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There is now a good deal of information available on control systems in several Salish languages (including a number of papers by Phil Davis and Ross Saunders on Bella Coola control phenomena--e.g. Saunders and Davis 1978, Davis and Saunders 1979, 1980; Beaumont 1977 on Seshelt; Galloway 1978 on Halkomelem). We have ourselves tried to document such phenomena, drawing on our experience with Straits languages, Tsimshian, and Lushootseed, and particularly with Thompson River Salish (Thompson and Thompson 1974, Thompson 1978, 1979). Work on this problem has continued, with concentration on the Thompson Salish system, and it seems important to share some new things we have been learning.

1. Semantic Features. At an earlier stage we thought that most morphemes of the language were marked either [+ control] or [ - control]; to handle some morphemes which introduced especially strong noncontrol notions we used a second feature [+ limited control]. In attempting to explain the system to various people we have found that it has not been easy to make ourselves understood. Certainly part of the problem has related to the notion of [+ limited control]: a number of people have found this notion difficult to grasp in its relationship to [ + control]; others have presumed that it referred to situations involving less than full control, but more control than [ - control]. This kind of notion may in fact be important in some languages--perhaps, for example, for Bella Coola (Ross Saunders, p.c.)--but such a difference does not seem to be formalized for Thompson Salish. In any case, it has seemed essential to find a different way to mark morphemes which convey strongly noncontrol ideas.

What seems now a more workable solution has evolved with the attempt to analyze this part of the semantic system of the language with binary features. A feature [emphatic], which is needed to specify other types of emphasis in the system, serves to separate strong from less strong control notions. So morphemes which formerly were marked [+ limited control] are now handled by [ + control + emphatic]. It will be seen shortly that this permits a meaningful binary scheme which was impossible to work out with the former approach.

2. The Marking of Morphemes. As work has progressed we have also become aware that while the marking of predicative words is relatively simple--they are, for the most part, either [+ control] or [ - control]--the way they have to come that marking is not so simple. A scheme of relative dominance is in operation, so that from the point of view of individual morphemes there is indeed a scale of degrees of control. This has also made clear that more morphemes than we used to think are simply unmarked for control.

At the moment, five degrees along the control axis seem adequate to handle the combinations we have observed. These are specified in Table 1, along with some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[+ control]</th>
<th>[ - control]</th>
<th>[ + control + emphatic]</th>
<th>[ - control + emphatic]</th>
<th>[ + control]</th>
<th>[ - control]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[s 'find']</td>
<td>[s 'cut']</td>
<td>[s 'go']</td>
<td>[s 'water']</td>
<td>[s 'see']</td>
<td>[s 'water']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s 'well']</td>
<td>[s 'hand']</td>
<td>[s 'arm']</td>
<td>[s 'like']</td>
<td>[s 'drink']</td>
<td>[s 'burn']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s 'choative']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s 'out-of-control']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s 'out-of-control']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
<td>[s 'caus']</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The familiar pattern is exhibited by the roots in the second column, which are marked [-control - emphatic]. With affixes that are unmarked for control resulting forms are [-control]; for example, causative inflection involves only unmarked affixes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nįx}s-t-x' & \quad \text{you cut it accidentally} \\
pbįx-s-t-x' & \quad \text{it swelled up on you}
\end{align*}
\]

In the latter see Carlson and Thompson in this same collection. These affixes regularly convert [-control] stems to [-control]. E.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
nįxk\text{st} & \quad \text{kn 'I got my hand/finger cut'} \\
pbįx\text{m} & \quad \text{kn 'my foot is swollen'}
\end{align*}
\]

We had also supposed that a root like \text{vkt} 'detach' similarly had [-control] marking. Then how could we account for derivatives like the following with [+control] force?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{y} & \quad \text{es-kəl/ko}l-\text{xən} \quad \text{kn 'I have my shoes off, I go barefoot'} \\
\text{kt} & \quad \text{qkt-\text{mm}-e} \quad \text{'I release it, let go of it'} (\text{with relational inflection, which involves no control-marked affixes})
\end{align*}
\]

What eventually became clear is that \text{vkt 'detach'} is unmarked for control, while the lexical inflections //\text{skst}// 'hand, lower arm' and //\text{xən}// 'foot, leg' are marked for control with weak [+control] force. That is, their [+control] marking is not strong enough to convert [-control] stems, but does accomplish this with stems that are unmarked for control. Such affixes, then, are marked [+control - emphatic], while affixes like the control middle and transitive and the autonomy suffix are [+control + emphatic]: they convert even [-control] stems to [+control]. E.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
nįx\text{m} & \quad \text{kn 'I cut some things, do some cutting'} \\
pbįx\text{e}-\text{s} & \quad \text{'she cut it'} \\
pbįx\text{ix} & \quad \text{'[snake or toad] swells up'}
\end{align*}
\]

Why then were we fooled about so many examples of \text{vkt 'detach'}, which seemed to have non-control force? That nuance was being added by other affixes, the most common of which is the inchoative: \text{kt-təp 'it came apart, got disconnected' qkt-p-s-t-\text{t}\text{-nəm} 'I accidentally disengaged it'}

We were also quite familiar with the strong noncontrol marking of words involving the noncontrol middle -\text{mən} and the out-of-control end-reduplication (for extensive exemplification of the latter see Carlson and Thompson in this same collection). These affixes regularly convert [+control] stems to [-control]. E.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ŋqə-}'-\text{məm} & \quad \text{he (finally) managed to get a drink'} \\
\text{nəs}'-\text{əs} & \quad \text{kn 'I managed to go'}
\end{align*}
\]

We had also identified a few roots that clearly called for [-control + emphatic] marking. Those noted in the early period of study simply lacked the usual control middle and transitive formations. E.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pən-}\text{məm} & \quad \text{kn 'I found it'} (\text{requiring relational inflection})
\end{align*}
\]

One troublesome fact was that there were a number of control middle and transitive forms with obvious strong noncontrol meanings:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{təx-}'-\text{t}-\text{təm} & \quad \text{'I looked and looked but couldn't find it'} \\
xl\text{x}-\text{e}-\text{m} & \quad \text{kn 'I vomited violently, vomited up blood'} \\
xl\text{x}-\text{e}-\text{s} & \quad \text{he missed the target, missed what he was shooting at'}
\end{align*}
\]

These were considered to be cases of fringe, product of what does seem likely to be a tendency for //\text{-t//-} transitive inflection (which should mark control positively) to take over cases where we would expect simple //\text{-t//-} inflection. Now it seems obvious that they represent [+control + emphatic] roots, and such stems are not converted to [+control] even by [+control + emphatic] affixes.

An interesting byproduct of this part of the investigation is that we may be getting better information on what the semantic coverage of //\text{-t//-} transitive inflection is—or once was. The root \text{qniq}'-\text{mə} 'sick, ill' is marked [-control + emphatic]; it appears with both //\text{-t//-} transitive and //\text{-t//-} causative inflection; note the semantic contrast:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qniq}'-\text{y}-\text{t}-\text{t}\text{-s} & \quad \text{'(she cooked something for us and it) made us sick'} \\
\text{qniq}'-\text{e}-\text{t}-\text{t}-\text{t}\text{-s} & \quad \text{'(she was spraying some insecticide and) it made us sick'}
\end{align*}
\]

It may well be that the pre-transitive suffix //\text{-n/-}, rather than simply marking [+control], indicates something like directed attention. (Both the above forms are [-control] in force.)

3. Implications. This means, of course, that there is a good deal of work now before us. Although we have extensive lexical materials on Thompson Salish, we often do not have the crucial combinations of morphemes necessary to determine the control marking of particular roots and affixes. On the bright side, however, we have learned some interesting things. For example, it now appears that most function morphemes—including the large range of particles—are unmarked for control. We have identified very few morphemes with [+control - emphatic] marking, and so far no roots are involved. On the other hand, there are many more roots in the category unmarked for control than we had earlier suspected. Among them are cases like \text{vqə} 'like, find pleasing', which are typically handled not with transitive inflection but with possessive inflection:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nəs}'-\text{mə} & \quad \text{kn 'I like you, you are pleasing to me'}
\end{align*}
\]

Although this seems to be a logical way to provide for two participants, both of whom are patients (experiencers), the form is really not either [+control] or [-control]. There is also the possibility of relational inflection for such cases, giving a different shade of meaning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vqə}'-\text{mən}-\text{c} & \quad \text{kn 'I like you; I find you pleasing'}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, we may mention the matter of an important dichotomy of [+control + emphatic] roots which emerges primarily in connection with the [-control + emphatic] suffix //\text{-t//-} of-control and affixes. Among the many colleagues who have helped with discussion of the control problem we should mention especially M. Dale Kinkade, Barry Carlson, and Sarah Bell. The research has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the British Columbia Provincial Museum, and the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund. This particular study of control phenomena was one of the subjects of intensive study during the 1979-80 sabbatical year, during which L. Thompson was generously supported by a Fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation.

The usual phonemic symbols are supplemented here by a slash '/' to mark non-initial roots in forms, by the equals sign '=' to indicate lexical suffixes, and the raised dot '.' to indicate reduplicative affixes.

FOOTNOTE

1. We are grateful to many persons and agencies for support of this research. For the Thompson Salish materials offered here we are indebted to Annie York of Spuzzum. Among the many colleagues who have helped with discussion of the control problem we should mention especially M. Dale Kinkade, Barry Carlson, and Sarah Bell. The research has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the British Columbia Provincial Museum, and the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund. This particular study of control phenomena was one of the subjects of intensive study during the 1979-80 sabbatical year, during which L. Thompson was generously supported by a Fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation.
Feature matrix for Thompson Salish morphemes with respect to CONTROL functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Patient-Presuming</th>
<th>Control-Marking</th>
<th>Goal-Marking</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
<th>Specialized</th>
<th>Agent-Presuming</th>
<th>Control-Marking</th>
<th>Control-Marking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-Marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-Presuming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e.g. na= LO- -meman -t- -min- -s- -xp 'VC -nwem -nem' -Glaut -xi- -ayx -ome -n-
=ehw =er(ih =x5n wik puy puy nes tew ek'u /house/ 'ear' 'foot' 'see')
'tover' 'lose' 'go' 'sell') HEARSAY
REFERENCES


O. Colville's (Cv) -út is one of those apparent suffixes with exemplification so limited that identification of its function is problematic. I will try to show that, notwithstanding the synchronic obscurity of the suffix, one might be able to puzzle out some of its history by means of Cv-internal and comparative evidence.

At least three functions and meanings are associated with -út, and I will proceed as though we were dealing with three distinct homonymous suffixes. The first suffix, -út, is connected with -útya’, and can be tentatively glossed 'susceptible to imitation and approximation; approximating ...'. The second suffix, -úty, is reminiscent of a lexical suffix with the meaning 'surface'; and the third, -úty, is the full-vowel grade of the stative suffix -ú when C₃ of the root is a rounded consonant (but not w), and where the stress valence of the root is weak.

1. The analysis of -út into three separate suffixes is not inducible from the Cv data alone, but rather requires supporting evidence from other interior Salish languages.

1.1. -út. Cv has a very few forms like
ty‘-m-út 'straight, real(ly)'
lut -út-um-út-un 'it’s not edible'
in which -út has the meaning given here (for short ‘-able’). There is evidence that other interior Salish (IS) languages, and consequently Proto IS, also have an affix -út of similar meaning.

The best evidence is from Kalispel (Ks) and Coeur d'Alene (Cr). Speck reports that Ks "(-m)-út 'capability' expresses aptitude, power, or ability to do something."(p. 115*) She states that the function and distribution of -m (preceeding -út) is not understood, and gives eleven examples in the text, plus two other examples in a footnote, a total of thirteen examples based on nine roots. Of these 13 examples, 5 have -m before -út, and the remaining 3 do not. This -m must be a stem-forming suffix required by the language before the affixation of -út. More significantly, all but two of the examples have word-final -m, which Speck presumes to be 'middle'. She offers no explanation for the lack of final -m in two of the forms. The examples are:


