Sliammon (Mainland Comox) Transitive Constructions with *-ʔəm*, *-ni*, and *-mi*[1]

Honoré Watanabe
Kyoto University

0. Introduction. The main concern of this paper is the use of three suffixes in Sliammon (Mainland Comox) transitive predicates.[2] They are: the 'indirective$_1$' *-ʔəm* (Ind), the 'indirective$_2$' *-ni* (Ind),[3] and the 'relational' *-mi* (Rlt). *-ʔəm* and *-mi* are quite productive, whereas very few occurrences of *-ni* have been found so far. Regrettably, information on these suffixes in previous works on Comox (both dialects) has been quite sparse: there has heretofore been no description of *-mi* and *-ni*, at least in published articles. Although the data gathered is still limited in a number of ways, this paper should give at least some idea of the functions of these suffixes.

This paper is organized as follows: before turning to the three suffixes in question, a general information on Sliammon transitive clauses is given in section 1. Then each of the suffixes is discussed in turn: *-ʔəm* in section 2, *-ni* in 3, and *-mi* in 4. Tables of pronominal markers are provided in the Appendix at the end of this paper.

1. Basic transitives. Sliammon predicates are either transitive or intransitive. All transitive stems are marked by one of the three transitive markers:[4] *-t* control,[5] *-nxʷ* noncontrol, and *-stxʷ* causative. Pronominal (direct) objects are indicated by suffixes which follow these transitive markers, and pronominal subjects by enclitics (except third persons, which are expressed by the suffix *-as*).[6]

1.1. Control and noncontrol. Control is a somewhat uncommon category, but is important in Sliammon just as in most, if not all, of the Salishan languages. Control indicates that the action of the predicate is under the control of the actor, that the action is intentional, and that the actor is making competent attempts to bring it about. Opposed to control is noncontrol which indicates that the event expressed is unintentional, or that the actor brought about the result

[1] I would like to thank the Sliammon people for allowing me to study their language, and I would especially like to thank my language consultants, Mrs. Mary George, Mr. Dave Dominick, and Mrs. Elsie Paul for data cited in this paper. I also thank Dr. M. Dale Kinkade and Dr. Ron Beaumont for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. Needless to say, I am responsible for any misinterpretation. My research on Sliammon has been generously supported at various times by grants from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, International Scientific Research Program (Field Research) (most recently granted to the project Urgent Linguistic Fieldwork of the North Pacific Rim, headed by Osahito Miyaoka, 1995-1996, #07041013), the Jacobs Research Funds, and the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society.

[2] Comox is the northernmost language of the Central branch of the Salishan language family. At least two dialects are recognized of Comox: Island Comox, spoken on Vancouver Island, and Mainland Comox. The latter is spoken by three groups: Sliammon, Klahoose, and Homalco. Further dialectal differences among these groups, if any, have not been recognized. Since my research has been carried out in Sliammon, I will hereafter refer to this dialect by that name. The name Comox is used to refer to the whole language. The Sliammon phonemic inventory includes the following: *p, (tᶿ), t, (λ), č, (k), (kʷ), q, qʷ, ʔ, p', t'ᶿ, t', λ', č', (k'), k'ʷ, q', q'ʷ, ǰ, g, ǰ', g', θ, s, ɬ, š, xʷ, x̣, x̣ʷ, h, m, n, (l), y, w, m', n', (l'), y', w', i, u, a, ə.* Those in parentheses are so far observed as rare or limited in their occurrences. Note that *ǰ'* and *g'* are realized phonetically as [ʔǰ] and [ʔg] respectively. For a justification in considering them as single unit phonemes, see Watanabe (1994a, b). Also for morphophonemic rules observed so far, refer to Watanabe (ibid.). See Blake (1992) for a more theoretical treatment of Sliammon phonology.

[3] I will use the same abbreviation 'Ind' to gloss both *-ʔəm* and *-ni*.

[4] Except some forms with roots which take the suffix *-(V)š*. See note 37 and also Kroeber (1989:112).

[5] In some cases, *-t* is not synchronically segmentable from a following pronominal suffix. See the Appendix.

[6] Intransitive stems are of various types. They may be, for example, unmarked, (i.e., bare roots, *ǰəλ'* 'run,' *č'əpx̣* 'dirty'), marked by the active-intransitive *-ʔəm* (*ǰuθ-ʔəm* 'push,' *λ'əxʷ-ʔəm* win'), or by the middle *-Vm* (*č'ah-am* 'pray,' *t'uq'ʷ-um* 'cough'), or formed with the stative *-it* (*xaɬ-it* 'angry').

with difficulty (because that actor did not have full control in performing the act). Thus, a noncontrol predicate can be translated into English as both 'to do X accidentally' and '(finally) manage to do X.' It is evident that the opposition 'volition' vs. 'nonvolition' is only a part of the control/noncontrol opposition.[7] (For more on control in Salish, see Thompson 1985.) The following examples are control transitives (marked by *-t*)[8] in (a) and their corresponding noncontrol transitives (*-nxʷ*) in (b):[9]

(1a) *tiǰ-i-θi* *tᶿəm*
wake-link-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll wake you up.'

(1b) *tiy-nu-mš* *čxʷ*
wake-NTr-1sg.Obj 2sg.Sbj
'You (accidentally) woke me up.'

(2a) *t'ug-u-θ-as*
recognize-link-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He recognized me.'

[7] This explanation of the control/noncontrol opposition may be oversimplified. Some roots are found to occur only with one of the two markers in question. For example, *gəx̣-* 'dream' and *niy-* 'forget' occur only with the noncontrol transitive marker. This restriction may be explained as semantically motivated. (One does not have control over what he/she will dream about, and one forgets because he/she has limited control in remembering.) However, there are some roots with which such an explanation seems inappropriate. For example, with *tiyč-* 'miss,' one finds a noncontrol transitive form *tiyč-uxʷ č* 'I missed it' (e.g. the ball when trying to hit it) and also a control transitive *tiyč-a-t-as tə ʔimin* 'he missed the door (and bumped into s.t.)' (*tə* Det, *ʔimin* door). The latter predication hardly seems to be a control situation. Perhaps the opposition is not so rigidly between control and noncontrol, but rather between neutral and noncontrol. See van Eijk (1991) for a similar situation in Lillooet (Interior Salish). It is also possible that roots carry a lexically specified control status, and the control status of a whole predicate is determined by the combination of the control statuses of both the root and the affixes. See Thompson (1985) and Thompson and Thompson (1992) for such an analysis for Thompson (Interior Salish). The Sliammon control category needs to be worked out in detail, but such an attempt is beyond the scope of this paper.

[8] *-t* has fused with the pronominal object suffixes in the following two examples.

[9] It is important to note that the control forms do not necessarily imply the success of a particular event, whereas the noncontrol counterparts do imply that the event was actualized (cf. Davis 1978).

(2b) *t'uw-nu-mš-as*
recognize-NTr-1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He finally recognized me.'

1.2. Causative. The third transitive marker is *-stxʷ* causative. Transitive predicates formed with this suffix imply that the subject is causing or obliging the activity described. It provides the means to transitivize stems which are not otherwise transitivized. For some of the examples, a more literal translation might be 'make s.o. do s.t.,' while for others, it might be 'make s.o./s.t. be X' or 'let s.o./s.t. be X'. However, examples are seldom translated as such by native speakers. E.g.,

(3) *ʔiɬtən-stu-mi* *tᶿəm*
eat-Cau-2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'm going to feed you.' (i.e., 'make you eat')

(4) *p'ap'im-stu-mš-as* *ɬə* *tᶿ* *tan*
work-Cau-1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Det 1sg.Psv mother
'My mother put me to work.' (i.e., 'made me work')

(5) *pəq-sxʷ* *čaxʷ*
white-Cau 2sg.Sbj
'Make it white!' (i.e., 'Make it be white!')

Some roots show rather idiomatic or idiosyncratic meanings when occurring with the causative suffix, e.g.,

(6) *qʷiqʷ-qʷay-stu-mi* *tᶿəm*
??-talk-Cau-2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll talk to you.'

(7) *ɬəx̣-stu-mi* *č*
bad-Cau-2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj
'I don't like you.'

1.3. Lexical arguments. The reference of third persons, marked or implied in predicates, can be specified by lexical arguments which usually follow predicates. These arguments are of two types. They are either unmarked or preceded by an all purpose particle *ʔə* (Obl). The former type will be called direct lexical arguments and the latter oblique lexical arguments.[10] Neither

[10] Both types of arguments are usually preceded by a determiner.

type is an obligatory part of a clause; as a 'head-marking' language, all Sliammon predicates are grammatically complete by themselves.

Direct arguments express subjects of intransitive and transitive clauses and objects of transitive clauses (i.e. all core arguments). Oblique arguments express all others. If only one direct lexical argument is expressed in a transitive clause in which the two (core) participants are both third person entities, then that argument refers to the object and not to the subject. (Cf. Gerdts [1988:57] on 'One-Nominal Interpretation') Thus,

(8) *t'a-t'ayš-a-t-as* *tə* *čuy'*
Impf-blanket-link-CTr-3.Sbj Det child
'He is covering the child with a blanket.'
*'The child is covering him with a blanket.'

If two direct lexical arguments cooccur in a transitive clause, one referring to the subject and the other to the object, then the order is usually Sbj-Obj. However, a clause with two such arguments rarely occurs, and it may be grammatically questionable.[11] The preferred strategy in such a case is to use a passive construction in which the agent is expressed as an oblique lexical argument.

1.4. Expansion with lexical suffixes. Stems in Sliammon (and in Salish in general) can be expanded by lexical suffixes which have concrete lexical meanings rather than some grammatical functions.[12] A full description of these suffixes is beyond the scope of the present paper. However, an exemplification of their general use in transitive clauses may be welcome here in order to provide some background information before turning to their function with (and without) the suffix *-ʔəm* (section 2.3).

Many of the lexical suffixes refer to specific body parts like 'head,' 'teeth,' 'tongue,' or 'knee,' but many others refer to such concepts as 'canoe,' 'house,' 'child,' or 'wind.' They are unusual in that many of them are formally unrelated to their corresponding independent words. When these suffixes are present in a clause, they often function to add precision of reference. In the following examples, simple transitive clauses are given in examples (a) and their corresponding clauses with lexical suffixes are in examples (b):

(9a) *ʔəp'-t*
wipe-CTr
'to wipe it'

[11] See Hess (1973) for information on Lushootseed (Central Salish) where a transitive clause with two direct lexical arguments are indeed ungrammatical.

[12] About 50 lexical suffixes have been identified for Sliammon so far.

(9b) *ʔaʔp'*=iws-*θi* *tʰəm*
wipe=body-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll wipe your body.' (*ə* > *aʔ* /(#) _ C'V)

(10a) *t'ug-u-θ-as*
recognize-link-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He recognized me.'

(10b) *t'uw*=*qi-θ-a* *čxʷ*
recognize=mouth-CTr+1sg.Obj-Qn 2sg.Sbj
'Do you recognize my voice?'[13]

2. Indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm* (Ind). The suffix *-ʔəm*[14] followed immediately by the control or the noncontrol transitive marker creates stems that imply an actor and two goals -- analogous to ditransitive verbs in, for example English, as in 'John gave a book to Mary.'

[13] =*qin* 'mouth/voice/language'. In most cases, *n* is lost before *t* and *θ*.

[14] *-ʔəm* is realized as *-aʔam* in the following three environments: (i) after roots that have lost their (first) vowel (due to a regular morphophonemic rule which deletes the root vowel *ə* when the root undergoes CV- Impf reduplication), (ii) after the roots of the shape √CVCC, and (iii) after the causative suffix (realized as *-st*). It is likely that these three conditions are correlated. Note that they all create consonant clusters of at least two consonants directly before the suffix in question. I suspect that with further analysis the shape *-aʔam* can be explained by regular phonological rules. In all other environments this suffix is realized as *-ʔəm* (phonetically [ʔʌm ~ ʔm]). It seems that the glottal stop can optionally merge with a preceding glottalized stop or affricate, especially in allegro speech. One exception has been found so far; after *p'ap'i(m)* 'work,' the indirective suffix is realized as *-ʔim*.

Kuipers (1967:78) considers the Squamish suffixes *-šit* and *-nit*, with somewhat similar functions as the Sliammon *-ʔəm*, as 'complex transitivizers' which are "obviously petrified complexes with as final members" the transitivizer *-t*. There is sufficient evidence to consider the Sliammon suffix as synchronically analyzable from the following control transitive *-t*. First, when *-ʔəm* is followed by the noncontrol transitive marker, it always appears as *-ʔəm* (and not **-ʔəmt*). Second, when it is followed by *-θ* CTr+1sg.Obj and *-θi* CTr+2sg.Obj, it also appears as *-ʔəm* (i.e., not **-ʔəmtθ* or **-ʔəmtθi*). (Note that these pronominal suffixes are historically **-t-s* and **-t-si* respectively.) The second point is also supported elsewhere. The phonotactics of this language seems to tolerate the sequence *tθ*; there seems nothing to prevent the form **-ʔəmtθ* from appearing, if the suffix ends in *t*. (However, there is only one clear

This suffix has been described in two of the previously published works on Comox: Harris (1977:52-3) on Island Comox and Hagège (1981:106-7) on Sliammon. However, these descriptions are quite limited, perhaps due to a lack of sufficient data at the time they were written. This section is intended to supplement those descriptions and to elucidate the function of this suffix.

2.1. Basic construction. Before turning to the suffix in question, note the following construction with the root √*χan-* 'give':

(11) *χan-a-θi-s-uɬ* *ʔə* *šə* *ǰanxʷ*
give-link-CTr+2sg.Obj-3.Sbj-Past Obl Det fish
'He gave a fish to you.'

In this example, the recipient is marked as the direct object (*-θi* 2sg.Obj) and the gift (*ǰanxʷ* 'fish') as an oblique argument. Thus what in English would be indirect object is treated as the direct object marked on the predicate, and in turn what in English would be direct object appears as an oblique argument. A translation such as 'He benefited you with a fish' may describe the Sliammon construction more appropriately. With roots that do not logically imply two goals, the addition of *-ʔəm* creates transitive stems that do in fact imply two goals. Consider the next two examples where (12a) is a simple transitive construction and (12b) a corresponding form with *-ʔəm*:

(12a) *λəs-t* *čan* *səm* *tə* *čuy'*
punch-CTr 1sg.Sbj Fut Det child
'I'll punch the kid.'

(12b) *λəs-ʔəm-θi* *tθəm* *ʔə* *tə* *čuy'*
punch-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg+Fut Obl Det child
'I'll punch the kid for you.'

It can easily be seen that the latter construction with *-ʔəm* parallels that of a simple transitive with √*χan-* 'give' above. In (12b) the beneficiary assumes direct object status marked on the predicate (*-θi* 2sg.Obj), and the patient (*čuy'* 'child'), which is treated as the direct object in the simple transitive (12a), is expressed as an oblique argument.

---

example of *tθ* sequence: *ʔu•ʔumat-θut* 'to be getting lazy,' CV• Impf, *ʔumat* 'lazy,' *-θut* CTr+Rfl 1sg.Sbj).

-ʔəm can also be attached to roots that are inherently intransitive. Stems thus formed can then be transitivized and take the pronominal object suffixes. The following examples are of a simple intransitive in (13a) and its corresponding form with *-ʔəm* in (13b):

(13a) *ǰəλ'* *čat* *səm*
run 1pl.Sbj Fut
'We will run.'

(13b) *ǰəλ'-ʔəm-θ* *ga*
run-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj Imp
'Run for me!' (i.e. on behalf of me)

A few more examples will suffice to illustrate the use of *-ʔəm*. The following examples (b) are, again, given with corresponding simple transitive or intransitive forms in (a). Thus,

(14a) *λəpxʷ-a-t* *tθəm* *tə* *χapay'*
break-link-CTr 1sg.Sbj+Fut Det stick
'I'll break the stick.'

(14b) *λəpxʷ-aʔam-θ* *čxʷ*
break-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj 2sg.Sbj
'Break it for me!'

(15a) *q'ətxʷ-a-t* *tθəm* *tə* *tθ* *ɬəχgamin*
burn-link-CTr 1sg.Sbj+Fut Det 1sg.Psv scrap
'I'll burn my scrap.'

(15b) *q'ətxʷ-aʔam-θi* *tθəm* *ʔə* *tə* *pəp•pipa*
burn-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut Obl Det Pl•paper
'I'll burn the paper for you.'

(16a) *ʔilq'ay* *štəm*
barbecue.deer 1pl.Sbj
'We'll barbecue deer.'

(16b) *ʔilq'ay-ʔəm-θi* *tθəm*
barbecue.deer-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll barbecue deer for you.'

(17a) *či-čiɬ-im-iw*
Impf-dance-Mdl-Pl
'They are dancing.'

(17b) *čiɬ-im-ʔəm-t-umuɬ-as* *Mary*
dance-Mdl-Ind-CTr-1pl.Obj-3.Sbj (name)
'Mary danced for us.'

2.2. Function. The previous works on Comox mentioned above treated this suffix as a marker of benefactive (Harris 1977:52 and Hagège 1981:106).[15] It is indeed easy to elicit forms with this suffix denoting benefactive. However, it can also carry a 'malefactive' sense. E.g.,

(18) *λəpxʷ-aʔam-θ-as* *ʔə* *tə* *tᶿ* *x̣apay'*
break-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv stick
'He broke my stick on me.' (Compare with 14a and 14b above.)

(19) *k'ʷəɬ-ʔəm-nu-mš-as* *ʔə* *tə* *tᶿ* *tihaya*
pour-Ind-NTr-1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv tea
'He accidentally spilled my tea.'

The choice between the two interpretations -- one benefactive and the other malefactive -- is not based on the roots that *-ʔəm* attaches to, as can be inferred from (14b) and (18), both of which involve the same root √*λəpxʷ* 'break'. The choice depends rather on the context, and, as might be expected, two different readings of the same form are often possible. Thus,

[15] In his treatment of Island Comox, Harris (1977:52) identifies the 'benefactive' suffix [-ʔəm] as the same morpheme as the 'detransitivizer.' In Sliammon an intransitive marker (active-intransitive) also takes the shape *-ʔəm*. While it may be interesting to pose the question of whether there exists any semantic and/or functional connection between 'intransitive' and the suffix in question, such a problem is not explored here. I will treat them as two distinct morphemes. Hagège (1981:106) identifies this suffix as *-aʔm* and its function as benefactive also. I had difficulties re-eliciting some of the examples in Hagège (ibid..) with the suffix in question (even when I used *-ʔəm* in place of his *-aʔm*), but I will not go into this problem further. (See Kroeber 1989 for a review of Hagège's work.) Note also that in a neighboring language Sechelt (Central Salish), Beaumont (1985) suggests the term 'benefactive ending' for a transitive marker *-ʔəmt*. For (Upriver) Halkomelem (also Central Salish), Galloway (1993:255) describes a suffix, *-(ə)ɬč*, which specifies the beneficiary of the action. Apparently, this suffix "can also be used *as a somewhat humorous malefactive* as in the English constructions" (ibid..; emphasis mine -- HW).

(20) *č'əpx̣-aʔam-θ-as* *ʔə* *tə* *tᶿ* *q'əsnay'*
dirty-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv dress
'She dirtied my dress on me./She dirtied my dress for me.'

And compare the following two examples:

(21a) *məkʷ-ʔəm-θ-as*
eat-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He ate it for me (because I couldn't finish it).'

(21b) *məkʷ-ʔəm-θ-as* *ʔə* *tə* *tᶿ* *ʔiɬtən*
eat-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv food
'S.o. ate my food on me.' (i.e., s.o. stole my food from my plate)

In yet another example the consultant's translation does not seem to indicate either a benefactive or a particularly malefactive connotation:

(22) *ɬəw-ʔəm-θ-as* *ʔə* *šə* *tᶿ* *ʔapləs-uɬ*
take.out-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv apples-Past
ʔə *tə* *k'ʷəxʷa*
Obl Det box
'He took my apples from the box.'[16]

The above examples clearly show that *-ʔəm* does not necessarily indicate a beneficiary. The presence of this suffix implies two goals, one of which is a person affected by the action, and this effect is unspecified. In other words, this suffix seems to be syntactically rather than semantically driven. Consequently the label 'benefactive' would be misleading. A more neutral term is clearly preferable, and following Thompson and Thompson (1980), the term 'indirective' is adopted here.

The indirective$_1$ suffix seems to be quite productive, occurring not only with the control transitive *-t* (as most of the examples cited thus far) but also with the noncontrol transitive *-nxʷ* (see also 19 above):

[16] The consultant's translation had also '... without telling me, but it's okay.' Her further explanation may be helpful here: "when I came back, my apples were gone. But that's okay, because I know it was one of my relatives who took them. He took them without asking me, but it's not really stealing. If it was, I would go for [i.e., use the word] *čəw'uɬ* ('steal')."

(23) *λ'əx^{w}-ʔəm-nu-mš̌-as*
win-Ind-NTr-1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He won (-- managed to win --) for me (in a gamble).'[17]

Clauses with the indirective$_1$ suffix can be in the passive voice, e.g.,

(24) *č'aẋ-ʔəm-θay-əm-uɬ* *ʔə* *tə* *ǰanx^{w}*
cook-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-Pass-Past Obl Det fish
'They cooked fish for me.'

The indirective$_1$ suffix likewise occurs with the causative suffix, but the order of these suffixes is distinct. The causative *-stx^{w}* is realized as *-st* and directly precedes the indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm*.[18] The latter, however, is still followed by the control transitive marker, so that two transitive markers appear in the same stem.[19] Compare (25a), a simple causative clause, with its corresponding form with the indirective$_1$ suffix in (25b):

(25a) *ʔiɬtən-sx^{w}* *t^{θ}əm* *tə* *čuy'*
eat-Cau 1sg.Sbj+Fut Det child
'I'm going to feed the kid.'

(25b) *ʔiɬtən-st-aʔam-θi* *t^{θ}əm* *ʔə* *tə* *čuy'*
eat-Cau-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut Obl Det child
'I'll feed the kid for you.'

Other examples of the indirective$_1$ suffix occurring with the causative are:[20]

(26) *pəq-st-aʔam-θ* *čx^{w}*
white-Cau-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj 2sg.Sbj
'Make it white for me!'

[17] This clause may be another interesting manifestation of the category noncontrol. I first suggested the same form, but with the control transitive, i.e., *λ'əx^{w}-ʔəm-θ-as* 'He won for me.' The consultant accepted it as grammatical but then suggested that the form in (23) may be more appropriate. Presumably, 'winning,' especially in a gamble, is perceived to be out of the control of the agent (i.e., the gambler).

[18] Apparently, this trait is shared with (at least) Sechelt (Beaumont p.c.).

[19] Data is lacking to see if the causative-indirective sequence can be followed by the noncontrol transitive suffix.

[20] I have no examples of these forms with a third person object, but this may be just an accidental gap in my corpus.

(27) *pəɬt-st-aʔam-θ* *čx^{w}* *ʔut*
thick-Cau-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj 2sg.Sbj ptc[21]
'Make it thick for me!'

2.3. Lexical suffixes and the indirective$_1$. The indirective$_1$ suffix can be attached to stems which contain a lexical suffix.[22] E.g.,

(28) *λəs=us-ʔəm-θi* *t^{θ}əm*
punch=head/face-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll punch him in the face for you.' Cf. example (12b)

Remove IND,
"I'm punch you in the face"

(29) *ɬuk^{w}=igiɬ-ʔəm-θ* *čx^{w}*
bail=canoe-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj 2sg.Sbj
'Bail the boat for me!'

(30) *miq'=ǰan-ʔəm-θ* *čx^{w}*
dip=net-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj 2sg.Sbj
'Set the fish net for me!'

The function of the lexical suffixes in the above examples is just what one would expect from simple transitives with lexical suffixes (cf. 1.4). However, there are some examples where the use of certain lexical suffixes seems to function in a different manner. These lexical suffixes have been noted to form stems which, although without the indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm*, function in a manner similar to stems formed with *-ʔəm*. Three such lexical suffixes have been recorded so far: *=šaw* 'door,' *=umix^{w}* 'floor/ground,' and *=aɬ* 'child'.[23] Note also that two readings have been elicited for (32). Thus,

[21] The function of this ubiquitous particle *ʔut* is not clear. See Hagège (1981:121) for a discussion (where he transcribes this particle as *ʔət*).

[22] I do not have any examples of the indirective suffix occurring with more than one lexical suffix in the same stem, but this also may simply be another accidental gap in my corpus.

[23] The identification of *=aɬ* as 'child' is not well attested and must remain tentative at this point. The lexical suffix meaning 'child' appears also as *=ən?aɬ*. E.g., *θap=ən?al* 'to bathe a baby/child' (√*θap-* 'bathe'). The two forms may simply be allomorphemic variations, or the longer form may well be further segmentable. Lacking a separate suffix **-ən(ʔ)* in the corpus, I am compelled to adopt the former possibility here. It may, however, be interesting to compare the apparent cognate forms in other Coast Salish languages: Sechelt *=aɬ* (and in one example, *=naɬ* : Beaumont p.c.); North Straits (Saanich) *=aɬ* 'offspring' (Montler 1986:65); Upriver

(31) *gəq'=šaw-θ* *ga*
open=door-CTr+1sg.Obj Imp
'Open the door for me!'

(32) *təq=šaw-t* *ga*
close=door-CTr Imp
'Close the door for him!/Close the door on him!'

(33) *x"ip=umix"-θi* *t^{θ}əm*
sweep=floor-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll sweep the floor for you.'

(34) *nag'=ay-θi* *t^{θ}əm*
baby.sit=child-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll baby-sit for you.'[24]

However, these lexical suffixes can cooccur with the indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm*:

(31') *gəq'=šaw-ʔəm-θ* *ga*
open=door-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj Imp
'Open the door for me!'

(33') *x"ip=umix"-ʔəm-θi* *t^{θ}əm*
sweep=floor-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll sweep the floor for you.'

(34') *nag'=ay-ʔəm-θi* *t^{θ}əm*
baby.sit=child-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll baby-sit for you.'

The functional difference between the forms with *-ʔəm* and those without this suffix is not entirely clear. However, judging from the examples, in the forms without the indirective$_1$ suffix (31 - 34 and 35a) the person marked as the direct object and the lexical suffix seem to be in close,

Halkomelem *=íɬ* 'baby,' *=(ʔ)á·lɬ* 'young,' *=əɬ* 'young' (Galloway 1993:216); Lushootseed (Snohomish) *=iʔɬ* 'baby, child' (Bates et al. 1994:114).

[24] *ɬ* and *y* alternate in certain environments which are not entirely clear yet. See Blake (1992) for a discussion.

intimate relation. Thus, in (35a) the 'floor' (*=umix"*) is that of the house of the direct object (*-θ* 1sg.). However, in (35b) the 'floor' is that of someone else's house:

(35a) *x"ip=umix"-θ* *ga*
sweep=floor-CTr+1sg.Obj Imp
'Sweep the floor for me!' (e.g. when the speaker is at her house)

(35b) *čəni* *səm* *x"ip=umix"-ʔəm-θi*
1sg. Fut sweep=floor-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj
'I will sweep the floor for you.' (When 'I' saw 'you' sweeping the floor at some third person's house, and 'I' offer to do it in place of 'you'.)

Likewise, a form with *-ʔəm* (36a) is used when the 'baby' (*=aɬ*) does not belong to the person specified as the direct object. For the same predication, a form without *-ʔəm* (36b) is questionable, and the speaker clearly preferred (36a):

(36a) *nag'=aɬ-ʔəm-θi* *t^{θ}əm* *t*
baby.sit=child-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut ptc[25]
ʔə *šə* *čuy'-s* *Norma*
Obl Det child-3.Psv (name)
'I'll baby-sit Norma's baby for you.' (E.g., you are baby-sitting Norma's baby, but since it's time for you to go, I can watch the baby until Norma gets home.)

(36b) *??nag'=ay-θi* *t^{θ}əm* *ʔə* *šə* *čuy'-s* *Norma*
baby.sit=child-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut Obl Det child-3.Psv (name)
??'I'll baby-sit Norma's baby for you.'

It is not entirely clear if this 'close, intimate' relation between the lexical suffix and the direct object can be described as that of possession. The above examples do suggest that possibility, but note the next set of examples. (37a) is a transitive clause with the indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm*, and (37b) is a corresponding form with a lexical suffix and *-ʔəm*. The corresponding form with a lexical suffix but without *-ʔəm* (37c) was judged by the language consultants as very questionable, if not entirely ungrammatical. (The reason for the denial is not clear.)[26]

[25] The function of the particle *t* has not been well identified, but I believe that this is not relevant to the issue discussed here.

[26] I will note here the judgments by my language consultants on the examples cited. One of the consultants seemed to prefer to have *-ʔəm* in (all?) forms like (31) and (34), and claimed that she would not say (33) but (33'). (She did, however, understand completely what was meant by 33). Note also, however, the next form elicited from yet another speaker: *q"əl(') čən x"ip=umix"-θi,*

(37a) *miq'-ʔəm-θi* *tᶿəm* *ʔə* *tə* *θ* *p'aʔač'*
dip-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut Obl Det 2sg.Psv fish.net
'I'll set the net for you.'

(37b) *miq'=ǰan-ʔəm-θi* *tᶿəm*
dip=net-Ind-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll set the net for you.'

(37c) ??/**miq'=ǰan-θi* *tᶿəm*
dip=net-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut

It is important to bear in mind that in all data gathered so far, in a stem with a lexical suffix that refers to body parts but which does not contain the indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm*, the referent of that lexical suffix is necessarily interpreted as a part of the entity expressed as the direct object. Cf. (9b) and (10b). In other words, if *-ʔəm* is removed from (28), the lexical suffix (*=us*) will refer to that of the person expressed as the direct object (*-θi*), and the interpretation will be 'I'll punch you in the face.'

3. Indirective$_2$ *-ni* (Ind).[27] The suffix *-ni* has so far been found to occur with only two stems: *čəw'uɬ* 'steal'[28] and *č'əɬ* 'rain.' These stems are both intransitives.[29] The attachment of *-ni*

and his translation, 'I come to sweep your floor' (*qʷəl'* 'come,' *čən* 1sg.Sbj: cf. 35a, b). I have heard the form represented in (31) uttered spontaneously by at least two native speakers.

[27] For considering this suffix to be *-ni*, rather than *-nit*, the same argument as that made for *-ʔəm* applies. See note 14.

[28] Incidentally, the phonemic shape of this word is problematic. Phonetically it is pronounced [čúʔoɬ]. The first vowel may be rendered as *u* or, together with the following glottal stop, as *əw'*. I have chosen to write the latter. Followed by *ʔ*, *u* is expected to realize, even after a high consonant *č*, as slightly lowered, whereas the sequence *əw'* is usually pronounced as [uʔ]. Writing *əw'* is also justified by a corresponding reduplicated form. Note the following example in which the form in question undergoes $C_1əC_2$· plural reduplication: [čú·ču?one·θʌs ʔətəɬᶿsə́psopɑ·yu] 'Lots of people stole my axes.' Its phonemic rendering and analysis are presumably as follows:

čəw·čəw'u-ni-θ-as *ʔə* *tə* *tᶿ* *səp·supayu*
Pl·steal-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv Pl·ax

Note that in $C_1əC_2$ · reduplication, glottalized resonants lose their glottalization in the reduplicated segment by a morphophonemic rule (see Watanabe 1994a, b), and the sequence *əw* is pronounced as [u· ~ u:]. This analysis is supported by an apparent cognate form in Sechelt,

forms a stem which can then be transitivized.[30] In such transitivized forms, the object is the sufferer of the action. E.g.,

(38) *čəw'u-ni-θ-as* *ʔə* *tə* *tᶿ* *tala*[31]
steal-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj Obl Det 1sg.Psv money
'He stole money from me.'

(39) *čəw'u-ni-t-əm* *ʔə* *šə* *ʔatnupil-ʔu-s*
steal-Ind-CTr-Pass Obl Det car-Past-3.Psv
'His car is stolen.'

(40) *č'əɬ-ni-θay-əm*[32]
rain-Ind-CTr+1sg.Obj-Pass
'I got rained on.'

čə́lʔúɬ (Beaumont 1985; I have converted the Sechelt orthography to the transcriptional conventions used in this paper.) Note Proto-Salish **l* > Sechelt *l*, Comox *y* and *w* (the latter in the environment of rounded segments [Galloway 1988]).

[29] *čəw'uɬ* 'steal' is an intransitive stem as can be judged from the following two sentences. In (i) the subject is not overtly marked (it would be *-as* if this clause were transitive), and what would be expressed as a direct object in a transitive clause is expressed as an oblique lexical argument. In (ii) the subject is specified by a direct lexical argument.

(i) *čəw'uɬ* *ʔə* *tə* *čuy'*
steal Obl Det child
'He stole the baby.'

(ii) *čəw'uɬ* *tə* *čuy'*
steal Det child
'The kid stole (s.t.).'

[30] Another way of transitivizing this form is through the use of the indirective *-ʔəm* discussed above, e.g., *čəw'uɬ-ʔəm-θ-as* 'He stole for me' (*-θ* CTr+1sg.Obj, *-as* 3.Sbj).

[31] I have no explanation to account for the loss of *ɬ* when *-ni* is attached. Note that a corresponding Sechelt form retains *ɬ* (Beaumont 1985):

čə́lʔúɬ-nit-tsí-čən-skʷa
steal-Malf-2sg.Obj-1sg.Sbj-Fut
'I'll steal it from you.'

[32] Note also the next form without *-ni*: *č'əɬ-θay-əm* 'it rained on me.' Incidentally, I am not entirely sure whether the English translations accurately reflect the semantic difference between these two forms with and without *-ni*.

The productivity of this suffix remains to be seen, but all testing to date indicates that its occurrence is limited to these two stems.[33] It seems possible to attribute this low productivity to the high productivity of the indirective suffix *-ʔəm*. Moreover, it seems likely that the fact that the semantic range of *-ʔəm* seems to cover, at least synchronically, that of *-ni* probably has some bearing on the productivity of the latter.[34]

4. Relational *-mi* (Rlt). Data is clearly still insufficient to draw any conclusion on the exact behavior and function of the third suffix to be treated, *-mi*.[35] Some patterns, however, have emerged from the ongoing research.

4.1. Basic construction. In most of the examples of this suffix in use, it has been observed that it attaches to intransitive stems which are already grammatically complete words. *-mi* is then directly followed by a transitive marker. Thus the resulting forms are transitive, and can take a direct object pronominal suffix (as in 41) or, in case where the object is third person, a direct lexical argument (as in 42). Thus,

(41) *ɬuk'ʷ-mi-θ-as*
fly-Rlt-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'It's flying towards me.'

(42) *ǰəλ'-mi-t ga tə θ man*
run-Rlt-CTr Imp Det 2sg.Psv father
'Run to your Dad!'

Interestingly, *-mi* has been recorded following the control transitive reflexive suffix *-θut*. In such a case, *-mi* is still followed by the control transitive marker, so that morphologically there seem to be two transitive markers on such a stem. Note, however, that the reflexive suffix

[33] There seem to be cognates of this suffix in the sister languages, at least in the Central and Tsamosan branches: Sechelt *-nit* (Beaumont 1985 and p.c.), Squamish *-nit* (Kuipers 1967:68), and Upper Chehalis *-ni* (Kinkade 1964:40, 1991:371, and p.c.). Also, Cowichan *-nit*, Nooksack *-nit*, Lushootseed *-di*, and Cowlitz *-ni* seems to fit here (Kinkade p.c.). All of these suffixes seem to be very restricted in their occurrences.

[34] For example, **məkʷ-ni-θ-as* (*məkʷ-* 'eat,' *-θ* CTr+1sg.Obj, *-as* 3.Sbj) was judged as ungrammatical by my consultants. Note that a 'malefactive' sense with √*məkʷ-* can be rendered by the indirective *-ʔəm* (see example 21b).

[35] For considering this suffix as *-mi*, rather than *-mit*, the same argument discussed for *-ʔəm* applies (see note 14).

detransitivizes a stem,[36] and thus what precedes *-mi* is still an intransitive stem. (This schema can be written out as: -transitive-detransitive-*mi*-transitive-.) The following examples are forms with *-θut* followed by *-mi* in (a), those without *-mi* in (b), and where available, their corresponding simple transitive forms in (c):

(43a) *ɬag-a-θut-mi-θ-as*
leave-link-CTr+Rfl-Rlt-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He walked/ran out on me./He ran away from me.'

(43b) *ɬa-ɬag-a-θut č*
Impf-leave-link-CTr+Rfl 1sg.Sbj
'I'm sneaking away.'

(43c) *ɬaw-š-as tə čuy' ʔə tə ʔayaʔ-s*
leave-Vš-3.Sbj[37] Det child Obl Det house-3.Psv
'He left the kid in his house.'

(44a) *təs-θut-mi-t-uɬ č tə qaymixʷ*
close-CTr+Rfl-Rlt-CTr-Past 1sg.Sbj Det Native.person
'I was getting closer to the person.'

(44b) *tə-ts-a-θut tə qigaθ*
Impf-close-link-CTr+Rfl Det deer
'The deer is coming closer.'

[36] Since the suffix *-θut* is synchronically unanalyzable into the control transitive marker and the (detransitivizing) reflexive suffix, one might suspect that it would be better to treat it simply as an intransitive marker. I do not treat it as such for several reasons. The *θ* element of this suffix parallels that of *-θ* CTr+1sg.Obj and *-θi* CTr+2sg.Obj., both of which must be considered to contain the control transitive force. Also, *-θut* contrasts with its noncontrol counterpart *-numut* which is clearly analyzable into the noncontrol transitive *-nxʷ* and *-mut*. This treatment is also historically valid: *-θut* < ***-t-sut* (-CTr-Rfl). See the Appendix for the pronominal object paradigm.

[37] The suffix *-(V)š* attaches to a small set of roots. About 20 such roots have been found so far. Some of the stems formed with this suffix is intransitive (e.g., *ǰəq-iš* 'to crawl,' *θap-iš* 'to take a bath,' *ʔaqʷ-iš* 'to go downstream') while others are transitive (e.g., *ɬaw-š* 'to leave him/her,' *nəp-iš* 'to put it in a container,' *məxʷ-aš* 'to gather it').

(44c) *təs-t-as* *tə* *q^{w}uɬišən-s* *ʔə* *tə* *tup*
close-CTr-3.Sbj Det shoe-3.Psv Obl Det stove
'He put his shoes close to the stove.'

(45a) *q'at'^{0}-ag-a-θut-mi-θi* *č*
gather-Pl-link-CTr+Rfl-Rlt-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj
'I'll get together with you guys.'

(45b) *q'at'^{0}-a-θut* *štəm*
gather-link-CTr+Rfl 1pl.Sbj
'We'll get together.'

In one example this suffix is followed by the reflexive *-θut*:

(46) *ɬəx̣-mi-θut* *tə* *čuy'*
bad-Rlt-CTr+Rfl Det child
'The kid is behaving badly, crying and screaming.'[38]
Cf. *ɬəx̣ tə čuy'* 'The kid is bad.'

4.2. Function. With a predicate that denotes motion, *-mi* serves to form a transitive stem whose object is an entity towards which the subject moves.[39] See (41) and (42) above as well as the following (47). In this section, available relevant forms are also exemplified following the forms with *-mi*:

(47) *ǰəλ'-mi-t* *štəm*
run-Rlt-CTr 1pl.Sbj+Fut
'We'll run towards him.'

The relation between the subject and the object may be locational rather than directional. E.g.,

[38] The exact translation of this sentence is problematical.

[39] The following was rejected as ungrammatical by the consultant: **ǰuθ-mi-θi t^{θ}əm* *'I'll push it towards you' (√*ǰuθ-* 'push,' *-θi* CTr+2sg.Obj, *t^{θ}əm* 1sg.Sbj+Fut). Presumably the reason is that it does not imply that the subject ('I') will move towards the object ('you') and perhaps also that the root is inherently transitive. In order to express 'I'll push it towards you,' an analytical expression was employed, i.e., *ǰuθ-u-t t^{θ}əm θu ʔə tə θ ni?* (√*ǰuθ-* push, *-u* link, *-t* CTr, *t^{θ}əm* 1sg.Sbj+Fut, *θu* go?, *ʔə* Obl, *tə* Det, *θ* 2sg.Psv, *ni?* exist/be.there).

(48) *k'^{w}iʔ-iš-mi-θ-as*
stand-Vš-Rlt-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'He's standing on me.'

(48') *k'^{w}iʔ-iš* *ga*
stand-Vš Imp
'Stand up!'

In other examples, the relation is not directional/locational; the object may be an entity in relation to whom/which the action is accomplished. Many of the following involve an attitude of some kind. E.g.,

(49) *x̣aɬ-it-mi-θi* *č*
angry-Stv-Rlt-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj
'I'm angry at you.'

(49') *x̣aɬ-it* *č*
angry-Stv 1sg.Sbj
'I'm angry.'

(50) *q'ay-mi-θi* *č*
believe-Rlt-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj
'I believe you.'

(50') *q'ay-nu-mš-as* *ga*
believe-NTr-1sg.Obj-3.Sbj ptc[40]
'He made me believe it.'

(51) *λ'ux̣^{w}-it-mi-t-as*
cry-Stv-Rlt-CTr-3.Sbj
'She's crying for him.'

(51') *λ'ux̣^{w}-it* *tə* *čuy'*
cry-Stv Det child
'The child is crying.'

[40] The function of the particle *ga* is unclear. There seem to be at least three particles of the same shape, i.e., *ga*. One is the imperative marker and another a subordinate marker. It seems that this example contains a third one, whose function remains unclear at this point.

(52) *qa•qas-mi-θ-as*
Impf•laugh-Rlt-CTr+1sg.Obj-3.Sbj
'They're laughing at me.'

(53) *q̓ʷay-mi-θi* *tᶿəm*
talk-Rlt-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut
'I'll scold you.'

(53') *q̓ʷəy•q̓ʷay* *št*
Pl•talk 1pl.Sbj
'We're talking.'

Still other examples express different kinds of relation towards the object. Note also that (55) is in the passive. (Also, see 45a.) Thus,

(54) *niʔ-mi-θi* *tᶿəm* *s* *na•nat* *səm*
exist-Rlt-CTr+2sg.Obj 1sg.Sbj+Fut Time CV•night Fut
'I'll stay with you tonight.'

(55) *yič̓-mi-θi-m-a* *ʔə* *kʷə* *θ* *ʔayaʔ*
fill-Rlt-CTr+2sg.Obj-Pass-Qn Obl Det 2sg.Psv house
'Is your house full of people?'

(55') *yi•yč̓-aš* *č* *tə* *kʼʷawʔiɬ*
Impf•fill-Vš 1sg.Sbj Det bucket
'I'm filling up the bucket.'

In summary, when the suffix *-mi* is present, the object expressed is an entity toward which the subject moves or in relation to which the subject acts. Following Thompson and Thompson (1992:73), the term relational is adopted here for this suffix.

5. Final Remarks. This paper treated three Sliammon suffixes involved in transitive constructions: *-ʔəm*, *-ni*, and *-mi*. The presence of the indirective$_1$ *-ʔəm* implies two goals, one of which is the person affected. It was shown that the person affected is not necessarily a beneficiary, as has been claimed in previous works. The indirective$_2$ *-ni* functions in a similar manner to *-ʔəm*, but its occurrence is very limited. The presence of the relational *-mi* implies that the action is accomplished in relation to the object. This relation can be directional or locational, and in addition, other kinds of relations were observed. All of the three suffixes seem to be syntactically, rather than semantically, driven.

Although the data gathered for this paper is still very limited, the foregoing discussion and illustrations hopefully have provided a basis for further study of the Sliammon transitive system.

REFERENCES.

Bates, Dawn, Thom Hess, and Vi Hilbert (1994): *Lushootseed Dictionary* (University of Washington Press, Seattle and London)

Beaumont, Ronald, C. (1985): *She Shashishalhem The Sechelt Language* (Theytus Books, Penticton)

Blake, Susan J. (1992): "Two Aspects of Sliammon (ɬáʔəmɪnqən) Phonology: Glide/Obstruent Alternation and Vowel Length," M. A. Thesis, The University of British Columbia

Davis, John H. (1978): "Pronominal Paradigms in Sliammon," 13th International Conference on Salish Languages.

Galloway, Brent (1988): "Some Proto-Central Salish Sound Correspondences," in William Shipley (ed.), *In Honor of Mary Haas, form the Haas Festival Conference of Native American Linguistics*, pp.293-343 (Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin)

---- (1993): *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*, University of California Publications in Linguistics 96 (University of California Press, Berkeley)

Gerdts, Donna B. (1988): *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish* (Garland, New York/London)

Hagège, Claude (1981): *Le comox lhaamen de Colombie britannique: présentation d'une langue amérindienne* (Amerindia, revue d'ethnolinguistique amérindienne, numéro spécial 2, Paris)

Harris, Herbert R. (1977): "A Grammatical Sketch of Comox," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas

Hess, Thom (1973): "Agent in a Coast Salish Language," *International Journal of American Linguistics* (>*IJAL*) 39, pp.89-94.

Kinkade, M. Dale (1964): "Phonology and Morphology of Upper Chehalis: III," *IJAL* 30, pp.32-61.

---- (1991): *Upper Chehalis Dictionary*, University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics (>UMOPL) 7 (University of Montana, Missoula)

Kroeber, Paul D. (1988): "Inceptive Reduplication in Comox and Interior Salishan," *IJAL* 54, pp.141-67.

---- (1989): Review of Hagège (1981), *IJAL* 55, pp.106-16.

Kuipers, Aert H. (1967): *The Squamish Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*, Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 73 (Mouton, The Hague/Paris)

Montler, Timothy (1986): An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish, UMOPL 4

Thompson, Laurence C. (1979): "Salishan and the Northwest," in Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun (eds.), *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*, pp.692-765 (University of Texas Press, Austin/London)

---- (1985): "Control in Salish Grammar," in Frans Plank (ed.), Relational Typology, Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 28, pp. 391-428 (Mouton, Berlin/New York/Amsterdam)
---- and M. Terry Thompson (1980): "Thompson Salish //-xi//," *IJAL* 46, pp. 27-32.
---- and M. Terry Thompson (1992): *The Thompson Language*, UMOPL 8
van Eijk, Jan P. (1991): "A Note on Control in Lillooet," 26th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages (University of British Columbia, Vancouver)
Watanabe, Honoré (1994a): "A Report on Sliammon (Mainland Comox) Phonology and Reduplication," M. A. thesis, Hokkaido University
---- (1994b): "A Report on Sliammon (Mainland Comox) Phonology and Reduplication," in Osahito Miyaoka (ed.), *Languages of the North Pacific Rim*, Hokkaido University Publications in Linguistics 7 (Sapporo) <a slightly abridged version of 1994a>
---- (1994c): "A Report on Sliammon (Mainland Comox) Reduplication," 29th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages <practically the latter half of 1994a, b>

APPENDIX

Symbols and abbreviations used in this paper are: √ root, • reduplication, = lexical suffix, Cau causative, CTr control transitive, Fut future, Imp imperative, Impf imperfective, Ind indirective, Intr intransitive, link link vowel, NTr noncontrol transitive, Obl oblique, Pass passive, Pl plural, Psv possessive, ptc particle, Qn question marker, s.o. someone, s.t. something, Stv stative. + (plus sign) is used in the gloss when two forms are fused into one morpheme and thus synchronically unsegmentable.

Sliammon Pronominal Subject and Possessive Markers

	Subject			Possessive
	Main		Subordinate	
	full	reduced		
1sg	čan, čən	č	-an	t$^{\theta}$
2sg	čax^{w}	čx^{w}	-ax^{w}	θ
1pl	čat	št	-at	ms
2pl	čap	čəp	-ap	-ap
3	-∅(Intr.) -as (Tr.)		-as	-s

The subject markers are divided into those used in main clauses and those used in subordinate clauses. First and second persons in main clause forms are enclitics, and appear either in full forms or in reduced forms. The exact conditioning factor as to which is used with a given predicate is not clear, though there seem to be certain tendencies (cf. Davis 1978). The third person markers are zero with an intransitive clause and *-as* with a transitive clause. Since third person object is always zero (see below), the paradigms yield a split ergative pattern. The

possessive markers for first person(s) and second person singular are proclitics. Those for second person plural and third person are suffixes.

Sliammon Pronominal Object Paradigm

	Active			Passive		
	Control (CTr) -t	Noncontrol (NTr) -nx^{w}	Causative (Cau) -stx^{w}	Control (CTr) -t	Noncontrol (NTr) -nx^{w}	Causative (Cau) -stx^{w}
1sg	-θ	-nu-mš	-stu-mš	-θay	-nu-may	-stu-may
2sg	-θi	-nu-mi	-stu-mi	-θi	-nu-mi	-stu-mi
1pl	-t-umuɬ	-nu-muɬ	-stu-muɬ	-t-uw	-nu-muw	-stu-muw
2pl	-t-anapi	-n-anapi	-st-anapi	-t-anapi	-n-anapi	-st-anapi
3	-t(-∅)	-(n)əx^{w}(-∅)	-stəx^{w} ~ -sx^{w}(-∅)	-t(-∅)	-nu(-∅)^{M} -nəg(-∅)^{S}	-stu(-∅)^{M} -stəg(-∅)^{S}
Rfl	-θut	-nu-mut				
Rcp	-t-awɬ	-ənx^{w}-igas	-st-awɬ			

(M and S indicate forms used in main clauses and subordinate clauses respectively.) Note that 1sg and 2sg object forms and the reflexive form in Control transitive are synchronically unanalyzable. These forms are glossed as, e.g., CTr+1sg.Obj and CTr+2sg.Obj. Historically, they developed from the transitive marker **-t* and the following pronominal suffixes **-s*, **-si*, and **-sut*.

Honoré Watanabe
c/o Dept. of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, Yoshidahonmachi, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, JAPAN 606-01
e-mail: bxa01252@niftyserve.or.jp