

Bibliography

A Note on Thompson Salish Surface *íy*
Laurence C. Thompson
University of Hawaii

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems. Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 1979. "Aspect, Transitivity and Viewpoint." Presented at the UCLA Tense/Aspect Symposium, May 4-6, 1979.

Friedrich, Paul. 1974. "On Aspect Theory and Homeric Aspect." IJAL 40.4, Part 2, Memoir # 28.

Hopper, Paul. 1977/78. "Some Observations on the Typology of Focus and Aspect in Narrative Language." NUSA: Linguistics Studies in Indonesian and Languages of Indonesia. Vol. 4.14-25.

_____. 1979. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse." in Talmy Givon. ed. Discourse and Syntax. New York: Academic Press.

_____. 1979. "On Perfectivity and Possession." Symposium on Tense/Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics. UCLA May 4-6, 1979.

Mattina, Anthony. 1973. "Colville Grammatical Structure." PhD dissertation. U. of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics Vol. 5, no. 3.

_____. 1978. "The Colville Transitive System." XIII International Conference on Salishan Languages. August 17-19th. U. of Victoria.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry. 197?. "Thompson." To appear in Handbook of American Indians.

Timberlake, Alan. 1979. "Invariance and the Syntax of Russian Aspect." Tense and Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics. A Symposium. UCLA. May 4-6, 1979.

In Thompson River Salish *íy* is the surface realization of both underlying *ííyíí* and *ííyíí*. This involves a quite natural rule *íííí* → *íí*_____y under stress, actually part of a more general accommodation of *íííí* under stress to various following consonants (to *ú* before a rounded velar, *á* before a plain uvular, *ó* before a rounded uvular, *é* before a laryngeal).

However, when, in the common diminutive reduplicative formation, the underlying vowel is separated from the semivowel, the surface vowel reflects *íííí* in both cases, rather than *íííí*. There are a few exceptions; those and some cases of variation are usually, if not always, traceable historically to earlier etyma with **í*. **í* is not otherwise affected by this replacement, and the diminutive pattern is otherwise describable as involving insertion of a copy of CV of the stressed syllable directly after that syllable, with regular phonological adjustments. (See examples below.)

While the first accommodation (**í* → *íí*_____y) is easily seen as a natural development in a rule-oriented model of historical change, and restitution of *í* is natural enough when the y is isolated from it, it seems difficult to formulate a natural rule dynamism to account for the shift of **í* to *í* in the parallel forms from **íy*. On the other hand, classical analogical change directly accounts for the forms and the dynamics as well: the large number of cases where diminutives with etymological *í* correspond to simplexes in *íy* provide the model for conversion of those involving etymological **í*. The forms exhibiting variation further support this analysis. The case is interesting because it supports the notion of this sort of change operating on the surface, in performance.

In the following examples the infixed diminutive reduplication is enclosed in brackets; resulting forms are "baby-talk" words where they are not otherwise glossed. The formative also involves glottalization of posttonic resonants.

Kalman,

Underlying //ə//, usually lost in unstressed syllables, is retained under stress; in order to see this basic pattern we may look at STATIVE and IMMEDIATE forms based on weak roots with obstruents:

√sək 'stick-like object strikes' : ʔes-sák 'struck' (STATIVE), sək-t
'just now struck' (IMMEDIATE), dim. sá[s]k-t
√kəɬ 'disengage' : ʔes-káɬ 'detached', dim. ʔes-kə[k]ɬ

Parallel to these forms we find from roots involving //əy//:

√səy 'strands twist together' : ʔes-síy 'twisted together', dim.
ʔes-sá[s]iʔ (-iʔ < ý)
√zəy 'flow' : zíy-t 'now flowing', dim. zá[z]iʔ-t
√sʷəy 'burn' : ʔes-sʷíy 'burned', dim. ʔes-sʷó[sʷ]iʔ (//ə// → ó/ __uvular)

With roots involving glottalized //ý// there is a further complication, there being no contrast between ý and ʔ after i (forms here are written consistently iʔ):

√kʷəy 'slant toward sun or fire' : ʔes-kʷíʔ 'slanted...', dim. ʔes-kʷú[kʷ]iʔ
(//ə// → ú/ __rounded velar)
√pəy 'belowt' : ʔes-píʔ 'lost', dim. ʔes-pá[p]iʔ

For the most part stems involving //í// form diminutives as we should expect, the í surfacing appropriately; e.g.

√míx 'mix' : ʔes-míx 'mixed', dim. ʔes-mí[m]x
√tíkʷ 'transport fire' : ʔes-tíkʷ 'fire made from another fire', dim.
ʔes-tí[t]kʷ
kíx 'elder sister', dim. kí[k]x 'dear elder sister'

But in cases where //y// or //ý// follows //í//, diminutives nearly always show á:

cíykst 'five' (PIS *cílakst), dim. cás[c]iʔkst 'five animals'
qʷc-íyx 'make a move' (AUTONOMOUS //-iyx// < PIS *-ilx), dim. qʷc-ás[c]iʔx
səxʷsəxʷ-íʔt 'grizzly cub' (//-íʔt// 'young offspring' < PIS *-ilʔt),
dim. səxʷsəxʷ-ú[xʷ]iʔt (//ə// → ú/ __rounded velar)
kʷm-íʔmeʔ 'small' (//-íʔCe//, creating a few shape/size words),
dim. kʷm-ás[m]iʔmeʔ

A few diminutives show í in such forms, or alternates with á or í:

kʷíʔeh-í[h]iʔt 'salmon trout', a diminutive based on kʷíʔe(h) 'spring salmon' with //-íʔt// 'young offspring' (immediate base *kʷíʔeh-íʔt not recorded)
cm-íʔmeʔ 'small (pl.)', dim. cm-í[m]iʔmeʔ ~ cm-ás[m]iʔmeʔ

SUBJECT AND OBJECT IN NEZ PERCE

Noel Rude

O. Introduction.¹ In Nez Perce the verb agrees with both subject and object, and there is a three way distinction in the function of NP's. The subject of a transitive verb suffixes nim (which also marks the genitive), the subject of an intransitive verb is unmarked, and the object of a transitive verb suffixes ne. For this reason Nez Perce is of special interest to syntacticians and typologists, especially since transitivity, case marking, and word order are all governed by differing semantic and pragmatic criteria. This paper is intended as a brief description of some of these criteria with reference to simple sentences. Verb and NP inflections will be dealt with first,² and then some of the splits in the use of these inflections will be considered.

In this paper the term ergative (ERG) will mean simply the subject of a transitive verb, nominative (NOM) will mean the undifferentiated subject of either a transitive or intransitive verb, and accusative (ACC) will mean the syntactic object of a transitive verb. This use of ergative, however, will not imply that Nez Perce has a corresponding absolutive case, but merely that an inflection marks the syntactic subject of a transitive verb. S will symbolize the subject of an intransitive verb.

1.0 Verb inflection. Separate morphemes index person and number in the verb, as can be seen in the following chart.

pé ((ʔe){hii}) (pe) (nées) Stem (Suffix)				
ACC	ERG/NOM	NOM	ACC	Aspect
	Person	Number		Number (NOM) Direction

Figure 1. Inflectional slots in the Nez Perce verb