Semantic Roles and Referent Tracking in Martha Lamont's "Pheasant and Raven"[1]

Dawn Bates

Arizona State University

0. Introduction

Bates and Hess (in prep) attempt to provide simple semantic specifications for a large number of Lushootseed stems and apply them uniformly across clause types to derive the semantic roles of all arguments. Here, I define ARGUMENT as a position in a sentence where a character is referred to in Martha Lamont's telling of "Pheasant and Raven" (Hess (1996)). This paper tracks characters (or DISCOURSE REFERENTS) through the story, told by Mrs. Lamont to Thom Hess in 1964 (see Langen (this volume)), and examines their semantic roles. To use a metaphor, characters have a life IN THE STORY, while semantic roles have a life only IN THEIR CLAUSE; the relation of clause to story is mediated by the semantic roles assigned by the predicates that head each clause. In an attempt to detail this relationship, the paper introduces the semantic roles employed here, overviews clause structure, and relates these in excerpts of lines from "Pheasant and Raven", presenting them within a story outline. The grammatical analysis shows the possible argument positions; a zero pronoun facilitates description of the mapping from predicate to argument position, and from argument position to story. Appendix A defines the abbreviations I employ here.

My discussion of semantic roles assumes little background from the large literature on lexical semantics in the generative tradition; readers familiar with this literature may detect some idiosyncracies not explicated here.

1. Semantic Roles

The semantic roles assigned by each transitive or intransitive stem are drawn from a small universal inventory including Agent, Experiencer, Possessor, Patient, Goal, and Instrument. Each stem designates the role it assigns to its direct complement, the one non-oblique determiner phrase in its clause. The designated role is underlined in the semantic specifications detailed here. The intransitive stem ʔɬʔəd 'eat', for example, assigns Agent to its subject, but implies an eater and a thing eaten, and its semantic specification is (Ag,Pat), while intransitive čʼaxʷ 'club', with the specification (Pat), assigns Patient to its subject. This contrast can be observed in the intransitive main clauses ʔuʔɬʔəd čəd 'I ate (it)', versus ʔučʼaxʷ čəd 'I got hit'. Hess (1995) categorizes stems as AGENT-ORIENTED or PATIENT-ORIENTED to capture these facts; I call the designated role the ORIENTATION ROLE after his work.[2] Informal definitions of the four most popular roles appear in (1); Appendix B details the semantic specifications for a number of Lushootseed stems. I use this list to ensure that I treat each stem consistently; it is my hope that such a list may invite comparative discussion.

---

[1] All my work on Lushootseed is informed by the published work of, and discussions with, Thom Hess, and inspired by Vi taqʷšəblu Hilbert. Thanks to Toby Langen for valuable discussion. All errors are my own.

[2] If I circumscribe many of his generalizations as being in the realm of lexical semantics, as opposed to the syntactic rubric Hess himself employs, that is not to say that the present work replaces his; rather, it builds on the careful analyses of Lushootseed verb stems in Hess (1993,1995).

(1)   Semantic Roles, Informally Defined

Agent   Someone who causes a change in the world. Examples would be the walker in an event of walking, the giver in an event of giving, or the speaker in an event of speech.

Patient   A non-Agent affected by a change in the world; something or someone located, changed, moved across space, or created. Examples would be the gift in an event of giving, the message in an event of speech, or the thing remembered in an event involving memory.

Experiencer   A non-Agent affected by a psychological or physiological state. Examples would be the sick person in an event involving illness, or the person remembering something in an event involving memory.

Goal   The endpoint in a path involving motion. Examples would be the receiver in an event of giving, the person spoken to in an event of speech, or the direction in which one is traveling.

By introducing characters and then choosing different predicates to describe their fates, a storyteller constantly changes the semantic roles a given character plays; each argument in each of the storyteller's sentences receives a semantic role from a governing predicate, and any pronouns receive reference from the discourse as well as a semantic role. The next section introduces the argument positions.

2. Clause Structure

Different series of subject markers distinguish types of clause in Lushootseed; main clauses employ a subject marker series that also appears in some subordinate clauses, while nominalized clauses are always subordinate and employ a special subject series.[3] The structure of nominalized clauses is outlined in (2), which highlights the positions in which arguments may appear. Spaces indicate word boundaries and coindexing indicates coreference.[4] Typically, (1) would follow a superordinate predicate which may impose restrictions on the embedded DP.

(2)a.   Nominalized Clauses Based on Intransitive Stems
DET (asp)-$<$S$>$-nom-(asp)-$\sqrt{}$root-(af)-$<$S$_i>$ (d.c.$_i$)   (oblique)

b.   Nominalized Clauses Based on Transitive Stems
DET (asp)-$<$S$_i>$-nom-(asp)-$\sqrt{}$root-(af)-tr-$<$O$_j>$-$<$S$_i>$ $<$d.c.$_j>$ (oblique)

Angled brackets indicate complementary distribution: the subject of an intransitive predicate is either a prefix (1sg, 2sg) or a suffix; a transitive predicate has either an object suffix or a direct complement. The order of direct and oblique complements is free, although they both follow their

---

[3] Another type of subordinate clause, marked with a special subject series (cf. Hess (1995), Kroeber (1991)), does not appear in "Pheasant and Raven."

[4] Not mentioned in (2) are optional adjuncts, which may be added to any embedded clause, and the aspect enclitic -əxʷ, which may optionally follow the subject suffix in nominalizations.

governing predicates and focus constructions may front material to clause-initial position (Hess (1995)).

Main clauses differ from (2) in lacking an introductory determiner and using a different subject series. The main clause subjects (called PERSON PARTICLES or čəd-WORDS in Hess (1995)) are listed in (3b). The subject series used in nominalized clauses comes from the possessive affix series.

(3) a. Possessive Series Subjects   b.   Main Clause Subjects

d-	1sg	čəł	1pl[5]		čəd	1sg	čəł	1pl
ad-	2sg	-ləp	2pl		čəxʷ	2sg	čələp	2pl
-s	3				0	3		

Contra Hess (1995) and Beck (1996), (3b) crucially employs a zero third person subject in main clauses. Hess eschews the notion SUBJECT and although the present analysis is consonant with Beck's claim that the term is relevant for Lushootseed, it is inconsistent with his analysis of null third person subjects as always the result of elision of a direct complement. I will not argue specifically for the zero pronoun analysis here; it is my hope, though, that any coherence in the present discussion will provide support for my grammatical analysis, which was originally formulated to account for separate facts (Bates (1997b)).

3. Details on Mapping

The semantic roles in (1) map to the argument positions in (2) by regular principles I detail below, referring to the structure in (2) and extending the analysis to main clauses. As shown in (2), valence assumes a central role in the present analysis; the transitivity of a given predicate determines its role-mapping behavior.[6] Passivized predicates are intransitive, as in (2a), but they inherit the semantic specifications of their transitive bases.

Every clause has one of the subjects listed in (3); an intransitive predicate assigns its orientation role to its subject and a transitive predicate assigns Agent or Experiencer to its subject.[7]

An intransitive predicate allows a direct complement coreferent with its subject, as shown by the coindexing in (2a); in this case, the subject shares the orientation role with the direct complement. A transitive predicate assigns its orientation role to its first or second person object suffix or third person direct complement; its direct complement is never coreferent with its subject. This direct complement, the object of a transitive, may be elided; the definite and specific reference of such zero direct complements supports the elision analysis, as will be shown below.[8]

Nominalized intransitive and transitive complements differ in their behavior toward oblique complements; an oblique may replace a third person subject -s and map the orientation role of a predicates

---

[5]The 1pl possessive marker is imported from the main clause subject series and is written as a separate word in the standard Lushootseed orthography.

[6]Hess's (1995) analysis does not require reference to valence; his account captures the vast majority of the facts in Lushootseed, and my extra layer of structure may ultimately prove unwarranted. As Beck (1996) notes, however, standard descriptive machinery including terms like SUBJECT and (IN)TRANSITIVE facilitates comparison of Lushootseed with other (Salish) languages.

[7]Agent and Experiencer are the common roles for transitive subjects cross-linguistically; by convention, they appear leftmost in semantic specifications.

[8]Bates (1997b) argues for a zero 3 object suffix, an analysis one degree more abstract than the present analysis.

---

nominalized intransitive predicate, but this option is not available for any other subject.[9] Any predicate can employ an oblique to map a non-orientation Patient, Goal or Instrument, but only passivized predicates allow a non-orientation Agent oblique.[10]

"Pheasant and Raven" is a story of sufficient length and rhetorical complexity that I thought (Bates (1997a)) it represented all relevant Lushootseed grammatical structure in context, but I was wrong; there are no object suffixes in subordinate clauses in this story, but they appear in other stories, and the analysis reflects this possibility.

After this (admittedly brief) explanation of the mapping between argument positions and semantic roles, I turn to the story.

4. "Pheasant and Raven"

Hess's (1996) draft of "Pheasant and Raven" prepares the text for classroom use, starting a new line at the beginning of most clauses that employ the main clause subject series. I follow Hess's line numbers; the transcription is a composite of transcriptions by Thom Hess, Vi Hilbert, Toby Langen and me. For the most part, I have used Hess's draft line glosses and annotated them with reference subscripts.[11] I count twelve principal referents in the discourse, and give each of them an identifying subscript in (4).

(4)   Referents in "Pheasant and Raven"

a.   Characters

Pheasant$_p$ Raven$_r$ the hunters$_h$
Pheasant's wife$_{pw}$ Raven's wife$_{rw}$ the elk-pack$_e$
Pheasant's children$_{pc}$ Raven's children$_{rc}$ the dogs$_d$

b.   Settings

home$_{home}$ the journey path$_{jp}$ in the high country$_{hc}$

In the presentation below, I subscript as many referents as are consistent with the discourse meaning as I understand it. Thus, the reference subscripts might be the result of several different grammatical and discourse processes; some syntactic constructions require two syntactic positions to be coreferent, for example, and there are pervasive discourse conventions that require all pronominals to receive reference from discourse actants. The semantic mapping principles are the cause of many of the subscripts; these are the only ones fully described here.

---

[9]This option is related to a periphrastic alternative to the affixal possessive construction: ti bad-s 'his father' vs. ti bad ʔə ti čʔačʔas 'the father of the boy'.

[10]As Beck (1996) suggests, the oblique in a passive expresses the demoted subject of the corresponding active transitive.

[11]I employ square brackets for three distinct uses. First, I maintain Hess's convention of enclosing in square brackets any Lushootseed he edits into a line; these additions mostly replace morphemes commonly deleted in casual speech. Second, I maintain (though not completely consistently) his use of brackets to enclose English gloss material implied, but not specifically mentioned, in a given Lushootseed line. Third, I enclose referential phrases in brackets and subscript them, e.g. [tiʔił sgʷəlub]$_p$ 'that Pheasant'.

To detail all 308 lines of the story here would be too ambitious, so I will provide overview statements by line numbers and insert the lines I wish to detail into this overview. The line numbers are on the left. The episode divisions are from Hess's draft, with a few revisions by Tob Langen, are marked here with a basket design ### (cf. Bierwert (1996)).

"Pheasant and Raven"

1-3	ML sets scene and introduces discourse referents Pheasant and Raven.

1. ?əs-√ɬaɬ-il   0$_{p+r}$ [ti?iɬ ?i   sg^{w}əlub]$_p$?i   [ti?ə? qaw'qs]$_r$
    asp-√dwell-incep(Ag,Loc$_{home}$)   3S   DET conj   pheasant   conj   DET raven

'Pheasant$_p$ and Raven$_r$ dwelled [there$_{home}$].'

In this opening sentence, Mrs. Lamont uses a conjoined DP to complement intransitive *ɬaɬil* 'dwell'. This is a main clause, so the pronoun subject is null and coreferent with the conjoined phrases. The predicate implies a Location not specified in the syntax here, but the English gloss reflects it. The predicate locates the home setting so later deictics can refer to that setting.

4-7	Pheasant's children and wife are introduced.
8-10	Raven's children and wife are introduced.
###	###
11-19	Pheasant identified as episode topic; tells his wife he's going to travel and sets out. The reason given for this journey is Pheasant's hungry children.
###	###
20-23	Pheasant comes upon two people, later identified as hunters, with dogs.

20. di?ɬ-əx^w 0$_E$ [k^{w}i   s-√?ad^{z}q-dx^w-s$_p$ [ti?ə?
     suddenly(E)-asp   3S   DET nom-√meet-tr(Ag$_p$,Pat$_h$)-3S   DET

wrong — DB

     [s]-əs-√g^w+aa+d-il   [[?ə]   ti?acəc   ?aciɬtalbix^w]$_h$]$_h$]$_E$
     nom-asp-√sit(Ag$_h$)+red7-sf   P   DET   people

'Suddenly he$_p$ met some people$_h$ who$_h$ were sitting [there].'

The zero matrix subject is coreferent with the direct complement of the focus predicate *di?ɬ* 'suddenly'; the entire rest of the sentence comprises the direct complement and maps the orientation role Event.[12] The nominalized transitive *?ad^{z}qdx^w* 'meet' has the 3 subject -*s* pronoun, given reference by the discourse topic, Pheasant, and its direct complement is a nominalized clause introducing the hunters. The final oblique phrase replaces the intransitive embedded subject -*s* and maps orientation Agent of *g^{w}aadil* 'sit'.

###	###
24-28	The dogs threaten Pheasant.

---

[12]The role EVENT here is used informally, as the rough semantic equivalent of a clause.

29-31	The hunters, not overtly mentioned, tell Pheasant to call "his" dogs off. The use an appositive vocative for Pheasant, which helps to track discourse referents.
32-36	Pheasant replies that the dogs aren't his. He respectfully suggests that they belong to the hunters.

32. x^{w}i?   k^{w}i   g^{w}ə-   d$_p$-s-   √g^{w}i(h)i-d   0$_d$
     neg   DET   subjunctive   1sgS-nom√call-tr(Ag$_p$,Pat$_d$)   zero d.c.

'I$_p$ won't call them$_d$.'

The direct complement, which maps orientation Patient of *g^{w}i(h)id* 'call, invite', has been elided. Note the definite and specific gloss: this does not mean 'I won't call anyone' or 'I won't call someone'; the dogs give reference to this zero object, and an elision analysis accounts for this reference. Beck (1996) makes a similar argument in favor of an elision analysis.

###	###
37-39	The hunters call off their dogs.
###	###
40-49	More questions from the hunters to Pheasant, about the nature of his visit to the high country. They are impressed with his replies.

43. tuɬ-√čad   k^w(i)   ad$_p$-s-ə-   √?ibəš,   Sou   s-√g^{w}əlub$_p$
     from-√where   DET   2sgS-nom-asp-   √travel.overland(Ag$_p$,Gol$_{hc}$)   nom-√pheasant

'Where$_{home}$ are you$_p$ traveling from, Pheasant$_p$?'

The 2sg subject maps orientation Agent of *?ibəš* 'travel overland', and the fronted question word maps its non-orientation role. The final word is an appositive vocative; Mrs. Lamont employs them often when she performs direct dialogue, perhaps to facilitate referent tracking by her audience. (I know I appreciate the help.)

45. dx^w-√ʕaq't$_{hc}$ ti?ə?   d$_p$-s-u-√?ibəš
     toward-√mountainward   DET   1s-nom-asp-√travel.overland(Ag$_p$,Gol$_{hc}$)
'Into the high country$_{hc}$ is where$_{hc}$ I$_p$ am traveling.'

The focused adjunct maps non-orientation Goal of *?ibəš* 'travel overland', which the 1sg subject prefix maps its orientation Agent.[13]

---

[13]Focus structures trigger a zero main clause subject coreferent with the rest of the sentence, but I omit this detail here. Focus constituents generally map a non-orientation role of an embedded predicate; Hess (1995) gives a much more complete description of focus constructions than I attempt here.

46. tux̌ʷ   tul'ʔal t(ə   ʔ)a(h)   dₚ-dəx̌ʷ-√ʔa(h),
    Adv   from DET   √be.there(Patₕₒₘₑ)   1sgS-nom-√be.there(Patₚ)

    dₚ-dəx̌ʷ-as-√ɬatl-il
    1sgS-nom-asp-√dwell-incep(Agₚ,Locₕₒₘₑ)

'But [from] over thereₕₒₘₑ is whereₕₒₘₑ Iₚ [come from], whereₕₒₘₑ Iₚ live.'

The subject prefixes each map the orientation roles of their intransitive predicates. Intransitive *łatlil* 'dwell' implies a Location, but rarely realizes it syntactically.

###	###	
50-57	A butchered elk, all wrapped up, is introduced. The hunters question Pheasant about it.
###	###
58-62	Pheasant replies that he can't hunt, that the elk-pack isn't his.
###	###
63-69	The hunters tell Pheasant that they will butcher the elk for him; they explain that this is the reason they were asking about it.

67. ɬu-√kʷičʼi-d   čəłₕ   [tiʔił   kʷagʷičəd]ₑ
    asp-√butcher-tr(Agₕ,Patₑ)   1plS   DET   elk

'Weₕ will butcher that elkₑ.'

The 1pl subject maps Agent, and the direct complement maps orientation Patient, of transitive *kʷičʼid* 'butcher'.

69. łil-d   čəłₕ   [ti   dəgʷiʔ]ₚ
    give food-tr(Agₕ,Patₑ,Golₚ) 1pl   DET 2sg.emph

    tiʔił   dəx̌ʷ-u-√wiliqʷʼi-d   čəłₕ   0ₚ
    DET   nom-asp-√ask-tr(Agₕ,Patₚ)   1plS   zero d.c.

'Weₕ are giving itₑ to youₚ which is why weₕ questioned [youₚ].'

The matrix transitive *łild* 'give food' takes an emphatic 2sg direct complement object to which it assigns Goal, the recipient.[14] The same direct complement is elided in the embedded clause. The matrix clause leaves the Patient role unexpressed.

###	###
70-73	Pheasant thanks the hunters.
###	###

---

[14]Jelinek and Demers, and Beck (1996), show that emphatic second and first person arguments have the syntactic properties of third person DPs.

74-86	The hunters fix the elk into a backpack that's magically lightened so Pheasant can backpack it.

86. [həlaʔb   s-√ʔəɬəd]ₑ   tiʔəʔ   s-√ɬil-t-əb-sₚ
    really   nom-√food   DET   nom-√give.food-tr(Agₕ,Patₑ,Golₚ)-pass-3S

'Itₑ was really [quite the] foodₑ that heₚ had been given.'

The preposed focus phrase maps non-orientation Patient, and the Agent of the passive is unexpressed.

###	###	
87-93	The hunters explain to Pheasant what they've done. He thanks them.
94-97	Pheasant renamed as episode topic.
###	###
98	The hunters speak to Pheasant, using an appositive vocative.

98. kiis-əx̌ʷ   čəx̌ʷₚ   sgʷəlubₚ
    stand(Agₚ)-asp   2sgS   pheasant(appositive)ₚ

    cx̌ʷₚ-a   ɬu-√ʔibəš-əx̌ʷ
    2sgS-conj   asp-√travel.overland(Agₚ,Golₕₒₘₑ)-asp

'Youₚ stand up now, Pheasantₚ, and youₚ will journey.'

Lushootseed has a special series of main clause subjects employs in conjoined sentences; the Agent of *ʔibəš* 'travel overland' is mapped by one such conjoined subjects here.

99-100	The hunters stand him up (with the pack on) so Pheasant can travel.

99. kiis-tu-b   0ₚ
    cause.to.stand-tr(Agₕ,Patₚ)-pass   3S

'Theyₕ stood himₚ up.'

This main clause shows the zero third person subject, glossed as the pronoun it is, and the active voice gloss that is the pragmatic equivalent of the Lushootseed morphological passive, if not its syntactic equal (cf. Beck (1996), Hess (1995)).

###	###	
101-110	The hunters explain to Pheasant what they've done and warn him not to turn his head to look at the pack during his journey home.

106. x̌ʷuľ   čəx̌ʷₚ   lə-√ʔux̌ʷ   dx̌ʷʔal t(i)   adₚ-s-√ɫč-il
     Adv   2sgS   asp-√go(Agₚ,Gol_home)   P   DET   2sgS-nom-√arrive(Agₚ,Gol)

     [dx̌ʷʔal   kʷ(i)   adₚ-√ʔalʔal]_home
     P   DET   2sg.poss-√house

'You_p just [keep] going until you_p arrive [at your_p house]_home.'

The matrix subject and the embedded subject are both 2sg and both map Agent, the orientation role of their respective intransitive predicates. The Goal role implied by ʔux̌ʷ 'go' is unexpressed, but the Goal role of the embedded predicate is assigned to the directional PP.

110. [hikʷ   kʷagʷičəd]ₑ   ti ʔiɫ   s-əs-√ɫil-d
     big   elk   DET   nom-asp-√give.food-tr(Ag_h,Patₑ,Gol_p)

     čəɫ_h   [ti   dəgʷiʔ]_p
     1pl   DET   2sg.emph
'A big elk_e is what we_h have given you_p.'

The focus phrase maps non-orientation Patient, and the 1pl subject maps Agent. The direct complement is a recipient Goal.

111   Pheasant thanks the hunters.
###
112-115   Pheasant travels; he's alone with the elk pack.
###
116-122   Pheasant talks to himself.

121. xʷiʔ   kʷ(i)   adₚ-s-√dʒalq= us-bi-d   0ₑ
     neg   DET   2sgS-nom-√turn= face-appl-tr(Agₚ,Patₑ)   zero d.c.

'Don't look over your_p shoulder at it_e.'

The direct complement has been elided here; it maps the orientation role of the nominalized transitive and gets its reference from the elk-pack, a discourse referent salient in this episode.

###
123-124   Pheasant arrives home.

123. bə-√ʔux̌ʷ   0_p   dx̌ʷʔal
     asp-√go(Agₚ,Gol_home)   3S   P

     [ti ʔiɫ]   s-√ča ʔkʷ-dx̌ʷ-s   0ₑ
     DET   nom-√manage.to.get.down.to.shore-tr(Agₚ,Patₑ)   zero d.c.

'He_p goes again until he_p manages to get it_e down to the shore_home.'

The adjunct PP maps non-orientation Gol, but I have not indicated that with a subscript. The zero matrix subject maps orientation Agent and gets its reference from the discourse topic, Pheasant.

125-128   Pheasant explains to his wife that they can distribute the food he was given by the hunters.
129-134   Pheasant and his wife slice the meat up for the people.
###
135-138   They give tallow to Pheasant's children.
###
139-141   Pheasant's children go outside and play with the tallow.
###
142   Raven reintroduced.
143-148   Raven stage-whispers to his children. He sends them outside to investigate what Pheasant's children are doing.
###
149-153   Raven's children bother Pheasant's children.
154-156   Pheasant's children get angry.
###
157-165   Raven's children return to him; report on their assignment.

158. ʔudawʼ_tallow   ti ʔiɫ   s-u-√ʔəɫəd   [ʔə   ti ʔiɫ   bəd+√bəda ʔ
     tallow   DET   nom-asp-√eat(Ag_pc,Pat)   P   DET   red2+√offspring

     ʔə   ti ʔiɫ   s-√gʷəlub]_pc
     P   DET   nom-√pheasant

'Tallow is what the children_pc of Pheasant_p are eating.'

The tallow isn't a salient discourse referent, so I subscript it with its full name. It is focused here, and maps non-orientation Patient. The oblique replaces the subject -s and maps the orientation Agent of ʔəɫəd 'eat'.

###
166-170   Raven eats all the food given to him for his whole family.

167. x̌ʷuľ   kʷid-əɫ-s-√ləkʷ   ti ʔiɫ   s-√ləkʷ-t-əb-sₑ
     only   QA-af-nom-√mouthful   DET   nom-√eat-tr(Ag_r,Patₑ)-pass-3S

     [ʔə   ti ʔəʔ   qawʼqs]_r
     P   DET   raven

'In just a [small] number of mouthfuls [i.e., a few gulps] Raven_r ate it_e [all].'

A focus adjunct introduces the passive nominalized clause, in which the subject -s maps the orientation Patient of transitive ləkʷəd 'eat' and the demoted Agent is realized by the oblique.

###
171-177   Raven tells his wife he's going on a journey.
###
178-183   A wrap-up of Pheasant's saga.

182. haʔkʷ   s-√ʔətəd-s_{p+pw+pc}   əlgʷəʔ
      Adv   nom-√eat(Ag_{p+pw+pc},Pat)-3S   plural

'For a long time they_{p+pw+pc} ate.'

A time adverbial is focused in this sentence, triggering the nominalized intransitive clause, which ha
an -s subject modified by the plural marker mapping the orientation role. The reference for this
plural pronoun comes from the discourse.

###

184-185   Raven reintroduced, sets off.
186-187   The hunters are reintroduced as Raven meets up with
           them.

187. x̌aľ   bə-√diɬ   dəxʷ-√ʔa   ʔə   ti?iɬ   dəxʷ-√ʔəy'-du-b-s_h
      AdvP   asp-√focus   nom-√be.there(Pat_h) P   DET   nom-√find-tr(Ag_p,Pat_h)-pass-3S

      [ʔə   ti?iɬ]_p
      P   pronoun

'They_h were at the very same place_{hc} that he_p had found them_h.'

There are two obliques here, with two very different functions: the first replaces the -s subject of
nominalized dəxʷʔa 'be there', while the second is the Agent oblique of passivized transitive ʔəy'dxʷ
'find'.[15]

###

188-201   The dogs bark in their reintroduction. The hunters
           question Raven about the dogs and he lies, says they are
           his.

198. təməliš_d   kʷədiʔ   s-u-√daʔa-d-s_r
      a.name   DET   nom-asp-√name-tr(Ag,Pat,object-predicative_{temelish})-3S

      [ti?əʔ   s-qʷəb+√qʷəbayʔ]_d
      DET   nom-red2+√dog

'Təməliš_d is what he_r called the dogs_d.'

The non-orientation role is assigned to the focus phrase; I am tentatively using the term OBJECT-
PREDICATIVE for the appellation in an event of naming. The named ones appear in direct
complement position.

###

---

[15]Hess gloss the matrix clause with an impersonal subject: '(It was at the very same
place) that he had found them.' My analysis of 187 may be faulty.

202-209   The hunters question Raven about the pack and he lies.

209. diɬ   d_p-dəxʷ-əs-√bəč= alq   [ʔə   ti?iɬ]_e
      focus   1sgS-nom-asp-√bring down= game(Ag_p,Pat_e)   P   pronoun

'That is how I_r [could] fell that game_e.'

The focus predicate diɬ maps a manner adjunct, while the subject prefix maps the orientation
Agent.

210-226   The hunters question Raven about the elk. They tell him
           to butcher it; he can't. They say they'll help him.
###
227-233   Raven eats tallow.
###
234-237   The hunters say they will fix the elk-pack for Raven.

236-7. ɬu-√čəbaʔ-əd   čəxʷ_r   [ti?əʔ s-əs-√ɬil-d   čəɬ_h
        asp-√pack-tr(Ag_r,Pat_e) 2sgS   DET nom-asp-√give.food-tr(Ag_h,Pat_e,Gol_r)   1pl

        [ti   dəgʷi?]_r]_e   ɬu-a(d)_r-dəxʷ-√ɬč-il-tx_w
        DET   2sg.emphatic   irr-2sgS-nom-√arrive.with-incep-tr(Ag_r,Pat_e,Gol_{rw})

        0_e   [dxʷ?al   kʷs(i)   ad-√čəgʷas]_{rw}
        zero d.c.   P   DET-f   2sg.poss-√wife

'You_r will backpack this_e which we_h are giving you_r so that you_r can arrive with it for your_r
wife_{rw}.'

The final PP maps the Goal end of a path of motion, and two DPs map the orientation roles of
the first two transitive predicates. The final transitive has a zero direct complement, elided under
identity with the matrix object.

###
238-243   Raven boasts about his hunting prowess.
###
244-246   Raven, not overtly mentioned, sets off on his journey home
           with the elk-pack.

245. lə-li?+√lil   0_r   ?al   kʷədi?čad   [kʷi]   tu-dəxʷ-√qa?kʷ-s_r
      asp-red1+√far(Ag_r) 3S   P   DET where   DET   asp-nom-√rest(Ag)-3S_r

'He_r went [only] a little ways to where_{jp} he_r rested.'

Both intransitive predicates assign Agent to their pronominal subjects, and each of them picks up its
reference from the episode topic, Raven.

247-248   Raven talks to himself.
###

249-252	Raven takes the forbidden look at the elk-pack.
###	###
253-255	The elk gets loose.
###	###
256-257	Rotten wood replaces the elk in the pack.
258-261	The elk returns to the hunters.
262-268	The hunters discuss Raven.

263. Ɂu-√dzalq= us-bi-t-əb   0ₑ   dzəł sixʷ [Ɂə   ti   qawʼqs]ᵣ
      asp-√turn= face-appl-tr(Ag,Patₑ)-pass 3S   modal modal P   DET   raven

      [tiɁəɁ tu-s-√łil-d   čəł   0ᵣ]ₕ
      DET   asp-nom-√give.food-tr(Agₕ,Patₑ,Golᵣ) 1plS   zero d.c.

      'Ravenᵣ must have looked over hisᵣ shoulder at what weₕ had given himᵣ.'

The DP tiɁəɁ tusłild čəł 'what we gave him' is the direct complement of the matrix passivized predicate and is coindexed with the zero matrix subject, mapping the orientation role, Patient. The embedded transitive has an elided 3 direct complement which gets the same reference (Raven) as the matrix Agent oblique allowed by the passive structure.

###	###
269-271	When Raven returns home, he has rotten wood in his pack.
###	###
272-278	Raven's wife points out the rotten wood. Raven vomits.

277. dzuxʷat-əxʷ   0ᵣ   [Ɂə   tiɁəɁ x̌ʷulʼ+ulʼ-əxʷ   pʼqʼ= ac
      vomit(Expᵣ,Patₑ)-asp   3S   P   DET   just+red3-asp   rotten= wood

      [tiɁəɁ]   tu-s-u-√Ɂəłəd-sᵣ]ₑ
      DET   asp-nom-asp-√eat(Agᵣ,Patₑ)-3S

      'Then heᵣ vomited nothing but rotten woodₑ which heᵣ had eaten.'

The oblique here receives a non-orientation role, Patient, from the intransitive matrix predicate. The zero matrix subject maps orientation Experiencer and receives its reference from Raven, who also gives reference to the embedded Agent subject -s of intransitive Ɂəłəd 'eat'.

###	###
279-286	Raven orders his children to harass Pheasant's children.

280. qah+a(h)   uɁxʷ   tiɁił   s-u-√Ɂəłəd
      a.lot+red3   particle DET   nom-asp-√eat(Agₚ,Patₑ)

      [Ɂə   tiɁił s-√gʷəlub]ₚ
      P   DET   nom-pheasant

      'Pheasantₚ still has a lot to eat.'

The focus manner adjunct introduces the nominalized intransitive Ɂəłəd 'eat', and the oblique

---

replaces its subject -s, mapping orientation Agent. The Patient role implied by Ɂəłəd 'eat' is left unrealized in the syntax.

###	###
287-289	Raven's children throw sucker fish at Pheasant's children.
###	###
290-295	Raven, behind the children, catches and eats what they throw.

292-3. diɁł+ił   ti   s-u-√kʷəd-(d)xʷ-s
        as.soon.as(E,E)   DET   nom-asp-√manage.to.get-tr(Agᵣ,Pat)-3S

        [tiɁił]fish   gʷəl   lə-√ləkʷ-əd   0ᵣ   0fish
        pronoun   conj   asp-√eat(Agᵣ,Patfish)   3S   zero d.c.

        'As soon as heᵣ managed to get onefish, heᵣ ate itfish.'

The transitive kʷəd(d)xʷ 'get' takes a demonstrative pronominal as its direct complement and assigns its orientation role, Patient, to it. These demonstrative pronominals may be the result of deletion of the substantive complement (in this case, skʷup 'sucker fish') of the determiner. In the final clause, the entire DP is elided under identity with tiɁił skʷupfish. The final zero subject is an Agent of the transitive ləkʷəd 'eat' and gets its reference from Raven, who is the Agent of the matrix transitive, too.

###	###
296-304	The children get angry.

297. x̌ʷulʼ-əxʷ   sixʷ   bə-lə-√čətxʷə-t-əb   0fish   [Ɂə   tiɁił qawʼqs]ᵣ
      Adv-asp   modal   asp-asp-√gobble-tr(Agᵣ,Patfish)-pass 3S   P   DET   raven

      [tiɁił tu-s-√Ɂukʷukʷ   [Ɂə   tə   wiwʼsu]ᵣc]fish
      DET   asp-nom-√play(Agᵣc,Instrfish)   P   DET   children

      'True to form, Ravenᵣ was just gulping down whatfish the childrenᵣc were playing with.'

The long direct complement is coreferent with the matrix zero subject; they both refer to the sucker fish. The matrix oblique maps the Agent of the passive. Inside the direct complement, the oblique replaces the -s subject of intransitive Ɂukʷukʷ 'play' and maps its orientation role, Agent; its Instrument role is assigned to the whole DP ('fish'), in a relative clause structure.

299. s-√kʷupfish   tiɁəɁ   s-√gʷaɁ-sfish   [tiɁəɁ
      nom-√sucker.fish   DET   nom-√own(Possₚc,Patfish)   DET

      s-u-√pus-il   [Ɂə   tiɁəɁ bəd+√bədaɁ-sᵣ]ᵣc]fish
      nom-asp-√throw-incep(Agᵣc,Patfish,Golₚc) P   DET   red2+√offspring-3poss

      'It was theirᵣc own sucker fishfish that hisᵣ childrenᵣc had been throwing.'

The initial focus constituent *skʷup* 'sucker fish' maps a non-orientation role, Patient, of the embedded intransitive *pusil* 'throw', the entity thrown. Its other non-orientation role, Goal, the direction of throwing, is not realized in this utterance, but the discourse seems to indicate that Pheasants's children are the targets of these projectiles, and that Raven's children are the Agents of the throwing.

###
305-308   Concluding remarks about Raven. End of story.
###

REFERENCES

Bates, Dawn. 1997a. Role assignment in Lushootseed embedded clauses. Presented at the University of Victoria Workshop on Salish Morphosyntax.
_____. 1997b. Person marking in Lushootseed subordinate clauses. Ms.
Bates, Dawn, and Thom Hess. In prep. Lushootseed reference grammar. Ms.
Bates, Dawn; Thom Hess; and Vi Hilbert. 1994. Lushootseed dictionary. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
Beck, David. 1996. Is there a syntactic subject in Lushootseed? Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, 1-33. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia.
Bierwert, Crisca. 1996. Lushootseed texts: An introduction to Puget Salish narrative aesthetics. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Hess, Thom. 1993. A schema for the presentation of Lushootseed verb stems. In American Indian linguistics and ethnography in honor of Laurence C. Thompson, ed. by Anthony Mattina and Tim Montler. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 10. Missoula: University of Montana.
_____. 1995. Lushootseed reader with introductory grammar, Volume 1. Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 11. Missoula: University of Montana.
_____. 1996. Draft of Volume 2, Lushootseed reader with introductory grammar. Ms.
Hess, Thom, and Vi Hilbert. 1977a. Lushootseed I. Seattle: Daybreak Star Press [second printing by Lushootseed Research, Seattle]
_____. 1977b. Lushootseed II. Seattle: Daybreak Star Press [second printing by Lushootseed Research, Seattle]
Jelinek, Eloise, and Richard Demers. 1994. Predicates and pronominal arguments. Language 70.697-734.
Kroeber, Paul. 1991. Comparative syntax of subordination in Salish. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
Langen, T. C. S. This volume. (A manuscript on "Pheasant and Raven" for which I lack complete citation information; my apologies to Toby Langen.)

Appendix A: Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
Adv	adverb
af	affix (string) of unspecified type
Ag	agent
appl	applicative
asp	any of several aspect morphemes
bf	benefactive
d.c.	direct complement
DET	determiner
dir	directional prefix
DP	Determiner Phrase
BHH	Bates, Hess and Hilbert (1994)
E	event
emph	emphatic
Exp	experiencer
f	feminine
Gol	goal
incep	inceptive intransitive
instr	instrument/instrumental
intr	detransitivizing suffix
irr	irrealis
lx	lexical suffix
neg	negative
nom	nominalizing prefix
O	object
obl	oblique phrase
P	preposition
Pat	patient
pass	passive
pl	plural
poss	possessive, possessor
red1	diminutive reduplication
red2	distributive reduplication
red3	reduplication for random action
red7	reduplication for counting people
QA	quantifying adverb
S	subject
sg	singular
tr	transitivizing suffix

Boundary symbols:
-	affix
=	lexical suffix
√	root
+	reduplication

Appendix B: Semantic Specifications

ʔaʔs-il-dxʷ
wait.for-incep-tr(Ag,Pat)

ʔab-yi-d
give-bf-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

ʔab-yi-t-əb
give-bf-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)-pass

ʔadᶻq-dxʷ
meet-tr(Ag,Pat)

ʔa(h)
be.there(Pat)

ʔal
be.in(Pat)

ʔatəbəd
die(Exp)

ʔəɫəd
eat(Ag,Pat)

ʔəx̌ʼ
come(Ag,Gol)

ʔəy̓-du-b
find-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

ʔibəš
travel.overland(Ag,Gol)

ʔibəš-tu-b
travel-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

ʔidigʷaa-c
say-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol) "say something to someone"

ʔidigʷat
say(Ag,Pat)

ʔili-d
sing/interpret(Ag,Pat)

ʔix̌ʷi-d
throw-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

ʔix̌ʷi-t-əb
throw-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)-pass

ʔukʷukʷ
play(Ag,Instr)

ʔuluɫ
water-travel(Ag)

ʔux̌ʷ
go(Ag,Gol)

ʔux̌ʷ-txʷ
go-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol) "take"

balč
willing(Exp)

bəč
fall(Pat)

bəč= alq
bring down= game(Ag,Pat)

bəq̓-əd
eat(Ag,Pat)

cut
tell(Ag,Pat,Gol)

cut+√cut
red2+√say(Ag,E)

dxʷ-√cut-əb
af-√think-mv(Exp,Pat)

cut-(t)-əb
tell-tr-(Ag,Pat,Go)-pass

c̓əb-əb
gather.berries-intr(Ag,Pat)

c̓ix̌
fry(Pat)

čaʔkʷ-dxʷ
manage.to.get.down.to.shore-tr(Ag,Pat)

čadᶻ-i-s
hide.from-appl-tr(Ag,Pat,So)

čala-t-əb
chase-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

čəbaʔ
pack(Ag,Pat)

čəbaʔ-əd
pack-tr(Ag,Pat)

čətxʷə-t-əb
gobble-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

čikʷ= apsəb
caulk= throat(Exp)

čša-d
send-tr(Ag,Pat,clause)

c̓əlp= šad
twist= foot(Exp) "turn one's ankle"

c̓əxʷa(= hə)-b
beat= tail-mv(Ag,Instr)

c̓əwit
clever(Exp)

daʔa-d
name-tr(Ag,Pat,object-predicative)

daʔə-t-əb
name-tr(Ag,Pat,object-predicative)-pass

dəč= agʷtxʷ-bi-d
visit-appl-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

dᶻalq= us-bi-d   "look over shoulder at"
turn= face-appl-tr(Ag,Pat)

dᶻalq= us-bi-t-əb
turn= face-appl-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

dᶻəkʷu-d
wrong-tr(Ag,Pat)

dᶻuxʷat
vomit(Exp,Pat)

gʷaʔ
own(Poss,Pat)

gʷaagʷəd
talk(Ag,Pat)

gʷa(h)-bi-d
accompany-appl-tr(Ag,Pat)

gʷah-txʷ
accompany-tr(Ag,Pat)

gʷəč̓-əd
look.for(Ag,Pat)

gʷəč̓-t-əb
look.for(Ag,Pat)-pass

gʷəd-il
sit(Ag)

gʷəd+√gʷatəd
red2+√speak(Ag)

gʷəgʷad+əd
speak(Ag,Pat)+red3

gʷəlal-t-əb
beat-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

gʷəlal= alikʷ
kill= activity(Ag,Pat)

gʷəx̓əla-txʷ
be.still-tr(Ag,Pat)

gʷi(h)-d
call-tr(Ag,Pat)

haʔl-əd
soothe-tr(Ag,Pat)

haʔl= iʔɫ
soothe= baby(Ag)

hay-dxʷ
know-tr(Exp,Pat)

həliʔ-il
live-incep(Exp) "get well"

hili-d
tell.to.do-tr(Ag,Pat)

huy
do(Ag)

huy-du-b
eat-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

huy-(y)i-t-əb
make-bf-tr(Ag,Pat,Go)-pass "make for"

huy-tu-b
make-tr(Ag,Pat) "prepare,package"

huyu-d
make-tr(Ag,Pat)

huyu-t-əb
make/do-tr(Ag,Pat)

ǰəc-txʷ
use-tr(Ag,Pat)

kiis
stand(Ag)

kiis-txʷ
cause.to.stand-tr(Ag,Pat)

kiis-tu-b
cause.to.stand-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

K'əyiɬ
pretend(Ag,E)

K'ič'i-d
squirt-tr

kʷaxʷa-d
help-tr(Ag,Pat)

kʷəda-d
take-tr(Ag,Pat)

kʷəda-t-əb
take-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

kʷəd-(d)xʷ
manage.to.get-tr(Ag,Pat)

kʷʼasa-d
roast-tr(Ag,Pat)

kʼʷič'i-d
twist-tr(Ag,Pat)

lax̌-dxʷ
remember-tr(Exp,Pat)

ləkʷʼ-əd
eat(Ag,Pat)

ləkʷʼ-t-əb
eat-tr(Ag,Pat)

ləli?-d
different-tr-(Ag,Pat) "change something"

ləq-du-b
hear-tr(Exp,Pat)

luƛʼ-il
old-incep(Exp) "grow up, get older"

luu-t-əb
hear-tr(Exp,Pat)-pass

ɬal-il-tu-b
beach-incep-tr(Ag,Pat) "bring ashore"

ɬaɬl-il
dwell-incep(Ag,Loc)

ɬč-il
arrive(Ag,Gol)

ɬč-i(l)-s
arrive-incep-tr(Ag,Gol) "come upon someone"

ɬč-il-txʷ
arrive.with-incep-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

ɬəts-əd
slurp-tr(Ag,Pat)

ɬid
tie(Pat)

ɬidi-d
tie-tr(Ag,Pat)

ɬil-d
give.food-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

ɬil-t-əb
give food-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)-pass

ɬya?-t-əb
shoot.harmful.objects.into-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass

x̌'ala-b
strand-mv(Pat)

x̌'al= aɬ= √qʷu?
sail= link= √water(Ag)

x̌'ax̌
cold(Exp)

x̌'əla-d
stop-tr(Ag,Pat)

x̌'əl-b
mature-intr(Exp)

x̌'əl-b-il
mature-intr-incep-(Exp)

pus-il
throw-incep(Ag,Pat,Gol)

p'ayəq
hew(Ag,Pat)

p'ix̌ʷ-əb-əd
drip-intr-tr(Ag,Pat) "flood (an area)"

qa?kʷ
rest(Ag)

qəɬ-d
wake-tr(Ag,Pat)

qəp'
alight(Ag)

q'axʷ
freeze(Pat)

q'il
load(Pat)

q'ili-d
load-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

q'il-du-b
load-tr(Ag,Pat,Gol)

qʷac-txʷ-bi-d
doubt-tr-appl-tr(Exp,Pat,E)

qʷuləč
dip.net(Ag)

qʷʼəl
cooked,ripe(Pat)

qʷʼəl-il
warm-incep(Pat)

saqʷ
fly(Ag)

səgʷq-əd
whisper.to(Ag,Gol)

suxʷt-əš
recognize-tr(Exp,Pat)

šab
dry(Pat)

šac'
end(Pat)

šu-dxʷ
see-tr(Exp,Pat)

šuu-c
look.at-tr(Ag,Pat)

ta?-t-əb
put-tr-(Ag,Pat,Go)-pass

tagʷəxʷ
hunger(Exp)

taqʷu?
thirst(Exp)

taqʷ= ači?-b
clap= hands-intr(Ag)

təlaw-il
run-incep(Ag)

təq-du-b
tight-tr(Ag,Pat)-pass "get cornered"

təš
fix(<u>Pat</u>) "done in"

tq'= ači(ʔ-ə)d
slap= hand-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>)

tux̌ʷ
stretch(<u>Pat</u>)

txʷad
take.to.flight(<u>Ag</u>)

ƛ'əc-dxʷ
shatter-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>)

ƛ'ili-b
sing-intr(<u>Ag</u>)

ƛ'iw-il-txʷ
pray-incep-tr(Ag,Pat,<u>Gol</u>) "ask"

ƛ'uc'u-t-əb
shoot-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>,Instr)-pass

ƛ'ukʷ-txʷ
go.home-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>) "take something home"

wəš-t-əb
distribute-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>)-pass

wiliqʷ
ask(<u>Ag</u>)

wiliqʷi-d
ask-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>)

xʷaa-c
forbid-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>,E)

xʷaƛʷ-il
tire-incep(<u>Exp</u>)

xʷəƛ'= šad
break= leg(<u>Exp</u>)

xʷiʔxʷiʔ
hunt(<u>Ag</u>,Pat)

xʷiƛ'-il
lower-incep(<u>Pat</u>)

x̌aƛ'-txʷ
desire-tr(Exp,<u>Pat</u>)

x̌əc
fear(<u>Exp</u>,E)

x̌əɬ
sick(<u>Exp</u>)

x̌əkʷ-t-əb
invert-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>)-pass

x̌ilix̌
fight-(<u>Ag</u>)

x̌ʷiƛ'-d
lose-tr(Ag,Pat,<u>Gol</u>)

x̌ʷisi-d
make.much.noise-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>)

yaƛ'a-b
fetch water-intr(<u>Ag</u>,Pat)

yayus
work(<u>Ag</u>)

yayus-bi-d
work-appl-tr(Ag,<u>Pat</u>) "work at something"

yəc-əb
tell-mv(<u>Ag</u>)

yəc-əb-txʷ
tell-mv-tr-(Ag,Pat,<u>Gol</u>)

yəq= qid
speak.up(<u>Ag</u>)