Interior Salishan (Di)transitive Systems

Jeffrey Shapard
University of Montana

0. Introduction. The purpose of this paper[1] is to raise questions about Interior Salishan (di)transitive systems, rather than to present any new theories. The descriptions of these systems, although very detailed for certain aspects, are generally incomplete for comparative purposes. There is a need for an overview so that the individual (di)transitive systems can be seen in relation to the other Interior Salishan systems. In this paper, I will present a brief summary of all the descriptions to

which I had access.[2]

A basic paradigm of Interior Salishan (di)transitive suffixes is as follows:

    trans.   -nt-
      "   -st-

    ditrans. -łt-
      "   -x(í)t-

Although there is some variation, at least three of them appear centrally in all the descriptions. (Traces of) two others, -xix- and -tułt-, can, likewise, be found in all the descriptions.

In order to have a complete overview of the system, certain questions about these suffixes need to be answered. What is their distribution? What are their distinctions and similarities? When and with which roots can each occur? What is their connection with the aspectual categories of the language? What privileges of co-occurrence do they share with other prefixes and suffixes?

The next sections summarize the descriptions of the Interior Salishan (di)transitive systems.[3]

1. Shuswap (Sh). Kuipers (1970) classifies Shuswap transitive verbs by the transitivizing suffix they normally take.[4] Class A verbs take -t-; Class B verbs take -n(t)-; and Class C verbs take -st-. He also calls three other transitivizers "complex" and classifies the resulting classes as Class D: -x(í)t-; Class E: -m(í)n(t)-; and Class F: -nwéň(t)-.

1.1. Sh Simple Transitives. Of the transitivizers, Kuipers refers to two as "mere transitivizers" (-t- and -n(t)-). Only

three verbs form Class A, and of these, one is base-stressed (I)
and two are suffix-stressed (II). Class A, therefore, is a
"relict type".

AI   wik   'see'   (-3 wíwk-t-n, 2-3 wík-t-x)

AII kəx   'give to' (-3 kəx-tét-n, 2-3 kəx-t-éx)

AII mt   'feed'   (-3 mtét-n,   2-3 mt-éx)[5]

Class B verbs (verbs that take -n(t)-) are "by far the most com-
mon type of transitive verb."

   The suffix that marks Class C is -st-. Class C verbs can
occur in either a 'causative' or a 'customary' form, the latter
always occurring in combination with the prefix c-/s-[6]. Kuipers
states that 'causative' -st- verbs are "mostly correlative" with
intransitive verbs, meaning presumably, that (most) any intran-
sitive verb can be transitivized by the addition of -st-, as in
the following examples:

1a. wi?   'be ready'

1b. wí?-st-   CI 'finish, tr.'

2a. nux̣ʷ   'to gallop'

2b. núx̣ʷ-st-   CI 'cause to gallop'

3a. q?em   'take the breast'

3b. qm-st-[7]   CII 'nurse (a child)'

4a. qíl-ql-t   'nice'

4b. qə-ql-st-   CII 'enjoy'

   Even though Kuipers classifies the Shuswap transitive verbs
into classes according to the suffixes they take, he also lists
several examples of verbs that occur not only as Class A or B

forms, but also as Class C forms with the 'customary' suffix -st-,

5a.   mtét-n   AII 'feed'

5b.   c-met-st-   CII   "

6a.   k̓ʷúl   BI   'make'

6b.   c-k̓ʷúl-st-   CI   "

7a.   q̓y-n̓t-   BII 'write'

7b.   c-q̓y-st-   CII   "

and he adds that he cannot assert with certainty whether or not
all transitive verbs allow 'customary' forms.

   To summarize, there are three basic transitivizers: -t-,
-n(t)-, and -st-. It seems that Class A (-t-) is a morphologi-
cally conditioned subclass of Class B (-n(t)-). Only three verbs
accept -t-, while most verbs accept -n(t)-. Other verbs accept
-st-. We do not know if all verbs can take either -n(t)- or -st-,
or if instead there are three classes of verbs, i.e.

      (1.) those that can take only -n(t)-

      (2.) "   "   "   "   "   -st-

      (3.) "   "   "   "   "   either -n(t)- or -st-

   1.2. Sh Complex Transitives. Of the three "complex tran-
sitivizers", -x(í)t- refers to "a human secondary object, usually
benefactive," and "in a minority of cases, to another object-type
('refuse somebody [something] ', etc.)." Kuipers' examples show
that in these 'benefactive' forms, -x(í)t- replaces either of the
simple transitivizers -n(t)- and -st-.

8a. xʷíc̓   BI 'show'

8b. x^wíc̓-xt-   DI 'show (something) to'

9a.   tn-t-   BII 'put, place'

9b.   tn-xít-   DII 'put down for'

10a. wíʔ-st-   CI 'finish'

10b. wíʔ-xt-   DI 'finish (something) for'

-m(í)n(t)- and -nwén(t)- are the other two "complex transi-
tivizers". -m(í)n(t)- refers to an object which is affected "in-
directly, superficially, or malefactively by the action" expres-
sed in the verb, and -nwén(t)- means "approximately 'manage to',
'be able to', or 'act involuntarily'."

2. <u>Thompson (Th)</u>. Laurence Thompson (1973,1979,1980) iden-
tifies -t- 'transitive' as the basic Thompson transitivizer. -t-
follows the stems[8], with or without one of several possible inter-
vening elements: -n- 'control'; -s- 'causative'; -xi- 'indirec-
tive'; -min- 'relational'; and -nwén² 'emphatic limited control'[9].

2.1. <u>Th Simple Transitives</u>. Most strong (root-stressed)
roots in Thompson form transitive stems with the suffixation of
-n-t-[10]. Diconsonantal weak roots normally seem to take only -t-
'transitive', but many of them have alternate forms with -n-t-[11],
and -n-t- is obligatory if reflexive or reciprocal endings follow:

11a. //x̣əc(-n-)-t-ep//---- x̣əc(-e)-t-ép

                             'you people bet with him'

11b. //x̣əc-n-t-wáxʷ//----- x̣əc-e-t-waxʷ

                             'they bet with each other'

Some strong roots always take -t- (and not -n-t-) - Thompson

identifies these roots as "control roots"[12] in which the -n- 'con-
trol' element is not needed since the root already contains the
notion of 'control'.

12a. //nés-t-ey-ep//------ nés-t-i-p

                             'you people took us, got us there'

12b. //wík-t-exʷ//-------- wík-t-xʷ 'you saw him'

                             (compare Sh. AI -- wík-t-x)

13a. n̓-t-és   'she gave him (something)'

13b. ʔúpi-t-p   'you people ate it'

-(n)t- is very productive. Thompson says that all stems ex-
panded by lexical suffixes take -(n)t- inflection and that it
seems recent borrowings are also handled this way.

-s-t- is what Thompson calls the 'causative' inflection, a
suffix that seems to introduce a "specialized notion of limited
control"[13] corresponding to simple transitive forms in -t- that
would be 'control'.

14a. pəkʷ-t-és   'she dumped or poured them out

                             (e.g., berries out of her basket)'

14b. pəkʷ-s-t-és   'she spilled them' or 'she managed

                             to get them dumped out'

The difference between -(n)t- and -s-t- is that -(n)t- im-
plies control by the subject, and -s-t- implies that the action
or state results from the activity of some agent who is not in
full control. The question of the distribution of -t-, -n-t-, and
-s-t- remains the same as in Shuswap:

(1) some roots take either -t- or -n-t-

(2) " " " only -t- or -n-t-

(3) " " " either -s-t- or -(n)t-

(4) " " " only -s-t- or -(n)t-

2.2. Th Complex Transitives. Three other productive formations "generally parallel simple transitives." The first is -xi-t- 'indirective' that "shifts the focus of the major object, usually from a thing to a person."[14] -xi-t- is "clearly a control affix."

The second complex form is -min-t- 'relational'. These formations "seem regularly to introduce an object as a reference point or suggest some special relationship," but -min-t- 'relational' does not change the control status of its stem.

15a. č̓ʔóz   'it got dark (non-control)'

15b. č̓ʔoz-mín-t-i-s   'it got dark on us'

16a. núx̣ʷ   'progress on four or more legs (control?)'

16b. //núx̣ʷ-n-t-es//------ núx̣ʷes 'he crawls over it'

                            (e.g., insect on a stone)

16c. //núx̣ʷ-min-t-sem-es// núx̣ʷmcəms 'he runs up to me'

                            (e.g., dog)

The third of the complex transitivizers, -nwén̓-t-, is 'emphatic limited control'. These formations are "extremely productive" and correspond to the intransitive stem -nweɬn, which added to simple or inchoative stems forms "non-control middles."

17a. x̣ək-p-nwéɬn   'he has managed to learn, he has accidentally found out"

17b. x̣ək-p-nwén̓-t-p   'you people found out about it, managed to learn"

17c. x̣ək-t-és   'he marked, indicated it'

-nwén̓-t- is a strong suffix, and captures the primary stress from any stem to which it is added. Sometimes the stem retains a secondary stress, but main word stress is on the suffix.

18. //wík-nwén̓-t-ep//   'you people manage to see him'

     wiknwén̓tp   "   "

     wìknwén̓tp   "   "

3. Colville (Cv) / Okanagan (Ok). I will be discussing work done on (di)transitivity in two of the Colville-Okanagan dialects. I'll deal first with Yvonne Hébert's (1979) paper on Nicola Lake Okanagan (spoken in British Columbia), and then I'll move to the southernmost dialect and talk about Mattina's (1973, 1978) work on Colville.

3.1. Ok Simple Transitives. The focus of Hébert's (1979) paper is not so much on the Okanagan transitive system itself as it is on "the consonantal opposition between -s- and -n-[15], usually occurring before the ubiquitous -t[16]" (i.e., -nt- vs. -st-). She says this opposition is possible "on most but not all predicates in Okanagan." Not all verbal roots may take either of the two suffixes, but some roots can take only one and would be ungrammatical with the other. For example, she says roots that

indicate "punctual or momentaneous action, i.e., action that does
or may not continue," take only -nt-.

19a. kʷʕínt   'Take it!'

19b. *kʷʕíst   *

20a. wík-n-n ʕi cítxʷ-tət 'I saw our house'

20b. *wíkstn   *

20c. *ts-wíkstn   *

She says some roots which can take -nt- are roots "which are
classified by this language [NL Ok] as non-continuous/punctual/
non-durative." Therefore, according to Hébert, the ungrammati-
cality of these forms is a function of semantic incompatibility.

Hébert says that the passive construction which "focuses
upon the patient and which views the termination point of an
vent" also uses the "perfective suffix" -nt-.

21a. kíʕlus-s ʕi sqílxʷ ʕi spíc̓ʕn 'The man coiled the rope'

21b. kíʕlus-n-təm ʕi spíc̓n ʕit sqílxʷ

                              'The rope was coiled by the man'

Hébert's aspect argument[17] rests also on her observation
that, with roots that can be extended by either -nt- or -st-, the
prefix ts- 'actually occurring action' may occur only with -st-,
but is ungrammatical with -nt-,

22a. ts-xʷλ̓ʕ-s-tín·   'I'm actually whittling'

22b. *ts-xʷʼ-n-tín   *'I'm actually whittled'

23a. ts-čka-s-tín ʕi ʕi-sklášʷ   'I'm counting my money'

23b. *ts-čka-n-tín ʕi ʕi-sklášʷ *'I'm actually counted my money'

and predicates which accept either -nt- or -st- may not accept

the prefix ks- 'unrealized action'[18].

3.2. Ok Complex Transitives. Hébert mentions two ditran-
sitive constructions, a -λt- 'indirective' and a -x(i)t- 'bene-
factive'. She gives examples of their occurrence with the same
stem,

24a. q̓ʷíc̓-λ-t-n   'I fill it up for/on anybody'

24b. q̓ʷíc̓-x-t-n   'I fill it up for him'

but does not discuss their differences in function or distri-
bution.

3.3. Cv Simple Transitives. Mattina (1973,1978) describes
the basic transitive paradigm of Colville as marked by the suffix
-nt- and followed by pronoun reference suffixes in the order
object-subject. He says -nt- transitives include reference to
"two and only two persons, an actor and a primary goal."

25a. q̓y̓-ənt-ín   'I write something'

26a. k̓ʷúl-ənt-xʷ   'You fix something'

In the personal reference set, third person singular goal (3s obj.)
is unmarked and third person plural is optionally marked by a suf-
fix. First person singular and plural goal (1sp obj.) is marked
by proclitics, and second person singular and plural goals (2sp
obj.) by suffixes. Schematically,

Cv -nt- paradigm

Subj.	1sp	2s	3s	2p	3p Obj.
1s		-nt-s-(í)n	-(nt-í)n	-ɬ(úl)m-ən	-(nt-í)n-əlx
2s	kʷu -nt-(í)xʷ		-nt-(í)xʷ		-nt-(í)xʷ-əlx
3s	kʷu -(nt-í)s	-nt-s-(í)s	-(nt-í)s	-ɬ(úl)əm-s	-(nt-í)s-əlx
1p		-nt-s-(í)t	-nt-(í)m	-ɬ(úl)əm-t	-nt-(í)m-əlx
2p	kʷu -nt-(íp)		-nt-(íp)		-nt-(íp)-əlx
3p	kʷu -(nt-í)s-əlx	-nt-s-(í)s-əlx	-(nt-í)s-əlx	-ɬ(úl)əm-s-əlx	-(nt-í)s-əlx
Indefinite			-nt-(í)m		-nt-(í)m-əlx

A second transitive paradigm, with -st- added to the stem, includes explicit reference to an actor and a primary goal (like -nt-), and, in addition, implied reference to "a third person, a secondary goal coterminous with the actor."[19]

25b. q̓y̓-əst-ín   'I write it (for myself)'

26b. k̓ʷúl-əst-p   'You (pl.) fix it (for yourselves)'

The personal reference pronouns used in the -st- paradigm are not quite the same as in the -nt- paradigm; schematically:

Cv -st- paradigm

Subj.	1sp	2sp	3s	3p Obj.
1s		-st-(ú)m-ən	-st-(í)n	-st-(í)n-əlx
2s	kʷu -st-(í)xʷ		-st-(í)xʷ	-st-(í)xʷ-əlx
3s	kʷu -st-(í)s	-st(ú)m-s	-st-(í)s	-st-(í)s-əlx
1p		-st-(ú)m-t	-st-(í)m	-st-(í)m-əlx
2p	kʷu -st-(í)p		-st-(í)p	-st-(í)s-əlx
3p	kʷu -st-(í)s-əlx	-st-(ú)m-s-əlx	-st-(í)s-əlx	-st-(í)s-əlx
Idf			-st-(í)m	-st-(í)m-əlx

Mattina says that the data indicate that all Colville roots "potentially participate" in both the -nt- and -st- paradigms, and proposes that the -nt- paradigm is basic, and the -st- paradigm secondary. He notes that he has found some roots that occur in only one or the other (and not both) of the paradigms, and he suggests that "these cases can be either exceptional, and/or possibly due to some semantic incompatibility of the root with one of the two suffixes."

3.4. Cv Complex Transitives.

In addition to -nt- and -st-transitives, Mattina lists two ditransitive constructions that "include explicit reference to an actor, a primary goal (the recipient), and a third person secondary goal (the direct object)." These two constructions are accomplished with -ɬt- and -x(í)t-.

27a. xʷíc̓-ənt-s-ən   'I endow you'

27b. xʷíc̓-əɬt-s-ən   'I endow you with something,
                                  I give you something'

27c. xʷíc̓-əxt-m-ən   "   "

Except for the second person plural objects, -ɬt- ditransitives use the same personal reference and particles as -nt- transitives, and -x(í)t- ditransitives use the same ones as -st- transitives.

Cv -ɬt- paradigm

Subj.	1sp	2sp	3s	3p Obj.
1s		-ɬt-s-(í)n	-ɬt-(í)n	-ɬt-(í)n-əlx
2s kʷu	-ɬt-(í)xʷ		-ɬt-(í)xʷ	-ɬt-(í)xʷ-əlx
3s kʷu	-ɬt-(í)s	-ɬt-s-(í)s	-ɬt-(í)s	-ɬt-(í)s-əlx
1p		-ɬt-s-(í)t	-ɬt-(í)m	-ɬt-(í)m-əlx
2p kʷu	-ɬt-(í)p		-ɬt-(í)p	-ɬt-(í)p-əlx
3p kʷu	-ɬt-(í)s-əlx	-ɬt-s-(í)s-əlx	-ɬt-(í)s	-ɬt-(í)s-əlx
Idf			-ɬt-(í)m	-ɬt-(í)m-əlx

Cv -x(í)t- paradigm

	1sp	2sp	3s	3p Obj.
1s		-x(í)t-m-ən	-x(í)t-ən	-x(í)i-n-əlx
2s kʷu	-x(í)t-xʷ		-x(í)t-xʷ	-x(í)t-xʷ-əlx
3s kʷu	-x(í)t-s	-x(í)t-əm-s	-x(í)t-s	-x(í)t-s-əlx
1p		-x(í)t-əm-t	-x(í)t-əm	-x(í)t-m-əlx
2p kʷu	-x(í)t-p		-x(í)t-p	-x(í)t-p-əlx
3p kʷu	-x(í)t-s-əlx	-x(í)t-s-əlx	-x(í)t-s-əlx	-x(í)t-s-əlx
Idf			-x(í)t-əm	-x(í)t-m-əlx

Mattina describes the difference between -ɬt- and -x(í)t-ditransitives as one of focus. He says "-ɬt- ditransitives mean 'X does Y for Z', and -x(í)t- ditransitives mean 'X does Y for Z'." He says that, unless the object is clearly understood in context, the difference is formally marked in the secondary goal complement and follows the predicate. -x(í)t- ditransitives require that the secondary goal complement be marked by the proclitic t, but -ɬt- ditransitives never do.

28a. xʷíc̓-əxt-xʷ i? t k-s-qláw̓s
                             'You give him (what will be) his money'

28b xʷíc̓-əɬt-xʷ i? s-qláw̓ 'You give him some money'

Besides the secondary goal complement expansions of ditransitives, it is possible to add primary goal and actor complements. A primary goal complement (placed before or after the predicate) must be co-referential with the object pronoun suffix. An actor

complement must be co-refential with the subject pronoun, and must
be marked by the proclitic t 'agentive'.[20]

Mattina says that all roots that allow direct affixation of
(di)transitive suffixes are transitive roots, and other roots,
"inferred intransitive", must add the "transitivizing suffix
-m(í)-" to form transitive stems which in turn attach the proper
transitive suffixes. -m(í)- occurs with either -nt- or -st-,
according to sense, but the transitivized -m(í)- stems never par-
ticipate in ditransitive (-ɫt- and -x(í)t-) constructions.

Mattina mentions another (di)transitive stem formation with
-nú-. These stems "carry the implication that the activity re-
ferred to is accomplished either accidentally or after a struggle."
-nú- is attached to the root directly, or after the reduplicative
suffix -(V)C₂ 'developmental', or after -p 'non-control' and can
then be followed by any of the (di)transitive suffixes.

29a. kʷən-nú-n   'I managed to get it'

29b. ƛ̓l-əl-nú-nt-s   'She'll kill you'

29c. ƛ̓əl-p-nú-nt-əm   'We can stop her'

29d. lut i? t s-qílxʷ kʷu ɫə c-kʷən-nú-st-s

                            'Nobody can catch me'

29e. kʷən-nú-ɫt-ən   'I managed to take it from her'

Finally, Mattina mentions two other suffixes, -xix- and
-(nt)uɫt-, that can also occur in (di)transitive constructions,
but he does not discuss them.

4. **Spokane (Sp) / Kalispel (Ka) / Flathead**. Spokane, Kalis-
pel and Flathead are so closely related that they can be consi-
dered dialects of one language. The most significant difference
is that /l/ and /r/, distinct phonemes in Spokane, have merged to
/l/ in Kalispel and Flathead. According to Carlson (1972), there
are also some lexical differences among these dialects, and Flat-
head tends to shorten words, deleting that which follows the ac-
cented vowel.

I will summarize Carlson's (1972,1980) findings on Spokane,
to Vogt's (1940) and Speck's (1980) works on Kalsispel.

4.1. **Spokane**. Carlson lists the inventory of transitive
suffixes in Spokane as having "two orders." The first is a set of
four suffixes: -n-, -s-, -ɫ-, -š(í)-, one of which is added to a
verb base to create a transitive stem. The second is the suffix
-t- 'transitive' that follows the suffixes of the first order.
-nt- and -st- constructions are one-goal stems and -ɫt- and -š(í)t-
constructions are two-goal stems.

4.1.1. **Sp Simple Transitives**. Carlson calls -n- 'control'
and -s- 'causative' for "labeling purposes." Although he finds no
semantic distinction between the two, he states that certain bases
always occur with -nt- and others always occur with -st-.

Adjuncts (referring to goal and actor) follow the transitive
verb construction. Actor adjuncts normally follow goal adjuncts,
and a general adjunct marking particle, ɫuʔ, usually precedes them
both. The particle t marks the actor, as well as "adjuncts that

translate as instruments." When there is both an actor adjunct
and an instrument adjunct occurring with a goal adjunct,
either the actor or the instrument is positioned in front of the
predicate. The adjunct is then linked to the predicate with a
conjunctive particle u 'and'.

30.   ɫuʔ t sqélixʷ   u   tapəntés   ɫuʔxxʌ́cín   ɫuʔ t ckʷíñč
      ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
        Actor   Pred.   Goal   Instr.

        'The Indian shot the dog with the bow and arrow'

He says that "the goal (unmarked) is primary and the other infor-
mation is secondary and specially marked" with an oblique marker,
t.

    4.1.2. Sp Complex Transitives. He calls -š(í)- 'benefac-
tive/substitutive' and -ɫ- 'relative'. -š(í)t- stems indicate
that the actor of a transitive paradigm is substituting for some-
one, or doing something for the benefit of someone "or perhaps
just something animate." This someone being substituted for or
benefited is the direct goal (DG) when present as an adjunct.
The other goal (indirect-IG) is marked by t 'oblique'.

    31a. xʷíčštən   ɫuʔ Agnes   ɫuʔ t yámxʷeʔ
          ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
          Pred.   DG   IG

                    'He gave a basket to Agnes'

In 31a., the direct goal (Agnes) is being benefited by the action
of receiving the basket. The focus is on Agnes, the beneficiary.

    32a. ʔíɫiištən   ɫuʔ Albert   ɫuʔ t sqéltč
          ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
          Pred.   DG   IG

                    'I ate some meat for (in place of) Albert'

Since sqéltč 'meat' is marked in 32a., the primary focus is on

Albert as the direct goal. The actor is substituting for Albert
by eating the meat.

    -ɫt- stems also indicate two goals, but the actor doesn't
substitute for someone, or necessarily do anything beneficial for
someone. The someone involved in -ɫt- constructions is always a
person and is indirectly involved.[21] The indirect goal (IG) in
-ɫt- constructions is marked with xʷəl 'relative to/by/for' or
c̓ 'to'.

    31b. k̓ʷúɫtən   ɫuʔ yámxʷeʔ   ɫuʔ xʷəl Agnes   'I made a basket
          ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   for Agnes'
          Pred.   DG   IG

    31c. xʷíc̓ɫtən   ɫuʔ yámxʷeʔ   ɫuʔ c̓ Agnes   'I gave a basket
          ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   to Agnes'
          Pred.   DG   IG

In 31b. and 31c., Agnes is the beneficiary, but the primary focus
is on yámxʷeʔ 'basket', the unmarked adjunct (the DG), and not on
Agnes (compare 31a.).

    Carlson notes that -ɫt- constructions are often followed by
a possessive construction as direct goal.

    32b. ʔíɫiɫtən   ɫuʔ Albert sqéltč   'I ate Albert's meat'
          ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
          Pred.   DG

    32c. ʕʷósɫtən   ɫuʔ Albert xxʌ́cís   'I lost Albert's dog'
          ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯
          Pred.   DG

In 32b., Albert is the (underlying) direct goal although he ap-
pears in a possessive construction that serves as the direct goal.
Carlson says the predicate alone means something like 'I ate some-
thing of his', and Albert is indirectly involved by acting as
possessor (compare 32a.). Sentences like 32c. can only occur with
-ɫt- constructions because -š(í)t- stems "never describe an acti-

vity detrimental to the direct goal." Conversely, -ɫt- stems are not limited in this way and can "describe non-benficial activity applying to the indirect goal." He says a -š(í)t- construction with a verb like in 32c. (*ʕʷosštən) would not be acceptable to a native speaker because it "sounds like you'ld be losing something for someone on purpose."

Some suffixes may follow the base to form a secondary stem. One of them is the suffix -nú- 'success' that is added to the verb base and then is followed by -nt- and the transitive pronouns[22] to form stems expressing "successful completion of an action." -nú- only occurs with transitive roots and always takes -nt- (-núnt-), even when occurring with bases that normally take -st- 'causative' transitive suffixes. He adds that these forms are often used "to emphasize that something difficult has been acheived."

33a. šələnúntxʷ   'You got it chopped'

33b. k̓ʷələnúntxʷ   'You managed to do it'

34a. hecəmi·stén   'I know it'

34b. mi·pənúntxʷ   'You succeeded in knowing, found out'

Two other suffixes that may seem alike, but are distinct elements are -min- 'instrumental' and -mi- 'transitive derivational'. Both are variable-stress suffixes. -min- 'instrumental' can occur either (1) with the intransitive possessive pronouns in nominal instrumental forms or (2) with -nt- 'control transitive' suffixes and the transitive pronouns in instrumental transitive forms.

35a. šil   'chop'

35b. šələmín   '(It's an) axe'

35c. šələmíntxʷ   'You use the axe to chop'

The suffix -mi- is added to an intransitive base to form a derived transitive stem. This stem then takes the regular transitive endings and the transitive pronouns. Some of the derived stems take -nt- and some take -st-.

36a. kʷu čx̌ʷəx̌ʷəʔəyəmíntxʷ[23]   'You laugh at me'

36b. čánəmstən   'I tighten it'

Carlson says the last example (36b.) shows that -mi- and -min- "are indeed different elements." He says that if the derivational ending were -min-, the n would develop to i before s. As it is (čan-mi-s-te-n), only the vowel is deleted and no segment occurs between m and the s of the causative transitive suffix.

Carlson lists a suffix -šiš-[24] 'substitutive' that can be used in either intransitive or transitive constructions. These forms in -šiš- convey "the meaning that a particular course of action is being followed by a person in place of another person who might otherwise be doing it," and adds further that "although these stems occur in organization with the transitive pronouns, they are not completely transitive." Stems with -šiš- may not take a separate object adjunct.

4.2. Kalispel (Ka). Vogt (1940) bases his classification of Kalispel verbs on their compatibility with certain suffixes. He divides verb forms into four classes, three of which (I-III) he calls "independent forms", and the fourth (Class IV), "dependent forms." Dependence is determined by the set of pronoun af-

fixes[25] that accompanies the verb. Independent forms occur only with "the series of personal prefixes" (intransitive), and dependent forms have "more than one person referred to by the series of referential affixes" (transitive).

Vogt divides each verb class into three different aspect forms: (1) 'continuative', (2) 'completive', and (3) 'resultative'. The 'resultative', "where apparently a state is considered as resulting from previous actions," has only dependent (Class IV) forms, and its "aspectual value is not always clear."

Class I verbs have no suffixes in the 'continuative' or 'completive' and "often correspond to nouns in the Indo-European languages." Due to this and the lack of suffixes (they utilize only the independent form prefixes), Class I verbs can be considered intransitive. Class II[26] contains "many verbs for intransitive activities" and verbs "derived from verbs or adjectives, expressing being so and so, becoming so and so." As with the verbs of Class I, pronoun reference in Class II verb forms is accomplished by independent form prefixes, suggesting that Class II verbs are also intransitive.

Class III includes "a great number of transitive verbs" that have an "indefinite object,"[27] and also some verbs which "would be considered intransitive." These Class II verbs can become Class IV (dependent)-type verbs, but this triggers "a change in point of view...the subject of the independent action becomes possessor of the dependent action."

37a. čineskúpi   (III-cont) 'I (am) pushing (someone)'

37b. yeskúpəm   (IV-cont) 'He (is) my pushing/I am
                              pushing him'

The Class IV 'continuative' suffix -əm occurs also with Class III verbs as the 'completive' suffix, and sometimes co-occurs with the Class III 'continuative' suffix -i.[28] Class III verbs and Class IV 'continuative' forms in -əm are intransitive because they are inflected with intransitive pronoun forms. Class III takes the independent (intrans.) pronoun forms, and Class IV 'continuative' takes the complex dependent (intransitive possessive) forms.

38a. činesšiləmí   (III-cont.) 'I (am) chopping something'

38b. činšilím   (III-comp.) 'I chop something'

38c. yeskʷeʔém   (IV-cont.) 'I am biting it'

4.2.1. <u>Ka Simple Transitives</u>. Class IV (dependent) verbs "correspond to transitive verbs with definite object." The "aspect" markings of Class IV verbs are as follows: 'continuative' (intrans.) prefix <u>es-</u> and suffix <u>-əm</u>; 'completive' (transitive) either suffix <u>-ən(t)</u>[29] or suffix <u>-st-ən</u> (a "subclass"); 'resultative' (transitive) prefix <u>es-</u> and the suffix <u>-st-</u>.

Vogt gives two examples of Class IV verbs in the 'completive' form, one root-stressed and the other suffix-stressed.

39a. kúpən   'I push him'

39b. u·ləntén   'I burn him'

Although this is not explicitly mentioned, the 'completive' suffix -ən(t) has morphophonemically been deleted from the root-

stressed example (39a.), leaving only the 1s subject pronoun affix -ən. Third person object is unmarked.

Vogt lists -st-ən as the suffix of a "subclass" of 'completive' forms, although they are inflected like the 'resultative' forms. All the examples given have a 1s subject, and this means that this is the suffix -st- followed by the 1s subject pronoun affix, -ən. The majority of verbs occurring with this suffix are "causative in meaning" and "the formal identity with the 'resultative' form may be due to the fact that there are common elements in the causative and the resultative meaning." He adds that most Kalispel 'causative' verbs "have no affinity with the resultative forms."

He lists three common verbs that "have carried the suffix -st- over in the continuative."[30]

40a. yeskúlstəm (cont.), kúlstən   'I send him'

40b. yespúlstəm (cont.), púlstən   'I kill him'

40c. yesqʷəlqʷélstəm (cont.), qʷəlqʷélstən 'I talk with him'

Vogt also lists two verbs that have the suffix -tən.

41a. wíčtən/wíčən   'I see him'

41b. wíctxʷ   'You see him'

41c. ʔémtən   'I feed him'

They take the same pronoun affixes as -st-ən and they also carry over into the 'continuative'. Examples 41a. and 41c. have a 1s subject, so the -ən must be the pronoun marker. Since these forms with -tən are inflected (with pronouns) the same as the -st-ən forms, -tən seems to be but a variant of -st-ən.

The 'resultative' (prefix es-, suffix -st-) aspect forms are found only with verbs of Class IV. The pronoun affixes that occur with 'resultative' and 'completive' -st- forms are slightly different than the paradigm occurring with the -ən(t) 'completive' forms (see footnote 25).

At least some Class IV verb roots can occur with suffixes of any aspect,

42a. yeskúlən (cont.) 'I am doing it' (intrans.)

42b. kúlən (comp.) 'I do it' (simple transitive)

42c. eskúlstən (rslt.) 'I do it' (-st- transitive)

but within the 'completive' aspect, verbs must take either -ən(t) or -st-(ən).

4.2.2. Ka Complex Transitives. Vogt list a group of 'relative' forms (ditransitive) occurring with Class III and Class IV verbs that have "reference to an indirect object." The 'relative' form suffixes are -š(í)t-, -ɫt-, and -š(íš)-.

-š(í)t- and -ɫt- occur only with Class IV verbs. Only the indirect object is considered 'definite' with -š(í)t-, but with -ɫt-, both objects are considered 'definite'. Vogt mentions that in the 'completive' aspect, -š(í)t- constructions take pronoun forms from the 'resultative' paradigm, and -ɫt- constructions take the regular dependent pronouns normally occurring in the Class IV 'completive' aspect.[31]

43a. kúpštən (comp.) 'I push something (indefinite) for him (definite)'

43b. kúpłtən (comp.) 'I push it (definite) for him (definite)
/I push his....'

Another distinction between -š(í)t- and -łt- is that the direct object with -łt- is "always in the possessed form and referred to in the verb by the personal suffixes for the grammatical subject."

44. kuʔespúlłtəms łuʔ isəmen (IV-cont.) 'He is killing
(Predicate) (Complement)
my wife'

In ex. 44., isəmen 'my wife' is the direct object, and the personal prefix ku- (1s) refers to the possessor indicated in the object complement by the possessive prefix i-.

The only 'relative' forms Vogt mentions in the 'resultative' aspect are -łt- forms, and these constructions include the 'resultative' prefix es-.

45a. esʔáçəx̌əłtən   'I watch his....'

45b. esʔáçəx̌əłcən   'I watch thy...'

-š(íš)- "expresses that an action takes place for someone," the "someone" referred to being an indefinite object. Class III 'relative' forms only occur with the suffix -š(íš)-. Vogt also lists -š(íš)- forms in the Class IV 'continuative' and 'completive' aspects. Therefore, the 'relative' suffix -š(íš)- occurs in constructions with dependent, complex dependent (possessive), and independent pronoun affixes, that is, in both transitive and intransitive constructions.

46a. čineskúlši   (III-cont.)   'I am working for someone'

46b. činkúlšəm   (III-comp.)   'I work for someone'

46c yeskúlšəm   (IV-cont.)   'I am doing it for someone'

46d. kúlšən   (IV-comp.)   'I do it for someone'

47a. čineskúpši   (III-cont.)   'I am pushing something
for someone'

47b. yeskúpsəm   (IV-cont.)   'I am pushing it (definite)
for someone (indefinite)'

48a. činesq̣eʔišíši (III-cont.)   'I am writing something
for someone'

48b. yesu·lšíšəm   (IV-cont.)   'I am burning it for someone'

48c. u·lšíšən   (IV-comp.)   'I burn it for someone'

Vogt lists two -mín- 'instrumental' suffixes. The first -mín- (unstressed -mən-) "forms instrumental nouns." The second can occur in transitive (or intransitive 'middle') constructions, and is "undoubtably related to the nominal suffix -mín-." He gives forms with -mín- followed by Class IV aspect and/or 'relative' form suffixes as follows: -mínəm 'continuative';-mín (2s subj. míntxʷ, 3s subj. -mís) 'completive'; and 'relative' forms -miłtəm and -mištəm.[32]

Another suffix that occurs only with Class IV verbs is -nún-. Verb forms with -nún- have "the meaning of succeeding in doing something." Vogt lists the following forms: -núnəm 'continuative'; -nún (2s subj. -núntxʷ, 3s subj. -núis) 'completive'; and a 'relative' form, -núłtəm.

4.3. Kalispel (Ka). Speck (1980) says Kalispel roots participate in transitive constructions marked by a suffix -t- 'transitive' that is preceded by one of four other transitive suffixes:

(1) -n- 'simple transitive'; (2) -s- 'causative'; (3) -ɬ- 'rela-
tional'; and (4) -ši- 'benefactive'.[33] -st- 'causative' transi-
tives are "typically in the actual aspect" and generally take the
prefix es- 'actual'.

4.3.1. Ka Simple Transitives. Although both Carlson and
Vogt state that certain verbs occur only with simple transitive
(-nt-) constructions and others occur only with causative (-st-)
ones, Speck says that "apparently any root can participate in all
four transitive derivations", and finds examples in Father Post's
data of the same root in all four constructions, including, of
course, -nt- and -st-.

49a. n-ʔeys-n (n-ʔeys-n-t-n) 'I pay for it'
49b. es-n-ʔéy-s-t-n   'I pay for it'
49c. n-ʔey-ɬ-t-n   'I pay for his'
49d. n-ʔey-š-t-n   'I pay him his, help him paying'

4.3.2. Ka Complex Transitives. Speck says forms with -ɬt-
'relational' "seem to refer to someone doing something to someone"
and forms with -š(í)t- 'benefactive' seem to refer "to doing some-
thing for someone."

50a. naq̓ʷ-m-ɬ-t-én   'I stole this from him'
50b. naq̓ʷ-š-t-én   'I stole (it) for him, helped him
                          stealing'

She lists a "derivational suffix" -nú- 'transitive success'
that is "added to roots before the transitive affixes." The ex-
amples, however, only show -nú- occurring with -nt- 'simple tran-

sitive'.

51a. nič̓-nú-n (nič̓-nú-n-t-en) "I succeed in cutting it"
51b. sq̓-q̓-nú-n (saq̓-q̓-nú-n-t-en) "I succeed in splitting it"

Speck adds that "middle and intransitive (bases with intran-
sitive derivational suffixes) can be 'transitivized' by attaching
the transitive suffixes (-nt-, -st-, -ɬt-, -š(í)t-) and the tran-
sitive person referents."

52a. n-q̓eʔ-cín-m-n-t-xʷ ɬuʔ s-qeltč-s
                          'You receive the body of J.C.'
52b. ʔey-čst-m-s-t-m-n   'I avenged you'
52c. noxʷ-noxʷ-m-ɬ-t-s sín-ceʔ 'He had his brother's wife'

Some 'transitivized' stems have an intransitive derivational suf-
fix plus -m- 'middle' preceding the transitive suffix (and the
person markers).

52a. kʷu n-kʷɬ-n-ʔaxl-éls-m-n-t-xʷ 'I think the same as you do'
     (volitive-middle-trans-2s actor)
52b. k̓ʷí-m-út-m-s-t-n   'I can make that'
     (capable-middle-causative-trans-1s actor)

Speck points out that intransitive stems with -min- 'instru-
mental' are "frequently" transitivized. Sometimes the 'transiti-
vized' forms have both 'instrumental' and 'middle' intransitive
derivational suffixes preceding the transitive suffix.

53a. ɬuʔ-mí-n (ɬuʔ-mín-n-t-en)[35] 'I use that to lance'
53b. ɬuʔ-mín-m-n   'I use that to lance'
53c. ɬuʔ-mín-m-ɬt-n   'I use his....to lance'

She also lists three suffixes that formally "detransitivize"

transitive stems by requiring personal reference with the intransitive pronoun set. The suffixes are -wé?xʷ- 'reciprocal', -cút- 'reflexive', and -(é)m 'indefinite intransitive'. Forms with the last one, -(é)m, add personal reference by means of the possessive intransitive pronouns.[36] .

Finally, Speck discusses stems with -šiš-, an 'indefinite benefactive' affix that can be added to roots "which subsequently participate in intransitive constructions" (that is, stems that require the intransitive pronouns). These intransitive stems with -šiš- can also be 'transitivized' by attaching an -m- 'middle' suffix and one of the transitive suffixes (-nt-,-st-,-lt-,-s(i)t-) followed by transitive person reference markers.

5. Columbian (Cm). Kinkade (1980) discusses several ditransitive suffixes, but I know of no other published work on the Columbian (di)transitive system. Three suffixes that can precede -t- 'transitive' are -x(í)- 'indirective', -ɬ-, and -tuɬ-, and he labels this class as 'redirectives'. He says -x(í)- 'indirective' functions in a similar manner to the Thompson cognate as described by Thompson (1980) "in that it is not simply benefactive," but the actual distinctions between -x(í)-t- and -ɬ-t- are confused due to lack of overt goal reference markers in the complement.[37] He adds that Columbian seems to be parallel, "at least superficially," to the distinction described by Carlson (1980) for the Spokane ditransitive suffixes.

54a. táwxts   'He bought it for him'

54b. táwɬn   'I bought it from him'

55a. q̓i?xítn   'I wrote to him'

55b. q̓íy̓ɬta?   'Write it for him!'

Kinkade gives examples of a third 'redirective' suffix -tuɬ-t-, but he doesn't describe the distinctions between it and the other two.

56a. nkʷnakstúɬn skʷəná?sts 'I took a club away from him'

56b. kʷáɬn   'I took it away from him'

57a. wakʷtúɬn   'I hid it from him'

57b. wákʷɬn   'I hid it for him'

57c. wakʷtúɬtls 'He hid it from us (and wouldn't give it up)

57d. wákʷɬtls   'He hid it for us'

Kinkade lists two more suffixes, -xíx- and -xáx-,[38] that "imply an object (or objects) that is not specified, and parallel the contrast between indirectives and simple transitives."

58a. wiy̓əmxíx   'finish something for someone else'

58b. wiy̓əmxáx   'finish something'

58c. wi?stúnən[39]   'I finished it'

59a. xəsmxíx   'He lost something for/of someone'

59b. xəsmxáx   'He lost something belonging to
                    someone else'

59c. xésən   'I lost it'

60a. čəkxáx   'count for someone'

60b. čəkxítn   'I counted for him'

60c. čəkɬn   'I counted them for him'

60d. čəkən   'I counted them'

He says -xíx- includes the 'indirective', but the source or break-
down of -xáx- is unclear. The function of the final -x of the two
suffixes is also not clear, although he suggests that "-x may be
some sort of detransitivizer, making intransitive what would other-
wise be transitive."

   61a. kʷanxíxmən   'I took it away (from someone)'

   61b. xəsxíxmən   'I lost it for them (not deliberately)'

   61c. k̓ʷəṅsxáamən   'I showed it'

      6. Coeur d'Alene (Cr). Gladys Reichard (1938) describes the
Coeur d'Alene transitive verb system[40] in terms of the affixes
that "express" three aspects. The first suffix, -c-, is 'comple-
tive aspect'; the second, -stm- (co-occurring w/the prefix ɫc-),
is 'customary aspect'; and the third, -əm, is 'continuative as-
pect'. The transitive pronouns,[41] as expected, follow the comple-
tive and customary suffixes in the order object-subject. The con-
tinuative forms take independent-possessive (intransitive) pronouns
(see footnote 41).

      6.1. Cr Simple Transitives. Most verbs[42] require the ad-
dition of the "transitivizing element", -ən, before the completive
aspectual suffix (i.e., -ən-c-). This corresponds to -nt- of the
other Interior Salishan languages. The transitivizer -ən- is like-
wise required before -cut- (-cɔt-) 'reflexive' and -tʷiš- (-tʷɐš-)
'reciprocal'.

   62a. táp-ən-c-ɫ-xʷ[43]   'thou shottest me'

   62b. tá-táp-əṅ-c-ɫlp   'each of you took a shot at me'

In contrast, -ən is never found in the customary forms;

   62c. a-táp-sən   'I cust. shoot it'

   62d. a-tá-tap-stṁ-ɫt   'We cust. shoot at him'

nor in constructions with what Reichard calls the "second subject-
first plural object combination."

   62e. kʷu-táp-šɐš   'thou shottest us'

   62f. kʷup-táp-šɐš   'you shot us'

    The customary transitive forms[44] are marked by the suffix
-stm-, but the prefix ɫc- (or variant ɫ-/a-) 'customary' must co-
occur.

   63a. gʷíč-tulm-n   'I saw you'

   63b. gʷíč-c   'He saw him'

   63c. ɫc-gʷíč-stm-ɫ-s   'He cust. sees me'

   63d. ɫc-gʷíč-stm-ɩ-t   'We cust. see thee'

    Reichard discusses "a true passive voice" in Coeur d'Alene
which "denotes that the subject has been acted upon by an agent."
The aspect suffixes are the same as for the active voice, but the
"passive endings" differ somewhat from the active constructions.[45]
According to her description, there also seems to be a shift in
subject focus. She describes this only by saying that "the passive
subjective pronouns are closely related to the active objective
pronouns."

   64a. níč-ən-txʷ   'You cut him' (active)

   64b. níč-ən-təm   'He has been cut' (passive)

   64c. ɫ-níč-stxʷ   'You cust. cut him' (active)

   64d. ɫ-níč-stəm   'He cust. has been cut' (passive)

65a. gʷíč-cᴕxʷ   'You see me' (active)

65b. gʷíč-cᴕlᴕm   'I have been seen' (passive)

65c. gʷíč-cιt   'You have been seen' (passive)

65d. ᴕc-gʷíč-stmᴕxʷ   'You cust. see me' (active)

65e. ᴕc-gʷíč-stmᴕlᴕm   'I cust. am seen' (passive)

65f. ᴕc-gʷíč-stmιt   'You cust. are seen' (passive)

Reichard says "generally speaking, [roots] ending in t, n, and 1 which are susceptible to transitivization seem to be irregular" in that they take -stm- (instead of the expected -ən-c-) for the completive forms. These 'completive' -stm- forms differ from the customary forms in that they don't have the prefix ᴕc- 'customary'. She adds that the number of these roots is small,[46] and and not all roots with these consonants (t,n,1) as finals behave this way. This, of course, contradicts the hypothesis that the distribution of -ən-c- (-nt-) versus -st(m)- (without ᴕc-) is phonologically motivated. In fact, there are two mutually exclusive classes of roots, the first of which occurs with -ᴕn-c- in the completive, and the second of which occurs with -st(m)- (and without ᴕc-) in the completive.

Reichard also discusses the 'continuative' transitive, a construction "built up on principles entirely different from the other two aspects, the sole likeness being that the object [pronoun] precedes the subject [pronoun]." She considers these (and their intransitive counterparts) "verbal nouns" because they occur with a combination of independent and possessive pronominal series (see footnote 41). These pronouns "combine to form a prefix de-

noting object-subject," which then "combines with the nominalizing s- and the ic- 'continuative' prefix."[47] In addition to being marked by the independent and possessive pronouns, these continuative transitives require the suffixation of -əm 'continuative'.[48]

The only difference between the intransitive and the transitive passive continuative is the addition of -əm 'continuative'.

66a. či?c-gʷíč   'I am seeing' (intrans.)

66b. či?c-gʷíč-əm   'I cont. am being seen' (passive)

Also, verbs requiring -əm in the intransitive differ only in having the suffix -əmš in the intransitive continuative and -əm in the passive. She explains this by saying that some stems seem to require a "psychological object".

66c. čι?-níč-əmš   'I cont. am cutting' (intrans.)

66d. čι?-níč-əm   'I cont. am being cut' (tr.pass.)

Both Gladys Reichard (for Coeur d'Alene) and Hans Vogt (for Kalispel) describe the suffix -əm as a transitive suffix for the continuative aspect. In both cases, the suffix -əm seems the same suffix that has been interpreted in more recent analyses of Interior Salishan languages a 'middle'.

6.2. Cr Complex Transitives. Reichard lists several other suffixes that in all three aspects form transitive constructions. She call three of these 'dative', and glosses them as follows: -ɬ- 'in behalf of, instead of'; -tuɬ- 'for, in reference to'; and -šit- 'as a favor to'. Only -c- (never -stm-) can follow the dative suffixes.

67a. ᴴčiɫc (ᴴčín-ɫ-c)   'He did with it for her'

67b. ᴴč-əčín-šɩcən   'I cust. scold him as a favor

to thee'[49]

Another suffix, -šiš- (-šᴴš-,-šᵊš-) 'something, for someone'
is used "to complete the meaning" when used with an intransitive
verb, and she notes that it may be translated as an "indefinite
pronoun". It means 'for someone' (indefinite object) when used
with a transitive verb.

68a. ɩc-x̣ᴴs-ᵊm-šᴴš-s   'He is using something carefully'

(intransitive)

68b. mᴴRʷ-šᴴš-mən-c   'He broke it (someone else's

property)'

This suffix, she believes, was "taken over for the pronominal
completive 2s(subj.)-1p(obj.) and 2p-1p" (i.e., kʷu(p).....šᴴš),
and has no correspondence to the other Cr transitive pronouns.
The suffix -šᴴš- can function as an ordinary pronoun, but it can
also contain the idea expressed by -šit- 'as a favor to'.

69a. kʷu-ᴴčín-šᴴš   'Thou gavest it to us/thou gavest

(did with) it as a favor to us'

69b. kʷu-ləǰ-šíš   'Thou stabbest us'

69c. kʷu-lᴴǰ-šᴴš   "   "

Two other transitive suffixes can be found in the Cr grammar:
-nún- (-nən-?) 'succeed after considerable effort'; and -min-
(-mᴴn-, -mən-) 'used for'. The latter furnishes difficulties be-
cause its setting "prevents one from determining whether it is
causative or usitative."

70a. šᵊt-ᵊt-nún-ən   'I succeeded in beating him'

70b. q̓ᴴy̓-mín-ən   'I wrote it'[50]

7. _Conclusion_. I propose the following as a basic paradigm
of (di)transitive suffixes in Interior Salish:

transitive   -nt-

"   -st-

ditransitive   -ɫt-

"   -x(í)t-

(Sh,Th,Cv/Ok,Cm x = Sp,Ka,Cr š)

In addition, several other (di)transitive suffixes frequently oc-
cur: -nú(nt)-, -min-/-mi-, -xix-, and -tuɫt-. They have been
described, if at all, in various ways. In the following chart I
show how these affixes are distributed in the Salishan languages
of the interior (see following page).

Several basic questions remain to be answered.

The distribution of the suffixes (especially the basic -nt-
and -st-) varies from language to language. This distinction can
be inferred either complementary or contrastive , depending on the
description of the language. I will call type A the complementary
distribution, and type B the contrastive. However, we must note
that in all the languages there are certain roots that can take
only -nt- or only -st-.

Within these two types (A and B) there is also much variation
among the languages as to the productivity and frequency of occur-
rence of the two suffixes (-nt- and -st-). -nt- usually proves to

INTERIOR SALISHAN (DI)TRANSITIVE AFFIXES

	Cr	Cm	Ka**	Ka*	Sp	Cv	Ok	Th	Sh
	-ənt-	-nt-(ʔ)	-nt-	-ən(t)-	-nt-	-nt-	-nt-	-n-t-	-n(t)-
		-st(ú)-	(es-,)-st-	-st-	-st-	(c-,)-st-	-st-	-s-t-	-st-
				es-,-st-			ts-,-st-		c-/s-,-st-
	(ac-, -stm)								
	-łt-	-łt-	-łt-	-łt-	-łt-	-łt-	-łt-	---	---
	-šit-	-x(í)t-	-š(í)t-	-š(i)t-	-š(í)t-	-x(í)t-	-x(i)t-	-xi-t-	-x(í)t-
	-šiš-/-šᵘš-	-xíx-	-šiš-	-š(íš)-	-šiš-	-xix-			
		-xáx-							
	-nun-		-mú-nt-	-nun-	-mú-nt-	-mú-	-mú-nt-	-nwéñ-t-	-nwéñ(t)-
	-min-		-min-	-min-	-min-			-min-t-	-m(í)n(t)-
					-mi-	-m(í)-			
	-tuł-	-tuł-t-				-(t)ułt-			

*Vogt (1940)
**Speck (1980)

37

---

be the more productive of the two, and is probably the basic tran-
sitive suffix. -st- usually carries some added meaning into the
construction.

Languages that are described to be more like type A often
allow roots that normally occur only with -nt- to occur in certain
-st- constructions, usually in conjunction with some type of caus-
ative or actual prefix. This raises the question about the con-
structions with -st-: How do forms with -st- plus the actual/
causative prefix differ from forms with -st- without the actual/
causative prefix?

Some of the languages have markedly different transitive pro-
noun paradigms occurring with -nt- (and -łt-) and with -st- (and
-x(í)t-). What languages have retained the original pronoun sys-
tem(s) and/or what languages have innovated? What is the status
and origin of the radically different 2-1p forms in Cr (kʷu(p)-...
...šᵘš) that differ from all the other paradigms?

The distinction between -łt- and -x(í)t- in Interior Salish
seems to be primarily one of focus. Predicates using the suffix
-x(í)t- (or cognate) usually focus on the beneficiary of the action,
while those with the suffix -łt- focus on the benefit or, loosely,
on the direct object.

What is the status of -łt- in Sh and Th? Thompson (1979b)
mentions that there are "just a few fossilized forms" with -łt-,
but that there are "enough to suggest that Thompson has probably
lost this category since Proto-Salish times." He also notes that
the -xit- construction in Th (this is probably true in Sh also)

"serves both ranges of meaning." Is -łt- missing from Sh com-
pletely?

The four (five?) other suffixes that are described in these
systems (-nú(nt)-, -min-/-mi-, -xix-, and -tułt-) also raise many
questions. They are the least described.

-nú(nt)- and -min-/-mi- seem to be fairly well understood,
but there is one major question about -min-/-mi-. Aside from
-min- 'instrumental', is there one or are there two transitivizing
suffixes?

And finally, what are the functions of -xix- and -tułt-?
These two (-xix- and -tułt-) are the least understood of the tran-
sitive suffixes. -xix- seems to be able to occur both as a tran-
sitive suffix (usually referring to some sort of indefinite object)
or as an intransitive one, and -tułt- has been, for the most part,
neglected.

I hope this paper will stimulate additional insights in the
(di)transitive systems of the Interior Salishan languages.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This paper evolved out of suggestions given to me in a sem-
inar taught by Dr. Anthony Mattina during Winter quarter, 1980, at
the University of Montana. Much gratitude and appreciation goes to
Dr. Mattina who counseled me, coerced me, supported and helped me
put this work together. Final responsibility for any misconcep-
tions, vagueness, or other errors, however, is my own.

[2]Dr. Anthony Mattina opened his files to me, and most of my
resources were found there.

[3]I will present the transitive subject and object and the
intransitive subject pronoun sets of most of the languages I dis-
cuss, but I will not be focusing on them. For fuller treatments
of them, see the individual grammar descriptions, or Gladys Reich-
ard (1938. "A Comparison of Five Salish Languages: II." IJAL, 3:
8-15.), James E Hoard (1971. "Problems in Proto-Salish Pronoun Re-
construction," in Studies in Northwest Indian Languages, ed. by
J.E. Hoard and T. Hess [Sacramento, Cal.: Sacramento Anthropolo-
gical Society], pp. 70-90.), M. Dale Kinkade (In press. "Plateau
Interior Salish: Historical Linguistics and Dialect Geography,"
to be pub. in Handbook of North American Indians, vol 11.), Lau-
rence C. Thompson (1979. "Salishan and the Northwest," in The
Language of Native America, ed. by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mi-
thun. Univ. of Texas Press.), and Stanley Newman (1979. "A History
of Salish Possessive and Subject Forms." IJAL, 45:3, 207-223.).

Sh

[4]In all of the transitive forms, reference to person in the
verb complex is made by object and subject suffixes (in that order)
that follow the transitivizer. Third person sing. and pl. are not
distinguished. An exclusive 1 pl. is expressed by the 3 person
forms combined with kex". The Shuswap personal affixes are:

| | TRANSITIVE | | INTRANS. |
	Obj.	Subj.	Subj.
1s	-cm-/-cl-*	-(e)n	k-n
1p (incl.)	-(e)l-	-(e)m/-t**	k-t
2s	-c(i)-	-(e)x	k
2p	-(u)lm-	-(e)p	k-p
3	--	-(e)s	-

*-cl- before a labial, -cm- elsewhere.
**Kuipers says that, in the indicative, passive forms
(the extension -(e)m in 1s and 3, the extension -t in
2s and 2p) are used for all cases with 1p subj.

In addition to suffixation, Kuipers says that certain forms with
reference to 1s (3 obj.-1s subj. and 1s obj.-2/3 subj.) are redup-

licated. Base-stressed verbs have reduplicated bases and suffix-stressed ones have reduplicated suffixes.

f1a. púl-st-   'kill'

f1b. púpl-st-n   'I kill him'

f2a. qm-st-   'nurse'

f2b. qm-stét-n   'I nurse him'

[5]There is a predictable morphophonemic merger that occurs in cases where the verb has root- or base-final t, n, or s. The root-final consonant merges with the (initial) consonant of the transitivizer.

[6]The 'customary' prefix is s- before t, ł, c; and is c- elsewhere.

[7]qʔem 'take the breast' can also be transitivized as Class E qm-(m)in- 'suck, tr."

Th

[8]Reference to person in Thompson is given by object and subject suffixes that follow (in that order) the transitivizing element. Number is not distinctive in third person elements, although plural can be emphasized in certain ways (such as a reduplication prefix, an ablaut-type relationship some plural roots have to a corresponding singular root, or a special suffix -íyxs [also used in the possessive system] that provides a specific third person plural). The basic Thompson personal pronominal elements are as follows:

	TRANSITIVE		INTRANS. INDEPENDENT
	Obj.	Subj.	Subj.
1s	-c(é)m-/-c(é)y-*	-(é)n(e)	k - n
1p	-(é)y-	-t	k - t
2s	-c(í)-	-(é)xʷ	kʷ
2p	-(ú)ym-	-(é)p	k - p
3	--	-(é)s	-

*-c(é)y- before a labial, -c(é)m- elsewhere.

1s subject suffix has a final -e only when the form refers to a third person object (3-1s). The 1p subj. suffix appears only with second person objects, and Thompson says that with third person objects, a "suppletive form (-(é)m) has been borrowed from another paradigm."

[9]According to certain inherent properties of roots and suffixes, Thompson classifies the resulting transitive forms as 1.) 'control' (the subject is in control of the situation); 2.) 'limited control' (subject is not in full control); and 3.) 'non-control'. While he says the language has a "predominance of non-control roots and affixes," he adds that "some affixes have a control feature and thus convert stems to which they are added to control status." He also notes that simple roots are intransitive and can be converted to transitive with certain affixes.

[10]A regular morphophonemic rule affects the -n-. -n- changes to the vowel e when it falls between two consonants, the second of which is homorganic. Triconsonantal weak (suffix-stressed) roots also regularly form transitive stems with -n-t-, and the -n- again appears as e.

f3a. //cék-n-t-es//--- cék-e-s   'she cooled it off'

f3b. //cék-n-t-ep//--- cék-e-t-p 'you people cooled it off'

f3c. //sələk-n-t-es//- səlk-e-t-és 'she turned it around'

[11]Thompson suggests that these roots all have an underlying -n-, but the surface vocalization optionally drops out when preceded by just a single consonant.

[12]However, Thompson notes that some apparent control roots (judging from the fact that the subjects of unsuffixed forms are agents) are not transitivized with either -t- or -n-t-, but instead take -s-t- 'causative'.

f4a. xʷesít   'he walked'

f4b. xʷesít-s-t-xʷ 'you took him for a walk, helped him walk'

He says this seems to be "simply a formal peculiarity of the language."

[13]Basically, he says -s-t- "nearly always clearly implies limited control on the part of the actor, yielding forms with either accidental, unintentional overtones or suggesting accomplishment of something difficult, timeconsuming, etc." Thompson also mentions its construction with the prefix ʔes- 'stative' to yield "stative transitives with meanings like 'acting now, acting as customarily'." In this function, no stative transitives are possible without -s- following stems created with "the other complex transitivizers."

[14]Thompson says an "understood" inanimate object for simple transitives can be specified and introduced by the particle e,

while with -xi-t- transitives, e introduces a person, and an in-
animate object must be otherwise marked.

f5a. máʔes e szélt   'he broke a plate'

f5b. máʔxcəms tə nszélt   'he broke my plate'

Ok

[15]Hébert proposes that the opposition between -nt- and -st-
reflects a distinction between perfective and imperfective as-
pects. She calls this theory the Aspect Hypothesis and claims it
does not link the semantic features of -nt- and -st- to transi-
tivity. She bases her hypothesis on "native speaker intuitions"
and the "syntax of aspect, i.e., the distribution of certain pre-
fixes, adverbials, and the interaction with the passive and lim-
ited control constructions."

Hébert"s definitions of perfective and imperfective come
from Bernard Comrie (1976). She gives (1) the characteristic
semantic features of the two aspectual categories, and (2) their
definitions in reference to view of the situation as:

Perfective-
  (1) "denotes a complete situation, with beginning, middle,
      end."
      -'non-durative'/'punctual'/'non-continuous'/'comple-
      tive'/'non-habitual'
  (2) "indicates the view of a situation as a single whole"
      -(external view)

Imperfective-
  (1) "expresses a continuous or durative situation as well as
      a habitual or customary situation, occurring over a
      period of time."
      -'durative'/'non-punctual'/'continuous'/'non-completive'/
      'habitual'
  (2) "pays essential attention to the internal structure of
      the situation"
      -(internal view)

[16]Hébert says that, according to her understanding of Mat-
tina's (1973,1978) work on Colville (di)transitivity, the -t- mor-
pheme encodes stative aspect. She is correct in that there is a
-t- 'stative' morpheme in Colville, but it seems to me that she is
misunderstanding Mattina's description when she describes the -t-
of the -nt- and -st- constructions as 'stative'. According to
Mattina (1973), the Colville -t 'stative' only occurs in intran-
sitive constructions and cannot appear before a lexical suffix.
This -t and -t- of Colville -nt- and -st- are different, as they
are in Okanagan.

[17]Hébert gives a further argument in support of her Aspect
Hypothesis: the adverbial pʕutíʔ 'still' can occur in construc-
tions with -st-, but not with -nt-.

f6a. pʕutíʔ ts-xʷʎʕ-s-tín   'I'm still whittling (and have
                               been for a long time)'

f6b. *pʕutíʔ xʷʎʕ-n-tín   *'I still whittled'

[18]This is refuted by Mattina (1980. "Imperative Formations
in Colville-Okanagan and in Other Interior Languages." Sec. 1.3.2.,
to be presented at the XV Salish Conference.) who explains the
incompatibility of ks- with the personal pronouns, rather than
with -nt- or -st-, as follows: "The unrealized prefix ks- and the
transitive pronouns are not compatible, and cannot cooccur in the
same form. The appropriate cooccurrence compatibility is between
ks- 'unrealized' on the one hand, and the intransitive proclitics
(kən, kʷ, ∅, kʷu, p) and the possessive affixes (i(n)-, a(n)-, -s,
-təm, -tp) on the other. Consequently, the unrealized aspect
counterparts of the transitives accept only intransitive inflec-
tion and require the middle suffix -m."

Hébert does note that these prefixes, ts- and ks-, may occur
in the "medio-passive [middle] construction."

f7a. kn ts-xʷʎʕam   'I'm actually whittling'

f7b. ʕi-ks-xʷʎʕam   'I'm gonna whittle'

Finally, in connection with -nt-, Hébert observes that tran-
sitive stems in -nt- (but not -st-) may be marked for 'limited
control' by the addition of -nú- preceding -nt- (-núnt-). These
stems seem to imply "accidental action with no intention or agency
on the part of the subject."

f8. čaʔ-nú-n-n   'I hit (it) accidentally'

Cv

[19]Mattina notes that the Colville -st- transitives "nearly
always" occur with the prefix c- 'actual', but he does not clas-
sify the strusture as 'customary' (the way cognate structures have
generally been classified in other Interior Salishan languages)
because the term 'customary' "seems too restrictive."

[20]When the actor is expanded by a complement, the predicate
remains in one of the participant (I, you, we) definite persons
unless the predicate is in the non-participant third person. Then
the predicate may either remain in the third person definite sub-
ject -(í)s, or be changed to the indefinite third person -(í)m.
Mattina says "actual occurrences of the indefinite third person
predicates are by far more common than their definite third person

counterparts" and adds that "this use of the predicate in the indefinite person (and complementized actor) is not restricted to ditransitives, but extends to all transitives."

f9. xʷíč-əɫt-əm iʔ t s-xʔít-x 'The oldest one gave it to him'

f10. cù-nt-əm t s-qəlt-míxʷ:... 'The man said to her:...'

f11. c-ʔam-st-ím-əlx t n̩číən 'Wolf feeds them'

Sp

[21]Carlson says, in addition to beneficiary (see ex. 31b. and 31c.) or possessor (see ex. 32b. and 32c.), the indirectly involved person in -ɫt- constructions can also act as "informant (séwɫtən 'I asked about that [X] of him [Y]') , or as the source (k̓ʷúɫiɫtən 'I borrowed it [X] from him [Y]')."

[22]The transitive subject (actor) and object (goal) markers, attached to the transitive stem in the order goal-actor, and the intransitive subject markers are as follows:

	TRANSITIVE		INTRANS.
	Goal	Actor	Subj.
1s	kʷu-	-	-en	čən-
1p	qeʔ-,	-l-	-em/-t	qeʔ-
2s		-si-	-exʷ	kʷ-
2p		-m-	-ep/-t	p-
3s		-	-es	-
3p	(Root₁(Root₂))	(V́ʔ)		V́ʔ

(Note: table has Goal/Actor under TRANSITIVE and Subj. under INTRANS.)

Third person goal is not overtly marked, but third person plural goal may be optionally indicated by distributive reduplication of the root morpheme. Third person plural actor may be optionally indicated by -ʔ- 'plural' inserted directly after the one primary stressed vowel (root or suffix) in a word.

[23]Carlson gives the derivations of 35c. and 36a. as:

35c. //šil-min-n-te-xʷ// šələmíntxʷ 'You use the axe to chop'

36a. //kʷu č-xʷxʷʔéy-mi-n-te-xʷ// kʷu čxʷəxʷəʔeyəmíntxʷ
(//xʷxʷʔey// 'laugh') 'You laugh at me'

He says short unstressed bases with either -min- 'instrumental' or -mi- 'transitive derivational' followed by -nt- 'control transitive' take stress on -min- or -mi-, and adds that "secondary stems with a variable-stress suffix are inherently stressed." Although he lists the secondary stem in 36a. as -mi-, it seems very possible that it could just as easily be -min-.

[24]Carlson (1972) states that -šiš- reduces to -ši- or -š- before the control suffix -t- 'transitive', but in later works he treats -š(í)t- as different suffix than -šiš-.

Ka (Vogt)

[25]Vogt calls the Kalsipel pronouns "possessor-agent" and the object pronouns "subject-patient". The dependent pronoun affixes follow the aspect and/or 'relative' form suffixes. The dependent (transitive) pronoun set listed below occurs with the Class IV 'completive' (-ən(t)-) forms. I include the independent (intrans.) subject markers for comparison and because they occur with Class IV verb forms.

	DEPENDENT (trans.)		INDEPENDENT
	(Obj.)	(Subj.)	(intrans.)
	'subject-patient'	'possessor-agent'	Subj.
1s	ku-	-	-ən (-un,-ín,-én,-án)	či(n)-
1p	qeʔ-,-ɫ(úl)əl-	-(i)t		qeʔ-
		qeʔ-,-t(é)m		
2s	-	-c-	-t(é)x	kʷ-
		-əm-	-t	
2p	-	-ɫ(úl)əm-	-t(é)p	p-
3	-	-	-s (-es,-ís)	-

In some cases, the vowels i and e of a suffix are replaced by a, when the stem itself contains the vowel a. The vowel harmony rule that affects the suffix is usually followed by a deletion rule that affects the stem vowel a.

Vogt lists the pronoun forms that occur with the 'resultative' constructions as being slightly different from the 'completive' paradigm listed above, except the plural object ('subject-patient') forms. I have omitted the verb root itself from his paradigm in order to show the affixes alone. In all the 'resultative' forms, the prefix es- directly precedes the verb root.

'resultative' (-st-) paradigm

Subj.	1s	2s	3s	Obj.
1s		-st(ə/ú)mən	-st(ə/é)n	
1p		-st(ə/ú)mt	-st(ə/é)m	
2s	kuʔ-,-st(é)xʷ		-st(é)xʷ	
2p	kuʔ-,-st(ə/é)p		-st(ə/é)p	
3	kuʔ-,-st(é)s	-st(ə/ú)ms	-st(é)s	

Third person plural forms are marked by a glottal stop infix in the suffix with suffix-stressed forms and in the root with root-stressed forms.

The Class IV 'continuative' pronoun paradigm is different than the two dependent forms listed above. The Class IV 'continuative' verbs occur with pronouns that appear to parallel the para-

digm for complex dependent forms of possessive and personal affixes for nouns. There is also the addition of the affix (y)es- that directly precedes the verb root and causes morphophonemic changes from the unaltered complex dependent affixes. Again, I have omitted the verb root to show only the affix (incl. 'continuative') forms.

COMPLEX DEPENDENT (intrans. possessive)

Possessor-Agent (Subj.)

	Subject-Patient (Obj.)				
	1s	1p	2s	2p	3
1s			kuyes-,-əm	piyes-,-əm	yes-,-əm
1p			k?es-,-əm	pes-,-əm	qe?es-,-əm
2s	ku?as-,-əm	qe?es-,-łəlt			as-,-əm
2p	ku?es-,-əmp	qe?es-,-łəlt			es-,-əmp
3	ku?es-,-əms	qe?es-,-łəls	k?es-,-əms	pes-,-əms	es-,-əms

These forms correspond to intransitive possessive forms in the other Interior Salishan languages.

[26]Some root-stressed Class II verbs show forms that appear to belong to Class I (i.e., lacking Class II 'continuative' suffix -i), but Vogt suggests this "vacillation between Class I and II is purely accidental."

[27]This poses some problem of interpretation since the "indefinite object" is always third person singular, and third person singular object is unmarked. Another argument against classification of Class III verbs as transitive is that they occur with the independent (intrans.) subject pronouns.

[28]Vogt mentions a suffix -m (-əm?) that forms "dependent verbs from independent verbs, and causative verbs from non-causative verbs." He also suggests that "the frequent instrumental or causative function" of another suffix, -min-, might indicate "that the causative suffix -əm is its unstressed form." It isn't clear to me whether Vogt identifies the Class IV 'continuative' suffix -əm with these others, or if he views it as a distinct suffix. Since it occurs with independent (intrans.) and dependent (trans.) forms and seems to have qualities of both, perhaps -əm corresponds to what is termed a 'middle' in the grammars of other Interior Salishan languages. It should also be mentioned that the pronouns occurring with Class IV 'continuative' -əm are different from those occurring with the other Class IV forms (see footnote 25).

[29]The Class IV 'completive' forms occur with "an expanded stem" -ənt- in most of the suffix-stressed forms. The vowel of a stressed suffix is affected by predictable morphophonemic rules and can be u, í, e, or á. (1) When the root has a final vowel, the suffix has the same vowel. (2) When the final vowel is a labialized palatal, the suffix vowel is $\underline{u}$. (3) When the final consonant

is a non-labialized postpalatal or $\underline{h}$, the suffix vowel is í. (4) In all other cases with suffix-stressed forms, the suffix vowel is í. These rules also apply to the 'continuative' suffix -əm.

[30]The suffix -əm here is acting opposite to the suffix -m (mentioned earlier in footnote 28) in that it is creating intransitive forms, rather that vice versa. This reinforces that -əm must be a 'middle' suffix as mentioned in footnote 28.

[31]-š(í)t- and -łt- can also occur in Class IV 'continuative' forms, that is, they can be detransitivized with -əm as described above.

f12a. yeskúpštəm   (IV-cont.)   'I am pushing something (indefinite) for him (definite)'

f12b. yeskúpłtəm   (IV-cont.)   'I am pushing it (definite) for him (definite)/I push his...'

[32]These forms suggest that the underlying 'instrumental' suffix for verbs is -mi- followed by a transitive suffix (and sometimes a 'middle' suffix followed by a transitive suffix).

Ka (Speck)

[33]The pronoun markers, as expected, follow the transitive suffixes in the order goal-actor. The Kalispel transitive actor pronoun forms are more regular than their goal counterparts. I list the goal forms according to Speck's descriptions. For comparison, I chart the transitive set alongside the intransitive actor paradigm.

	TRANSITIVE		INTRANS.
	Goal	Actor	Actor
1s	kʷu-	-(e)n	čin-
1p	qe?-,-ł(úl)-1-	-(e)t	qe?-
		qe?-	
2s	-s(í)-	-(e)xʷ	kʷ-
	-(u)m-	-(e)xʷ	
2p	-ł(úl)-m-	-(e)p	p-
3	-	-(e)s	-
	(-(é)m)		

In a sense, there are two variations of the transitive goal pronoun set. The 2s goal forms for the -nt- and -łt- constructions differ from the 2s goal forms for the -st- and -š(í)t- constructions, and this is like Colville. In the -nt- and -łt- constructions, -t- 'transitive' merges with the 2s goal suffix -s(í)- and is realized as -c(í)-, which receives stress in combinations with

weak roots. In the -st- and -š(í)t- constructions, the 2s goal suffix is -(ú)m-, which is stressed in combinations with weak roots unless it occurs with -š(í)t- (-š(í)t- then takes the stress).

Third person goals are unmarked, except when occurring with 1p actor or an indefintie actor. In those cases, third person goal is marked with the suffix -(é)m; and if the actor is 1p, the proclitic qeʔ '1p actor' is also used. An actor may be specified in a complement following third person indefinite actor forms and marked by the proclitic t 'agent'.

f13. kʷuɫ-n-t-m t i-sín-ceʔ 'It was done by my younger
                                brother'

The element -ɫ(úl)- replaces the transitive suffixes -nt-, -st-, and -ɫt- in constructions with 1p and 2p goals. The proclitic qeʔ and the suffix -l- mark 1p goal, and the 2p goal marker is -m-. The -š(í)- of -š(í)t- transitive suffixes is not replaced in the 1p and 2p goal forms. -š(í)- is followed by -ɫ- (never -ɫúl-), and then by the same goal and actor pronouns as the other transitive constructions.

[34]With stressed roots, -nt- forms with 1s and 3 actor markers are reduced. -nt-n ('trans.'-3 goal(unmarked)-1s actor) is reduced to -n, and -nt-s ('trans."-3 goal(unmarked)-3 actor) is reduced to -ís.

[35]This derivation raises again the question of whether -mín- and -mí- are two distinct suffixes.

[36]This is significant in that this suffix is very similar to Vogt's description of the Class IV 'continuative' aspect suffix. These two descriptions must be different interpretations of the same Kalispel suffix.

Cm

[37]Kinkade says "Cm does not often use either deictics or direct/oblique markers, as do the other Interior Salishan languages, so the primary guide to the goal reference of these suffixes (-x(í)t- and -ɫt-) is determined by word order. But I have not found speakers who either like to produce sentences such as these, or who are consistent in the order of complements."

[38]Kinkade says that Cm -xíx- may be cognate with Cr, Ka and Sp -sis-, but he is not sure about the possible cognate of -xáx-. Cm -xáx- is always stressed, but cognate forms in Cr would appear as -sís- and the form that should appear as cognate in Sp, if it existed, -sés-, does not exist.

[39]Kinkade says his data show no "simple transitives" of this

root, but that it is common with the 'causative' suffixes. The usual 'causative' suffix is -st(ú)-. He lists several other examples of forms with -s- that "look like causatives", but he says "some of them may turn out to be additional redirectives." It is not at all clear that they are ditransitive. Some of the constructions occur either with a suffix containing -s(t)- or with only the personal affixation, suggesting an underlying suffix that may be cognate with the basic -nt- suffix found in other Interior Salishan languages.

f14a.	qʷə́lxʷsən	'I hung it down for him to get a hold of'
f14b.	qʷə́lxʷən	'I hung it down'
f15a.	táxlxsən	'I got them (fish) up the riverbank'
f15b.	táxən	" "

Cr

[40]Except for the "neutral verbs" (?), she says "practically every [root] has the potentiality of appearing either intransitive or transitive."

[41]Reichard lists the pronouns in combination with the aspect suffixes, but segments so as to provide the basic set of transitive pronouns that accompanies the completive and customary (see also footnote 44) aspects. This set and the intransitive subject and possessive (which occurs with the continuative forms) set are listed below:

| | TRANSITIVE | | INTRANSITIVE | |
	Obj.	Subj.	Subj. (for cont.=Obj.)	Poss. (for cont.=Subj.)
1s	-ɫ(1)-	-n	čɪn-	hin-/his-
1p	-tɫl-,(-šɅš-)	-mɅt	č-	-ɫt
2s	-ɪ-	-xʷ	kʷu-	in-/is-
2p	-tulm-	-p	kʷup-	-mp
3s	-t-	-s	-	-s
3p	-	-s-ɪlš	(-ɪlš)	-s-ɪlš

Reichard glosses -t- '3s', but it is more likely to be -t- 'transitive'. If her analysis of second person subject-1p object forms (kʷu-/kʷup-....-šɅš-) is correct, then Coeur d'Alene has restructured the paradigm away from the Interior Salish norm.

[42]Reichard lists eight roots that do not take affixation with the transitivizing element -ən, and accept the pronominal morphemes immediately after the stem. They are: gʷič 'see'; Ʉm 'share';

sᴚxʷ 'carry on back'; suxʷ 'know'; kʷin 'take hold of'; čiⱡ 'give'; qʷiⁱ 'starve'; and gʷunit 'call'.

[43]I retranscribed Reichard's examples with the aid of Clarence Sloat's (1968) "A Skeleton Key to Reichard's Coeur d'Alene Transcriptions." He notes that the vowel ᴚ can also be represented as ɛ or æ .

[44]The pronoun set that accompanies the customary forms is basically the same as that of the completive forms. There are, however, "certain contractions" operating on the aspect suffix which slightly differentiate the completive and customary constructions. I list the forms that have "contractions" or differ somehow:

(Obj.-Subj.)	Completive	Customary
3s - 1s	-n	-s-n
3s - 1p	-t-mᴚt	-stm-ᴚ-t
3s - 2s	-t-xʷ	-st-xʷ
3s - 2p	-t-p	-s-t-p
3s - 3s	-c	-s-t-us
2p - 1s	-tulm-n	-s-tulm-n
2p - 1p	-tulm-ɪt	-s-tulm-ɪt
2p - 3s	-tulm-ɪs	-s-tulm-ɪs
1p - 3s	-tᴚl-ɪs	-s-tᴚl-ɪs

[45]The loss (contraction?) of the aspect suffixes -c- and -stm- "corresponds exactly to the case of their loss in the active," i.e., -c- and -tm- are lost before -t- (if they actually were originally there). Reichard lists the "passive endings" as:

	Completive	Customary
1s	-c-ᴚl-ᴚm	-stm-ᴚl-ᴚm
1p	-tᴚl-it	-s-tᴚl-ɪt
2s	-c-ɪ-t	-stm-ɪt
2p	-tulm-ɪt	-s-tulm-ɪt
3s	-t-əm	-s-təm
3p	-t-əm-ɪlš	-s-təm-ɪlš

She suggests that the -t- between the aspect suffix and the pronouns "seems to be a sign of the passive for these two aspects," but it is probably just the transitive marker.

[46]She lists the most common as: ᴚčɪn 'do with'; ᴚkʷn 'tell'; qʷa?qʷᴚ?l 'speak'; and gʷᴚy 'finish'. As for morphophonemics, she says that the final consonant of the root (n,t,y,l) is lost or assimilated before -s- of the customary ending. However, she doesn't explain the disappearance of the -m- of -stm-.

f16a.	ᴚkʷn	'tell'
f16b.	ᴚkʷóstus	'He told him'
f16c.	ᴚc-əkʷé-stus	'He cust. says to him'
f17a.	aҳil	'do'
f17b.	ᴚҳístus	'He did thus to him'
f17c.	ᴚc-əҳístus	'He cust. does thus to him'

[47]The presence of the possessive pronouns and the nominalizing s- in the compound prefix with these continuative forms contributes to Reichard's label of "verbal noun".

[48]If -ⱡ- 'dative' or any other suffix ending in -ⱡ- precedes -əm, then the continuative suffix occurs as -təm. This form compares with the third person passive constructions of the other two aspects.

f18a.	níč-ən-təm	'He has been cut' (passive)
f18b.	ᴚ-níč-stəm	'He cust. has been cut' (passive)
f18c.	hi?-níč-əm	'I cont. am cutting' (active)
f18d.	i-níč-əm	'He cont. is being cut' (passive)
f18e.	kʷi?-c-k̓ʷóĺ-ⱡ-təm	'I cont. am making it for thee'

The examples show that -əm can follow any transitive stem, as well as an intransitive one. But the examples also show that pronominal reference is with the intransitive set. For a discussion of the analogous cognate forms in Colville, cf. Mattina's (1980) "Imperative Formations in Colville-Okanagan and in the Other Interior Languages " (MS), especially section 1.3.2.

[49]ᴚčɪn 'do with' means 'scold' in the customary aspect.

[50]Although glossed by Reichard, 'book, paper, writing', this looks like a first person transitive.

REFERENCES

Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A Grammar of Spokan: A Salish Language
     of Eastern Washington. University of Hawaii Working
     Papers in Linguistics 4:4.

------   1980. "Two-goal Transitive Stems in Spokane." IJAL 46:1,
          pp21-26. (revised edition of paper presented at the
          11th ICSL, Seattle, 1976.)

Hébert, Yvonne M. 1979. "A Note on Aspect in (Nicola Lake) Oka-
          nagan." Paper presented at the 14th ICSL.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1980. "Columbian Salish -xi, -ł, tuł." IJAL
          46:1, pp33-36. (revised edition of paper presented at
          the 11th ICSL, 1976.)

Kuipers, Aert H. 1970. "Shuswap Transitive Verbs." Paper pre-
          sented at the 5th ICSL, Spokane.

Mattina, Anthony. 1973. Colville Grammatical Structure. Univer-
          sity of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5:3.

------   1978. "The Colville Transitive System." Paper presen-
          ted at the 13th ICSL.

------   1980. "Imperative Formations in Colville-Okanagan and
          in Other Interior Lnaguages." (MS-to be presented at the
          15th ICSL, Vancouver)

Reichard, Gladys A. 1938. "Coeur d'Alene," in Handbook of Ameri-
          can Indian Languages, Part 3, ed. by Franz Boas, pp517-
          707. Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York: J.J. Augustin Inc.

Sloat, Clarence. 1968. "A Skeleton Key to Reichard's Coeur d'A-
          lene Transcriptions." Anthropological Linguistics, 10:5,
          pp8-11.

Speck, Brenda J. 1980. An Edition of Father Post's Kalispel
          Grammar. University of Montana Occasional Papers in
          Linguistics, #1.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1973. "Thompson Transitive Formations."
          Paper presented at the 8th ICSL.

------   1979a. "The Control System: A Major Category in the
          Grammar of Salishan Languages."in The Victoria Confer-
          on Northwestern Languages, ed. by Barbara S. Efrat,
          British Columbia Provincial Museum, Heritage Record
          No. 4, pp154-176.

------   1979b. "Salishan and the Northwest," in The Languages of
          Native America, ed. by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun.
          University of Texas Press.

------   and Thompson, M. Terry. 1980. "Thompson Salish -xi."
          IJAL 46:1, pp27-32. (revised edition of paper presented
          at the 11th ICSL, 1976.)

Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel Language. Det Norske Videnskaps-
          Akademi, Oslo.