

Correspondence address: Institute of Linguistics, Department of Languages of the World, Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, B. Kislovskij per., 1/12, 103009 Moskva, Russia; e-mail: kibrik@iling.msk.su

Reference

Campbell, Lyle & Marianne Mithun (eds.) (1979). *The Languages of Native America: A Historical and Comparative Assessment*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins & M. Dale Kinkade (eds.), *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives*. (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 107.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998, x + 575 pages, ISBN 3-11-015492-7, US\$ 138.

Reviewed by DAVID BECK, University of Alberta

One of the biggest problems facing typologists interested in uncovering new and “exotic” structures in the world’s languages is finding ways to become familiar with some of the less well-described language families. Unfortunately, much of the material available on many of these is often located in hard to find places or published in obscure venues known only to a select group of language specialists. Up until recently, this was the case with materials on languages of the Salishan family, a group of twenty-three languages spoken in the Pacific Northwest of North America. While the past ten years have seen the publication of a few works on individual languages by mainstream academic publishers (e.g., Galloway 1993; van Eijk 1997; Kroeber 1999), the family as a whole remains relatively obscure outside of Americanist circles, in spite of the many typologically interesting and theoretically challenging features of these languages. A wide-ranging collection of uniformly high-quality articles, *Salish Languages and Linguistics* goes a long way towards correcting this situation, providing an introduction to the major features of the language family and a series of in-depth examinations of many of the most noteworthy topics in Salishan studies. The linguistic works are complemented by a 66-page bibliography comprising as complete a list as possible of the literature on Salishan languages produced prior to the book’s date of publication.

Perhaps the strongest point of this book from the viewpoint of the typologist is the introductory survey, “Salish languages and linguistics,” by the editors themselves. Nearly 70 pages in length, this article is the most comprehensive overview to date, superceding the oft-cited but long out-of-date articles by Laurence C. Thompson (1973, 1979). This chapter gives a bird’s-eye view of the salient phonological, morphological, and syntactic traits of the family, as well

as discussing issues of classification and comparison. It surveys the literature on Salishan languages in these areas as well, and goes on to review work on ethno-semantic, discourse/textual studies, prehistory, and lexicography. This section is perhaps less easily digested than it might have been due to the wholesale lack of accessible, analyzed examples, particularly examples illustrating the infamously complex Salishan morphosyntax – although in all fairness, doing a credible job of this might well have turned the article into a book-length work in its own right. The authors make up a certain measure of this by providing ample citations where the interested party can find the necessary exemplification. Sadly, much of the source material still exists only in manuscripts, unpublished dissertations, and the widely unavailable proceedings of past Salish conferences (a listing of which is provided in an appendix to the volume, covering the years 1966–1995). Readers anxious to get straight to the data are referred to the less comprehensive but more thoroughly-exemplified sketch of Salishan morphosyntax provided in the first chapter of Kroeber (1999).

The remainder of the book is divided into four parts – “Phonetic and phonological studies,” “Morphological and syntactic studies,” “Ethnosemantic studies,” and “Comparative and historical studies” – and consists of articles taking on theoretical analyses of a variety specific topics. Included in the first section on phonetics and phonology are studies on the phonetics of retracted vowels (Nicola J. Bessell, “Phonetic aspects of retraction in Interior Salish”) and the multi-faceted Salishan schwa (M. Dale Kinkade, “How much does a schwa weigh?”). For typologists with a phonological bent, Bruce Bagemihl’s “Maximality in Bella Coola (Nuxalk)” presents an analysis of syllable structure (or the apparent lack thereof) in Bella Coola, a language renowned for its ability to tolerate seemingly limitless consonant-clusters, as in the following examples (p. 74):

- (1) a. $t\chi^w t\chi^w$
 $t\chi^w t\text{-}t\text{-}c\chi^w$
 spit-PAST-1SG.OBJ:2SG.SUBJ
 ‘you spat on me’
- b. $x\acute{t}p\text{'}\chi^w t\acute{t}p\acute{t}s$
 $x\acute{t}\text{-}p\text{'}\chi^w t\text{-}\acute{t}p\text{-}\acute{t}\text{-}s$
 have-bunchberry-plant-PLUPERFECT-3SG
 ‘he had had in his possession a bunchberry plant’

Although the theoretical treatment of the problem is controversial, the data themselves are well-presented and thought-provoking, and represent a challenge to anyone seeking a cross-linguistically valid notion of syllable structure.

The next article in the anthology, “Spokane (Npoqínišcn) syllable structure and reduplication” by Dawn Bates and Barry Carlson, also deals with Salishan syllables, this time from the point of view of reduplication. Salishan lan-

guages are well-known for having a variety of co-existing reduplicative processes, each expressing a different semantic category: the language described in this article, Spokane-Kalispel-Flathead (the last a.k.a. Montana Salish), has four (marking PLURAL/AUGMENTATIVE, DIMINUTIVE, OUT-OF-CONTROL, and REPETITIVE), while another language from a different branch of the family, Lushootseed (Bates et al. 1994), has seven distinctive reduplicative patterns. The origins and diachronic development of such rich systems of reduplicative morphology are examined in Part IV by Jan van Eijk (“CVC reduplication in Salish”), who discusses reduplication in the family as a whole, paying particular attention to the origin and nature of the plural/augmentative pattern.

Other contributions in the volume offer detailed studies of morphosyntactic problems in Salishan grammar. These range from the mismatch between morphological and phonological units (Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, “The morphological and phonological constituent structure of words in Moses-Columbian Salish (Nxaʔamxín)”) to a reanalysis of the inflectional morphology of the extinct, poorly documented Tillamook (Steven M. Egesdal and M. Terry Thompson, “A fresh look at Tillamook (Hutyéyu) inflectional morphology”), an important task from the areal-historical point of view given Tillamook’s isolated location in Oregon and intensive contact with non-Salishan neighbours. In the only overt attempt at typological comparison in the anthology, Philip W. Davis and Ross Saunders take a look at relative clauses in Bella Coola (“The place of Bella Coola (Nuxalk) in a typology of the relative clause”), while Dwight Gardiner’s article on Shuswap (“Topic and focus in Shuswap (Secwepemct-sín)”) does a nice job of presenting an interesting array of topicalizing and foregrounding structures. The presentation in this article is unfortunately hampered by an unsophisticated notion of information structure, as well as by a willingness to let tree-structure diagrams stand in for precise semantic description. Structural analysis is important, but Shuswap is a dying language, and without further investigation into how the structures illustrated in this paper are actually used, the nuances of their meanings will never be recovered.

Two of the articles in the collection address the most typologically interesting features of Salishan syntax – syntactic ergativity and the apparent lack of a noun–verb distinction. Continuing her earlier work on the first of these problems (Gerds 1988), Donna Gerds (“Mapping Halkomelem voice”) develops a Mapping Theory account of the complex Halkomelem voice system. As in most Salishan languages, bare Halkomelem verb roots are almost uniformly monovalent, semantically transitive verbs such as *qʷəl* ‘bake, cook’ taking a single argument corresponding to the patient (pp. 315, 309, 308, 320):

- (2) a. *ni qʷəl tʰə sce:tən*
 AUX bake DET salmon
 ‘the salmon baked’

- b. *ni qʷəl-ət-əs θə steniʔ tʰə sce:tən*
 AUX cook-TR-3ERG DET woman DET salmon
 ‘the woman cooked the salmon’
- c. *ni qʷəl-əm θə steniʔ ʔə tʰə sce:tən*
 AUX cook-INTR DET woman OBL DET salmon
 ‘the woman cooked the salmon’
- d. *niʔ qʷəl-ət-c-θámʔs-əs ʔə kʷθə sce:tən*
 AUX bake-BEN-TR:1OBJ-3ERG OBL DET salmon
 ‘he baked me the salmon’
- e. *ni cən qʷəl-əm-stəxʷ θə steniʔ ʔə tʰə*
 AUX 1SUBJ bake-INTR-CS:3OBJ DET woman OBL DET
səplil
 bread
 ‘I made the woman bake the bread’
- f. *ni qʷəl-əm-st-əm θə steniʔ ʔə tʰə səplil*
 AUX bake-INTR-CS-INTR DET woman OBL DET bread
 ‘the woman was made to bake the bread’

Building on the bare “patient-oriented” stem (a), various affixes are pressed into service to create transitive (b), anti-passive (c), passive (not shown), causative (not shown), lack of control (not shown) and benefactive (d) forms, not to mention combinations of the above such as the causative of the anti-passive (e) and the passive of the causative of the anti-passive (f). Although Gerdts’ goals in this article are primarily theoretical, she gives a clear and accessible account of these patterns, providing a good introduction to one of the fundamental features of clause-structure in the grammars of most Salishan languages.

The second perennial issue of Salishan syntax to be addressed in the volume is the rather tenuous distinction that the languages of the family make (or don’t make) between nouns and verbs. This debate has a long history in Salishan and Northwestern linguistics, going back to observations by, among others, Franz Boas (1911) and Edward Sapir (1921), who noted that languages of the area seem to use words corresponding to English verbs and nouns interchangeably as both syntactic predicates and as arguments. The issue was first examined in detail for Squamish in Kuipers (1968) and for Salishan in general in Kinkade (1983), and has since sparked a lively debate both *pro* (Jelinek & Demers 1994), and *con* (van Eijk & Hess 1986; Beck 1995, to appear; Davis & Matthewson 1995; Haag 1998; and, for Wakashan and Chimakuan, Jacobsen 1979) the absence of the noun–verb distinction. This problem has also attracted some attention from non-Salishanist typologists (e.g., Bhat 1994; Croft 1992, 2000), who should be interested in Eloise Jelinek’s latest contribution to the anti-noun/verb cause, “Prepositions in Northern Straits Salish and the noun/verb question”. Couched in terms of a mid-1990’s version of generative

grammar, Jelinek's argument is that while Salishan languages do distinguish between main and nominalized clauses (as pointed out by van Eijk & Hess 1986 and Beck 1995), at the lexical level there are no roots that are associated exclusively with the maximal projections VP or NP. While many of the details of the argument itself are theory-specific, the data are well-laid out and the examples informative: readers will take away from the article a good notion of the phenomena that have sparked the noun–verb debate in the first place, as well the issues that will have to be resolved by anyone wishing to have the last word on the subject, whatever their theoretical persuasion.

From the opposite end of the theoretical spectrum, Gary Palmer's article "Foraging for patterns in Interior Salish semantic domains" offers a Cognitive Grammar analysis of the folk-semantic domains of plant-terms, body-parts, place names, and basic colours and colour terms (including related patterns of sound-symbolism). This is followed by a study of tree names in an Interior Salish language ("Secwepemc (Shuswap) tree names: Key to the past?") by Nancy Turner, Marianne Boelscher Ignace, and Brian D. Compton. This article attempts to reconstruct early migrations through the etymology of the names of trees particular to different ecological zones in the Interior of British Columbia, and provides a nice lead in to the section on comparative and historical studies.

In this final section, Paul D. Kroeber's contribution, "Pre-history of the Upper Chehalis (Q'w'ay'áyiłq') continuative aspect," is of special interest to typologists interested in tracing out the potential paths for the grammaticalization of aspectual morphemes. Upper Chehalis, a member of the little-known Tsamosan branch of the Salishan family, distinguishes three verbal aspects, two of which – the completive (perfective) and stative – make use of ordinary valency-altering and person morphology. The third aspect, the continuative (imperfective), makes use of what Kroeber convincingly argues are reflexes of the Proto-Salishan transitive subject suffixes (generalized here to continuative intransitives) and a Pan-Salishan nominalizing prefix, *s-*. While the semantics of this development may be somewhat counter-intuitive (temporally bounded perfective events seeming to have more in common semantically with nominalization), Kroeber offers a plausible diachronic path for the phenomenon and points to a similar (although demonstrably independent) innovation in the Southern Interior branch of the family. Reading this article one is impressed not only by the author's erudition, but also by the tremendous variety and creativity found among the members of this most unique of language families.

References

- Bates, Dawn, Thomas M. Hess, & Vi Hilbert (1994). *Lushootseed dictionary*. Seattle: Washington University Press.
- Beck, David (1995). A conceptual approach to lexical categories in Bella Coola and Lushootseed. In *Papers for the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 1–31. Victoria: University of Victoria.
- (to appear). *The Typology of Parts of Speech Systems: The Markedness of Adjectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhat, D. N. S. (1994). *The Adjectival Category*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Boas, Franz (1911). Kwakiutl. In Franz Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian languages*, vol. 1, 423–557. Washinton, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Croft, William (1991). *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (2000). Parts of speech as language universals and as language-particular categories. In Petra M. Vogel & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Approaches to the Typology of Word Classes*, 65–102. Berlin: Mouton.
- Galloway, Brent D. (1993). *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, 96.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gerdts, Donna B. (1988). *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland.
- Haag, Marcia (1998). Word-level evidence for lexical categories in Salishan languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 64: 379–393.
- Kinkade, M. Dale (1983). Salish evidence against the universality of ‘noun’ and ‘verb’. *Lingua* 60: 25–39.
- Kuipers, Aert (1968). The categories verb-noun and transitive-intransitive in English and Squamish. *Lingua* 21: 610–626.
- Kroeber, Paul D. (1999). *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Morphosyntax*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Matthewson, Lisa & Henry Davis (1995). The structure of DP in St’at’imcets (Lillooet Salish). In *Papers for the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 55–68. Victoria: University of Victoria.
- Sapir, Edward (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Co.
- Thompson, Laurence C. (1973). The Northwest. In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 10: Linguistics in North America*, 979–1045. The Hague: Mouton.
- (1979). Salishan and the Northwest. In Lyle Campbell & Marianne Mithun (eds.), *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*, 692–765. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- van Eijk, Jan (1997). *The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- van Eijk, Jan & Thomas M. Hess (1986). Noun and verb in Salish. *Lingua* 69: 319–331.