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0. Introduction

This paper makes the following universal claims:

(I) All predicates are based on roots which are lexically associated with a single, internal argument.

(II) All transitive and all unergative predicates are derived by morphosyntactic operations, which may be phonologically null.

I will provide evidence for both claims from St'at'imcets (Lillooet), a member of the Northern Interior branch of the Salish family. Salish languages are particularly pertinent for the analysis of sub-lexical syntax, since they give overt morphological expression to many operations which are covert in highly lexicalized languages such as English. I will show that the claims in (I-II) are equally applicable to English-type languages, given the independently available mechanism of zero-morphology (Pesetsky 1995).

(I-II) have obvious implications for the proper formulation of the unergative/unaccusative distinction. Salish evidence is consistent with an approach such as that of Hale and Keyser (1993, to appear), in which unaccusatives are primitive and unergatives derived. I-II challenge accounts such as Levin and Rappaport-Hovav (1995), who treat unergatives as primitive and (a significant subset of) unaccusatives as derived, or more traditional analyses where both are distinct types of primitive intransitiveness (Rosen 1984, Grimshaw 1987, Van Valin 1990, Zaenen 1995). The issue of argument mapping in Salish and its place in a cross-linguistic typology forms part of the broader theoretical question of whether argument selection properties are derived directly from the meaning of a predicate (encoded in the form of a Lexical Conceptual Structure) or are mediated by (sometimes abstract) morpho-syntactic structures and operations. I will argue, following Davis and Demirdache (1995), that argument structure mapping takes place directly from event structure representations, generated by an aspectual calculus adapted from that of Pustejovsky (1991). Under this conception, thematic roles are derivative; predicates are lexically equipped with a single, underspecified "theme" argument, and other theta roles - in particular, that of agent - are added via aspectual operations.

Aside from its relevance to a general theory of argument structure, the paper also addresses a parallel debate within Salishan linguistics as to the appropriate classification of roots. On the one hand, it has been claimed that argument structure differences between predicates are part of the meaning of roots, and are thus irreducible properties of lexical items (Thompson and Thompson (1992), Gerdts (1991), Howett (1993), Thomason and Everett (1993), Thomason (1994)). On the other hand, it has been argued that argument structure in Salish is radically decompositional; under this conception, all roots have the same (minimal) argument structure, with differences being derived from different affixation possibilities (Egedal (1993), Davis (1994b)). The debate has centred around a small set of agentic unaffixed intransitives, termed control roots (Thompson 1985). If control intransitives are primitive, then roots must be lexically specified as either unaccusative or unergative. I will argue, on the contrary, that control intransitives are derived, showing that their behaviour precisely parallels the class of overtly derived intransitives variously referred to in the Salishan literature as "middles" or "back-formation".

3Mattina (1994) argues that a verbal 'base' rather than a root should be taken as the appropriate elementary unit of lexical (de-)composition in (Colville Okanagan) Salish. She takes a base to be "a form of any morphological complexity which corresponds to a single lexeme", where lexeme is an arbitrary form-meaning association. Her criteria for rejecting the root as a viable unit of meaning are based on the non-compositional nature of many root+suffix combinations. However, her approach is far too restrictive, in that it eliminates all but completely productive and compositional morphological operations. Though clearly there are non-compositional forms in St'at'imcets, and these may get reanalyzed as roots, such cases are overwhelmingly outnumbered by fully compositional combinations. Moreover, non-compositionality is not restricted to a particular level of the lexicon, or even the lexicon itself; the existence of non-compositional (idiomatic) structures in the syntax, for example, does not preclude an analysis of their internal structure. In fact, Mattina's base seems to cut across established morphological divisions in arbitrary ways; on her analysis the Okanagan reflexive suffix, for example, does not preclude an analysis of their internal composition. Her criteria for rejecting the root as a viable unit of morpho-syntax can be made on the basis of a back-formation process which I have observed with several fluent St'at'imcets speakers. These speakers reanalyze opaque root-suffix combinations to create new (unaccusative) roots. Two examples are given below:

(i) $(rw) + + t \rightarrow \text{zwat} \quad = \quad "\text{to know the land}"$

(ii) $(may) + + \$ \rightarrow \text{may$} \quad = \quad "\text{to build}"$

Evidence that reanalysis has taken place comes from (a) the existence of the original root in forms such as the following:

(iii) $(zw) + a + tm\text{ts$} \quad = \quad "\text{to know the land}"$

(iv) $(may) + + t \quad = \quad "\text{to build}"$

(b) the existence of the (opaque) suffixal element in a number of other forms, such as

(v) $(n) + \text{ts$} \quad = \quad "\text{to say what?" (inst.)}; cf.

(vi) $(n) + \text{ts$} \quad = \quad "\text{to say what?" (tr.)}$

$(n) + \text{ts$} \quad = \quad "\text{to prepare (tr.)}$

The existence of the back-formation roots in (i) and (ii) thus shows us that new roots may be formed from opaque root plus affix combinations, and that these roots are invariably ascribed intransitive (more specifically, unaccusative) meanings. This constitutes a powerful argument for the psychological reality of the root, rather than the base, as the elementary unit of morphological composition.
The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, I present a brief overview of the structure of the St'Atlantaemc predicates. Section 2 discusses the basic morphological division between transitive and intransitive predicates. Section 3 discusses non-control roots, and section 4 introduces the various classes of derived intransitive. Section 5 presents an analysis of in/transitivity in St'Atlantaemc, closely based on that of Davis and Demirdache (1995). In section 6 I turn to a detailed analysis of control roots, showing that they are best analyzed as being derived by zero-morphology. Finally, in 7 I consider the implications of the analysis presented here for a general theory of zero morphology and lexical representation.

I. Structure of the word in St'Atlantaemc

The St'Atlantaemc word displays complex internal structure. A simplified schema is given below:


Four word-internal domains can be distinguished, based on evidence from both prosodic and morphological criteria. The innermost, (1), contains the root, the only element which is obligatory in all predicates. The stem-level domain, (2), contains a variety of aspectual and other affixes, including transitivizers and intransitivizers, but excluding pronominal affixes. The latter occupy (3), the outermost affixal domain, which is equivalent to the level of the morphological word. Domain (4), which contains various pro- and en-clitics, is the maximal domain of word-level stress assignment and corresponds to the prosodic word.

Stem-level affixation has a variety of functions in St'Atlantaemc. The three most important ones are (a) aspectual modification (b) lexical suffusion and (c) intransitivization.

(a) Aspect pervades St'Atlantaemc grammar, being marked stem-internally by reduplication, infixation, prefixation, and suffixation, stem-externally by clitics, and word-externally by aspectual auxiliaries.

Several of these markers will be discussed at greater length below, so I defer further comments until then.

(b) Lexical suffusion are an areal phenomenon of the Pacific Northwest; they consist of a large set (> 100 in St'Atlantaemc) of referential suffixes which modify the meaning of a root. There are two types of lexical suffusion, somatic (body-related) and non-somatic; the two types may be distinguished by their relation to intransitivizers, which induce a medio-reflexive (self-directed) reading with somatic but not with non-somatic suffusions (discussed in more detail below).

(c) St'Atlantaemc, like other Salish languages, encodes transitivity through a set of transitivizers and intransitivizers. Transitivizers convert a stem into a (morphologically dyadic) transitive predicate; intransitivizers convert a stem into a derived intransitive predicate. Transitivizers will briefly be discussed in 2 below; intransitivizers will be extensively discussed in section 4.

Stem-external affixes, which attach only to transitivized stems, consist of object suffixes (including reflexive and reciprocal markers) and the third person ergative suffusion -a. Other person markers (subjects and possessors) are clitics rather than suffixes. Subject and possessive clitics further differ from person affixes in attaching to both transitive and intransitive stems.

2. Transitives vs intransitives

The principle transitivizers in St'Atlantaemc are given below:

Table 2: Transitivizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)1-</td>
<td>prefix</td>
<td>static</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>resulting state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-p/-t-/</td>
<td>suffix/infix</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>change of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-am</td>
<td>suffix</td>
<td>characteristic</td>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>continuing state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t</td>
<td>suffix</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>IMM</td>
<td>continuing state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C1,C2][C1,C2]</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
<td>total redup.</td>
<td>TRE</td>
<td>inherent state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C1,C2][C2,C2]</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
<td>iterative redup.</td>
<td>IRE</td>
<td>iteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C1,C2]</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
<td>final redup.</td>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-w</td>
<td>abstract suffix</td>
<td>developmental</td>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>change of state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several minor transitivizers which act like combinations of the principle types illustrated in Table 2. The transitivizer -an/-a, for example, has a directive meaning (i.e., it indicates full control over the action) but causative morphology (it takes causative object suffixes); I gloss it as directive for the purposes of this article.
All predicates without a transitiveizer in St'at'imcets are formally intransitive; they cannot appear with object suffixes or the third person ergative marker, even when their meaning might entail two arguments.  

(2a). qahfim=kan  b. *qahfim-tum=t=kan  c. qahfim-anb-tum=t=kan  
hear=1SG.SUB  hear-2SG.OBJ=1SG.SUB  hear-DIR-2SG.OBJ=1SG.SUB  
"I heard."  "I heard you."  "I heard you."  

(3a). ?uqWu?  b. *?uqWu?-a?  c. ?uqWu?-an=æ=a?  
drink  drink-ERG  drink-DIR-ERG  
"S/he drank."  "S/he drank it."  "S/he drank it up."  

The ungrammatical cases in (2b) and (3b) differ from their grammatical counterparts in (2c) and (3c) only in the absence of a (directive) transitiveizer. It is important to note that this is a formal requirement; the meaning of the (b) cases is perfectly coherent. In fact it is even possible to supply an overt object Determiner Phrase with formally intransitive predicates like those in (2-3b), as long as there is no corresponding object pronominal morphology:  

(4). qahfim=kan  k'ut  a?  a?  
hear=1SG.SUB  DET  PRG  come  
"I heard someone coming"  

(5). ?uqWu?  k'ut  t?  k'utc'ul='a?  
drink  DET  coffee  DET  chief=REF  
"The chief drank coffee."  

Following van Eijk (1985), such cases will be referred to as with-object constructions. They will play an important part in the discussion below.  

Intransitive predicates may be cross-classified along two dimensions. The first is morphological; it distinguishes unsuffixed from suffixed intransitives, the latter containing an overt transitiveizer. The principle intransitivizers are given in Table 3 below:  

Table 3: Intransitivizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Vn(‘)</td>
<td>-Vnè</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-S/è</td>
<td>CAU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-min(‘)</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-xtÈ</td>
<td>INDIRECT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The second dimension is that of control. For our purposes, control may be equated with agency; for discussion of possible distinctions between the two notions, see Thompson (1976, 1985). All suffixed intransitives are control predicates; however, unsuffixed intransitives are divided up into control and non-control subclasses. We thus have the following distribution:

Table 4: Morphological and semantic properties of intransitive predicates
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<tbody>
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<td>MID</td>
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<td>-xal</td>
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<td>AUTONOMOUS</td>
<td>AUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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b. Adjectival predicates:

- kax “to be dry”
- q̄a1 “to be cooked, ripe”
- qa1 “to be bad”

While the roots in (6) may be used as predicates, they lack overt derivational morphology, most non-control intransitive predicates in (6a-f) pose no immediate problem for this analysis, since their control (agentive/non-agentive) status is not affected by such aspectual modification. This can be seen in (7), where I give some typical paradigms with bound roots:

(7a)  

- a. “boil”
- pū+h “boiling”

b. “melt”
- za−ʔq̄a “melt”
- za−ʔq̄a “soft, melted consistency”

Note that not all aspectual processes apply to all roots. This is partly a function of lexical semantics, but also of idiosyncratic variation in affixation possibilities.

3.1. Non-control intransitives are unaccusative

In this section, I claim that all non-control intransitive predicates take a single argument, to which they assign an internal theta role: that is, they are unaccusative.

While the nominal, adjectival, and uncontroversially unaccusative predicates in (6a-f) pose no immediate problem for this analysis, the patient-oriented predicates in (6g), whose counterparts in English are canonically transitive, do not appear at first sight to be candidates for unaccusative status. We shall term these cases antitransitives. The English glosses in (6g) suggest that antitransitives might be detransitive, i.e. derived from underlyingly transitive predicates by a type of lexical passivization process. However, Stjärne’s hypothesis is syntactic passive; it turns out that a comparison of antitransitives with passives reveals a number of contrasts that can only be accounted for if passives are detransitivized while antitransitives are fundamentally intransitive.

First of all, antitransitives are morphologically non-derived: they consist of bare roots (though these might be extended by lexical and aspectual suffixes, with no effect on argument structure). In marked contrast, passives are uniformly derived from transitivized predicates, which invariably contain an overt transitivizer. (8) gives passive equivalents of the antitransitives in (6g).

(8a)  

- qašt-ʔ-tuh hit-CAU-3SG.PAS “S/he was hit (by a thrown object).”
- tawal-an-ʔalām leave-DIR-3PL.PAS “They were left behind.”
- tiwāl-an-ʔalām leave-DIR-3PL.PAS “I was left behind.”
- tawal-an-ʔalām leave-DIR-3PL.PAS “We were left behind.”
- tawal-an-ʔalām leave-DIR-3PL.PAS “You folks were known.”

The morphological distinctness of passives and antitransitives is mirrored in the syntax. Since antitransitives are unaccusatives, we expect to find no implicit agent effects of the type that typically surface with passives. In other words, we should be able to replicate the English unaccusative-passive contrast illustrated in (9):

(9a)  

- The boat sank (*by the French).  
- The boat was sunk (by the French).
This is indeed the case. Passive agents may be introduced by an oblique marker, as shown in the textual examples in (10), which are taken from van Eijk and Williams (1981).

(10) a. ḥāt-ši? ṭu? ṭa ṭa ḥāt-ši? ṭu?
cross=QUO then cross=QUO to there
see=DIR-PAS=QUO OBL=PL.DET

"Well then he crossed over, he crossed over there, and he was seen by the people."

In contrast, antitransitives do not permit oblique agents:

(11) a. *qāḥt (1) ṭa ḥōšy-x=a ta twāš.wat=a
get.hit (ORL=DET) man=REF DET boy=REF

The boy was hit by the man.

b. qāḥt u-tuh ṭa ḥōšy-x=a ta twāš.wat=a
get.hit-CAU-3PL PAS ORL=DET man=REF DET boy=REF

The boy was hit by the man.

Where an oblique is present with an antitransitive predicate, it is interpreted as a locative or sometimes as an instrument, but never as a volitional actor; hence the absence of an agentive interpretation in (12a), in contrast to the agentic interpretation of the oblique with the passive in (12b):

(12) a. ḥāh-xiš man a ṭa ūša=ga=ta
get.hurt=1SG.SUB OBL=DET bear=REF

I got hurt by the bear."(only ok if bear is dead, and I tripped on it, for example)

b. ḥāh u-tuh ūša=ga=ta ṭa ūša=ga=ta
get.hurt=CAU-1SG.PAS OBL=DET bear=REF

I got hurt by the bear."(i.e., it attacked me)

I conclude that, on the basis of both morphological and syntactic evidence, antitransitives are unaccusatives, thus forming a unitary morpho-syntactic class with the other non-control roots in (6).

4. Suffixed control intransitives

We now turn to control (agentive) intransitives, beginning with those which are suffixed with an overt intransitivizer. As can be seen in Table 3 above, there are three main intransitivizers, labelled active, autonomous, and middle. Subsections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 will deal with each of them in turn; 4.4 will deal with cases where lexical suffixes appear without an overt intransitivizer.

4.1. Active intransitives

Active intransitives are suffixed with the intransitivizer -xal:

(13) kāx-xal "to dry" (intr.) ṭu?=xal "to discard" (intr.)
čēp-xal "to cool" (intr.) ṭāq=xal "to scare" (intr.)
ēx=xal "to bring things" (intr.) ṭāk=xal "to hit with a stick" (intr.)

-xal creates an atelic intransitive predicate with an agentive subject and an implied object; the latter is generally interpreted as generic, non-specific, or collective, and may be expressed overtly through the with-object construction. This is shown in (14-15):

(14) kēf-xal kēu puk=kē ṭa mēm=amī=xal=a
lay-ACT DET potato PL.DET people=REF

"The people plant potatoes."

(15) pu=1 xal=kē u=kē ṭa u=xal=ma
boil-ACT=1SG.SUB=intr. DET egg

"I will boil some eggs."

The use of the non-referential determiner kēu is typical of DPs in the with-object construction, as are both the generic reading of the object in (14) and the irreals in mood in (15). In fact, active intransitives are generally restricted to these environments. In telic contexts they are replaced by directive transitives:

(16) pu=1 u=1 kēn=tu? ṭa ṭ̆a xal=amī=xal=a
boil-DIR=1SG.SUB=CMPL DET egg=REF

"I boiled some (specific) eggs."

I will henceforth refer to the class of intransitive predicates which entail an understood object (and therefore take the with-object construction) as implied-object intransitives.

When suffixed to stems containing lexical suffixes, both the active intransitivizer and the directive transitivizer yield an interpretation paraphrasable as "to act on the referent of the suffix", as shown in (17-19) below. However the contrast between the non-delimited reading of actives (the b cases) and the delimited reading of directives (the c cases) is retained:

(17a) a. ṭāw "to be scratched"
b. ṭāw-xn=xal "to scratch people's feet" (in general)
c. ṭāw-xn=ah "to scratch someone's foot" (in particular)

(18a) a. ṭā w "to be washed"
b. ṭā w-xa=xal "to wash people's hands" (in general)
An important and distinctive property of active intransitives concerns the distribution of two near-homophous i-prefixes: one of these marks stative aspect (see Table 1 and the examples in 7 above), while the other is nominalizing. The autonomous suffix is incompatible with other intransitivizers or the directive transitivizer; compare the autonomous examples in (24-26) with the somatic suffix-intransitivizer combinations in (17-19).

(24a)  √i-up
  b. i-put(=*-xal/*-am/*-ai'l)  "to scratch oneself"

(25a)  √i-w
  b. i-w(=*-xal/*-am/*-ai'l)  "to wash oneself"

(26a)  √i-x
  b. i-x(=*-xal/*-am/*-ai'l)  "to dry oneself"

The autonomous intransitivizer creates self-directed predicates with a reflexive interpretation, as seen in (27):

(27)  i-put  "to hide oneself"
  i-w  "to dance"
  i-x  "to wash oneself"

I refer to this as the medio-reflexive interpretation.

Autonomous intransitives do not take an overt object:

(28)  i-w(=*-xal/*-am/*-ai'l)  no object.

They also contrast with active intransitives with respect to i-prefixation; instead of the nominal interpretation parallel to that associated with ordinary non-control predicates:

(29)  i-put = "stopped" (animate)  cf. i-put = "stopped" (inanimate)

12This reflects the fact that the St'at'imcets form is clearly cognate with its northern counterpart iyw, and emphasizes that it is not, as van Eijk (1985) suggests, a deviant lexical suffix (with a meaning such as ‘body’), but a bona fide intransitivizer.

4.2. Autonomous intransitives

11In fact, there are two separate types of nominalization in St'at'imcets, and in Salish more generally. One is derivational, and creates nouns, the other is inflectional, and creates nominalized subordinate clauses. While the same i nominalizer is responsible for both, it is a suffix when used derivationally and a pronominal when used inflectionally.
These stative predicates fail tests for noun-hood: they cannot occur in the final position of a complex predicate (30), act as the head of a relative clause (31), or take possessive morphology in predicate position (32):

(30)* ?ama s-la5:”-(lx .
  good NOM-hide-AUT DET find(DIR)=1SG.CNJ=REF when=day=3.CNJ
  “It was a good hiding (place) that I found yesterday.”

(31)* ?p;S1-p-s=kan nukwun
  nl s-la'i:”-(lx=a
  lost-INCH-CAU=ISG.SUB
  again DET find(DIR)=ISG.CNJ-REF
  • “I lost the hiding (place) that I found.”

(32)* n-l-la'i:”-flx
  nl pal-p-i=an=a
  lSG.POS=NOM-hide-AUT
  DEI
  10se-INC-CAU=lSG.CNJ=REF
  ”My hiding (place) was what I lost.”

The stative i-prefix is not compatible with all autonomous predicates. It only attaches to those with an underlyingly telic event structure (i.e. one involving a change of state leading to a resulting state), as in (29). Atelic predicates may not be i-prefixed at all, as shown in (33):

(33) (*E-l-q-ɑ2f-lax = to swim (no stative variant)
  (+E-l-q-ɑ2f-lax = to dance (no stative variant)
  (+E-l-q-ɑ2f-lax = to jump (no stative variant)

Note that the autonomous intransitive is not associated with a particular aspectual interpretation. It generally inherits the aspectual characteristics of the root to which it attaches, in contrast to the active intransitivizer, which invariably yields an atelic predicate.

In Table 5, I summarize the differences between active and autonomous intransitivizers.

Table 5: Diagnostic properties of active and autonomous intransitivizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Allow overt object</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>S-prefixation</th>
<th>Allow lexical suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active (-xal)</td>
<td>implied object</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stative/yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous (-1ax)</td>
<td>medio-reflexive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>undefined</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Middle intransitives

The third class of suffixed intransitives is suffixed with -Vm(‘). This is the St’at’imcets version of a pan-Salish morpheme most frequently glossed as middle, a term which I adopt here. In St’at’imcets, middle-marked predicates may be interpreted either like implied object or like medio-reflexive intransitives, depending on the stem to which they attach:

(34) Implied object middles:
  lɑ q-ɑ2f-lɑm = “to hide (stuff)” (intr.)
  xɑ f-lɑm = “to seek” (intr.)
  kɑ q-ɑ2f-lɑm = “to sew” (intr.)
  tɑw-ɑm = “to sell” (intr.)

(35) Medio-reflexive middles:
  kɑ f-lɑm = “to make” (intr)
  kɑ lɑm = “to see” (intr.)

(36) Implied-object middles in (34), like active intransitives, may express their understood object overtly, as shown in (36):

(36)a. nI tI ɑmɑč-ɑm tɑw-ɑm tI ɛkq-ɑz=a
  DET woman=REF sell-MID DET fish=REF
  “It’s the woman that sold the fish.”

b. xɑ f-lɑm kɑ dɑ mɡɑ tI wa? pɡ-ɑh
  DET bear DET PROG hunt-MID
  “The hunter is looking for a bear.”

c. kɑ f-lɑm tI ɛlɑ=ɑ tI ɛyɡq-ɑ=a
  DET basket=REF DET woman=REF
  “The woman is making a basket.”

S-prefixation yields a nominal interpretation with implied-object, again like active intransitives:

(37) lɑ q-ɑ2f-lɑm = “something hidden”
  (cf lɑ q-ɑ2f-lɑm = “hidden”)
  lɑ f-ɑ2f-lɑm = “something cooked”
  (cf lɑ f-ɑ2f-lɑm = “cooked, ripe”)
  lɑ lɑm = “something one sings”
  (cf lɑ lɑm = “singing”)

In contrast, the medio-reflexive middles in (35) may not take an object DP: either an oblique marker must be introduced, as in (36a), or an object is simply ungrammatical, as in (36b):

(38)a. kɑ f-lɑm xɑ q-ɑ2f-lɑm tI wa? pɡ-ɑh
  climb-MID DET NOM-mountain=REF DET PROG hunt-MID
  “The hunter climbed the mountain.”

b. Eɡ-ɑm kɑ vɑ lɑ q-ɑ2f-lɑm tI wa? taq-ɑh-1ɑlɑ
  breathe-MID DET NOM-smoke PL.DET PROG put.out-DIR-PL.ERG
  “The ones who put out the forest fire were breathing smoke.”

Moreover, with medio-reflexive middles $E$-prefixation is either ungrammatical or yields a resulting state interpretation:
or augmentative reduplication (marked by a period in the examples below): clearly related to the standard medio-reflexive interpretation of the autonomous suffix -xal.

In contrast, there are two environments where the middle yields only an implied-object reading. One involves roots which normally take -xal and switch to -vm(·) if the stem undergoes diminutive or augmentative reduplication (marked by a period in the examples below):

(39) a. ñì-kwì-xal “to wade” (no s-prefixation permitted)
b. ñì-ì-wì-xal “to go up hill” (no s-prefixation permitted)
c. ñì-mì-xal “stooped” (stative s-prefixation)

Thus, middle-marked predicates show ambivalent behaviour: they either act as though they were suffixed with the active intransitivizer (in which case they allow an object and yield a nominal interpretation with _i_-prefixation), or they behave as if they were suffixed with the autonomous intransitivizer (in which case no object is possible and _i_-prefixation never yields a nominal interpretation). The most obvious explanation for this ambivalence is that the middle suffix is ambiguously interpreted as either an active or an autonomous intransitivizer, a hypothesis supported by morphological evidence in the form of predicates which take either middle and active marking, as in (40), or middle and autonomous marking, as in (41).

(40) a. ñì'-ì'}}-xal “to cook, roast” (intr.)
b. ñì'-ì'}}-xal “to make, create” (intr.)
c. ñì'-ì'}}-xal “to cover oneself with a blanket”

In these cases, the alternating suffixes are in free variation, confirming the ambiguous behaviour of the middle marker -vm(·). On the other hand, predicates which allow both the active (-xal) and autonomous (-ì}}xal) intransitivizers always show a regular and predictable contrast in meaning:

(41) a. mì-ì'}}-xal “to rest”
b. ñì-ì'}}-xal “to move (stuff)”

While in general the middle suffix can either induce an implied-object or a medio-reflexive reading, depending on the root, there are cases where it is morphologically restricted to one or the other. When it is suffixed to a stem containing a somatic lexical suffix, the middle invariably yields a medio-reflexive interpretation paraphrasable as “to act on one’s body part”:

(42) a. ñì'-ì'}}-xal “to move (stuff)”
b. ñì'}-ì'}}-xal “to wash (stuff)”
c. ñì'}-ì'}}-xal “to drop (stuff)”

4.4. Intransitives derived via lexical suffixation

There is a fourth class of derived intransitive predicate, which unlike the other three, does not involve an overt intransitivizer. Instead, members of this class seem to be derived directly by lexical suffixation:

(46) a. ñì'ì’-ì’-ì’ “to be clean”
b. ñì'ì’-ì’ “to be close”

c. ñì'ì’-ì’ “to be close”
suffixes are not inherently agentive (iii) in some cases, an oven middle suffix is in free variation with (i) In most cases, when one of the roots in (46) surfaces without an intransitivizer, as in (47), it has a interpretation.
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arguments for this contention: (i) the relevant forms are not they contain a concealed middle marker, a zero-variant of the as can be ascertained from the glosses, these [root + lexical suffix] combinations are agentive, and thus resemble derived intransitives. In fact, I suggest that they are derived intransitives. To be precise, they contain a concealed middle marker, a zero-variant of the (ii) the lexical suffixes are not inherently agentive (iii) in some cases, an overt middle suffix is in free variation with a zero-marked (covert) alternant.

(i) In most cases, when one of the roots in (46) surfaces without an intransitivizer, as in (47), it has a non-control reading:

(47a) ča?x, ča?x = "to be clean" (total reduplication; -am = characteristic)
(47b) n-ča?x = "to be close" (n- = stative)
(47c) kax = "to be dry"

(Note that two of the roots in (47) have undergone aspectual operations - total reduplication in (47a) and stative prefixation in (47b) which do not affect the control status of the predicate.)

(48) shows the roots in (46-47) with different lexical suffixes; again, these cases have a non-control interpretation.

(48a) a. n-ča?x = "laxative" (literally, "clean inside") (ča?x = "inside")
(48b) b. n-ča?x-k = "to have one’s back against something" (n- = back)
(48c) c. n-kax-fiwas = "island" (literally, "dry place inside") (fiwas = "inside")

Finally, in (49-50), we see that an intransitivizer is obligatory in other derivations with an agentive reading involving the same roots. The cases in (49) involve lexical suffix plus middle marking, the cases in (50) active and autonomous intransitivizers.

(49a) ča?x-pali-alkm = "to clean the graveyard" (lex.suff. -alk "surface")
(49b) a. n-ča?x][(am = "to get close where one is going") (lex.suff. -am = "foot")
(49c) c. n-kax-fitkwam = "to dry one’s back" (lex.suff. n- = back)

(50a) ča?x[(am = "to clean (stuff)") (active)
(50b) b. kax[(am = "to dry (stuff)") (active)
(50c) c. ča?x[(am = "to get close to something") (autonomous)

I conclude that the meaning of the root cannot be responsible for the control (agentive) reading of the forms in (46).

(ii) However, it turns out that the lexical suffixes are not the source either, since when attached to other roots, these same suffixes yield a non-control reading, as in (51). A control reading obtains only when a middle marker is also added, as in (52):

(51a) kjan-ča?x = "blunt point" (kjan = "blunt")
(51b) n-ča?x = "laxative" (ča?x = "clean")
(51c) n-kax-ča?x = "warm in the house" (n-kax = "warm")

(52a) kša?x = "blow one’s nose" (kša?x =?")
(52b) n-ča?x = "to take a laxative" (ča?x = "clean")
(52c) pali-ča?x = "to visit people" (pali =? "one")

(iii) If neither the root nor the lexical suffix is responsible for the control reading of the examples in (46), then the only remaining logical possibility is that there is some other (phonologically null) element contributing agentive force. There is direct evidence for the existence of such an element: the middle suffix is optionally available (without change of meaning) on many lexically suffixed predicates with an agentive reading:

(53a) ča?x = "to shave, peel"
-ak = lex. suff. "log, long object"
-alk = "to shave a log"

(53b) ča?x-alk = "to take off"
-alk = lex. suff. "fruit, round object"
-alk = "to peel fruit"

(53c) ča?x = "good"
-alk = lex. suff. "child, human being"
-alk = "to fancy someone as a parent for one’s children"

This alternation is easily explained if we assume the existence of a zero-allomorph of the middle intransitivizer. In that case, "intransitivizing" lexical suffixes are simply morphophonological variants of the productive combination of lexical suffix plus middle intransitivizer. As we shall see in section 6, this possibility provides us with a more wide-reaching explanation for the distribution of unsuffixed control intransitives.

5. On the status of derived intransitives

We have yet to address the issue of whether derived intransitives are syntactically or lexically derived. If syntactically derived, the predicate will be intransitive in the sense that the suppressed argument will be syntactically inert. The next two sections will examine first active and then medio-reflexive derived...
intransitives, with the aim of establishing that both are intransitive, i.e. they are lexically derived.

5.1. Active intransitives are not anti-passives

We begin with actives. Many authors, including Gerds (1988), Kroeber (1991), Thomason and Everett (1993), have claimed that Salish active intransitives are anti-passives: in other words, they are detransitivized constructions, involving suppression or absorption of a patient theta role, just as passive involves suppression or absorption of the agent role. Under such an analysis, the availability of an overt object for active-type intransitives follows from their underlying transitivity, just as passive agents are licensed by the underlying transitivity of passivized predicates. In spite of its initial attractiveness, it turns out that there is both morphological and syntactic evidence against an anti-passive analysis, and in favour of a lexical treatment of actives.

The most obvious evidence for the lexical analysis is provided by morphology. Unlike passives, which must be based on transitivized stems, active intransitives show no morphological reflexes of transitivity. In fact, they parallel rather than contain directive transitives, since both are formed by affixation to non-control roots. This is shown in (54):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Unaffixed</th>
<th>Active/middle</th>
<th>Directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(be) dry&quot;</td>
<td>k a x</td>
<td>kʻa x-xa1</td>
<td>kʻa x-ən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(be) afraid&quot;</td>
<td>p̣a q̣u?</td>
<td>p̣a q̣u?-xa1</td>
<td>p̣a q̣u?-ən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(be) cooked&quot;</td>
<td>ə́q̣ə́l</td>
<td>ə́q̣ə́l-am-xa1</td>
<td>ə́q̣ə́l-ən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(be) punched&quot;</td>
<td>tut</td>
<td>ṭụp-xa1</td>
<td>ṭụp-uh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(be) seen&quot;</td>
<td>?ə́q̣ə́</td>
<td>?ə́q̣ə́-am</td>
<td>?ə́q̣ə́-ən</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These paradigms are not irregular; while not every root occurs without affixation, the active intransitive/directive transitive alternation is fully productive.

Next, we turn to syntax, concentrating on properties of the object in the with-object construction. We have seen that an oblique marker may be present with a passive agent (see 10 above). Under an anti-passive analysis, we expect the patient of an active intransitive to behave similarly. This is not the case: an oblique marker is ungrammatical with an overt object:

(55a) ḳa x-xa1 (*ap/ra/) ḳu ʔa ḳa? 
Dry-ACT (*OBL=DET) huckleberry
"She dried some huckleberries."

b. ʔa ḳa ḳa? ta ṇaỵụp a (*ap/ra/) ḳu ʔa ḳa? 
Drink DET COYOTE-REF (*OBL=DET) water
"The coyote drank some water."

Another difference surfaces with syntactic movement. In general, direct arguments of a predicate (subjects of intransitives, subjects and objects of transitives) may be freely extracted in WH-questions, focus cleft constructions, and relative clauses without inducing any special morphology on the predicate. This is shown in the WH-questions in (56):<br>

13For arguments that direct extraction of both subjects and direct objects in St'át'imcets is possible, see Davis (1994a); for a contrasting viewpoint, Roberts (1994).

(56a) swat ḳu ʔa ḳa-ḳa-ʔiʔ q̣a? 
Who DET see-DR=2SG.OBJ-ERG
"Who saw you?"

b. swat ḳu ʔa ḳa-ʔiʔ q̣a? 
Who DET see-DR=2SG.OBJ
"Who did you see?"

The contrast between (57) and (58) shows us that, unlike passive agents, the objects of active intransitives do not count as direct arguments in the syntax (see Hukari 1994 for similar conclusions on Halkomelem). This provides further evidence against an detransitive ("anti-passive") analysis of derived intransitives, and in favour of an intransitive (lexical) analysis.

5.2. Medio-reflexives are not syntactic reflexives

I now turn to the derivation of medio-reflexive (autonomous-type) intransitives, which I will also claim are lexically derived intransitives.

St'át'imcets has a straightforwardly detransitivizing reflexive morpheme, -cut, shown in (59):

(59a) c̣ụ ḳa-ʔiʔ q̣ụ ḳa? 
See-face-DIR-REF DET NOM-7SG.POS-7SG.POS 
"The woman looked at herself in the mirror."

b. čaq̣ʷʔiʔ q̣ụ ḳa-ʔiʔ q̣ụ ḳa? 
Wash-hand-MID=3PL then=so DET NOM-MID=3PL.POS
"They washed their hands and got undressed."

The presence of the directive transitiveizer (Vh1) in these forms, while the absence of ergative marking in (59a) and the presence of the third person intransitive plural marker -q̣ụ and the subordinate third person possessive plural -ɬ in (59b) are diagnostic of final intransitivity. Cut reflexives, then, are canonically de-transitive.
In marked contrast, autonomous-marked (medio-reflexive) predicates show no signs of underlying transitivity. This can easily be seen with predicates which take both types of reflexive:

\[ \begin{align*}
(60a) & \text{wu}^\prime & \text{an-} & \text{tu}^\prime & \text{ku}^? \\
(60b) & \text{wu}^\prime & \text{f} & \text{tu}^\prime & \text{ku}^? \\
(60c) & \text{w} & \text{an-} & \text{Et} & \text{tu}^\prime & \text{ku}^?
\end{align*} \]

The transitive reflexive (60a) is clearly formed from a transitivized form, as evidenced by the presence of the directive transitivizer -an. However, note that the predicate in (b) is constructed directly from the unaccusative root, while that in (c) is clearly derived from a transitivized form, as evidenced by the presence of the directive transitivizer -an.

A further argument for the lexical status of autonomous-marked reflexives is provided by productivity. The reflexivization is productive; any transitivized predicate may be syntactically reflexivized, subject to semantic plausibility. On the other hand, the medio-reflexive is not fully productive: while there exist many reflexive pairs like (60), there are an even larger number of predicates which simply do not take the autonomous suffix, even when the resulting predicate might appear to be perfectly plausible. This is shown in (61):

\[ \begin{align*}
(61) & \text{Syntactic reflexive} & \text{Medio-reflexive} \\
\text{za} & \text{an-} & \text{Et} & = & \text{to kill oneself, commit suicide} & \text{*z} & \text{a} & \text{an-} & \text{f} & \text{x} \\
\text{ma} & \text{an-} & \text{Et} & = & \text{to blame oneself} & \text{*ma} & \text{an-} & \text{f} & \text{x} \\
\text{nuk} & \text{an-} & \text{Et} & = & \text{to help oneself} & \text{*nuk} & \text{an-} & \text{f} & \text{x}
\end{align*} \]

I conclude that, like active intransitives, medio-reflexives are lexically rather than syntactically derived. Middles, which by hypothesis are ambiguous between active and autonomous intransitives, are a fortiori also lexically derived.

5.3. Control intransitives and event structure

We have now established that neither active intransitives nor medio-reflexives can be derived in the syntax from (directive) transitive. As yet, however, I have provided no clue as to the nature of the lexical process or processes which actually do derive them. In this section, I will show how this can be achieved using the aspectually-driven theta-theory of Davis and Demirdache (1995). (I provide a much-abbreviated version of the theory: see Davis and Demirdache (1995), Demirdache (this volume) for more details). It is worth emphasizing that the approach employed here is to a large extent independent of the principle goal of the paper, which is to establish the derived status of control predicates and the underlying status of non-control predicates, independently of any particular derivational mechanism.

Recall that all roots in St'at'imcets come lexically equipped with a single internal argument. The lexical representation for a root will then be as in (62):

\[ \begin{align*}
(62a) & \text{v} & \text{ax} \text{"dry"} = & \lambda x (\text{dried } x) \\
(62b) & \text{f} & \text{up} \text{"punch"} = & \lambda x (\text{punched } x)
\end{align*} \]

Obviously, this argument may find itself realized differently in different syntactic frames: it corresponds to the single argument of stative and inchoative predicates, the agreement-linked object in directive transitive constructions and the unexpressed (unlinked) patient in derived intransitives. We will assume that it cannot be arbitrarily deleted. This is a commonly accepted recoverability constraint on argument structure operations (see e.g. Marantz (1984)).
can be further decomposed into two separate parts.

The most important consequence of this approach is that all agentive (control) predicates (both transitive and intransitive) must be morphologically derived through the mapping of aspectual substructures onto underlyingly unaccusative predicates. In other words, there are no overtly agentive predicates. There is straightforward morphological evidence for this conclusion in St'atl'ímsct's, where, as we have seen, overt intransitivizing affixes are responsible for introducing agents. On the other hand, the same analysis is far harder to motivate in a morphologically opaque language like English, which seems more amenable to an approach where roots are lexically partitioned into transitive, unaccusative and unergative subclasses, without postulating a derivational relationship between them.

In the next section, I show that in fact St'atl'ímsct's also tolerates a degree of (English-type) morphophonological opacity, in the form of a set of control predicates which show no overt derivational morphology. I argue that in spite of appearances, these “control roots” are derived. I will then point out that exactly the same mechanisms employed to account for opacity in St'atl'ímsct's (essentially, zero morphology) are independently available in English (see Pesetsky 1995, Hale and Keyser to appear). I conclude that the two systems are formally identical; they differ only in the degree of zero morphology employed, an independently known parameter of cross-linguistic variation (Haselmath 1995).

6. Unsuffixed control intransitives and the concealed middle hypothesis

So far, we have seen that there is a one-to-one correspondence between control and derived status in St'atl'ímsct's: all derived intransitives are control predicates; all control predicates are derived. In the last section, we saw how this generalization could be captured in a theory where agency was entailed by a particular (derived) event structure configuration.

However, the generalization itself is put into doubt by the existence in St'atl'ímsct's (and in all Salish languages) of a set unsuffixed control intransitives, roughly corresponding to the class of unergatives in English (as pointed out by Halkonemeth by Gerds 1991). There are about 75 unsuffixed control intransitives in St'atl'ímsct's, divided into several semantic sub-classes; broadly following the verb classification of Levin (1993), these include predicates involving (a) motion (including inherent direction and manner) (b) communication (including directed communication and manner of communication) (c) perception (d) transfer of possession (e) creation (f) search or seeking (g) social activity/performance (h) bodily processes. A more or less complete list is given in (66):

66(a). Motion predicates:

| Maq | to walk |
| Naq | to dodge |
| Huk | to lie down (L) |
| Nuk | to go |
| Kuk | to go home |
| Kuk | to go down to the shore |
| Nuk | to go inside |
| Nuk | to accompany |
| Huk | to run |
| Maq | to crawl |

The most important consequence of this approach is that all agentive (control) predicates (both transitive and intransitive) must be morphologically derived through the mapping of aspectual substructures onto underlyingly unaccusative predicates. In other words, there are no overtly agentive predicates. There is straightforward morphological evidence for this conclusion in St'atl'ímsct's, where, as we have seen, overt intransitivizing affixes are responsible for introducing agents. On the other hand, the same analysis is far harder to motivate in a morphologically opaque language like English, which seems more amenable to an approach where roots are lexically partitioned into transitive, unaccusative and unergative subclasses, without postulating a derivational relationship between them.

In the next section, I show that in fact St'atl'ímsct's also tolerates a degree of (English-type) morphophonological opacity, in the form of a set of control predicates which show no overt derivational morphology. I argue that in spite of appearances, these “control roots” are derived. I will then point out that exactly the same mechanisms employed to account for opacity in St'atl'ímsct's (essentially, zero morphology) are independently available in English (see Pesetsky 1995, Hale and Keyser to appear). I conclude that the two systems are formally identical; they differ only in the degree of zero morphology employed, an independently known parameter of cross-linguistic variation (Haselmath 1995).

6. Unsuffixed control intransitives and the concealed middle hypothesis

So far, we have seen that there is a one-to-one correspondence between control and derived status in St'atl'ímsct's: all derived intransitives are control predicates; all control predicates are derived. In the last section, we saw how this generalization could be captured in a theory where agency was entailed by a particular (derived) event structure configuration.

However, the generalization itself is put into doubt by the existence in St'atl'ímsct's (and in all Salish languages) of a set unsuffixed control intransitives, roughly corresponding to the class of unergatives in English (as pointed out by Halkonemeth by Gerds 1991). There are about 75 unsuffixed control intransitives in St'atl'ímsct's, divided into several semantic sub-classes; broadly following the verb classification of Levin (1993), these include predicates involving (a) motion (including inherent direction and manner) (b) communication (including directed communication and manner of communication) (c) perception (d) transfer of possession (e) creation (f) search or seeking (g) social activity/performance (h) bodily processes. A more or less complete list is given in (66):

66(a). Motion predicates:

| Maq | to walk |
| Naq | to dodge |
| Huk | to lie down (L) |
| Nuk | to go |
| Kuk | to go home |
| Kuk | to go down to the shore |
| Nuk | to go inside |
| Nuk | to accompany |
| Huk | to run |
| Maq | to crawl |

The most important consequence of this approach is that all agentive (control) predicates (both transitive and intransitive) must be morphologically derived through the mapping of aspectual substructures onto underlyingly unaccusative predicates. In other words, there are no overtly agentive predicates. There is straightforward morphological evidence for this conclusion in St'atl'ímsct's, where, as we have seen, overt intransitivizing affixes are responsible for introducing agents. On the other hand, the same analysis is far harder to motivate in a morphologically opaque language like English, which seems more amenable to an approach where roots are lexically partitioned into transitive, unaccusative and unergative subclasses, without postulating a derivational relationship between them.

In the next section, I show that in fact St'atl'ímsct's also tolerates a degree of (English-type) morphophonological opacity, in the form of a set of control predicates which show no overt derivational morphology. I argue that in spite of appearances, these “control roots” are derived. I will then point out that exactly the same mechanisms employed to account for opacity in St'atl'ímsct's (essentially, zero morphology) are independently available in English (see Pesetsky 1995, Hale and Keyser to appear). I conclude that the two systems are formally identical; they differ only in the degree of zero morphology employed, an independently known parameter of cross-linguistic variation (Haselmath 1995).

6. Unsuffixed control intransitives and the concealed middle hypothesis

So far, we have seen that there is a one-to-one correspondence between control and derived status in St'atl'ímsct's: all derived intransitives are control predicates; all control predicates are derived. In the last section, we saw how this generalization could be captured in a theory where agency was entailed by a particular (derived) event structure configuration.

However, the generalization itself is put into doubt by the existence in St'atl'ímsct's (and in all Salish languages) of a set unsuffixed control intransitives, roughly corresponding to the class of unergatives in English (as pointed out by Halkonemeth by Gerds 1991). There are about 75 unsuffixed control intransitives in St'atl'ímsct's, divided into several semantic sub-classes; broadly following the verb classification of Levin (1993), these include predicates involving (a) motion (including inherent direction and manner) (b) communication (including directed communication and manner of communication) (c) perception (d) transfer of possession (e) creation (f) search or seeking (g) social activity/performance (h) bodily processes. A more or less complete list is given in (66):

66(a). Motion predicates:

<p>| Maq | to walk |
| Naq | to dodge |
| Huk | to lie down (L) |
| Nuk | to go |
| Kuk | to go home |
| Kuk | to go down to the shore |
| Nuk | to go inside |
| Nuk | to accompany |
| Huk | to run |
| Maq | to crawl |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tâq'wut</td>
<td>&quot;to bend over&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâ?q'wât</td>
<td>&quot;to come down a hill&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âx</td>
<td>&quot;to move house&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'âl-âl</td>
<td>&quot;to come down a hill diagonally&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-čâw</td>
<td>&quot;to go around in circles&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Communication predicates:
- wa?aw | "to shout" |
- xâ'qan | "to whisper" |
- kâ'kâ | "to lie" |
- ptâl | "to tell a legend" |
- 7lal | "to cry" |
- qâ'w | "to speak" |
- kâma | "to guess" |

(c) Perception predicates:
- pâq | "to have a look" |
- qâ'ag | "to notice" |
- kâl | "to listen" |

(d) Transfer of possession predicates:
- nâq | "to steal" |
- kâ'qan | "to borrow" |

(e) Predicates of creation and transformation:
- kâ'uk | "to cook" |
- may-t | "to fix" |

(f) Seeking and searching predicates:
- 7âq-tak | "to catch fish with a dipnet" |

(g) Predicates of social activity:
- 7âklâl | "to work" |
- gâyt | "to fight" |
- yâx | "to get dressed" |
- zâhâ | "to rest" |

(b) Bodily process predicates:
- 7âso | "to eat" |

(Note that a few of these forms are suffixed; however, none of the suffixes are intransitivizers, or have any argument-structure effects.)

Clearly, if we accept the non-derived status of these forms at face value, we must acknowledge the existence of agentic (unergative) roots in addition to the non-agentive (unaccusative) roots introduced in section 3 above. On the other hand, if we can show that control "roots" in Salish are actually derived, then we have a potential argument in support of the universally derived status of control predicates, including unergatives.

There are several initial reasons to be suspicious of the primitive status of "control roots" in St'át'imcets. First of all, there is a huge disparity between the relative size of the two root-classes: as already mentioned, there are only around 75 control roots, but upwards of 2,000 non-control roots. Second, while we have seen three suffixes which create control intransitives from non-control roots, there are no comparable affixes which convert control roots into non-control derived intransitives: this suggests an asymmetrical derivational relationship between the two classes. Third, most control roots fail to conform to the canonical CVC Salish root-shape. This is shown in Table 7 below:

Table 7: Percentages of root-shapes for all roots (1) and for control roots (2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. all roots</th>
<th>2. control roots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVVC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUE</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the top row (1) are taken from van Eijk's (1985) overall estimate of root shapes in St'át'imcets; those in row (2) are based on all the control roots I have been able to identify in St'át'imcets. Notice that the percentage of CVC control roots is less than half of that of the overall CVC percentage; in contrast, the figures for CVCC constitute a far larger percentage of control roots than of roots in general. In fact, there is a strong general tendency for control roots to be "bigger" than non-control roots, as is obvious from the larger percentages on the right-hand side of row (2). This is directly connected to another important property of control roots: they contain a very high proportion of frozen affixed material, either in the shape of formatives that no longer have any clear grammatical function, or morphological operations that are used productively with non-control roots but have fused with roots in control cases. Examples of the former type include -(e), -(e), -(te), -(en), all of which are simply designated as "formatives" by van Eijk (1985). Examples of the latter include all three main types of reduplication, inchoative suffixation/inflection, and lexical suffixation. In fact, fully 70% of all control roots contain some detectable affixal residue. This accounts for the high proportion of multisyllabic control roots (37%) compared to the overall proportion of multisyllabic roots (5%).

All of these reasons lead us to be suspicious of the morphophonological opacity and/or invisibility of the affixes which derive them.

In the following sections, I give a particular explanation for this opacity: namely, that unsuffixed control intransitives are actually concealed middles. We have already seen (in section 4.4) that middle marking is optional or absent with certain predicates containing lexical suffixes. It is then a short step to the claim that the control intransitives in (65) are also zero-marked middles. I further
justify this claim by showing, first of all, that control intransitives display certain properties shared by all overtly derived intransitives. These include (a) incompatibility with certain aspectual markers, notably the inchoative; (b) interpretative differences associated with "out of control" marking; and (c) choice of desiderative suffix. Second, I will show that control intransitives, just like overt middles, may be partitioned into implied-object and medio-reflexive sub-classes, each with a distinctive set of properties, as described in sections 4.1-4.4 above. Finally, I give morphological evidence for the concealed middle hypothesis, based on forms that show alternations between an overt and a zero realization of the middle marker.

6.1. Properties shared by overtly and covertly derived intransitives

(a) Inchoatives. The inchoative marker denotes a non-instantaneous change of state. It attaches only to an aspectually appropriate subset of non-derived roots (i.e., those whose lexical content is compatible with a change-of-state reading; for discussion of the semantic underpinnings of this compatibility, see Hajek 1993, Levin and Rappaport-Hovav 1995). Some examples are given in (67). (The inchoative morpheme surfaces as a suffixed -p with 'weak' roots containing schwa, as in (67a), but as an infixed glottal stop with 'strong' roots containing a full vowel, as in (67b)).

(67a). ṭač-p = "to get tied up" b. v1-?-p = "to grow"
čač-p = "to get stretched" nu-?-q = "to warm up"
lab-p = "to get caved in" za-?-q = "to melt"

The inchoative is generally incompatible with agent control: where a change of state is imputed to an agent, either the autonomous suffix or the active intransitive suffix is used, depending on whether the event is medio-reflexive or implies an object. This yields contrasts like the following:

(68a). ča-?-q = "to cool off" čač-1ax = "to cool oneself off"
b. šač-p = "to bounce" šač-1ix = "to jump"
c. kšč-p = "to come off" kšč-1ix = "to quit"

(69a). ẓašn-p = "to dry out" ẓašn-xal = "to dry out (stuff)"
b. ŧašl-p = "to burn" ŧašl-xal = "to burn (stuff)"
c. v1-?-p = "to grow" všl-xal = "to grow, raise (stuff)"

It follows under the present analysis that if the autonomous and the active markers are in complementary distribution with the inchoative, so will the middle marker be, since either it has an implied-object or a medio-reflexive interpretation. This is indeed the case, as can be seen in (70), where forms with lexical suffixes either appear with an inchoative marker (in non-control derivations) or a middle suffix (in control derivations):

(70a). kści-1uš = "to get hurt, embarrassed" (-uš = "face")
kści-1am = "to do something shameful"
b. n₁aš-p = "to get entombed, caved in on" (-ana? = "ear")
n₁aš-šn? = "to entomb, cave s.o. in"

c. ẓašl-p = "logs get burned" (-a|lq? = "log")
čašl-šn? = "to burn logs"

Now, under the concealed middle hypothesis, we expect unsuffixed control intransitives to be also incompatible with inchoative marking. This appears to be overwhelmingly true, there are only four exceptions, shown in (71):

(71a). wa-?-šw to shout" b. tsa-?p = "to buy"
c. ẓa-?w to fish with a rod" d. ẓa-?wa "to accompany"

In fact, these potential counter-examples to the generalization actually conform it, since in all four cases the inchoative marker has fused with the root. This can be demonstrated by transitivizing the roots: whereas in general inchoative marking is incompatible with the directive and indirective transitivity, as shown in (72), it remains present with the roots in (71), as shown in (73).

(72a). ẓašl-p = "to burn" (inchoative)
b. ẓašl-k-šn? = "to burn (something)" (directive)
c. ẓašl-k-šn?-xft = "to burn (something for someone)" (indirective)

(73a). wa-?-šw-an = "to shout at someone" (directive)
b. tsa-?xft = "to buy something for someone" (indirective)

(b) Out of control. Next, I will briefly examine the behaviour of the "out-of-control" clitic combination, k.a. which is discussed in detail in Demirdache (this volume). The interpretation of k.a. depends on the predicate to which it attaches. With non-control intransitives it has a strictly aspectual interpretation, meaning "suddenly, all at once", as shown in (74):

(74a). ẓap n₁a=ka-šl+a suddenly 1SG.POS=OMN=OOC=stop=OOC DET 1SG.POS=OOC 1SG.POS=OOC DET 1SG.POS=OOC DET 1SG.POS=OOC
"Suddenly I stopped (unexpectedly)."
"The rock fell."

With active intransitives, on the other hand, it means "to be able to", as illustrated in (75):

(75a). ka-l₁ap-šn? = "I was able to plant." b. ka=šl+a-šn? = "I was able to sit at the table."

With autonomous-marked predicates, the ablative interpretation also obtains:

(76a). ka=shl-xal=kšn+a OOC=plant-ACT=1SG.SUB=OOC
"I was able to sit at the table."

The prediction of the concealed middle hypothesis is that all middles and all unsuffixed control intransitives will show the ablative rather than the simple aspectual reading. This prediction is borne out.
Implied-object middles:

- 

Medio-reflexive middles:

- 

Implied-object unsuffixed control intransitives:

- 

Medio-reflexive unsuffixed control intransitives:

- 

(c) Desideratives. The two desiderative markers -lman and -lman are found only in intransitives and attach outside all other derivational affixes. -lman means "want to", -lman means "almost".15

Only -lman is found with overtly derived intransitives, including active (81a), autonomous (81b), and middle (81c-d) predicates:

- 

Both desiderative forms are found with unsuffixed intransitives. However, their distribution is not free: control intransitives (of both the implied-object type, as in (82a)), and the medio-reflexive type, as in (82b)) select only -lman, whereas non-control intransitives (83) take only -lman.

- 

If the control intransitives in (82) are concealed middles, then they are expected to behave in a parallel fashion to the suffixed intransitives in (81), and to contrast with the non-control intransitives in (83). This is exactly what we find.

6.2. Subtypes of concealed middles

So far, I have established that unsuffixed control intransitives share a number of properties with their suffixed counterparts, in opposition to non-control intransitives. However, it could be argued that these tests simply divide predicates along the semantic dimension of agent control, without in any way establishing the morphologically derived status of the unsuffixed control forms. In this section, I will show that the concealed middle hypothesis makes a further set of predictions which cannot be reduced in this way to the semantics of control, since they are based on a precise morphological parallel between overt and concealed middles. This parallel stems from the fact that overt middles fall into implied-object (active-type) and medio-reflexive (autonomous-type) subclasses, as shown in section 4.3. If unsuffixed control intransitives are zero-marked middles, then they should show the same type of ambivalent behaviour. I show that this is indeed the case.

Recall the diagnostic properties of the active and autonomous intransitivizers, summarized in Table 5, which is repeated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>active</th>
<th>implied-object</th>
<th>with-object</th>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>s-prefixation</th>
<th>lexical suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>implied-object</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>atelic</td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomous</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>undefined</td>
<td>static</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prediction is that we should be able to distinguish between active-type and autonomous-type unsuffixed control intransitives on the basis of the criteria above, just as we can distinguish between active and autonomous middles.16 Let us turn to the active subtype first. The first diagnostic property of actives is their ability to participate in the with-object construction. The following control intransitives from the list (66) may take an overt object DP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With-object unsuffixed intransitives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. *cut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c. *paq | "to tell a story" | *qaw-at | "to say what?"
| d. *qafm | "to hear" | *qaw-at | "to listen"
| e. *kat | "to notice" | *qaw-at | "to see"
| f. *kat | "to steal" | *qaw-at | "to take"
| g. *kat | "to pay for" | *qaw-at | "to fix, build, create"

15 I refer to both these forms as "desiderative", though the second has lost its desiderative force, because they are clearly historically derived from a single desiderative morpheme, which is attested in many Salish languages, including Halkomelem (Gerdi 1991) and Halkomelem (Howett 1995).

16 The third possible type of control intransitive, which is equivalent to predicates with a lexical suffix plus a zero middle marker (see section 4.4), yields a medio-reflexive interpretation parallel to that of autonomous-type intransitives; for the purposes of the present discussion, we will treat it as a subtype of the autonomous-type middle.
### Transitive Intransitives

#### (85a) to soak (things)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
<th>Analytical Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qtafl</td>
<td>to soak</td>
<td>to pick-cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Examples

Example is given below (with the unlicensed object in italics):

(85a) a. ?uqwa? ta nkyaP=a ta qWu?=a

"The coyote drank the water."

There is a correspondence between the various semantic subclasses of control intransitive and their ability to take an overt object. Subclass (a) (motion) predicates are completely incompatible with an object - as we would expect if these predicates are basically medio-reflexive. On the other hand, subclasses (c-h), comprising perception predicates, predicates of transfer, creation or transformation, searching/seeking, social activity, and bodily process, are all compatible with an object. We next turn to a related property of active intransitives: the nominal interpretation associated with i-prefixation (see section 4.1 above). Given the concealed middle hypothesis, we expect the control intransitives which take an overt object to yield a nominal interpretation under i-prefixation. This is indeed the case, as shown by the examples in (86):

#### (86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa?aw</td>
<td>&quot;to shout&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tut</td>
<td>&quot;to say&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qWaHit</td>
<td>&quot;to speak&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.i.kza?</td>
<td>&quot;to lie&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamas</td>
<td>&quot;to guess&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paq&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;to have a look&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaqll</td>
<td>&quot;to peek&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qWaHit</td>
<td>&quot;to see&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwukw</td>
<td>&quot;to cook&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, the following control intransitives have a medio-reflexive interpretation:

#### (90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matq</td>
<td>&quot;to walk&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma?k</td>
<td>&quot;to dodge&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qWafl</td>
<td>&quot;to lie down&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nafl</td>
<td>&quot;to go&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (88) to hear footsteps

Examples are given below (with the unlicensed object in italics):

(85a) a. ?uqwa? ta nkyaP=a ta qWu?=a

"The coyote drank the water."

"I saw you guys when you were playing bingo."

"So he told the people..." (van Eijk & Williams 1981: 45)

### Active Intransitives

#### (89) to hear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qaMm</td>
<td>&quot;to hear&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaMm-xan</td>
<td>&quot;to hear footsteps&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalan</td>
<td>&quot;to listen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-kalan-afl</td>
<td>&quot;to listen without speaking&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwutan</td>
<td>&quot;to borrow&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwutan-fnak</td>
<td>&quot;to borrow a gun&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?az'</td>
<td>&quot;to pay for&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?az'-q</td>
<td>&quot;to buy shoes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mud</td>
<td>&quot;to say&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may-t</td>
<td>&quot;to build&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (90) to walk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matq</td>
<td>&quot;to walk&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma?k</td>
<td>&quot;to dodge&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qWafl</td>
<td>&quot;to lie down&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nafl</td>
<td>&quot;to go&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusion

Finally, recall that active intransitives, unlike autonomous intransitives, are possible with a lexical suffix. This predicts that implied-object but not medio-reflexive control intransitives should co-occur with a lexical suffix. This prediction is also borne out; out of the predicates in (65), the following take a lexical suffix, and all are implied-object predicates:
autonomous-marked predicates, and those which are equivalent to predicates containing a lexical suffix plus the middle marker. It is not easy to differentiate these cases, since they yield similar suffixes, indicating that they are of the latter type:

(91) \( \text{mat-q} \) "to come down a hill"
\( \text{qayt} \) "to get to the summit"

Further evidence for the concealed middle hypothesis is provided by three types of morphological alternation. First there are a few predicates where a suffixed form is in free variation with a functionally and formally identical unsuffixed form. Examples are given below:

(92) a. \( \text{mat-q} \) "to come down a hill"
    (lex. suff. = -q, "behind, bottom")
    \( \text{qayt} \) "to get to the summit"

Second, there are cases which involve synonymy or near-synonymy between two separate roots, which have different affixation possibilities. Some of these cases arise from dialect variation as in (93b, c); others occur in both dialects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffixes</th>
<th>Unsuffixed form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(93a) ( \text{ciq}^2\text{xal} ) &quot;to eat (intr.)&quot; ((\text{U/L}))</td>
<td>( \text{ciq}^2\text{xal} ) &quot;to eat (intr.)&quot; (U/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ( \text{kz}^2\text{-am} ) &quot;to work&quot; (L)</td>
<td>( \text{kz}^2\text{xal} ) &quot;to work&quot; (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ( \text{kz}^2\text{-lx} ) &quot;to lie down&quot; (U)</td>
<td>( \text{kz}^2\text{xal} ) &quot;to lie down&quot; (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ( \text{zow}^2\text{-lx} ) &quot;to go around&quot; (intr.) n-( \text{zamam} ) &quot;to go around&quot; (intr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ( \text{sal}^2\text{-lx} ) &quot;to gather, meet&quot; ( \text{zow}^2\text{xal} ) &quot;to gather, meet&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ( \text{ma+-am/-lx} ) &quot;to rest&quot; ( \text{zow}^2\text{xal} ) &quot;to rest&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third morphological indication that middles and unsuffixed control intransitives are closely related involves cases where middle forms are reanalyzed as unsuffixed; in other words, the -\( \text{vm}^2\) ending becomes part of the root. This tendency is responsible for the idiosyncratic (non-compositional) meanings of the middle in (94) below, and for cases where other suffixes which are normally in complementary distribution with the middle end up suffixed to it, as shown in (95):

(94) a. \( \text{sal}^2\text{am} \) "difficult (task); to have difficulty (person)"
    b. \( \text{sal}^2\text{xal} \) "to go up hill"

The forms in (95) are particularly interesting, in that they show an intermediate stage of reanalysis. The applicative transitive-\( \text{xal} \) is normally in complementary distribution with all other intransitives; the two forms in (95b) are consistent with this generalization, if the root is construed as optionally including the (reanalyzed) middle suffix.

All this evidence points in one direction: control intransitives are zero-marked middles.

7. Implications

I have now provided considerable evidence from St'at'imcets for the principle claims of this paper, repeated below:

(I) All predicates are based on roots which are lexically associated with a single, internal argument.

(II) All transitive and all intransitive predicates are derived by morphosyntactic operations, which may be phonologically null.

In this final section I address the implications of this analysis in more general terms, concentrating on two issues; first, the status of zero morphology; second, potential explanations for why languages should consistently display a near-identical set of zero-derived intransitives (e.g., "control roots", "inergatives").

17Van Eijk (1987) notes that "The consultants from whom I recorded \( \text{ciq}^2\text{xal} \) translate it as "to eat some of it." By contrast, \( \text{ciq}^2\text{am} \) and \( \text{ciq}^2\text{an} \) are activity-oriented and refer exclusively to the action of eating." In spite of this meaning difference, however, both commonly take a with-object and otherwise behave alike syntactically. I will therefore assume here that the difference is not related to argument structure.
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7.1. Zero morphology

Under the analysis proposed here, non-control roots are uniformly unaccusative; moreover, they are the only type of non-derived predicate in St'át'imcets, and by hypothesis, universally. This implies for lexical representation: to put it simply, aside from categorial status (N vs. V) there is no need to specify argument structure at all.

There is considerable conceptual advantage to a model of the lexicon which minimizes the role of idiosyncratic information in individual lexical entries. Nevertheless, it might be objected that the one presented here simply shifts the burden of idiosyncrasy onto the morphological component, and more particularly onto the role of zero morphology. Clearly, if zero-derivation is unconstrained, then such criticisms are well-founded, since an invisible morpheme can be conjured up every time overt evidence is lacking for a desired derivation. The situation, indeed, is much the same as in syntax, where empty categories must be constrained if their use is not to lead to vacuity.

One important constraint on zero-derivation has become known as Myers' Generalization (Myers 1984):

(96) Zero-derived words do not permit the affixation of further derivational morphemes.

Pesetsky (1995) uses Myers' Generalization to account for, amongst other phenomena, the lack of 'causative' nominalizations with psych-predicates like 'annoy' or 'amuse'. According to his analysis, these are complex forms consisting of bound roots affixed with a zero causative morpheme. Thus, 'annoyance' means 'the state of being annoyed' not 'the activity of annoying'; 'amusement' means 'the state of being amused', not 'the activity of amusing' and so on. This follows if the nominalizations may only be based on the underlying non-causative bound roots 'annoy', 'amuse', rather than their zero-derived causative counterparts 'cause to be annoyed', 'cause to be amused'.

Myers' generalization, however, is counter-exemplified by nominalization in St'át'imcets. Recall the distinction between i-prefix implied-object and unaccusative predicates (the former derived by zero middle-marking):

(97) Implied object Unaccusative

- i-put = "something said"  - ñ-m-ë = "written"
- i-k'uk' = "something cooked"  - ñ-pù = "boiled"
- i-nʌq' = "something stolen"  - ñ-tìx = "set (of table)"
- i-ñad' = "something drunk"  - ñ-saq = "put down (with opening up)"

i-prefixation of the implied object predicates on the left yields a nominal interpretation, in contrast to the resulting state interpretation of the unaccusative predicates on the right. However, by hypothesis, both sets of predicate are based on unaccusative roots; the difference is that the implied object predicates contain a Ø middle marker, which must be present prior to i-prefixation in order to yield the difference in interpretation. Since the nominalizing i-prefix is clearly derivational (amongst other things, it is category-changing), Myers' generalization as a general restriction on zero-derivation must be false.

However, a relativized version of the generalization (due to Pesetsky 1995, building on work by Fabb 1988) does not run into these problems. Pesetsky terms this version Morphological Opacity:

(98) a. A suffix β may attach to a form headed by a suffix α only if α is opaque to β.
   b. Suffix α is opaque to suffix β if α satisfies the opacity index of β.

The basic idea behind this approach is that, in general, derivational i-prefixes resist attaching to derived forms, but this resistance can be overcome when certain (α) affixes are supplied with features ("opacity indexes") which allow them to conceal their derivational history from certain other (β) affixes. Forms affixed with α will then act as non-derived for the purposes of affixation by β. Opacity indexes are of two types: (i) contains morphophonological features, whilst (ii) contains syntactic features. Importantly, Ø-derivational affixes are never treated as having a type (i) opacity index (logically enough, since they are by definition morphophonologically empty) but they may have a type (ii) index.

Next, compare nominalizing i-prefixation to stative i-prefixation, illustrated with non-derived (unaccusative) roots on the right-hand side of (97). Unlike the nominalizer, the stative prefix makes no reference to the category of the root to which it attaches. By hypothesis, then, it cannot refer to a type (ii) opacity index. This means that the zero-middle-marker is not opaque to the stative prefix, which means that it should resist stative i-prefixation. This is indeed the case: the i-prefixated unergatives (i.e., zero-derived middles) on the left of (97) have only a nominalized and not a resulting state interpretation.18

Stepping back from Pesetsky's specific proposal, we can begin to see the outlines of a general theory of zero-morphology. Zero-morphemes differ from overt morphemes in that while the latter may be

18This analysis runs into one set of potential problems. As we have seen, there are a few medio-flexive zero-marked middles which do permit stative i-prefixation, contrary to the predictions of Morphological Opacity. This is shown in (97), repeated below as (i):

(i) ñ-m-ëq = "sitting"  ñ-uk'ë = "(being) inside"

However, there is a way out of this problem, if we assume that the stative i-prefix, unlike its nominalizing counterpart, is added prior to affixation with the zero middle-marker. In fact, there is some evidence for this. In some bound forms, the stative prefix obligatorily cooccurs with the locative prefix i, as in the examples in (ii):

(ii,a) n-ñ-e-šómč-kä-t = "bossy"  b. n-ñ-e-tìl-q = "generous"
   c. n-ñ-e-k'da? = "conceited"  d. n-ñ-e-gìl = "stingy"

There are, however, no cases of nominalizing i-prefixes inside the locative prefix. (The prefix combination i-n-e- is ruled out by an independent morphophonological condition, so there are no cases of either i-prefix preceding the locative). Note also that the stative i-prefix is only compatible with telic predicates, so it will never attach to implied object intransitives, which are all atelic; this will rule out derivations where the stative i-prefix is attached to the root, which is then suffixed with an active-type zero middle marker. I tentatively conclude that the stative prefix is added prior to intransitivizing suffixes (including the Ø-alternant), allowing us to maintain Morphological Opacity.
licensed by either morphophonological or syntactic features, zero-morphology must be licensed by
syntactic features. There is an obvious link between the behaviour of zero-derivation as outlined here
and commonly proposed constraints on zero-inflection. Zero-inflection is usually proposed when
syntactic considerations force its existence: these considerations include systematic gaps in \( \phi \)-feature
specifications, as in person and number paradigms, as well as universal conditions on the realization
of functional morphemes such as tense, mood, and aspect (Déchaine 1993). In all of these cases,
zero-inflection is licensed by syntactic features, just as Pesetsky has proposed for zero-derivation. An
important question remains as to exactly which syntactic features are relevant for different levels of
the grammar: in a model such as that of Hale and Keyser (1993, to appear), for example, only
(lexical) categorial features are available in the derivational component (I-syntax) while functional
heads and \( \phi \)-features are introduced in the inflectional component (s-syntax). Whether this division
can be maintained remains an open question.

7.2. Lexicalization and the unaccusative-ungeneric distinction

Finally, let us return once again to the distinction between 'non-control' and 'control' roots. I have
argued at length that control roots do not really exist; contrary to appearances, they are zero-derived
versions of overtly suffixed intransitives. I have, however, left unanswered the question as to why a
particular, relatively small set (about 75) of intransitive predicates should be zero-derived, and not a
random subset of roots. Moreover, why should the same 75 intransitives get zero-derived more
generally across the Salish family? And why should these 75 in large part overlap with the class of
ungerative predicates identified cross-linguistically?

The answer lies in the process of lexicalization whereby a particular morphosyntactic substructure
receives a separate morphophonological shape. Clearly, not all forms made available by the
morphosyntax are realized phonologically. Roots may be bound, for example, which is another way
of saying that they cannot be associated with an independent phonetic matrix. The same is true - by
definition - for affixes. A particular pattern of association and non-association between the
morphosyntax and the morphophonology is what of course defines the lexicon of a given language.

Now, let us assume that lexicalization is sensitive not only to morphological structure, but also to
patterns of language use, that is, real-world knowledge and pragmatic utility. Overt forms of the
morphosyntactic component will get an independent morphophonological shape only if they are of
'communicative value', through frequency of usage and/or cognitive saliency. I have kept these
questions deliberately vague, in order to allow a certain degree of cross-linguistic variation, since
languages may differ as to which morphosyntactic representations they choose to lexicalize. For
example, it is hard for English speakers to conceive of unaccusative versions of predicates like
"punch", or "cut someone's throat". Yet they do surface in St âl'îmêcts:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sqrt{kat}x &= \text{"(get) severed"} \\
\sqrt{tup} &= \text{"(get) punched"} \\
\sqrt{tup} &= \text{"(get) whipped"}
\end{align*}
\]

Cross-linguistic variation in lexicalization is a real and inescapable source of difference between
languages, and may even reflect culturally different ways of conceiving the world. However, and
quite crucially, lexicalization does not vary without limit. On the contrary, languages tend to
consistently lexicalize more or less the same (useful) types of predicate.

Now, one of the most salient properties of zero-derived (control) intransitive predicates is that they
are semantically asymmetrical, in that they involve actions in which the focal (human) participant is
far more likely to be construed as agent than as patient. This is true of implied object as well as
medio-reflexive zero-derived intransitives. Implied object intransitives, while derived aspectually by
"s-eliciting" a predicate (see section 5.3) are often used to defocalize an underlying object, and
focus the predicate itself: 'eat' and 'drink' are typical members of this class. Medio-reflexive zero-
intransitives have a similar defocalizing effect, but this time by forcing an inclusion or identity
relation between subject and underlying object, typically yielding body-centred activities such as
'bathe' or 'dress'. In both cases, there is a clear asymmetry between agent, the focalized participant,
and patient, the defocalized participant.

Now, under a conception of morphosyntax such as that advocated here, both classes of unspecified
control intransitive must be derived; and since they are derived directly from roots, Morphological
Opacity will not stop them from being zero-derived. It follows that the only possible class of zero-
derived intransitives will be 'control roots' (i.e., zero-derived unergatives). Conversely, the
unaccusative roots which underly them will not be lexicalized (i.e., will surface only when bound),
because their (non-agentive, non-focal) argument will find few or no real world contexts of use.

It should be emphasized that the notion of semantic asymmetry appealed to here is a continuum. At
one end are the control predicates, where the focal participant is strongly agentive; these are most
likely to be lexicalized as zero-derived unergative intransitives. At the other, we find non-control
predicates where the participant is devoid of any agency at all; these are most likely to surface as
bare roots. In the middle, however, we find predicates which are more or less symmetric, in that
neither agent-orientation nor patient-orientation is favoured by the inherent lexical properties of
the root. It is these predicates which typically show alternations between unspecified unaccusatives
and suffixed unergatives.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that the existence of the class of control intransitives in particular,
and patterns of lexicalization more generally, are better conceived of as by-products of the process of
language acquisition than as formal properties of the grammar. Children go through a period of
rote-learning prior to abstracting morphological regularities from their linguistic input, and they are
liable to learn the most common predicates which they encounter. Moreover, it has often been noted that
ungerative (control) predicates are (i) salient (ii) few in number and (iii) frequently employed -
precisely the types of predicate, in fact, which are liable to be rote-learned before the productive rules
of morphology are fully acquired. We might think, then, of unergatives as constituting part of a core
of "relic" forms acquired early in childhood and resistant to morphophonological reanalysis. (In fact,
we have already observed that unspecified control intransitives in St âl'îmêcts are characterized by an
unusual preponderance of fossilized derivational material; we can now posit a source for this
phenomenon in language acquisition.)

Now, what happens when the child's morphological component is reorganized so that - in conformity
with universal properties of lexical composition - all control predicates are derived? As fossilized
rote-learned forms, control intransitives resist morphophonological reanalysis: but they are by no
means resistant to zero-derivation, which allows them to retain their morphophonological integrity
while adding the requisite syntactic features. The logical result of this developmental step is the
creation of a set of zero-derived agentive predicates - in other words, control intransitives or
ungeratives.