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LEXICAL REPRESENTATION OF SALISH VERB ROOTS:
A Preliminary Examination

Nile Robert Thompson
and Douglas W. Isaacs

Little attention has been given to lexical representation in
Native American languages. In this paper we will examine some of the
types of lexical information necessary for verb roots of the domain FALL
within several of the Salish languages. Particular attention will be
paid to the area of selectional restriction. Bever and Rosenbaum (1971:
390) state:

"Lexical items are marked as to the ... classes which they
share ... these class-markings restrict the kinds of noun-
verb-noun combinations that may appear within a clause. Such
constraints are referred to as 'selectional restrictions'."

The Salish language family dominated the vast area spanning from
the coast of Washington State into western Montana, and from the central
Oregon coast to southern British Columbia. The basic word order in all
of the languages is verb initial. To the verb root are most often
affixed morphemes which convey aspect, transitivity, control and person.
The basic lexical unit is, in most cases, the bare root.1

The topic of this paper was initially stimulated by field work on
the Puget Salish language of western Washington. In speaking with two
knowledgable speakers of the Huckleshoat dialect, Bertha McJoe and Eva
Jerry, it appeared that a singular/plural distinction was playing a role
in the choice between two verb roots meaning 'fall', namely #x'it' and
#bi?:

(1) [Fox#x'it'tod tak'ay] My plate fell.
(2) [Obi?itit ?apols]2 Those apples fell.

By the close of the session, other qualities of the accompanying
noun beyond number were also found to determine the verb root. Three
roots were preliminarily categorized according to their cooccurrence with
intransitive subjects:

(3) #bi? is used when the falling object is a building,
such as a barn or house;

(4) #x'it' is found with singular objects such as a falling
plate, child, book, bobby pin or ribbon.

(5) #bi? accompanies groups of objects falling together, such as a group of plates, apples or bobby pins.

Thus it appeared that #bi? is the general root for "fall", #at the root used only when the falling object is a building and #bi? the collective plural root.\(^3\)

But the view of #bi? as a 'collective plural root' may be an oversimplification. Evidence for this statement is found in the Twana language, Puget Salish's closest relative. In Twana, like Puget Salish, there is a distinction for certain actions in verb roots. The root may be either a collective or noncollective plural.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>collective plural</th>
<th>non-collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>#c'ox</td>
<td>#bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>#aq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>#quë</td>
<td>#në</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A distinction is made in the lexicon for certain actions as to whether they involve (i) one actor, (ii) more than one actor performing individually, or (iii) more than one actor simultaneously or sequentially undergoing the action. For example,

(7) a. [?atobaddox] He died.

b. [tomatatobaddox] They died (in unrelated accidents).

c. [c'ax'saladox] They died (together).

(8) a. [pasasatadbot] She is standing.

b. [pastasatadbot] They are standing (in different places).

c. [pas'olap] They are standing (together).

In (7b) and (8b) the same root appears as in (7a) and (8a), respectively. In the former examples it has undergone reduplication to express plurality. However, in (7c) and (8c) the root differs altogether and specifically expresses the collective plural.

Parallel to the above examples (6-8) are the roots #hak and #q'iy. They both appear with the category of tall, thin and upright nouns, which includes tree and fence posts. The root #hak is used when the objects of this class fall unrelatedly as either a singular or reduplicated plural. By contrast, #q'iy is used when an object of the same
class is caused to fall by the wind, an animal (most usually a beaver) or a human (with the traditional technique of burning, or with newer equipment such as an axe or a saw). Thompson (1979) lists the following examples:

(9) [ʔaʃˈhɑ:] it [a tree, bush or post] fell.
(10) [aʔoʔaʔaʔ] it [a tree] was felled.

Additionally, #q′iwy is also used with nouns of the class BUILDING.

To express the collective plurals for the classes of BUILDING and tall, thin and upright objects, the reduplicated stem of the root #q′iwy is used. Again from Thompson (1979):

(11) [biʔ1iʔi1i5əʔaw] the [e.g. trees] are falling.

Thus, the root #q′iwy is used with two different classes of nouns. When placed in a reduplicated stem it expresses the collective plural for not only actions which would otherwise require #q′iwy but also those which would take ʔhak⁵. Therefore, at least in Θənna, the expression of the collective plural need not be limited to a verb root which is used exclusively for that purpose. Rather, it can also be expressed through the reduplication of one of the verb roots within the domain.

In attempting to formulate theselectional restrictions for Θəgət Salish #q′iwx it is obvious that some characterization of the environment is necessary. A mere listing of all the words for types of buildings for this and all like roots is too lengthy. The list would include:

(12) ʔaʔadaltxʷ burger stand
kʷ‘adilaltxʷ church
ʔalʔal house
ʔalalʔi post office
ʔaʔalʔal hut
ʔaʔadaltxʷ restaurant
ʔalaltxʷ school
waxtəd sweat shop
ʔaʔalaltxʷ tavern
silaltxʷ tent
A suffix common to many of the nouns in (12) is "altx". This suffix is termed a 'lexical suffix' in Salishan literature. Hess (1976:x) defined it as:

A suffix having relative concrete meaning, e.g., -ači? hand, lower arm, -ʔač? baby, -čup fire, firearm. Typically, the lexical and an independent word of the same or similar meaning are mutually exclusive. One may say either ?učič? ači? čad or ?učič? čad to čdalis, both I cut my hand... It is not grammatical to say ?učič? ači? čad ču čdalis.

As a suffix, a lexical suffix can substitute for a class of lexical items; here "altx" represents the class BUILDING. The following are etymologies of some of the words shown in (12):

(13) restaurant ?ači? 'eat' + altx "building'
tent sil 'cloth' + altx "building'
hospital ?ač? 'sick' + altx "building'
tavern lab 'alcohol' + altx "building'

The suffix "altx" appears as well in productive nouns and verbs with cooccurrence restrictions similar to those outlined above; for example,

(14) /q'?aq"altx"/ white building

It is interesting that the same class of nouns which can be signified by the suffix "altx" is also the same class which selects for the verb root 6d"čča. Rather than attempting to write out the semantic features of BUILDING in the selectional restrictions of all verb roots in Puget Salish where it must be specified, it may be possible to use the suffix "altx" instead. Clearly, the semantic features of BUILDING would already be fully specified in the lexicon under "altx".7

However, the use of a lexical suffix in marking verb selectional restrictions makes a claim: the nouns which select a given root will be a category of nouns which is identical to those nouns which the suffix can
replace. Furthermore, it suggests that this correspondence is no accident but rather a systematic way in which the language operates with regard to the classification of nouns. A one to one correspondence between the noun classes which appear in selectional restrictions and those which can be replaced by lexical suffixes would allow for simplification of the lexical representation in Puget Salish.

In an effort to check the preliminary descriptions of the verb roots (3-5) obtained in the field session, a search of the literature was conducted. The most comprehensive Puget Salish dictionary to date, Hess (1976), contains the following verb roots and stems, each exclusively within the domain FALL. They may be summarized as:

(15) ꭌ ꭌ hət̓əb - used for a person falling into the water from a canoe.
    e.g. ꭌ ꭌ həb̓əhəd t̓ul̓ t̓al to də̅ˈɬəɬəy
    'I fell out of my shovel-nose canoe.'

(16) ꭌ ꭌ hət̓ t̓ - used for a falling object such as food, a person the surf, a bottle or basket.
    e.g. ꭌ ꭌ hət̓ t̓ il to b̓əl̓ dəx̌əl̓ t̓a l to had
    'The meat fell into the fire.'

(17) ꭌ ꭌ həi - used for river banks washing away,
    e.g. bəl̓ bət̓ tab  'The river banks are being washed away.'

(18) ꭌ ꭌ ḡəq̓ - used for the falling of an upright object, e.g. a tree or a person.
    e.g. də̅ ḡəq̓ dx̌ə 'He fell.'
    ḡə̅ ḡəq̓ ič 'it [a tree] fell on it.'

(19) ꭌ ꭌ ḡəs̓ - used for the falling of a tree,
    e.g. ꭌ ꭌ ḡəs̓ ̓ s̓ id tiʔə? dəʔəʔ əwət̓x̌ət̓ ndəd
    'He [a beaver] falls the tree(s).'

(20) ꭌ ꭌ ḡəs̓ a - used for a person falling into the water,
    e.g. təmət̓ t̓ a  gə̅ ̓ ɬəʔ os gə̅ ̓ ɬəkʷ 'it's də̅x̌əl̓ tət̓ ul̓ kə,
    gə̅ ɬə̅ k̓ ɬ̓ i təb̓ət̓ aʔə?
'I told him not to go to the river, he might fall in.'

(21)  #dśix - used for the falling of a bridge,
    e.g. ʔósədśiix 'It [a bridge] has collapsed.'
    - also used for the falling apart of a mechanical
devise,
    e.g. ʔóqadśiix 'It [the machine] is broken.'

While the earlier analyses of #.xticks and #bli? are upheld, the
selectional restrictions of the root #dśix must be expanded to include
other classes of nouns beyond buildings, namely those which contain
'bridge' and 'machine'. The lexical suffix #adā SUPPORT includes 'bridge'
as one of its referents. It is not known if there is a lexical suffix
which contains 'machine'; it might resemble #adā-EQUIPMENT, GEAR.

Other distinctions are made in the lexicon beyond selectional
restrictions. Roots used as predicates will be characterized 'according
to the number of "arguments" that they take.' (Fellmore 1971:375) While
there may be flexibility in the number of arguments a given root may take,
the root #dśix is the only one of those listed (15-21) which must take at
least two arguments.

Individual roots can in fact be categorized according to
complexity. The most simple contain only one primitive component; for
example,

(22)  #xt'it' [FALL.IX]

At the other end of the spectrum is a root such as #xt'lab, meaning 'to
fall overboard'. The case relations are more or less fixed by presupposi-
tions: the Source (or where something moves from) must be a type of
boat, while the Goal (where it moves to) must be some type of body of
water. Neither of these is necessarily explicit in a given sentence
however.

Rather than claiming that only selectional restriction noun
categories are identical to lexical suffix replacement noun categories, a
stronger claim is that all nouns within the semantic representation of
roots are also identical to them as well. What this would indicate is
that nouns are divided into certain specific and non-alterable categories.
By 'specific', it is meant that the categories are defined within the
grammar - clearly each lexical suffix must be defined for its semantic
features. Additionally, a category cannot change its composition (i.e.,
those nouns which make up that category cannot alter) in varying environ-
ments. This possible relationship is expressed in (23):
Noun Category Restriction

Where $N_1$, $N_2$, and $N_3$ are each a set of noun categories, and $N_1$ appears within Selectional Restrictions, $N_2$ can be replaced by Lexical Suffixes, and $N_3$ appears in the Semantic Representations:

$$N_1 = N_2 = N_3$$

Earlier we noted a one-to-one correspondence between one category within $N_1$ and one within $N_4$, that of buildings. If there is an equivalence between $N_2$ and $N_3$, there should be a lexical suffix for each noun category found in examples (15-21). There are in fact lexical suffixes for most of these.

(24) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>+abo$\xi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>+q\nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canoe</td>
<td>+i$k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree</td>
<td>+uc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td>+ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collective plural</td>
<td>+bix$\nu$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>+sod (SUPPORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>+i$\nu$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottle, basket</td>
<td>+u$\nu$ (CONTAINER)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verb roots (25) through (28) are examples of ones which come under the domain FALL when they are not marked as having the action taking place under control. With control, the meaning refers most often to a body position:

(25) Root | Lack of Control | Control |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\xi$pix</td>
<td>fall off, drop</td>
<td>shake out, shake off, brush off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g. $\xi$pix'$\epsilon$ | 'It [a pine cone or leaf] fell.'

$\xi$pix'$\epsilon$ | 'Knock it off!, Shake it off!'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Lack of Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#k'wə</td>
<td>fall on back</td>
<td>lay on back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#ba'x</td>
<td>fall down</td>
<td>lay down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#taux</td>
<td>fall on front</td>
<td>lay on front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that 'fall' is associated with all of the lack of control cases but that the reference where the action is under control varies from root to root, it is most likely that the latter group contains the primary semantic reference.

In order to validate our observation for lexical restrictions in Puget Salish, we conducted field work in a distantly related Salish language - Lillooet, a language of southeastern British Columbia. Our source for all Lillooet data is Mary Lagasca, one of few remaining speakers of the Skookumchuck dialect.

Skookumchuck has at least six verb roots which can be categorized within the domain FALL. Like Puget Salish #x'it (examples 16 and 22), there is a root which contains only one semantic primitive:

(26)  #k'is [FALL]X
  
e.g. k'iś ti ʔaqaxəʔ  'The dog fell down.'

This verb root enjoys broad, general usage and is most often used with singular objects such as a falling person, animal, wig, arm, star, rock or ribbon. In unreduplicated form, #k'is can be utilized in plural constructions if the falling objects are animate.

Other verb roots meaning 'fall' in Lillooet are:

(27)  #ki̱xop - used for groups of small objects that fall simultaneously or in succession. These small objects range from rice, snow, hair and pine needles up to apples.
  
e.g. ki̱xop ʔi mäqənə  'The hairs are falling out.'

(28)  #ziht - used with an upright object such as a tree, fence post or even an upright, hand-held tape recorder;
  
e.g. ziht ti ʔurapə  'The tree fell.'

(29)  #zil?oxʷ - used for a building which falls down or falls apart;
e.g. zil?aq⁹ ti čitx⁹ 'the house fell down.'

(30) #1?i?aq - this root is selected for stacked or nailed together objects that fall, fall apart or become disjoined. These objects include furniture, household appliances, machines and fences.

e.g. 1?i?aq ti q'el?in'E 'the chair fell apart.'

(31) #plq⁹ - multiple objects which fall out of a container require this verb root. If it is a singular object, it must be animate, such as a dog or kitten; plural objects may be either animate or inanimate, solid or liquid, but in all cases capable of rapid movement, such as rice, flowers, books, water or puppies. Even gravel from a dump truck occurs with this root; however, if only one piece of gravel falls the root used will be #k*i?is.

e.g. plq⁹ ti layšxa 'the rice is falling.'

Thus it appears that #k*i?is is the general term for FALL, #k*i?isp is the collective plural used with small objects, #zitk appears with tall, upright objects, #zil?aq⁹ is used with buildings, #1?i?aq appears with objects made up of components and #plq⁹ is selected for objects which are falling from a container.

During our evaluation of Puget Salish, we posited a one-to-one correspondence between the category N₁ (noun categories used in the selectional restrictions of verb roots) and N₂ (the nominal categories of surface forms which can be replaced by lexical suffixes). The example used (6) was one in which N₁ = BUILDING and the nouns for buildings could be replaced by the lexical suffix *altx⁹. Can this same claim be made for Lillocet? Apparently it can.

In Lillocet, the root #zil?aq⁹ appears with members of the noun class BUILDING. There are, however, two lexical suffixes which replace nouns in that category:

(32) #aič⁹ - it can refer to any single building, especially one that can be lived in; it can also substitute for barn, restaurant and chicken coop.

e.g. čoq'eq⁹#aič⁹ 'a red building or house', which equals: čoq'eq⁹ čitx⁹ 'a red house';

₃#₁?if⁹ 'tent'
(33) +Amx⁻ can be used for any building, whether known to the
speaker and hearer or not; also used for the plural
"houses"

  e.g. szikAmx⁻ "a log building"
  11pešk"ihAmx⁻ "bakery"
  čeq"išq"Amx⁻ "red building", not equal to
  čeq"ćeq" čix⁻ "red house".

Apparently, the distinction between these two suffixes is such that +Amx⁻
("house") is a subset of +Amx⁻ ("building"). The noun groups which they
refer to are not mutually exclusive, nor do they differ with regard to
selectional restrictions. Thus, in equating a lexical suffix with the
category BUILDING which selects the root szilqœv, the suffix +Amx⁻ will
be used.

Correlations between the categories of nouns which figure in the
selectional restrictions of verb roots within FALL (N₁) and those which
can be represented by a lexical suffix (N₂) are shown in (34) below:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb root</th>
<th>N₁ category</th>
<th>N₂ category</th>
<th>lexical suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>szik⁻</td>
<td>TALL, UPRIGHT</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>+Amx⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szilqœv⁻</td>
<td>TALL, UPRIGHT</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>+Amx⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pešk⁻</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>+alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ičeq⁻</td>
<td>ASSEMBLED</td>
<td>MECHANICAL</td>
<td>+alux⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šavenport⁻</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>+slowit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this analysis, chart (34), there is strong evidence to support a one-
to-one correspondence between various categories in N₁ and N₂, as proposed
earlier.

However, the selectional restrictions of verb roots are not so
easily defined. When the Lillooet language is examined more closely, a
different picture emerges which argues against selectional restrictions
as we have presented them thus far. This revision is due to a greater
flexibility in the cooccurrences between verb roots and noun categories.
By using the selectional restrictions previously stated for Lillooet, the noun 'smokehouse' would require the root #zi?on within the domain FALL. But this view is too simplistic. If the smokehouse falls apart piece by piece, the root #zi?on is used instead. The root #zi?kt is used if the smokehouse is pushed over. Or, when the smokehouse falls off a cliff, the root #ki? is required.

The example above is not unique. Further examples of this phenomenon are shown below:

(35) table: selects #zi?on when it falls apart all at once,
    #zi?on if it falls apart piece by piece,
    #ki? if it falls from a height (e.g. out of a window),
    and #zi?kt if it just falls over or is forced over.

(36) mountain: selects #zi?on when it falls apart,
    and #zi?on if it is blasted.

(37) airplane: selects #ki? when it falls out of the sky,
    #zi?on if the undercarriage gives way and the plane falls onto the runway,
    and #zi?on if the pieces of the plane gradually fall off piece by piece.

(38) fence: selects #zi?on if the entire fence falls apart,
    #zi?kt if it is forced (e.g. wind-blowed),
    and #zi?on if it falls apart all at once.

(39) water: selects #ki? when raining, for example,
    and #ki? if it falls out of a bucket.

(40) tape recorder: selects #zi?kt if it falls over when set upright,
    #ki? when it falls when laid flat,
    #zi?on when its internal parts fall apart,
    and #ki? if it falls out of a bucket.
(41) apple: selects *ki’t’iš if a single apple falls,

*ki’t’iš if more than one are forced down (e.g. by shaking),

*ki’t’iš if more than one and by natural random course,

and *ki’t’iš if they fall out from a basket.

Further mention must be made of the distinctions between the verb root *ki’t’iš and the reductioated form of the root *ki’t’iš, namely *ki’t’iš. First, *ki’t’iš requires that the falling objects are small, but generally not smaller than an apple, whereas *ki’t’iš requires that the objects be the size of, or smaller than, an apple.

The second distinction involves the contrast between collective plural and non-collective plural. Again, as in Puget Salish and Twana, a distinction is made in the lexicon for certain actions as to whether they involve (42a) one actor, (42b) more than one actor performing individually (non-collective), or (42c) multiple actors, simultaneously undergoing the action (collective). Here this distinction is between inanimate objects:

(42) a. The apple fell. *ki’t’iš ti ?Aposal

b. The apples fell. *ki’t’iš ti ?Aposal

c. The apples fell. *ki’t’iš ti ?Aposal

In (42c) the apples have been forced down, either by wind or by shaking, and have thus undergone the action concurrently. The distinctions made in (42) are the same as in the Twana examples (6-8).

We still maintain that to a native speaker there is a primary usage assigned to the selection of verb roots. If a speaker is asked how a building falls, the general reply indicates that *ki’t’iš is used, as in (29). In the same way, an airplane will *ki’t’iš and a fence will *ki’t’iš. Therefore, we must posit that selectional restrictions are ordered for individual verb roots within the lexicon.

The ranking of selectional restrictions is largely dictated by pragmatic considerations. For instance, houses collapse (ZI?aq) more often then they fall over a cliff (ki’t’iš). By contrast, a car is more likely to go over a bank (ki’t’iš) than it is to collapse (ZI?aq). The following chart depicts three grades of selectional restrictions. The symbol -x- signifies primary usage, a secondary usage and (x) limited, but acceptable usage of the verb root.10
(41) A Ranking of Selectional Restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun category</th>
<th>#k'is</th>
<th>#d8ap</th>
<th>#tikr</th>
<th>#z1’taq</th>
<th>#1’e7aiko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-X-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRIGHT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-X-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-X-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSEMBLED</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-X-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the appearance of Bever and Ross (1971), theoretical linguistics has moved away from the depiction of selectional restrictions in the lexicon, preferring to leave it to pragmatics instead. The correlation throughout this paper between selectional restrictions and pragmatic considerations supports such a shift. This approach, however, argues against the categories of nouns termed herein N₁ (see chart 25).

Another trend in recent theoretical linguistics is the listing of all words in the lexicon. For unwritten languages such as those in the Salish family, where morphological manipulation is so productive, this would fail to allow for the grammaticality of many novel word utterances. The linguist should not list all possible morpheme combinations based on the possibility they might be said. However, native speakers are able to productively do such manipulation.

In Twana, a speaker can combine morphemes into descriptive terms which are novel to them. For example, Louisa Pulsifer provided the following two words to describe hand:

(44) /dɔxʷ-tas-əd-bad/ 'what you hit with'
    dɔxʷ  ...-bad instrument
    #tas 'hit'
    -ad transitive, control

(45) /dɔxʷ-xʷac-əd-bad/ 'what you lift with'
    #xʷac 'lift'

Lexical suffixes in Twana can be used in place of corresponding nouns:

(46) a. [Pɔsc’op’ ti əlaʔ] My hand is in the water.
    b. [Pɔsc’nači] (same meaning)
The stem իք"iqa can also combine with the suffix for 'nose' in the same manner:

(47) a. [պեգ"եգ'ուն' եւ բոսու] My nose is dirty.
    b. [պեգ"եգ'փու] (same meaning)

In fact, իք"iqa can combine with a number of suffixes:

(48) a. [պեգ"ինս] My hand is dirty.
    b. [պեգ"ինս] My head is dirty.
    c. [պեգ"իժ] My eye is dirty.
    d. [պեգ"ինս] My tongue is dirty.
    e. [պեգ"ինս] My elbow is dirty.

However, there are certain objects which will only be grammatical with this root when expressed through a noun phrase and not a lexical suffix:

(49) a. [պեգ"ուն' եւ սուլու] My back is dirty.
    b. [պեգ"ուն' ելա] (same meaning)

(50) a. [պեգ"ուն' եւ ճաւ] My rock is dirty.
    b. [պեգ"ուն' ելա] (same meaning)

If the lexicon is productive, rather than limited through a comprehensive listing of words and possible words like 'back' and 'rock' must differ in their relationship to the stem իք"iqa from the other nouns expressed in (47-48). That stem appears to have a primary association with nouns which refer to body parts and specifically body parts which are localized. 'Back' and 'rock' are outside of this definition. As such, they require overt mention in the sentence rather than the use of a corresponding lexical suffix.

The aspects of Maana grammar outlined above argue against a lexical listing of all words in a language. The data suggest that pragmatics is not the sole determinant of verb root selection. In Salish languages, lexical information needs to incorporate the notion of the collective/non-collective distinction and a hierarchy of noun category association.
NOTES

1 The symbol # is used to designate a root. Some roots thus identified in this paper are actually stems. Such a generalization in no way affects the discussion.

2 The lax vowels represented as [A, E, I and U] correspond, respectively, to the vowels in the English words 'hat', 'get', 'kit', and 'put'.

3 The choice to gloss these roots as 'fall', rather than giving them more complex meanings (e.g. 'collapse', 'free fall'), is based on translations and definitions of the informants.

4 Kinkade (1977) discusses this phenomenon.

5 These examples have been extracted from Hess (1976), Haegerlin and G. O. (1936) and Snyder (1965a; 1965b), and standardized in terms of orthography.

6 The symbol + indicates a lexical suffix. The Nara language has lexical prefixes as well.

7 This is a development of a proposal made in Thompson (1981).

8 We take these restrictions, as designated by the speaker (informant), to be the primary restrictions of the verb roots.

9 The following noun group categories were supplied by the Lillooet speaker.

10 The semantic representation serves to define the root as well and can lend itself to analogy. Although a word is not considered to be a container, by analogy objects such as rice which fall from cupped hands can be said to flat.
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