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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. xúy 'go') are agent-oriented and lack a lexically specified patient;ambi-valent roots are agent-oriented and imply a patient (e.g. ?wá 'eat'); and bivalent roots are patient-oriented and have a lexically specified patient (e.g. wí 'see, find'). There may also be a class of trivalent roots (e.g. xú '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 -ms[n]a 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 non-pronominal 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 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 pronouns (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. I will also ignore affixes which, though they entail plurality, have another primary function—notably -wi 'plural imperative' and -wel '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 tL- 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. Pipulst is tL-samStin. 'She killed a lot of flies'
b. Pséñwi is p tL-es-w£-psd! 'Get firewood, all you firewood-gatherers!' (lit. 'COLLECT-AGENT-gather')
c. Xe epOqéNx a cpntis is tL-Séld. 'There were already people here when the Salish came in.'
d. Us-uvadi '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: -e§ás (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 Manganini et al. 1877-79; but Spokane, 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 séšq by the inchoative suffix -p), morphologically transitive in 2c (the root is again séšq), and morphologically intransitive in 2d.5

(2) a. saceq-éáás 'they two are brothers' vs. qe saceq-élis 'we are all brothers'
b. essaq-p-éás 'it splits in two' vs. essaq-p-élis 'it splits into several pieces'
c. naq-éw-sa 'I split it in two' vs. naq-élis-a 'I split it into many pieces' (in these words the final -n is underlyingly /-nt-en/ 'TRANS.-1.SG.TRANS.SUBJ')
d. eslq-éýw 'two are tied together' vs. eslq-élis 'several are tied together'
e. Spokane: bec-a-Íp=ms=eéás 'two things are standing up end to end' vs. bec-a-Íp=ms=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 ?V and a prefixed C1(V)V2.4 Like -ešás and -élis...
construction (compare plural construction: with plural construction in one important respect: monovalent stems it indicates plurality of an actor or an experiencer (4a-d), and with bivalent 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).

(3) a. čitįпл 'they hunted something' (cf. čitп 'he hunted something'); the root, synchronically at least, is apparently čitп
b. čitпntečęs 'they hunted it' (cf. čitpatečę 'he hunted it')
c. npižiš 'they went in (all at once)' (cf. qe npiži 'we went in')
d. cίćšta 'their house' (cf. clxšta 'her house')
e. nξešeta 'they're happy' (cf. nξeseta 'she's happy')
f. uc-ίwίί-is-a 'I kept seeing them' (/wίί-ίwίί-ίs-nt-en/ 'see-frequentative -(p) TRANS-leg.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 or experiencer, while bivalent stems have monovalent reference to agent plurality in 3rd-on-3rd transitive forms. In any case, the differential reference to agent and the infix usually has distributive force, it doesn't always, unlike a parallel infix (3c and 4c below). It is always used to express a plural argument—almost always an agent (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.

(4) a. Či nίćpέn ίn ες-έSi-έHy ę es-eγìmæncεδ. 'I joined everyone who was going to the dance.'16
b. Kίšεn u-ιg-εγ-εγείεn ę ες-gεγεgεgε. Xίśε niśέε. 'Then the buffalo crossed the river. Lots of them crossed it.'17
c. n-πι-πιžίlί 'they went in one at a time'
d. qί-qί-πί-t 'they're fat'
e. Xί śε nίq-m-q-m-nέεn 'I swallowed a lot of them one at a time' (cf. Xί śε qnætέn 'I swallowed a lot of them (all at once)')
f. uc-ίwίί-is 'he saw each of them separately'
g. Kέε(?)-ίεε-p-nέεn ίn οεe t niæmε. 'Several black bears bit several cow elk.'
h. Tίæčε es-cu-cau-άεs ίn smæε. My younger brother was hitting a grizzly bear.'
i. Ei-ίί'ίjί-s i ye kίyε? 'The boat was moving (rocking back and forth in the water).'

A few comments about these examples are in order. First, lexical plurals like Xί staunch 'many' generally occur with forms that are not marked for plural, as in the second sentence of 4h 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 npiži 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 -ες/είδις and the cliticized 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-piži above (1c, 3c, 4c): a plural patient with a lexically plural bivalent stem is exemplified by n-piži-at-εn 'I put several round objects in something (e.g. potatoes in a sack)' [lit. 'input.roundobj.TRANS-leg.TRANS.SUBJ'] cf. the singular counterpart root če? 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 Xί 'go' is lexically singular and has a plural counterpart lέε?ί 'go, walk (pl.)'. But in 4a the form es-έSi-έHy refers to several people going somewhere. Mengarini et al.
describe the semantics as follows: if several go together, *qe est££k'it* 'we go' is preferred; if people go separately (as is the case in 4a) the form is always *qe est££k'ip' 'we go severally'; but *qe est££k'it*—with $C_1C_2$ duplication—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 transplanting 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 continulative and the antipassive, lack the transitive apparatus 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 continulative and the antipassive share one transitive feature: the presence of a syntactic object. The transitive continulative 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 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 *$u$-*, 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 *$-e\&w/-el\&s*$, 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. *$\text{cn ad-ellis}$* 'I cut something into pieces'

b. *$\text{cn ell\&ew=\text{sa}}$* *$-m$* 'I wash my foot' (cf. *$\text{cn ell\&ew=\text{sa}}$* *$-m$* 'I wash my foot', lit. *$\text{1sg.intr.subj-wash=foot-antipassive}'$

b. *$\text{Spokane: mI-mI\&f=\text{el\&at}}$* *$-m$* 'he made his hands into fists' (lit. 'pl-balled=hand-antipassive')

d. *$\text{cn qun\&in}$* *$-m$* 'I laid them down' (*$\text{qun}$* is lexically plural; cf. sg. *$\text{t\&/a}$*.)

e. *$\text{cn j\&an}$* *$-m$* 'I laid them [long objects] together' (*$\text{j\&an}$* is lexically plural; cf. sg. *$\text{\&/i}$*.)

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 *$-e\&w/-el\&s*$ 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:  

a. *$u\&\text{\&an}$* *$-m$* 'I did something with a bunch of them'
(6) a. ʔe u3-y3-qemılı ‘they had finished setting up their tipis’ (lit. ‘already pl-
finish=lodging’)
b. ʔe u3-ʔe=ʔe ‘I saw a lot of different people’ (lit. ‘pl-see=person’)
c. es-p’e=tı=k ‘spawning’ (lit. ‘round objects are being put in the water’, lit.
’sTATIVe-inPut=roundobj=water-inTR.CONTINT’)
d. Scm’malıq elex3’ı3’ı3’ı3 pem p’e=we’t ‘Clumps [of clay] were left behind scattered
around’ (the last word is lit. ‘put.roundobj=place’).
e. Spokane: ćä e l’s=üb=ä ‘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 ʔe es-č-lq-ci-il ‘Are they [the fish] already cleaned?’ (lit. ‘Q already
STATIVe-to.open.up-pl’)
b. es-ex-pl-id ‘several coatings are put on top’
c. Spokane: ʔa=če=č ’old-fashioned winiers that were tied together’
d. n-č-č-n-p ‘broken eggs’ (cf. n-č-n-p ‘a broken egg’, lit. ‘in-break-
INCHOATIVE’)
e. es-a-nč ‘they’re all cut’ (by a saw or knife) (cf. ćä es-nč ‘I am cut’)
f. es-č=č-č ‘they’re shaded’
g. es-pč ‘they [round objects] are thrown in’
h. es-č-pč ‘they [pieces of wood] are loaded on [a wagon]’

It is instructive to compare Th, es-č-pč, to es-č-pč-pč ‘they [long objects, e.g. pieces
of wood] are loaded on several wagons!’: in the longer form, the C1C2-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 composi-
tion 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; disem-
nilation 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.
pš= ‘her cat’; cf. the usual suffix consonant -s, as in kš=š-a ‘his mother’).

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 (1931:292-93 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-čac-čč ‘they are tied together by me’
b. Sc-č-čmoq elex3’ı3’ı3’ı3’ı3 pem p’e=we’t ‘Clumps [of clay] were left behind scattered
around’ (the first word is lit. ‘result-pl-balled’).
c. i-sc-č-čč ‘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 sx- ‘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. sx-čč-čč ‘a roper of cattle’
b. sx-čč-čč =leX3’ı3’ı3’ı3’ı3 m ‘a sower’ (one who scatters round objects, lit. ‘AGENT-
put.roundobj=ground-ANTIPASIVE’)

4. CONCLUSION. In this paper I have described five MSal plural formations and have
shown that three of them—the suffix pair -éw/éll, prefixed C1C2-reduplication, and lex-
cally 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 c(-)-c, and stems with the agent prefix sx-. The first three of these occur com-
monly 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 mor-
phologically intransitive has two implications for Montana Salish grammar. First, it supports
the analysis of MSal transitivty as gradient rather than discrete (see S. Thomason & Everett
1993), because it provides further evidence that the presence of a transitivizer plus transi-
itive pronominals is not a prerequisite for the presence of other characteristics of transitivty.
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**

1. 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 Durgo, Margaret Finley, Noel Pichette, and Alice Camel. I owe them all a great debt of gratitude.

2. One of these involves $C_1$-reduplication and a following vowel $i$, as in $n-i-\tilde{\text{q}}\text{assii} '\text{dogs}'$ (cf. $n-i-\text{qassii} '\text{dog}'$) and $\tilde{\text{c}}-\text{i-\text{i-\text{i}}} \text{(a)} '\text{skinny ones}'$ (cf. $\text{c-i-\text{i-\text{i}}} '\text{a skinny one}'$). 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.

3. Where I have no partially equivalent modern examples, the transcription of forms taken from Mengarini et al. has some indeterminacies. In $\text{snee}-\text{ews}$, for instance, it's not certain that the sequence $\text{e}\text{?}$ 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.

4. Compare $\text{es}-\text{16-16-\text{eiis}} '\text{several sheaves}', (i.e. several bundles of things tied together), with two plural markings, each with its own separate function.

5. 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.

6. Compare also $\text{n}\text{?ulX' 'he went in'}$; this is the singular counterpart to $\text{apil\text{e}}$, which is used only with plural actors.

7. In $\text{es-\text{i-\text{i}-\text{i}}} \text{\text{e}}$, the $i$ in $\text{\text{i}}$- results from vocalization of the root's $C_1$ between two consonants. Unlike most unstressed vowels (other than $e$), vowels resulting from vocalization of underlying consonants never delete in MSal.

8. The root for 'cross water' appears to be $y\text{?eJr}$ in MSal, which is a rather odd root shape. The phonology of the nonreduplicated form $\text{ni?eJr}$ straightforward, since $y$ regularly vocalizes between consonants. Without the glottal stop the reduplicated form would be peculiar, because the $k$ 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 $\text{=etJt'}$ (or, in one instance after a pharyngeal, $\text{=atJt'}$); the suffix consonant $t$ is absent only in unstressed allomorphs, and I have found no examples of this suffix with a glottalized $k$. The root is obviously connected with the Colville root $\text{y\text{\text{-}}} \text{\text{?eJr}}$, as in $\text{/n-yall/ 'cross over water'}$ (Mattina 1987:262), though the glottal stop in the phonetic Colville form seems puzzling if the root lacks it. A connection with Spokane $\text{n-i-\text{\text{-}}} \text{\text{e}} \text{\text{i-\text{\text{-}}} e-t\text{\text{-}}} \text{\text{'carried it across (the river)'}}$ is also obvious, but both the phonology and the semantics make it difficult to assign this to the Spokane root $\text{y\text{\text{-}}} \text{\text{?eJr}} '\text{past (time)}', as Carlson & Flett (1989:3) do.

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

10. Moreover, the underlying form of the stative prefix in Spokane is $\text{hec}-$, so further investigation might show that MSal $c$ in $\text{\text{-}} \text{\text{c}}$- is a relic of an earlier morpheme shape $\text{ec}$-.
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