THOMPSON TRANSITIVE FORMATIONS

Laurence C. Thompson
University of Hawaii

Paper presented at the
8th International Conference on Salish Languages
Eugene, Oregon - August 13-15, 1973

1. The transitive forms of Thompson (Th) are in many respects very similar to those of neighboring and closely related Shuswap (Sh) which Kuipers (1970) discussed in a preliminary way for the Spokane conference. It seems useful to present some notion of the Thompson[1] system to show the similarities and differences and hopefully to catch a glimpse of the older system from which they must both descend. The dialect represented here is that of Spuzzum, which is geographically closest to Coast Salish Halkomelem, but there do not appear to be any substantial differences in the transitive system for the language as a whole.

2. Kuipers (1970) limits the discussion to simple root stems and recognizes for Shuswap three main formal classes defined by different transitivizing suffixes: A. -t-, B. -n(t)-, C. -st-; and, in addition, three complex transitivizers: D. -x(í)t-, E. -m(í)n(t)-, and F. -nwén(t)-, of which D pairs with A, and E and F with B. He characterizes -t- and -n(t)- as mere transitivizers; -st- as yielding causative and customary forms (the latter always with the previx c-/s-[2]); -x(í)t- as referring to a secondary human object (usually benefactive); -m(í)n(t)- as referring to an object affected indirectly, superficially, or malefactively; and -nwén(t)- as approximately 'manage to, be able to' or 'act involuntarily'. He separates roots into two types--I., root-stressed, and II. suffix-stressed; suffixes thus have two shapes--with full vowel when stressed, but with reduced or zero vowel when base is stressed. The F. suffix -nwén(t)-, however, always has stress on the suffix.

Essentially all of this can be said to apply to Thompson transitive formations as well. However, as we shall see, there are a number of interesting morphophonemic developments which produce rather different surface forms, and the pronominal system is different in certain ways.

3. Personal pronominal elements. As in Shuswap, reference to person in Thompson transitives is afforded by suffixes in the order object-subject after the transitivizing element. Third person elements refer indifferently to singular or plural, although plural reference can be emphasized in several ways (see 5. below). The suffixes are given here, together with other personal pronominal elements for comparison.

	TRANSITIVE		INTRANSITIVE (enclitics)	
	Object	Subject	Independent	Dependent
1sg.	-c(é)m-, -c(é)y-	-(é)n(e)	k-n	w-n
1pl.	-(é)y-	-t	k-t	u-t
2sg.	-c(í)-	-(é)x^w	k^w	u-x^w
2pl.	-(ú)ym-	-(é)p	k-p	u-p
3	ø	-(é)s	ø	u-s

	POSSESSIVE
1sg.	n-
1pl.	-kt
2sg.	e?-
2pl.	-ep/-mp
3	-s/-c

In the 1st sg. object the shape ending in -y appears before endings containing a labial. The subject suffix has a final -e only when the form refers to a third person object. The 1st pl. subject suffix appears only with 2d person objects; with 3d person objects a suppletive form has been borrowed from another paradigm (see discussion below).

Remembering that Thompson has converted PS *l to y, we can recognize that these elements correspond nearly exactly to their Shuswap counterparts. Differences are (1) the special form -(é)ne of the 1st sg. subj. with 3d obj.; (2) the rounded velar in 2d sg. subj. -(é)x^w (and in the corresponding independent intransitive form k^w, about which more later); (3) the rounded vowel of the dependent intransitive enclitics; (4) the alternation of the 2d pl. possessive suffix: -ep after consonants, -mp after vowels. (An apparent difference in the 2d sg. possessive prefix is presumably only a matter of analysis: Thompson regularly has the vowel e, which often could be considered to belong to a preceding particle; in pause-group initial [and after vowels in careful speech] the form is he?-. Still another apparent difference is analytical as well: I list -t as 1st pl. subj. ending, although it does not figure in forms involving 3d person objects; in both languages it appears in the appropriate subject position following 2d person object endings and in the intransitive subject enclitics, both dependent ut and independent kt. Kuipers considers this -t an extension of the passive endings for 2d sg., 2d pl., and 1st pl.; in his view passive forms are borrowed to cover 1st pl. subject with both 2d person objects, as well as with 3d person objects, and apparently the similarity of the intransitive ending is coincidental. The origin of the various passive endings is at present obscure, but it seems to me worthwhile to recognize formally the recurrence of -t in forms marking 1st pl. subjects; perhaps the 1st pl. passive subject ending -(é)y-t furnished the basis for reinterpretation of some forms, resulting in the present homonymy.)

There are other features of the system which are different as well. In Northern Shuswap certain forms referring to 1st sg. have reduplication. The kind of reduplication involved (infixing after the stressed vowel whatever consonant immediately precedes it) occurs also in Thompson, but the forms are diminutives, used in speaking or referring to children or animals, and having as well various extensions of meaning that are common with diminutives (see Mary Haas' discussion of the diminutive [reference to be

added]). Among these is a notion of depreciation and it seems likely that the Shuswap usage has arisen from a social pattern of humility or deference of speakers in referring to themselves. Southern Shuswap (Gibson 1973) does not utilize this "personal reduplication"; one wonders whether Athapaskan speech neighboring northern dialects has any features that would relate to this. Thompson also lacks the inclusive-exclusive distinction in the 1st pl. which characterizes all Shuswap dialects. Again one wonders about areal influences, because so far as I know no other Salish language has this distinction.

4. Paradigms. We shall observe some paradigms here which can be compared directly with the Shuswap paradigms (Kuipers 1970: sec. 8). As in Shuswap, we can speak of an indicative (or active), a passive, and an imperative. (The imperative endings in Thompson, however, are actually more general--they can be added to many intransitive stems as well; this is presumably also true in Shuswap.) As in Shuswap, the forms with 1st pl. subject are identical with forms from the passive set. However, in Thompson it would not be accurate to say that these 1st pl. subject forms are actually passives; syntactically they act exactly like other active (indicative) forms. For the purposes of comparison we may use the paradigms of root-stressed kíc- arrive at location of, and suffix-stressed səlk- turn (someone or something) around, both of the class corresponding to Kuipers' -n(t)- class in Shuswap. (Forms are identified, as in his paper, by formulas of the type 1-3, 1st sg. subj. with 3d obj.; 2p-1, 2d pl. subj. with 1st sg. obj.; etc. Some forms were not included in the Shuswap paradigms[3]; they are added here to fill out the system, marked with a plus sign.)

Indicative	1-3	kíc-ne	səlk-et-éne
	2-3	kíc-n-x^{w}	səlk-et-éx^{w}
	3-3	kíc-e-s	səlk-et-és
	1p-3	kíc-et-m	səlk-et-ém
	2p-3	kíc-et-p	səlk-et-ép
	1-2	kíc-e-c-n	səlk-e-cí-n
	3-2	kíc-e-c	səlk-e-cí-s
	1p-2	kíc-e-c-t	səlk-e-cí-t
	1-2p	kíc-et-im-n	səlk-et-úym-n
	3-2p	kíc-et-im-es	səlk-et-úym-es
	1p-2p	kíc-et-im-et	səlk-et-úym-et
	2-1	kíc-e-cm-x^{w}	səlk-e-cém-x^{w}
	3-1	kíc-e-cm-s	səlk-e-cém-s
	2p-1	kíc-e-ci-p	səlk-e-céy-p
	3-1p	kíc-et-i-s	səlk-et-éy-s
	+ 2p-1p	kíc-et-i-p	səlk-et-éy-p
Imperative	2-3	kíc-et-e	səlk-et-ét-e
	2-1	kíc-e-cm-e	səlk-e-cém-e
	+ 2-1p	kíc-et-y-e	səlk-et-éy-e
	2p-3	kíc-et-uz-e	səlk-et-ét-uz-e
	2p-1	kíc-e-cm-uz-e	səlk-e-cém-uz-e
	+ 2p-1p	kíc-et-y-uz-e	səlk-et-éy-uz-e
Passive	1	kíc-e-ci-me	səlk-e-céy-me
	2	kíc-e-c-t	səlk-e-cí-t
	3	kíc-et-m	səlk-et-ém
	1p	kíc-et-i-t	səlk-et-éy-t
	2p	kíc-et-im-et	səlk-et-úym-et

We are immediately struck by the fact that, except for the first two forms of the root-stressed paradigm, Thompson shows -e- corresponding to Shuswap -n-. This reflects a regular morphophonemic rule of Thompson by which underlying //n// is realized as

e when it comes to fall between any preceding consonant and a following t, s, c, or ɬ. (We may perhaps class these conditioning consonants as coronal obstruents, but examples of alternations in which č and ǰ function in this way are so far lacking.) In rare cases, where a vowel appears before it, the transitivizing //-n-// emerges as -n-; so, for example, ʔínu- say what (to)?: ʔínu-n-s what does she say to him?, ʔínu-nt-p what do you people say to him?, ʔínu-n-cm-xʷ what do you say to me?, etc.; qʷi- speak (to): qʷi-nt-éne I speak to him, etc.

Besides the differences discussed in 3 above, we note a few other small ways in which the languages diverge. (Cases where we have here adopted a somewhat less abstract representation should not be construed as differences between the languages: Kuipers retains the -t- of his -n(t)- transitivizer before a suffix beginning with -c-, although, as he says, it actually merges with the -c-; for reasons which will be apparent later, we shall not adopt that convention for the surface forms, in order to retain the same surface notation throughout the paper. Similarly, the 3d person subject -s merges with a preceding -c-, but Kuipers adopts a morphophonemic notation, writing the -s, which we shall also omit. The actual pronunciation of these parts of comparable forms, however, is apparently roughly the same in the two languages.) The 3-2p and 1p-2p forms of the indicative, show a small difference: there is a clear vowel between -m- and the final -s and -t, where Shuswap shows none. A similar vowel appears at the end of the 1sg. passive form, again following -m-; and of course, as noted above, the 2pl. passive form is identical with the 1p-2p form. Some more substantial differences emerge in the imperative. The ending -e is identical, but the handling of the stem before it is different for the 3d person object forms in suffix-stressed inflexion: both languages add an extra syllable here, but in Shuswap it is -ék- (with -k reminiscent of the Shuswap 2d sg. independent intransitive subject clitic k), while in Thompson it is -ét-, which could be construed as reduplicating the preceding transitivizer. If we recall that Thompson has usually converted

PS *y to z, we recognize this correspondence in the imperative plural element Th -uz- : Sh -y-. Interestingly, Thompson shows consistently the vowel -u-, and we can presume that a similar element is in the background of the Sh -y-, because the -k- of the -ék- extension is rounded in 2p-3 1x̣-nt-ék^{w}-y-e. Kuipers characterizes the Sh 2p-1 imperative ending as having an 'extra suffix -m- after the object suffix'; Th 2p-1 imperatives have the -m-, but lack an element corresponding to the preceding Sh -1-, so that they seem to have the regular 1st sg. obj. suffix followed directly by the imperative. The Shuswap treatment is reminiscent of the 1st sg. passive ending in both languages (Sh -c(éc)1m Th -céyme/-cime), and--perhaps more to the point--the 2p-1 indicative ending in both languages (Sh -c(éc)1-p Th -céy-p/-ci-p). Two explanations seem possible: (1) that Shuswap has remodeled its 2p-1 imperatives by analogy with the 2p-1 indicative forms (supported by the 1st sg. passive endings); or (2) that Thompson has remodeled its 2p-1 imperatives by analogy with the corresponding imperative singular forms (supported by all other 1st sg. object forms). For the moment (2) appears more likely, and it is further supported by a tendency toward mutual influence of 2d sg. and pl. forms elsewhere in the system.

The underlying nasal of the transitivizer does not vocalize to -e- when it is glottalized: so ʔáq^{w}-ṅ-s <u>he licks, laps it</u>, ʔáq^{w}-ṅt-e <u>lick it!</u> (It is still unclear why this transitivizer is glottalized after certain roots; Shuswap apparently lacks comparable cases--not surprisingly, since the occurrence of glottalized resonants is in any case far less frequent in that language than in Thompson.) The 1-3 and 2-3 forms for roots of this sort seem to have analogically extended -ne and -nx^{w}: ʔáq^{w}-ṅ-ne <u>I lick it</u>, ʔáq^{w}-ṅ-nx^{w} <u>you lick it</u>.

The differences of rounding in the pronominal elements in the two languages seem to point to earlier *-x marking 2d sg. subj. Shuswap (Kuipers and Gibson, p.c.) seems to have a strong tendency to round velars near other rounded elements; dependent ex^{w} probably reflects *wx. Thompson apparently extended -x^{w} analogically. Presumably Sh k < *kx, Th k^{w} < *kx^{w}--interesting for comparative work.

5. Pluralization. Different devices provide emphatic allusion to a plurality. (The Shuswap correlates of these pluralizing devices are not known at this time.) A reduplication prefix $C_1(V)C_2$- indicates that the action affects a group of persons or things or is repeated several times: e.g. səlsəlketés she turns them (several in a group) around/she turns him around repeatedly. Some roots are inherently plural in reference: n-míx̣^{w}-et-e lay them (the children) down (cf. cút-et-e lay him down). Some such plural roots have an ablaut-type relationship to a corresponding singular root: sək-t-és she hits him with a stick, sék-e-s she hits them with a stick.

Most interesting in connection with the transitive, however, is the suffix -íyxs, which provides a specific 3d person plural. (The same element is used in the possessive system as well: cítx^{w}-s his house, citx^{w}-íyxs their house.) It is added in place of the general 3d person subject suffix -(é)s, giving specifically 3p-3 forms: kic-et-íyxs they arrive at his place, səlk-et-íyxs they turn her around. In addition the forms thus created serve as bases for a kind of secondary inflexion, utilizing the type B transitivizer (underlying //-n-t-//)[4] and providing 3d pl. obj. reference: kic-et-íyxs-ne I get to their place, kic-et-íyxs-nx^{w} you..., kic-et-íyxs-es she..., kic-et-íyxs-et-m we..., etc. (The double use is seen in kic-et-ìyxs-et-íyxs they arrive at the location of those (other) people, but is not common.) But some forms refer still to a subject: e.g. kic-et-íyxs-e-cəm-s they get to my place.

6. More about paradigms. Further differences emerge as we compare the inflexion of stressed roots with the other transitivizers. In all cases we find the 1-3 form ending in -ne without preceding -t-: AI wík-n-e I see it (cf. wík-t-x^{w} you see it and Sh wíwk-t-n), CI púy-s-ne I kill it (cf. púy-st-x^{w} you kill it and Sh púl-st-x), DI má^{ʔ}-x-ne I break (something of his) (cf. má^{ʔ}-xt-x^{w} you... and Sh x^{w}íx^{w}c^{ʔ}-xt-n I show it to him). The two languages agree in lacking the -t- in 1-3 forms of E-type (as well as B-type) inflexion from stressed roots: pún-m-ne I find it (cf. pún-m-t-m we find it and Sh néns-mn I approach it). F-type inflexion, which always stresses the transitivizer -nwéʔn-, also shows no -t- in 1-3 forms in either language: cu-nwéʔn-ne I manage to make it (cf. cu-nwéʔn-t-m we... and Sh qm-nwéʔwn I hit it).

This disappearance of -t- (as well as several other factors) leads us to consider some general morphophonemic rules that will allow us to posit the same underlying forms for both stressed and unstressed roots. As a matter of fact, a number of interesting generalizations emerge from the study, beginning with stress itself. In the discussion that follows underlying forms are noted between double slashes: //...//. (Some of these findings may help throw light on the intricacies of the Shuswap system as well, but a full comparison is not possible here.)

6.1. Stress. As already noted, certain roots are usually stressed, others usually (in the transitive system always) unstressed. Because, however, there are cases of stress shift in derivations, it is convenient to rename these strong (usually stressed) and weak roots, respectively. Let us adopt the convention of writing strong roots with stress in underlying form, weak roots without. (Other forms of the language indicate that most weak roots very frequently end in the underlying vowel ə: so //səkə// hit with stick, //sələkə// turn around.) Suffixes also differ in their stress-assuming properties, and main word stress depends on a complex interplay of these elements (prefixes do not affect stress). Some suffixes are unstressed: they never take

stress at all; usually they lack an underlying vowel. In the transitive system the elements //-t-// transitive, and //-s// causative are unstressed suffixes; they are always accompanied by other suffixes, and do not, of course, influence the stress of a word. A very common kind of suffix is ambivalent: it takes main word stress after a weak root, but after a strong root it is unstressed and appears in reduced form. (Let us leave ambivalent suffixes unmarked for stress in underlying forms.) The transitive subject suffixes are of this type: thus, after weak roots we find them stressed in //səkə-t-ex^{w}// səktéx^{w} you hit him, //səkə-t-ep// səktép you people hit him, etc. But with strong roots they are reduced: so //wík-t-ex^{w}// wíktx^{w} you see him, //wík-t-ep// wíktp you people see him. A further interesting thing about ambivalent suffixes is that when one is added to a weak root it creates a stem which is strong from the point of view of further suffixing. Another way of saying this is that in a string of two or more ambivalent suffixes, it is always the first which assumes stress. For example, transitive objects are marked by ambivalent suffixes, and since they precede the subject suffixes, they regularly take stress with weak roots: //səkə-t-uym-es// səktúymes he hits you people, //səkə-t-ey-ep// səktéyp you (sg. or pl.) hit us.

There are also strong suffixes, which capture stress from any stem to which they are added; we shall mark them with an acute accent. The elements //-nwéʔ// and //-íyxs// are of this type. //səkə-nwéʔ-t-ep// səknwéʔtp you people manage to hit him, //səkə-nwéʔ-t-ey-ep// səknwéʔtip you (sg. or pl.) manage to hit us. However, strong stems are not usually reduced when strong suffixes are added (although they may be optionally in rapid speech); they sometimes retain a secondary stress, but main word stress is on the strong suffix: //wík-nwéʔ-t-ep// wiknwéʔtp ~ wìknwéʔtp (rarely wəknwéʔtp) you people manage to see him. In a sequence of strong suffixes the latest has the main word stress: //wík-nwéʔ-t-íyxs-n-t-es// wiknweʔtíyxses he manages to see them.

Clearly, ordered rules are indicated which will assign and shift stress appropriately in keeping with the principles outlined

here. And these rules in general precede those which detail vocalic developments after stress patterns are clarified.

6.2. Vocalic developments. As our previous examples already show, vowels in unstressed syllables tend to weaken and disappear. The actual facts are complex and still not fully understood, and we cannot go into the details here. But several developments in the transitive system stand out clearly. Vowels with underlying stress retain their quality or reduce to ə when they come to precede main word stress (cf. the next to last example in 6.1. above). After main stress all vowels tend to be lost, as in wík̓tx^{w}, wík̓tp above. But after a resonant which itself is preceded by another consonant, a vowel remains: //wík̓-t-uym-et// wík̓timet we see you people.

In addition to the tendencies suggested here, other patterns of the language indicate that word-final vowels result from various special circumstances. We are prompted then to look for reasons for the vocalic finals observable in the paradigms. Our attention is called early to the 1-3 form, which shows regularly -ne for 1sg. subj., whereas in all other cases we observe final -n. Retention of underlying -e after a cluster seems contrary to the facts--otherwise we should expect -ne in 1-2p. For the moment let us imagine that 1 sg. subj. is //-en//, parallel to 2 sg. //-ex^{w}//, 3 //-es//, 2pl. //-ep//; we may similarly expect parallel //-et// for 1 pl. subj.

The imperative ending is also puzzling in this respect. A reasonable underlying form is //-eh//, although it is necessarily tentative; final //-h// is regularly lost, but preceding vowels remain, retaining cardinal values, parallel to their treatment before the other laryngeal //-ʔ//.

6.3. Semivowel developments. When vowels are lost they sometimes leave semivowels between other consonants. These semivowels vocalize, providing new vocalisms in unstressed syllables. E.g. //wík̓-t-ey-ep// wík̓tip you (sg. or pl.) see us.

6.4. Consonantal developments. Certain consonants have special developments when they appear in clusters, whether original or resulting from vocalic losses. The tendency can be generalized as simplification.

6.41. //-ts-// is fused to c: //wík-t-es > wíkts// wíkc she sees him. This rather clear development late in the suffix string suggests that the 1 sg. and 2 sg. object suffixes may not in fact begin with c-, but rather with s-, which fuses with the transitive -t-; so let us set up //-sem, -sey// 1sg obj., //-si// 2sg obj., both ambivalent suffixes. Thus //wík-t-sem-es// wíkcms she sees me, //wík-t-si-et// wíkct we see you.

6.42. In a variety of other clustering circumstances //-t-// is lost. This brings us to understand why certain forms in Thompson paradigms seem to lack the familiar transitivizing element, although -t- appears elsewhere in all the paradigms. Pertinent to these transitive patterns is its disappearance after //-n-// and before //n, s, x^w//: so //kíc-n-t-en > kíc-n-t-n > kícnn// kícne I get to his place (see further discussion in 6.44 below); //kíc-n-t-ex^w > kícntx^w// kícnx^w you...; //kíc-n-t-es > kícnts > kícns// kíces he... (further derivation also discussed in 6.44 below). //-t-// is also lost between any preceding consonant and following //-n-//: //púy-s-t-en(e)// púysne I kill it (cf. //púy-s-t-ex^w// púystx^w you kill it), //wík-t-en(e)// wíkne I see it, etc.

6.43. On the other hand, //-n-// is lost in special circumstances--after //ʔ// or postconsonantal //m// and (at the same time) before either //s// or //t//: //ʔúq^{w}eʔ-n-t-es > ʔúq^{w}eʔnts > ʔúq^{w}eʔns// ʔúq^{w}eʔs he drinks it, //ʔúq^{w}eʔ-n-t-ep > ʔúq^{w}eʔn-tp// ʔúq^{w}eʔtp you people drink it; //pún-min-t-es > púnmnts > púnmns// púnms she finds it, //pún-min-t-ep > púnmntp// púnmtp you people find it.

6.44. We noted above that //n// is vocalized to e when it falls in certain interconsonantal environments (after any consonant and before a coronal obstruent): //səlәkə-n-t-es > sәlkntés// sәlketés he whirls her around, //mén-n-t-sem-es > ménncms// ménecms he shades me, //kíc-n-t-es > kícns// kíces he gets to her place.

We may now suggest an origin for the mysterious ubiquitous -ne of 1-3 forms, although unfortunately there is no strong independent evidence to confirm it. It seems likely that //n//, falling between consonants would become syllabic, and it was presumably this syllabic [n̩] which developed to the vowel e. Now in the derivation of kícne I get to his place the 1st sg. subj. //-en// of course loses its vowel, leaving the //n// at word end after the consonant //t//: //kíc-n-t-en > kícntn//; syllabification of this //n// would seem certain. Then, following loss of the //t// in the //-ntn// cluster we would have presumably syllabic-plus-consonantal [n̩n] followed by syllabic [n̩]. It seems reasonable to suppose that this [n̩] vocalized to e in this special position after homorganic [n]. This provides a regular derivation for -ne in the most widespread paradigm (strong roots overwhelmingly have //-n-t// inflexion); it is easy to imagine that it was extended analogically to other 1-3 forms in paradigms where it cannot be original. (The fact that other cases of -e cannot be explained in analogous ways should not, I think, automatically disqualify this suggestion. It is already clear that unstressed surface e has a number of different sources.)

6.45. At a late stage the final cluster -cs is simplified to -c: //wík-t-si-es > wíkcies > wíkcs// wík he sees you. Note that this is homonymous with //wík-t-es// wík he sees her. But weak roots show the expected difference in the endings: //səkə-t-si-es > səkcíes// səkcís he hits you with a stick, //səkə-t-es// səktés he hits her with a stick.

6.5. Ordering. It is apparent, of course, that these rules must be carefully ordered. It develops that we need to recognize the fusion of //-ts-// to c at two different stages, once very early, just after pretonic vowel adjustments, but before loss of //t// between //n// and //s//; once again very late. It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into all the details, but some sample derivations involving crucial differences will help demonstrate working of the system. (The last entry in each column is the surface form.)

	you speak to me	he sees you	she shades him
1) Underlying form	//qʷəyə-n-t-sem-exʷ	wík-t-si-es	mén-n-t-es//
2) Stress assignment	qʷəyəntsémexʷ	wíktsies	ménntes
3) Pretonic V adjmts	qʷyntsémexʷ	--	--
4) ts > c	qʷyncémexʷ	wíkcies	--
5) Posttonic V adj.	qʷyncémxʷ	wíkcs	ménnts
6) Semivowels vocalized	qʷincémxʷ	--	--
7) Liquids become syllabic	--	--	ménn̩ts
8) t lost	--	--	ménn̩s
9) n lost	--	--	--
10) ts > c	--	--	--
11) -cs > -c	--	wíkc	--
12) n̩ > e	--	--	ménes

	she finds him	you people find him	I get to his place
1)	//pún-min-t-es	pún-min-t-ep	kíc-n-t-en//
2)	púnmintes	púnmintep	kícnten
3)	--	--	--
4)	--	--	--
5)	púnmnts	púnmntp	kícntn
6)	--	--	--
7)	púnm̩nts	púnm̩ntp	kícn̩tn̩
8)	púnm̩n̩s	--	kícn̩n̩
9)	púnm̩s	púnm̩tp	--
10)	--	--	--
11)	--	--	--
12)	--	--	kícn̩e

(The syllabic resonants which remain on the surface need not be specially indicated, but have been left in these derivations. Note that while both //n//s of //kíc-n-t-en// would become syllabic, only the final one is vocalized--n̩ does not vocalize before another n or n̩.)

6.6. Some anomalies. There remain some transitive forms which do not seem to fit any of these categories. Perhaps the most interesting is the inflexion of the root //ɬwéy// get ahead (of), beat (in a race), leave behind: 1-3 is ɬwéyne I get ahead of him, as one might expect, but 2-3 is ɬwéyxʷ you..., and 3-3 is ɬwéys she..., with no trace of the //-t-// transitivizer. On the other hand, -t- reappears in other forms: ɬwéytm we..., ɬwéytp you people..., etc. What we may suspect is that stem-final -y here, going back to PS *1, acts in the same way as //n// in eliminating //t// before //n, xʷ, s//. We have then simply a root of Kuipers' A-class, taking simple //-t-// as transitivizer. Since strong A-class roots are not common it is hardly surprising that there are not more examples. This may also explain the inflexion of the root meaning eat (something): ʔúpine I eat it, ʔúpinxʷ

you eat it, ʔúpis he eats it, ʔúpitm we eat it, in which ʔúpinxʷ would have added -nxʷ analogically; the root should presumably be //ʔúpəy//. (Note this doubtless also involves PS *1; cf. Tillamook ʔəhál- eat.)

Our speculations about underlying forms are mostly corroborated by developments in other systems of the language, although it is difficult to find parallels for some, as I have already suggested in certain cases. One interesting confirmation of the //-t-s-// type development comes with study of reflexive forms: with weak stems the reflexive suffix appears as -cút, but with strong stems as -st. An underlying representation //-əsut// (ambivalent) handles these differences, as the following derivations show.

	he shades himself	he pulls himself (up)
1)	//mén-n-t-əsut	cəkʷə-n-t-əsut//
2)	ménntəsut	cəkʷəntəsút
3)	--	cəkʷntsút
4)	--	cəkʷncút
5)	ménntst	--
6)	--	--
7)	ménn̥tst	cəkʷn̥cút
8)	ménn̥st	--
9)	--	--
10)	--	--
11)	--	--
12)	ménest	cəkʷecút

6.6. Underlying paradigmatic endings. With this background we can now summarize the underlying forms of endings, listed below with the //-n-t-// transitivizer. All the suffixes are either ambivalent or unstressed, so no stress need be written. There are indeterminacies in the passive system, where there is still too little material to confirm analyses convincingly. In the imperative, the status and form of the imperative ending

(and its pluralizer) are still problematic. They never take stress, and //-eh// needs to be marked as an unstressed suffix (ambiguity otherwise does not arise, as all other unstressed suffixes have no underlying vowel); we adopt here a wedge (suggesting a breve mark).

Indicative	1-3	//-n-t-en [analogical after weak stem]
	2-3	-n-t-ex^{w}
	3-3	-n-t-es
	1p-3	[Transferred from passive?]
	2p-3	-n-t-ep
	1-2	-n-t-si-en
	3-2	-n-t-si-es
	1p-2	-n-t-si-et
	1-2p	-n-t-uym-en
	3-2p	-n-t-uym-es
	1p-2p	-n-t-uym-et
	2-1	-n-t-sem-ex^{w}
	3-1	-n-t-sem-es
	2p-1	-n-t-sey-ep
	3-1p	-n-t-ey-es
	2p-1p	-n-t-ey-ep
Imperative	2-3	-n-t-ĕh [extended to -n-t-et-ĕh after weak stem]
	2-1	-n-t-sem-ĕh
	2-1p	-n-t-ey-ĕh
	2p-3	-n-t-wz-ĕh [extended to -n-t-et-wz-ĕh after weak stems]
	2p-1	-n-t-sem-wz-ĕh
	2p-1p	-n-t-ey-wz-ĕh
Passive	1	-n-t-sey-me
	2	-n-t-si-et
	3	-n-t-em
	1p	-n-t-ey-et
	2p	-n-t-uym-et//

The final element in the 1 sg. and 3 passive is perhaps equatable with the middle suffix, which for complex other reasons needs to be set up //-əme//, an ambivalent suffix; it would regularly develop to -m after a vowel, but derivation would be regular in 1 sg. passive -ime only after a strong stem; -éyme could then be analogical (we should expect *-éym). Better understanding of the passive and imperative systems will have to await further descriptive and comparative work.

7. Distribution of roots. Kuipers (1970) indicates that most Shuswap roots fall into his Class B--i.e., have -n(t)- as transitivizer. Class A he terms a 'relict-type', comprising only a small handful of roots. The situation is quite different with Thompson roots, which are predominantly of Class B type for strong roots, but of Class A type for weak roots. Alternate forms with //-n-t-// and simple //-t-// inflexion for a good many weak roots suggests that analogical leveling is taking place: e.g. cu-t-és ~ cuw-et-és //cuwə-(n-)t-es// he makes it, x̣əc-t-és ~ x̣əc-et-és //x̣əcə-(n-)t-es// he bets with him. The direction of change seems supported by two independent facts: (1) the B-type inflexion appears to be more common in traditional texts; (2) the B-type stem is called for before reflexive and reciprocal endings with many roots, although their simple transitive forms have -t-: e.g. cək^{w}-t-és he pulls it vs. cək^{w}-e-cút he pulls himself (up), cək^{w}-e-t̓wáx^{w} they pull each other. Both these features deserve careful study to determine which roots are involved. So Thompson has probably converted a large number of roots from BII to AII transitive inflexion. On the other hand Thompson has a substantial number of stressed roots with A-type inflexion (simple //-t-// as transitivizer): e.g. //wík// see (as also in Shuswap), //nés// convey, //súx^{w}// recognize (cf. //súx^{w}// conceal, with //-n-t-// inflexion), //néx// hand over, //ɬwéy// leave behind, //ʔúpəy// eat. Here analogical leveling would presumably work in the inverse direction, so we may suspect that Shuswap has shifted many members of this class. It will be important to work out class membership

in both languages fully. In Thompson all stems expanded by lexical suffixes take //-n-t-// inflexion; it also seems that recent borrowings entering the language are handled this way. Thus for Thompson, as well as for Shuswap, //-n-t-// is the productive category.

Kuipers indicates that Shuswap roots ending in -n take //-n-t-// inflexion but coalesce the two //n//s. Note that in Thompson this is not the case; there is a clear difference between //mén// shade, inflected with //-n-t-//, and //kʷén// take hold of, inflected with //-t-//: ménnxʷ you shade him vs. kʷénsxʷ you take hold of him, kʷéns she takes hold of him, ménes she shades him vs. kʷénne I take hold of him is simply analogical, looking like all 1-3 forms in the language. Indications are that at least some of these roots ending in //-n// have developed from older roots with vocalic final: we have kʷéxcəms beside kʷénxcəms he catches it for me (//kʷé(n)-xi-t-sem-es//).

In Thompson there are a number of roots which have both strong and weak inflexions, an indication that a shift of stress patterns is under way. There is also the fact that secondary derivation of inflectable stems is possible; in secondary derivatives ordinary ambivalent suffixes become strong, taking stress from the earlier derived stem. And the Thompson inchoative infix converts strong stems to weak ones, which take causative inflexion. But these details must await another opportunity for exposition.

8. Transitive suffixes. A good deal needs to be said about the elements that immediately precede the //-t-// transitive, but this is again beyond the scope of this paper. For now let us note that in Thompson //-n-// seems to be simply a formal extending suffix, although careful study of the distribution of //-n-t-// vs. //-t-// inflexion may ultimately tell us something about the function of a PS (or perhaps more likely Pre-Salish) //-n-//.

The other suffixes all have fairly clearly defined provinces. //-s-// causative is interesting in Thompson in that it nearly always clearly implies limited control on the part of the actor,

yielding forms with either accidental, unintentional overtones or suggesting accomplishment of something difficult, time-consuming, etc. (Even //púy-s-// beat up, kill may be understood in this way, with administering death as a kind of extreme activity, albeit intentional. There are other expressions for murder, slaughter, and the like.) It emerges that there are certain roots (e.g. //péw// swell up) which have no simple //-(n-)t// transitivation, and the //-s-t-// forms always carry the limited control notion: péwsne it swelled up on me; a paraphrase is necessary to express intentional action: c̓əx̣ʷténe ʔu? e spéwsne I acted intentionally on it and made it swell up. This specialization of the causative would seem to have some theoretical interest as well. (Its construction with ?es- stative to yield stative transitives with meanings like acting now, acting as customarily, must also be drawn into consideration. In this function //-s-// follows stems created with the other complex transitivizers; no stative transitives are possible without it.)

//-xi// seems better characterized as indirective, rather than benefactive; the consistent feature is that it shifts the focus of the major object, usually from a thing to a person. This emerges in the syntax: for simple transitives an "understood" inanimate object can be specified, introduced by the particle e; but with //-xi// transitives, e introduces rather a person, and an inanimate object must be otherwise marked. Thus má?es e szélt he broke a plate, má?xcəms tə nszélt he broke my plate. As Kuipers suggests for Shuswap, these stems generally parallel simple transitives.

//-min// formations also parallel simple transitives in many cases and seem regularly to introduce an object as a reference point or suggest some special relationship, so that the gloss relational seems appropriately suggestive. Cf. nú̓x̣ʷes //nú̓x̣ʷ-n-t-es// he crawls over it [e.g. insect on stone], nú̓x̣ʷmcəms //nú̓x̣ʷ-min-t-sem-es// he runs up to me [e.g. dog] (//nú̓x̣ʷ// progress on four or more legs).

Finally //-nwéɁn// is extremely productive, affording emphatic transitives with the notion emphatic limited control; it corresponds to the intransitive ending -nwéɬn, which must be related, although the morphophonemics is still unclear.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Material on Thompson has been collected over the last several years from Chief William Sampson of Kanaka Bar, B.C., and principally from Miss Annie York of Spuzzum, B.C. I am most grateful for their help and interest, and particularly for the extreme patience of Miss York in working out the intricacies of paradigmatic material. The language has a typical Northern Interior Salish phonological system: consonants p p̓ m m̓ t n n̓ t̓ɬ ɬ l l̓ c̓ c s z z̓ y y̓ k k̓ x ɣ ɣ̓ kʷ k̓ʷ xʷ w w̓ q q̓ χ̣ ʕ ʕ̓ qʷ q̓ʷ χ̣ʷ ʕʷ ʕ̓ʷ ʔ h; vowels i u e a ə. Distinction between e and a is marginal and problematic; there are also marginal (unpredictable) lowered variants ə̣ of ə, and o of u, and, in the consonant system marginal (unpredictable) variants ç of c and s̱ of s. (Kuipers has now offered his own comparison of the Shuswap and Thompson transitive systems in Dutch Contributions to the 8th ICSL, pp. 11-14, q.v.)

[2]The corresponding prefix in Th is ʔes-.

[3]One form which is omitted is 2p-1p; it is an interesting form because it also does duty for 2-1p--i.e., there is no difference between 2sg. and 2 pl. subj. in this case, and the form historically clearly has the 2 pl. subj. element -p. It will be interesting to know whether Shuswap has made the same merger.

[4]The transitivizing element of the B type is here divided into //-n-t-//, parallel to //-s-t-//, etc.

REFERENCES

Gibson, James A. 1973. Shuswap grammatical structure. Univ. of Hawaii PhD dissertation.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1970. Shuswap transitive verbs. Paper presented at the 5th ICSL, Spokane.