitive continuatives lack this ‘transitive apparatus’ completely; in its place one finds the transitive continuative suffix *-m*. In ditransitive continuatives, the relational transitive suffix *-lt* or *-šit* surfaces before the transitive continuative suffix *-m*. All transitive continuatives also have the aspectual prefix *es-*. Person inflection is completely different from that found in non-continuative transitives. For convenience, this ‘mixed’ transitive paradigm is repeated here in table 7:

Table 7 Mixed transitive inflection

	SINGULAR	PLURAL		SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	<i>k^wu ~ q^wo</i>	<i>qe...-húl-l¹¹</i>	1	<i>in-</i>	<i>qe</i>
2	<i>k^w</i>	<i>p</i>	2	<i>an-</i>	<i>-mp</i>
3		<i>Ø</i>	3		<i>-s</i>
	PATIENT/OBJECT			AGENT/SUBJECT	

¹¹ In the 3PL object forms, the suffixes *-húl-l* replace the transitive suffix *-nt* or *-st* present in other transitive forms.

Agents are marked by possessive morphemes. Patients are marked in different ways: 1SG and 1PL are marked by the same morphology as in non-continuative transitives, while 2SG and 2PL are marked by the intransitive subject particles. Third-person patient is left unmarked, as in all other transitive forms.

Transitive continuatives are syntactically transitive verbs, even though they do not contain a transitive suffix (S. Thomason & Everett 1993:329). This claim is supported by four properties of the construction. First, when full NPs appear referring to the arguments of a transitive continuative construction, the subject is preceded by the oblique *t* and the object is optionally preceded by *lu*, just as in non-continuative transitives. Second, although the 2nd person patients are marked by intransitive subject particles, the 1st person patients are marked by normal 1st person object marking. Third, a transitive suffix surfaces in ditransitive continuative constructions. Finally, there is a crosslinguistic link between possessive morphology and the expression of agents. In transitive continuative forms, normally possessive morphemes do not actually mark a possessor, but the agent (1993:329-332).

All continuative verbs are negated by the negative particle *tam*, not the particle *ta* which negates verbs. If it is true that transitive continuatives were originally nominalizations (Kroeger 1999:351), the negation in *tam* is probably a relic of their former nominal status. Although intransitive continuatives do not originate in nominalized forms, the use of the negative *tam* with those verbs is probably due to analogy with negative transitive continuatives.

As mentioned briefly in section 1.3.5, there are irrealis verbs whose form appears almost identical to non-irrealis continuatives. Consider the following two forms, an intransitive irrealis verb in 39a and a transitive irrealis in 39c:

- (39) a. *či* *qsnmúli.*
 čn *qs-n-múl-i*
 1SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-in-dip-INTR.CONT
 ‘I’ll get some water.’
- b. *či* *esnmúli.*
 čn *es-n-múl-i*
 1SG.INTR.SBJ ASP-in-dip-INTR.CONT
 ‘I’m dipping water up.’
- c. *iqsčχ^wóyqnm*
 in-qs-čχ^wóyqn-m
 1SG.POSS-IRR-pile.up-TR.CONT
 ‘I’m going to pile stuff up.’
- d. *iesčχ^wóyqnm*
 in-es-čχ^wóyqn-m
 1SG.POSS-IRR-pile.up-TR.CONT
 ‘I’m piling stuff up.’

Both have features of continuative verbs. In 39a, the intransitive irrealis verb *qsnmúli* has the intransitive continuative suffix *-i*. In 39c, the transitive irrealis verb looks almost exactly like a transitive continuative construction. The verb has the transitive continuative suffix *-m* instead of the transitive apparatus. The agent is marked by the possessive prefix *in-* and the patient is marked by the intransitive subject particle *k^w*. The only difference between the forms in 39 and continuative constructions is that they have the irrealis prefix *qs-* instead of the aspectual prefix *es-*.

There are also irrealis verbs that do not have continuative morphology. These look like any other non-continuative verb with intransitive subject particles (40a), while transitives have a transitive suffix with normal transitive person marking (40b):

- (40) a. *ta* *k^w* *qsx^wúy.*
 ta *k^w* *qs-x^wúy*
 NEG 2SG.INTR.SBJ IRR-go
 ‘You’re not going to go.’

- b. ta qsk^wúpncn.
 ta qs-k^wúp-nt-si-n
 NEG IRR-push-TR.CONT-2SG.OBJ-1SG.TR.SBJ
 ‘I’m not going to push you.’

There are no readily apparent aspectual differences between the irrealis verbs in 39 and those in 40. The irrealis verbs marked as ‘continuative’ in 39 do not express the normal meaning of continuatives, as they do not seem to express any sense of duration. If these suffixes do not express such an aspectual meaning in irrealis verbs, it is problematic to label them ‘continuative’. For this reason, I will refer to irrealis verbs *without* continuative suffixes as ‘unmarked’ irrealis verbs and irrealis verbs *with* continuative suffixes as ‘marked’ irrealis verbs.¹²

Several questions arise from the observation that the suffixes *-mí* and *-m* do not mark continuative aspect in irrealis forms. First, what is the difference between the two types of irrealis? Second, how did the parallelism between the marked irrealis and the continuative aspect come about historically? Finally, what purpose do the suffixes serve in the formation of the marked irrealis, and can this function be unified with the role that the suffixes play in continuative formation? I will first examine the distribution of unmarked and marked irrealis forms in section 4.2. In section 4.3, I discuss the historical development of both the two types of verbal irrealis, and offer an alternative to Kroeber (1999). In section 4.4, I compare the function of the ‘continuative’ suffixes in truly continuative constructions and marked irrealis constructions.

¹² Although I will refer to irrealis forms with *-mí* and *-m* as ‘marked’ irrealis, I will continue to gloss these suffixes CONTINUATIVE to preserve continuity with previous examples.

4.2. Distribution of marked and unmarked irrealis forms

The marked irrealis is the more frequent of the two irrealis constructions. It is most commonly found as the predicate of a main clause, while the unmarked irrealis is ungrammatical in this position:

- (41) a. *či qsx^wúyi č' uté*
 'I'm going to go downstream.'
- b. **či qsx^wúy č' uté*
- c. *k^w iqscujúm*
 'I'm going to hit you.'
- d. **qscujuntsín*

This distribution is true of both intransitive and transitive forms, as can be seen from 41. While the marked irrealis forms in 41a (intransitive) and 41c (transitive) may function as main predicates, unmarked irrealis equivalents may not occur in the same position, as in 41b and 41d.

Main clause predicates may be preceded by particles, such as *x^wumi* 'please', *λ'e* 'already', and the yes/no question particle *ha*. Unmarked irrealis forms are again ungrammatical:¹³

- (42) a. *ha p qšč'úwi?*
 'Are you guys going to be gone?'
- b. **ha p qšč'úw?*
- c. *x^wumí či qšč^wécti!*
 'Let me pass by!'
- d. *λ'e qe qsk^wn'čstmí qwo qswénši.*
 'We're going to dress up for war-dancing.'

¹³ I do not have examples of unmarked irrealis after other initial particles that have been explicitly rejected in elicitation. However, they are not found in the data and I take this to indicate their ungrammaticality.

The marked irrealis is only ungrammatical after the negative particle *ta*. In this position, only the unmarked forms occur:

- (43) a. $ta\ k^w\ qsx^w\ úy$
 ‘You’re not going to go.’
- b. $*ta\ k^w\ qsx^w\ úyi$
- c. $ta\ qsk^w\ úpncn$
 ‘I’m not going to push you’
- d. $*ta\ kw\ iqsk^w\ úpm$

When the negative particle appears before non-irrealis, non-continuative verbs, it forces those verbs to appear with the nominalizer prefix *s-*, as in 44a; non-negated verbs do not have the nominalizer, as in 44b:

- (44) a. $ta\ swíčis$
 $ta\ s-wíč-nt-es$
 NEG NOM-see-TR-3TR.SBJ
 ‘He didn’t see it.’
- b. $wíčis$
 $wíč-nt-es$
 see-TR-3TR.SBJ
 ‘He saw it.’

Baier & Wdzcenczny (2009) take this as a sign that predicates after *ta* are subordinated, as nominalization was, at least historically, a sign of subordination. A further sign that predicates after *ta* after may be subordinated is that *ta* seems to be itself a predicate; it may be separated from the predicate that follows it with *u* ‘and’:

- (45) ta u léʔ qe qsčnʔawqisqáxeʔmłs.
 ta u léʔ qe qs-č-n-ʔaw=qin=sqáxeʔ-m-łul-es.
 NEG and close 1PL.OBJ IRR-at-in-call=head=domestic.animal-DER.TR-TR-3TR.SBJ
 ‘He won’t sic his dogs on us again.’

If the negative is indeed a higher predicate, then it is probably the case that the predicates following it are subordinated, and I will assume from here on that this is the case.

Interestingly, there are no irrealis verbs negated by *tam*, marked or unmarked. This is significant, as continuative predicates are negated by *tam*, and since at least the marked irrealis of transitive verbs seems to have developed through nominalization, one might expect to find at least transitive predicate inflected for marked irrealis after *tam*. It will be seen in section 4.3 that this fact can be explained by the historical development of the two irrealis paradigms.

Both the marked irrealis (in 46) and unmarked irrealis (in 47) are allowed as the predicate of a subordinate clause:

- (46) a. qeʔ esnté qe qscíl’ši
 ‘We want to camp.’
 b. yoʔstén či qsnč’alí.
 ‘I know how to swim.’
 c. ta snté qsnł’eʔék^wms łu čqq’am’éy’es
 ‘He didn’t want to look for his fishing rod in the water.’
- (47) a. ta sl’cíʔistm qsnʔúłx^w.
 ‘They wouldn’t let him come in.’
 b. k^w iesntéłsm k^w qsx^wúy
 ‘I want you to go.’
 c. qe χménč qe qscúʔcáʔ.
 ‘We liked to go swimming.’

Morphosyntactically, the irrealis predicates in 46 and 47 do not have overt signs of subordination. This is true of subordination in Montana Salish and Interior Salish in general; subordinate clauses are not well differentiated from main clauses (Kroeber 1999:250). Because of this, I rely on a conceptual, rather than a morphosyntactic, definition of ‘subordinate’, based on Langacker (1991:435-7) and Cristofaro (2005:2). Here, a ‘subordinate’ clause will be defined as a clause that is “construed in the perspective” of the main clause (Cristofaro 2005:2). In all the above examples, the irrealis clauses are conceptualized as part of the larger clause. For example, the sentence in 6a describes a situation of knowing, rather than a situation of swimming.

The type of the verb in the predicate of the higher clause does not seem to condition the use of marked or unmarked irrealis. In fact, the same verb may take both types of irrealis, as is seen clearly by comparing examples 46a and 46c, in which the verb *esnté*¹⁴ ‘want’ takes, in which marked forms in the subordinate predicate, with example 47b, in which the same predicate (this time as an transitive continuative) takes an unmarked irrealis predicate in the subordinate clause.

The environments where marked irrealis and unmarked irrealis may occur are summarized in table 8:

Table 8 Distribution of marked / unmarked irrealis

	Unmarked	Marked
Main clause	✗	✓
After negative <i>ta</i>	✓	✗
Subordinate clause	✓	✓

The unmarked irrealis only occurs in subordinate contexts (subordinate clauses and subordinated after *ta*). The marked irrealis, on the other hand, can occur in both independent contexts, as the

¹⁴ The form *snté* in 6c is probably due to deletion of *e* after the vowel of the negative *ta*.

predicate of a main clause, and in subordinate contexts, as the predicate of a subordinate clause. Additionally, there does not seem to be any semantic difference between the two types of verbal irrealis. Both express the meanings described in chapter 2: hypothetical or future. If there is any difference between the meaning of marked irrealis and the meaning of unmarked irrealis when appearing as the predicate of a subordinate clause, it is certainly subtle. This being the case, the difference between the marked irrealis and the unmarked irrealis will be considered syntactic, and not semantic. A more thorough investigation of the way irrealis interacts with subordination in the language is certainly warranted, but the data do not permit such an analysis at this time.

The contrast between unmarked and marked irrealis verbs corresponds to what Kroeber (1999) refers to as “Irrealis-I” and “Irrealis-II” in Southern Interior Salish. Though he does not devote much discussion to the differences in use or meaning between the two different constructions, Kroeber does note that “marked irrealis is fairly common as a sort of modally tinged future, perhaps a volitional future” (1999:225). It is true that the Montana Salish marked irrealis is used as a future, but this use arises from its use in main clauses, and not necessarily from the inherent meaning of the marked irrealis itself.

4.3. Historical development of the marked/unmarked distinction

In this section I present evidence that both the transitive continuative construction and the transitive marked irrealis construction originate from nominalized forms. This analysis is supported by the use of possessive morphology to mark agents in these forms, and by the fact that the transitive continuative construction is negated by *tam*, which otherwise only negates nouns. An understanding of the way these two forms developed is critical for understanding the origin of the contrast between the marked irrealis and unmarked irrealis.

In this section, I examine Kroeber's (1999) account of how a contrast of marked irrealis (his "irrealis-II") and unmarked irrealis ("irrealis-I")¹⁵ developed in Southern Interior Salish. This distinction is present in one other language of the branch, Okanagan (1999:355). Kroeber argues that the form underlying both the transitive continuative and marked irrealis was originally a nominalized form of transitive verbs that was used in forming relative clauses (1999:351). This form contained the suffix *-m*, an intransitive suffix and the nominalizer *s-*. He proposes that the ancestor of Montana Salish *qł-/qs-*, which he reconstructs as **kał-*, was originally only attached to nominals (1999:355). This explains why *qł-* is used only with nominals in the modern language. The morpheme **kał-* came to be attached to nominalized transitives, and the prefix sequence **kał-s-* eventually collapsed and was analyzed as *ks-* in most of the Southern Interior languages and *qs-* in Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish. This form was extended to intransitive forms, which were given the suffix *-mí* by analogy with the intransitive continuative, and also extended to other verbs with regular inflection. This second extension created the 'unmarked irrealis', my 'unmarked' irrealis.

Though this analysis explains the development of the two types of irrealis, it cannot explain the distribution of those forms in Montana Salish satisfactorily. For this reason, I propose an alternative account of the historical development of these forms. I argue that the modern distribution observed in Montana Salish in the modern language is better explained by a parallel development of both the unmarked irrealis and the marked irrealis. In my account, it is not the nominalized forms of the marked irrealis that drive the creation of an unmarked irrealis paradigm. Instead, I argue that the irrealis morpheme was originally used with subordinated predicates, which bore some form of nominalization. This morpheme then spread to other

¹⁵ For the remainder of the section I will use my terminology of 'marked' irrealis and 'unmarked' irrealis for Kroeber's terms 'irrealis-II' and 'irrealis-I', respectively.

predicates nominal in form: the nominalized transitive forms also used in the creation of the transitive continuative, and nouns proper. I agree with Kroeber that intransitive marked irrealis forms were created by analogy with the intransitive continuatives. I will show that my analysis better accounts for both the distribution of the irrealis allomorphs *qł-* and *qs-* and for the synchronic distribution of unmarked irrealis and marked irrealis.

Before continuing with the discussion of the two proposals, I should note that not everyone agrees about the reconstruction of the Proto-Salish irrealis morpheme. While Kroeber (1999:70) reconstructs **kał-* for early Southern Interior Salish, Kinkade (2001:190) reconstructs the morpheme with a uvular **qal-*.¹⁶ Kroeber holds that Montana Salish *q* is unexplainable from the cognates in the Southern Interior branch, all of which have *k*, or *č* in Coeur d'Alene, which is related to *k* by regular sound change (1999:70). Outside the Interior Salish languages however, cognates of the Proto-Salish morpheme have *q* instead of *k*, and Kinkade argues that this speaks for the reconstruction **q* (2001:196). From this perspective, the Montana Salish forms are regular, while the forms with *k* are aberrant. I believe that Kinkade's proposal for the Proto-Salish morpheme to be more sound than Kroeber's, and I will use Kinkade's **qal-* when discussing my analysis in section 4.3.2. While examining Kroeber's account in the next section, however, I will continue to refer to his Pre-Southern Interior Salish morpheme **kał-*.

4.3.1. Kroeber's (1999) account

Kroeber (1999:352) proposes that in Southern Interior Salish, the aspectual prefix **ac-* (predecessor of Montana Salish *es-*) came to be used with intransitive verbs to mark continuative aspect. In order to be used with transitive verbs, this prefix was then extended to nominalized relative clauses, which could act as predicate nominals. At this point, intransitive verbs of this

¹⁶ Kinkade questions whether this form was mono- or bimorphemic at the Proto-Salish level. I will not take a direct stand on this issue; see Kinkade's article for discussion of the problem.

type had only **ʔac-*, while transitive verbs of this type had the nominalizer *s-*, **ʔac-*, and the intransitive suffix *-m* (1999:353). Agents were marked by possessive morphology and subject clitics marked the object. In the transition from Pre-Southern Interior Salish to the modern languages, either the prefix **ʔac-* or the prefix combination **s-ʔac-* has been generalized to all continuative verbs. Okanagan and Coeur d'Alene have generalized **s-ʔac-* to intransitives (giving *s-c-* in Ok and *y'c-* in Coeur d'Alene), while Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish has generalized **ʔac-/ʔas-* to transitive forms (1999:353-354). After this step, special suffixes for intransitive continuatives were created: Okanagan has *-(mi)x/-(mix)aʔx*, Coeur d'Alene has *-mš*, and Montana Salish has *-mi/-i*. This meant that both transitive continuatives and intransitive continuatives were marked by a combination of prefix and suffix (1999:354).¹⁷

Kroeber theorizes that a similar process created the marked irrealis construction. He argues that in early Southern Interior Salish, the irrealis prefix **kał-* could only be attached directly to nouns (1999:355). The marked irrealis arose when this prefix was added to the same nominalized relative-clause transitive verbs used in the creation of the transitive continuative. The prefix sequence **ka(t)-s-* was then generalized to intransitive verbs, and by analogy the same suffixes used in intransitive continuatives (*-mi* in Montana Salish) were generalized to the marked irrealis of intransitive verbs (1999:354), apparently to mirror the appearance of intransitive continuatives with both a prefix and a suffix. After the creation of the marked irrealis, Okanagan and Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish reanalyzed the prefix sequence *k-s-/q-s-* as a single irrealis marker used on verbs, and extended this marker to transitive verbs with regular morphology: transitive suffixes, subject suffixes, and object suffixes. This created the unmarked irrealis marking (1999:355-356).

¹⁷ Kroeber does not comment on the origin of these various suffixes.

While the story that Kroeber presents for the development of continuative aspect inflection does seem sound at first, there are several problems with his account of irrealis development. First, why would the irrealis prefix have attached to only nouns or those verbal forms that Kroeber says were “treated as lexical nouns” (1999:355)? Cross-linguistically, irrealis is a verbal category, and therefore it seems strange that such a morpheme would be limited to nouns. Additionally, Southern Interior Salish is the only branch to use reflexes of **kal-* with nouns (Kinkade 2001), suggesting that it was an innovation of the branch. This in turn suggests that older uses of **kal-* probably existed alongside the nominal uses.

Second, if the marked irrealis developed in a similar process to the transitive continuative, one would expect to find marked irrealis forms negated by *tam*, as continuative verbs are. This is decidedly not the case; there no marked irrealis verbs negated by *tam*. If the marked irrealis developed before the unmarked irrealis, why would the unmarked irrealis taken over in negative clauses so completely? If the unmarked irrealis forms had already been limited to negative positions before the development of the marked irrealis, this problem is solved, thus suggesting that the unmarked irrealis preceded the marked irrealis, or at least developed in parallel to it. On this point the other language with an unmarked / marked irrealis distinction, Okanagan, is not helpful, as there is only one negative, *lut*, used with both nouns and verbs (N. Mattina 1996:32).

Thirdly, there is a problem with Kroeber’s reconstruction of the irrealis morpheme **kal-* as a prefix in early Southern Interior Salish. Outside of the Southern Interior branch of the family, reflexes of the morpheme are generally clitics or particles (Kinkade 2001). This is also true of Coeur d’Alene, which has particles (Kinkade 2001, Doak 1997). This suggests that the morpheme started as a particle in Southern Interior Salish, later fusing to the following word as a prefix in languages other than Coeur d’Alene.

Kroeber (1999:251) notes that there is another possible source for the unmarked irrealis, based on a what he calls ‘propositional nominalization.’ This type of nominalization differs from the ‘aspectual nominalization’ seen in the Southern Interior transitive continuatives and marked irrealis in that it is syntactic, marking most types of complement clauses and some adverbial clauses in Proto-Salish (1999:249). In Montana Salish, remnants of this type of nominalization can be seen in negated non-continuative verbs in *s-*. Kroeber remarks that it is possible that future complement clauses and adverbial clauses may have been marked by propositional nominalization of the predicate and the irrealis particle **kał* (1999:251). Like in the scenario he prefers, this morpheme and *s-* on the predicate fell together into a single prefix. However, in this alternative approach, the unmarked irrealis did not develop after the marked irrealis. Instead, it originated before or in parallel to the marked irrealis. In the next section, I will show that a model incorporating this path of development for the unmarked irrealis is much better suited to accounting for the synchronic facts.

4.3.2. An alternative approach

I do not dispute Kroeber’s account of the development of the continuative forms in Southern Interior Salish. I will assume that the transitive continuative forms were created as an extension of the aspectual prefix **ʔac-* to nominalized transitive relative clauses with the suffix *-m* and that the intransitive continuative suffixes were created by analogy to mirror the appearance of both a prefix and suffix in transitive continuative forms.

I follow Kroeber’s alternative model of unmarked irrealis development in proposing that in early Southern Interior Salish, there was an irrealis particle **qal-*¹⁸ that marked future or hypothetical complement clauses in combination with propositional nominalization of the

¹⁸ As noted above, I will use Kinkade’s (2001:190) reconstruction of Proto-Salish irrealis **qal-*.

predicate by the prefix *s-*. The particle was also found in negative future clauses, which, as we have seen, contained propositional nominalization. The use of **qal-* was then extended to other contexts where the following form was nominal. In all Southern Interior languages this extended the particle to occurring before lexical nouns. In those languages that developed a marked irrealis form, Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish and Okanagan, **qal-* was also extended to occurring before transitive verbs with aspectual nominalization.

At this point, irrealis **qal* could occur in three positions: in future or hypothetical complement clauses, including after negatives; before transitive verbs with aspectual nominalization; and before lexical nouns. Subsequently, the changes that turned **kal* into a prefix in Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish and Okanagan occurred: before a nominalizer *s-* or (or other pre-locative prefix in Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish) the particle became *q-*, but became *qt-* on nouns. Eventually, the sequence *k-s-/q-s-* came to be reanalyzed as the verbal irrealis prefix, and became a single morphological unit. In Coeur d'Alene the particle remained as such, but deleted the /t/ before *s-* and other coronals (Kinkade 2001:196).

Following the development of prefixes in irrealis forms, the paradigm contrasted intransitive unmarked irrealis forms with transitive unmarked irrealis forms, but only had a single marked irrealis, namely for transitive verbs. Marked irrealis forms were innovated for intransitive verbs in both Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish and Okanagan. First the prefix *ks-/qs-* was extended to regular intransitive predicates. Then, the continuative suffix used in intransitive continuatives was added to these forms by analogy to distinguish them from their intransitive unmarked irrealis counterparts.¹⁹

¹⁹ Oddly, Okanagan has also generalized possessive marking of agents to intransitive irrealis-I verbs. This will be discussed in more detail in section 5.3 below.

This model of development fixes the problems associated with Kroeber's account of the development of the unmarked / marked irrealis distinction. By assuming that the early Southern Interior morpheme was a particle, it accounts for the fact that the reflexes of that morpheme are found as both prefixes and particles. It accounts for a transition from the use of the irrealis in only verbal contexts to its use in nominalized contexts as well, while still explaining why the allomorph *kt-/qł-* is only found with nouns in the synchronic data. The fact that the unmarked irrealis originated in propositionally nominalized clauses explains both the synchronic limitation of unmarked irrealis forms to subordinate environments in Montana Salish and the fact that there are no marked irrealis forms negated with *tam*. By the time the marked irrealis developed, the unmarked irrealis was already used in negated contexts, and therefore a new set of negative marked irrealis forms were not needed.

If unmarked irrealis was originally limited to subordinate contexts, then why can marked irrealis forms be found in subordinate clauses as well? Kroeber (1999:250) notes that the Southern Interior languages have greatly reduced the use of propositional nominalization in subordinate clauses, largely due to the development of aspectual nominalization. Except for the use of *s-* on negated non-continuative verbs, Montana Salish has largely lost the process. This loss has led to the poor morphological differentiation of main and subordinate clauses. Because of this, it is not surprising that both types of irrealis marking would come to be used in subordinate clauses.

4.4. The suffixes *-mí* and *-m*

It has previously been assumed that the suffixes *-mí* and *-m* mark continuative aspect when they occurred in irrealis forms. However, as I have argued, the 'marked' irrealis forms that contain these suffixes do not appear to differ aspectually from 'unmarked' irrealis forms that do not

contain the suffixes. The difference between the marked irrealis and the unmarked irrealis is syntactic, and not semantic. If *-mí* and *-m* do not mark aspect in irrealis forms, what is their actual function, and can this meaning be unified with their function in continuative forms?

Both marked irrealis and continuative constructions are formed with a combination of a prefix and suffix. In the case of continuative forms, the prefix is aspectual *es-*, in irrealis cases the prefix is *qs-*. In intransitive verbs, the suffix *-mí* occurs, while in transitive verbs, the suffix *-m* occurs. In both constructions, the meaning of the construction is not carried by a single affix, but is shared between both affixes. That is, continuative meaning is not solely signaled by the prefix *es-* or the ‘continuative’ suffix. When the continuative prefix occurs without the ‘continuative’ suffix, it has other functions, and generally marks some sort of stative aspect. This is also true of the marked irrealis forms. In these forms *qs-* alone does not indicate that the verb is inflected for the marked irrealis, nor does the suffix (intransitive *-mí* or transitive *-m*). As has been shown, when *qs-* appears without the suffix, the irrealis verb is used in different syntactic contexts.

Besides being used in the transitive continuative and transitive marked irrealis constructions, the suffix *-m* is found in two other constructions. With bare intransitive verb stems it forms antipassives. When it is suffixed to verbs with a transitive suffix it backgrounds the agent of that transitive construction. These two uses of *-m* are united with the transitive continuative *-m* into a single morpheme by S. Thomason & Everett (1993:19). All three of these constructions signal a reduction of the prototypical transitivity of a clause, which is defined as being complete transfer of an action from a definite agent to a definite patient (Hopper & Thompson 1980:251). In the antipassive construction, the patient is made indefinite and backgrounded, and therefore the transitivity of the event is reduced. Likewise, the backgrounded

agent constructions indicates that the agent is indefinite, and also reduces the transitivity of the event. In the transitive continuative construction, the action itself is seen as incomplete, similarly decreasing the transitivity of the clause.

Like the transitive continuative, the marked irrealis of transitive verbs indicates a deviation from prototypical transitivity. The action is construed as unreal, and therefore cannot be interpreted as complete. It could be that marked irrealis *-m* serves the same function as the *-m* in the three constructions outlined above. Yet, there are also transitive irrealis verbs that do not have the suffix *-m*. As has already been shown, the difference between the marked irrealis and unmarked irrealis is syntactic; neither form construes an event as ‘more unreal’ than the other. Both signal the same type of deviation from prototypical transitivity, and it does not make sense that one form would receive the morpheme indicating this deviation and the other not. Therefore, the suffix *-m* found in the marked irrealis of transitive verbs cannot be the same morpheme as the suffix *-m* found in transitive continuatives, antipassives, and backgrounded agent constructions.

It is hard to claim that the suffix *-mí* has any content of its own, as it does not occur without the aspectual prefix *es-* or the irrealis prefix *qs-*. In both these intransitive continuative and the marked irrealis of intransitive verbs, the suffix serves to ‘narrow’ the interpretation of the prefix with which it occurs. Thus, it forces *es-* to indicate continuative aspect, and forces *qs-* to indicate marked irrealis. Unlike in the case of the two *-m* suffixes, it seems impractical to classify each occurrence of *-mí* as a separate morpheme, as in each construction in which it occurs it performs the same function.

This ‘narrowing’ function could also be extended to the occurrences of *-m* in the transitive continuative construction and the marked irrealis construction. Under this analysis, the function of *-m* in the transitive continuative, like that of *-mí* in the intransitive continuative, would be to

limit the interpretation of the aspectual prefix *es-* to its continuative meaning. In the transitive marked irrealis construction, the function of *-m* would be to limit the syntactic function of the irrealis *qs-*.

While this would illuminate a commonality of the two *-m* morphemes, it would not actually add anything to the analysis. There is no pressing requirement that the *-m* in the marked irrealis construction be analyzed as the same morpheme as the *-m* in the transitive continuative construction. While these morphemes have the same historic source, the detransitivizing suffix *-m* found in nominalized relative clause forms of transitive verbs (Kroeber 1999:351), *their* functions do not have sufficient similarity to classify them the same way. They are simply homophonous. It is also not troubling that the formant of the intransitive continuative and the intransitive marked irrealis be analyzed as a single morpheme, while the formants of the transitive continuative and transitive marked irrealis are split up. This is because the transitive continuative and intransitive continuative suffixes share just about as much in common as the transitive continuative shares with the transitive marked irrealis suffix. The suffix *-mí* cannot be seen as marking a reduction of transitivity (Thomason & Everett 1993:19), as by definition intransitives are not transitive.

In summary, it seems that there are three suffixes involved in the formation of continuative and marked irrealis forms. The suffix *-mí* is used in combination with the prefixes *es-* and *qs-* to form the intransitive continuative and intransitive marked irrealis, respectively. In the transitive forms, there are two homophonous suffixes of the form *-m*. The first *-m* is used with the aspect prefix *es-* to form the transitive continuative, and is also used in the antipassive, backgrounded agent, and derived transitive constructions. The second *-m* is used with the irrealis

prefix *qs-* to form the transitive marked irrealis. In both type of *-m* construction, the verb takes the 'mixed' type of transitive person/number inflection.

Chapter 5

Cognate Morphemes Elsewhere in Southern Interior Salish

5.1. Introduction

All Southern Interior Salish languages have morphemes cognate with Montana Salish *qł-/qs-*. In Kalispel-Spokane, Okanagan, and Columbian, the morpheme is a prefix; in Coeur d'Alene the morpheme is a particle. The functions of the morpheme are all similar, generally expressing 'future', 'prospective aspect', 'unreal' or 'subjunctive'. Cognates are also found in languages outside the Southern Interior branch of the family, but that branch is the only group of contiguous languages to have the morpheme (Kinkade 2001). As discussed in the previous chapter, reflexes of the Proto-Salish morpheme show either *k* or *q* as their initial consonant. The languages with *k* (or Coeur d'Alene *č*, a regular derivative of **k*) are all contiguous and in the interior except for Bella Coola. The only language to have *q* in the interior is the Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish dialect continuum. These facts lead Kroeber (1999:70) to reconstruct **kał* as the Proto-Southern Interior Salish morpheme, considering the *q* in Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish as irregular. Kinkade (2001:190) disagrees, reconstructing instead an initial **q*, giving **qał* for Proto-Salish, and not just Proto-Southern Interior Salish (2001:190). This reconstruction seems sounder, as outside of the Interior Salish languages, all reflexes of the proto-morpheme have *q*. Additionally, the languages with *q* are distributed throughout the entire family, while the *k* languages are all geographic neighbors (with the exception of Bella Coola). Kinkade posits that this reflex is due to analogy (2001:196).²⁰ In this chapter, I discuss the various cognates of Montana Salish *qł-/qs-*, showing that the distribution found in Montana Salish is found also throughout the rest of the branch.

²⁰ Kinkade does not actually posit which morpheme would have been involved in the analogy.

5.2. Kalispel and Spokane

Kalispel and Spokane, members of the same dialect continuum as Montana Salish, both have a prefix *qł-*, identified as ‘subjunctive’ by Vogt (1940:27) for Kalispel and as ‘unreal’ by Carlson (1972:119) for Spokane. In Spokane, the prefix is usually translated as ‘going to’, as in 48a. It can also be used to “refer to something unrealized in the past” (1972:119), as in 48b:

- (48) a. či qecx^wúy
 čn qł-ec-x^wúy
 1SG.SBJ unreal-actual-go
 ‘I’m going to go’ (Carlson 1970: 119)
- b. ta qsəwíčən ł u? stém’
 ta qł-s-wíč-ən ł u? s-tém’
 NEG unreal-NOM-see-1SG.SBJ 2NDRY particular NOM-what
 ‘I couldn’t see a thing. (Carlson 1970: 119)

As in Montana Salish, the /h/ of *qł-* is lost before *s-* and before *ec-* ‘actual’, which is cognate with Montana Salish *es-*. Carlson does not give any examples of verbs occurring with *qł-* without the prefix *s-*, which appears to point to a single unit *qs-*, as in Montana Salish. He does not discuss whether or not the prefix can be used with nouns, information that would be needed to make a firm conclusion as to whether the distribution is exactly the same.

In his grammar of Kalispel, Vogt (1940:27) discusses what he calls the “subjunctive”, which occurs with both nouns and verbs. Nouns form the subjunctive with “the prefix *qł-*, or *q-* before *s-*.” The subjunctive of verbs is formed with “*qł-*, always combined with *s-*, to give *qs-*” (Vogt 1940:41). He remarks that this *qs-* is not actually an “*s-* form” and that it is “one morphological unit.” (Vogt 1940:41). When found before the prefixes *el* ‘back’ and *es-* ‘actual’, the prefix *qs-* takes the form *qe-* in Kalispel. The sequence *qs-ept-* becomes *qept-*, instead of *qe’ept-*, however (Vogt 1940:41-42).

The meaning of the Kalispel subjunctive is similar to the meanings expressed by the Montana Salish irrealis. When used independently, it expresses a “subjective future”, indicating that the action is dependent on factors such as “desire” or “intention” (Vogt 1940:77-78). It is also found following another verb, expressing intention.

The Kalispel subjunctive prefix displays the exact same allomorphy as the Montana Salish irrealis morpheme. The category is marked by two prefixes *ql-* and *qs-*, the distribution of which is governed by the type of word to which the prefix attaches. The two Kalispel prefix forms have alternatives before certain other prefixes, though the details differ slightly from Montana Salish. Before *s-*, the nominal subjunctive *ql-* becomes *q-*. However, the verbal subjunctive *qs-* does not become *q-* in Kalispel, but *qe-*. This vowel is probably a leftover from the original vowel in the Proto-Salish form **qal-*. In Montana Salish, this vowel has merged with the vowel of the following prefixes, while in Kalispel this merger has only occurred in forms with *epl-*.

Though Vogt (1940) does not recognize it as such, there is clearly an unmarked / marked irrealis distinction in Kalispel. He considers irrealis forms with continuative suffixes simply to be marked for continuative aspect; He remarks, “the continuative prefix *es-* is dropped after *qs-*” (1940: 41). So, for Vogt, a form like *čiqsaimti* ‘I am going to be mad’ actually contains an underlying *es-*. It is not clear why he makes this analytic decision, as there are clear examples of *es-* prefixes not used in continuative constructions occurring after the subjunctive prefix. There are still enough forms in Vogt’s grammar to establish that the same unmarked / marked irrealis distinction is present, however. Carlson’s (1972) grammar of Spokane does not contain enough examples of *qs-* forms to determine if there is an unmarked / marked irrealis distinction in that language. There probably is, as both of Spokane’s sister dialects have the distinction.

5.3. Okanagan

Okanagan has two prefixes, *kl-* and *ks-*, both used to form futures (A. Mattina 1996:1). The first prefix, *kl-*, attaches to noun with possessive prefixes to mark “unrealized possession” (N. Mattina 1996: 163). In this construction, it is the possessive prefix that is interpreted as future, and not the noun (N. Mattina 1996:163). Predicate nominals may take the prefix to form the future and the prospective aspect. The prospective aspect involves the continuative suffix $-(míx)aʔx$:

- (49) a. kn kłnaʔníkʔmn
 kn kł-naʔníkmn
 1SG.SBJ FUT-knife
 ‘I will be a knife.’ (N. Mattina 1996:177)
- b. kn kłnaʔníkʔmnaʔx
 kn kł-naʔníkmn-aʔx
 1SG.SBJ FUT-knife-CONT
 ‘I am going to be a knife.’ (N. Mattina 1996:177)

The form in 49a is a future, while the form in 49b is a prospective. The difference between the two categories is not completely clear. N. Mattina defines the category ‘prospective aspect’ as “a situation in progress with relevance to the future” (1996:61), yet she does not explicitly define what future expresses. According to her, the prospective aspect is not found with predicate nominals in texts, and speakers vary with respect to how acceptable they find such formations. Despite this, she still argues that the prospective aspect is a valid category for nouns, as it is in verbs (N. Mattina 1996: 178). A. Mattina (1996) does not mention this form in his discussion of the nominal prefix *kl-*. These facts cast doubt upon the validity of the prospective aspect as a nominal category, but the issue will not be dealt with further here.

The second prefix, *ks-*, creates future verbs. As in Montana Salish, there are two constructions, one with only the prefix *ks-* and one with *ks-* and the continuative suffix $-(míx)aʔx$.

When only the prefix is present, the form is future, and the predicate takes what A. Mattina calls “genitive inflection”:

- (50) a. k^w $iksíwm$
 k^w $i-ks-síwm$
 2OBJ 1GEN-FUT-ask
 ‘I will ask you.’ (N. Mattina 1996: 179)
- b. $iksx^wúy$
 $i-ks-x^wúy$
 1GEN-FUT-go
 ‘I will go.’ (N. Mattina 1996: 192)

This type of inflection is present on both transitive (50a) and intransitive (50b) verbs. When both the prefix *ks-* and the continuative suffix *-(míx)aʔx* are present, the predicate takes normal (non-genitive) person inflection:

- (51) a. kn $ksʔacmíxaʔx$
 kn $ks-ʔac-míxaʔx$
 1SBJ FUT-tie-CONT
 ‘I am going to tie something.’ (N. Mattina 1996: 179)
- b. kn $ksx^wúyaʔx$
 kn $ks-x^wúy-aʔx$
 1SBJ FUT-go-CONT
 ‘I am about to go.’ (N. Mattina 1996: 192)

This split corresponds to the unmarked / marked irrealis split discussed in the previous chapter. Okanagan is the only other language with such a distinction, and its system is organized differently from that of Kalispel-Spokane-Montana Salish. In Okanagan, as in Montana Salish, there are forms that have the prefix *ks-* and a continuative suffix. Also as in Montana Salish, the transitive forms with the continuative suffix have possessive inflection. The generalizations and extensions made in the Okanagan system are quite different from that in Kalispel-Spokane-

Montana Salish, however, as the possessive inflection marking subjects has been generalized to intransitive verbs *without* the continuative suffix $-(míx)a^?x$. These forms correspond to Montana Salish intransitive unmarked irrealis forms.

A. Mattina (1996:239) does not separate predicates with only $ks-$ from those with $ks-$ and $-(míx)a^?x$ explicitly, calling them both “future.” N. Mattina does distinguish the two forms, calling the first “future” and the second “prospective aspect,” like the distinction she sets up for nouns (1996:177). Here, again, the difference between the ‘future’ and the ‘prospective aspect’ is not completely clear.

5.4. Coeur d’Alene

Coeur d’Alene has a particle $čəl$, which is used to indicate a “future event or entity” (Doak 1997: 191). It is used with nouns that are “spoken of as existing in the future, or when implying a future relationship to the subject” (Mattina 1996: 6, quoting Reichard 1938: 666). When used with a verbal predicate, the particle indicates future, and requires the use of the $s-$ form of the verb. When the particle precedes the verb form directly, the l is deleted before $s-$, leaving $čəs$ (Doak 1997: 191). $Čəl$ occurs before person marking morphemes, and this means that $čəl$ and $s-$ are often not contiguous. Compare the form in 52a, where contraction occurs, to the form in 52b, where there is no contraction:

(52) a. lu čəspúlpulustx^w
 lut čəl s-púlpulut-stu-∅-x^w
 NEG FUT INT-beat.DISTR-CT-3ABS-2ERG
 ‘Don’t beat him!’ (Doak 1997:191)

b. čəl k^wu smiy^wng^wílⁿ
 čəl k^wu s-miy-p=ng^wílⁿ
 FUT you INT-know-INCH=S.T.
 ‘You’ll know it.’ (Doak 1997:191)

In some cases, it seems, the *s-* comes before the person morpheme, and *čel* appears as *čes*, as in 53:

- (53) česčq^wá[?]q^wə[?]ɛl
 čɛl-s č q^wá[?]q^wə[?]ɛl
 FUT-INT 1SBJ talk
 ‘We’re going to talk.’ (Doak 1997:192)

It is not clear if cases like the above represent a separate *čes* particle, or whether they are in fact the *s-* being prefixed before the person marker. On this point, authors disagree. Doak (1997) analyzes it in the latter way, while A. Mattina (1996:10) contends that there are in fact two particles *čel* and *čes*.

5.5. Colombian

Kinkade (2001:195-196) reports that Colombian has a morpheme that forms futures for both nouns and verbs. It has the shape *kał-* with nouns, as in 54a, and with verbs it has the form *kas-*, as in 54b:

- (54) a. máx^w na[?] kn kaɣəlmíx^wm
 máx^w na[?] kn kał-yəlmíx^wm
 maybeFUT 1SG.SBJ FUT²¹-chief
 ‘I’m going to be chief.’ (Kinkade 2001: 196)
- b. kasta[?]a[?]umíx
 ka-s-ta[?]a[?]u-míx
 FUT-IMPF-rain-IMPF
 ‘It’s going to rain.’ (Kinkade 2001: 196)

Kinkade says the verbal morpheme is *kas*, without a morpheme boundary between the *ka-* and the *s-* (2001:196), yet there seems to be one in his gloss of the verb in 54b. It could be that these verbal forms are assumed to come from the prefixation of *kał-*, which would make his claim of

²¹ Kinkade does not actually give a gloss for this morpheme, but I have glossed it ‘future’ here.

kas- strange. There is no further discussion of the issue in Kinkade's article, and I have not had access to other sources on Columbian. The issue as to whether there are one or two morphemes in Columbian must therefore be left open. The system does bear a strong resemblance to the systems already discussed above, however.

5.6. Discussion

The various morphemes cognate with Montana Salish *qł-/qs-* are presented in the table below, along with an indication of whether the language in question has the unmarked / marked irrealis distinction:

Table 9 Reflexes of Proto-Salish **qal* in S. Interior Salish

	Noun	Verb	Unmarked / marked irrealis?
Montana Salish	<i>qł- ~ q-</i>	<i>qs- ~ q-</i>	✓
Kalispel-Spokane	<i>qł- ~ q-</i>	<i>qs- ~ qe-</i>	✓
Okanagan	<i>kł- ~ k-</i>	<i>ks-</i>	✓
Coeur d'Alene	<i>čɛł ~ čɛ</i>	<i>čɛ(l)...s-, (?čɛs)</i>	✗
Columbian	<i>kał</i>	<i>kas</i>	✗

Authors vary on how the distinction between the nominal and verbal forms is treated. Vogt (1940) seems to be the only one who treats the *qł-* and *qs-* as the same morpheme, calling them both 'subjunctive', though this is not explicitly stated. In his brief discussion of 'unreal' forms, Carlson (1972:119) does not analyze *qs-* as a unitary morphological unit, treating it as always derived from *qł-*. This is also true of the treatments given to the Coeur d'Alene and Columbian morphemes. Doak (1997:191) considers there to be only one particle *čɛł* in Coeur d'Alene, and that any surface sequence *čɛs* is derived through deletion of the /l/ before *s-*. Kinkade (2001:196) seems to think that Columbian *kas* is derived from underlying *kał-s-* though it is not entirely clear from his very brief discussion. A. Mattina (1996) and N. Mattina (1996:182) are the only authors

explicit in his analysis of *kl-* and *ks-* as different morphemes for Okanagan. A. Mattina stresses that the prefix *ks-* “has to be kept separate from the *kl-* ‘likely-to-be’ morpheme,” as, although the morphemes are in complementary distribution, “their functions and morpho-syntax are different” (1996:240).

It seems certain that the *ql-/qs-* forms belong to the same morpheme in Kalispel and Spokane. This position seems defensible for Okanagan, as well. While it is true that the surface semantics and morphosyntax of the Okanagan constructions is somewhat different, they are no different than the surface differences we have seen in Montana Salish. In Montana Salish, these differences do not arise from the from the prefixes themselves. Instead they arise from the type of word to which they are attached. This can also be seen in Okanagan. For example, the clearest difference that Mattina notes, the difference in personal inflection in nominal predicates with the *kl-* prefix and in verbal predicates with the *ks-* prefix (1999:240), does not originate in the prefixes themselves, but rather in the difference in predicate type: nominal predicates simply take different person inflection than do verbal predicates. This strengthens the case for grouping the prefixes together into a single morpheme.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

This thesis has shown that there is a grammatical category IRREALIS in Montana Salish that is marked on both nouns and verbs. All constructions marked as irrealis are interpreted as being part of the ‘unreal’ world. In practice, this is usually interpreted as either hypothetical or future, depending on the construction that the irrealis occurs in, but it may also be translated as desire, ability, or permission. The irrealis may co-occur with other constructions that mark the ‘logical unreality’ of a situation, though it need not do so. These other constructions are negatives formed with the particle *ta*, yes/no questions formed with the particle *ha* and conditional constructions.

Irrealis is marked by a prefix, which has two lexically conditioned allomorphs, *ql-* and *qs-*. The first allomorph occurs with nouns, and the second occurs with verbs. This distribution supports the position that there is a distinction between nouns and verbs in the language, a controversial issue which for Salish languages in general.

A third allomorph, *q-*, alternates with both *ql-* and *qs-* when they are followed by one of the pre-locative prefixes, a group which is composed of the nominalizer *s-*, the aspectual prefix *es-*, the result prefix *sc-*, *el-* ‘back/again’, and *epl-* ‘have’.

There are some irrealis verb forms that contain the suffix *-mi/-i* (for intransitives) or *-m* (for transitives). These suffixes are also found in continuative verb forms, which has led to their analysis as aspectual suffixes in the past. When they appear in irrealis constructions, these suffixes do not appear to actually mark aspect, instead distinguishing two types of irrealis, ‘marked’ (with suffixes *-mi* or *-m*) and unmarked (without either suffix). Although the suffix *-mi* can be analyzed as the same morpheme in both

intransitive marked irrealis and intransitive continuative constructions, this is not the case for the suffix *-m* found in marked irrealis verbs of transitive verbs and the suffix *-m* found in transitive continuatives. These are actually two homophonous *-m* morphemes that originated in the same historical suffix.

The difference between marked and unmarked irrealis verbs is syntactic, and not semantic. Unmarked irrealis verbs can only be used in subordinate contexts: after the negative particle *ta* and as the predicate of irrealis subordinate clauses. The marked irrealis, on the other hand, can appear as the predicate of a main clause, and can also appear in subordinate clauses. The difference between subordinate clauses that have a marked irrealis verb as opposed to those that have unmarked irrealis verb is not entirely clear. A thorough investigation of subordination, or syntax more generally, in the language is needed to answer this question. Also unanswered is how the irrealis fits into the larger aspectual system of the language. This is mostly because the aspectual system has not been completely analyzed. Further investigation of aspect would certainly be a fruitful topic.

References

- Baier, Nicholas, and Dibella Wdzenczny. 2009. 'Negation in Montana Salish' *ICSNL 43 (UBCWPL, vol. 23)*:1-13.
- Bar-el, Leora and Ryan Denzer-King. 2008. 'Irrealis in Blackfoot?' *Proceedings from the eleventh Workshop on American Indigenous Languages (Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics, vol. 19)*.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1998. "Irrealis" as a Grammatical Category.' *Anthropological Linguistics* 40:257-271.
- Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carlson, Barry F. 1972. *A Grammar of Spokane: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Cristafaro, Sonia. 2005. *Subordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa, and M. Dale Kinkade. 1998. 'Salish languages and linguistics. In Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade (eds.) *Salish languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives*, 1-68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Doak, Ivy Grace. 1997. *Coeur d'Alene Grammatical Relations*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Elliot, Jennifer R. 2000. 'Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalization of reality.' *Linguistic Typology* 4:55-90.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse.' *Language* 56:251-299.
- Jelinek, Eloise, and Richard A. Demers. 1994. 'Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in Straits Salish.' *Language* 70:697-736.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1983. 'Salish Evidence Against the Universality of 'Noun' and 'Verb'.' *Lingua* 60:25-40.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1998. 'Is Irrealis a Grammatical Category in Upper Chehalis?' *Anthropological Linguistics* 40:234-244
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 2001. 'Proto-Salish irrealis'. *ICSNL 36 (UBCWPL, vol. 6)*:189-200.
- Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax*. Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1996. 'Interior Salish *to-be* and *intention* Forms: A Working Paper.' *ICSNL 31*:239-248.

- Mattina, Nancy. 1996. *Aspect and Category in Okanagan Word Formation*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Montana.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1999. *The Languages of Native North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Speck, Brenda. J. 1980. *An Edition of Father Post's Kalispel Grammar*.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 1992. *The Flathead Word*.
- Thomason, Sarah G., and Daniel Everett. 1993. 'Transitivity in Flathead.' *ICSNL* 28:317-344, Seattle, Washington.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2009a. *Cumulative Montana Salish field notes*.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2009b. *Salish-Pend d'Oreille dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, ms.
- Thompson, Sandra, and Robert E. Longacre. 1985. 'Adverbial Clauses.' in Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol. 2*: 171-234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Eijk, Jan P., and Thom Hess. 1986. 'Noun and Verb in Salish.' *Lingua* 69:319-331.
- Vogt, Hans. 1940. *The Kalispel Language*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.