Resultatives and Actuals in SENĆOŦEN

Claire Kelly Turner
University of Victoria

SENĆOŦEN Resultatives are used to describe the resulting state of an event, forming on Perfective bases by reduplication or ablaut. Actuals may also be formed by reduplication, though usually a different kind; infixing rather than prefixing. There are some words in SENĆOŦEN that use the Resultative pattern of reduplication, but seem more like Actuals in meaning. Arguing that these words are Actuals, this paper presents criteria for distinguishing Actuals from Resultatives, both semantically and phonologically. First, the two are compared in terms of the verb class they can be used with and the argument type each occurs with. Next, resonant glottalisation is considered, which is a distinct property of Actuals, and is argued to be the main exponence of Actual aspect in SENĆOŦEN. It is shown that, despite the overlap in form between Resultatives and Actuals, ambiguity does not arise.

1 Introduction

SENĆOŦEN is the language of the Saanich people of the Saanich Peninsula of Vancouver Island, B.C., and its surrounding bays and islands (Elliott, 1983). It is considered a dialect of North Straits Salish. Many of the example sentences given in this paper were provided by Ivan Morris Sr., a West Saanich speaker from W̱JOŁEŁP (Tsartlip), as part of a University of Victoria field methods course in the fall of 2004 and also through elicitation in February and March 2005. Others are based on examples found in Montler (1986, 1989), transliterated, and checked with Ivan. My heartfelt thanks go to Ivan for sharing so much of his language with me, and helping me to learn.[1] Citations include the speaker's initials and the date elicited. All SENĆOŦEN in this paper is written

[1] I am grateful to the Saanich Native Heritage Society for allowing us to do fieldwork there. Thanks also to Su Urbanczyk for making me interested in this topic, and for much help throughout, and to Janet Leonard, Sonya Bird, Tom Hukari, Dave McKercher, Marianne Nicolson, and Nick Claxton, for listening to earlier versions of this research, and for help and suggestions. Of course I take responsibility for any errors or misinterpretations. This research was supported by SSHRC Grant #410-2003-1523 to Suzanne Urbanczyk.

in Dave Elliott Sr.'s SENĆOŦEN alphabet, in use in the Saanich community. See Appendix A for a key to pronunciation.

The SENĆOŦEN Resultative aspect is used to express the resulting state of an action, and is formed on a Perfective base by either ablaut or Cə-reduplication. (1b) is an example of a Resultative, formed by reduplication from the base ŦIŁEN̲ in (1a).

(1)	a.	ŦIŁEN̲	SW̲	HÁLE	
		stand-MID	2SU	GROUP	
		'Stand up everyone.'			IM28/9/04
	b.	ŦEŦIŁEN̲		SEN[2]	
		RED(RES)-stand-MID		1SGSU	
		'I'm standing up.'			IM05/16/05

Previous research on the Resultative is restricted to a few pages in Montler's (1986) description of the morphology and phonology of the language.

The SENĆOŦEN Actual aspect, which is similar to the English progressive *–ing*, is also formed on Perfective (unmarked) bases. There are three main ways to form Actuals: glottal stop infixation, stress shift, and -Cə reduplication are the main allomorphs. Regardless of which allomorph is used, most plain resonants in a base form are glottalised in the Actual. The plain resonants in SENĆOŦEN are M N Y W and N̲ and these can all be glottalised. Glottalised resonants are represented in the alphabet by a comma before or after the resonant: ,N or N,. In (2b), an example of a reduplicated Actual is given, formed from the base given in (2a).

(2)	a)	ŁIQSEN	
		snag=foot	
		'trip'	IM05/16/05
	b)	ŁIŁEQSEN,	
		snag(ACT)=foot	
		'tripping'	IM05/16/05

The Actual has been described in greater detail than the Resultative, and its phonological properties have been discussed by several authors. (Montler, 1986, 1989; Stonham, 1994; Caldecott, 1999; Kurisu, 2002; Turner, 2005).

The type of reduplication shown in (2b) is usual for Actuals. However, there are some bases in SENĆOŦEN which use the reduplicative pattern associated with Resultatives to create forms with an Actual meaning.

[2] This refers to the state of standing, not the action of standing up.

(3) a. DILEM ŦE Janet
sing DET Janet
'Janet sang (a song).' IM03/09/05

b. DEDI,LEM, ŦE Janet
RED(ACT)-sing DET Janet
'Janet's singing.' IM03/09/05

As shown in (1) to (3), there are certain phonological similarities between Actuals and Resultatives: they both use reduplication as one allomorph, though usually different types. There is also a semantic similarity: they are both Imperfectives, viewing only part of an event; either a stage internal to the event, or one after its final endpoint (Smith, 1991). They both act on Perfective bases, taking an event that is viewed as a punctual whole, and focussing on a piece of that whole.

Given these similarities between the Resultative and Actual, it is possible to suppose that forms such as (3b) above are Resultatives, just as it is possible that they are Actuals. In Sections 3 and 4, I seek to distinguish Resultatives and Actuals semantically, in terms of which predicates and which types of arguments each can occur with. Once the properties that distinguish these morphemes are recognised, it is possible to come to a conclusion regarding such anomalous forms: they are Actuals, since they bear the distinct Actual properties of applying to Activity predicates and being agent-oriented.

Then, in Section 5, I will consider the phonological form of Actuals and Resultatives, particularly focussing on the resonant glottalisation which accompanies Actual formation. It is argued that resonant glottalisation is the main exponence of the Actual. The question of why one morpheme (i.e. progressive, prefixing reduplication) can be used to express Resultatives in some cases and Actuals in others is posed. It is argued that this morpheme is only used for Actuals when it is unambiguous that the interpretation be Actual, and that resonant glottalisation, used with Actuals only, confirms an Actual interpretation of these forms.

I begin, in Section 2, with short descriptions of the function and form of Resultatives and Actuals.

2 Resultatives and Actuals in SENĆOŦEN

2.1 Resultatives

Montler (1986) describes the Resultative[3] as indicating "an emphasis on the result or outcome of the action expressed in the predicate" (p. 130). The canonical Resultative clearly expresses the resulting state of the predicate base upon which it is formed. The word *predicate* is used in this paper, rather than

[3] Montler (1986) uses the term 'resultive' rather than 'resultative'. I have decided to use 'resultative', as it is more conventional.

verb, for two reasons. First, in SENĆOŦEN, as with other Salish languages, many things can be predicative, in the verbal position, which would not be considered verbs in English, so it is clearer to speak of predicates. Second, both the verb and its object(s) are relevant when discussing Resultatives and Actuals.

When the base upon which a Resultative is formed has a schwa (E) in the verb root, ablaut (vowel change) is used to form the Resultative. The resulting vowel is either Á or O. O is usually used when there is some rounded consonant either preceding it or following it, and Á elsewhere. (4) through (7) below give examples of Perfectives ((a) forms) followed by Resultatives formed by ablaut ((b) forms).

(4) a. BEȻ TŦE MO,EḰ
float DET duck
'The duck floated to the surface.' IM03/02/05

b. SBOȻEŁ TŦE ḰŁÁ,
ST-float(RES)-DUR DET log
'The log is floating (in one place).' IM03/02/05

(5) a. U, EMET SW̲ OL,
CON sit/at.home 2SGSU LIM
'Please sit down.' (respectful welcome for a visitor)
IM03/02/05

b. O,MET SEN
sit/at.home(RES) 1SGSU
'I'm lazy; I'm sitting; I'm at home.' IM03/02/05

(6) a. K̲ES
'fell overboard, fell into water' IM05/16/05

b. SK̲ÁSEŁ
fall.overboard(RES)-DUR
'He's overboard; He's in the water.' IM05/16/05

(7) a. XEL,ET TŦEN, SNÁ
write-TR DET-2POSS name
'Write your name.' IM11/29/04

b. ȻŁ SXÁL,EŁ TŦE NE SNÁ
REAL ST-write-DUR DET 1SGPOSS name
'My name is already written down.' IM11/29/04

The Resultative often co-occurs with the Stative prefix S- and/or the Durative suffix -EŁ, which are found in (4b), (6b), and (7b). These co-occurrences are particularly frequent with Resultatives formed by ablaut. Since

the Stative prefix is also used to express the resultant state of a predicate, it is difficult to see what the separate roles of Resultative and Stative are. Some predicates can only take one, and some have to take both. This is a question not addressed further by this paper, but it is significant for a full understanding of SENĆOŦEN Resultatives.

When a Perfective base has a root vowel other than E, that is, a full vowel, its Resultative is formed by reduplication of the initial consonant, plus insertion of a schwa (E). The reduplication is progressive; the copying occurs to the left, so the reduplicant is located to the left of the base.

(1)	a.	ŦIŁEN̲	SW̲	HÁLE	
		stand-MID	2SU	GROUP	
		'Stand up everyone.'			IM28/9/04
	b.	ŦEŦIŁEN̲		SEN	
		RED(RES)-stand-MID		1SGSU	
		'I'm standing up.'			IM05/16/05
(8)	a.	ŦIMO,T			
		freeze-TR			
		"Freeze it."			IM05/16/05
	b.	SŦEŦI,MO,			
		ST-RED(RES)-freeze			
		"It's frozen."			IM05/16/05

This section has given a basic description of SENĆOŦEN Resultatives. In the next section, I will introduce the regular phonological shapes associated with Actuals.

2.2 Actuals

Montler (1986) describes the Actual aspect as "opposed to 'nonactual' and signal[ling] that the action, state, or other reference of predicate is actually occurring at an indicated time. It is often translated into English in the form of 'be...-ing' progressive aspect" (p. 111). There are three main ways to form an Actual from a Perfective base: -Cə reduplication, stress shift, and glottal stop infixation. All Actual allomorphs are accompanied by resonant glottalisation, which is shown in the SENĆOŦEN alphabet by a comma. An example of each, again preceded by a base Perfective form, is given in this section.

Reduplication is used when the verb root has the shape CVC, and the Perfective may include a prefix or a consonant-initial suffix (Montler, 1989, p. 95). Although both Resultative and Actual can be formed by reduplication, the type of reduplication is different. While Resultatives are formed by progressive, or prefixing reduplication, Actuals are normally formed by regressive, or infixing reduplication, where the initial consonant is copied, and the copy is

located to the right of the root vowel. Since stress usually falls on full vowels in SENĆOŦEN, this also amounts to a difference in where the stress lies. In reduplicated Resultatives, the second syllable is stressed, while in reduplicated Actuals, the first syllable is stressed.

(9) a. ȻƛL YÁ, ȻE DOQ ŦE Janet
REAL go INF go.home DET Janet
'Janet went home; Janet's gone home.' IM02/23/05

b. YÁ, SEN I DODEQ
go 1SGSU AUX go.home(ACT)
'I'm going home; I'm on my way home.' (already walking)
IM02/23/05

(10) a) QƛX SEN
get.hungry 1SGSU
'I got hungry.' IM05/16/05

b) QÁ,QI, SEN LE,
get.hungry(ACT) 1SGSU PST
'I was hungry.'[4] IM05/16/05

When a Perfective is of the form CCəC(C), its Actual will be formed by stress shift. The term stress shift may sound odd, given (11) to (13) below, which are monosyllabic. The process has been alternately termed metathesis. (Montler 1986, 1989; Kurisu 2000). Montler (1986), however, argues that the process is stress shift. Using (11) as an example, the root in this word is TḰ /tqʷ/ 'tighten', which is vowelless, and the suffix is argued to be ET /-ət/ in Montler (1986). When the two are combined to form a Perfective predicate, stress falls on the suffix. To form an Actual, the stress is shifted to fall on the root. (Montler, 1986, p. 122). The reason that the Actual in (12) still has a E [ə] in the suffix, but the Actual in (11) does not, is that a sequence of CR (a consonant followed by a resonant) is not allowed, and the E [ə] is needed to break up such a cluster. (Montler, 1989, p. 102). Otherwise, the suffix's E [ə] is deleted. It may be possible to alternatively analyse the suffix as underlyingly vowelless, with a E [ə] inserted to break up the CR cluster.

As with the reduplicated examples above, all resonants in these Actual forms are glottalised. APA transcriptions are given, where needed, to show stress.

[4] I am assuming here that this form is an Actual, although the progressive-like meaning may not be immediately obvious. Phonologically, the form is a regular Actual. See Section 3.2 for discussion.

(11) a. TḰET
tighten-TR
'tighten it' IM05/16/05

b. TEḰT
tighten(ACT)-TR
'tightening it' IM05/16/05

(12) a) QSEN̲
count-MID
'count' IM05/16/05

b) QESEN̲,
ḵ̓ʷə́s-əŋ'
count(ACT)-MID
'counting' IM05/16/05

The default allomorph of the Actual morpheme is a glottal stop infix, which is usually placed immediately following the stressed vowel. Glottal stop is also represented by a comma in the SENĆOŦEN alphabet.

(13) a. HÁSEN̲ SEN
sneeze-MID 1SGSU
'I just sneezed.' IM09/28/04

b. HÁ,SEN̲, SEN
hé-ʔ-s-əŋ'
sneeze(ACT)-MID 1SGSU
'I'm sneezing.' IM09/28/04

(14) a) WÁḴES
'yawn' IM05/16/05

b) WÁ,ḴES
wé-ʔ-qəs
yawn(ACT)
'yawning' IM05/16/05

This section has outlined the regular allomorphs of the Actual aspect and their phonological distribution. Next, I will present examples of forms that take Resultative reduplication but function as Actuals.

2.3 Actuals that Look Like Resultatives

Montler (1986) provides a short list of forms that seem semantically to be Actuals but are formed by progressive reduplication rather than regressive

reduplication. Recall that this is the reduplicative pattern used to form Resultatives. Examples (2) and (15) through (17) are examples of Actuals that are formed with this Resultative-like reduplication.

(2) a. DILEM ŦE Janet
sing DET Janet
'Janet sang (a song).' IM03/09/05

b. DEDI,LEM, ŦE Janet
RED(ACT)-sing DET Janet
'Janet's singing.' IM03/09/05

(15) a. YÁ, SEN XŁÁM E TŦE TÁTI,
go 1SGSU watch OBL DET canoe.race(PL)
'I'm going to watch the canoe race (all the races).'
IM03/09/05

b. XEXŁÁ,EM SEN E TŦE TÁTI,
RED(ACT)-watch 1SGSU OBL DET canoe.race(PL)
'I'm watching the canoe races.' IM03/09/05

(16) a. YÁ, E SW̱ ŚQOM
go Q 2SU swim
'Are you going for a swim?' IM03/02/05

b. ŚEŚQO,EM E SW̱
RED(ACT)-swim Q 2SU
'Are you swimming?' IM03/02/05

(17) a. ɈÁĆEN̲, ŦE Janet
yell DET Janet
'Janet yelled.' IM02/23/05

b. ɈEɈÁĆEN̲, ŦE Janet
RED(ACT)-yell DET Janet
'Janet is yelling.' IM02/23/05

In order to show that the anomalous forms given in this section do pattern like Actuals, not Resultatives, and to better understand the distinction between Actuals and Resultatives, in the next two sections I define two semantic criteria for distinguishing Resultatives and Actuals, based on the clearest examples of each. First, I will consider the interaction of these morphological aspectual forms with a predicate's lexical Aspect, Aktionsart, or Situation Type (using the term of Smith (1991)). Then I will consider how agentivity interacts with Resultatives and Actuals.

3 Aspect: The Interaction of Viewpoint and Situation Type

3.2 Viewpoint Aspect and Imperfectives

The term Aspect refers to the description of "the internal temporal constituency of a situation" (Comrie, 1976, p. 3). This is separate from tense, which describes the temporal properties of a situation in relation to the time of the utterance or in relation to some other time of reference (Comrie, 1976, p. 2). In the literature, there have been two different uses of the word Aspect, closely related, and interacting, but distinct from one another. Smith (1991) provides a detailed description of the two. One is an inherent property of a predicate, which she calls Situation Type. Each predicate, a verb with its object(s), can be classed according to certain temporal properties it has. Situation Type will be described in detail below. The other type of Aspect Smith (1991) calls Viewpoint, and it refers to how much of the situation expressed by a predicate is made visible to the listener (p. 5).

Resultative and Actual in SENĆOŦEN are both types of Viewpoint Aspect. Smith (1991) contrasts Perfective and Imperfective Aspect, arguing that other, more specific, Viewpoints can be placed in one of these two general categories. Perfective and Imperfective contrast in how much of a situation is 'viewed'. Perfectives show both endpoints of a situation, initial and final. The situation is seen as punctual; as a whole (Smith, 1991, p. 103-4). For example, the English sentence *Mary walked to school* is Perfective, because it is viewed as a whole (p. 95). We know that Mary started to walk, and finished walking to school, but we do not view any part of the walk to school itself. Imperfectives focus an internal interval of a situation, and show neither endpoint (Smith, 1991, pp. 93, 111). For example, the sentence *Mary was walking to school* focusses on the event of walking, and does not mention the start or finish of her walk. (95). In fact, it is possible that Mary never got to school. The English progressive, used in the previous example, is one kind of Imperfective, which only applies to certain Situation Types, and can be applied to any tense (Smith, 1991, p. 112).

Resultatives and Actuals are both kinds of Imperfective. Smith describes Resultatives as "marked Imperfectives", which "present states via the events that bring them about", viewing only some stage after the final point of a Situation (Smith 1991, p. 116). The Actual is an unmarked Imperfective, focussing on the internal stages of an event.

3.2 Situation Type

Viewpoint affects and is affected by the lexical classes of predicate that Smith (1991) calls Situation Types. These classes were originally proposed by Vendler (1967), who gave them the terms States, Activities, Accomplishments, and Achievements. Smith describes his original four classes, and adds a fifth, Semelfactives, to give the full list outlined here. The classes are distinguished by the values a predicate in each bears with respect to three properties: telicity, durativity, and stativity.

Stativity is used to distinguish *States* from all other Situation Types. States are static (unmoving), and all other types of predicate are dynamic (Smith, 1991, p. 28). English examples of States are *know, love,* and *be tired.*

Telicity distinguishes *Accomplishments* and *Achievements* from all other Situation Types. Accomplishments and Achievements are telic, meaning that they have a natural conclusion (Smith, 1991, p. 29). For example, an Accomplishment like *mow the lawn* has an endpoint that will be reached eventually if the event continues. Once the lawn is finished being mown, the event has reached its natural conclusion. States, *Activities*, and *Semelfactives*, on the other hand, are atelic, because they have no natural conclusion (Smith, 1991, p. 29). An activity like *run* can be stopped (and likely will be), but there is no point at which running is finished. Of course there is a natural endpoint to *run a kilometre*, but that predicate is an Accomplishment. Thus, Situation Type is a property of sentences; not just the verb is relevant for determining Situation Type (Smith, 1991, p. 7).

Durativity distinguishes Accomplishments from Achievements, and Activities from Semelfactives. Accomplishments and Activities are durative, they persist for some conceptually recognisable period of time, however short. States are also durative. Achievements and Semelfactives, on the other hand, are instantaneous. Although they may scientifically take up a measurable unit of time, they are generally conceived to be instantaneous (Smith, 1991, p. 29). Classic examples of Achievements include *reach the top* and *win the race.* Semelfactives include *sneeze, blink,* and *jump.*

3.3 The Interaction of Situation Type and Viewpoint in SENĆOŦEN

Situation Type and Viewpoint interact. For example, the English progressive [-ing] has traditionally not been able to be used with States. It is not possible to say *I am knowing the answer*, or *I am loving you.* In SENĆOŦEN too, Viewpoint and Situation Type interact. Resultatives seem to occur only with telic predicates, Accomplishments and Achievements. Kiyota (2004, 2005) uses several language internal tests to determine which Situation Types form natural classes in SENĆOŦEN, and determines that Accomplishments and Achievements do not seem to be distinguished in any way. Therefore, he argues, they form a single class in the language. Also, Matthewson (2004) argues that St'át'imcets Accomplishments are derived from unaccusative Achievement roots, a claim which is confirmed to fit for SENĆOŦEN as well by Kiyota (2005). I will refer to Accomplishments and Achievements as Telic predicates from now on. It is logical that Resultatives would only occur with Telic predicates, because they focus on a resultant state. If there is no natural conclusion, no finishing state, of a predicate, it will not have a result. Example (15) is a Telic predicate, which can take a Resultative, and example (16) is an Activity (atelic) which cannot.

(18) a. LEȾET SEN
fill-TR 1SGSU
'I'm going to fill it up; I filled it up.' IM11/29/04

b. ȻȽ SLÁȾEȽ
REAL ST-fill(RES)-DUR
'It's full; (S)he has learned everything (full of teachings).'
IM11/29/04

(19) a. YÁ, SEN U, ŚTEN̲, OL,
go 1SGSU CON walk LIM
'I'm just going to walk.' IM03/09/05

b. *ŚTÁN̲ *ŚTON̲
'a walk', 'I walked.' (walking is completed) IM05/16/05

This is the same distribution found by Burton & Davis (1996) and Bar-el (2003) for St'át'imcets and Squamish (two other Salish languages) respectively, when analysing the behaviour of a Stative prefix. There is a Stative prefix [es-] found in both languages (7es- in the Squamish orthography) that has a similar meaning to SENĆOŦEN Resultatives. Both analyses make use of Pustejovsky's (1991) idea of event structure, suggesting that the Stative prefix removes the process component of a transition event. Transitions in Pustejovsky's (1991) analysis are equivalent to the Telic predicates mentioned in this paper. They consist of a transition from a process into a state. The Squamish and St'át'imcets Stative prefixes remove the process of a Transition, leaving only a resulting state.

This appears to be the behaviour of SENĆOŦEN Resultatives too. Here again, however, the puzzle of Statives and Resultatives, not addressed in this paper, but mentioned as a precursor for other research, comes about. The SENĆOŦEN Stative prefix is probably related to the statives of these other two Salish languages, and likely can be analysed in the same way as them. However, the Resultative seems to have the same function. For now, I will consider the Resultative to be equivalent to the St'át'imcets and Squamish statives in function, as they also act only on Telic predicates.

SENĆOŦEN Actuals are not so restricted in their distribution. At first glance, they appear to be able to occur with all Situation Types. Examples are given in Kiyota (2004). For the sake of brevity, only a telic and an atelic predicate are given below in (20) and (11) respectively.

(20) a. ŚTEN̲
walk-MID
'walk' IM05/16/05

b. ŚETEN̲,
walk(ACT)-MID
'walking' IM05/16/05

(11) a. TḰET
tighten-TR
'tightening it.' IM05/16/05

b. TEḰT
tighten(ACT)-TR
'tightening it.' IM05/16/05

The class of States in SENĆOŦEN, and in some other Salish languages, is not quite the same as Smith's (1991) and other classical definitions of States. Bar-el (2003) calls similar predicates in Squamish "change-of-states" because in their base forms they have an inchoative, 'becoming' kind of meaning. The inchoative nature of SENĆOŦEN States has been noted by Kiyota (2005).

When one of these States takes the Actual, they acquire the interpretation that an English-speaking mind would normally associate with States. In their Perfective form, they have a meaning of coming into that state.

(21) a. QÁ, SEN ȻNEs QENNEW̲
hungry 1SGSU COMP-1SGPOSS-3POSS see-TR
TŦE S,IŁEN
DET NOM-eat
'I got hungry when I saw the food.' IM02/23/05

b. QÁ,QI, LE SEN I JAN̲ SEN
hungry(ACT) PST 1SGSU AUX arrive.home 1SGSU
'I was hungry when I got home.' IM05/16/05

So it may not be that States, as defined by Smith (1991) and others, are able to take the SENĆOŦEN Actual, but that those state-like predicates that take the Actual are more like Achievements. Right now, there are not many documented examples of these change-of-states in SENĆOŦEN. But it does appear that Actuals can be found on every kind of Situation Type, although they may not appear on every single predicate.

The unusual forms in section 2.3 are all based on atelic Activities (DILEM *sing,* XŁÁM *watch,* ȻÁĆEN̲ *yell,* ŚQOM *swim*), so from the perspective gained in this section, they are best classified as Actuals. In the next section the function of Actuals and Resultatives is considered further, with respect to the types of arguments they occur with, and more reason will be given to suppose these forms are Actuals.

4 Agentivity in Actuals

Another distinction between Actuals and Resultatives is that Resultatives are always unaccusatives. That is they always have a patient subject, and they can never be transitive sentences (sentences with a direct object). I am using the term patient here in a rather informal manner, to mean

the undergoer of an event. The subject of a Resultative is someone or something that has undergone a change of state. The subject of an Actual, on the other hand, is always an agent, again interpreted loosely as someone who is executing an action, whether voluntarily or involuntarily.

Saunders & Davis (1993) describe a morpheme /ʔał-/ in Bella Coola (Nuxalk) which is both a "perfective" and an "imperfective". The perfective interpretation arises when the form is an unaccusative, (c), and the imperfective with transitives and unergatives, (b).

(22) a. tap-is snac ti-numucta-tx unmarked
open-he.it Snac Prox-door-Prox
'Snac opened the door.'

b. ʔał-tap-is snac ti-numucta-tx imperfective
IMP-open-he.it Snac Prox-door-Prox
'Snac keeps opening the door.'

c. ʔał-tap-∅ ti-numucta-tx perfective
PERF-open-it Prox-door-Prox
'The door's open.'

(Saunders & Davis 1993, p. 167)

Recognising that the unaccusative/unergative distinction in Salish languages is a complex issue, no claims are made regarding these two types of sentence. Rather, the point that I wish to draw upon from the discussion of Saunders and Davis (1993) is that the perfective use is patient-oriented and the imperfective use is agent-oriented.

The 'perfective' described by Saunders & Davis (1993) could also be called a Resultative, and the 'imperfective' bears a resemblance to SENĆOŦEN Actuals, though it appears to have a narrower Imperfective meaning. Although the morphemes of Actuals and Resultatives differ morphologically (at least most of the time) in SENĆOŦEN, the distribution seen in Bella Coola is also found in SENĆOŦEN. Resultatives are patient-oriented and Actuals are agent-oriented.

Considering the possible Actuals in Section 2.3, here is a third reason to call them Actuals. They are all agent-oriented. It is the doer and not the undergoer of the action described that is used in the Actual versions of these predicates.

In Sections 3 and 4, I have considered the distinction between Resultatives and Actuals. Semantically, both intuitively and more formally, it seems that the forms in Section 2.3 are Actuals. The next section considers the partial homophony of Actuals and Resultatives that results from this conclusion.

5 The Absence of Ambiguity

I have argued that the forms in Section 2.3 are best described as Actuals, but they do take the reduplicative pattern associated with Resultatives.

This raises the issue of potential ambiguity. If the same morpheme is used for two different processes, it is possible that ambiguity will arise between an Actual form and a Resultative form. There *are* some predicates which take both Actuals and Resultatives, to yield different interpretations. In reality, however, ambiguity does not arise, because all of the Actuals that take Resultative-like reduplication are agent-oriented Activities. Resultatives cannot be used with these kinds of predicates. Any examples of predicates that do take both Actuals and Resultatives take phonologically regular allomorphs of each morpheme. An example of a predicate that takes both is given in (23). The Actual is formed by stress-shift, which is only used to form Actuals, and the Resultative uses ablaut, which is not used to form Actuals.

(23) a. TḰET
tighten-TR
'tighten it' IM05/16/05

b. TEḰT
tighten(ACT)-TR
'tightening it' IM05/16/05

c. STOḰEƚ
ST-tight(RES)-DUR
'It's tight.' IM05/16/05

Ambiguity is also avoided by the presence of resonant glottalisation, which only occurs with Actual forms. In Turner (2005) I argued that resonant glottalisation is the main allomorph used to mark the Actual in SENĆOŦEN. It was suggested that, because resonant glottalisation is not particularly salient, the other allomorphs (i.e. reduplication, stress shift, and infixation) are used to make the Actual more distinct from the Perfective. Reduplication and stress shift are only used in very narrow environments, and the glottal stop infix is used elsewhere. The idea of Turner (2005) is that the glottal stop is phonologically related to the resonant glottalisation (as suggested by Montler (1989)) and it occurs when reduplication and stress shift are not possible, so that the Actual can be distinctly, saliently identified.

The notion of perceptual salience is somewhat fuzzy and not easily measured. However there is some reason to suppose that resonant glottalisation is not a particularly salient process. Stevens and Keyser (1986) argue that laryngeal features, such as [constricted glottis] are not very salient, and are used contrastively in very few languages; they are therefore classed as 'secondary features' (p. 92-93). Among Salish languages, where such features are used contrastively (eg. there is a phonemic contrast between plain resonants and glottalised resonants), resonant glottalisation is almost never the sole identifying feature of a morpheme distinction. It is usually, as with the SENĆOŦEN Actual, found accompanying some other process (Su Urbanczyk, p.c.).

The idea outlined here with respect to Actuals is similar to the process of *enhancement* (Stevens & Keyser, 1986), which was proposed to talk about features, but has recently been used in a parallel way to describe morphological processes by Urbanczyk (2005). Urbanczyk uses the term to refer to secondary processes that make a distinction between two otherwise homophonous forms. For example, in Mainland Comox, CV- reduplication is used to express diminutive and imperfective, but syncope also occurs with the diminutive. Urbanczyk (2005, pp. 2-3) argues that this extra process, namely syncope, is used to enhance the distinction between the diminutive and the imperfective.

My suggestion regarding Actuals in SENĆOŦEN is somewhat different. Urbanczyk's idea of enhancement is used to distinguish otherwise homophonous forms, and the secondary process is a less salient process than the reduplication itself. Here, I am suggesting that glottalisation, the less salient process involved, is the main process involved, and that it is simply not salient enough to distinguish Actual from Perfective. Reduplication and stress shift are not exactly enhancement processes, like the syncope discussed in Urbanczyk (2005), as they do not distinguish between homophonous forms. But they are being argued here to serve the purpose of making the Actual and the Perfective more distinct from one another.

To turn back to the Actual forms that take Resultative reduplication, glottalisation is present in most of these forms. However, two of the examples in 2.3 do not have resonant glottalisation, although the same words in Montler's (1986) list of Actuals with prefixing reduplication do. This may be due to historical loss of glottalisation. But, both in Montler's list, and in the words as spoken by Ivan, there is a glottal stop infix added to those two Actual forms: XEXŁÁ,EM and ŚEŚQO,EM (cf. (15) and (16)). Perhaps this infix is being used in these forms to make them more distinct, not only from Perfectives, but also from Resultatives.

Now that resonant glottalisation has been discussed, there is an example that may be added to the list of Actuals that look like Resultatives. Example (24) is a change-of-state predicate, and, although (24b) was classed as a Resultative by Montler, and is indeed interpreted as a resultant state, it fits in with the pattern of (21) above (hungry) and the Squamish change-of-states outlined by Bar-el (2003a, 2003b). It also undergoes resonant glottalisation, which is made possible by the alternation between obstruent J and glide Y, another process which sometimes accompanies Actuals.

(24) a. DÁJEK TŦU,NIŁ
angry 3SGMASC
'He got angry' IM10/12/04

b. DEDÁ,YEK TŦU,NIŁ
RED(ACT) 3SGMASC
'He's (already) angry' IM10/12/04

This predicate is also unambiguous in its interpretation, for, although I am puzzling over whether to call it an Actual or a Resultative, there is only one way to translate sentence (24b), "He's angry".

This lack of ambiguity makes sense. The distinction between Resultatives and Actuals was formed based on their ability to appear with different kinds of predicates, so there are few cases where they will both be able to occur. In some languages, such as Bella Coola and Japanese, Resultatives and Actual-like Imperfectives are formed using the same morpheme, but there is still no ambiguity. The sentence is interpreted as "resultative" or "actual" based on what type of predicate the morpheme occurs with. (Saunders & Davis 1993; Ishida 2004).

This section may answer the question "Why *can* the Resultative and Actual have a similar allomorph?" But the question remains "Why *are* some Actuals formed with the Resultative type of reduplication. According to the usual pattern of Actual formation, outlined in Section 2.2, the forms taking Resultative reduplication are predicted to take the glottal stop infix allomorph of the Actual. There may be some historical reason for this anomalous behaviour. Most of these forms end in -M [-m] or -EM [-əm], which is identical to the middle suffix used in Halkomelem (Gerdts & Hukari, 2000). In SENĆOŦEN, the middle suffix is of the form -N̲ [-ŋ] or -EN̲ [-əŋ]. Perhaps these forms are borrowed from the neighbouring dialect of Halkomelem, Hul'q'umi'num'. More comparison must be done between the two languages to see if this is indeed what has happened, and what bearing it has on the issue at hand.

6 Conclusion

This paper has provided a comparative look at SENĆOŦEN Resulatives and Actuals, two Imperfective forms that are formed on Perfective bases. The phonological and semantic similarities between the two morphemes were considered, and it was argued that the semantic distinction between the two lies in which predicates each can occur with and whether they are agent-oriented or patient-oriented. Resulatives are used with Telic predicates only, and consist of a resultant state. They are patient-oriented, always bearing subjects that have undergone a change of state. Actuals are used with all Situation Types. It was argued, following Bar-el (2003a), that at least some states in SENĆOŦEN, which take the Actual, really express a change of state in their base form. Actuals have an agent subject.

Actuals and Resultatives are also distinguished phonologically by the presence or absence of resonant glottalisation. Plain resonants after the stressed vowel become glottalised in Actuals but not in Resultatives.

Some Actual forms were given that take the reduplicative pattern normally used to form Resultatives. When these forms are considered in terms of Situation Type and event structure, and in light of the fact that they have either resonant glottalisation or a glottal stop infix, it seems they are best classified as Actuals. It is as yet unclear why these predicates take an exceptional form of the Actual. It was posited that although Actuals and

Resultatives can both be formed by the same reduplicative pattern, there is no ambiguity in interpretation.

The issue of where these morphologically irregular Actuals come from is left for further study, as is a description of the function of Resultative in comparison to the Stative prefix, as the two so often co-occur and seem to play the same semantic role. Another remaining issue is the co-occurence of Resultatives and Actuals, because there are a few examples of both occurring at once on a predicate. (28b) appears to be both Resultative and Actual; it exhibits ablaut, reduplication, infixation, *and* glottalisation.

(28) a. BEȻ TŦE MOEḰ
rise.to.surface DET duck
'The duck floated to the surface.' IM03/02/05

b. I BEBÁ,ȻEN, TŦE ḰŁÁ,
AUX rise.to.surface(ACT/RES) DET log
'That log is floating/drifting away.'

This co-occurrence is an interesting and challenging topic that I wish to learn more about.

Lastly, this author has only considered a rather meagre number of Resultative constructions in SENĆOŦEN, and has very little experience with the language. Many more Resultative forms must be considered and much more time spent looking at them for a comprehensive study of this morpheme.

Appendix A Key to the SENĆOŦEN Alphabet

SENĆOŦEN	APA	SENĆOŦEN	APA
Á	e	M	m
A	ɛ	N	n
Ⱥ	ey	N̲	ŋ
B	p̓	O	ɑ
C	k	P	p
Ć	č	Q	k̓ʷ
Ȼ	kʷ	S	s
D	t̓	Ś	š
E	ə	T	t
H	h	Ŧ	θ
I	i	Ƭ	t̓θ
Í	ai	T̲	ǰ
J	č̓	U	u, əw
K	q̓	W	w
K̲	q	W̲	xʷ

ḱ	q^w	X	x̌
ḳ	$\dot{q}^w$	X̲	$\check{x}^w$
L	l	Y	y
Ł	ɬ		
'	ʔ or glottalised resonant		

Appendix B Morphological Abbreviations

ACT	Actual
AUX	Auxiliary
COMP	Complementiser
DET	Determiner
DUR	Durative
FUT	Future
GROUP	Group (addressed to all people present)
INF	Informative
LIM	Limiting
MID	Middle
NOM	Nominaliser
OBL	Oblique
PL	Plural
PST	Past
Q	Question marker
REAL	Realised
RED	Reduplication
RES	Resultative
ST	Stative
TR	Transitive
1SGSU	1st person singular subject
1SGPOSS	1st person singular possessive
2SU	2nd person subject
2POSS	2nd person possessive
3SGMASC	3rd person masculine singular independent pronoun
IMP	Imperfective
PERF	Perfective
Prox	Proximate

References

Bar-el, L. 2003. Squamish States. Handout of presentation at the GSIL Workshop, February 15-16.

Burton, S. and Davis, H. 1996. Stative aspect and possession in Salish. *Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, pp. 13-22.

Caldecott, M. 1999. A comparison of glottalized resonants in sənčaθən and St'at'imcets. M.A. Thesis, University of British Columbia.
Elliott, D. 1983. *Saltwater People.* Saanich: School District No. 63.
Gerdts, D. and Hukari, T. 2000. The Halkomelem middle: A complex network of constructions. ms.
Ishida, M. (2004). Effects of recasts on the acquisition of the aspectual form *-te i-(ru)* by learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Language Learning, 54* (2), 311-394.
Kiyota, M. 2004. Aspectual classification of verbs in Sənčáθən. In *Papers for the 39th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*. UBCWPL. pp. 253-267.
Kiyota, M. 2005. Aspectual classification and properties of verbs in Sənčáθən. University of British Columbia. ms.
Kurisu, K. 2002. The phonology of morpheme realization. PhD Dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz.
Matthewson, L. 2004. On the absence of telic accomplishments in St'át'imcets. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Languages of the Americas*. UBCWPL.
Montler, T. 1986. *An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish.* University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics.
Montler, T.R. 1989. Infixation, reduplication and metathesis in the Saanich Actual aspect. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 9, 92-107.
Pustejovsky, J. 1991. The Syntax of Event Structure. *Cognition* 41, 47-81.
Saunders, R., and P. Davis. 1993. Natural aspect in Bella Coola. In Mattina, A., and Montler, T. (Eds.), *American Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson.* University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 10. pp. 265-278.
Smith, C. 1991. *The parameter of aspect.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Stevens, K. and Keyser, S.J. Primary features and their enhancements in consonants. *Language* 65: 81-106.
Stonham, J. 1994. *Combinatorial morphology.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Turner, C. 2005. Resonant glottalisation and perceptual salience in the SENĆOŦEN Actual aspect. University of Victoria. ms.
Urbanczyk, S. 2005. Enhancing contrast in reduplication. In Hurch, B. (Ed.), *Studies in Reduplication.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Claire K. Turner
ckturner@uvic.ca