Introduction

The purpose of this paper 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.

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

- trans. -nt-
- ditrans. -xt-

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

1. Shuswap (Sh). Kuipers (1970) classifies Shuswap transitive verbs by the transitivizing suffix they normally take.

Class A verbs take -t-; Class B verbs take -nt(t)-; and Class C verbs take -st-. He also calls three other transitivizers "complex" and classifies the resulting classes as Class D: -xt(t)-; Class E: -m(t)n(t)-; and Class F: -mwéh(t)-.

1.1. Sh Simple Transitives. Of the transitivizers, Kuipers refers to two as "mere transitivizers" (-t- and -nt-). 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 wíwik-t-n, 2-3 wíik-t-x)
AII kox 'give to' ( -3 kox-tét-n, 2-3 kox-t-éx)
AII mt 'feed' ( -3 mtét-n, 2-3 mt-éx)  

Class A verbs (verbs that take -nt-) are "by far the most common 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 intransitive verb can be transitivized by the addition of -st-, as in the following examples:

1a. wí? 'be ready'  
1b. wí?-st- CI 'finish, tr.'
2a. raqw' 'to gallop'  
2b. raqw'-st- CI 'cause to gallop'
3a. qam 'take the breast'  
3b. qm-st- CI 'nurse (a child)'
4a. qíl-ql-t 'nice'  
4b. qa-ql-st- CI '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. k'ul BI 'make'
6b. c-k'ul-st- CI "
7a. qy-At BII 'write'
7b. c-qy-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-, -nt-, and -st-. It seems that Class A (-t-) is a morphologically conditioned subclass of Class B (-nt-). Only three verbs accept -t-, while most verbs accept -nt-. Other verbs accept -st-. We do not know if all verbs can take either -nt- or -st-, or if instead there are three classes of verbs, i.e.

(1.) those that can take only -nt-  
(2.) " " " " -st-  
(3.) " " " " either -nt- or -st-

1.2. Sh Complex Transitives. Of the three "complex transitivizers", -x(j)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(j)t- replaces either of the simple transitivizers -nt- and -st-.

8a. x'íd BI 'show'
identifies these roots as "control roots" in which the -n- 'control' element is not needed since the root already contains the notion of 'control'.

12a. //nës-t-ey-ep//------- nës-t-i-p
'y you people took us, got us there'

12b. //wik-t-ex"//------- wik-t-x' 'you saw him'
(compare Sh. Al -- wik-t-x)

13a. À-t-ës 'she gave him (something)'

13b. 'upi-t-p 'you people ate it'

-(n)t- is very productive. Thompson says that all stems expanded 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" corresponding to simple transitive forms in -t- that would be 'control'.

14a. pok"-t-ës 'she dumped or poured them out (e.g., berries out of her basket)'

14b. pok"-s-t-ës 'she spilled them' or 'she managed to get them dumped out'

The difference between -(n)t- and -s-t- is that -(n)t- implies 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:

8b. x'ët-xt- DI 'show (something) to'
9a. tn-t- BII 'put, place'
9b. tn-xit- DII 'put down for'
10a. wi?-st- CI 'finish'
10b. wi?-xt- DI 'finish (something) for'

-m(ì)n(t)- and -mëh(t)- are the other two "complex transitivizers". -m(ì)n(t)- refers to an object which is affected "indirectly, superficially, or malefactively by the action" expressed in the verb, and -mëh(t)- means "approximately 'manage to', 'be able to', or 'act involuntarily'."

2. Thompson (Th). Laurence Thompson (1973,1979,1980) identifies -t- 'transitive' as the basic Thompson transitivizer. -t- follows the stems with or without one of several possible intervening elements: -n- 'control'; -s- 'causative'; -xi- 'indirective'; -min- 'relational'; and -nweh- 'emphatic limited control'.

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

11a. //xâc(-n-)-t-ëp//------- xâc(-e)-t-ëp
'y you people bet with him'

11b. //xâc-n-t-wax"//------- xâc-e-t-wax"'
'they bet with each other'

Some strong roots always take -t- (and not -n-t-) - Thompson
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." -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. ṣož 'it got dark (non-control)'  
15b. ṣož-min-t-i-s 'it got dark on us'  
16a. mwik 'progress on four or more legs (control?)'  
16b. //mwik-n-t-es/------- mwik'es 'he crawls over it'  
(e.g., insect on a stone)  
16c. //mwik-min-t-sem-es/ mwik'ncams 'he runs up to me'  
(e.g., dog)

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

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 -t₁₆ (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. k'ìnt 'Take it!
19b. *k'ìst
20a. wik-n-n sì cítx'-tät 'I saw our house
20b. *wikstn
20c. *ts-wikstn

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 ungrammaticality 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 event" also uses the "perfective suffix" -nt-.

21a. k'ilus-s ñ sqilx" ñ spíčn 'The man coiled the rope
21b. k'ilus-n-tät ñ spíčn ñit sqilx" 'The rope was coiled by the man'

Hébert's aspect argument 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-x'k-ì-s-tin 'I'm actually whittling'
22b. *ts-x'k-m-tín '*I'm actually whittled'
23a. ts-čka-s-tín ñ sì-skilaw 'I'm counting my money'
23b. *ts-čka-n-tín ñ sì-skilaw '*I'm actually counted my money'

and predicates which accept either -nt- or -st- may not accept the prefix ks- 'unrealized action'.

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

24a. q'že-i-t-n 'I fill it up for/on anybody'
24b. q'že-x-t-n 'I fill it up for him'

but does not discuss their differences in function or distribution.

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. q'nte-nt-in 'I write something'
26a. k'ul-nte-x'w '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 suffix. First person singular and plural goal (1sp obj.) is marked by proclitics, and second person singular and plural goals (2sp obj.) by suffixes. Schematically,
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. ḥy'-ost-in
   'I write it (for myself)'

26b. ḳw'-ost-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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cv -nt- paradigm</th>
<th>Subj. 1s</th>
<th>2sp</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>Obj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-an</td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-ax</td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-ax</td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-ax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cv -st- paradigm</th>
<th>Subj. 1s</th>
<th>2sp</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>Obj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-an</td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-ax</td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-ax</td>
<td>-st-(ū)m-ax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 re-
cipient), and a third person secondary goal (the direct object)."
These two constructions are accomplished with -lt- and -x(i)t-.

27a. x'lec-wnt-s-on 'I endow you'
27b. x'lec-xlt-s-on 'I endow you with something,
       I give you something'
27c. x'lec-xlxt-s-on " "

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

Cv -lt- paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub.</th>
<th>1sp</th>
<th>2sp</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>Obj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-lt-s-(i)n</td>
<td>-lt-(i)m-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>k prominence -lt-(i)x'</td>
<td>-lt-(i)x'-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>k prominence -lt-(i)s</td>
<td>-lt-(i)s-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-lt-s-(i)t</td>
<td>-lt-(i)m-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>k prominence -lt-(i)p</td>
<td>-lt-(i)p-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>k prominence -lt-(i)s-olx</td>
<td>-lt-(i)s-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1df</td>
<td>-lt-(i)m-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cv -x(i)t- paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub.</th>
<th>1sp</th>
<th>2sp</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>Obj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-x(i)t-m-on</td>
<td>-x(i)t-on</td>
<td>-x(i)i-n-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>k prominence -x(i)t-x'</td>
<td>-x(i)t-x'-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>k prominence -x(i)t-s</td>
<td>-x(i)t-s-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-x(i)t-om-t</td>
<td>-x(i)t-om-t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>k prominence -x(i)t-p</td>
<td>-x(i)t-p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>k prominence -x(i)t-s-olx</td>
<td>-x(i)t-s-olx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1df</td>
<td>-x(i)t-om-t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mattina describes the difference between -lt- and -x(i)t-
ditransitives as one of focus. He says "-lt- ditransitives mean
'X does Y for Z', and -x(i)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 comple­
ment and follows the predicate. -x(i)t- ditransitives require
that the secondary goal complement be marked by the proclitic t,
but -lt- ditransitives never do.

28a. x'lec-xlxt-s-on 'You give him (what will be) his money'
28b. x'lec-xlxt-x' s-qliw 'You give him some money'

Besides the secondary goal complement expansions of ditran­
sitives, 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-referential with the subject pronoun, and must be marked by the proclitic * 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(l)" to form transitive stems which in turn attach the proper transitive suffixes. -m(l) occurs with either -nt- or -st-. according to sense, but the transitivized -m(l)- stems never participate in ditransitive (-~t- and -x(l)t-) constructions.

Mattina mentions another (di)transitive stem formation with -nū-. These stems "carry the implication that the activity referred to is accomplished either accidentally or after a struggle." -nū- 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. k'oon-nū-n 'I managed to get it'
29b. ƛ₁-ƛ₁-nū-nt-s 'She'll kill you'
29c. łł₁-p-ń̓-ń̓-nt-łm 'We can stop her'
29d. lut iʔ t s-qllx' k₄m Łc-k'oon-nū-st-s 'Nobody can catch me'
29e. k'oon-nū-st-on 'I managed to take it from her'

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

4. Spokane (Sp) / Kalispel (Ka) / Flathead. Spokane, Kalispel and Flathead are so closely related that they can be considered 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 Flathead tends to shorten words, deleting that which follows the accented vowel.

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

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-, -t-, -x(l)t-, 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 -t- and -x(l)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, ƛ₄ʔ, usually precedes them both. The particle Ł 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. 4u? t sqéltc' u tammatex 4u? yamyxcin 4u? t ckx*ian
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 information is secondary and specially marked" with an oblique marker, t.

4.1.2. Sp Complex Transitives. He calls -s(i)- 'benefactive/substitutive' and -t- 'relative'. -s(i)t- stems indicate that the actor of a transitive paradigm is substituting for someone, 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. x*scítstun 4u? Agnes 4u? t yamyxc' 4u? t sqéltc'
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. x*fiúston 4u? Albert 4u? t sqéltc'
Pred. DG IG
'I ate some meat for (in place of) Albert'

Since sqéltc' '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.

-4t- stems also indicate two goals, but the actor doesn't substitute for someone, or necessarily do anything beneficial for someone. The someone involved in -4t- constructions is always a person and is indirectly involved. The indirect goal (IG) in -4t- constructions is marked with yamyxc' 'relative to/by/for' or x'*i 'to'.

31b. x*fiúston 4u? yamyxc' 4u? x'*i Agnes 'I made a basket for Agnes'
31c. x*fiúston 4u? yamyxc' 4u? x'*i Agnes 'I gave a basket to Agnes'

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

Carlson notes that -4t- constructions are often followed by a possessive construction as direct goal.

32b. x*fiúston 4u? Albert sqéltc'
Pred. DG
'I ate Albert's meat'
32c. x*fiúston 4u? Albert x*yicis
Pred. DG
'I lost Albert's dog'

In 32b., Albert is the (underlying) direct goal although he appears in a possessive construction that serves as the direct goal. Carlson says the predicate alone means something like 'I ate something of his', and Albert is indirectly involved by acting as possessor (compare 32a.). Sentences like 32c. can only occur with -4t- constructions because -s(i)t- stems "never describe an acti-
vity detrimental to the direct goal." Conversely, -st- stems are not limited in this way and can "describe non-beneficial activity applying to the indirect goal." He says a -st- construction with a verb like in 32c. (**kos'ton) would not be acceptable to a native speaker because it "sounds like you'd be losing something for someone on purpose."

Some suffixes may follow the base to form a secondary stem. One of them is the suffix -nū- '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." -nū- only occurs with transitive roots and always takes -nt- (-nūnt-), 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 achieved."

33a. šolamúntxw 'You got it chopped'
33b. kšolamúntxw 'You managed to do it'
34a. hecamístén 'I know it'
34b. mišamúntxw 'You succeeded in knowing, found out'

Two other suffixes that may seem alike, but are distinct elements are -mín- 'instrumental' and -mi- 'transitive derivational'. Both are variable-stress suffixes. -mín- '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. šolámín 'It's an axe'

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. kšu čy'νwššovamúntxw 'You laugh at me'
36b. čamamístén 'I tighten it'

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

Carlson lists a suffix -šǐx-\(^{24}\) 'substitutive' that can be used in either intransitive or transitive constructions. These forms in -šǐx- 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 -šǐx- 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\textsuperscript{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 "aspectsual 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\textsuperscript{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,"\textsuperscript{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."

\textsuperscript{25}The Class IV 'continuative' suffix -\textsuperscript{am} occurs also with Class III verbs as the 'completive' suffix, and sometimes co-occurs with the Class III 'continuative' suffix -i.\textsuperscript{28} Class III verbs and Class IV 'continuative' forms in -\textsuperscript{am} 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.

Class II\textsuperscript{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,"\textsuperscript{27} and also some verbs which "would be considered transitive." 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."

\textsuperscript{26}Although this is not explicitly mentioned, the 'completive' suffix -\textsuperscript{on}(t) has morphophonemically been deleted from the root-
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 -on(t) 'completive' forms (see footnote 25).

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

42a. yeskulan (cont.) 'I am doing it' (intrans.)
42b. kulan (comp.) 'I do it' (simple transitive)
42c. eskulstan (rslt.) 'I do it' (-st- transitive)

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

4.2.2. Ka Complex Transitives. Vogt lists 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 -s(i)t-, -t-, and -s(is)-.

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

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

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

Vogt lists -st-on as the suffix of a "subclass" of 'completive' forms, although they are inflected like the 'resultative' forms. All the examples given have a Is subject, and this means that this is the suffix -st- followed by the Is subject pronoun affix, -an. 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."

40a. yeskūlustom (cont.), kūlstan 'I send him'
40b. yespūlustom (cont.), pūlstan 'I kill him'
40c. yesq'olq'gīlston (cont.), q'olq'gīlston 'I talk with him'

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

41a. wîcston/wicston 'I see him'
41b. wîctsw 'You see him'
41c. qëmton 'I feed him'

They take the same pronoun affixes as -st-on and they also carry over into the 'continuative'. Examples 41a. and 41c. have a Is subject, so the -an must be the pronoun marker. Since these forms with -tān are inflected (with pronouns) the same as the -st-on forms, -tān seems to be but a variant of -st-on.
Vogt lists two -mln- 'instrumental' suffixes. The first -mln­ (unstressed -man-) "forms instrumental nouns." The second can occur in transitive (or intransitive 'middle') constructions, and is "undoubtedly related to the nominal suffix -mín-." He gives forms with -mín- followed by Class IV aspect and/or 'relative' form suffixes as follows: -mín- 'continuative'; -mín (2s subj. mátx", 3s subj. -mís) 'completive'; and 'relative' forms -mišτ ymin and -mištok. 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: -nún- 'continuative'; -nún (2s subj. mátx", 3s subj. -nýis) 'completive'; and a 'relative' form, -núšṭom.

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:
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-?eys-n (n-?eys-n-t-n) 'I pay for it'
49b. es-n-?eys-s-t-n 'I pay for it'
49c. n-?ey-4-t-n 'I pay for his'
49d. n-?ey-5-t-n 'I pay him his, help him paying'

4.3.2. Ka Complex Transitives. Speck says forms with -4t- 'relational' "seem to refer to someone doing something to someone" and forms with -5([t])t- 'benefactive' seem to refer "to doing something for someone."

50a. naqW-m-4-t-5n 'I stole this from him'
50b. naqW-s-t-5n '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 examples, however, only show -nú- occurring with -nt- 'simple transitive'.

51a. ní$hí-mú-n (ní$hí-mú-n-t-en) "I succeed in cutting it"
51b. sá$hí-mú-n (sá$hí-mú-n-t-en) "I succeed in splitting it"

Speck adds that "middle and intransitive (bases with intransitive derivational suffixes) can be 'transitivized' by attaching the transitive suffixes (-nt-, -st-, -4t-, -5([t])t-) and the transitive person referents."

52a. n-?eý-cin-m-n-t-x 'You receive the body of J.C.'
52b. ?eý-cst-m-s-t-m-n 'I avenged you'
52c. no$qW-noqW-m-4-t-s sin-ce? 'He had his brother's wife'

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

52a. kWu n-?eý-cin-m-n-t-x 'I think the same as you do'
52b. kWu-m-ut-m-s-t-n 'I can make that'

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

52a. au?-min-n (au?-min-n-t-en) 'I use that to lance'
52b. au?-mín-m-n 'I use that to lance'
52c. au?-mín-m-t-t '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‘ú- 'reciprocal', -cú- 'reflexive', and -(é)m 'indefinite intransitive'. Forms with the last one, -(é)m, add personal reference by means of the possessive intransitive pronouns.

Finally, Speck discusses stems with -žiš-, 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 -žiš- 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(f)- 'indirective', -t-, and -tu-. He labels this class as 'redirectives'. He says -x(f)- '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(f)-t- and -t-t- are confused due to lack of overt goal reference markers in the complement. He adds that Columbian seems to be parallel, "at least superficially," to the distinction described by Carlson (1980) for the Spokane ditransitive suffixes.

54a. tawxts 'He bought it for him'

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

55a. qi?xítm 'I wrote to him'
55b. qi?xíta? 'Urîte it for him!'

56a. nk?makáxts skóná?sts 'I took a club away from him'
56b. k'wa'n 'I took it away from him'
57a. wak'xu'n 'I hid it from him'
57b. wak'xu'n 'I hid it for him'
57c. wak'xu'tis 'He hid it from us (and wouldn't give it up)
57d. wak'xu'tis 'He hid it for us'

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

58a. wi'xímíx 'finish something for someone else'
58b. wi'xímáx 'finish something'
58c. wi'sítmán 'I finished it'
59a. xosmxíx 'He lost something for/of someone'
59b. xosmxáx 'He lost something belonging to someone else'
59c. xóssk 'I lost it'
60a. čökáx 'count for someone'
60b. čökáít 'I counted for him'
60c. čökán 'I counted them for him'
60d. čókán 'I counted them'
He says -xix- includes the 'indirective', but the source or breakdown 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 dem transitivizer, making intransitive what would otherwise be transitive."

61a. k'axÁxÁx 'I took it away (from someone)'
61b. xasíx 'I lost it for them (not deliberately)'
61c. k'axÁxÁx 'I showed it'

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

61. Cr Simple Transitives. Most verbs require the addition of the "transitivizing element", -an, before the completive aspectual suffix (i.e., -an-c-). This corresponds to -nt- of the other Interior Salishan languages. The transitivizer -an- is likewise required before -cut- (-cat-) 'reflexive' and -t'mi- (-t'ms-) 'reciprocal'.

62a. t'ap-an-c-t's 'thou shottest me'
62b. t'a-t'ap-on-c-t's 'each of you took a shot at me'

In contrast, -an is never found in the customary forms;
62c. a-t'ap-san 'I cust. shoot it'
62d. a-t'a-t'ap-stm-út 'We cust. shoot at him'

The customary transitive forms are marked by the suffix -stm-, but the prefix Mc- (or variant N-a-) 'customary' must co-occur.

62a. k'u-t'ap-t's 'thou shottest us'
62b. k'u-t'ap-t's 'you shot us'
62c. Mc-g'ic-t's 'he cust. sees me'
62d. Mc-g'ic-stm-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. 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."

63a. g'ic-t's 'I saw you'
63b. g'ic-t 'He saw him'
63c. Mc-g'ic-stm-t 'He cust. sees me'
63d. Mc-g'ic-stm-t 'We cust. see thee'
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Reichard says "generally speaking, [roots] ending in t, n, and l which are susceptible to transitivization seem to be irregular" in that they take -stm- (instead of the expected -an-c-) for the completive forms. These 'completive' -stm- forms differ from the customary forms in that they don't have the prefix Mc- 'customary'. She adds that the number of these roots is small, and not all roots with these consonants (t,n,l) as finals behave this way. This, of course, contradicts the hypothesis that the distribution of -an-c- (-nt-) versus -st(m)- (without Mc-) is phonologically motivated. In fact, there are two mutually exclusive classes of roots, the first of which occurs with -an-c- in the completive, and the second of which occurs with -st(m)- (and without Mc-) 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-
263

67a. k'um (k'in-4-c) 'He did with it for her'
67b. k'-k'in-4icon 'I cust. scold him as a favor to thee'49

Another suffix, -sīs- (-sīn-,-sī-) '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. t-šūs-um-šūs-s 'He is using something carefully'
68b. mūm'-šūs-šom-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., k'um(p)....šūs), and has no correspondence to the other Cr transitive pronouns. The suffix -šūs- can function as an ordinary pronoun, but it can also contain the idea expressed by -šit- 'as a favor to'.

69a. k'um-k'in-šūs 'Thou gavest it to us/thou gavest (did with) it as a favor to us'
69b. k'um-1u'-šūs 'Thou stabbest us'
69c. k'um-1u'-šūs " "

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

70a. š-it-š-mīn-on 'I succeeded in beating him'
70b. qāy-mīn-on 'I wrote it'50

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Transitive Suffix</th>
<th>Ditransitive Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-nt-</td>
<td>-st-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, several other (di)transitive suffixes frequently occur: -mū(nt)-, -mī-/mī-, -xī-, and -tūt-. 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 occurrence of the two suffixes (-nt- and -st-). -nt- usually proves to
### INTERIOR SALISHAN (DI)TRANSITIVE AFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sh</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>Ka*</th>
<th>Ka**</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Cr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-nt(t)</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>-nt(?)</td>
<td>-nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/s*, s-t</td>
<td>c/s*, s-t</td>
<td>ts-, s-t</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>es-, st</td>
<td>st, (s*)</td>
<td>st(u)</td>
<td>s-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
<td>-x(i)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
<td>-xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
<td>-m(1)n(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t)ukt</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
<td>-tuk-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Veget (1940)  
**Speck (1980)
"serves both ranges of meaning." Is -it- missing from Sh completely? The four (five?) other suffixes that are described in these systems (-nú(nt)-, -min/-mi-, -xix-, and -tuit-) 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 -tuit-? These two (-xix- and -tuit-) are the least understood of the transitivizing suffixes. -xix- seems to be able to occur both as a transitivizing suffix (usually referring to some sort of indefinite object) or as an intransitive one, and -tuit- 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

1This paper evolved out of suggestions given to me in a seminar 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 misconceptions, vagueness, or other errors, however, is my own.

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


Sh

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 *koxes*. The Shuswap personal affixes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>INTRANS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-cm/-c1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p (incl.)</td>
<td>-(e)1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-(e)1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-(u)lm-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *<c1>- 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.-ls subj. and ls obj.-2/3 subj.) are redup-
Base-stressed verbs have reduplicated bases and suffix-stressed ones have reduplicated suffixes.

- **pul-st-** 'kill'
- **pu-pl-st-n** 'I kill him'
- **qm-st-** 'nurse'
- **qm-st-o-st-n** 'I nurse him'

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.

The 'customary' prefix is s- before t, l, c; and is c- elsewhere.

'take the breast' can also be transitivized as Class E

- **qm-(m)ln-** 'suck, tr.'

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 -fiks [also used in the possessive system] that provides a specific third person plural). The basic Thompson personal pronominal elements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>INTRANS. INDEPENDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s -c(e)m/-c(ê)y-</td>
<td>-c(e)m(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lp -(ê)y-</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s -(ê)x*</td>
<td>-(ê)p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p -(ê)m*</td>
<td>-(ê)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 <strong>-c(ê)y</strong> before a labial, -c(ê)m- elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 -(ê)m has been borrowed from another paradigm."

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.

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.

- **cek-n-t-es/-cêk-e-s** 'she cooled it off'
- **cek-n-t-ep/-cêk-e-t-p** 'you people cooled it off'
- **solk-n-t-es/-solk-e-t-ës** 'she turned it around'

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

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'.

- **xWesft** 'he walked'
- **xWesft-s-t-x W** 'you took him for a walk, helped him walk'

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

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, time-consuming, etc." Thompson also mentions its construction with the prefix ?es- '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."

Thompson says an 'understood' inanimate object for simple transitives can be specified and introduced by the particle g.
while with -xi-t- transitives, e introduces a person, and an inanimate object must be otherwise marked.

f5a. máles e szelt 'he broke a plate'
f5b. maxcans to szelt 'he broke my plate'

Ok

15. Hebert proposes that the opposition between -nt- and -st- reflects a distinction between perfective and imperfective aspects. She calls this theory the Aspect Hypothesis and claims it does not link the semantic features of -nt- and -st- to transitivity. She bases her hypothesis on "native speaker intuitions" and the "syntax of aspect, i.e., the distribution of certain prefixes, adverbials, and the interaction with the passive and limited control constructions."

Hebert's definitions of perfective and imperfective come from Bernard Comrie (1976). She gives (1) the characteristic semantic features of the two aspeclual 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'/ complete'/ 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'/ punctual'/ continuous'/ non-complete'/ habitual'
- (2) "pays essential attention to the internal structure of the situation" (internal view)

16. Hebert says that, according to her understanding of Mattina's (1973, 1978) work on Colville (di)transitivity, the -t- morpheme 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 intransitive 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. Hebert gives a further argument in support of her Aspect Hypothesis: the adverbial pūti? 'still' can occur in constructions with -st-, but not with -nt-.

f6a. pūti? ts-x4'k-s-tín 'I'm still whittling (and have been for a long time)'
f6b. *pūti? x4'k-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 (k8n, k8, Ñ, k8u, p) and the possessive affixes (i(n)-, a(n)-, -t8m, -tp) on the other. Consequently, the unrealized aspect counterparts of the transitives accept only intransitive inflection and require the middle suffix -m." Hebert does note that these prefixes, ts- and ks-, may occur in the "medio-passive [middle] construction."

f7a. kn ts-x4'kām 'I'm actually whittling'
f7b. Ñi-ks-x4'kām 'I'm gonna whittle'

19. Mattina notes that the Colville -st- transitives "nearly always" occur with the prefix c- 'actual', but he does not classify the structure 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 subject (i)f, or be changed to the indefinite third person (-l)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."

The oldest one gave it to him'

The man said to her: ...'

Wolf feeds them'

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

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

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-.

Carlson (1972) states that -si5- reduces to -si- or -s- before the control suffix -t- 'transitive', but in later works he treats -s(i)- as different suffix than -si5-.

Vogt calls the Kalskpel 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' (-on(t)-) forms. I include the independent (intrans.) subject markers for comparison and because they occur with Class IV verb forms.

In some cases, the vowels a 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.

Carlson (1972) states that -si5- reduces to -si- or -s- before the control suffix -t- 'transitive', but in later works he treats -s(i)- as different suffix than -si5-.

Ka (Vogt)

Vogt calls the Kalskpel 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' (-on(t)-) forms. I include the independent (intrans.) subject markers for comparison and because they occur with Class IV verb forms.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>INTRANS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s k'u-</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p qe?-</td>
<td>-i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s -si-</td>
<td>-en/-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s -es</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p (Root1</td>
<td>(Root2))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 -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-.

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

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.

Carlson (1972) states that -si5- reduces to -si- or -s- before the control suffix -t- 'transitive', but in later works he treats -s(i)- as different suffix than -si5-.

Ka (Vogt)

Vogt calls the Kalskpel 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' (-on(t)-) forms. I include the independent (intrans.) subject markers for comparison and because they occur with Class IV verb forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT (trans.)</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT (trans.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Obj.)</td>
<td>(Subj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'subject-patient'</td>
<td>'subject-patient'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'possessor-agent'</td>
<td>'possessor-agent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is ku-    -an (-un, -in, -em, -un)</td>
<td>zl(n)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lp qe?- -i(ů)juL -i(t)</td>
<td>qe?-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s - c- -t(e)x</td>
<td>k'w-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s - n- -t</td>
<td>p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p - z(ů)juLan -t(e)p</td>
<td>-p-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the vowels a 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.

Carlson (1972) states that -si5- reduces to -si- or -s- before the control suffix -t- 'transitive', but in later works he treats -s(i)- as different suffix than -si5-.

Ka (Vogt)

Vogt calls the Kalskpel 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' (-on(t)-) forms. I include the independent (intrans.) subject markers for comparison and because they occur with Class IV verb forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT (trans.)</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT (trans.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Obj.)</td>
<td>(Subj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'subject-patient'</td>
<td>'subject-patient'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'possessor-agent'</td>
<td>'possessor-agent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is ku-    -an (-un, -in, -em, -un)</td>
<td>zl(n)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lp qe?- -i(ů)juL -i(t)</td>
<td>qe?-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s - c- -t(e)x</td>
<td>k'w-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s - n- -t</td>
<td>p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p - z(ů)juLan -t(e)p</td>
<td>-p-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the vowels a 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.

Carlson (1972) states that -si5- reduces to -si- or -s- before the control suffix -t- 'transitive', but in later works he treats -s(i)- as different suffix than -si5-.

Ka (Vogt)
digm for complex dependent forms of possessive and personal affixes for nouns. There is also the addition of the affix (yes- 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor-Agent (Obj.)</th>
<th>Subject-Patient (Obj.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>3p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1s** ku?as-,-um qe?es-,-um yes-,-um
ek?es-,-um pes-,-um qe?es-,-um

**2s** ku?as-,-um qe?es-,-bol
ku?es-,-um qe?es-,-bol

**3s** ku?as-,-um qe?es-,-bol
ku?es-,-um qe?es-,-bol
k?es-,-um pes-,-ums es-,-ums

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 -am (-om?) 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, -am, might indicate "that the causative suffix -am is its unstressed form." It isn't clear to me whether Vogt identifies the Class IV 'continuative' suffix -am 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 -am 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' -am 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" -ent- in most of the suffix-stressed forms. The vowel of a stressed suffix is affected by predictable morphophonemic rules and can be u, ə, or a. (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 ə. (3) When the final consonant is a non-labialized postpalatal or h, the suffix vowel is i.

30 The suffix -am here is acting opposite to the suffix -um (mentioned earlier in footnote 28) in that it is creating intransitive forms, rather than vice versa. This reinforces that -am must be a 'middle' suffix as mentioned in footnote 26.

31 The suffix -nt- and -kt- can also occur in Class IV 'continuative' forms, that is, they can be detransitivized with -am as described above.

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

### Transitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>k?u-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>qe?-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-s(f)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-f(u)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intrans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a sense, there are two variations of the transitive goal pronoun set. The 2s goal forms for the -nt- and -f(t)- constructions differ from the 2s goal forms for the -st- and -s(f)t- constructions, and this is like Colville. In the -st- and -f(t)- constructions, -st- 'transitive' merges with the 2s goal suffix -s(f) and is realized as -c(f), which receives stress in combinations with
weak roots. In the -st- and -x(i)t- constructions, the 2s goal suffix is -(u)m-, which is stressed in combinations with weak roots unless it occurs with -(s)(t)-, then the stress is placed on 3s.

Third person goals are unmarked, except when occurring with -nt- or -nt-n. In those cases, the third person goal is marked with the suffix -(e)m; and if the actor is Ip, the proclitic -qe? 'lp 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. kWu-n-t-m i-sin-ce? 'It was done by my younger brother'.

The element -(u)m- replaces the transitive suffixes -nt-, -st-, and -(s)(t-) in constructions with lp and 2p goals. The proclitic -qe?, and the suffix -(e)m mark lp goal, and the 2p goal marker is -(nt) or -(st). The -(s)(t)-transitive suffixes is not replaced in the lp and 2p goal forms. -(s)(t)- is followed by -tm- (never -tlu-), and then by the same goal and actor pronouns as the other transitive constructions.

34. With stressed roots, -(s)(t)-forms with Is and 3 actor markers are reduced. -(nt)-('trans.'-3 goal(unmarked)-Is) actor) is reduced to -st-, and -(st)-('trans.'-3 goal(unmarked)-3 actor) is reduced to -tm-.

35. This derivation raises again the question of whether -mn- and -m- 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(i)t)- and -(s) 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 -sx- may be cognate with Cr, Ka and Sp -s-is-, but he is not sure about the possible cognate of -xax-. Cm -sx- is always stressed, but cognate forms in Cr would appear as -s-is- and the form that should appear as cognate in Sp, if it existed, -s-is-, 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 -(u)m-. He lists several other examples of forms with -(s)(t)- 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. q"gil"son 'I hung it down for him to get a hold of'
f14b. q"gil"son 'I hung it down'
f15a. tixl"son 'I got them (fish) up the river'
f15b. tixl"son

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>INTRANSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>Poss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for cont.=Obj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-w(i)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-t(i)-, -(s)M-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-tulm-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>-s-s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>-s-s-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reichard glosses -t- `3s', but it is more likely to be -x- 'transitive'. If her analysis of second person subject-lp object forms (k"u-/k"u- -is-) 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 -on, and accept the pronominal morphemes immediately after the stem. They are: g"i# 'see'; m" 'share';
sux 'carry on back'; sux 'know'; qili 'give'; q'ui 'starve'; and g'unit '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 u can also be represented as @ or @.

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 -t-n
3s - 1p -t-nmt -stnmt
3s - 2s -t-x' -st-x'
3s - 2p -t-p -st-p
3s - 3s -c -st-tus
2p - 1s -tulm-n -stulm-n
2p - 1p -tulm-tt -stulm-tt
1p - 3s -thl-tt -sthl-tt

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 -stm- are lost before -t- (if they actually were originally there). Reichard lists the "passive endings" as:

(Obj.-Subj.) Completive Customary
1s -c-ml-mm -stml-mm
1p -thl-tt -sthtt
2s -c-t-t -st-tt
2p -tulm-tt -stulm-tt
3s -t-tom -st-tom
3p -t-tom-tiš -st-tom-tiš

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: Mk'n 'do with'; Mk'n 'tell'; qaq'ur 'speak'; and g'uy '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 -n- of -stm-.

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

48 If -t- 'dative' or any other suffix ending in -t- precedes -am, then the continuative suffix occurs as -tom. This form compares with the third person passive constructions of the other two aspects.

f18a. nič-on-tom 'He has been cut' (passive)
f18b. nič-stom 'He cust. has been cut' (passive)
f18c. hi?nič-am 'I cont. am cutting' (active)
f18d. i-nič-am 'He cont. is being cut' (passive)
f18e. k'i?c-kič-ā-tom 'I cont. am making it for thee'

The examples show that -om 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 Mk'n 'do with' means 'scold' in the customary aspect.

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