Selish

TRANSITIVITY IN FLATHEAD

Sarah Thomason & Daniel Everett
University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

Flathead, a Salishan language spoken in northwestern Montana, has a verbal system that seems at first glance to distinguish transitive constructions from intransitive ones in a quite straightforward way: transitive verbs have a transitive suffix and a characteristic set of subject and object markers, while intransitive verbs lack the transitive suffix and have a completely different set of subject markers. In addition, the two constructions differ systematically in their marking of adjunct (or argument) noun phrases. Initial appearances are deceiving, however. It turns out that morphologically intransitive verbs can take object noun phrases, and that certain transitive constructions, notably monotransitive continuatives, lack part of the transitive morphology. The goal of this paper is to explore the morphosyntactic means by which different kinds and degrees of transitivity are signalled in Flathead, and to propose an analysis that pulls apparently disparate facts together in a unified way.*

Not surprisingly, Salishan languages show both similarities and differences in their morphosyntactic patterns relating to transitivity. Many of these patterns have been described, of course, but as far as we know there is as yet no detailed description of the relevant morphological and syntactic patterns for a Southern Interior Salishan language (see e.g. Mattina 1982, Kinkade 1981, and Carlson 1980 for descriptions of the morphology of transitive verbs in Colville-Okanagan, Columbian, and Spokane, respectively, and Kroeber 1991 for insightful comments on parts of the transitivity system in various Salishan languages). Since Flathead transitivity differs from that of other Southern Interior languages in certain respects, a description of this system should be of interest to Salishanists.[1] More generally, the Flathead system is of potential interest to theoreticians concerned with types and degrees of transitivity, because of the wide variety of constructions—some of them quite unusual—in which transitivity plays a role. Our account is strictly synchronic and specific to Flathead; we have not yet carried out any systematic study of the diachronic sources of the current structures, or any systematic comparison with cognate structures in other Salishan languages.

The bulk of this paper consists of a description of nine relevant constructions (§§1.1-1.9): ordinary transitives; ditransitives; unmarked intransitives; intransitives with the

ANTIPASSIVE suffix -$(e)m$ (usually called "middle" in the Salishan literature); transitives with the BACKGROUNDED AGENT suffix -$(e)m$ (often called "passive/indefinite agent" in the literature); DERIVED TRANSITIVES in m; TRANSITIVE CONTINUATIVES in -$(e)m$; transitives detransitivized by lexical suffixes; and transitives detransitivized by the reflexive suffix *-cut*. These nine constructions do not, of course, exhaust the list of relevant patterns; our work is at a preliminary stage, and we have not yet explored all the constructions that have some connection with transitivity. We omit a few detransitivizing constructions, notably the reciprocal, because they behave basically like reflexive forms with respect to transitivity. We do not consider unaccusatives. We also omit discussion of the so-called "intransitive reflexives". A more significant omission is the lack of any specific consideration of interactions between control and transitivity (see e.g. Thompson 1985); we have as yet too little information on control features in Flathead to comment on them here. Another major transitivity-related topic that is largely omitted from our account is the patterning of the various constructions in discourse. We will mention interactions between discourse and transitivity here and there, but we have not yet studied enough textual material to draw systematic conclusions in this domain.

After presenting the data, we will discuss ways in which the various constructions reflect differing kinds and degrees of transitivity, and we will offer preliminary suggestions for an overall treatment of these differences (§2). We adopt, with modifications, the common view of transitivity in which the prototypical transitive construction involves a completed transfer of action from a definite agent to a definite patient. Some modification of this view is necessary for Flathead because here the two main variables that correlate with transitivity alternations turn out to be ASPECT and FOCUS ON THE AGENT VS. FOCUS ON THE PATIENT. Definiteness per se is not as important a variable in Flathead as it is said to be in some other Salishan languages, though it does play a minor role (especially in the marking of patient NPs in ordinary transitive sentences). As we will show in the following descriptions, the ordinary transitive represents the prototypical transitive type in Flathead, while other transitive-related forms deviate from the neutral type in various ways. Although we will not explore them in any detail in this paper, the Flathead facts have interesting implications for theories of transitivity and for the concept of the morpheme.

Our primary goal is to understand the interactions between the morphology and the sentence-level syntax of the relevant constructions. A secondary goal, one that we can only sketch in this paper, is to establish the circumstances under which the different constructions are used. One significant departure from most previous analyses of these phenomena in Salishan languages is our proposal that four of the constructions contain a suffix -$(e)m$ which has the effect of altering transitivity in a stem to which it is added—either changing valency (antipassive, derived transitive) or reducing transitivity without

changing valency (backgrounded agent, continuative aspect). That is, we will argue that, for Flathead, it is reasonable to treat all these occurrences of -(*e*)*m* in transitive-related constructions in a unified way. The construction in which Flathead seems to differ most sharply from other Salishan languages is the transitive continuative; here our account diverges from previous analyses, notably those of Kroeber (1986, 1991) and Vogt (1940), in that we treat these forms as transitives, not intransitives (§1.7).

1. NINE RELEVANT CONSTRUCTION TYPES. In its basic morphological patterns, Flathead appears to make a straightforward distinction between transitive and intransitive predicates.[2] With some necessary simplifications, having to do primarily with co-occurrence restrictions, Figure 1 is a schematic representation of the maximal Flathead word (and it cannot easily be further reduced in size, so it will be distributed as a handout at ICSNL 28 rather than appearing here in the conference preprints). Inspection of the chart shows that all the subjects of intransitive verbs are proclitic particles that appear at the left edge of the verb complex (third-person intransitive verbs have no overt subject marking), while the morphological transitive apparatus appears at the right edge of the verb complex—first a transitive suffix, then an object marker, and finally the transitive subject. There are two general kinds of exceptions to the basic transitive pattern. First, all 1pl forms have a proclitic component, which in transitive constructions occurs in conjunction with a suffix in the usual place, and the 1sg object marker is also a proclitic; and second, the subjects of nominalized transitive continuative predicates are possessive markers—prefixes for 1sg, 2sg, and 1pl, and suffixes for 2pl and 3 (there is no number distinction in third-person pronominals). With the sole exception of the 1pl proclitic, non-nominalized predicates in the basic system are divided cleanly into transitive and intransitive forms according to their pronominal markers. Examples of the basic patterns—ordinary monotransitive verbs, ditransitives, and intransitives—are given in exx. 1-3.[3]

1.1. Ordinary ("vanilla") transitive verbs, illustrated in exx. 1a-f, are aspectually noncontinuative. They consist of a transitive stem to which a transitive (+ control) suffix, either *-nt* or *-st*, is added.[4]

All of the transitive stems in ex. 1 are bare roots, with the exception of 1f. Ex. 1f consists of a root *pqʷ* 'spill, pour' followed by a lexical suffix *=ús* 'fire, face'. By itself, this combination would be intransitive, because the lexical suffix detransitivizes the inherently transitive root; but the resulting stem is transitivized by the addition of the locative prefix *c̓-*, so that the transitive suffix is added directly to the stem without an intervening transitivizing suffix *-m*.

Note, crucially, the marking of full-word subjects and objects in 1b and 1c: objects are marked optionally by the subordinator *ɬu*, and subjects are marked obligatorily by the oblique particle *t*.[5] Kroeber (1991:355) observes that Okanagan, Kalispel (including

Flathead), and Coeur d'Alene are unique in Salish in making this distinction between the case-marking of transitive subject NPs and that of object NPs, and that this distinction is obligatory in Kalispel only. We have found no exceptions to the case-marking of full-word subjects of transitive verbs. We do have example sentences in which an indefinite object NP is marked by *t* rather than by *ɬu*, but since most objects of transitive verbs, whether definite or indefinite, are marked instead by optional *ɬu*, we treat the *t*-marked objects as nondistinctive variants (and see §2 for some discussion of the implications of the *t* marking of indefinite objects). The important point about the case-marking of NPs in simple transitive constructions is that the object NP is most intimately linked to the verb, as shown by its lack of obligatory case-marking; the agent NP, by contrast, must be set off from the verb complex by the oblique particle.

1. Ordinary transitives:

a. **Púlstx .**

púls–st–0–éxʷ	
kill–TRANS–3.OBJ–2sg.SUBJ1	
You killed him.	

b. **C̓łpntés ɬu nłámqe t C̓oní.**

c̓łp–nt–0–és	ɬu	nłámqe	t	C̓oní
hunt–TRANS–3.OBJ–3.SUBJ1	2ndary		OBL	
He [= Johnny] hunted it [= bear]		bear		Johnny

c. **K'ʷe?entén ɬu nłámqe.**

k̓ʷe?–nt–0–én	ɬu	nłámqe
bite–TRANS–3.OBJ–1sg.SUBJ1	2ndary	
I bit it [= a bear]		bear

d. **Kʷu wíc̓tx .**

kʷu	wíc̓–st–éxʷ
1sg.OBJ	see–TRANS–2sg.SUBJ1
me	you saw [me]

e. **Wíc̓təmən.**

wíc̓–st–m–én
see–TRANS–2sg.OBJ–1sg.SUBJ1
I saw you.

f. **Ełčpqʷósəntx .**
eł–č–pqʷ–ús–nt–0–éxʷ
again–LOC:to–pour–fire–TRANS–3.OBJ–2sg.SUBJ1
You pour it [the rotten wood] on the fire again.

1.2. Exx. 2a-d illustrate the second relevant construction type, noncontinuative ditransitive verbs. These differ from simple transitives in that they have a RELATIONAL (+control) suffix, either *-łt* or *-śit*, in place of the transitive (+control) suffix *-nt* or *-st*. The two relational suffixes differ semantically—*śit* is a benefactive suffix, as in 2a-c (assuming that the recipient wanted a cat!), while *-łt* has a neutral or negative connotation, as in 2d (see Carlson 1980 for discussion)—but they are often used interchangeably. All the examples in 2 are formed to bare roots, *xʷíč* 'give' and *máẇ* 'break, destroy'.

It is rare for all three NPs to appear together in a ditransitive construction, but when they do appear, as in 2a, *łu* optionally marks the recipient of the action and *t* marks the patient, the "direct" object.[6] The subject NP is obligatorily case-marked as an oblique, either by the simple oblique marker *t*, as in 2a, or by the particle *təl* 'from'. The general pattern resembles that of the monotransitives: one NP, in this case the recipient, is closely tied to the verb and has no obligatory overt case-marking (and no permitted case-marking if it is definite); the other NPs are obligatorily set off by oblique markers. Predictably, when the recipient is expressed by a pronominal (as in 2b-d), the usual object pronominal form is used. There is, moreover, some variation in the case-marking of the patient NP in ditransitive constructions when the recipient is a pronoun rather than a full-word NP: in this case the patient NP sometimes appears with zero case-marking, as in 2d, 'He wrecked my car' (but this does not seem to be possible with the verb 'give'). The general rule still holds—at most one full-word NP is nonoblique, i.e. lacking overt case-marking—but the zero-marked position may be filled by the patient NP when there is no full-word recipient NP. There may be some dialect difference between Flathead and Spokane in the case-marking of object NPs in ditransitive constructions: according to Carlson (1980:24), the marking described here is valid only for ditransitives with the suffix *śit*; for ditransitives with *łt*, Spokane marks the recipient NP with a preposition and the patient ("direct object") with optional *łu*. In Flathead, the normal case-marking is the same with both relational suffixes.

2. Ditransitives:

a. **Xʷíčšts łu Malí t pús t Čoní.**

xʷíč–šit–0–és	łu	Malí	t	pús
give–REL.TRANS–3.OBJ–3.SUBJ1	2ndary		OBL	
he [= Johnny] gave [it = cat] to her [= Mary]		Mary		a cat

t	Čoní.
OBL	
	Johnny

b. **Xʷíčštəmən t pús.**

xʷíč–šit–əm–én	t	pús
give–REL.TRANS–2sg.OBJ–1sg.SUBJ1	OBL	
I gave [it = cat] to you.		a cat

c. **Kʷu xʷíčštxʷ t pús.**

kʷu	xʷíč–šit–éxʷ	t	pús
1sg.OBJ	give–REL.TRANS–2sg.SUBJ1	OBL	
me	you gave [it = cat] to [me]		a cat

d. **Kʷu maẇłts inṗiṗúyšən.**

kʷu	maẇ–łt–0–és	in–ṗiṗúyšən
1sg.OBJ	break–REL.TRANS–3.OBJ–3.SUBJ1	1sg.POSS–car
me	he wrecked [it = car] to [me]	my car

1.3. Plain intransitive verbs, illustrated in exx. 3a-d, stand in sharp contrast to simple monotransitive and ditransitive constructions. Subject pronominals are proclitics (or, in the third person, zero). Full-word subject NPs pattern exactly like a definite main object of a transitive verb: they lack overt case-marking, being marked, if at all, by the optional particle *łu* (compare 3c and 3d, both meaning 'Johnny went out'). Unlike indefinite objects, full-word subjects of intransitive verbs never take the oblique marker *t*. Simple intransitives do not, of course, have a transitive suffix. (Some complex intransitive constructions do have a transitive suffix, but it is always followed by a detransitivizing suffix; see, for instance, reflexives, as illustrated in ex. 9 below.)

3. Plain intransitives:

a. **K^{w} ʔíṁš.**

k^{w}	ʔíṁš	
2sg.SUBJ2		
You	moved.	

b. **Čən q^{w}oyúlex .**

čən	q^{w}oyúlex^{w}	
1sg.SUBJ2		
I	am rich.	

c. **ʔocqé? łu Čoní.**

ʔocqé?	łu	Čoní
	2ndary	
went out		Johnny

d. **ʔocqé? Čoní.**

ʔocqé?	Čoní
went out	Johnny

1.4. So far the constructions we have discussed are morphosyntactically and semantically straightforward: the morphology and syntax of the transitive constructions reflect prototypical transitive semantics, with completed transfer of action from an agent to a patient, and the plain intransitives lack any such transfer. (The semantic patterns are not, of course, completely transparent throughout the language; as in all languages, the general semantic categories leak.) With the antipassive construction, illustrated in ex. 4, we see more complicated relations between morphosyntax and semantics. The form we call antipassive (a term used by others too, for instance Kroeber 1991:25, Darnell 1990, Gerdts 1993, and, with reservations, Thompson & Thompson 1992:102) is most often called 'middle' in the Salishan literature, and Newman (1980:158) posits a Proto-Salish suffix *-*m* 'middle'. If this suffix has a genuinely middle function in other Salishan languages, with action that reflects back on and/or affects the verb's subject, then Flathead has diverged from the rest of the family in this respect. The function of the suffix in Flathead is simply to detransitivize a transitive stem: the suffix is added only to transitive stems, replacing the transitive apparatus, and there is no tendency toward a middle function.[7] The form in fact fits the standard definition of

an antipassive: a normally transitive verb is changed to an intransitive verb, but the agent remains the subject, while the object loses its object properties.

The transitive stem to which the antipassive suffix is added may be either a simple root, as in 4a-c, or a root with affixes, as in 4d; but the antipassive suffix is never added to a stem transitivized by -*m*, a fact that is relevant to our overall analysis of these two patterns (see §2 below). The evidence for the transitivity of stems to which the antipassive is added lies in their ability to take the transitive apparatus directly, without an intervening derived transitive suffix; compare, for instance, the antipassives in 4a and 4d with their ordinary transitive counterparts: *ƛ̓^{w}e?entén* 'I bit it' and *čx̣^{w}éycpəntx^{w}* 'you cut the hair off'.

As a detransitivizing suffix, the antipassive changes the valency of the stem: antipassives are intransitive constructions. Accordingly, the subject pronominals are the usual intransitive proclitic particles, and full-word subject NPs are marked by optional *łu*, as in 4c (for which the free translation is 'I skinned it and my wife sliced and dried it', 'it' being deer meat). But since, unlike ordinary intransitives, these are semantically transitive constructions, they also have notional objects. When the object is overtly expressed, as in 4a and 4b, it is marked obligatorily by the oblique proclitic *t*. Antipassives thus have the opposite marking from ordinary transitive constructions with two arguments: in antipassives a subject NP is marked by optional *łu* and an object NP by obligatory *t*, while in transitives a subject NP is marked by obligatory *t* and an object NP by optional *łu*.[8] Note that in 4d the oblique marker precedes an instrument NP, not an object NP; this common type of adjunct phrase underlines our point that the oblique marker indicates a phrase that is less closely linked to the verb, and thus arguably less important, than the "main" NP.

4. Intransitives with ANTIPASSIVE **-(*e*)*m*:**

a. **Čən ƛ̓^{w}e?ém t nłámqe.**

čən	ƛ̓^{w}e?–ém	t	nłámqe
1sg.SUBJ2	bite–ANTIPASSV	OBL	
I	bit		bear.

b. **Čən esx̣̓e?emí t ululím.**

čən	es–x̣̓e?–m–i	t	ululím
1sg.SUBJ2	ASPECT–look.for–ANTIPASSV–INTR.CONT	OBL	
I	am looking for		money.

c. **x̣ʷcəntén u ɬéləm ɬu innóx̣ʷənx̣ʷ u cqáy̓is.**

x̣ʷc–nt–0–én	u	ɬél–m	ɬu	in–nóx̣ʷənx̣ʷ
skin–TRANS–3.OBJ–1sg.SUBJ1		slice–ANTIPASSV	2ndary	1sg.POSS–wife
I skinned it	and	sliced		my wife

u	cqay̓–nt–0–és
	dry–TRANS–3.OBJ–3.SUBJ1
and	she dried it.

d. **Ṅe wisčxʷəntéxʷ m kʷ čx̣ʷéycpəm t anɬníʔ.**

ṅe	hóy-s-čx̣ʷ-nt-éxʷ	m	kʷ
	finish-NOM-cut.off.meat-TRANS-2sg.SUBJ1	FUT	2sg.SUBJ2
when	you finish cutting off the meat	will	you

č-x̣ʷéyc-p-ém	t	an-ɬ-ńíč	
LOC:to-cut.off.hair-CHANGE-ANTIPASSV	OBL	2sg.POSS-DIM-cut	
cut off the hair	[with]	your knife.	

1.5. The next construction in our list is the one typically characterized in the Salishan literature as a passive or indefinite-agent construction. In many or most other Salishan languages this characterization is accurate, but the cognate construction in Flathead is clearly active and transitive, and the agent is very often definite. Morphosyntactically, the construction differs from ordinary transitives only in that the BACKGROUNDED AGENT suffix *-(é)m* (or its allomorph *-t*; see below) replaces the usual transitive subject suffix; that is, the suffix *-(é)m* is the subject suffix, and it is always preceded by a transitive suffix—*-nt*, *-st*, or relational (ditransitive) *-ɬt* or *-ɬit*. The case-marking of subject and object NPs, as in 5a, 5b, 5d, and 5e, is identical to that of any other transitive sentence, with the object optionally marked by *ɬu* and the subject obligatorily marked by *t*. (Ex. 5a means 'One-Night told Qeyqeyši', not vice versa. Zero marking of the patient in 5d is permitted because the recipient, the "indirect object", is pronominal.) Unlike the antipassive, the backgrounded agent construction may co-occur with a verb transitivized by *-m*, as in ex. 9d below.

No overt object suffix occurs between the transitive suffix and the backgrounded-agent suffix *-(é)m*. In practice, this means that only a 1sg object (which is marked solely by a proclitic *kʷu*) or a third-person object (which is marked by zero) may appear with this suffix. However, these forms are functionally identical to and in complementary distribution with transitive forms suffixed in *-t*, which does permit a preceding overt

object marker, as in 5e;[9] that is, the forms with *-t* occur always and only with 1pl and 2nd-person objects. We therefore treat this *-t* as an allomorph of the backgrounded-agent suffix, an analysis also found elsewhere in the literature (see e.g. Kroeber 1991:22, with reference to Interior Salish generally, and Thompson & Thompson 1992:63, with specific reference to Thompson; Kroeber considers the construction to be a true passive, while Thompson & Thompson treat it as an indefinite-agent construction).

5. Transitives with so-called "passive/indefinite agent" *-(e)m* (3rd SUBJ1) [= BACKGROUNDED AGENT]:

a. **Cúntəm Qeyqeyší t Nɬ̓ʷuskʷkʷʔé, ...**

cú–nt–0–ém	Qeyqeyší	t	nɬ̓ʷuʔ-s-kʷ-kʷʔé(c)
say–TRANS–3.OBJ–BACKGRND.AG		OBL	one-NOM-REDUP-dark
he told him	Qeyqeyši		One-Night

b. **Kʷu ɬ̓ʷeʔəntém t səmx̣é.**

kʷu	ɬ̓ʷeʔ–nt–ém	t	səmx̣é
1sg.OBJ	bite–TRANS–BACKGRND.AG	OBL	
me	he bit [me]		grizzly bear

c. **Espuʔpúlstəm.**

es–puʔ–púls–st–0–ém

ASPECT–spouse–kill–TRANS–3.OBJ–BACKGRND.AG

Her husband got killed. [= She got spouse-killed. = They spouse-killed her.]

d. **Kʷu púlɬtəm iskʷísʷs.**

kʷu	púls–ɬt–ém	in–skʷísʷs
1SG.OBJ	kill–REL.TRANS–BACKGRND.AG	1sg.POSS–chicken
me	someone killed [them = chickens] on [me]	my chickens

e. **qe nčcníčiɬəlt t sčq̓iq̓ʷé.**

qe	n–čic(n)=íčn–ɬul–l–t	t
1pl	LOC:in–arrive=back–TRANS–1plu.OBJ–BACKGRND.AG	OBL
us	they caught up with us	

s–č–q̓i–q̓ʷé[y=us=šn]

NOM–LOC:to–REDUP–black=face=foot

Blackfeet

Although this construction is an ordinary active transitive in Flathead, it does have one prototypical functional characteristic of passives (see Shibatani 1985): as our label suggests, it indicates backgrounding of the agent. This is not a new observation; Thompson & Thompson (1992:58), for instance, interpret the Thompson cognate construction similarly, remarking that the indefinite-subject forms (as they analyze them) 'serve to shift focus from the transitive subject to the object'. The discourse function of the Flathead construction, at least, appears to be identical to that of Columbian, as described in Kinkade 1989. Kinkade argues that the construction serves to track participants, being used to indicate a less prominent agent throughout a discourse. The Qeyqeyši story from which ex. 5a is taken illustrates this feature very neatly. The overall discourse environment is story-telling about a prominent tribal member named Qeyqeyši, specifically about his wild younger days when he and his friend One-Night repeatedly got into trouble. The particular story in which 5a occurs follows one in which Qeyqeyši himself is the major character; but in this later story, One-Night is the main instigator of the prank. In spite of One-Night's greater prominence in this context, however, transitive verbs referring to his actions consistently have the backgrounded-agent suffix throughout this rather lengthy story. The reason surely is that, in the overall discourse environment, Qeyqeyši himself is the primary character. Although this story sequence is an especially clear example of the participant-tracking function described by Kinkade, the same phenomenon recurs in Flathead texts. The point that needs to be underlined here is that there is nothing indefinite about One-Night. It is of course true that indefinite agents are typically less prominent than other participants in discourse, e.g. when the patient is 1st or 2nd person (5b, 5e) or when no particular agent is specified (5c, 5d); but the common factor in these (and other) examples is backgrounding of the agent, not indefiniteness.

1.6. The derived transitive suffix *-m* is added to an intransitive stem, either a root or a derived stem. Its function is to add an argument, a patient, to the verb's argument structure; it thus effects a change in valency, like the antipassive but in the opposite direction. The suffix is followed immediately by the transitive apparatus—transitive suffix, object suffix (if any), and subject suffix—or by a detransitivizing suffix (but never the antipassive), or by the transitive continuative suffix (see §1.7 below).[10] In other words, this suffix creates a transitive stem. It presents no particular morphosyntactic complications: complete transitive verbs that contain this suffix are straightforward transitive forms, both morphologically and syntactically, and detransitivized verbs that contain this suffix follow the usual patterns for such constructions (see e.g. §§1.8-9 below, especially ex. 9d, in which the derived transitive suffix occurs twice). Mattina (1982:430) observes that Colville-Okanagan stems derived with the cognate suffix never participate in ditransitive constructions; there is no such restriction in Flathead, as ex. 6d illustrates.

6. Derived transitives in *-m*:

a. **S̓X̓əmstéxʷ.**
   š̓X̓-m-st-0-éxʷ
   all.kinds-DER.TR-TRANS-3.OBJ-2sg.SUBJ1
   You get/make all kinds [of things].

b. **Čxʷúymәntәm łu Malí t Čoní.**

č-xʷúy-m-nt-0-ém	łu	Malí	t	Čoní
LOC:to-go-DER.TR-TRANS-3.OBJ-BACKGRND.AG	2ndary		OBL	
He visited her		Mary		Johnny

c. **Ełptaxʷәmis.**
   eł-ptaxʷ-m-nt-0-és
   again/back-spit-DER.TR-TRANS-3.OBJ-3.SUBJ1
   He spat it out again.

d. **Wicínəmłts askʷískʷs**

hóy=cín-m-łt-0-és	an-s-kʷís-kʷs
finish=mouth-DER.TR-REL.TRANS-3.OBJ-3.SUBJ1	2sg.POSS-NOM-REDUP-chicken
He ate [it/them]up	your chickens

This suffix has been analyzed in various ways in the literature. It is not clear to us which, if any, of these interpretations are incompatible with ours; the apparent divergence may be due in large part to nonsubstantive terminological differences. In addition, of course, the suffix may function in less transparent ways in other Salishan languages. We will mention a few representative analyses here, but will not attempt to sort out the differences in any detail. Like us, Vogt appears to analyze the suffix as a transitivizer (1940:59-60), though his analysis of it is complicated (and made somewhat unclear) by his treatment of Kalispel transitive continuative forms as intransitives (see our ex. 7b below for a typical co-occurrence of the derived transitive and transitive continuative suffixes). Kinkade treats the cognate Columbian suffix as an intransitive suffix, specifically the middle suffix *-m*; the resulting stem is then transitivized, in his analysis, by the addition of the causative suffix (1981:105). Gerdts' 1993 analysis of the analogous construction in Halkomelem looks very similar to Kinkade's, except that his middle category is her antipassive (see e.g. her ex. 45). The Kinkade/Gerdts approach not seem well suited to the Flathead facts, however. The Flathead transitive suffixes, including the so-called causative *-st* as well as *-nt* and the relational transitive suffixes, can be added only to stems that are already transitive; transitive roots are

lexically specified, while lexically intransitive roots and stems detransitivized by lexical or other detransitivizing suffixes can take the transitive apparatus only after the derived transitive suffix *-m* has been added. There is also no obvious preference for *-st* over *-nt* after this suffix in Flathead.

Note, finally, that the derived-transitive suffix may appear either after a lexical suffix, thus transitivizing an intransitive stem (ex. 6d), or before a lexical suffix, in which case the transitive stem formed by this suffix is detransitivized by the lexical suffix (ex. 8b).

1.7. The transitive continuative construction is the most interesting of the Flathead transitivity-related constructions, thanks to the complications presented by its analysis. We will describe and illustrate the construction before discussing the analytic complications.

The transitive continuative suffix *-(e)m* does not co-occur with the transitive apparatus in monotransitive forms (e.g. exx. 7a-e). Instead, it occurs at the end of a transitive stem—i.e. after a transitive root (7a, 7e) or a stem transitivized by DER.TR *-m* (7b-d)—and there is never an object suffix or an agent suffix. The form is nominalized by the prefix *s-*, which in this construction appears in the form [es].[11] The agent of a transitive continuative verb is expressed by a possessive affix, either a prefix (1sg, 2sg, 1pl) or a suffix added after the TRANS.CONT suffix *-em* (3, 2pl). The patient is expressed in two different ways: either it is a normal object marker (1sg) or it is an intransitive subject particle (2sg, 2pl). In Flathead, 1pl and third-person patients provide no evidence for the "basic" marking of notional patients in this construction, because third-person objects and third-person intransitive subjects are all zero-marked, and the preposed part of the 1pl object is identical to the 1pl intransitive subject particle.

In ditransitive continuative constructions the transitive suffix does appear, specifically the relational transitive suffix *-łt*, which immediately precedes the TRANS.CONT suffix (7f). Otherwise the ditransitive forms are morphologically identical to the monotransitive forms.

Syntactically, the transitive continuative is identical to an ordinary transitive construction: subject NPs are obligatorily marked by oblique *t* (7c, 7e) and object NPs are optionally marked by *łu* (7a, 7d-f). (In 7f, the fact that the recipient of the action is a pronominal is what allows the patient NP to receive optional *łu* marking.)

7. Transitive continuatives in *-(e)m*:

a. **Iesx̌e?ém ululím.**

in-s-x̌e?-ém	ululím
1sg.POSS-NOM-look.for-TRANS.CONT	
I'm looking for [it]	money.

b. **K^{w}u esáẏmtəməms.**

k^{w}u	s-áẏm-t-m-ém-s
1sg.OBJ	NOM-angry-STATV-DER.TR-TRANS.CONT-3.POSS
me	He's mad at [me].

c. **P esáẏmtəməms t Čoní.**

p	es-áẏm-t-m-ém-s	t
2pl.SUBJ2	NOM/ASPECT-angry-STATV-DER.TR-TRANS.CONT-3.POSS	OBL
you all	he's mad at [you all]	
Čoní		
Johnny		

d. **Iesáẏmtəməm łu Čoní.**

in-s-áẏm-t-m-ém	łu	Čoní
1sg.POSS-NOM-angry-STATV-DER.TR-TRANS.CONT	2ndary	
I'm mad at him		Johnny

e. **Esx^{w}épəms łu síc̓əm t isq^{w}sé?.**

s-x^{w}ép-ém-és	łu	síc̓əm	t
NOM-spread-TRANS.CONT-3.SUBJ1	2ndary	blanket	OBL
he is spreading it		the blanket	
in-s-q^{w}sé?			
1sg.POSS-NOM-son			
my son			

f. **K^{w} iesc̓éx^{w}łtəm łu asíc̓əm.**

k^{w}	in-s-c̓éx^{w}-łt-ém	łu	an-síc̓əm
2sg.SUBJ2	1sg.POSS-NOM-REL.TRANS-TRANS.CONT	2ndary	2sg.POSS-blanket
you	I'm drying [it] for you		your blanket

As mentioned above, our analysis of this continuative construction as transitive differs sharply from the analyses of Kroeber (1986, 1991) and Vogt (1940), who treat the construction as an intransitive. In Kroeber's analysis (1991:29), a transitive verb 'is one that contains a Transitive or Ditransitive suffix, or at least inflects with Object

pronominals. All other predicates are intransitive.' This definition straightforwardly excludes monotransitive continuative constructions from the transitive category; however, as we will try to show, the definition is too restrictive, primarily because it does not take relevant syntactic patterns into account.

The construction has two properties that make it look intransitive. First, and most obviously, it lacks the transitive suffix in the monotransitive form; and second, the use of the 2sg intransitive subject proclitic for the notional patient makes the construction look intransitive. A form like *k̓ iswíčəm* (*k̓ in-s-wíč-em*, lit. 2sg.SUBJ2 1sg.POSS-NOM-see-TRANS.CONT) would be glossed by Vogt and Kroeber as 'you are my seeing', whereas for us the translation is literally as well as freely 'I am seeing you'.

The construction has two properties that are compatible with either a transitive or an intransitive analysis: the ambiguity in the marking of 1pl and third-person notional patients, already mentioned above, and the optional *ɬu* case-marking on the notional object NP, as in 7a and 7d. The sentences in 7a and 7d could be glossed either as ordinary transitives, 'I'm looking for money' and 'I'm mad at Johnny', respectively, or literally in the Vogt/Kroeber style, 'money is my looking for' and 'Johnny is my being mad at'.

However, the construction has four properties that make it look transitive. First, the 1sg object proclitic appears where the notional object is 'me'. Second, a full-word agent NP is obligatorily marked by oblique *t*, as expected in a transitive but emphatically not in an intransitive sentence; this marking in turn shows that the apparently ambiguous optional *ɬu* marking on the other possible full-word NP must indicate the object, not an intransitive subject, because notional full-word subject NPs are invariably marked by *t* in this construction. Third, as noted above, the transitive suffix appears obligatorily in two-goal transitive continuative forms (e.g. 7f). And fourth, given the crosslinguistic links between possessive and agentive marking, the expression of the notional subject by possessive pronominals suggests that they are, indeed, agents (compare, for instance, English *I wrecked his car* and *my wrecking of his car*). This property is suggestive, but it cannot be considered diagnostic for the analysis of any particular language. A possibly relevant fifth property is the fact that the transitive continuative suffix *-(e)m* occurs immediately after the derived transitive suffix *-m*, which otherwise precedes only a transitive suffix. (However, this property might perhaps be dismissed on the ground that the co-occurrence of these two suffixes could mean simply that what we're calling the transitive continuative suffix has a detransitivizing effect, an analysis that would fit with the Vogt/Kroeber interpretation.)

The two intransitive-like properties, the absence of a transitive suffix in monotransitive continuative forms and the use of 2nd-person intransitive subject proclitics, are balanced by two of the transitive-like properties, the presence of a transitive suffix in ditransitive continuative forms and the use of the 1sg object proclitic. The crosslin-

guistic tendency toward linking of transitive agents and possessives does not provide solid evidence for our analysis. That leaves us with one property which, in our view, argues strongly for a transitive analysis, namely, the case-marking of full-word subject and object NPs. As we have seen in §§1.1-1.6 (and will see below in §§1.8-1.9), this case-marking is consistent throughout the language in identifying subject NPs and object NPs in both transitive and intransitive constructions. If the transitive continuative construction is not to be viewed as transitive, there is an inconsistency in case-marking NPs that has no explanation.

By contrast, we do have an explanation for at least one of the two intransitive-like properties of this construction—the use of 2sg and 2pl intransitive proclitic pronominals to indicate the notional patient. Since, in monotransitive continuative forms, there is no transitive suffix, there is nothing to attach an object suffix to. In fact, the TRANS.CONT suffix replaces the entire transitive apparatus, so there is also no agent suffix, which must follow an object suffix in a normal transitive form. Obviously, then, patients must be expressed by some other means. This presents no problem for the 1sg object, which is a proclitic already, or for a third-person object, which has no overt marking, or for a 1pl object, which in ordinary transitive forms has both proclitic and suffixed components (so that the proclitic can take over the entire function). But how are 2nd-person objects to be expressed, given that the usual suffix position is not available? There are three other sets of person markers: transitive subject suffixes, possessive affixes, and intransitive subject proclitics. The transitive subject suffixes are unavailable for the morphological reason just given, even aside from the poor notional fit. The possessive affixes are unavailable because that set is already in use for the subject of the nominalized verb. This leaves only the intransitive subject proclitics, if a 2nd-person marker is to be used at all; and so that is what we find. Notice, moreover, that an analogous explanation will not account for the use of the 1sg object proclitic if the construction is viewed as intransitive: since both the 1sg object and the 1sg intransitive subject are proclitics, both are available—in contrast to the second person, where only the intransitive subject particles can be pressed into service as object markers in this construction.[12]

The other intransitive-like property of the transitive continuative, the lack of a transitive suffix in monotransitive forms, is what it appears to be: a signal that the forms in question are less transitive than their completive counterparts. On our analysis, adding the transitive continuative suffix does not change the valency of the transitive stem, but it does reduce the degree of transitivity associated with the action. We will discuss this further in §2.

1.8. The remaining two constructions that we want to illustrate are two types of detransitivized verbs. This section concerns verbs detransitivized by lexical suffixes, as in exx. 8a-c. These suffixes may be added to roots, as in 8a, or to stems that have

been transitivized by the addition of the derived transitive suffix, as in 8b-c. There are no morphosyntactic problems here: the verbs take intransitive subject particles, as expected in an intransitive construction; a subject NP is marked by optional *łu* (8c); and an object NP is marked by obligatory *t* (8a-b).

These constructions resemble antipassives in that the lexical suffix replaces the entire transitive apparatus; that is, it is added directly to the transitive stem, either a lexically transitive stem or a derived transitive stem. But where the antipassive is formed by a semantically empty suffix *-(e)m*, the present constructions are formed by a lexical suffix with (often) transparent semantic content. A more significant difference between the two construction types is that a stem detransitivized by a lexical suffix may be transitivized again by the addition of the derived transitive suffix, as in ex. 6d above. As we have seen, this is not possible with an antipassive.

8. Transitives detransitivized by lexical suffixes:

a. **Kʷpəlsqé t šméń.**

kʷ	púls=sqé	t	šméń
2sg.SUBJ2	kill=person	OBL	
You	killed [person]		an enemy.

b. **Ntx̣ʷəmsqá t x̣ˇcís.**

n–tóx̣ʷ–m=sqá		t	x̣ˇcín–s
LOC:in-straight-DER.TR=domestic.animal		OBL	horse-3.POSS
He turned stock [horse] around			his horse

c. **Čxʷimsqé łu Malí.**

č–xʷúy–m=sqé	łu	Malí
LOC:to-go-DER.TR=person	2ndary	
She visited him		Mary

A common proposal in the Salishan literature is that verbs like those in ex. 8 contain an incorporated noun—that is, that the lexical suffixes are in fact incorporated noun stems. Such an analysis would of course account for their inransitive status. In order not to expand the present paper beyond reasonable bounds, we will not consider the implications of this interpretation here, in spite of its obvious relevance to the general topic of transitivity.

1.9. The final construction we will consider is the reflexive in *-cút*, which—like reflexives in many other languages—detransitivizes the verb to which it is added. As

with verbs detransitivized by lexical suffixes, these reflexives are straightforward intransitives: the pronominal subject is the usual intransitive subject proclitic (9a, 9c), and a full-noun subject NP is marked optionally by *łu* (9b). For obvious semantic reasons, the reflexive takes no overt object NP. The reflexive construction differs strikingly from the other two detransitivizing constructions we have seen, the antipassive and the lexical-suffix constructions in §1.8: instead of replacing the entire transitive apparatus, the reflexive suffix is added to it, immediately after the transitive suffix. In other words, the reflexive suffix replaces the (object and) transitive subject suffix(es). Like lexical-suffix constructions, but unlike the antipassive, a reflexive may be re-transitivized by the addition of the derived transitive suffix, as in 9d.

9. Transitives detransitivized by REFLEXIVE ***-cut*:**

a. **Čən cl̓ipməncú təl̓ esšíl̓.**

čən	c–l̓ip–m–nt–cút	təl̓	esšíl̓
1sg.SUBJ2	LOC:hither–drop–DER.TR–TRANS–REFLXV		
I	came down	from	the tree

b. **Qsəncú łu Čoní.**

qs–nt–cút	łu	Čoní
scratch–TRANS–REFLXV	2ndary	
He scratched himself		Johnny

c. **Čən espəlscúti.**

čən	es–púls–st–cút–i
1sg.SUBJ2	ASPECT–kill–TRANS–REFLXV–INTR.CONT
I	am killing myself.

d. **Kʷu čtax̣ʷəlməncútəməntəm.**

kʷu	č–tax̣ʷl–m–nt–cút–m–nt–em
1sg.OBJ	LOC:to-start–DER.TR–TRANS–REFLXV–DER.TR–TRANS–BACKGRND.AG
me	He came up to [me].

This completes our survey of nine Flathead constructions that are relevant to an analysis of the language's transitivity system. The next step is to try to pull the various constructions together into a less fragmented system.

2. AN ANALYSIS OF TRANSITIVITY IN FLATHEAD. In this section we will propose an analysis in which the transitivity-related constructions illustrated in §§1.1-1.9 fit

into a coherent overall picture. We should begin by noting that plain intransitives fall outside the transitive system entirely; they are included only to show what the usual intransitive construction is like, with its subject proclitics and its full-word subject NP marked only by optional *łu*.

As we said in our introduction, two main variables turn out to correlate interestingly with transitivity alternations in Flathead: first, there is a systematic morphosyntactic distinction between semantically transitive constructions with a FOCUS ON THE AGENT and those with a FOCUS ON THE PATIENT; and second, ASPECT plays a role in conditioning transitivity alternations. On our analysis, the ordinary (noncontinuative) transitive construction carries no particular emphasis on agent or patient, and no special marking of aspect: it is the neutral transitive construction. The object NP is most closely linked to the verb, as indicated by its lack of obligatory case-marking; in a ditransitive form, usually only one object NP, the recipient (the "indirect object"), may lack case-marking. A full-word subject NP in a transitive construction is marked obligatorily by oblique *t*. This neat picture is complicated by the influence of definiteness, a typical feature affecting transitivity in other languages (and apparently elsewhere in Salish): an indefinite object NP may be marked with oblique *t*. This alternative marking, though it is not at all consistent in Flathead, indicates in effect a reduction in the transitive force of the verb—a deviation from the prototypical transitive, which involves a completed transfer of action from a definite agent to a definite patient.

The next four constructions are all characterized by a suffix *-(e)m*. We propose to treat all four of these suffixes as a single morpheme with one general function and with specific interpretations linked to the various morphological environments in which it occurs:[13] the antipassive occurs in absolute final position, without a preceding transitive suffix and without a nominalizing prefix plus possessive agent; the backgrounded-agent suffix occurs in absolute final position after a transitive suffix and without a nominalizing prefix plus possessive agent; the derived transitive suffix occurs at the end of a stem but before the transitive apparatus or a replacement for the transitive apparatus (namely, a detransitivizing lexical suffix or the transitive continuative suffix); and the transitive continuative suffix occurs finally, except for a possessive agent suffix, and always with a nominalizing prefix plus a possessive agent. In other words, the four specific functions (designated by our four labels) of these four *-(e)m* suffixes are predictable from the position they take in a particular verb form.

The primary function of the proposed morpheme is simply to signal a deviation from the neutral transitive type as represented by the ordinary transitive. The *-(e)m* suffixes reflect two different kinds of deviation from the prototypical transitive: they indicate either a focus on one of the two main participants in the action—i.e. the agent or the patient (or perhaps, in a ditransitive verb, the recipient)—or a change in aspect that affects the transitive force of the verb. The transitive continuative is the sole member of

the aspect-changing category. In the focus category, the participant that is highlighted is predictable from the morphological context in which the suffix occurs.

The antipassive *-(e)m* emphasizes the agent—so much so that it changes the valency of a verb to which it is added, removing the patient argument. The resulting intransitive construction is analogous to verbs detransitivized by a lexical suffix; these too highlight the agent, removing the patient from the verb's argument structure. The reflexive in *-cut* also fits here functionally and syntactically, its formation differing from the other two agent-focusing constructions only in that it retains the transitive suffix. Example 4c provides a hint about at least one use of this agent-highlighting construction. This sentence, which means 'I skinned it and my wife sliced and dried it', has an antipassive ('sliced') flanked by two ordinary transitive verbs. With the second verb comes a change of agent, a switch that is marked by the use of the antipassive. Note that Vogt's characterization of what we call the antipassive as occurring with an indefinite object (1940:31) would not capture this usage, since the 'it' in question refers to the same deer meat throughout the sentence; the only difference is the switch in agents. Vogt was partly right, because antipassive constructions do often include indefinite patients, but definiteness is not (in our view) the primary factor.

In the backgrounded-agent construction, the *-(e)m* focuses on the patient. This is evident, for instance, throughout the particular Qeyqeyši tale from which ex. 5a is taken: as described above, Qeyqeyši is the main character in all the stories about him, even this one, where his friend One-Night is the instigator of the prank and the agent of most of the transitive verbs. Qeyqeyši's more prominent overall status is highlighted by the use of the backgrounded-agent construction throughout. We will not speculate about why there is no valency change in this instance; since the verbs are clearly transitive, the *-(e)m* suffix here is probably best viewed as the agent suffix.

The derived transitive construction also highlights the patient, since it adds a patient to the verb's argument structure. The non-peripheral position of the derived transitive suffix in the word opens the possibility that it will co-occur with other functional variants of the *-(e)m* morpheme. And, as we have seen, it does so—but only with variants that are compatible with its patient-highlighting function, namely the backgrounded-agent suffix (see ex. 9d) and the transitive continuative (exx. 7b-d). Our analysis predicts that the derived transitive will NOT co-occur with the antipassive, and this prediction is borne out. But the fit is closer with the other *-(e)m* formations than with functionally related constructions: as we have seen, the derived transitive suffix does occur routinely before detransitivizing lexical suffixes and with the reflexive in *-cut*, two formations that, like the antipassive, carry a focus on the agent.

As mentioned above, the transitive continuative construction does not participate in the argument-focusing functions of the other three manifestations of the proposed *-(e)m* morpheme. Instead, its role is to signal a change in aspect, a change that reduces

the transitive force of the verb in that the action is not completely transferred from the agent to the patient. The reduced transitivity of this construction is reflected in its one clear intransitive-like feature, the lack of a transitive suffix in monotransitive forms.

All four -(e)m formations, then, can be viewed as changing an ordinary transitive to a form that is in some sense less transitive—with unbalanced emphasis on one participant or with a deviation from the prototypical completive aspect. It is interesting to note that only the two patient-highlighting formations, the backgrounded-agent construction and the derived transitive, remain straightforwardly transitive morphologically. By contrast, the agent-highlighting antipassive is morphosyntactically intransitive, and the transitive continuative construction, though transitive, is morphologically peculiar for a transitive verb.

Our analysis ends here: this is as far as we have proceeded in our effort to work through the Flathead facts related to transitivity. We should close by emphasizing again that our analysis is necessarily incomplete. Aside from remaining gaps in our understanding of the constructions we have already examined, there are still other constructions that must be studied before we can aim at a complete analysis of the system. But we hope to have shown, at least, that there are interesting interrelationships among transitivity-related constructions that seemed at first to be quite disparate.

Footnotes

* Thomason is most grateful to elders and members of the Flathead Culture Committee of St. Ignatius, Montana, for permitting her to study their language. Besides examining written and tape-recorded materials prepared by the Culture Committee, she has worked extensively with several fluent speakers: Harriet Whitworth, Dorothy Felsman, Felicite "Jim" McDonald, Clarence Woodcock, and Lucy Vanderburg. We both thank Ken Hale and Tony Woodbury for discussing some of the data in this paper and offering valuable comments about the analysis; we have made use of some of their suggestions, with gratitude, in the overall analysis in §2.

1. The language called Flathead today is primarily a mixture of Flathead proper, or Bitterroot Salish, with Pend d'Oreille ([pandəréy]), as spoken by people whose homeland was the Jocko River area. There is also admixture from Kalispel speakers who moved from Washington to the Camas Prairie area in the 1880s. Both the Bitterroot and the Jocko valleys are in western Montana, and the two dialects were always very similar; the Pend d'Oreille disappeared as a distinct tribe after the Bitterroot Salish moved to the current Flathead Reservation, through which the Jocko River flows. However, elders can still identify tribal members according to their Flathead or Pend d'Oreille origin, and descendants of the three original tribes still tend to live in different parts of the reservation. The modern tribal organization is known as the Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribes; Kutenai is a non-Salishan language with no generally agreed-upon genetic affiliation. Flathead belongs to a dialect complex that also includes Spokane and Kalispel; these dialects comprise a single language, but there is no language name that covers all three. Therefore, following the usual practice of naming the language after the dialect one knows best, we will use 'Flathead' to refer to the entire complex. We have not carried out a detailed comparison among the dialects, but in the major features of the system, at least, Flathead and Kalispel seem to be identical. The data in this paper come from Thomason's field notes and materials compiled by the Flathead Culture Committee.

2. In this paper we will use the terms 'verb' and 'predicate' interchangeably, and we will also talk about 'nouns' and 'noun phrases'. We use this terminology for convenience; we do not mean to take a firm position on the question of whether Flathead and other Salishan languages have a clear distinction between nouns and verbs (see e.g. Kinkade 1983 and van Eijk & Hess 1986 for discussion of this issue). We are persuaded by (for instance) Kroeber's argument that a noun/verb distinction is established by the fact that a noun, but not a verb, can be 'directly inflected with possessive affixes' (1991:26; see also van Eijk & Hess 1986). However, the morphosyntactic consequences of the distinction between these two categories are certainly not as far-reaching in Salishan as in most other language families.

3. Abbreviations used in this paper are: 1sg = first person singular; 2sg = second person singular; 1pl = first person plural; 2pl = second person plural; 3 = third person; 2ndary = 'secondary in importance', a complement or subordinate to the main predicate; ANTIPASSV = antipassive; BACKGRND.AG = backgrounded agent; CONT = continuative aspect; DER.TR = derived transitive (a transitivizing suffix); INTR = intransitive; LOC = locative; NOM = nominalizer; OBJ = object; OBL = oblique case marker; POSS = possessive; REDUP = reduplication; REFLXV = reflexive; REL = relational (indicating that there is a recipient or other "indirect object"); STATV = stative; SUBJ1 = transitive subject (agent); SUBJ2 = intransitive subject; TRANS = transitive.

The grammatical terminology used in this paper is based on that of Carlson 1972; we deviate from Carlson's early terminology primarily where we have decided that Flathead structure is best analyzed in slightly different terms. Like Mattina 1987, we distinguish ordinary suffixes from lexical suffixes by using different boundary symbols: an ordinary suffix is preceded by a hyphen, while a lexical suffix is preceded by an equals sign.

4. These two suffixes differ functionally in some Salishan languages, such that the former is noncausative and the latter causative. Although semantically causative verbs usually have *-st* in Flathead, however, some verbs with this suffix are not causative, and in fact we have not found a systematic functional difference between the two suffixes. Even the quintessential causative verb 'kill' occurs occasionally with the suffix *-nt*—e.g. *T inl?éw u púlsis ci səmxe* 'My father killed that grizzly', where the *i* is morphophonemically *nt*—beside the more common *-st* (e.g. *T inl?éw u púlsts ci səmxe*). At least for the time being, therefore, we gloss them identically. Note that, unlike e.g. Mattina & Montler 1990:23-24, we do not consider these two suffixes to be transitivizers, at least not in Flathead: on our analysis, they may be added only to stems that are already transitive—i.e. lexically transitive roots or stems transitivized by the suffix *-m*. See §1.6 below for further discussion of this point.

5. We will not consider in this paper the question of the status of full words other than the main predicate (typically the first word) in the Flathead sentence. In particular, we do not address the issue of adjunct vs. argument status for noun phrases that are translated in English as subjects and objects. It is clear that some noninitial full words are adjuncts, and some of these adjuncts are regularly marked by optional *łu*. Moreover, the oblique marker *t* is attached to words other than subject NPs, e.g. time adverbials. These facts do not necessarily mean that the NPs under consideration here are **not** arguments of the verb; still, their syntactic behavior does resemble the behavior of full words that are certainly not arguments. In any case, the status of the "subject" and "object" NPs is not crucial for our present purposes. For convenience, and without prejudice, we will refer to them simply as subjects and objects.

6. It is in a sense misleading to specify *łu* as marking one object in a transitive

construction, because this particle also occurs sometimes before the oblique marker *t*, as well as before certain subordinate clauses and other adjuncts. But the particle is especially frequent with an object NP, and in any case the point is that the main object of a verb is normally the only NP in a transitive construction that may be preceded by this particle alone, whether the main object is the so-called direct object of a monotransitive verb or the so-called indirect object of a ditransitive verb.

7. This point is also made for Squamish in Darnell 1990. Darnell's analysis of the antipassive is similar to ours in other respects too; but our analysis of the Flathead backgrounded-agent construction (see §1.5 below) differs from his description of the cognate Squamish passive, mainly because the two languages differ, and our explanation of the various alternations also differs from his.

8. Formally marked antipassives are not the only verbs that participate in this pattern; some unsuffixed intransitive stems also do so. An example is the verb *čłíp* 'hunt', as in *Čən čłíp t nłámqe* vs. *Čłpəntén łu nłámqe*, both meaning 'I hunt(ed) bear'.

9. The transitive suffix *-łul* in 5e is a variant of the standard transitive suffixes, occurring always and only with a 1pl or 2pl object.

10. The derived transitive suffix differs from the other *-m* suffixes in that it seems to have a stressed variant with a final vowel: *-mí*. This variant is rare, however; the suffix is common only in the unstressed form *-m*. Moreover, the analysis of the stressed form is not entirely clear. Vogt, for instance, treats it as a separate suffix from the transitivizer *-m* (1940:59). We will not consider the implications of the possible stressed variant in this paper, but will treat the suffix, for the time being, as invariant *-m*. If this interpretation should turn out to be inaccurate, we will either have to incorporate a morphologized morphophonemic rule or abandon our grouping of this suffix with the others. Given the functional interrelations that link the four *-m* suffixes, the latter move would seem less attractive than the former.

11. The other possibility is that this prefix is the actual aspect prefix rather than the nominalizer. Phonologically, the aspect prefix is a perfect fit; morphologically, the nominalizer is a better fit, given that the subject is expressed by possessive affixes, which can be added only to nominal stems. As others have pointed out (notably Kroeber 1991), there has been some conflation of these two prefixes in Flathead. For the time being, at least, we will treat this prefix as the nominalizer, with a shape that is determined by the particular construction.

12. Tony Mattina (personal communication, 1992) has suggested a different analysis of the transitive continuative forms, as a 'genitive' construction. He points out that in Flathead, as in Colville-Okanagan, there are constructions like (Flathead) *k̓ inxménč* 'I like you' and *k̓u anxménč* 'you like me', with pronominal marking identical to that of the transitive continuative forms—possessive affix for notional agent, 2sg proclitic

intransitive subject vs. 1sg object for notional object—but with no nominalizer and no *-m* suffix. Vogt (1940:32) also comments on links between transitive continuative verbs and possessed nouns. We do not have time (or space) to explore these connections in the present paper, but they obviously must be considered in a complete analysis of the phenomena. As far as we can tell now, they will not require a change in our analysis of the transitive continuative construction.

13. The idea of linking two or more of these *-(e)m* suffixes is of course not new, although our particular interpretation and our grouping of all four into a single morpheme is, as far as we know, original. For instance, some authors connect the antipassive and the backgrounded-agent suffixes; examples are Kuipers 1967 (Squamish), Darnell 1990 (Squamish, with an analysis that, like ours, involves de-emphasis of one argument in each case), and Gerdts (1989:185, Halkomelem). Other authors, e.g. Kinkade (1981:105, Columbian), consider the antipassive and the derived transitive suffix to be the same, and still others (e.g. Vogt 1940:32, Kalispel), Newman 1980:158-59, and Kroeber 1986:5, 1991:294) group the antipassive and the transitive continuative suffixes together.

References

Carlson, Barry F. 1972. *A grammar of Spokan, a Salish language of eastern Washington.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii dissertation. (University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 4.4.)

Carlson, Barry F. 1980. Two-goal transitive stems in Spokane Salish. *IJAL* 46:21-26.

Darnell, Michael. 1990. Squamish /m/ constructions. Paper presented at Berkeley Linguistics Society 16.

Eijk, Jan P. van, and Thom Hess. 1986. Noun and verb in Salish. *Lingua* 69:319-31.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1989. Object agreement in the Halkomelem Salish passive: A morphological explanation. *General and Amerindian ethnolinguistics in remembrance of Stanley Newman*, ed. by Mary Ritchie Key and Henry M. Hoenigswald, 185-99. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——. 1993. Mapping transitive voice in Halkomelem. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 19, to appear.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1981. Transitive inflection in (Moses) Columbian Salish. *The Working Papers of the XVI ICSL*, ed. by Anthony Mattina and Timothy Montler, 103-10. Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Lingistics 2.

——. 1983. Salish evidence against the universality of 'noun' and 'verb'. *Lingua* 60:25-40.

——. 1989 (?). [Title?—Paper on the use of the passive/indefinite agent construction for topic management in discourse. *Working Papers of the 000 ICSL.*]

Kroeber, Paul Demarest. 1986. Nominalized subordinate clauses in Salish. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia.

——. 1991. *Comparative syntax of subordination in Salish.* Chicago: University of Chicago dissertation.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. *The Squamish language.* The Hague: Mouton.

Mattina, Anthony. 1982. The Colville-Okanagan transitive system. *IJAL* 48:421-35.

——. 1987. *Colville-Okanagan dictionary.* Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5.

—-, and Timothy Montler. 1990. Towards a reconstruction of the Proto-Salish transitive system. Paper presented at the Third Spring Workshop on Theory and Method in Linguistic Reconstruction, University of Pittsburgh.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives [full title?]. *Language* 61:821-48.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1985. Control in Salish grammar. *Relational typology*, ed. by Frans Plank, 391-428. Berlin: Mouton.

——, and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. *The Thompson language.* Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8.

Vogt, Hans. 1940. *The Kalispel language.* Oslo: Det Norsk Videnskaps-Akademi.