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0. Introduction

A comparison of two Coast Salish languages, Halkomelem (Cowichan) and Puget Sound Salish or Lushootseed (Skagit), shows virtual formal identity of relative clause constructions, where the clause type corresponds to the understood relationship between the relative clause and the adjunct head to which it is attributive. ¹

A relative clause may be marked with a so-called nominalizing prefix or not, depending on the syntactic role the adjunct head is understood to play within the relative clause. Further, depending on this role, either the ə- nominalizer or the instrumental prefix may appear.² The distributional identity of these elements in two Coast Salish languages seems highly significant, suggesting a genetic basis for these constructions which bears investigation in related languages.

We are labeling as relative clauses clausal constituents which (normally) follow an adjunct head in Cowichan or Skagit.³ The internal form of relative clauses varies, as noted above, depending on the understood relationship between the adjunct head and the clause. By "understood relationship" we mean the syntactic role the head plays in a corresponding independent
clause. In English, for example, this relationship may be overtly marked by an inflected relative pronoun.

Charles shot the lad whom Myrtle loved.

Myrtle loved the lad.

Skagit and Cowichan lack such relative pronouns, yet the appropriate understood relationship between the adjunct head and the relative clause is by and large determinable due to other grammatical devices.

1. Direct (Nonoblique) Relations

1.0 Introduction

The syntactic relationship of an adjunct to a predicate may be classified as either direct or oblique. A direct adjunct is not preceded by a prepositional element, such as the catch-all preposition ?e, while an oblique adjunct is.


DIRECT OBLIQUE

Skagit: The man gave me some money.

?u-?abyit-s ti stubš ?e k*i tía.e
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

1 completive 5 man
2 give 6 oblique
3 me 7 article
4 article 8 money


DIRECT OBLIQUE

Cowichan: The man gave me some money.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
1 nonproximal  6 man  
2 give  7 oblique  
3 me  8 article  
4 3rd agent  9 money  
5 article

Direct adjuncts correspond functionally to person markers which we call subject clitics and goal suffixes.

SUBJECT CLITICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SKAGIT</th>
<th>COWICHAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>čed</td>
<td>čed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>čexʷ</td>
<td>čeləp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL SUFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SKAGIT</th>
<th>COWICHAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-ubuł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>-sid</td>
<td>-ubułəd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is, although the person markers are distributionally distinct from adjuncts, either an adjunct or a person marker may mark a given relationship (such as agent or patient).

For reference here, we term those direct adjuncts which are interpreted analogously to goal suffixes as goal adjuncts and those which correspond to subject clitics as subject adjuncts.

The syntactic status of direct adjuncts is an open question. It is not obvious, for example, that the traditional subject-object distinction yields significant generalizations about the syntax of these languages.
When an adjunct head is interpreted as standing in a direct adjunct relationship to the relative clause which modifies it, no nominalizer is present. We discuss examples for Skagit and Cowichan below.

1.1 Subject Adjunct

1.1.1 Skagit

When the adjunct head is interpreted as subject adjunct of the relative clause, a Skagit relative clause contains no marker indicating subordination. And, in fact, it could stand as an independent sentence.


Do you know the woman who gave my father the salmon?


1 static aspect 2 know 3 you 4 question 5 article 6 woman 7 completive aspect 8 give (food) 9 article 10 my 11 father 12 oblique 13 article 14 salmon

1.1.2 Cowichan

When the adjunct head is interpreted as subject adjunct of the relative clause, a Cowichan relative clause is marked by the absence of a third person agent suffix, -əs, if the clausal predicate is transitive.


men ko kʷə səcəʔtən.

Do you know the woman who gave my father the salmon?
| 1  | nonproximal          | 9  | give (food)           |
| 2  | question             | 10 | article               |
| 3  | you                  | 11 | my                    |
| 4  | conditional          | 12 | father                |
| 5  | know                 | 13 | oblique               |
| 6  | article              | 14 | article               |
| 7  | woman                | 15 | salmon                |
| 8  | nonproximal          |    |                       |

The corresponding independent sentence form has the third person agent suffix \(-es\).

4s. ni? ?exʷeʔ tos kʷθə no men ?ə kʷθə sceeʔən

\((He, she, it) gave my father the salmon.\)

If, however, the relative clause predicate is intransitive, then the relative clause is homophonous with an independent sentence, since independent clause intransitive constructions do not take the agent suffix.

1.1.3 Summary

In neither language is there an overt relative clause marker when the adjunct head is interpreted as standing in a subject adjunct relationship to the relative clause. Cowichan, however, differs from Skagit in that the absence of an agent suffix when the relative clause predicate is transitive is significant, since Cowichan, unlike Skagit, marks third person agents of independent clause transitive constructions with the \(-es\) agent suffix.
1.2 Goal Adjunct

1.2.1 Skagit

When the adjunct head is interpreted as goal adjunct of the relative clause, a Skagit relative clause again contains no marker indicating subordination.

5. tuhuydxʷ čəx ti sqigʷoc tuqʷuxʷed čod.

We ate the deer which I butchered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tuhuydxʷ</th>
<th>čəx</th>
<th>ti</th>
<th>sqigʷoc</th>
<th>tuqʷuxʷed</th>
<th>čod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 remote</td>
<td>5 deer</td>
<td>6 remote</td>
<td>7 butcher</td>
<td>8 I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seems to be a potential for ambiguity between subject or goal interpretation when the relative clause contains no adjuncts or person markers. It is not obvious, for example, why the following sentence is not ambiguous (other than the bizarreness of one interpretation).

6. tušiltubul̓ ʔə ti sqigʷoc tuqʷuxʷed.

(He) gave us the deer which he butchered.

not: (He) gave us the deer which butched him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tušiltubul̓ ʔə</th>
<th>ti</th>
<th>sqigʷoc</th>
<th>tuqʷuxʷed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 remote</td>
<td>5 article</td>
<td>6 deer</td>
<td>7 remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A subject interpretation is apparently possible, as in the following example.

7. ?utigʷitəb ʔə ʔə tad syaʔya ti stub ʔu txumlah̓ ʔə to sʔuladəxʷ.

Did your brother thank the man who gave him the salmon?
That is, in (6) the adjunct head `sqigwec` is interpreted as the goal adjunct while in (7) the adjunct head `stubx` is interpreted as the subject adjunct of the relative clause.

1.2.2 Cowichan

When the adjunct head is interpreted as goal adjunct of the relative clause, a Cowichan relative clause exhibits subordinate clause morphology, marking the subject with the subordinate clause suffix forms of the subject clitics.

### SUBORDINATE SUBJECT MARKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>-(e)n?</td>
<td>-et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>-ox</td>
<td>-olop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. niʔ ct ʔeyʔ t kʷʔe smeyeʔ niʔexʷ kʷiʔat.

*We ate the deer which you butchered.*

niʔ ct ʔeyʔ t kʷʔe smeyeʔ niʔ-oxʷ kʷiʔat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nonproximal</th>
<th>proximal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>deer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subject and goal type relative clauses in Cowichan may be treated under one analysis, if we assume that the subject marker of the relative clause is transformationally deleted whenever it is coreferential with the head. In both types, then, we would claim that the clause is marked as subordinate, by the presence of subordinate subject markers when the head is interpreted as the goal, and by the absence of such markers when the head is interpreted as the subject of the relative clause.

1.3 Summary

When an adjunct head is interpreted as standing in a direct relationship to a relative clause which modifies it, Skagit and Cowichan are syntactically parallel in that the relative clause has no nominalizer. They differ, however, in that Cowichan uses subordinate clause subject affixes (when the head is interpreted as the goal of the relative clause) while Skagit does not. Further, when the adjunct head is interpreted as the relative clause subject, the lack of an -os agent suffix is significant in Cowichan (as independent clause transitive constructions require one) but not in Skagit.

It is compatible with the Cowichan data to analyze un-nominalized relative clauses as subordinate, in the sense of requiring subordinate clause subject markers, with a rule deleting the subject marker if it is coreferential with the adjunct head. A deletion analysis is suggested by the conspicuous absence of the agent marker under the appropriate conditions. This could be extended to cases where the adjunct head is
coreferential with an understood relative clause goal, although third person goals are unmarked in the person system. While the deletion of person markers is compatible with the Skagit data, we have no supporting evidence, since both third person agent and goal are unmarked in the person systems.

2.0 The s Nominalizer In Relative Clause Constructions

The s nominalizing prefix in a relative clause marks the oblique object relationship between an adjunct head and a relative clause which modifies it. Many predicates permit an adjunct in addition to those corresponding to slots in the person systems (subject or goal). Such adjuncts, which are introduced by the preposition ?a, are called here oblique objects. The transitive predicate ?abyit 'give' in Skagit, for example, permits an oblique object.

9. ?u?abyic ti dbad ?a ti sduuk'.

My father gave me a knife.

?u?-?abyit-s ti d-bad ?a ti sduuk' 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1 completeive 6 father
2 give 7 oblique
3 me 8 article
4 article 9 knife
5 my

2.1 Skagit

The following example illustrates the use of the s nominalizer in signalling an oblique relation between an adjunct head and the relative clause which modifies it.

We dried the salmon which you gave us.

tu-šabäd čət ti s?uladxʷ tu-ʔad-s-iilt-ubul

1 remote 6 remote
2 dry 7 your (sg.)
3 we 8 s-nominalizer
4 article 9 give (food)
5 salmon 10 us

This may be compared to the following independent clause, where
iilt, like ?abyit, permits an oblique object.


The man gave us the salmon.

ṭu-ʔiilt-ubul ti stubš ?ə ti s?uladxʷ

1 completive 5 man
2 give (food) 6 oblique
3 us 7 article
4 article 8 salmon

The use of ḥad- "your" rather than čəxʷ "you" in the relative clause of (10) illustrates the switch from subject clitics to possessive affixes when a nominalizer is present. That is, the subject relationship of unnominalized clauses corresponds to the possessives of nominalized clauses.

SKAGIT POSSESSIVE AFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>ḥ-</td>
<td>čəx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>ḥad-</td>
<td>ḥad-lop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Cowichan

The situation in Cowichan is parallel, where the oblique object relation is signalled in relative clauses by the s-nominalizer.


We dried the salmon which you gave us.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nonproximal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>your (sg.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>dry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may be compared to the following independent clause, where ?exʷeʔt permits an oblique object.


Our friend gave us the salmon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nonproximal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>give (food)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>oblique</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Skagit, the possessive forms are used instead of subject clitics when a clause is nominalized, so in the relative clause of sentence (12) the subject is signalled by the possessive prefix ?enʔ- "your" rather than the second person singular clitic ċexʷ.
COWICHAN POSSESSIVE AFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>-ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>?on?-lolop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Instrumental Prefix In Relative Clause Constructions

The instrumental prefix is used in Skagit and in Cowichan when the adjunct head is interpreted as playing the role of instrument, locative or translocative within the relative clause that modifies it.

3.1 Instrumental

3.1.1 Skagit

When an adjunct head is interpreted as standing in the role of instrument in a relative clause which modifies it, the instrumental prefix dɔxʷ-...sa is used. As with the s-nominalizer, the clausal subject role is then expressed by a possessive.


*Did you see the rock that hit me?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That this is instrumental, not subject, is illustrated by the corresponding independent clause.
15. ?u-?us čəd ḋə ti čəa.

I was hit with-by a rock.

?u-?us čəd ḋə ti čəa
I 2 3 4 5 6
1 completive 4 oblique
2 hit 5 article
3 I 6 rock

3.1.2 Cowichan

Similarly in Cowichan the instrumental prefix š(x⁶)-
appears when the adjunct head is interpreted in the role of
instrument within the relative clause that modifies it.

I burned the stick you clubbed me with.

ni? con yoqʷt kʷəə sčəst ḋə ?ən?šqʷaqʷəəm?š
I 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1 nonproximal 6 proximal
2 I 7 your
3 burn 8 instrumental
4 article 9 club
5 stick 10 me

3.2 Place

When the adjunct head is interpreted as a locative or
translocative within the relative clause which modifies it,
the instrumental prefix is also used.

3.2.1 Skagit

17. ?abyic ḋə ti yiqʷus dəxʷəsdəkʷ ḋə ti sčiʔyu.

Give me the basket which the strawberries are in.

?abyit-s ḋə ti yiqʷus dəxʷ-əs-dekʷ ḋə ti sčiʔyu
I 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
1 give 7 static
2 me 8 be-in
3 oblique 9 oblique (possessive here)
4 article 10 article
5 basket 11 strawberry
6 instrumental
This may be compared to a corresponding independent sentence, where the locative relation is expressed by the preposition-predicate \( \text{al} \).

18. \( ?\text{es-dek}' \ u \ ti \ \text{s\ddot{c}i\?'yu} \ \text{al} \ ti \ \text{yi\ddot{i}q}'\text{us}. \)

Are the strawberries in the basket?

\( ?\text{es-dek}' \ u \ ti \ \text{s\ddot{c}i\?'yu} \ \text{al} \ ti \ \text{yi\ddot{i}q}'\text{us} \)

1 static 5 strawberry
2 be-in 6 locative preposition
3 question 7 article
4 article 8 basket

The instrumental is also used when the relation between the adjunct head and the relative clause is translocative.

19. \( \text{\dagger} \text{ad ti yi\ddot{i}q}'\text{us} \ ?\text{adex}'\text{dog}'\text{a\dagger} \ ti \ \text{s\ddot{c}i\?'yu}. \)

Where is the basket you put the strawberries in?

\( \text{\dagger} \text{ad ti yi\ddot{i}q}'\text{us} \ ?\text{adex}'\text{dog}'\text{a\dagger} \ ti \ \text{s\ddot{c}i\?'yu} \)

1 be-where 5 instrumental
2 article 6 put-in
3 basket 7 article
4 your 8 strawberry

This may be compared to the following independent clause, where the translocative is indicated by the preposition \( \text{dx}'\text{?al} \ "\text{to, toward}". \)

20. \( \text{\dagger} \text{dog}'\text{a\dagger} \ ti \ \text{lebetulqid} \ \text{dx}'\text{?al} \ ti \ \text{\dagger}\text{u\dagger}\text{qs}. \)

Put the wool in the box.

\( \text{\dagger} \text{dog}'\text{a\dagger} \ ti \ \text{lebetulqid} \ \text{dx}'\text{?al} \ ti \ \text{\dagger}\text{u\dagger}\text{qs} \)

1 put-in 4 to
2 article 5 article
3 wool 6 box
3.2.2

The Cowichan forms are parallel to the Skagit. The instrumental prefix is used when the adjunct head is interpreted as standing in a locative relationship to the relative clause which modifies it.


Come give me the box the wool is in.

(nos)m?i ?amost-Sam? s? o ze x?om ni? s-s-hon?iwiw? s k"Oe sey?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

1 come 7 nonproximal
2 give 8 instrumental
3 me 9 static
4 oblique 10 be-in (resultative of new? "in")
5 article 11 third possessive
6 box 12 article
13 wool

This compares to the following independent sentence, where the locative is introduced by the oblique preposition ?ə.


Is the wool in the box?

ni? o s-hon?iwiw? k"Oe sey? o k"Oe x?om

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1 nonproximal 6 wool
2 question 7 oblique
3 static 8 article
4 be-in 9 box
5 wool

Similarly, when the relationship between an adjunct head and a relative clause is translocative, the instrumental is used.


Where is the box you put the wool in?
This may be compared with the following independent sentence.

24. newʔeʔ ze sey? 긍 e ze ḥ̤em.

Put the wool in the box.

newʔeʔ ze sey? 긍 e ze ḥ̤em

In both Cowichan and Skagit the instrumental prefix is used when the adjunct head is interpreted as standing in one of three relationships to a relative clause which modifies it: instrumental, locative or translocative. That these languages should show this formal parallel can hardly be attributed to mere coincidence. There is no reason a priori to expect instrumentals and locatives to follow the same pattern. One would expect, in fact, instrumentals to pattern like oblique objects, since they are formally identical in independent clauses, both oblique adjuncts and instrumentals being preceded by the preposition 긍 e.

4. An Explanation

Only the direct grammatical relations of subject and goal are expressible without nominalizers in the relative clause.
This is a fact that requires an explanation, and any natural explanation should somehow link this with the fact that only direct relations are expressible within the person system.

One hypothesis, which we tentatively suggest here, is that only subject and goal relations are relativizeable. Our claim is that relativization in these languages involves coreferentiality between an adjunct head and an element of the person system (subject or goal). This state of affairs is not particularly surprising since these languages exhibit no relative pronouns, so oblique relations would not be recoverable if relativization were a simple deletion rule, where any relative clause adjunct could be transformationally deleted by identity with the adjunct head.

Running counter to this claim is the fact that various oblique relations are expressible in relative clause constructions by means of nominalizing prefixes. We suggest that these prefixes are immediate constituents at the lexical, not the clausal, level and that syntactically the understood relationship between an adjunct head and a relative clause is that of subject. Consider the following construction involving the predicate q̂ada "steal" in Skagit.

25. ?uq̂ada ti stub̃ a ci'il̂ sl̂ad̂ oy?

\textit{The man stole the woman.}

?u-q̂ada ti stub̃ a ci'il̂ sl̂ad̂ oy?

\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
1 completeive & 5 oblique \\
2 steal & 6 article \\
3 article & 7 woman \\
4 man & \\
\end{tabular}
This predicate may also be nominalized as səgəda and this may, in turn, function predicatively.

26. tusqada ci sələdəy?.

The woman was stolen.

\[ \text{tu-s-qada ci sələdəy?} \]

1 remote 4 article
2 s-nom. 5 woman
3 steal

Note that in this case the subject is the patient, while in (25) the subject was the agent and the patient was an oblique object.

Given these two constructions, it seems plausible to say that in both of the following sentences the adjunct head is interpreted as the subject of the relative clause which modifies it.

27. ?uʔeʔdəxʷ čod ti stubš tu-qada ?ə ci sələdəy?.

I found the man who stole the woman.

\[ ?uʔeʔdəxʷ čod ti stubš tu-qada ?ə ci sələdəy? \]

1 completive 6 remote
2 find 7 steal
3 I 8 oblique
4 article 9 article
5 man 10 woman


I found the woman whom the man stole.

\[ ?uʔeʔdəxʷ čod ci sələdəy? tu-s-qada ?ə ti stubš \]

1 completive 7 s-nom.
2 find 8 steal
3 I 9 oblique (possessive here)
4 article 10 article
5 woman 11 man
6 remote
The relative clause of (27) is interpreted in the sense of (25), with stubš as its understood subject, while the relative clause of (28) is interpreted in the sense of (26), with sliadéy? as its subject. In (28), we view the predicate as complex, including the possessive phrase ?e ti stubš "of the man".

We hesitate to diagram these relations, as we are currently reviewing the syntactic base for Skagit, but the following trees accord roughly with the base proposal given by me at the 1974 Salish Conference.

```
... ci sliadéy? tusqada ?e ti stubš
```
We suggest that this analysis can be generalized to cover other cases where a nominalizing prefix occurs in relative clauses, so that such relative clauses consist of a nominal phrase occurring predicatively within the relative clause and the adjunct head (the N node circled in the diagrams above) is coreferential with the understood subject of the relative clause (the circled clitic in the diagrams above).
Footnotes:

1 Lushootseed examples were elicited from Louise George, a speaker of the Skagit dialect living in Everson, Washington. Halkomelem (Cowichan) examples were elicited from Ellen White of Nanaimo (originally from the Kuper Island area) and from Ruby Peter of Cowichan proper. Strictly speaking, our discussion is confined to the dialects examined.

2 The reader may substitute the phrase "ubiquitous s" for "s- nominalizer" throughout this work if the latter phrase seems too heavily laden with linguistic implications.

3 Since a one-word predicate may function as a clause in these languages, a minimal relative clause may be a predicate which is attributive to a preceding adjunct head.

   Limiting the discussion to cases involving an adjunct head is somewhat artificial. To the best of my knowledge, given a construction of the following form:

   article - head - Relative Clause

   one can predict that the following is also grammatical:

   article - Relative Clause.

4 See Hilbert and Hess (1975) for a discussion of the preposition ?o in Lushootseed.
I take the first and second singular goal suffixes to be -Sam?§ and -Samo, where § represents an element which combines with transitive -t to produce /@/.

Cognate forms exist in Lushootseed, however they do not occur in this particular construction.

The static s- prefix of §(s)en?iw?§ elides in normal speech, although I detect it in deliberate speech.

My position, that the s- and instrumental prefixes are in construction with the relative clause predicate at the lexical level is empirically strong and can be verified, although I have not yet had the opportunity to do so. If these prefixes shift to adverbs or other elements modifying the lexical predicate, this would constitute a counterexample. A weaker hypothesis is that these prefixes are in construction with the predicate phrase.