

Thompson Salish // -xi//

Laurence C. Thompson
 M. Terry Thompson
 University of Hawaii

A common transitive stem is created in Thompson by addition of the element // -xi// directly before the transitivizing // -t// (followed in turn by object and subject or detransitivizing [reflexive or reciprocal] suffix). At first it is easy to suppose that the meaning is 'benefactive'; e.g.

- (1) q^winxⁱcn //q^win-xi-t-si-en// 'I spoke for you'; cf.
 q^wincⁱn //q^win-t-si-en// 'I spoke to you'¹
- (2) čəq^wxite //čəq^w-xi-t-è// 'write [a letter] to her!' or
 '...for her'; cf. čəq^wtéte //čəq^w-t[et]-è// 'write
 it!' (reduplicative // [ét]// inserted under stress before imperative ending)
- (3) mlámxtye //mlám-xi-t-ey-è// 'bless it for us!' (used in
 before-meal prayer); cf. mlámetye //mlám-n-t-ey-è//
 'bless us!' (// -n// 'control')
- (4) ʔ^wyáqsxcms //ʔ^wəy-aqs-xi-t-sem-es// 'he turned on the
 light [orig. lit the torch] for me'; cf. ʔ^wyáqses
 //ʔ^wəy-aqs-n-t-es// 'he turned on the light' (// -aqs//
 'nose; front or functional end of something')
- (5) q^wícxⁱc //q^wícxⁱ-xi-t-es// 'she did his laundry'; cf.
 q^wíces //q^wícxⁱ-n-t-es// 'she did the laundry'
- (6) q^woʔ^wxítis //q^wəʔ^w-xi-t-ey-es// 'they made it cheaper
 for us, gave us a discount'; cf. q^woʔ^wtéys //q^wəʔ^w-

t-ey-es// 'they forced us to lower our price'

But other cases shortly appear that require a 'malefactive' qualification; e.g.

- (7) ?úq^we?xcms //?úq^we?-xi-t-sem-es// tə tíy 'she drank my tea up on me'; cf. ?úq^we?s //?úq^we?-n-t-es// 'she drank it'
- (8) má^hxtimes //má^h-xi-t-uym-es// tə széltep 'he broke you people's dish'; cf. má^hes //má^h-n-t-es// 'he broke it'
- (9) ciqnwéxcmx^w //cíq-nwéñ-xi-t-sem-ex^w// 'you (accidentally) dug up my [flowers] on me'; cf. ciqnwéñx^w //cíq-nwéñ-t-ex^w// 'you dug them up (accidentally)' (//-nwéñ// 'reduced control')
- (10) cúiqsxtx^w //cúí-aqs-xi-t-ex^w// 'you pointed the gun [aborig. bow and arrow] at him'; cf. cúiqsm //cúí-aqs-ǎme// 'aim a gun' (//-ǎme// 'middle voice')

Still other examples carry little or no connotation of either benefit or ill effect; e.g.

- (11) wíkcñ //wík-xi-t-si-en// 'I see what you have' or 'I see your tracks'; cf. wíkcñ //wík-t-si-en// 'I see you'
- (12) nexíc //nehe-xi-t-es// 'he pronounced her name'; cf. netés //nehe-t-es// 'he pronounced a name'
- (13) xíxíc //xəy-xi-t-es// 'she asked him for it (something he had)'; cf. xítés //xəy-t-es// 'she requested it'
- (14) q^wu?xítne //q^wəw-xi-t-enè// 'I set a trap for it [a par-

ticular animal]'; cf. $\acute{q}^w u^? t \acute{e} n e$ // $\acute{q}^w \acute{a} w - t - e n \acute{e}$ // 'I trapped it'

- (15) $k^w i y x t i s$ // $k^w i y - x i - t - e y - e s$ // 'she shows it to us, faces us with it'; cf. $k^w i y \acute{e} s$ // $k^w i y - n - t - e s$ // 'she sets it up facing [a particular direction (esp. the sun)]'

As we might expect, some cases show specialization of meaning; e.g.

- (16) $n \acute{c} \acute{q} \acute{u} s x c$ // $n \acute{a} - \acute{c} \acute{a} \acute{q} - u s - x i - t - e s$ // 'they added something to the contributions for a feast'; cf. $n \acute{c} \acute{q} \acute{u} s e s$ // $n \acute{a} - \acute{c} \acute{a} \acute{q} - u s - n - t - e s$ // 'they hit him in the eye' (// $n \acute{a} - \dots - u s$ // 'eye')

- (17) $k \acute{a} s x i c m s$ // $k \acute{a} s - x i - t - s e m - e s$ // $t \acute{a} n s k^w \acute{e} z e^?$ 'they refused my daughter [as wife for their son]'; cf. $k \acute{a} s t$ // $k \acute{a} s - t$ // 'bad; ugly; ill-tempered' (// $-t$ // 'immediate aspect'), $k \acute{a} s c \acute{u} t$ // $k \acute{a} s - t - s u t$ // 'say no [to a marriage proposal]' (// $-s u t$ // 'reflexive', also specialized)

In a number of cases one can see that the beneficial or detrimental effect has to do with the semantic coverage of the root. In addition to examples 3, 5, 8, 10, 17 above, note the following:

- (18) $y \acute{e} x i c m x^w$ // $y \acute{a} h - x i - t - s e m - e x^w$ // 'you make me happy'; cf. $y \acute{e}$ // $y \acute{a} h$ // 'it's good'
- (19) $c e^? x^w m i x c$ // $c e^? e x^w - m i n - x i - t - e s$ // 'he congratulates her'; cf. $c e^? x^w m i n s$ // $c e^? e x^w - m i n - t - e s$ // 'he's happy to see her' or 'he appreciates it'

Cognate formations have been observed in many other Salish languages and it is instructive to review what other scholars have said about them.

For neighboring and closely related Shuswap: describing eastern dialects, Gibson (1973:34f) treats this suffix in the category of voice, which 'describes the relationship between the referents and the activity'—here '///-xi// benefactive—subject/agent acts on behalf of object/patient'; covering northern and western dialects, Kuipers (1974:46f) considers it one of three 'complex transitivizers—...-x(i)t- refers to a human secondary object, usually a benefactive, in a minority of cases to another object-type ("refuse somebody [something]", etc.)'

In Coeur d'Alene and Kalispel it is interesting to note that the cognate suffixes function in intransitive as well as transitive formations. Under the category 'syntactic suffixes...showing relationships between different parts of the sentence...datives', Reichard (1938:625f; orthography converted to conform to current practice) gives '-šit...as a favor to' and '-šiš...something, for someone...used with an intransitive...to complete the meaning and may be translated as an indefinite pronoun. If used with the transitive it means "for someone"'. (Johnson 1975:36 gives underlying representations for these with glosses as follows: '-šət as a favor to, -šiš indefinite pronoun'.) Vogt (1940:31f; orthography likewise converted) has a category of 'relative forms' in his Class III and IV verbs in Kalispel: 'The suffix -š, in the suffix-stressed verbs -šiš-, expresses that the action takes place for someone'. For Spokane dialect, Carlson (1972:106f) terms it 'substitutive, ... [which] conveys the meaning that a particular course of action is being followed by a person in place of another person who might otherwise be

doing it... Although these stems occur in organization with the transitive pronouns, they are not completely transitive. They may not take a separate object adjunct. Thus they are different from the semantically similar relational forms with *//-i-//...* The transitive pronouns with substitutive forms serve to denote the person substituting (subject) and the person substituted for (object). Reichard (626) notes a Coeur d'Alene cognate *'-i* in behalf of, instead of', so that the two languages seem to have parallel systems at this point. It seems likely that both Kalispel and Coeur d'Alene have a suffix *//-ši//*, cognate with Thompson and Shuswap *//-xi//*, with vowel reduction or loss under weak stress; the longer sequence *-šiš* probably contains that suffix followed by another, which is perhaps an indefinite object marker. This final *-š* may be cognate with Lushootseed (Puget Sound Salish) *-š*, which derives a few special transitives (Hess 1967:19), and Thompson *-x*, of uncertain function because of limited examples, but probably referring to a goal unspecified or clear in the context (*kíc-x* 'he got there, reached a place just referred to'; cf. *kícecms //kíc-n-t-sem-es//* 'he came to my place, paid me a visit').

For Okanagan Watkins (1970:210) gives *'-xt* "dative: to or for a person or thing" (Head of the Lake dialect). Mattina (1973:44f) says *'//-x(i)-t//* may be suffixed to any base to indicate action on behalf of (even if the action is directed against, or to the detriment of) the recipient. It is a sort of "dative of interest." *//-i-t//* optionally replaces either *//-n-t//* or *//-s-t//* to introduce a third party, which is then usually specified by a complement,

or is clearly understood in context' (Colville dialect). Okanagan then, has much the same system as Kalispel and Coeur d'Alene along these lines. M. Dale Kinkade (p.c.) reports a similar opposition in Columbian. Neither Shuswap nor Thompson, however, seems to have a productive *//-ɬ//* of this sort; their *//-xi//* may well have taken over also the functions of an original **-ɬ*.

The coastal languages, as currently described, offer less information on this matter than we should like, but even so the distribution of cognate suffixes seems clearly to indicate a Proto-Salish element **-xi* with much the function we have been observing. Tillamook probably has a system much like that of Thompson: Edel (1939:33; orthography converted) combines *-š(ɪ)-t* with what is presumably an unrelated suffix string *-s(ə)-t*—'In order to express an indirect relationship between subject and object...a special suffix *-sət (-šit)*, with regard to, is used.' Upper Chehalis also shows a cognate, *{-še}* for, to, on, which Kinkade (1964:39) classes as a 'positional suffix'; he indicates '...it appears to be fairly productive. It is always followed by subclass I object suffixes', which fall into what he calls (48) the 'T-group'—i.e. involving mostly *t* or *c* at the beginning. This looks like the **-t* 'transitive', which it seems reasonable to suppose was Proto-Salish.

The southern dialects of Lushootseed (Snyder 1968:38-41) seem to have both *-ɬ* and *-š(e)*, and the two can co-occur (in that order): 'The term "positional" voice has been adopted to indicate the general semantic category to which *-š* has been assigned. The seventh order morph */-š¹/* indicates that the subject changes the location,

position, or possession of an object... {-i} indicates an object which belongs to the subject... Morph sequences such as.../-š-e-d/ indicate that the subject is acting upon an object in relation to someone else.' Northern dialects have a suffix with a similar function, but its shape is -yi; Hess (1967:42f) terms it "'transferred responsibility"... Someone else is responsible for an act; the expected agent is replaced by some other actor. The English glosses... usually involve either "do something for someone" or "take something away from someone".'

Kuipers (1967:78f) lists Squamish /-šit/ as one of 'three complex transitivizers..., all referring to an object which is only indirectly involved in the action expressed by the stem... /-šit/ refers to the destinee of the action (do for, give to, take from; in all my examples the destinee is human)'. Information on this sort of construction is not yet available for Bella Coola, but it is interesting to note that Newman (1969:299) refers to a particle x 'indirective'.

What these uses do have in common is displacement of the emphasis from the reporting of an activity to the effect on a particular person or thing—the sort of meanings expressed in many familiar languages by a dative type of case relationship. Note the English translations of a number of our Thompson examples: 'I spoke for you', 'write to her/for her!', 'bless it for us!', 'he turned on the light for me', 'you pointed the gun at him', 'I set a trap for it', 'she drank my tea up on me'. But it turns out that in Thompson the situations are handled in reverse fashion—what is a

sort of "dative of interest" in many languages corresponds to a direct object in Thompson, while the element corresponding to the direct object of those other languages is cast in Thompson as an oblique (indirect) complement.

We need to examine a major syntactic pattern of the language in order to see how this works. Thompson can specify the reference of third-person entities implicit in predicates through noun-phrase-like elements following them. Phrases of one type, which we call complements, are marked by proclitic particles to clarify their relation to their respective predicates.² The particle (h)e 'direct' marks a complement specifying the subject of an intransitive predicate or the patient-subject of a passive transitive predicate:

(20) q^wcōc e tmix^w 'it's an earthquake' ('it-moves-uncontrolled direct earth') (intransitive)

(21) nīketm e n^ʔyōns 'he had an abdominal operation' ('it-is-cut direct his-belly') (passive)

With a third-person possessed form, the possessor is specified:

(22) nk^wuk^wtōns e séytkm̄x 'it is the people's blessing' ('their-blessing direct people')

With active transitives, direct complements specify primarily objects, although where first- or second-person objects are specified (within the predicate), direct complements clarify the reference of the third-person subject:

(23) qāyēs e snūk^we^ʔs 'he shot his friend' ('he-shoots-him direct his-friend') (object)

(24) nk^wāncēms e q^wūw^ʔ 'the water poisoned me' ('it-poisons-me

direct water') (subject)

The particle *tə* 'oblique' marks a complement specifying an entity logically related to the predicate:

- (25) *łəit kn tə čil'* 'I got stuck up with pitch' ('sticky I oblique pitch')
- (26) *nq'ecewil tə scəkmīn* 'the [railroad] car is full of wood-chips' ('full-conveyance oblique wood-chips')
- (27) *q'écne tə sła'xāns* 'I filled him up with food' ('I-fill-him oblique food')
- (28) *pūt kn xè'e tə tīy* 'I've had enough tea now' ('suffice I nearby oblique tea')

Agents with third-person passives are handled in this way (subjects marked with (h)e 'direct'):

- (29) *qáyetm tə snúk'w'e?s* 'he was shot by his friend' ('he-is-shot oblique his-friend')
- (30) *nme'nústm tə sq'uyi? e sk'ák'wes* 'a cloud covered the sun' ('it-gets-eye-shaded oblique uncontrolled-clouding direct sun')

Now certain roots regularly imply two objects—like the ditransitive verbs of many other languages. The interesting feature, however, is that what in English would be indirect object is marked by the direct complement particle—

- (31) *nténe he nsinci?* 'I gave it to my younger brother' ('I-give-it-to-him direct my-younger-brother')

while what would be the English direct object appears introduced by the oblique particle—

- (32) $\acute{n}t\acute{e}ne\ t\acute{o}\ q^w\acute{u}w'$ 'I gave him some water' ('I-give-it-to-him oblique water')

In other words, the construction is more like that of English expressions such as They presented us with a new problem, She entertained them with a song, They showered her with gifts, He rewarded her with a smile, He sold me on the value of this property, and so on.

It is clear from paradigmatic material that the incorporated objects in transitive forms are direct objects in this sense:

- (33) $\acute{n}c\acute{e}ms\ t\acute{o}\ q^w\acute{u}w'$ 'he gave me some water'
 (34) $\acute{n}c\acute{i}s\ t\acute{o}\ q^w\acute{u}w'$ 'he gave you some water'
 (35) $\acute{n}t\acute{e}s\ e\ s\acute{i}nci?s\ t\acute{o}\ q^w\acute{u}w'$ 'he gave his younger brother some water'

The syntax of // -xi// transitives is consistently of this type:

- (36) $k^w\acute{e}nxc\ t\acute{o}\ sq^wn\acute{o}x^w's$ 'he diagnosed her illness' ('he-regards-xi-her oblique her-being-sick')
 (37) $?e\ pi?px\acute{i}cmx^w\ t\acute{o}\ nq^wisqn$ 'you might lose my axe' ('advance-notice you-come-to-lose-xi-me oblique my-axe')

What emerges, then, is that // -xi// transitives convert ordinary roots to this same status. With simple transitive inflection most roots refer to persons, animals, or inanimate things as direct goals of their action. Overt specification of this goal is made with a direct complement introduced by (h)e:

- (38) $w\acute{i}ktx^w\ e\ sm\acute{u}lec$ 'you see the woman' ('you-see-her direct woman')

// -xi// redefines the goal as the entity³ affected or interested,

still marked as a direct complement and thus in primary focus, but the action itself is redirected toward a goal related to this entity:

(39) $wikxtx^w$ e $smúlec$ 'you see what the woman has'

Considering this unifying function of these forms we have adopted the term indirective for them. Many roots whose transitives, by virtue of their semantic coverage, would normally not take a personal goal at all appear with // -xi// and such personal goals:

(40) $má'xtx^w$ e $smúlec$ 'you smashed the one belonging to the woman'

If the real thing affected by the action (what in English would be the direct object) is specified in Thompson, it is introduced by means of a complement introduced by $tə$ 'oblique':

(41) $má'xtx^w$ e $smúlec$ $tə$ $szélts$ 'you smashed the woman's dish' ('... oblique her-dish')

This formation is extremely frequent. Taken together with the ditransitive roots it appears an important characteristic of the language of considerable typological interest. Indications are it is a general Salishan phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A grammar of Spokane: a Salish language of eastern Washington. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 4:4.
- Edel, May Mandelbaum. 1939. The Tillamook language. IJAL 10.1-57.
- Gibson, James A. 1973. Shuswap grammatical structure. University

- of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5:5.
- Hess, Thomas M. 1967. Snohomish grammatical structure. University of Washington dissertation.
- Johnson, Robert E. 1975. The role of phonetic detail in Coeur d'Alene phonology. Washington State University dissertation.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1964. Phonology and morphology of Upper Chehalis: III. IJAL 30.32-61.
- Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. The Squamish language. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 73.) The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1974. The Shuswap language. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 225.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1973. Colville grammatical structure. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5:4.
- Newman, Stanley. 1969. Bella Coola paradigms. IJAL 35.299-306.
- Reichard, Gladys A. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. HAIL 3.517-707.
- Snyder, Warren A. 1968. Southern Puget Sound Salish: phonology and morphology. Sacramento Anthropological Society Paper 8.
- Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson. In press. Thompson. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 16, Languages, ed. by Ives Goddard. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel language. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.
- Watkins, Donald. 1970. A description of the phonemes and position classes in the morphology of Head of the Lake Okanagan (Salish). University of Alberta dissertation.

FOOTNOTES

¹We acknowledge gratefully support from the National Science Foundation and the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund (Whatcom Museum, Bellingham, Washington), which has made possible the assembling of data on this language over the last several years. We are also grateful to Annie York of Spuzzum, B.C., who has patiently furnished the material represented here as well as endless other details about her language and has regularly offered invaluable insights about them.

Examples are given here in autonomous phonemic transcription; forms involving // -xi// and those contrasting with them are further given in (morphophonemic) underlying representation, with morphemes separated by hyphens. Thompson predicative words generally do not mark either tense or the animateness, sex, or number of third person entities; such details are added in glosses here representing the situations covered by the utterances cited. Longer sentences are supplied more literal renderings in which each successive Thompson word is glossed by a word or words strung together by hyphens. Recurring elements are: object morphemes // -sem// 'me', // -si// 'you (sg.)', // -ey// 'us', // -uym// 'you people' (third person object is zero); subject morphemes // -en, -enè// 'I', // -ex^w// 'you (sg.)', // -es// 'he, she, it, they', // -et// 'we', // -ep// 'you people'; imperative // -è//. Some further elucidations are given in parentheses. The forms involve complex morphophonemic developments; for an explanation of these and other details about the phonology and grammar see our grammatical sketch (Thompson and Thompson, in press).

²Phrases of the other main type—adjuncts—indicate aspectual and wider contextual connections and only occasionally mark also their relationship to their predicates. It is the first type that is of interest to us here. It should also be noted that first- and second-person entities are indicated within the predicate itself, either by affixes or enclitics, and in context they always refer to specific people. But third-person entities are automatically

not limited in this way, and it is their reference that complements and adjuncts serve to specify.

³Although persons are the most common goals referred to, animals, inanimate objects, and ideas also occur (note examples 14, 16).