S-PREFIXATION
ON UPPER CHEHALIS (SALISH) IMPERFECTIVE PREDICATES

M. Dale Kinkade
University of British Columbia

A prefixed s- is common throughout Salish. Sometimes more than one s- prefix is identified for a language, and one of these is nearly always glossed 'nominalizer'. Upper Chehalis also has this prefix, although it is difficult to say whether there is more than one s- there, or if s- simply has a range of functions including nominalization. Whichever might be the better analysis, I will give primary consideration here to the use of a prefixed s- as an aspect marker. Since this is probably ultimately a derived usage, I will also make limited comments about some of the other functions of s-.

It has been claimed for Upper Chehalis that "the formal sign of a continuable aspect form is the prefix /s/-, although it can be determined from many suffixes as well" (Kinkade 1964:33-34). This is true for all elicited sentences and phrases in this language, both in my field notes and in those collected by Boas in 1927. Several suffixes are, however, better taken as diagnostics for this aspect (which I now call 'imperfective', rather than 'continuative'), notably subject and passive suffixes. This is because it turns out that texts do not usually have a prefixed s- on imperfectives. This seemingly contradictory occurrence—imperfectives marked by s- in elicited material but not in texts—has, in fact, a systematic explanation, largely determined by discourse structure.

Boas does not directly address the issue; he notes that "all verbs have two forms, completive or momentary, and continuative" (1934:105, note 12), but he says nothing about the s- prefix in this context (he otherwise identifies it only as a nominalizer). It does indeed follow the patterns discussed below in sometimes being present and sometimes not in the text fragment he presents. However, the various paradigms he presents all show continuative (i.e. imperfective) forms beginning with s-.

Examples of imperfective predicates with s- from elicited material are given in (1).

---

1 Abbreviations used are: AUT 'autonomous', CAUS 'causative', COP 'copula', DEF 'definite', DESCRIPTIVE, DETR 'detransitive', DIMIN 'diminutive', EXT 'extender', (f) 'feminine gender', FUT 'future', HAB 'habitual', IMPF 'imperfective', INDEF 'indefinite', INDIR 'indirective', INTR 'intransitive', MDL 'middle voice', MOD 'modal', OBJ 'object', OBL 'oblique', PASS 'passive', PERF 'perfective', PL/pl 'plural', POSS 'possessive', Q 'question', QUOT 'quotative', REFL 'reflexive', sg 'singular', SUBJ 'subject', TRANS 'transitive', UNR 'unrealized, future'.
(1)  s-sáw’a-w-n čsa tit manó-mš.  ?it šáw’uy’i 0
    [s-play-INF-3SUBJ(IMPF) again DEF children]
The children are playing again.

    s-máx”a-t-n tit x”iyíq-w-φqs.  ?it máx”-n 0
    [s-drive-TRANS-3SUBJ(IMPF) DEF automobile]
    He’s driving the car.

    s-t’ayóc’-tu-stí ʔat’ tit tavn.  ?it t’ayóc’-t-m 0
    [s-parade-CAUS-PASS(IMPF) in DEF town]
    There is a parade in town.

    s-X’á:zn-mit-anš t X’á:raláš.  ?it X’á:zan-m ɛn
    [s-hunt-MDL-1SGSUBJ(IMPF) OBL deer]
    I’m hunting deer.

The final suffix in each of these predicates has an imperfective form different from the
perfective aspect equivalent (i.e. 0 for 3SUBJ, -tm for PASS, and ɛn for 1SGSUBJ); these endings
would themselves be sufficient to mark which aspect is represented (and in turn affect the
specific shape of what precedes them). The perfective forms of each of these predicates is
given to the right of the example. The s- is thus redundant for marking aspect.

It was well after I had written my initial description of Upper Chehalis, in which I
claimed that s- marked imperfectives, that I realized this prefix is most often missing from
imperfectives in texts. Although I have been aware of this discrepancy for some time, I had
never bothered to investigate it further until I recently read the draft of a paper by Paul
Kroeber, in which he also noted, and was mystified by, the absence of s- in texts. A sample
text fragment is given in (2), where there is a series of imperfectives, not one of which has
s- prefixed to the main predicate of the line, which in each case is unmistakably
imperfective.²

(2)  xáwas tawé-la-t-n.
    [first sit-AUT-3SUBJ(IMPF)]
    First he sits down.

² The first line is somewhat ambiguous in this regard, since sequences of two or more s’s tend to collapse
into one in allegro speech, and an s- prefixed onto the form meaning ‘sit’ might either be omitted or missed by
the transcriber.
q"aq"aq"ix'-t-n tóm'-a-t-ti tit s-maq"m=umš.
[cut-trans-3subj(impf) short-pl-intr-pl def prairie=people]
He cuts the grass up short.

yél-t-n š-at t'amé·tn.
[thread-trans-3subj(impf) to-in string]
He threads it on a string.

tam=élus·tw-n.
[tie-mid-caus-3subj(impf)]
He ties them together.

?áqa n yánq=anus-n.
[now and put.around.neck=3subj(impf)]
He puts it around his neck.

This s- prefix may be replaced by a proclitic t 'unrealized, future' (which can also occur with perfective forms); t and s- do not co-occur. This means that constructions with this t do not provide information on the actual occurrence of s-. It also needs to be noted that s- is used regularly to mark subordinate predicates (which may be either participial-like, gerundial, or possessed), and this usage is consistent both in elicited material and in texts. Examples of such subordinated material are given as (3) through (7).

(3) ṽtu tó'-t-stw-ití t s-?l'an-n.
[then hear-caus-3psubj(impf) indef s-sing-3subj(impf)]
Then they hear singing.

(4) xáwas ?lk"-mal-n t t qá·? tu ?at t s-cétx-mít-n tu ?at t s-máníči.
[at.first fetch-detr-3subj(impf) obl indef water from at indef s-dribble-mdl-3subj(impf)
 from at indef s-mountain]
First he fetches water from a spring dripping from a mountain.

(5) mé·tta t s-k"aw=q-s tit pósa.
[not indef s-join=voice-3poss def monster]
The monster doesn't answer a thing.

(6) X'ál-stw-n t cá· X'a s-q'al-ám-s.
[look.for-caus-3subj(impf) indef where fut s-camp-mdl-3poss]
He looks around to where he will camp.

(7) ?at t s-nám-ití-n-s, n m'ús-mít-ití.
[when indef s-finish-eat-3poss and sleep-mdl-3psubj(impf)]
When they have finished eating, and they sleep.
In each of these sentences, s- nominalizes what follows; the nominalization is further indicated by the use of an article (t 'indefinite' in 3, 4, 5, 7, and k’a ‘future’ in 6), and -s 'third person possessive' in (5) through (7). The first two examples are very much like English gerunds (i.e. nominal and based on imperfective forms); the other three require possessive inflection to indicate the subject of the subordinated form. In (3) the gerund is direct object, in (4) it is the object of a (compound) preposition. In (5) the initial negative requires the predicate following to be subordinate; in (6) a question-word does the same. In (7) the subordinate predicate occurs in a clause beginning with a subordinating conjunction.

In order to try to determine what, if any, pattern there is to the presence or absence of s-, I extracted 15 pages (containing about 540 clauses) of a long text, then marked all the imperfective predicates. This identified roughly 275 examples—imperfective being the predicate of choice in narration; only 49 had a prefixed s-. These results were surprising enough, given the uniformity of the presence of s- in elicited material, although more startling was the distribution of forms with and without s-. It turned out that directly quoted speech consistently used s- on imperfectives, while it was consistently absent from the rest of the narrative text. There are a very few exceptions both ways which I have not yet figured out, although most of the s- prefixed forms in the non-quoted narrative text turned out to be subordinate clauses, where their occurrence is regular. Some of the forms in quoted speech are indeterminate as to the use of s- because either the stem itself begins with s- or there is a particle or word preceding that ends in s, and, as noted earlier, sequences of more than one s tend to collapse into one segment. Other imperfective forms in quoted speech are marked with t ‘unrealized, future’, and thus cannot include s-. Thus (8) through (10), which include quoted speech, can be contrasted with (2) above. Unlike the usage without s- in the narrative text, quoted speech does not contain strings of imperfectives. Rather, one finds them interspersed with various subordinate constructions, and with the quoted speech moving along in short sequences interspersed with narrative text.

(8)  cūnaxn t xʷenēxʷone,
     [say-def-3subj(impf) indef Xʷenēxʷone]
     xʷenēxʷone says,
     ?at ta s-kʷaná-t-s,
     [when past s-get/take-trans-3poss]
     when he gets it,
     "tō- nāxʷt-qʷulati tit ?a-s-ʔum-c.
     [oh true-? def 2sgposs-s-give.food-1sgobj(perf)]
     "Oh, thank you for feeding me.
cilaś t s-qāx-čť;
[five INDEF s-many-1plposs]
We are five in number;
mūs n-s-nēšči-m.
[four 1sgposs-pl-younger.brother-pl]
I have four younger brothers.
χʷqʷ w cē q'ic'-t-āliwan-χ.
[all yet 1plsubj(perf) thus-?=appearance-def]
All of us look alike.
ʔām u ?a[l]at i'ūqʷ-n
[when yet when[2sgposs] find-3obj(perf)]
So when you find him
čā. ?at tu s-māniči.
[where on def s-mountain]
anywhere on the mountain.
ʔām u q'ic'-t-āliw-n u t ŋēncē,
[when yet thus-?=appearance-def yet to I]
If he should look like me,
wi tāx wi ?伯·c's tu ?at n-s-nēšči-m.
[and that.one cop one from in 1sgposs-pl-younger.brother-pl]
and that is one of my younger brothers.
wi ?āqa s-ławā-mi-n-anš.
[and now s-leave-2sobj(impf)-n-1sgsubj(impf)]
And now I am leaving you.
tan s-wākʷs-anš š-at t s-xāχ.'
[now s-go-1sgsubj(impf) to-in indef s-bush]
Now I am going into the bush.
itu šān'-χ
[from there-def]
From there
n t l'a-yāχ'ā-w-anš."
[and unr again-go.home-intr-1sgsubj(impf)]
and I will go back home."
cün-t-nax-n cic pósa?,
[say-?-def-3subj(impf) def(f) monster]
The monster says,
"hiy č.
[goodbye 2sgsubj(perf)]
"Goodbye.

ʔáqa s-wák"s-anš."
[now s-go-1sgsubj(impf)]
Now I am going.

wá'·k"s-n t xʷənéxʷəne š-at t s-xáš'.
[go-3subj(impf) indef xʷənéxʷəne to-in indef s-bush]
xʷənéxʷəne go·es into the bush.

(9) kʷáw-aq-n c man-s c malé,
[join-voice-3subj(perf) indef(f) child-3poss indef(f) Malé]
The daughter of Malé answers,

"s-tawá-mi-n-anš,
[s-leave-2sgobj(impf)-n-1sgsubj(impf)]
"I will leave you,

ʔáqa s-ʔík"a-t-anš t s-šam'=-álax".
[now s-fetch-trans-1sgsubj(impf) indef s=?=people]
now I will fetch the people.

kʷáw-a-w-n š-at xʷáqʷ u t pé-pš-ayu.
[get.to-intr-3subj(impf) to-in all yet indef ?=animal]
She gets to all the animals/birds.

yáy-s-ni-t-n
[tell-indir-indir-trans-3subj(impf)]
She tells them

ʔít ʔík"taqi-t-m t ta mán-s.
[perf steal-trans-pass by past child-3poss]
that her child was stolen. ["My child was stolen."

(10) cút-nax-n t tukʷáš ź-ʔáat šit s-šam'=-álax",
[say-def-3subj(impf) indef Moon to-in def s=?=people]
Moon says to the people,

"pó· s-ʔini-n-ap ṭat šit cáʔ-ʔaʔš."
[oh s-do-n-2plsubj(impf) in def stream[dimin]]
"Oh, what are you doing in the stream?"

"s-yus-taut š-at t s-qʷáq".
[s-work-1plsubj(impf) to-in indef Raven]
"We work for Raven.

"We work for Raven.
s-á'at=úl-itn-stawt."
[s-look.for=EXT=food/fish-1plSUBJ(IMPF)]
We are salmon fishing."

cít-nax-n,
[say-DEF-3SUBJ(IMPF)]
He says,
"t ċús na nkʷg wínwin-nax-ap."
[INDEF always Q HAB do-DEF-2plSUBJ(IMPF)]
"Do you always do that?"

These passages, then, show how direct quotations may be identified by the use of a prefixed s-.

Other s- prefixes occur where expected, but what is striking is the contrast between quoted speech and narrative text. We are familiar with the common requirement in various European languages to flag indirect speech, often by switching verbal mood to subjunctive or by using modal auxiliaries, as well as shifting pronominal referents. In Upper Chehalis, it is direct speech that is flagged, and by using the usual signal for subordinate predicates. (Mode may be marked, although not in any way that could be said to distinguish direct from indirect speech.) It does not seem necessary, however, to claim that quoted speech is in fact subordinate. It is only imperfective forms that are so marked; perfective forms show no difference whatever from the regular narrative text usage, and it seems unlikely that one aspect would be categorized as subordinate in direct speech while others would not. The use of s- to mark these imperfectives is, however, most likely derived from its use as a sign of subordination.

To clarify the difference between direct and indirect speech, it is necessary to turn now to examples of the latter. It is possible to identify some indirect speech in Upper Chehalis, although it is used much less frequently in the texts available to me than is direct speech. Traditional stories are far more likely to be dramatized by quoting the actual utterances of characters than to refer to their speech indirectly. Examples of indirect speech, however, show nothing out of the ordinary. I have identified only ten or twelve instances of indirect speech in the entire Adventures of Xʷenéxʷene text, which is over 4000 lines (or clauses) long, and replete with directly quoted speech. Examples are given in (11) through (16); those in (11) and (12) are instances of indirect speech from the narrative portion of the story, those in (13) through (16) are instances within direct quotations. For each example of indirect speech I have added (in English) what the equivalent would be as direct speech; this shows in particular the pronominal displacements.
(11) $k^\prime \eta k^\prime \eta n=\acute{\eta} \cdot n \cdot s \cdot m \\
    {\text{pay.attention=insides-MDL-3SUBJ(IMPF)}}

He wonders,

$t\acute{\alpha}m \cdot a \acute{n}i n$
[what-now]
What is it

$q'\acute{a} t \ s\acute{a} \cdot t \cdot a \cdot n \ c\acute{\i} t \cdot n.$
[mod make-3OBJ(PERF) food]
how he can make food?  ["How can I make food?""]

(12) $k^\prime \eta k^\prime \eta n=\acute{\eta} \cdot n \cdot s \cdot m \\
    {\text{pay.attention=insides-MDL-3SUBJ(IMPF)}}

He wonders

$\acute{\eta} \cdot \acute{e} \cdot n \cdot m \ t \ q'\acute{a} t \ s \cdot q'\acute{a} t \ s \cdot \acute{i} \ n \ s \ - s \ - s$
[how INDEF MOD S-MOD-S-do?-3OBJ(PERF)-3POSS]
how he can do it  ["How can I do it?""]

$cu \ q'\acute{a} t \ k^\prime \acute{\i} \ i \ a \ . \ i \ x \ w \ i \ t \ c\acute{\acute{\alpha}} \ w \ t.$
[so.that MOD get/take-3OBJ DEF spring, salmon]
so that he can get the spring salmon.  ["(How) can I get the spring salmon?""]

There are only a few examples in the narrative portion like those in (11) and (12) (only four have been noted), and three of them are introduced with 'he wonders'. These three also have the modal particle $q'\acute{a} t$ after an interrogative word, and in all three the main predicate of the indirect speech is a perfective transitive form with third person arguments. The example in (12) has a subordinated form of 'do' with a third person possessive suffix as well. A third instance is in the last two lines of (9) above; the indirect speech there is an ordinary perfective passive form.

Examples (13) through (16) illustrate indirect speech within quoted speech. In (13) a primary second person becomes first person in indirect speech. In (14) first and second person arguments reverse their roles for subject and object. In (15) a first person possessor is referred to in indirect speech as third person. In (16) a third party is cited as referring to the person addressed, resulting in a shift from third to second person.
(13a) "ʔó-sʔínwat-n t p’ayók"—
[oh s-say.what-3SGSUBJ(IMPF) INDEF Bluejay]
"Oh, what is Bluejay saying—
n-k”uí ači."
[1SGROSS-MOTHER QUOT]
my mother, he says." ["Your mother."]

(13b) "wi ?it cún-c
[and PERF say/tell-1SGOBJ(PERF)]
"And he told me
ʔáq”uí s-yëc’a-w-anš.
[better! QUOT s-turn.back-INTR-1SGSUBJ(IMPF)]
I’d better turn around and go back, he says.
ʔónca."
[I]
I (should)." ["You’d better turn around & go back."]

(14a) "q’áʔ c’áp’-nt títʔa-s-cún-c-x
[MOD disagreeable-DESCR DEF 2SGPOSS-s-tell-1SGOBJ(PERF)-DEF]
"What you told me was disagreeable
q’áʔ X’ámyx-c č tač títʔa-X’é[-]ʃX’ʃ." [MOD stab-1SGOBJ(PERF) 2SGSUBJ(PERF) with DEF 2SGPOSS-stick[Dimin]]
that you would stab me with your little stick." ["I will stab you."]

(14b) "sʔínwat-š.
[s-say.what-2SGSUBJ(IMPF)]
"What are you saying?
ʔi-cút-š č na
[ʔ-say-DEF 2SGSUBJ(PERF) O]
Didn’t you say
t t yucá-mš č."
[UNR INDEF kill-1SGOBJ(PERF) 2SGSUBJ(PERF)]
you will kill me?" ["I will kill you."]

(15) "wi ?it cút
[and PERF say]
"And he said
"My older brothers have disappeared."

"And your mother and your grandmother told me

well, you should go home, they say."  "[He should come home."

None of these shows any notably unusual morphology or syntax in the indirect speech. The instance in (13a) is merely a possessed form. The predicates in (14) through (16) are all ordinary perfectives; both (14a) and (14b) are simple transitives, (15) is reflexive, and (16) is intransitive with a quasi-auxiliary (\(\lambda'\lambda^{'q}\)). The indirect speech in (13b) looks superficially as if it is an imperfective predicate with a prefixed \(s\) that might be explained as simply being the result of its occurrence within quoted speech. However, it is more likely that this \(s\) is a subordinate marker; \(\lambda'\lambda^{'q}\) is a quasi-auxiliary that can be followed by either perfective or imperfective predicates, although imperfectives are the more common. In all such cases, this imperfective has the \(s\)-prefix, suggesting that it is not the quoted speech that requires it.

Returning to the earlier point that within texts, imperfectives in directly quoted speech have an \(s\)-prefix, and those outside quoted speech do not, we have a simple explanation for why it is, as was observed at the outset, that all separately elicited imperfectives have \(s\): they are quoted speech. The usual way of eliciting is to ask "How do you say 'XYZ'?" That which is asked for is given as a quotation. The response, with or without an introductory "you would say" is likewise quoted speech, hence may require a prefixed \(s\).
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