Puget Salish has sentences in which directive phrases introduced by (?a) immediately follow the predicate.\(^1\) Constituent relationships between the predicate and these phrases are of two types. The difference is revealed in three ways: by relative order in expanded sentences, by cooccurrence restrictions with the suffix {-(e)b}, and by a comparison of agnate sentences.

Consider the following:

1) /?upúsuteb ?a ti?e? wìw?su/  'The children threw something at it.'
   (threw at) ( the children )

2) /?upúsuteb ?a ti?e? ?påÁ?/  'Someone threw rocks at it.'
   (threw at) (the rock(s))

If meaning is to be the end product of language and not the means by which language is analyzed, then (1) and (2) look the same. Their surface structures are identical.

However, expansions of (1) and (2) show this similarity to be illusory:

   (threw at) ( the children )( that dog ) (the rock(s))
   'The children threw rocks at (that dog).'</n

   (threw at) (the rock(s))( that dog ) (the children)
   *'The rocks threw children at (that dog).'
The directive phrase underlined once (referred to as A) always precedes the one underlined twice (B).\(^3\) In fact, the most frequent order puts the former immediately after the predicate and before all else including attributive phrases (/ti?i?i sq^webay?/ in these examples).

Very occasionally, the attributive phrase and directive phrase A are reversed:\(^4\)

(threw at) (that dog) (the children)

'The children threw something at that dog.'

This relatively rare alternative order results in identical surface structures again. Compare (5) with (6).

6) /\^upúsuteb ti?i?i sq^webay? ?a ti?e? ^w^h^a^w/  
(threw at) (that dog) (the rock(s))

'Someone threw rocks at that dog.'

In (6), of course, the position of B is the only one possible.

This difference in order between the two directive phrases reflects the fact that A is intimately bound to predicates having the suffix sequence /-t/ plus /-(e)b/. Without /-t-eb/, for example, A is impossible. There is no such restriction on B. Rather B can be attributive to a variety of constructions. Three possibilities are illustrated with the following diagrams:

7) /\^upúsud (ti?i?i sq^webay?) ?a ti?e? ^h^a^w?  
(threw at) (that dog) (the rock(s))

'Someone threw rocks at that dog.'
8) /\"uk^wad\'ad te s\'e\'e\'t\'e\'ad te s\'ul\'ad\'a/  'Someone grabbed the tail of the salmon.'
   ^\(\text{grabbed}) \text{ (fishtail) (the salmon})\]

9) /\"esli\'ai\'il te s\'a\'i\'ac\'er sw\'a\'t\'a\'x\'et /\"e\'i\'il g\'e\'i\'al dibal /
   (dwell) \((\text{at this particular place})\) \((\text{of ours} / \text{to us})\)
   'They dwelled in this particular place of ours.'
   ^\(\text{dwell}) \text{ (at this particular place}) \text{ (of ours / to us})\]

Agnates of examples (1) and (2) also reveal structural differences between A and B. There is a transformation\(^7\) of (1) such that the directive phrase becomes the predicate (occurring initially) and the director (?e) drops. The former predicate becomes an attributive phrase restricted to second position and the suffix \{-a\} drops. A determiner (in this case /\'i\'e\'/) no longer modifies /wiw\'su/, the new predicate; but one does modify the verb /\'upus\'ud/, now attributive to /wiw\'su/. Compare (1) and (10), (3) and (11).

10) /\'wiw\'su ti\'e\'e\' \'upus\'ud\'' \''It was the children who threw something at it.'
   \(\text{child-} \text{ (threw at} \text{ ) it})\]

11) /\'wiw\'su ti\'e\'e\' \'upus\'ud ti\'i\'il sq\'e\'\'a\'b\'a\'y /\'e\'i\'e\'e\' \'\'i\'e\'/ \'\'a\'/
   \(\text{child-} \text{ (threw at} \text{ ) (that dog} \text{ (the rock(s))})\)
   'It was the children who threw rocks at that dog.'

Identical changes operate on (2) with this crucial addition. When B is transposed, the verb always requires a substantive prefix, either \{s-\} or \{dex\}, and a possessive affix. (In these examples, the third person possessive \{-s\} is given.) Because there is no direct structural
relationship between B directive phrases and the suffix \(-(e)b\), this suffix can remain. Compare (2) with (12) and (3) with (13).

12) /\textcolor{red}{\hat{\xi}\hat{\text{\textacute{x}}}\text{\textquoteright} ti\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright} d\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright}w\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}p\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}/ or /\textcolor{red}{\hat{\xi}\hat{\text{\textacute{x}}}\text{\textquoteright} ti\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright} d\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright}w\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}p\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}/

\textcolor{red}{(\text{rock}) (\text{threw at}) (\text{rock}) (\text{threw at})}

'It was rocks that someone threw at it.'

13) /\textcolor{red}{\hat{\xi}\hat{\text{\textacute{x}}}\text{\textquoteright} ti\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright} d\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright}w\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}p\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}/

\textcolor{red}{(\text{rock}) (\text{threw at}) (\text{the children}) (\text{that dog})}

'It was rocks that the children threw at that dog.'

or

/\textcolor{red}{\hat{\xi}\hat{\text{\textacute{x}}}\text{\textquoteright} ti\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright} d\text{\textquoteright}e\text{\textquoteright}w\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}p\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}s\text{\textquoteright}u\text{\textquoteright}/

\textcolor{red}{(\text{rock}) (\text{threw at}) (\text{that dog})}

'It was rocks that someone threw at that dog.'

Directive phrases in \(?e\) are not limited to Puget Salish. They are found in neighboring Clallam\textsuperscript{10} and in Sliammon much further north. Significantly, however, they do not occur in Squamish.\textsuperscript{11} Such distribution has interesting historical implications. We should like to know how many and which Salish languages have directive phrases of the sort described here; and whether or not both types of constituent relationships between predicate and directive phrase are found. We suspect for Puget Salish that directive phrases in \(?e\) may have, in more recent times, been pressed into service as agents dependent on \(-(e)b\) predications; and that originally, they were found only in relationship B. But, whatever the origin, it is important that they be distinguished.
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Footnotes

1 The predicate is the head of a clause. In all examples given here, no sentence is more than a single clause.

This paper is concerned with the relation of directive phrases to the rest of the sentence and not with the structure of the phrases themselves. It is sufficient to describe them briefly as consisting of a director (?a) and an axis. The axis is a very short attributive phrase. Typically, it includes a determiner and noun. For purposes of this discussion, it is convenient to liken directive phrases in Puget Salish to English prepositional phrases. The structure of directive phrases is described in Hess, *Snohomish Grammatical Structure*, University of Washington Dissertation, 1967, p. 88.

2 Parentheses around /ti?ii sq"ebay?/ 'that dog' indicate that a sentence is possible in which this portion is omitted, e.g.,


'The children threw rocks at it.'

As will be apparent with subsequent examples, no phrase except the predicate is obligatory.

3 It is the relationships between the predicate and these phrases that are being distinguished and not the phrases themselves.


5 An utterance */"upusud ?a ti?a? wiw?su ti?ii sq"ebay?/ is impossible. The final /-d/ of */upusud/ is a member of the same morpheme as /-t-/ in */upusuteb/. The parentheses around /ti?ii sq"ebay?/ are explained in footnote 2.
6 /ʔal tiʔecec swətɨxʷted/ is a directive phrase with the same sort of relations to the rest of the Puget Salish sentence as B. {ʔal} is the director. Thus, while {ʔə} is the only director in A, both {ʔə} and {ʔal} occur as directors of B. See Hess, op. cit. p. 88.

7 'Series of transformations' would be more accurate, but the details have yet to be worked out.

8 The single and double underlining is continued to show what becomes of the directive phrases in the corresponding agnate sentences. See the second sentence of footnote 5.

9 /j/, a voiced alveolar affricate, replaces the sequence /d/ plus /s/.


11 Compare the Squamish 'relative case'. Kuipers, op. cit. p. 136.