Aspectual properties of SENĆOŦEN reflexives•

Claire K. Turner
University of Surrey

This paper addresses the question of whether valence/control morphology affects situation type in a predictable way in Salish languages. It applies Kiyota's (2008) situation type tests to SENĆOŦEN control and limited control reflexives (*-sat* and *-naŋət*), finding that valence/control does appear to affect situation type. The results show that core and "grammaticized" uses of reflexives are distinguished in SENĆOŦEN as they are in Halkomelem (Gerdts 2000). Another interesting finding is that core control reflexives pattern with achievements with respect to the culmination cancellation test (Bar-el et al. 2006, Kiyota 2008), but like accomplishments with respect to the 'almost' test (Kiyota 2008). I suggest this results from the two semantic roles held by their subject participant: it is both an affected patient, like the subject of unaccusative achievements; and an agent with a normal amount of control, like the subject of control transitive accomplishments.

1   Introduction

SENĆOŦEN [sənčaθən], a dialect of North Straits Salish, is the language of the Saanich community of the Saanich Peninsula, Vancouver Island. It is currently spoken fluently by fewer than twenty elders, but language revitalisation is ongoing in the community and schools. Examples in this paper, unless otherwise cited, result from fieldwork with two elders 2008-2010.

Like other Salish languages, SENĆOŦEN has a large number of suffixes indicating valence changes and agent control, including control transitives (1) and limited control transitives (2).

(1)   SU,   W̱Ø̵EꝘ**ETS**[1]
       səẁ   xʷ-kʷəq-**ət**-s
       then   LOCAT-unlock-**C.TR**-3POSS
       'Then she opened it (the door).'

(2)   SU,   W̱Ø̵EꝘ**NOW̱**S   TꞍE SOŁ
       səẁ   xʷ-kʷəq-**naxʷ**-s   tθə sał
       then   LOCAT-unlock-**LC.TR**-3POSS DET door
       'Then she managed to unlock the door.'

Recent work by Kiyota (2007, 2008: 66) shows that the valence/control distinction can affect SENĆOŦEN situation type: control transitives pattern as accomplishments and limited control transitives pattern as achievements. [2] One question arising from this observation is whether a verb's situation type is always predictable on the basis of its valence/control morphology, i.e., whether all control transitives are accomplishments, and whether the existence of other valence/control suffixes on a verb guarantees it will pattern with a certain situation type. Situation type is affected by the number and type of a verb's arguments (Verkuyl 1972, Krifka 1989, Tenny 1994, Smith 1997, etc.), and Salish valence/control morphology gives information about argument structure, so we might expect that it will play a role in determining a verb's situation type. In addition, Jacobs (to appear) has found that control distinctions affect situation type in Sḵwx̱wú7mesh.

       Kiyota's (2007, 2008) claims regard only control transitives, limited control transitives, and unaccusatives. This paper begins to address the general contribution of valence/control to situation type in SENĆOŦEN by looking at another set of verbs: reflexives. Gerdts (2000) has argued that each of the two reflexive suffixes in Halkomelem, -θat and -namət, has a "core" use and a "grammaticized" use, giving rise to four different verb types among the reflexives, with distinct morphological structures. This classification can be extended to SENĆOŦEN, as in (3-6).

---

[1] Examples are given in Dave Elliott's SENĆOŦEN orthography and in the North American phonetic alphabet. See the appendix for a key to glossing abbreviations.
[2] Kiyota (2008) follows Montler (1986) in calling this a *non-control transitive*. I follow Jacobs (2007: 272-3), in using the term *limited control* to refer to these suffixes, as opposed to the *out of control* distinctions made in Interior Salish languages. This is also consistent with the literature on Halkomelem (e.g., Suttles 2004).

Core control reflexive[3]
(3)   **ḴEȻESET**   ȻNES   NU,NONET
       qək̓ʷ-ə-sət   kʷ=nə=s   nəw̓-naŋət
       get.warmed-C.TR-REFL COMP=1SG.POSS=NMLZ go.in-LC.REFL
       'Warm yourself (by the fire) after coming in.'

Core limited control reflexive
(4)   **QENNONET**   ŦE   METULIYE
       k̓ʷən-n-aŋət   θə   mətuliyə
       see-LC.TR-LC.REFL FEM.DET   Victoria
              LÁ,E TŦE   ŚQENOSEN
              le?ə tθə   šk̓ʷənasəŋ
              in   GNRL.DET   mirror
       'Victoria's seeing herself in the mirror.'

Inchoative control reflexive
(5)   **QÁSSET**   TŦE   SḴEḴEL, E   ȻSI,Á   ĆELAḴEȽ
       k̓ʷes-sət tθə   sqʷəqʷəl ?ə kʷsi?e čəleqəl
       warm-REFL GNRL.DET sun   OBL REM.DEM yesterday
       'The sun got hot yesterday.'

Managed-to limited control reflexive
(6)   NEḰNONET
       nəq̓ʷ-naŋət
       fall.asleep-LC.REFL
       'He/she finally fell asleep.'

In this paper, I apply Kiyota's (2008) situation type tests to the SENĆOŦEN reflexives and find that the reflexives can also be distinguished on aspectual grounds.

        Following Montler (1986) and Gerdts (2000), I assume that the control and limited control reflexive suffixes can be affixed to a transitive base, giving rise to a *core reflexive* (3-4) (the term is Gerdts's). Both core reflexives (control and limited control) pattern with achievements with respect to Kiyota's (2008) culmination cancellation test. Thus, they both pattern with unaccusatives, which are also achievements (Kiyota 2008, following Bar-el 2005, Bar-el et al. 2006). The observation that reflexives pattern with unaccusatives is suggested in §5 to result from the fact that they both take a syntactic subject which refers to an affected participant. In this they are both strongly telic, which is one defining

---

[3] Note that Gerdts (2000) does not call the Halkomelem cognates *control reflexives*, but simply *reflexives*, since they are neutral with respect to control. She also calls *-ət* a *general transitivizer*, as opposed to a *control transitivizer*. For now, I am following Montler (1986) in referring to *control transitives*, and by extension talk about the *control reflexive*.

property of SENĆOŦEN achievements, according to Kiyota (2008). However, the two types of core reflexive behave differently with respect to the 'almost' test: core control reflexives behave like accomplishments, while core limited control reflexives behave like achievements. This is not wholly surprising, since it mirrors the distinction between control and limited control transitives. Kiyota (2007: 291) suggests that it is the presence of a DO event, associated with agentivity, in the control transitive which allows for an event cancellation reading with *ĆELÁL čəlel* 'almost'. Control reflexives also involve an agentive subject, so it is reasonable to propose that they also contain a DO event.

As argued by Montler (1986) (and Gerdts (2000) for the Halkomelem cognate), when the control reflexive is attached directly to a root, as in (5), the verb has an inchoative meaning. This paper shows that these inchoative reflexives appear to be activities. When the limited control reflexive is attached directly to a root, as in (6), the verb has a "managed to" reading. These managed-to reflexives pattern with accomplishments.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the reflexives in more detail, comparing the evidence shown by Montler (1986), Gerdts (2000), and Kiyota (2008) for the different types. Section 3 provides background on situation type in Salish languages, and introduces four of Kiyota's (2008) tests, which will be employed in this paper. Section 4 applies the tests to the four different reflexives. Section 5 provides a discussion of the results. Section 6 is a conclusion.

2   Background: Four SENĆOŦEN reflexives

This section provides the necessary background for my assumption that the two reflexive suffixes -*sat* and -*naŋət* together realize four different verb types. Following Gerdts's (2000) arguments for Halkomelem, I assume that each of these suffixes may attach to a transitivized verbal base, yielding a "core" reflexive; or may attach directly to a root, yielding a verb which does not have a core reflexive meaning. I will discuss -*sat* in §2.1 and -*naŋət* in §2.2.

A further background assumption is that all verbs containing the reflexive suffixes are *intransitive*. This is claimed by Montler (1986: 184), and various arguments are provided for Halkomelem by Gerdts (2000: 139-141) which extend to SENĆOŦEN. One argument regards the use of the ergative agreement suffix -əs, which is found with all main clause transitives containing a third person subject (7).

(7)   QEN,T**ES**   ŦE   WÁĆs
       k̓ʷən̓-t-**əs**   θə   weč-s
       see-C.TR\IPFV-**3ERG**   FEM.DET   watch-3POSS
       'She was looking at her watch.'

This suffix is not used with reflexives that have third person subjects (8).

(8) QEN,SET   ŦE   METULIYE LÁ,E TŦE   SQENOSEN̲
     k̓ʷən̓-sət   θə   mətuliyə   le?ə tθə   šk̓ʷənasəŋ
     see-C.REFL\IPFV FEM.DET Victoria   in   GNRL.DET mirror
     'Victoria's looking at herself in the mirror.'

I will not provide further evidence here, as arguing for the intransitivity of reflexives is not the central focus of this paper, and instead refer the reader to Gerdts (2000). However, it is important to remember throughout the following section that, whatever their morphological structure, all reflexives are syntactically intransitive, and this point will be revisited in §5.

2.1   Control reflexive suffix *-sat*

Both Gerdts (2000) and Montler (1986) argue on different grounds that there are two types of verb containing *-sat* (Halkomelem *-θət*). Although they have different reasons for distinguishing the two types, the distinctions they make are the same, and so the Halkomelem evidence and the SENĆOŦEN evidence complement each other to provide a strong argument for distinguishing these two types. In what follows, I will refer to core control reflexives, which have reflexive semantics, and inchoative reflexives, which have inchoative semantics.

Gerdts (2000: 137-8) argues that core (control) reflexives are derived from control transitive bases by addition of a reflexive suffix *-sat*. In Halkomelem, the control transitive suffix /-t/ and the initial /s/ of the reflexive suffix fuse to yield [θ], as shown in (9). This is a regular pattern occurring at a morphological boundary, found also when the control transitive is followed by /s/-initial object suffixes (10).

Halkomelem:
(9) a.   q̓ʷaqʷ   b. q̓ʷaqʷ-ət   c. q̓ʷaqʷ-əθət   (>q̓ʷaqʷ-ət-sət)
         club   club-TR   club-TR:REFL   (>club-TR-REFL)
         'get clubbed'   'club it'   'club self'   (Gerdts 2000: 137)

(10)   ni?   **q̓ʷaqʷ-əθám̓š-əs**   łə   słeni?   (>q̓ʷaqʷ-ət-sam̓š-əs)
         AUX   **club-TR:1OBJ-3ERG**   DET   woman   (>club-TR-1OBJ-3ERG)
         'The woman clubbed me (on purpose).'   (Gerdts 2000: 137)

In SENĆOŦEN, the /t/ of the control transitive suffix and the /s/ of a following suffix also interact, but deletion rather than fusion occurs, as the /t/ does not surface. It is possible to detect the presence of the control transitive suffix by the presence of an extra schwa (Montler 1986: 185).

Core control reflexives: [root + C.TR + REFL]

(11) **BȻESET** TŦE MO,EḰ
      p̓k̓ʷ-ə-sət tθə ma?əqʷ
      surface-C.TR-REFL GNRL.DET duck
      'The duck surfaced on its own.'

(12) **W̱EȻESET** ŦE Katie
      x̌ʷəč-ə-sət θə Katie
      wake.up-C.TR-REFL FEM.DET Katie
      'Katie woke herself up.'

Core control reflexives are derived from control transitives, and their roots are unaccusative. Inchoative reflexives, in contrast, are based on homogeneous states (Kiyota 2008; states with no internal event structure).[4]

Inchoative reflexive: [root + reflexive]

(13) **T̓ŁONESET** TŦE SȻÁĆEL
      t̓ɬaŋə-sət tθə skʷečəl
      cold-REFL GNRL.DET day
      'The days are getting colder.'

Gerdts (2000) argues that, unlike the core use of the reflexive suffix, this inchoative use does not derive an intransitive from a control transitive, since the roots with which it is found do not otherwise take the control transitive.

However, as the inchoative reflexives are formally identical to the core control reflexives in Halkomelem, Gerdts is led to argue that there is a reanalysis of these forms, whereby -θət is taken to be a single suffix with an inchoative use (p. 152). Fortunately, SENĆOŦEN provides evidence to support Gerdts's claim, since its control reflexives and inchoative reflexives *are* formally distinct, at least with respect to roots lacking a full vowel (Montler 1986: 185-6). Example (14) differs from the control reflexives in (11-12) above in that it lacks the extra schwa between the root and the reflexive, and in that stress is found on the reflexive suffix, which thus surfaces with a full vowel.

Inchoative reflexive: [base + REFL]

(14) **ĆEḴSOT** TŦE S̱ḴELÁḺNEW̱
      čəq-sat tθə sqəlelnəxʷ
      big-REFL GNRL.DET tree
      'The tree's getting big.'

---

[4] Montler (2003) provides evidence that these are adjectives.

As shown in (15), a full vowel root can also take *-sat* directly, but only the semantics tells us that this is an inchoative relexive and not a core control reflexive (Montler 1986: 185).

(15) **QÁSSET** TŦE   SḰEḰEL, E   ȻSI,Á   ȻELAK̲EⱢ
     ḵʷes-sət tθə   sqʷəqʷəl̓ ʔə kʷsiʔe čələqəɫ
     hot-REFL GNRL.DET sun   OBL REM.DEM yesterday
     'The sun got hot yesterday.'

Montler's (1986) examples of the reflexive suffix attaching directly to a root coincide perfectly with Gerdts's (2000) inchoative use of reflexives: their roots are states, not unaccusatives, and they have an inchoative meaning.

      Kiyota (2008: 43-44) also discusses inchoative reflexives, though not in contrast with core control reflexives. He shows that /-sat/ attaches to homogeneous states (Montler's (2003) adjectives) to provide an inchoative meaning, and that these derived forms behave like non-states with respect to a few of his aspectual tests. For example, (16) shows that an inchoative reflexive can appear with a "punctual adverbial" modification, something its root *ḵʷamḵʷəm* 'strong' cannot do.

(16) **ḵʷamḵʷəm-sat** tθə   Jack kʷ=s
     strong-REFL GNRL.DET Jack COMP=NMLZ
         kʷɬ kʷən-ət-əŋ-s   tθə   stel̓ŋəxʷ-s
         PERF take-C.TR-PASS-3POSS GNRL.DET medicine-3POSS
     'Jack felt strong when he took the medicine.'   (Kiyota 2008: 44)

The following table summarizes the differences between control reflexives and inchoative reflexives, and shows that Montler (1986), Gerdts (2000), and Kiyota (2008) all provide evidence for the same two-way distinction.

Table 1 Core control reflexives vs. Inchoative reflexives

	Core control reflexive [base+C.TR+REFL]	Inchoative reflexive [base+REFL]
Montler (1986)	• Contain control transitive suffix (schwa). • Have "control" meaning.	• Do not contain control transitive suffix. • Have "non-control" meaning.
Gerdts (2000)	• Contain control transitive suffix. • Have reflexive meaning. • Contain unaccusative roots.	• Are reanalyzed without control transitive, though its formal presence is detectable. • Contain stative/unergative roots.
Kiyota (2008)	• Not discussed.	• Are derived from homogeneous states. • Pattern with non-states.

When taken together, the arguments provided by these authors provide strong evidence that there are two verb types containing *-sat*. In §4, we will see that the situation type tests support this distinction, since core control reflexives pattern with achievements, while inchoative reflexives pattern with activities.

2.2   Limited control reflexive *-naŋət*

Verbs containing the suffix *-naŋət* express an event in which there is a single participant with a limited amount of control. Montler (1986: 178) calls it a *non-control middle*, presumably because of its "managed-to" readings described below. Here I follow Gerdts (2000: 153-155), who calls it a *limited control reflexive*, and argues that the reflexive use of the cognate Halkomelem suffix *-namət* is primary. When this suffix is used with unaccusative roots, the verb describes an event which occurs either accidentally (17) or suddenly (18), or it may describe a reflexive event which is carried out through difficulty (19).

(17)   **MÁȻEȽNOṈET**   T̵E   SPÁ,EȻ
       mekʷəɬ-n-aŋət   tθə   speʔəθ
       get.injured-LC.TR-LC.REFL GNRL.DET   bear
       'The bear injured itself accidentally.'

(18)   **W̱INOṈET**   ȻE   Katie
       xʷəy-n-aŋət   θə   Katie
       wake.up-LC.TR-LC.REFL FEM.DET   Katie
       'Katie woke up.' [context: phone suddenly wakes her up]

(19)   ȻAȽ   **SEḴNOṈET**   E   TI,Á   SḰÁL ȽTE
       čeɬ   **səq-n-aŋət**   ʔə   tiʔe   s-qʷel=ɬtə
       finally **go.out-LC.TR-LC.REFL** OBL   PROX.DEM   NMLZ-speak=1PL.POSS
       'Our words finally came out.'

Both Montler (1986) and Gerdts (2000) suggest that the limited control reflexive suffix may contain the limited control transitive suffix *-n(axʷ)*, and I have glossed examples of core limited control reflexives with the limited control transitive followed by a reflexive suffix.[5]

The limited control reflexive suffix can also be used with unergative roots, in which case the participant "manages to" do something, or "finally" achieves something. Since this use does not involve a causative semantics, where an agent acts on itself, Gerdts (2000: 153-155) argues that it reflects an extension of the reflexive suffix outside of its core reflexive use.

Unlike the core and inchoative uses of the control reflexive described in the last section, there is no morphophonological evidence to distinguish the core and managed-to use of the limited control reflexive suffix. However, I follow Gerdts's (2000) arguments for Halkomelem and assume that the core limited control reflexive contains a reflexive suffixed to a limited control transitive verb base, while the managed-to reflexive involves *-naŋət* suffixed directly to a root. This is reflected in the different glossing in (17-19) versus (20-21).

(20)   **ŦIȽENNONET**   ŦE   NE   TÁN
       θiȽən-naŋət   θə   nə   ten
       stand.up-LC.REFL FEM.DET   1SG.POSS   mother
       'My mother finally stood up, my mother's managed to stand.'

(21)   JÁN   U,   ĆESE   SȻÁĆEL I,   YÁ, SEN   **DOQNONET**
       čen   ʔəẃ   čəsə   skʷečəl   ʔi?   ye?=sən   **ƚak̓ʷ-naŋət**
       really CONTR two   day   CONTIN go=1SG.SBJ   **go.home-LC.REFL**
       'It took me two days before I finally got home.'

Due to the absence of morphophonological evidence and the fact that both the core limited control reflexive and the managed-to reflexive can have a "managed to" reading (19 and 20), distinguishing the two uses of *-naŋət* is more problematic than distinguishing the two uses of *-sat*. It relies largely on knowing whether the suffix is attached to an unaccusative or an unergative root. However, we will see in §4 that the two types of verb described here, the core limited control reflexive and the managed-to reflexive, are distinguished by situation type.

---

[5] Gerdts (2000: 138-9) actually suggests that the form is *-nem+sat*, thereby containing the same *-sat* found in the reflexives described in §2.1. In my glosses, I have only glossed the [n] in the string [naŋət] as part of the limited control transitive, because this is the only phoneme which is shared between the limited control reflexive and the limited control transitive as it appears in non-reflexive contexts. This is an area for further analysis.

3   Background: SENĆOŦEN situation type

        In this section, I will summarise four language internal tests developed
by Kiyota (2008) to distinguish five situation types in SENĆOŦEN. The
situation types are accomplishments, achievements, activities, inchoative states,
and homogeneous states. Some of these tests are based on universal tests for
situation type, some are based on tests developed by Bar-el (2005), and some are
unique to SENĆOŦEN.
        Two of the four tests reproduced here distinguish telic or quasi-telic
events (i.e., those with an entailment or implicature of an endpoint)[6] from atelic
events (those without an inherent endpoint): 1) out-of-the-blue translations and
2) translation with perfect *ĆŁ kʷɫ*. These are discussed in §3.1. Two of the tests
distinguish accomplishments from achievements: 3) interpretation with *ĆELÁL
čəlel* 'almost' and 4) culmination cancellation. These are discussed in §3.2.

3.1   Tests distinguishing atelic from telic/quasi-telic

        Kiyota (2008: 26-33) found that predicates with an activity or state-like
semantics were consistently translated with English present tense, when
presented to a native speaker *out of the blue*, in the perfective aspect, and with
no morphological tense.

(22)   x̣ʷəŋ   θə   Mary
         cry-MID FEM.DET   Mary
         'Mary is crying.'   (Kiyota 2008: 248; my gloss)

On the other hand, predicates with an accomplishment or achievement-like
semantics were consistently translated with English past tense in out of the blue
contexts.

(23)   x̣eč-ət=sən   tsə   sčeenəx̣ʷ
         dry-C.TR=1SG.SBJ GNRL.DET   salmon
         'I dried the salmon.'   (Kiyota 2008: 250; my gloss)

        As another test for telicity, Kiyota (2008: 34-36) used the translation of
clauses containing *ĆŁ kʷɫ*, which he argues is a marker of PERFECT. Montler
(1986) shows that this particle can sometimes be translated as 'already' and
sometimes as 'starting to'. Kiyota (2008) shows that clauses translated with

---

[6] Kiyota (2008: 33) is careful to point out that accomplishments differ from achievements
in that they are not really telic in SENĆOŦEN, since they do not entail culmination. They
do have an implicature of culmination, which yields the past tense interpretations of out
of the blue accomplishments. See Matthewson (2004), Bar-el (2005), Bar-el et al. (2006),
Kiyota (2008) for discussion of the difference between achievements and
accomplishments in Salish languages.

'starting to' contain activity or state predicates (24), while clauses translated with 'already' contain accomplishment or achievement predicates (25).

(24) kʷɬ   ɬčikʷəs   tə   Jack
      PERF   get.tired   GNRL.DET   Jack
      'Jack has begun to feel tired.'   (Kiyota 2008: 34; my gloss)

(25) kʷɬ   tečəl=sən
      PERF   arrive=1SG.SBJ
      'I have (already) arrived./I am here.' (Kiyota 2008: 35; my gloss)

Kiyota (2008) follows Bar-el (2005) in arguing that the results of these tests show that activities and inchoative states are atelic: they do not contain any inherent endpoint or culmination. Accomplishments and achievements, on the other hand, do include culmination in their semantics: accomplishments have a culmination implicature and achievements have a culmination entailment (Kiyota 2008: 80; see also Bar-el 2005, Bar-el et al. 2006).

3.2   Tests for accomplishment vs. achievement

In the previous subsection, we saw that Kiyota's (2008) tests for atelicity tested both control and limited control transitives as (quasi-)telic, or containing some culmination. In this subsection, two of his tests are given which distinguish between two different kinds of telic verbs. As they are relevant to this paper, I will use control and limited control transitives, which behave differently with respect to these two tests. First, Kiyota (2007, 2008: 61-63) found that clauses containing the word ĆELÁL čəlel 'almost' have two potential interpretations when they contain accomplishment-like predicates, including control transitives. They could be interpreted either as saying that an event started but was not completed (event non-completion), or that the event almost took place but did not actually begin (event cancellation).

(26) čəlel=sən   ?i?   le-t   tsə   latem
      almost=1SG.SBJ CONTIN get.fixed-C.TR GNRL.DET   table
      'I almost started fixing my table/I almost finished fixing my table.'
                                            (Kiyota 2008: 269; my gloss)

On the other hand, clauses containing ĆELÁL čəlel 'almost' with achievement-like predicates, including limited control transitives, can only have the event non-completion interpretation, as in (27).

(27) čəlel=sən   ?i?   le-nəxʷ   tˢə   nə   snəxʷəɬ
      almost=1SG.SBJ CONTIN get.fixed-LC.TR GNRL.DET   1SG.POSS   canoe
      '*I didn't start fixing my canoe / √I started fixing my canoe, but
      didn't finish it.'   (Kiyota 2008: 270; my gloss)

Another test, adapted from Bar-el et al. (2006) and Bar-el (2005), is culmination cancellation. Kiyota (2007, 2008) shows that clauses containing accomplishment-like predicates, such as control transitives, have a culmination implicature, but can have this culmination cancelled.

(28) xʷəč-ət=sən   tə Jack ʔiʔ   ʔawa kʷ=s   xʷəy-s
      wake-C.TR=1SG.SBJ DET Jack CONTIN NEG COMP=NMLZ wake-3POSS
      'I woke up Jack but he did not wake up.'
                                        (Kiyota 2008: 265; my gloss)

Clauses containing achievements, such as limited control transitives, cannot have their culminations cancelled.

(29) # ləɬ-nəxʷ=sən   kʷsiʔə   pul ʔiʔ   ʔawa kʷ=s   ləɬ
      fill-LC.TR=1SG.SBJ REM.DEM pool CONTIN NEG COMP=NMLZ fill
      'I filled the pool but it did not get full.'
                                        (Kiyota 2008: 266; my gloss)

These distinctions are used by Kiyota (2008: 67) to argue for two fundamental distinctions between accomplishments and achievements: first, achievements contain a BECOME (change of state) event, while accomplishments contain a DO (process) event; second, achievements entail culmination, while accomplishments only contain an implicature of culmination, which can be cancelled. The first property ties in with the 'almost' test. Since achievements contain no DO event, they do not involve agency (Kiyota 2007: 291). They contain only a BECOME event, so the 'almost' refers to the culmination of the change of state. The second distinction relates to the culmination cancellation test. Since accomplishments can have their culmination cancelled, they must not entail culmination.

Kiyota (2008) found that both control and limited control transitive verbs tested as telic, but that control transitives tested as accomplishments, while limited control transitives tested as achievements. The behaviour of control transitives is consistent with Sḵwx̱wú7mesh control transitives and St'át'imcets directive transitives (Bar-el et al. 2006, Bar-el 2005). These sources do not claim explicitly that *all* control transitives are accomplishments and (for SENĆOŦEN) *all* limited control transitives are achievements, but I will take that as a hypothesis for the present paper. This sets the stage for testing one set of *intransitive* control and limited control predicates, namely reflexives. The next section shows the results of these tests.

4   Testing the situation type of SENĆOŦEN reflexives

The previous two sections provided the necessary background for testing the situation type of reflexives in SENĆOŦEN. Section 2 showed that there is evidence from several sources of a two way distinction in verbs

containing control reflexive *-sat*, and that there is some evidence for a two way distinction in verbs containing *-naŋət*. These four reflexive verb types will be the testing ground for the general question this paper begins to address: whether valence/control morphologically affects situation type in a predictable way. Section 3 provided examples of the four of Kiyota's (2008) situation type tests that will be used in this section. It also exemplified Kiyota's (2008) claim that control transitives are accomplishments while limited control transitives are achievements. We are ready now to move on to the situation type of *intransitives* which differ in control: §4.1 looks at core control reflexives, §4.2 at core limited control reflexives, §4.3 at inchoative reflexives, and §4.4 at managed-to reflexives.

4.1   Core control reflexives: Achievements

This section considers core control reflexives. Recall that these are verbs with a reflexive suffix attached to a control transitive base, which are syntactically intransitive and have a co-referential agent and patient. These test as telic according to two of Kiyota's (2008) tests: interpretation with the perfect (30-31) and translation of out of the blue sentences (32-33).

(30)   ȻŁ   W̱EĆESET   TŦE   K̠AK̠
        kʷɬ   xʷəč-ə-sət   tθə   qeq
        PERF   wake.up-C.TR-REFL   GNRL.DET   baby
        'The baby woke himself/herself up.'

(31)   ȻŁ   ȻEL,ESET   TŦE   TÁ,EȻEŁ
        kʷɬ   kʷəl̓-ə-sət   tθə   tey̓əkʷəɬ
        PERF   get.tipped-C.TR-REFL   GNRL.DET   race.canoe
        'The canoe tipped over.'

(32)   ȻEL,ESET   TŦE   TÁ,EȻEŁ
        kʷəl-ə-sət   tθə   tey̓əkʷəɬ
        get.tipped-C.TR-REFL   GNRL.DET   race.canoe
        'The canoe got tipped over, the canoe tipped over.'

(33)   K̠XESET   LÁ,E   TŦE   SȾU,ÁĆEN
        qx̌-ə-sət   le?ə   tθə   st̓ᶿəw̓ečən
        go.down-C.TR-REFL   DEM   GNRL.DEM   chair
        'He hid behind a chair.'

These two tests show that core control reflexives are either achievements or accomplishments.

In tests designed to distinguish between accomplishments and achievements, core control reflexives appear to pattern with both. When it

comes to the 'almost' test, core control reflexives can have an event cancellation reading or an event non-completion reading. Example (34) shows both.

(34) ĆELÁL I,   TSESET SEN   E   TŦE   SOŁ
čəlel   ʔiʔ   ts-ə-sət=sən   ʔə   tθə   saɫ
almost   CONTIN   get.near-C.TR-REFL=1SG.SBJ   OBL   GNRL.DET   door
'I almost got close to the door; I'm nearing the door.'

I have noticed that some predicates get a reading with *ĆELÁL čəlel* 'almost' that is not event cancellation or event non-completion. This is a reading where the event is about to take place but has not started yet, as in (35-36).

(35) ĆELÁL   I,   BȻESET   TŦE   MO,EḰ
čəlel   ʔiʔ   ṗkʷ-ə-sət   tθə   maʔəqʷ
almost   CONTIN   surface-C.TR-REFL   GNRL.DET   duck
'The duck's ready to surface (looking for food, getting ready).'

(36) ĆELÁL   I,   ȾÁȻESET SEN
čəlel   ʔiʔ   ƛ̓ᶿekʷ-ə-sət=sən
almost   CONTIN   wash-C.TR-REFL=1SG.SBJ
'It's almost time for me to wash up.'

I take this reading to be similar to the event cancellation reading, which is only available with accomplishments, since it suggests some intention on the part of the agent to carry out the event.

Although they behave like accomplishments with respect to the 'almost' test, it seems that core control reflexives behave like achievements with respect to the culmination cancellation test. Examples (37-38) show that control reflexives entail culmination, like other achievements.

(37) #ṗkʷ-ə-sət=sən
#surface-C.TR-REFL=1SG.SBJ
    ʔiʔ   ʔəwə   kʷ-nə=s   ʔəne   ṗəkʷ
    CONTIN   NEG   COMP-1SG.POSS=NMLZ   come   surface
'I'm surfacing but I can't seem to reach the surface.'

(38) #xʷəč-ə-sət   θə   Katie
#wake.up-C.TR-REFL   FEM.DET   Katie
    ʔiʔ   ʔəwə   kʷ=s   xʷəy-s
    CONTIN   NEG   COMP=NMLZ   wake.up-3POSS
'Katie woke up but she's not awake.'

In addition, sometimes an imperfective control reflexive describes the stages leading up to the event, a typical property of achievements (Smith 1997: 172).

(39) I,   ĆEL,SET   TŦE   TⱢ,EĆEŁ
      ʔiʔ   kʷəl-sət   tθə   teẏəkʷəɫ
      CONTIN   get.tipped-[C.TR]REFL\IPFV GNRL.DET race.canoe
      'The canoe is on the verge of tipping over.' (not 'in the process')

The results shown here suggest that core control transitive reflexives share some
properties with achievements, and some with accomplishments. This duality will
be discussed further in §5.

4.2   Core limited control reflexives: Achievements

        This section looks at core limited control reflexives. Recall that these
are verbs with the suffix -*naŋət*, which I assumed in §2 include a limited control
transitive suffix. The roots of core limited control reflexives are normally
unaccusative, and they have a reflexive use involving limited agent control.
They test as accomplishments or achievements ((quasi-)telic predicates) with
respect to Kiyota's (2008) perfect test and "out of the the blue" translation test.
With both they have a past tense, completed translation.

(40) ĆŁ   ĆÁLNOṈET   TŦE   HOLES
      kʷɫ   kʷel-n-aŋət   tθə   haləs
      PERF hide-LC.TR-LC.REFL GNRL.DET Horace
      'Horace managed to hide.'

(41) ĆŁ   MÁĆEŁNOṈET SEN
      kʷɫ   mekʷəɫ-n-aŋət=sən
      PERF get.hurt-LC.TR-LC.REFL=1SG.SBJ
      'I hurt myself.'

(42) TEĆNOṈET   TŦE   LETÁM
      təkʷ-n-aŋət   tθə   lətem
      break-LC.TR-LC.REFL GNRL.DET table
      'The table broke (i.e., under a heavy load).

(43) QÁSNOṈET SEN
      ƙʷes-n-aŋət=sən
      get.hot-LC.TR-LC.REFL
      'I burned myself.'

Like limited control transitives, they pattern with achievements with respect to
the 'almost' and culmination cancellation tests. With ĆELÁL *čəlel* 'almost', it
seems that core limited control reflexives cannot have an event cancellation
reading.

(44) ĆELÁL I,   QÁSNOṈET SEN
     čəlel   ʔi?   ḱʷes-n-aŋət=sən
     almost CONTIN burn-LC.TR-LC.REFL=1SG.SBJ
     'I almost burned myself.'

It appears that in some cases they cannot event take *ĆELÁL čəlel* 'almost':

(45) #čəlel ʔi?   x̣ʷiĺ-n-aŋət   tθə   sƛ̓əliƛ̓qəɬ
      almost CONTIN get.lost-LC.TR-LC.REFL GNRL.DET child<PL>
      attempt at: 'The child almost got lost.'

More testing is required of core limited control reflexives to confirm that they really do behave like achievements.

When it comes to culmination cancellation, core limited control reflexives cannot have their culmination cancelled.

(46) ??mekʷəɬ-n-aŋət=sən   ʔi?   ʔəwə kʷ=s   mekʷəɬ
      get.hurt-LC.TR-LC.REFL=1SG.SBJ CONTIN NEG COMP=NMLZ get.hurt
      'I got hurt but I didn't get hurt.'
      Speaker's comment: "He admits he hurt himself, but then says he's not hurt!?"

(47) X̣IL,NOṈET   TŦE   STITETḰEŁ
      x̣iɬ-n-aŋət   tθə   sƛ̓iƛ̓əƛ̓qəɬ
      get.lost-LC.TR-LC.REFL   GNRL.DET   child
          I,   EWE ȻS   X̣IL,S
          ʔi?   ʔəwə kʷ=s   x̣ʷiɬ-s
          CONTIN NEG COMP=NMLZ get.lost-3POSS
      'The young boy got lost. He doesn't usually get lost.'

Note how in (47) the attempted culmination cancellation is interpreted as a separate phrase concerning the boy's habits. He is still lost. It appears that core limited control reflexives, like limited control transitives, are achievements.

4.3   Inchoative reflexives: Activities

This section considers the situation type of inchoative reflexives, verbs with an inchoative meaning that contain a reflexive suffix *-sat* attached directly to a stative root. These behave differently from core control reflexives with respect to Kiyota's (2008) tests. They pattern as atelic with the perfect and in out of context translations. The translations of (48-51) are all inceptive and ongoing, as is the case with activities and inchoative states.

(48) JÁN U, ȻŁ SĆUÁTSET ŦE SŁÁNI,
      čen ?əẁ kʷł sčuet-sət θə słenəẏ
      really CONTR PERF smart-REFL FEM.DET woman
      'The woman's getting really smart/really good at it.'

(49) kʷł x̌əm-sat tə qeq
      PERF heavy-REFL GNRL.DET baby
      'The baby is getting heavier.' (Kiyota 2008: 254)

(50) MIMENEK̲ENSET
      mimən-əqən-sət
      small-LSvoice-REFL
      'getting a small voice'

(51) ĆEK̲SOT TŦE SOŁ
      čəq-sat tθə sał
      big-REFL GNRL.DET road
      'The road is getting bigger.'

These tests show that inchoative reflexives are atelic; this means they are either activities (homogeneous processes containing an inception into the process) or they are inchoative states (predicates describing a change into a state; term is due to Bar-el 2005). One way in which activities and inchoative states differ is in their interpretation in the imperfective. Imperfective activities have a progressive reading (52), while imperfective inchoative states have a result state reading (53).

(52) I, ŚETEN̲, ŦE KÁ,N̲I,
      ?i? šətəṅ θə q̇eṅəẏ
      CONTIN walk\IPFV FEM.DET young.woman
      'The young woman is walking.'

(53) EWES U, SETKT ŦE Katie.
      ?əwəs ?əẁ sətq̇-t θə Katie.
      NEG CONTIN get.disturbed\IPFV-C.TR FEM.DET Katie
        DEDAY,EK.
        ła~łeẏəq̇
        IPFV~get.mad
      'Don't disturb Katie. She's mad.' (not 'She's getting mad')

Imperfective inchoative reflexives have an ongoing, rather than a result state reading.

(54) QEQÁSSET   TŦE   SȻEȻEL,
      k̓ʷə~k̓es-sət   tθə   skʷəkʷəl
      IPFV~warm-REFL   GNRL.DET   sun
      'The sun's getting warm.' (not 'the sun is warm')

Therefore, inchoative reflexives appear to pattern as activities.

4.4 Managed-to reflexives: Accomplishments

The last type of reflexive considered here is the managed-to reflexive. This is a verb containing *-naŋat* attached directly to an unergative root. Managed-to reflexives pattern as telic (accomplishments or achievements) with respect to Kiyota's (2008) perfect test and out of the blue translation test. Both tests yield a past tense, completed translation.

(55) ȻŁ   NEK̓NO̱NET   ŦE   Katie
      kʷɬ   nəqʷ-naŋət   θə   Katie
      PERF fall.asleep-LC.REFL FEM.DET   Katie
      'Katie fell asleep.'

(56) ȻŁ   ŦIŁE̱NNO̱NET   ŦE   NE   TÁN
      kʷɬ   θiɬəŋ-naŋət   θə   nə   ten
      PERF stand.up-LC.REFL   GNRL.DET   1SG.POSS mother
      'My mother was able to stand up.'

(57) DOQNO̱NET SEN
      ƛ̓ak̓ʷ-naŋət=sən
      go.home-LC.REFL=1SG.SBJ
      'I finally got home.'

(58) SȻUÁTNO̱NET   TŦE   STELITḴEŁ
      sč̓uet-naŋət   tθə   sƛ̓<əl>i?ƛqəɬ
      be.smart-LC.REFL   GNRL.DET   children<PL>
      'The children got smarter.'

With respect to the 'almost' test and the culmination cancellation test, managed-to reflexives appear to behave like accomplishments. With ĆELÁL *čəlel* 'almost', they can have either the event non-culmination reading, or the event cancellation reading only available to accomplishments.

(59) ĆELÁL I,   DÁJEKNO̱NET   ŦE   Katie
      čəlel ?i?   ƛ̓ečəq̓-naŋət   θə   Katie
      almost CONTIN get.angry-LC.REFL FEM.DET   Katie
      'Katie almost got mad, Katie's darn near getting mad/Katie's losing her temper.'

(60) ĆELÁL   I,   DOQNOṈET SEN
     čəlel   ʔi?   ƚaƙʷ-naŋət=sən
     almost CONTIN go.home-LC.REFL=1SG.SBJ
     'I almost made it home (I haven't left yet OR I'm on the way).'

Preliminary testing shows that managed-to reflexives can have their culmination cancelled, another property of accomplishments.

(61) DOQNOṈET SEN   I,   W̱UÁ SEN SE,   JÁṈ,
     ƚaƙʷ-naŋət=sən   ʔi?   xʷəẃe=sən=sə?   čeŋ̓
     go.home-LC.REFL=1SG.SBJ CONTIN   yet=1SG.SBJ=FUT be.home
     'I was going to go home, and I still haven't made it home.'

It thus appears that the managed-to reflexives differ from core limited reflexives in their situation type, as they are accomplishments. However, further testing is required to confirm the situation type of managed-to reflexives.

4.5   Reflexives compared

Table 2 summarises the situation type tests applied to all four reflexive types. This table shows an interesting result: core control reflexives appear to pattern with control transitives as accomplishments when it comes to the 'almost' test. However, they pattern with core limited control reflexives as achievements with respect to the culmination cancellation test. The table also shows how the non-core uses of the reflexive suffixes yield different situation types from the core uses: the inchoative reflexives test as activities, while the managed-to reflexives seem to be accomplishments.

Table 2 Summary of situation type tests applied to reflexives

	Perfect	Out of the blue	Almost	Culmination cancellation
Core control reflexives *ƙʷənsət* 'look at self'	Telic	Telic	Accomplishment	Achievement
Core limited control reflexives *mekʷəɬnaŋət* 'hurt self'	Telic	Telic	Achievement	Achievement
Inchoative reflexives *sčuetsət* 'get smart'	Atelic	Atelic		
Managed-to reflexives *nəqʷnanət* 'fall asleep'	Telic	Telic	Accomplishment	Accomplishment

5 Discussion: core control reflexives

This paper has begun to examine whether the effect of valence/morphology on situation type is systematic and predictable in SENĆOŦEN. Preliminary evidence was found on the basis of four of Kiyota's (2008) tests suggesting that it is. It appears that the four types of reflexive behave differently with respect to the situation type tests. However, one interesting result is that the core control reflexives pattern with accomplishments *and* achievements. I suggest that this is because the two tests used to distinguish accomplishments and achievements here pick out different properties. The 'almost' test distinguishes accomplishments from achievements on the basis of the DO event, while the culmination cancellation test distinguishes accomplishments from a achievements on the basis of culmination entailments (Kiyota 2007, 2008).

Before applying Kiyota's (2008) tests to the reflexives, I had expected control reflexives to behave like control transitives as accomplishments, since both contain a subject representing a semantic agent with control over the event. In addition, Jacobs (to appear) has found that control verbs in Sḵwx̱ú7mesh behave like accomplishments with respect to culmination cancellation. SENĆOŦEN core control reflexives do not behave like accomplishments with respect to culmination cancellation, but they do behave like accomplishments with respect to the 'almost' test. I suggest that this results from their containing a DO event, as discussed in Kiyota (2007) for control transitives. Since core

control reflexives have an agent with a normal amount of control, some intention is possible. With an event cancellation reading, or the readings where the event has not started yet, 'almost' tells us that the agent is or was intending to carry out the event.

In terms of culmination cancellation, core control reflexives pattern not with control transitives, but with *unaccusatives*. Within work on other Salish languages, both Gerdts (1989) and Davis & Demirdache (2000) discuss similarities between unaccusatives and reflexives. Both also refer to work on Romance languages, where parallels between the two are also found. Within Relational Grammar, Gerdts (1989: 267, 272) treats the Halkomelem -$\theta \partial t$ reflexives as referring to an initial object (in RG terms, the head of a 2-arc). She cites work by Rosen (1981/1988) on Italian, where reflexives take the same past tense auxiliary as unaccusatives, *essere*.

Davis & Demirdache (2000) discuss Chierchia's (1989/2004) proposal that unaccusatives are underlying causatives involving a type of reflexivization. They also show that St'át'imcets, like Italian, has unaccusative verbs with morphological/syntactic reflexive marking. Similar examples are found in SENĆOŦEN, as in (12), repeated as (62) here, where Katie is a semantic patient and the reflexive suggests that there was no external agent which caused the waking up.

(62)   **W̱EĆESET**   ŦE   Katie
          x^{w}əč-ə-sət   θə   Katie
          wake.up-C.TR-REFL FEM.DET   Katie
          'Katie woke herself up.'

Recall that the distinction between accomplishments and achievements in SENĆOŦEN which is picked out by the culmination cancellation test is related to telicity. Achievements are fully telic, since they entail culmination. In Kiyota's (2008) formalization, they contain a BECOME subevent. It makes sense that core reflexives, both control and limited control, are fully telic, since they have a subject participant which is affected by the event; i.e., undergoes a change of state. This property they share with unaccusatives.

Only a small number of verbs have been tested at the time of writing this paper. If the patterns observed so far turn out to hold, they may provide evidence that a finer grained classification of situation types is necessary for SENĆOŦEN. Since achievements differ from accomplishments in two respects (DO event and culmination entailment), it is logically possible for an event to behave like an accomplishment in one respect and like an achievement in the other. This seems to be the case with core control reflexives. The duality ultimately results from the fact that their subject is both an agent with control and an affected patient.

6   Conclusion

This paper has provided evidence that the distinction among reflexive uses in Halkomelem discussed by Gerdts (2000) is found in SENĆOŦEN too. Both the control reflexive suffix -*sat* and the limited control reflexive suffix -*naŋət* are found on verbs that do not have a core reflexive meaning. The verbs derived from these non-core uses of the reflexive suffixes behave differently with respect to situation type from the core reflexives and from each other. Inchoative reflexives appear to be activities, while managed-to reflexives appear to be accomplishments.

The tests used in this paper have also shown that core reflexives pattern with both accomplishments and achievements. I suggested in §5 that this results from dual nature of their subject, which is both an agent with control and an affected patient. The presence of an agent with control suggests that they contain a DO event, like accomplishments; however, the patient subject suggests that they share properties with unaccusatives, which also entail culmination.

The investigation undertaken in this paper contributes to work on the nature of situation types in Salish languages, and to the interaction of morphology and semantics. The results are preliminary; many more verbs would need to be tested to draw stronger conclusions. However, they suggest that the presence of valence/control morphology in SENĆOŦEN, and perhaps in other Salish languages, can be used to predict the situation type of a verb. Further research includes testing other valence/control categories, such as control and limited control reciprocals; and determining whether the availability of grammatical aspects can also predict a predicate's situation type. In addition, I have considered only some of Kiyota's (2008) situation type tests. This research would benefit from looking at other tests. The current paper is intended as a starting point for investigating the relationship between valence/control morphology and situation type in SENĆOŦEN beyond control and limited control transitives.

Appendix: Glossing abbreviations

AUX=auxiliary; C=control; COMP=complementizer; CONTIN=continuing; CONTR=contrastive; DEM=demonstrative; DET=determiner; ERG=ergative; FEM=feminine; FUT=future; GNRL=general; IPFV=imperfective; LC=limited.control; LOCAT=locational; MID=middle; NEG=negative; NMLZ=nominalizer; OBJ=object; OBL=oblique; PERF=perfect; PL=plural; POSS=possessive; PROX=proximal; REFL=reflexive; REM=remote; SG=singular.

Glossing follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules where possible. Please note that = in the glosses separates a clitic from its host, and -LS is used to indicate a lexical suffix.

References

Bar-el, Leora. 2005. Aspectual distinctions in Skwxwú7mesh. Vancouver: University of British Columbia. PhD Thesis.

Bar-el, Leora, Henry Davis & Lisa Matthewson. 2006. On non-culminating accomplishments. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society*, ed. by Leah Bateman & Cherlon Ussery. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. A semantics for unaccusatives and its syntactic consequences. ms. Published 2004 in *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Martin Everaert, 22-59. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, Henry & Hamida Demirdache. 2000. On lexical verb meanings: Evidence from Salish. In *Events as Grammatical Objects*, ed. by Carol Tenny & James Pustejovsky, 97-141. Stanford: CSLI.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1989. Relational parameters of reflexives: the Halkomelem evidence. In *Theoretical Perspectives on Native American Languages*, ed. by Donna B. Gerdts & Karin Michelson, 259-280. New York: State University of New York Press.

Gerdts, Donna B. 2000. Combinatory restrictions on Halkomelem reflexives and reciprocals. In *Reciprocals*, ed. by Zygmunt Frajzyngier, 145-60. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jacobs, Peter. 2007. Txw as an out of control marker in Skwxwú7mesh. In *Papers for the 42nd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, ed. by Kristín M. Jóhannsdóttir & Martin A. Oberg, 256-284. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics.

Jacobs, Peter. to appear. Control, aspect and event structure in Skwxwú7mesh. University of British Columbia. PhD Thesis.

Kiyota, Masaru. 2007. Aspectual properties of unaccusatives and transitives in Sənčáθən. In *Papers for the 42nd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, ed. by Kristín M. Jóhannsdóttir & Martin A. Oberg, 285-292. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics.

Kiyota, Masaru. 2008. Situation aspect and viewpoint aspect: From Salish to Japanese. University of British Columbia. PhD Thesis.

Krifka, Manfred. 1989. Nominal reference, temporal constitution and quantification in event semantics. In *Semantics and Contextual Expression*, ed. by Renate Bartsch, Johan van Benthem & Peter van Emde Boas, 75-115. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Montler, Timothy R. 1986. *An outline of the morphology and phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish.* Missoula, MT: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics.

Rosen, Carol. 1981. *The Relational Structure of Reflexive Clauses: Evidence from Italian*. Harvard University. PhD thesis. Published 1988. New York/London: Garland.

Smith, Carlota S. 1997. *The Parameter of Aspect.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Suttles, Wayne. 2004. *Musqueam Reference Grammar*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Tenny, Carol. 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Verkuyl, Henk J. 1972. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Claire K. Turner
c.turner@surrey.ac.uk