Introduction

In this paper we wish to present a set of observations that raise interesting questions about the status of the pronominal system in Shuswap. There is a form \(-as\) in Shuswap that occurs in several common syntactic constructions. It behaves as a third person marker in the grammatical system, but also appears cliticized to \(-w-\) and has developed a broader function triggered by aspectual and discourse factors. This development is shared only with the closely related Thompson language although Tillamook may have separately developed a similar system (Thompson 1976, Newman 1980).

Shuswap \(-as\) shows up as a 3rd person pronominal agreement marker in Wh-question, focus, and relative clause constructions.

\[
(1) \quad \text{swētē k-čntēs}^2 \\
\quad \text{swētē k-čn-n-t-§-ōs} \\
\quad \text{who \ irr-punch-fc-tr-3obj-3subj} \\
\quad \text{Whom did he punch?}
\]

\[
(2) \quad \text{swētē k-čntēmēs} \\
\quad \text{swētē k-čn-n-t-§-ém-ēs} \\
\quad \text{who \ irr-punch-fc-tr-3obj-intr-?} \\
\quad \text{Who punched him?}
\]

In (1), it is the Patient argument being questioned and the verbal morphology is identical to the corresponding independent clause (3). In (2), it is the Agent argument that is questioned. The notional verb is grammatically intransitive and is extended with \(-as\). It is similar, but not identical to the independent clause (4) which is an impersonal passive construction.

---

1 Shuswap is spoken on the Interior Plateau of British Columbia and is the northernmost member of the Interior Salish language family. It is a predicate-initial language with a system of pronominal person marking on the predicate. Shuswap is spoken with several minor dialectal differences. The data in this paper is representative of the Deadman’s Creek/Kamloops area. We would like to thank Leslie Jules of Kamloops, Mona Jules of Barriere, Annie-May Jules and Sam Camille of Deadman’s Creek, and Marie Antoine of Bonaparte who have helped us to understand their language.

2 The following abbreviations have been used: caus (causative), compl (completive), deic (deictic), det (determiner), emph (emphatic pronoun), exp (expectational), fc (full control), hab (habitual), incompl (incompletive), intr (intransitive), irr (irrealis), inv (invisible), obj (object), Qu (question), [...] (reduplication), subj (subject), tr (transitive).
In (7-8) the preverbal emphatic pronoun corresponds to the Patient. There is a pronominal agreement suffix attached to the verb and the construction is identical to the corresponding independent clauses in (11):

(11) čntēs
čn-n-t-Ø-és
punch-fc-tr-3obj-3subj
He punched him.

čnĉ[ê]lms
He punched me.

In (9-10) the preverbal emphatic pronoun corresponds to the Agent. There is no pronominal agreement suffix attached to the notional verb. Independent clauses are shown in (12).

(12) čntēs
čnt[ē]l
He punched him.
čnt[ē]l
I punched him.

The third construction that displays the same distribution of the form is one that has properties resembling relative clauses.

(13) člxmst[ē]l
vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čntēs
č-lx-m-s-t-Ø-n vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čn-n-t-Ø-és
hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3obj-3subj
I know the man whom he punched.

(14) člxmst[ē]l
vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čntēx
č-lx-m-s-t-Ø-n vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čn-n-t-Ø-éx
hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3obj-2subj
I know the man whom you punched.

(15) člxmst[ē]l
vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čnĉis
č-lx-m-s-t-Ø-n vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čn-n-t-Ø-s
hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-2obj-3subj
I know the man who punched you.

(16) člxmst[ē]l
vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čntēmes
č-lx-m-s-t-Ø-n vx-sqēlamx l'e-m-čn-n-t-Ø-éms
hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3obj-2subj?
I know the man who punched him.

The relative clauses (13-14) are headed by a nominal that corresponds to the Patient internal to the clause. All of the persons are marked on the predicate of the relative.
In (15-16) the relative clause is headed by a nominal that corresponds to the internal Agent. There is a pronominal agreement suffix corresponding to the nominal head on the predicate in (15) but in (16) the predicate is made intransitive with /-éms/ and the /-es/ form is added.

These constructions can also occur without nominal heads.

(17) ėłxmstęłtln lę-m-ćńtęs
   ė-łx-m-s-t-Œ-n lę-m-ćń-n-t-Œ-és
   hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3obj-3subj
   I know whom he punched.

(18) ėłxmstęłtln lę-m-ćńtę́ms
   ė-łx-m-s-t-Œ-n lę-m-ćń-n-t-Œ-éms-as
   hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3obj-intr?
   I know who punched him.

The pattern of person marking in relative clauses parallels that of Wh-questions and focus constructions.

1.0 Properties of Wh-Constructions

In this section we examine the syntactic properties of Wh-constructions. An analysis of focus constructions and relative clauses will follow from this treatment. Active and impersonal passive constructions are repeated in (19-20).

(19) swę́ty k-ćńtęs
    swę́ty k-ćń-n-t-Œ-és
    who  irr-punch-fc-tr-3obj-3subj
    Whom did he punch?

(20) swę́ty k-ćńtę́m
    swę́ty k-ćń-n-t-Œ-éms
    who  irr-punch-fc-tr-3obj-intr-3subj
    Who was punched?

Both of these constructions are Patient-centered.3 The Wh-construction in (21) is Agent-centered.

(21) swę́ty k-ćńtę́ms
    swę́ty k-ćń-n-t-Œ-éms-as
    who  irr-punch-fc-tr-3obj-intr?
    Who punched him?

Together these constructions constitute a set that represents the range of possible voices that derive of a typically transitive relationship. All of the constructions occur with the transitive marker /-t-/. In (19) both the Agent and Patient are morphologically present whereas in (20-21), one of the arguments is not and the clause is marked intransitive with /-éms/. In (20) the Agent is not overt and the construction is an impersonal passive. In (21) it is the form /-es/ which represents the Agent.

In the Wh-question construction /swę́ty/ occurs in initial position, the position where predicates typically occur. In (22) Patient-centered Wh-constructions are compared with independent clauses. The person markings for both sets are identical.

(22) swę́ty k-ćńtę́ltn
    swę́ty k-ćńtę́x
    swę́ty k-ćńtę́s
    swę́ty k-ćńtę́m
    ċńtę́ltn  I punched him.
    ċńtę́x   You punched him.
    ċńtę́s   He punched him.
    ċńtę́m   He was punched.

In (23) Agent-centered Wh-constructions are compared with independent clauses.

(23) swę́ty k-ćńččę́[ɕ]ms
    swę́ty k-ćńččś
    swę́ty k-ćńtę́ms
    who  irr-punch-fc-tr-3obj-intr
    Who punched me?
    ćńččę́[ɕ]ms  He punched me.
    ćńččś   He punched you.
    *ćńtę́ms/ćńtę́s  He punched him.
    ćńtę́m   He was punched.

In Agent-centered Wh-constructions (23) with first and second person Patients it is clear that there is a pronominal copy of the Agent manifested as a pronominal agreement suffix on the verb. The person marking is exactly the same as in independent clauses. In the third person Agent-centered construction the form /k-ćńtę́ms/ is grammatically marked as an intransitive and is morphologically the same as the independent clause /ćńtę́m/. There is, in addition, the /-es/ ending.

3The terms Agent-centered and Patient-centered are used in Kuipers (1974).

5
The situation is much clearer in the Coast Salish language Halkomelem (Gerdt 1988).

(24) nawa nl 1am-8-ema-?en?
2emph aux look-tr-20bj-1subj
It's you that I looked at.

(25) ?en?8a nl q"aq"-a8-?en?
1emph aux club-tr-10bj-3subj
It's me who he clubbed.

(26) ?en?8a nl q"aq"-at ('q"aq"-et-?en?)
1emph aux club-tr
I'm the one who clubbed it.

(27) n'ilte t3n3ni7 ni q"aq"-at (*q"aq"-at-?en?)
3emph det woman aux club-tr
It's the woman who clubbed it.

Observe (24-25) and obliques have pronominal copies whereas subjects (26-27) do not. There is no shift in transitive marking.

Jacaltec (Craig 1976) a Mayan language has a similar construction in which the subjects behave differently than objects. Transitive clause structure is shown in (28).

(28) x'il nej lx
saw cl/he cl/her
He saw her.

In (29-31) third person pronominal objects are referred to in question, cleft, and relative clause constructions and there is no mark on the verb.

(29) mec x'il nej
Who saw cl/he
Who did he see?

(30) he' lx x'il nej
clief cl/she saw cl/he
It's her that he saw.

(31) woh'ej lx x'il nej
I know cl/her saw cl/he
I know the man that he saw.

In (32), the reference to subjects requires additional marking on the verb /x'il-ni/.

(32) mec x'il-ni lx
Who saw-suffix cl/her
Who saw her?

(33) he' nej x'il-ni lx
cleft cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
It's he who saw her.

(34) woh'ej nej x'il-ni lx
I know cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
I know the man who saw her.

In Lummi, another Coast Salish language (Jelinek 1987) the Patient-centered paradigm (35) is in all relevant respects the same as in Shuswap.4

(35) ca-xčí-t-en
det-know-tr-1subj
the one that I know
ca-xčí-t-ex
det-know-tr-2subj
the one that you know
caxčí-t-č
det-know-tr-3subj
the one that he knows

In (36) the Agent-centered paradigm is given.

(36) ce-xčí-t-čp
det-know-tr-1/2obj
the one that knows you/me
caxčí-t-č
det-know-tr-3obj
the one that knows him

Jelinek assumes that because there is no ergative argument in the Agent-centered construction that there is no absolutive argument in the Patient-centered construction.

In (37) the corresponding Shuswap forms with Patient-centered interpretations are given.

(37) la-č'-1xm-s-t-č'8-č
the one I know
la-č'-1xm-s-t-č'8-čx
the one you know
la-č'-1xm-s-t-č'8-fs
the one he knows

In (38) forms with Agent-centered interpretations are given.

4We assume that /a/ corresponds to /3/ in Jelinek's orthography.
In both the Patient-centered and Agent-centered paradigms, pronominal forms are fully represented. Notice that it is only in the third person system in (38) that there is any deviation from the pattern. We now turn to the pronominal system.

2.0 The Pronominal System

Person is referenced by sets of affixes and clitics that occur on the predicate. We first discuss first and second person. In intransitive clauses, first and second person is supplied by clitics.

(39) x?c{k-kn
    go-1subj
    I go/went.

(40) x?c{k-k
    go-2subj
    You go.

The clitic paradigm is shown in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-kn</td>
<td>-kt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>-kp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitive clauses are referenced for person by pronominal suffixes. The predicate is suffixed with /-t/ and the pronominal subject follows the object marker.

(41) c{n-t-s{c}m-x
    hit-fc-tr-1obj-2subj
    You punch me.

(42) c{n-t-s{n
    hit-fc-tr-2obj-1subj
    I punch you.

The pronominal subjects are shown in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-(c)m</td>
<td>-(c)p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-(c)x</td>
<td>-(c)p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronominal objects are given in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-(c)m</td>
<td>-(c)p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-(c)x</td>
<td>-(c)p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First and second person are marked according to a nominative/accusative system. In intransitive clauses, first and second person is supplied by clitics. In transitive clauses, the first and second person markers are suffixes.

The subject clitic paradigm behaves differently from the suffixal paradigms. Evidence that these are different paradigms comes from the question suffix /-n-/:

(43) m-x?c{k-n-k
    compl-go-Qu-2subj
    Did you go?

(44) c{n-n-t-s{n
    hit-fc-tr-2obj-3subj-Qu
    Did he hit you?

The question suffix /-n/ intervenes between the predicate stem and the subject clitic in intransitive clauses whereas it is suffixed after the pronominal objects and subjects in transitive clauses.

---

5The discussion is limited to singular pronominal forms. The plural system functions exactly the same in all respects relevant to the present topic. There are however other interesting properties of the plural system, notably the development of a first person plural inclusive/exclusive distinction.
3.1 Third Person Marking

The behaviour of third person pronominals in intransitive clauses is shown in the following examples:

(45) xʔɛk-Ø
    go-3subj
    He goes.

(46) wik-m-Ø
    see-intr-3subj
    He is looking.

(47) wik-t-Ø-m
    see-tr-3subj-intr
    He was seen.

Clauses (45-47) are intransitive and the third person marker is /-Ø/. The following clauses are transitive.

(48) wik-t-Ø-s
    see-tr-3obj-3subj
    He saw it.

(49) wik-t-Ø-x-saq’lép
    see-tr-3obj-3subj deic-coyote
    He saw the coyote.

(50) wik-t-Ø-s x-saq’lám x-saq’lép
    see-tr-3obj-3subj deic-man deic-coyote
    The man saw the coyote.

Third person behaves according to an ergative/absolutive system. Subjects of transitive clauses in (48-50) are marked with /-Ø-/ and /-Ø-/ is the ergative. Third person objects are marked with /-Ø-/ and /-Ø-/ is the absolutive, parallel to subjects of intransitive clauses (45-47).

Shuswap then has a split ergative system for person. First and second person are nominative/accusative and third person is ergative/absolutive. The common types of split systems recognized are on the basis of person marking, aspect and clausal type. We now turn to aspect.

3.2 Aspect

Split ergative systems frequently make a distinction based on aspect. Often in the completive aspect third person behaves as an ergative/absolutive whereas in the incompletive aspect third person behaves as a nominative/accusative. Clauses (51-53) are marked with the completive prefix /m-/.

(51) m-xʔɛk[?]k-kn
    compl-go-1subj
    I went.

(52) m-xʔɛk-k
    compl-go-2subj
    You went.

(53) m-xʔɛk-Ø
    compl-go-3subj
    He went.

The completives (51-53) are all independent clauses. First and second person are nominative and third person is absolutive. Incompletive constructions have the particle /wʔɛx/ in predicate initial position and the notional verb is a dependent clause.

(54) wʔɛx x-xʔɛk[?]k*-en
    incompl deic-go-1subj
    I am going.

(55) wʔɛx x-xʔɛk*-ex [ux*]
    incompl deic-go-2subj
    You are going.

(56) wʔɛx x-xʔɛk*-es
    incompl deic-go-3subj
    He is going.

Notice that the pronominal markers are attached to /-w-/ in (54-56) parallel to being attached to /-k-/ in (51-53). The incompletive pronominal paradigm is given in the following chart.

6Phonological developments often obscure this grammatical process.
The behaviour of third person marking would follow from an account of split ergativity based on aspect. In (57) the third person of the completive clause is absolutive whereas in (58) the third person subject of the incompletive clause is nominative.

(57) m->xʔek-∅
    compl-go-3subj
    He went.

(58) wʔex x-xʔek-"-as
    incompl deic-go-w-3subj
    He is going.

Incompletives have a strong active interpretation as shown by the derived nominals in (59-60). In (59) the predicate /k'úlməs/ is focussing on the action of 'making' and the nominal is an adjunct. In (60) it is the action that is questioned by the form /kɛnəm/.

(59) wʔex x-xʔ-úlməs tə-mɪnx7
    incompl deic-make-w-3subj deic-basket
    He is making a basket./He's a basket-maker.

(60) ?ex k-kɛn-ux
    incompl irr-do-w-2subj
    What are you doing?

It is not clear that an analysis of third person marking can be advanced on the basis of aspect given that incompletives are constructions that exhibit behaviour paralleling subordinate clauses. We now go on to look at the status of these clauses.

Subordinate clauses are underlined in (63-65).

(63) meʔ kexɛfn tə-spoqeq c qʷənɛnux
    meʔ kex-ɛfn tə-spoqeq c qʷənɛn-ux
    expect give-2obj-1subj deic-berrys if want-2subj
    I'll give you some berries if you want.

(64) ṣpfpqʷ=tən yəx̣̣y ləʔ wʔexʷəs qʷiy[qxʷ-"as
    ṣ-pfpqʷ=s-t-∅-n yəx̣̣y ləʔ wʔexʷ-as qʷiy[qxʷ-"as
    hab-watch-caus-tr-3obj-1subj that one part incompl-w-3subj
dance-w-3subj
    I was watching him when he was dancing.

(65) sqʔɛnənəstmntəʔ yəx̣̣y la-saqʕnəms
    sqʔɛnən-tə-∅-n ləʔ yəx̣̣y la-saqʕnəm-w-as
    listen-caus-tr-3obj-1subj part that one deic-sing-w-3subj
    I was listening to him when he was singing.

The subordinate clauses are marked in the same way as incompletives, taking a member of the clitic paradigm suffixed to /-w-/.

There is a distinction in Shuswap between subordinate clauses and dependent clauses. The dependent clauses (66-67) take ergative/absolute marking.
(66) ċīxmsṭēn x-sqelmx l-m-q*ēćē
ć-1x-m-s-t-ŋ-ečlīn x-sqelmx l-m-q-ečć-Ŏ
hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-man deic-compl-leave-3subj
I know the man who left.

(67) ċīxmsṭēn x-sqelmx l-m-čntēs
ć-1x-m-s-t-ŋ-eč-1l-n x-sqelmx l-m-čn-n-t-ŋ-ēs
hab-know-intr-caus-tr-3obj-1subj deic-man deic-compl-punch-forc-tr-3obj-3subj
I know the man whom he punched.

A similar distribution of clausal type has been reported for Halkomelem with pronominals behaving as ergative/absolutives in dependent clauses and as nominative/accusatives in subordinate clauses (Gerds 1988).

The following chart for third person displays the distribution of morphological case marking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completive</th>
<th>Nom/Accus</th>
<th>Erg/Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incompletive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that for third person in incompletives and subordinates (68-69) the nominative/accusative case marking system is clear. The predicates are marked as intransitives so that there is no evidence of a shift in transitivity.

(68) w?tx x-k'ūlm-ēs ta-mǐn
incompl deic-make-w-3 deic-basket
He is making a basket./He's a basket-maker.

(69) sQ'ltinamstn lu? yɛvęy 1e-sečfnmes
sQ'ltinam-s-t-ŋ-n lu? yɛvęy 1e-sečfnm-w-ēs
listen-caus-tr-3abs-1nom part that one deic-sing-w-3nom
I was listening to him when he was singing.

There is a split within the third person constructions in transitive dependent clauses. The third person Patient construction (70) parallels complete and independent clauses and the third person Agent construction (71) parallels incomplete and subordinate clauses.

4.0 Conclusion

Although there is strong evidence of a grammatical split in the Shuswap pronominal system, the appearance of /-ēs/ as a third person Agentive in dependent clauses still requires an explanation. One promising line of investigation would be to view this behaviour as reflecting an animacy hierarchy, certainly well recognized in being involved in split systems (Silverstein 1976). This line has been followed for the Coast Salish language Lummi (Jelinek and Demers 1983). The following hierarchy has been proposed.

(72) 1&2 > 3 > N

First and second person often behave the same in the animacy hierarchy and are the highest on the scale of agentivity. Nominals tend to be the lowest on the scale of agentivity. It has been noted that languages with split systems pick out particular points to make the split. In Dyribal (Dixon 1979), an Australian Aboriginal language, 3rd person pronominals behave according to a nominative/accusative system whereas nominals behave ergatively. A possible statement of this behaviour would be that patients cannot outrank agents on the animacy hierarchy.

In Shuswap there is evidence of an animacy hierarchy with inclusive first person plural pronominal subjects. The Shuswap form for 'we saw him' occurs as a passive and has the alternate interpretation 'he was seen'.

(73) wikt-Ŏ-m
see-3abs-intr
He was seen./We saw him.

For Shuswap first person plural inclusives behave in the same way as nominals on the animacy hierarchy:

(74) 1/2 > 3 > N/1pl inclusive
With dependent clauses Shuswap has taken the option of interpreting third person agents as behaving as nominative/accusatives.

(75) 1/2 /3(agents) > 3(patients) > N/1pl inclusive

Evidence for an animacy hierarchy suggests that Shuswap may have behavior parallel to direct/inverse person marking systems well recognized for the Athabaskan language family. Whistler (1985) has looked at direct/inverse marking in Nootkan suggesting that this person marking system typologically may be more widespread in the area. Jelinek and Demers have explored this possibility for the Salish language Lummi (1985).

There are some intriguing similarities in the Navaho paradigms in (76-77) (Jelinek 1987) and the Shuswap paradigms in (78-79).

(76) yiztał
yiztał-ge the one who was kicked...
'ashkil yiztał He kicked the boy.
'ashkil yiztał-ge the one who kicked the boy...

(77) biztał
biztał-ge the one who got kicked by him (approx).
'ashkil biztał He got kicked by the boy.
'ashkil biztał-ge the one who got kicked by the boy...

(78) m-čntēs
la-m-čntēm
m-čntēs y-sqēlmx
m-čntēm y-sqēlmx
the one who was punched...
He punched the man.
the one who punched the man...

(79) m-čntēm
la-m-čntēm
m-čntēm y-sqēlmx
m-čntēm te-sqēlmx
la-m-čntēm y-sqēlmx
la-m-čntēm te-sqēlmx
He got punched.
The man got punched.
the one who got punched the man...
the one who got punched the man...

The two languages have several features in common: the predicate is fully marked for person, there is an animacy hierarchy banning certain Agent/Patient co-ocurrences, and nominals are not part of the argument structure of the predicate but are adjoined clausal elements.

Finally it should be pointed out that the behaviour of /-as/ is not triggered strictly on grammatical grounds. It also occurs frequently in deixis.

(80) t'ěna mě? kex-čf-n-as
from this expect give-2obj-1subj-3subj
I'll give you some from this.

(81) kəm m-k-šēl-xmust-č-č w̱ṉén yətə'y qʷəčč-č-as
do irr-know-3obj-2subj when that one left-3subj
Do you know when that person left?

In (80) the predicate /kex-čf-n/ is fully marked for its arguments and the /-w-as/ is triggered by spatial deixis as it is with the temporal deixis in (81).

Kuipers (1974) has noted the frequent occurrence of /-as/ in texts and that the texts often have forms with and without the suffix. This is suggestive that /-as/ may have diverse functions in discourse styles. A full treatment of the /-as/ form in textual materials should provide some answers. Given that /-as/ has such strong active readings it may be functioning as a reference tracking device in discourse, somewhat akin to switch-reference systems. The Shuswap form /-as/ appears to be what Nichols and Woodbury (1985) call an emergent linguistic category, one with "tendencies in discourse which are almost, but not quite, rigid and grammaticalized".8

8Nichols and Woodbury, pg.8.