PLURALS AND TRANSITIVITY IN MONTANA SALISH

Sarah Thomason
University of Pittsburgh
June 1997

1. INTRODUCTION. In several papers (S. Thomason & Everett 1993, S. Thomason et al. 1994, L. Thomason 1994, 1995,) my colleagues and I have explored issues of valency and transitivity in Montana Salish (also called Flathead; henceforth MSal). One major conclusion of the earlier work was that MSal distinguishes valency, the number of semantic arguments associated with a stem, from transitivity, the number of morphosyntactic arguments associated with a stem. Crucially, valency is discrete, while transitivity is gradient: in principle, every root or complex stem has a specific valency, but full verb forms may be more or less transitive.

MSal has three basic classes of roots. Monovalent roots (e.g. *xʷúy* 'go' are agent-oriented and lack a lexically specified patient; ambi-valent roots are agent-oriented and imply a patient (e.g. *ʔíłn* 'eat'); and bivalent roots are patient-oriented and have a lexically specified patient (e.g. *wíc̓* 'see, find'). There may also be a class of trivalent roots (e.g. *xʷíc̓* 'give'). A derived stem is also specified for valency, and its valency may differ from that of its root. For instance, a stem derived by the suffix *-mí(n)* from a monovalent root is bivalent and semantically causative. All three classes occur in both transitive and intransitive constructions, but their semantic aspectual structures differ in these constructions (see L. Thomason 1994, 1995 for a systematic analysis of both simple and derived stems).

In this paper I will show that three different plural formations provide further evidence for the gradience of transitivity in MSal. A brief survey of the main nonpronominal MSal plural constructions (§2) will set the stage for the following discussion of plurals and transitivity (§3). The basic finding is that certain morphologically intransitive forms are marked for plurality of a semantic patient. Most of these forms have straightforward bivalent stems; the rest have bivalent stems derived with the inchoative suffix *-p*, which, when added to a bivalent stem, yields a form that 'lacks even implicit reference to an agent', but whose 'single semantic argument...remains a patient with respect to the verbal action' (L. Thomason 1995:21). The results of this analysis also provide further evidence for the existence of distinct root and stem classes in the language, because monovalent and bivalent stems differ sharply in plural reference in the relevant intransitive constructions. For the most part I will ignore ambi-valent stems in this discussion, because their in-between status complicates their interpretation in plural constructions.

2. PLURALITY IN MONTANA SALISH. Like other Salishan languages, MSal has various ways of expressing plurality. The category is morphosyntactically obligatory only in the case of first- and second-person pronominals (which I will not discuss here, as plurality in pronominals is similar to that of most other languages of the world). The survey in this section is not meant to be exhaustive; there are at least one or two other plural formations as well, but I have too few examples to attempt a systematic account of them.[1] I will also ignore affixes which, though they entail plurality, have another primary function—notably *-wi* 'plural imperative' and *-wéxʷ* 'reciprocal'.

Two or (depending on how one counts the two related formations) three constructions refer to plural entities as collections rather than as individuals. First, the collective prefix *uł-* denotes a group qua group, as in 1. Most of the examples I've found with this prefix are in syntactic noun phrases, but some occur with stative predicates, as in 1d. All these stems are monovalent and intransitive; I have found no examples of this prefix with bivalent stems.

(1) a. *Plpúlsts łu uł-x̓amáłtn.* 'She killed a lot of flies'

b. *Psésuwi łu p uł-sxʷu-psé!* 'Get firewood, all you firewood-gatherers!' (lit. 'COLL-AGENT-gather')

c. *x̓e epsqélixʷ u cnpíls̓ łu uł-Séliš.* 'There were already people here when the Salish came in.'

d. *uł-uẇá* 'they (e.g. all the horses) are wild'

There are also two suffixes that may fit into the general category of plural-as-collective, since they seem to lack a focus on separate entities. These form a paradigm of sorts: *-éẇs* (which is otherwise a lexical suffix meaning 'half, middle') denotes a pair and *-élis* (which apparently occurs only as a grammatical suffix, not as a lexical suffix) denotes a group of more than two. I don't know how active this paradigm is in the modern language, since my clearest MSal examples (e.g. 2a-d) come from Mengarini et al. 1877-79; but Spokane evidence, as in 2e (from Carlson & Flett 1989:100), suggests that the pattern is still at least somewhat active in the Kalispel-Spokane-MSal dialect complex. In 2a and 2e the suffixes are added to monovalent stems and refer to actor or experiencer. In 2b-d they are added to bivalent stems and refer to semantic patients: "unaccusative" and morphologically intransitive in 2b (this stem is derived from the bivalent root *sáq̓* by the inchoative suffix *-p*), morphologically transitive in 2c (the root is again *sáq̓*), and morphologically intransitive in 2d.[2]

(2) a. *snce?-éẇs* 'they two are brothers' vs. *qe snce?-élis* 'we are all brothers'

b. *esnsq̓-p-éẇs* 'it splits in two' vs. *esnsq̓-p-élis* 'it splits into several pieces'

c. *nsq̓-éẇs-n* 'I split it in two' vs. *nsq̓-élis-n* 'I split it into many pieces' (in these words the final *-n* is underlyingly /-nt-én/ 'TRANS.-1.sg.TRANS.SUBJ')

d. *eslc̓-éẇs* 'two are tied together' vs. *eslc̓-élis* 'several are tied together'[3]

e. Spokane: *hec-n-t̓p=s=éẇs* 'two things are standing up end to end' vs. *hec-n-t̓p=s=élis* 'things are standing up end to end (like a few sections of stove pipe)'

The other two major morphological plurals in MSal generally seem to emphasize separate actions and/or individuals—that is, they are distributive plurals, indicating such things as repeated action, or several agents acting independently, or several patients being acted on separately. The two constructions are an infixed *ʔV* and a prefixed $C_1(V)C_2$-.[4] Like *-éẇs* and

-élis, these affixes are added to both monovalent and bivalent stems, and to morphologically intransitive as well as morphologically transitive stems.

The infix consists of a glottal stop followed by an unstressed copy of the word's stressed vowel; it is placed immediately after the stressed vowel, regardless of whether the stressed vowel is in the root (e.g. 3a) or in a suffix (e.g. 3b). The vowel copy in this morpheme might not be present underlyingly; some (but not all) speakers regularly have a phonetic vowel copy after a glottal stop following a stressed vowel in the same syllable. Although this infix usually has distributive force, it doesn't always, unlike the C_1C_2- construction (compare 3c and 4c below). It is always used to express a plural argument—almost always an actor (3a-c), a possessor (3d), or an experiencer (3e). I have one example, however, in which it can only refer to a patient (3f; this example was not elicited, but was produced spontaneously in a story told by a master story-teller). Only 3b and 3f are morphologically transitive; the stem in 3a-b is ambi-valent and the other stems are monovalent.

(3) a. *ćłí?ip* 'they hunted something' (cf. *ćłíp* 'he hunted something'; the root, synchronically at least, is apparently *ćłíp*)

b. *ćłp?nté?es* 'they hunted it' (cf. *ćłpntés* 'he hunted it')

c. *npí?ilś* 'they went in (all at once)' (cf. *qe npílś* 'we went in')[5]

d. *cí?itxʷ-s* 'their house' (cf. *cítxʷ-s* 'her house')

e. *nx̣é?esls* 'they're happy' (cf. *nx̣ésls* 'she's happy')

f. *uć-l̓wí?is-n* 'I kept seeing them' (/wíć-l̓wí(-?i)s-nt-én/ 'see-FREQUENTATIVE (-pl)-TRANS-1sg.TRANS.SUBJ')

The contrast between 3b and 3f, both of them ordinary transitive forms, raises the question of whether the plural infix is potentially ambiguous in its plural reference. There is no ambiguity in 3f, because the subject is 1sg, but what about 3b, where both agent and patient are 3rd persons? This infix is the only means available to indicate a plural 3rd-person agent, since the 3rd agent suffix *-s* is used for both singular and plural referents. I believe, however, that in fact there is no potential ambiguity in such forms: all the examples I have indicate that the infix always expresses agent plurality in 3rd-on-3rd transitive forms. In such forms patient plural is expressed by *-éẇs/élis* or by the C_1C_2- marker (see below).

There is certainly no ambiguity with the prefixed C_1C_2- plural construction: with monovalent stems it indicates plurality of an actor or an experiencer (4a-d), and with bivalent stems it indicates plurality of a patient (4e-g). However, there seems to be no clear boundary between its function as an indicator of repeated action and its specification of a plural argument. This is unsurprising: since this is a distributive plural, typically emphasizing separate actions performed by or on separate individuals, all the actions are by definition repeated. Nevertheless, a distinction is possible when repeated actions are associated with a single referent (4h-i) and when no action is involved (4d), and in some cases (though here my interpretation may be influenced by an English bias) the focus seems to be on agent or patient rather than on repetition of action. In any case, the differential reference to agent

vs. patient is striking, and that is the main point of interest to me here. It is also important to note that this construction co-occurs with the glottal-stop infix plural, both when only one plural argument is present (4c) and when there are two plural arguments (4g, where it is safe to assume that the infix refers to the agent and the prefix to the patient).

(4) a. *Čn šiẏém łu c̓ es-xʷi-xʷúy c̓.esq̓ʷeyməncú.* 'I joined everyone who was going to the dance.'[6]

b. *Kʷémṁt n-i?-ey?éḵʷ łu q̓ʷeyq̓ʷáy. X̌ʷ?ít ni?éḵʷ.* 'Then the buffalo crossed the river. Lots of them crossed it.'[7]

c. *n-pl-pí?ilś* 'they went in one at a time'

d *q̓ʷc-q̓ʷóc-t* 'they're fat'

e *xʷ?ít q̓m-q̓m-ntén* 'I swallowed a lot of them one at a time' (cf. *xʷ?ít q̓mntén* 'I swallowed a lot of them (all at once)')

f *uć-wíć-is* 'he saw each of them separately'

g *K̓ʷe(?)-ḵʷe?-nté?es łu sne t nłamqe.* 'Several black bears bit several cow elk.'

h *T isínce es-cu-cu?-úms łu smx̣é.* My younger brother was hitting a grizzly bear.'

i *Es-iʕʷ-íʕʷ-i ye x̌iyé?.* 'The boat was moving (rocking back and forth in the water).'

A few comments about these examples are in order. First, lexical plurals like *xʷ?ít* 'many' generally occur with forms that are not marked for plural, as in the second sentence of 4b and the alternate form in 4e. Emphasizing the separateness of the actions, however, will lead to overt plural marking, as in 4e. Similarly, lexically plural stems like *npílś* are most likely to be marked overtly for plurality when there is an emphasis on separate actions, as in 4c; however, as 3c shows, this is merely a tendency. Note also that double plural marking—that is, marking the same argument for plurality twice—can be used for extra emphasis, as in 4c.

A final comment should be made here about lexically plural stems, because they pattern like *-eẇs/élis* and the C_1C_2- plural construction in one important respect: monovalent stems have a plural actor or experiencer, while bivalent stems have a plural patient (L. Thomason 1995:13). A plural actor with a lexically plural monovalent stem is exemplified by forms of *n-pílś* above (1c, 3c, 4c); a plural patient with a lexically plural bivalent stem is exemplified by *n-pḵʷ-nt-én* 'I put several round objects in something (e.g. potatoes in a sack)' (lit. 'input.roundobjs-TRANS-1sg.TRANS.SUBJ'; cf. the singular counterpart root *c̓e?* 'put.roundobj'). One point that should be kept in mind, though it isn't directly relevant to the focus of this paper, is that the relationship between a lexically singular stem and its lexically plural counterpart is complex. In particular, both may occur with plural reference. For instance, the root *xʷúy* 'go' is lexically singular and has a plural counterpart *tḵʷ(?)út* 'go, walk (pl.)'. But in 4a the form *es-xʷi-xʷúy* refers to several people going somewhere. Mengarini et al.

describe the semantics as follows: if several go together, *qe estkʷʔút* 'we go' is preferred; if people go separately (as is the case in 4a) the form is always *qe esxʷixʷúy* 'we go severally'; but *qe estkʷtkʷʔút*—with C_1C_2- reduplication—is used if several of us go together in different bands.

3. MORPHOLOGICAL INTRANSITIVES WITH PLURAL PATIENTS. Valency and transitivity are independent grammatical categories in MSal, and they are therefore not inextricably linked. For this paper, the most important corollary of this fact is that bivalent roots and stems occur routinely in both transitive and intransitive constructions, if transitivity is assumed to be indicated solely by the presence or absence of the morphological transitive apparatus—namely, one of the transitivizing suffixes together with the specifically transitive pronominal elements. It has been argued elsewhere (in S. Thomason & Everett 1993, L. Thomason 1994, 1995) that transitivity should not be defined so narrowly for MSal, because certain constructions, notably the transitive continuative and the antipassive, lack the transitive apparatus[8] but nevertheless have some morphosyntactic characteristics of a transitive construction. In other words, transitivity is a gradient category, not a discrete one, in this language (and of course this is true for many other languages as well).

The transitive continuative and the antipassive share one transitive feature: the presence of a syntactic object. The transitive continuative construction has several other transitive characteristics as well, so many that it is best treated as transitive rather than intransitive (see S. Thomason & Everett for detailed arguments on this point). It is therefore irrelevant to the topic of this paper, and will not be discussed further here; but for those who still prefer to consider it an intransitive construction, it is worth noting that there are many examples of this construction with morphological plural marking for patients.

By contrast, the antipassive looks at first glance like a quite ordinary intransitive construction except for its syntactic object—it has intransitive subject particles, and the object (if there is an overt one) is marked as an oblique. MSal is hardly unique in having predicates which, though intransitive morphologically, may take a syntactic object. The same phenomenon is found elsewhere in Salishan, of course, and it is found outside Salishan as well. For instance, the Algonquian language Fox has what Ives Goddard has called a 'detransitive' construction, in which a suffix removes the object argument from the verb morphology, but the resulting verb still occurs with an oblique-marked object; and Yupik Eskimo has what Anthony Woodbury calls a 'half-transitive' postbase that renders a transitive verb intransitive as far as pronominal inflection is concerned, but oblique-marked objects may occur in construction with such verbs (Lucy Thomason, personal communication, 1997). In this respect, then, the MSal antipassive belongs to a well-established category of semi-transitive constructions.

Another MSal semi-transitive feature, the focus of this paper, is perhaps more unusual: antipassives and several other morphologically intransitive forms of bivalent stems[9] may occur with plural marking that refers to a patient, even though no object is (or can be) specified in the verb's pronominal inflection. Of the five means of marking plural that we have examined—four morphological, one lexical—three may refer to patients in morphologically intransitive bivalent forms. The two that don't are the collective prefix *uɬ-*, which, as we have seen, seems to occur only with monovalent intransitive stems, and the glottal-stop infix. The latter formation can indicate plurality of a patient, but the only example I have (3f, above) is in a fully transitive form; it is possible that it could indicate a patient in an intransitive

form, but it seems relatively unlikely, since this very common construction otherwise marks only plural of agent, actor, or experiencer.

The other three plural formations—the suffix pair *-éẇs/élis*, the prefixed reduplicative C_1C_2-, and lexically plural bivalent stems—all have patient reference in a variety of construction types. I have relatively few examples of the first and third formations, so I will not be able to give a complete set of examples for each construction in which examples have turned up so far. In some cases, especially with C_1C_2-, the form has been lexicalized, but most of the examples below reflect productive formations. In the following discussion I will not distinguish between simple bivalent stems and stems derived from bivalent roots with the inchoative suffix *-p*, in spite of the complexities surrounding the determination of valency for the latter stem type (L. Thomason 1995:21-23): whatever the status of these *-p* forms may be, their single argument is certainly a semantic patient, not an agent (they are in fact unaccusatives). A few Spokane examples are included below, as an indication that the phenomenon extends beyond this one dialect.

First, there is the antipassive (marked by the suffix *-m*, often called 'middle' in the Salishan literature):

(5) a. *c̓n nc̓-élis-m* 'I cut something into pieces'

b. *c̓n c̓u-c̓éẇ=sn-m* 'I wash my feet' (cf. *c̓n c̓éẇ=sn-m* 'I wash my foot', lit. '1sg.INTR.SUBJ-wash=foot-ANTIPASSIVE')

c. Spokane: *ml-mlq̓ʷ=éc̓st-m* 'he made his hands into fists' (lit. 'pl-balled=hand-ANTIPASSIVE')

d. *c̓n qmín-m* 'I laid them down' (*qmín* is lexically plural; cf. sg. *tkʷú*.)

e. *c̓n p̓ní-m* 'I laid them [long objects] together' (*p̓ín* is lexically plural; cf. sg. *c̓íc̓*.)

A related construction is the combination of a bivalent root with a lexical suffix that represents a patient. In this construction the lexical suffix, like the antipassive suffix *-m*, specifies the patient and causes the underlying semantic agent to surface as the primary argument; the difference between the two constructions is that the antipassive is a general patient indicator, while the lexical suffix adds more specific semantic information about the patient. The lack of examples with *-éẇs/élis* may not be accidental: it's possible that the position of the plural suffix precludes the addition of a lexical suffix, though strings of lexical suffixes and also of lexical + grammatical suffixes are certainly permitted otherwise in the language. Examples are given in 6:

(6) a. *x̓e uý-uý=éɬxʷ* 'they had finished setting up their tipis' (lit. 'already pl-finish=lodging')

b. *uc̓-uc̓=sqé* 'I saw a lot of different people' (lit. 'pl-see=person')

c. *es-n-pǩʷ=étǩʷ-i* 'spawning' (lit. 'round objects are being put in the water', lit. 'STATIVE-in-put.roundobjs=water-INTR.CONTIN')

d. *Scmlmálq̓ʷ eɬesx̌ʷlx̌ʷélm pǩʷ=éwt* 'Clumps [of clay] were left behind scattered around' (the last word is lit. 'put.roundobjs=place').

e. Spokane: *c̓n eɬ-q̓ʷúm̓=lt* 'I took my children back' (lit. '1sg.INTR.SUBJ back-take.objs=child')

Perhaps the most common examples are those consisting of the root, bare or (much more often) with the stative prefix *es-* and/or the inchoative suffix *-p*, and often also with a locative prefix:

(7) a. *Ha x̓e es-c̓-i̓lq̓ʷ-éi̓s?* 'Are they [the fish] already cleaned?' (lit. 'Q already STATIVE-to-open.up-pl')

b. *es-x̌p-éi̓s* 'several coatings are put on top'

c. Spokane: *ʃaʃc=éi̓s* 'old-fashioned wieners that were tied together'

c. *n-cm̓-cóm̓-p* 'broken eggs' (cf. *n-cóm̓-p* 'a broken egg', lit. 'in-break-INCHOATIVE')

d. *es-nc̓-níc̓* 'they're all cut (by a saw or knife)' (cf. *c̓n es-níc̓* 'I am cut')

e. *es-c̓ɬ-c̓i-c̓éy* 'they're shaded'

f. *es-n-púǩʷ* 'they [round objects] are thrown in'

g. *es-pín* 'they [long objects] are laid down'

h. *es-c̓ɬ-pín* 'they [pieces of wood] are loaded on [a wagon]'[10]

It is instructive to compare 7h, *es-c̓ɬ-pín*, to *es-c̓ɬ-pn-pín* 'they [long objects, e.g. pieces of wood] are loaded on several wagons': in the longer form, the C_1C_2- reduplication refers to an oblique object—yielding an intransitive form that marks plurality for two different objects!

Another rather common construction consists of the root preceded by *s(-)c-*. The composition of this prefix (or prefix set) is a puzzle. Historically, at least, it is probably the nominalizer *s-* followed by the stative aspect prefix *c-*, but the phonology is off. The usual form of the stative in MSal is *es-*. The problem doesn't lie in the prefix consonant; dissimilation of *s* to *c* after a morpheme ending in *s* is productive elsewhere (though not everywhere)

in MSal, namely in the 3rd possessive suffix when it is added to a stem ending in *s* (e.g. *púss-c* 'her cat' ; cf. the usual suffix consonant *-s*, as in *sǩʷúy-s* 'his mother').[11] Instead, the problem is with the vowel: *e* is the one underlying MSal vowel that does not usually delete in unstressed syllables (which this always is, since prefixes are never stressed in MSal). Vogt (1940:48) defines *sc-* as a unitary prefix that 'forms from verbal stems nouns of participial meaning'; see also Kroeber (1991:292-93 et passim) for discussion. I will refer to it as a unit here for convenience, but I think it likely that it is synchronically as well as diachronically complex, even though I can't explain its shape satisfactorily.

Its functions are less puzzling: in bivalent stems it usually refers to the result of an action (hence my gloss 'result'), but when used verbally it has (as Vogt noted) a participial meaning, specifically 'having been Xed'.

(8) a. *i-sc-ʃac-éẇs* 'they are tied together by me'

b. *Sc-ml-málq̓ʷ eɬesx̌ʷlx̌ʷélm pǩʷéwt* 'Clumps [of clay] were left behind scattered around' (the first word is lit. 'result-pl-balled').

c. *i-sc-q̓ʷóm̓* 'the things I took' (lit. '1.POSS-RESULT-take.objs')

I have found (so far) one other intransitive bivalent formation in which plural patients are morphologically encoded: forms derived with the agent prefix *sxʷ-* 'one who does [the verb's action]' can occur with plural patient reference. With bivalent stems this prefix must co-occur with the antipassive suffix, which enables the semantic agent to surface:

(9) a. *sxʷ-ʃac-ʃací-m* 'a roper (of cattle)'

b. *sxʷ-pǩʷú=lexʷ-m* 'a sower' (one who scatters round objects, lit. 'AGENT-put.roundobjs=ground-ANTIPASSIVE')

4. CONCLUSION. In this paper I have described five MSal plural formations and have shown that three of them—the suffix pair *-éẇs/éi̓s*, prefixed C_1C_2- reduplication, and lexically plural stems—occur in constructions that encode plural patients even though they lack standard transitive morphology. I have identified five such constructions: the antipassive, intransitives with lexical suffixes, forms consisting of (*es-*)-(LOC)-ROOT(*-p*), stems with the result prefix *s(-)c-*, and stems with the agent prefix *sxʷ-*. The first three of these occur commonly in the language and are clearly quite productive. Significantly, all the relevant stems are bivalent; monovalent stems also occur in all these constructions, but plural reference is then to actors or experiencers, not to patients.

This pervasive pattern of marking plurality of patients on forms that are otherwise morphologically intransitive has two implications for Montana Salish grammar. First, it supports the analysis of MSal transitivity as gradient rather than discrete (see S. Thomason & Everett 1993), because it provides further evidence that the presence of a transitivizer plus transitive pronominals is not a prerequisite for the presence of other characteristics of transitivity. And second, it supports the analysis of MSal as having distinct root and stem classes (S. Thomason et al. 1994, L. Thomason 1994, 1995) because of the strikingly different behavior

of monovalent and bivalent stems in plural reference in forms that have neither transitivizers nor transitive pronominals.

FOOTNOTES

* As always, I am immensely grateful to the Salish Culture Committee of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, St. Ignatius, MT, for their generous support of my work on Montana Salish since 1981. Most recently I have worked with an extraordinarily helpful group of elders, most prominently John Peter Paul, but also Agnes Paul, Felicite Sapiye (McDonald), Mike Durglo, Margaret Finley, Noel Pichette, and Alice Camel. I owe them all a great debt of gratitude.

[1] One of these involves C_1- reduplication and a following vowel *i*, as in *n-q̓ʷ-i-q̓ʷsmí* 'dogs' (cf. *n-q̓ʷ-q̓ʷosəmí* 'dog') and *c̓-t̓-i-t̓á(s)* 'skinny ones' (cf. *c̓-t̓á(s)* 'a skinny one'). In 'dogs' the reduplicated C_1- is part of the singular stem too, but in 'skinny ones' the reduplicated element belongs solely to the plural formation.

[2] Where I have no partially equivalent modern examples, the transcription of forms taken from Mengarini et al. has some indeterminacies. In *snce?-éẇs*, for instance, it's not certain that the sequence *e?* is actually present, since Mengarini et al. do not indicate glottal stop in unstressed syllables, and the vowel would be present only if the glottal stop were present.

[3] Compare *es-lc̓-lc̓-élis* 'several sheaves', (i.e. several bundles of things tied together), with two plural markings, each with its own separate function.

[4] In a full phonological analysis this prefix can be shown to contain a copy of the root vowel, an observation I owe to Steven Egesdal (p.c. 1997). But since there is no phonetic vowel in the examples in this paper, I will ignore this complication in the following discussion.

[5] Compare also *n?úɬxʷ* 'he went in'; this is the singular counterpart to *npílś*, which is used only with plural actors.

[6] in *es-xʷi-xʷúy*, the *i* in *xʷi-* results from vocalization of the root's C_2 between two consonants. Unlike most unstressed vowels (other than *e*), vowels resulting from vocalization of underlying consonants never delete in MSal.

[7] The root for 'cross water' appears to be *y?ék̓ʷ* in MSal, which is a rather odd root shape. The phonology of the nonreduplicated form *ni?ék̓ʷ* straightforward, since *y* regularly vocalizes between consonants. Without the glottal stop the reduplicated form would be peculiar, because the *k̓ʷ* doesn't reduplicate. The first *e* of the reduplicated form is a bit puzzling, but it probably simply reflects the tendency of some MSal speakers to diphthongize a vowel *i* to *ey* next to a back consonant, including (sometimes) glottal stop. It would be difficult (though tempting) to interpret these forms as consisting of a root plus the lexical suffix for 'water', because the stressed form of that suffix is always *=étk̓ʷ* (or, in one instance after a pharyngeal, *=átk̓ʷ*); the suffix consonant *t* is absent only in unstressed allomorphs, and I have found no examples of this suffix with a glottalized *k̓ʷ*. The root is obviously connected with the Colville root *yk̓ʷ*, as in /n-yak̓ʷ/ [ni?ák̓ʷ] 'cross over water' (Mattina 1987:262), though the glottal stop in the phonetic Colville form seems puzzling if the root lacks it. A connection with Spokane *n-i-?ek̓ʷ-s-t-én* 'I carried it across (the river)' is also obvious, but both the

phonology and the semantics make it difficult to assign this to the Spokane root *?ek̓ʷ(ú)* 'past (time)', as Carlson & Flett (1989:3) do.

[8] This statement must be qualified for the transitive continuative, which does have transitivizing suffixes in ditransitive forms.

[9] It is possible for antipassives to occur with monovalent stems, in which case they have causative force: compare e.g. *c̓n xʷúy* 'I go' with *c̓n xʷúy-m* 'I make someone go' (the latter form has the antipassive suffix *-m*). But antipassives of monovalent stems are very rare, in sharp contrast to bivalent stems, where the antipassive is so common that it is the preferred citation form—that is, the typical answer to a question like 'how do you say "see"?' is '*wíc̓m*'. Since the present discussion focuses on bivalent stems, antipassives and other causatives derived from monovalent stems will not be considered here.

[10] Moreover, the underlying form of the stative prefix in Spokane is *hec-*, so further investigation might show that MSal *c* in *s(-)c-* is a relic of an earlier morpheme shape *ec-*.

References

Kroeber, Paul Demarest. 1991. *Comparative syntax of subordination in Salish.* Chicago: University of Chicago dissertation.

Mengarini, Gregory; Joseph Giorda; Leopold van Gorp; Joseph Bandini; and Joseph Guidi. 1877-79. *A dictionary of the Kalispel or Flat-head Indian language.* St. Ignatius, MT: St. Ignatius Print.

Thomason, Lucy. 1994. Transitivity-related morphological alternations in Montana Salish. *Papers for the 29th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages,* ed. by Joyce Silverthorne, 000-000. Pablo, MT: Salish Kootenai College.

Thomason, Lucy. 1995. Transitivity and valency in Montana Salish. Austin: University of Texas, ms.

Thomason, Sarah, and Daniel Everett. 1993. Transitivity in Flathead. *Papers for the 28th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages,* ed. by William Seaburg, 317-43. Seattle: University of Washington.

Thomason, Sarah; Dorothy Berney; Gail Coelho; Jeffrey Micher; and Daniel Everett. 1994. Montana Salish root classes: Evidence from the 19th-century Jesuit dictionary. *Papers for the 29th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages,* ed. by Joyce Silverthorne, 288-312. Pablo, MT: Salish Kootenai College.

Vogt, Hans. 1940. *The Kalispel language: An outline of the grammar with texts, translations, and dictionary.* Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo.