

UC Berkeley

Survey Reports, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages

Title

S-prefixation on Upper Chehalis (Salish) Imperfective Predicates

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9qj9330t>

Author

Kinkade, M Dale

Publication Date

1994

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 continuative 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

¹ Abbreviations used are: AUT 'autonomous', CAUS 'causative', COP 'copula', DEF 'definite', DESCR '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-šáw'a-w-n čsa tit manó·mš.* *?it šáw'uy'i Ø*
 [s-play-INTR-3SUBJ(IMPF) again DEF children]
 The children are playing again.
- s-máx^wa-t-n tit x^wiyíy-əqs.* *?it máx^w-n Ø*
 [s-drive-TRANS-3SUBJ(IMPF) DEF automobile]
 He's driving the car.
- s-í'ayác'-tu-stš ?at tit táwn.* *?it í'ayác'-t-m Ø*
 [s-parade-CAUS-PASS(IMPF) in DEF town]
 There is a parade in town.
- s-š'á·xn-mít-anš † s'áláš.* *?it š'á·xan-m čn*
 [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. Ø for 3SUBJ, -tm for PASS, and čn 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.

qʷáyqʷiXʷ-t-n tómʷ-a-ʔ-ti tit s-máqʷm=umš.

[cut-TRANS-3SUBJ(IMPF) short-PL-INTR-PL DEF s-prairie=people]

He cuts the grass up short.

yél-t-n š-atʷ lʷamé·tn.

[thread-TRANS-3SUBJ(IMPF) to-in string]

He threads it on a string.

ʔam=éʷus-tw-n.

[tie=middle-CAUS-3SUBJ(IMPF)]

He ties them together.

ʔáqa 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 *ʔ* ‘unrealized, future’ (which can also occur with perfective forms); *ʔ* and *s-* do not co-occur. This means that constructions with this *ʔ* 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) *ʔítu tó·ʷ-stw-iʔti t s-ʔíʷan-n.*

[then hear-CAUS-3plSUBJ(IMPF) INDEF s-sing-3SUBJ(IMPF)]

Then they hear singing.

(4) *ʔáwas ʔíkʷ-mal-n ʔ t qá·ʔ tu ʔatʷ t s-cétx-mit-n tu ʔatʷ t s-mániči.*

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·ʔta t s-kʷáw=q-s tit pása.*

[not INDEF s-join=VOICE-3POSS DEF monster]

The monster doesn't answer a thing.

(6) *Xʷál-stw-n t čá· Xʷa s-qʷal-ám-s.*

[look.for-CAUS-3SUBJ(IMPF) INDEF where FUT s-camp-MDL-3POSS]

He looks around to where he will camp.

(7) *ʔatʷ t s-nám-iʔn-s, n mʷús-mit-iʔti.*

[when INDEF s-finish-eat-3POSS and sleep-MDL-3plSUBJ(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 *κ’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 *ʔ* ‘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) *cú-t-nax-n t xʷənéxʷəne,*
 [say-DEF-3SUBJ(IMPF) INDEF Xʷənéxʷəne]
xʷənéxʷəne says,
ʔát ta s-kʷaná-t-s,
 [when past s-get/take-TRANS-3POSS]
 when he gets it,
"ʔó· náxʷt-qʷulati tit ʔa-s-ʔúm-c.
 [oh true-? DEF 2sgPOSS-s-give.food-1sgOBJ(PERF)]
 "Oh, thank you for feeding me.

cílačs t s-qáx-čt;

[five INDEF s-many-1plPOSS]

We are five in number;

mús n-s-nésči-tn.

[four 1sgPOSS-PL-younger.brother-PL]

I have four younger brothers.

x^wáq^w u čt q'ic'-t-áliwan-x.

[all yet 1plSUBJ(PERF) thus-?=appearance-DEF]

All of us look alike.

?ám u ?a[la]t' t'úq^w-n

[when yet when[2sgPOSS] find-3OBJ(PERF)]

So when you find him

čá· ?at' tit s-mániči.

[where on DEF s-mountain]

anywhere on the mountain.

?ám u q'ic'-t-álwn-x u? t' ?ónca,

[when yet thus-?=appearance-DEF yet to I]

If he should look like me,

wi táx wi ?ó·c's tu ?at' n-s-nésči-tn.

[and that.one COP one from in 1sgPOSS-PL-younger.brother-PL]

and that is one of my younger brothers.

wi ?áqa s-tawá-mi-n-anš.

[and now s-leave-2sgOBJ(IMPF)-n-1sgSUBJ(IMPF)]

And now I am leaving you.

tan s-wák^ws-anš š-at' t s-xáx'.

[now s-go-1sgSUBJ(IMPF) to-in INDEF s-bush]

Now I am going into the bush.

tu šán'-x

[from there-DEF]

From there

n t' a-yá'á-w-anš."

[and UNR again-go.home-INTR-1sgSUBJ(IMPF)]

and I will go back home."

cín-t-nax-n cic pásá?,

[say-?-DEF-3SUBJ(IMPF) DEF(f) monster]

The monster says,

"húy č.

[goodbye 2sgSUBJ(PERF)]

"Goodbye.

?áqa s-wák^ws-anš."

[now s-go-1sgSUBJ(IMPF)]

Now I am going."

wá·k^ws-n t x^wənéx^wəne š-at t s-xáx'.

[go-3SUBJ(IMPF) INDEF X^wənéx^wəne to-in INDEF s-bush]

x^wənéx^wəne go·es into the bush.

- (9) k^wáw=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,
 ?áqa s-?ík^wa-t-anš t s-šam' =álox^w."
 [now s-fetch-TRANS-1sgSUBJ(IMPF) INDEF s-?=people]
 now I will fetch the people."
 k^wx^wá-w-n š-at x^wáq^w u t pé·ps=ayu.
 [get.to-INTR-3SUBJ(IMPF) to-in all yet INDEF ?=animal]
 She gets to all the animals/birds.
 yáy-š-ni-t-n
 [tell-INDIR-INDIR-TRANS-3SUBJ(IMPF)]
 She tells them
 ?it ?ík^wtaqi-t-m t ta mán-s.
 [PERF steal-TRANS-PASS by PAST child-3POSS]
 that her child was stolen. ["My child was stolen."]

- (10) cú-nax-n t tuk^wát š-?at tit s-šam' =álox^w,
 [say-DEF-3SUBJ(IMPF) INDEF Moon to-in DEF s-?=people]
 Moon says to the people,
 "?ó· s-?íni-n-ap ?at tit cá[·]pš."
 [oh s-do-n-2plSUBJ(IMPF) in DEF stream[DIMIN]]
 "Oh, what are you doing in the stream?"
 "s-yús-tawt š-at t s-q^wáq^w.
 [s-work-1plSUBJ(IMPF) to-in INDEF Raven]
 "We work for Raven.

s-χ'a? =úl =itn-stawt."

[s-look.for=EXT=food/fish-1plSUBJ(IMPF)]

We are salmon fishing."

cú-nax-n,

[say-DEF-3SUBJ(IMPF)]

He says,

"t čús na nk" s winwin-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 *X^wənéχ^wəne* 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) *kʷən kʷən = é · nus - mit - n*,
 [pay.attention=insides-MDL-3SUBJ(IMPF)]
 He wonders,
tám - anin
 [what-now]
 What is it
qʼat sá? - ən cítn.
 [MOD make-3OBJ(PERF) food]
 how he can make food? ["How can I make food?"]
- (12) *kʷən kʷən = é · nus - mit - n*
 [pay.attention=insides-MDL-3SUBJ(IMPF)]
 He wonders
?é · nm t qʼat s - qʼat - s - ín - s - n - s
 [HOW INDEF MOD S-MOD-S-DO-?-3OBJ(PERF)-3POSS]
 how he can do it ["How can I do it?"]
cu qʼat kʷəna - xʷ tit cʼáwt.
 [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 *qʼat* 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· s-ʔínwat-n t p'ayák"
 [oh s-say.what-3SUBJ(IMPF) INDEF Bluejay]
 "Oh, what is Bluejay saying—
 n-k'íy ačĭ."
 [1sgPOSS-mother QUOT]
 my mother, he says." ["Your mother."]
- (13b) "wi ʔit cún-c
 [and PERF say/tell-1sgOBJ(PERF)]
 "And he told me
 ʔ'áq' ačĭ s-yəc'á-w-anš.
 [better! QUOT s-turn.back-INTR-1sgSUBJ(IMPF)]
 I'd better turn around and go back, he says.
 ʔánca."
 [I
 I (should).] ["You'd better turn around & go back."]
-
- (14a) "q'at' c'áp'-nt' tit ʔa-s-cún-c-χ
 [MOD disagreeable-DESCR DEF 2sgPOSS-s-tell-1sgOBJ(PERF)-DEF]
 "What you told me was disagreeable
 q'at' ʔámχ-c č tač tit ʔa-ʔé[·]š ʔš."
 [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) "s-ʔinnwat-š.
 [s-say.what-2sgSUBJ(IMPF)]
 "What are you saying?
 ʔi-cút-χ č na
 [ʔ-say-DEF 2sgSUBJ(PERF) Q]
 Didn't you say
 †t yucá-mš č"
 [UNR INDEF kill-1sgOBJ(PERF) 2sgSUBJ(PERF)]
 you will kill me?" ["I will kill you."]
-
- (15) "wi ʔit cút
 [and PERF say]
 "And he said

xʷáya-cš ači ta nš-xʷát-m-s."

[disappear-REFL QUOT PAST PL-older.sibling-PL-3POSS]

his older brothers had disappeared, they say."

["My older brothers have disappeared."]

(16) *"wi ?it cún-c-x ?it ?a-kʷúy ča c ?a-káy*

[and PERF tell-1sgOBJ(PERF)-DEF DEF 2sgPOSS-mother and INDEF(f) 2sgPOSS-grandmother]

"And your mother and your grandmother told me

xʷáqʷ č ači ?ayó[··?]t u t tít yá·xʷ."

[better! 2sgSUBJ(PERF) QUOT should[DIMIN] yet UNR DEF go.home]

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 (*xʷáqʷ*). 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; *xʷáqʷ* 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-*.

REFERENCES

- Boas, Franz. [1927] [Chehalis Field Notes.] (Manuscript No. [30(S2c.1)] [Freeman No. 589] in American Philosophical Society Library, Philadelphia.)
- . 1934. A Chehalis text. *IJAL* 8(2):103-110.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1964. Phonology and morphology of Upper Chehalis: III. *IJAL* 30(1):32-61.

REPORT 8

**SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND
OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES**



**Proceedings of the Meeting of
the Society for the Study of the
Indigenous languages of the Americas
July 2-4, 1993
and the Hokan-Penutian Workshop
July 3, 1993**

both held at the 1993 Linguistic Institute at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio

Margaret Langdon, Volume Editor
Leanne Hinton, Series Editor

REPORT 8

**SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND
OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES**

Proceedings of the Meeting of the
Society for the Study of the Indigenous languages of the Americas
July 2-4, 1993

and the Hokan-Penutian Workshop
July 3, 1993

Both held at the 1993 Linguistic Institute at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio

Margaret Langdon
Volume Editor

Leanne Hinton
Series Editor

copyright © 1994
by the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages
cover design by Leanne Hinton (Santa Barbara Chumash rock painting)

This volume is dedicated to
JAMES E. REDDEN
on the occasion of his retirement
for his enduring commitment to the publication
of the results of research on Yuman, Hokan, Penutian and
other American Indian languages
and also
for his contributions to the
documentation of the Hualapai language

INTRODUCTION

This volume includes a number of papers presented in conjunction with the 1993 Linguistic Institute at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio, at two conferences on American Indian Languages: the meeting of the Society for the Study of the Indigenous languages of the Americas, held July 2-4, 1993, and the meeting of the Hokan-Penutian Workshop, held on the morning of July 3, 1993.

This continues a tradition initiated during the Linguistic Institute at the University of Arizona in 1988, of offering conferences on American Indian languages during the summer Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, which is held every two years on the campus of the host institution. The interaction thus afforded between students and faculty of the Institute and specialists in American Indian languages has proved mutually profitable.

We gratefully acknowledge the dedication of Catherine Callaghan in making these meetings thoroughly enjoyable, as well as the hospitality of Ohio State University.

The Hokan-Penutian Conference has a tradition of meetings dating as far back as 1970, when the first Hokan Conference was hosted by Margaret Langdon at UCSD. Since 1976, the Hokan (and later Hokan-Penutian) Conference proceedings were published most years by James Redden, as part of the series *Occasional Papers on Linguistics*, out of the department of Linguistics at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Beginning this year, with James Redden's retirement, the reports of these conferences are being published as part of the *Survey Reports* out of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages at the University of California at Berkeley.

Margaret Langdon
Volume Editor

Leanne Hinton
Series Editor

CONTENTS

GENERAL

- Putting pronouns in proper perspective in proposals of remote relationships
among Native American languages 1
CAMPBELL, LYLE
- S- prefixation on Upper Chehalis (Salish) imperfective predicates 21
KINKADE, M. DALE
- Comparative difficulties of the "Gulf" languages 31
KIMBALL, GEOFFREY
- Like hair, or trees: Semantic analysis of the Coeur d'Alene prefix *ne'* 'amidst' 40
OCCHI, DEBRA J., GARY B. PALMER, AND ROY H. OGAWA

SOUTH AMERICA

- Constituent order variation in Apurinã 59
FACUNDES, SIDNEY
- Case, verb type, and ergativity in Trumai 75
GUIRARDELLO, RAQUEL
- Nheengatu (Língua Geral Amazonica), its history, and the effects of language
contact 93
MOORE, DENNY, SIDNEY FACUNDES, AND NADIA PIRES
- Reconstruction of Proto-Tupari consonants and vowels 119
MOORE, DENNY, AND VLACY GALUCIO
- Basic word order in Karitiana (Akirem family, Tupi stock) 138
STORTO, LUCIANA R.

HOKAN-PENUTIAN WORKSHOP

- 'How', and 'thus' in UA Cupan and Yuman: A case of areal influence 145
ELLIOTT, ERIC
- Kroeber and Harrington on Mesa Grande Diegueño (Iipay) 170
LANGDON, MARGARET
- Conjunctions and reference tracking in Yuma 183
MILLER, AMY
- The shifting status of initial glottal stop in Barbareño Chumash 199
MITHUN, MARIANNE, TSUYOSHI ONO, AND SUZANNE WASH
- Final glottalization in Barbareño Chumash and its neighbors 208
ONO, TSUYOSHI, SUZANNE WASH, AND MARIANNE MITHUN