



The Colville–Okanagan Transitive System

Author(s): Anthony Mattina

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 48, No. 4, (Oct., 1982), pp. 421–435

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1264844>

Accessed: 22/04/2008 01:33

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We enable the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE COLVILLE-OKANAGAN TRANSITIVE SYSTEM<sup>1</sup>

ANTHONY MATTINA

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

- |               |                             |               |  |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| <b>0.</b>     | Introduction                | <b>1.2.2.</b> | <i>-nu-</i> and <i>-xixm</i> stems             |
| <b>1.</b>     | (Di)transitives             | <b>2.</b>     | Pseudo-intransitives and detransitivized forms |
| <b>1.1.</b>   | Simple stems                | <b>2.1.</b>   | Reflexives                                     |
| <b>1.1.1.</b> | <i>-nt</i>                  | <b>2.2.</b>   | Reciprocals                                    |
| <b>1.1.2.</b> | <i>-st</i>                  | <b>2.3.</b>   | Detransitivized forms                          |
| <b>1.1.3.</b> | <i>-h</i> and <i>-x(i)t</i> | <b>3.</b>     | Summary  |
| <b>1.2.</b>   | Complex stems               |               |  |
| <b>1.2.1.</b> | <i>-m(i)-</i> stems         |               |  |

**0.** Four major suffixes lie at the heart of the transitive grammar of Colville-Okanagan (Cv), an interior Salishan language spoken in north-eastern Washington and southern British Columbia. Of these suffixes, two are properly transitive and include reference to two entities (a subject and an object), while the other two form the ditransitive subset and include reference to three entities (a subject and two objects).<sup>2</sup> In **1**, I describe the grammar of these affixes—the regular core of the system; in **2**, I explain the ways in which reflexive and reciprocal stems, formally intransitive, resemble transitive stems; and in **3**, I summarize my analysis.

<sup>1</sup> My research on Colville has been supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the Whatcom Museum (Jacobs Fund), the University of Montana, and the University of Hawaii. I gratefully acknowledge this support.

<sup>2</sup> This article is a revision of two papers, the first, titled “The Colville Transitive System,” was read at the Thirteenth International Conference on Salishan Languages, Victoria, B.C., August 1978; and the second, titled “Parallels between the Colville Transitives and Pseudo-Intransitives,” was read at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Western Conference on Linguistics, Eugene, Oregon, October 1978. I thank those who read earlier drafts of this article, discussed many of its points with me, and contributed substantial and much valued comments, especially Laurence C. Thompson, M. Dale Kinkade, Anatole Lyovin, M. Terry Thompson, and Timothy Montler.

TABLE 1  
-NT PARADIGM

Subject	Object				
	1sp	2s	3s	2p	3p
1s		<i>-nt-s-(i)n<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>-(nt-i)n</i>	<i>-ḥ(úl)m-ən</i>	<i>-(nt-i)n-əlx</i>
2s	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -nt-(i)x<sup>w2</sup></i>		<i>-nt-(i)x<sup>w</sup></i>		<i>-nt-(i)x<sup>w</sup>-əlx</i>
3s	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -(nt-i)s</i>	<i>-nt-s-(is)</i>	<i>-(nt-i)s</i>	<i>-ḥ(úl)əm-s</i>	<i>-(nt-i)s-əlx</i>
1p		<i>-nt-s-(i)t</i>	<i>-nt-(i)m</i>	<i>-ḥ(úl)əm-t</i>	<i>-nt-(i)m-əlx</i>
2p	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -nt-(i)p</i>		<i>-nt-(i)p</i>		<i>-nt-(i)p-əlx</i>
3p	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -(nt-i)s-əlx</i>	<i>-nt-s-(i)s-əlx</i>	<i>-(nt-i)s-əlx</i>	<i>-ḥ(úl)əm-s-əlx</i>	<i>-(nt-i)s-əlx</i>
ldf			<i>-nt-(i)m</i>		<i>-nt-(i)m-əlx</i>

<sup>1</sup> In tables 1–4, the parentheses are notational devices that abbreviate stressed and unstressed allomorphs. These suffixes retain their stressed vowels when occurring in forms with weak roots and lose them in forms with strong roots. In addition to losing the suffix vowels, root-stressed forms lose *-nt-* in the first singular, third singular, and third plural subject with third singular and plural object, as well as *-l-* in all subject persons with second plural objects.

<sup>2</sup> The disambiguation of *k<sup>w</sup>u* 'first-person sg. and pl.' object can be accomplished with third-person subjects: with *-(i)s* *k<sup>w</sup>u* is singular 'me', with *-(i)m* *k<sup>w</sup>u* is plural 'us'. At the moment I cannot explain the origin of this phenomenon. Watkins (1970:139) describes the cognate Okanagan phenomenon as follows: "When singular – plural distinctions exist among Class 2 pronouns the difference is expressed by cooccurrence.

*kowéks* 'he saw me'

*kowéknm* 'he saw us'

Here, the number, singular or plural, of the pronoun prefix *ko* '1st person object' is signaled by the choice of pronoun suffix, *-s* 'he', *-m* 'he'. When *-s* appears, *ko-* is singular; when *-m* appears, *ko-* is plural. Such distributional differences are, however, infrequent. More typical is

*kowéknip* 'ye saw me/us'

*kowéknix<sup>w</sup>* 'thou saw me/us.'

In the same year Hoard (1970:13–15) reported Bouchard's analysis of Okanagan 1st. sg. obj. pronoun as *ko . . . əntəm* and Ok 1st pl. obj. pronoun as *ko . . . s*—the exact opposite of the analysis given by Watkins. I ignored the phenomenon in my 1973 dissertation. Several years later Newman (1979:207–23) discussed the disappearance of the number distinction in some languages, including Ok, and made some interesting references to the diffusion of *k* in the first-person pronoun from Kutenai to Ok, observing that "Kutenai *ke?*—simply marked the subject, making no distinctions in person, number, or transitivity; *k-u-* specified first-person subject, without denoting number or transitivity. Subject number and all pronominal object references in Kutenai were marked by suffixes, none of which was borrowed [by a Salish language]. The prefix loans, consequently, underwent considerable revision in their adaptation to the more elaborate paradigmatic system of Salish" (1979:219). The historical developments remain unclear to me. Synchronically Cv has three homophonous morphemes *k<sup>w</sup>u*: (a) 1st pl. intransitive subject; (b) 1st sg. transitive object; (c) 1st pl. transitive object. The disambiguation of *k<sup>w</sup>u* with third-person subject is optionally accomplished not only in the *-nt* paradigm, but in all (di)transitive paradigms, as described here.

1. It is easiest to begin with a discussion of simple (di)transitive stems and then proceed to complex ones.

1.1. A simple stem is one where a transitive suffix is attached directly to the root, with no intervening suffixes.

1.1.1. The basic transitive paradigm of Cv is marked by the suffix *-nt* added to a stem, and followed by suffixes that mark pronoun reference.<sup>3</sup> These transitives obligatorily include reference to two and only two persons, an actor and a primary goal:

(1a) *q̣ỵ-ənt-ín*.<sup>4</sup> 'I write something'.

(2a) *ḳẉúḷ-ənt-x̣ẉ*. 'You fix something'.

Note that the *-nt* predicate:

(3a) *x̣ẉíç̣-ənt-s-ən*,

which translates loosely 'I give it to you', with explicit reference in the translation to an actor (I) and two goals (it and you), is to be interpreted as containing reference only to an actor (I) and a primary goal (you), and can be translated more appropriately as 'I endow you', parallel to *wík-ənt-s-ən* 'I see you'.

Person reference in the *-nt* paradigm is accomplished with a heterogeneous set of affixes and particles. While all actor (subject) persons, singular and plural, are represented by pronominal suffixes, third-person singular goal (object) is unmarked, third-person plural is optionally marked by a suffix, first-person (ambiguously singular or plural) goal is marked by proclitics, and second-person singular and plural goals are marked by suffixes. Schematically the set is presented in table 1.

1.1.2. A second transitive paradigm, marked by *-st* added to the stem, followed by pronoun suffixes, also includes reference to an actor and a primary goal, but in addition implies reference to a third person, a secondary goal coterminous with the actor:

(1b) *q̣ỵ-əst-ín*. 'I write it (for myself)'.

(2b) *ḳẉúḷ-əst-ən*. 'I fix it (for myself)'.

Similarly to *-nt*, person reference in the *-st* paradigm is expressed with a heterogeneous set of affixes and particles, as represented in table 2.

The difference between *-nt* and *-st* transitives is the one of reference just alluded to.<sup>5</sup> Even though spontaneous English translations seldom

<sup>3</sup> Any derivational and inflectional prefixes that may accompany such stems would not disturb the integrity of the definition.

<sup>4</sup> All citations are surface forms with morpheme boundaries indicated and reflect broad phonetic reality except where a stop precedes its homorganic spirant or a glottal stop at a morpheme boundary, and the coalescence of the two sounds into an affricate or a glottalized stop, respectively, is ignored to preserve the segmentation of morphemes. The numbering of the examples is sequential, by the occurrence of the root in the text, including notes. A letter following a number signals that the root is exemplified elsewhere in the article.

<sup>5</sup> The data, including all the examples given here, indicate that all Cv roots potentially participate in both the *-nt* and *-st* paradigms; my argument is that the *-nt* paradigm is basic

TABLE 2  
-ST PARADIGM

Subject	Object			
	1sp	2sp	3s	3p
1s		-st-(ú)m-ən	-st-(i)n	-st-(i)n-əlx
2s	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -st-(i)x<sup>w</sup></i>		-st-(i)x <sup>w</sup>	-st-(i)x <sup>w</sup> -əlx
3s	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -st-(i)s</i>	-st-(ú)m-s	-st-(i)s	-st-(i)s-əlx
1p		-st-(ú)m-t	-st-(i)m	-st-(i)m-əlx
2p	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -st-(i)p</i>		-st-(i)p	-st-(i)s-əlx
3p	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -st-(i)s-əlx</i>	-st-(ú)m-s-əlx	-st-(i)s-əlx	-st-(i)s-əlx
ldf			-st-(i)m	-st-(i)m-əlx

show this contrast well, the *-st* predicates always imply either purposeful or customary involvement on the part of the actor—and this is why I have characterized them as transitives with coterminous actor and secondary goal. However, context often reveals the nature of this contrast, especially if the predicate is expanded by complements:

(4a) *k<sup>w</sup>u ʔác-əcqaʔ, ixiʔ mət t-ʔúk<sup>w</sup>-ənt-s-ən kəl an-təmx<sup>w</sup>-úlaʔx<sup>w</sup>.*  
‘Let’s get out and then **I’ll take you back** to your place’.

(4b) *naḵ<sup>w</sup>əm cniḵə ʔaʔ k-s-c-ḡàʔ ut c-ʔúk<sup>w</sup>-st-s.* ‘He’s the one who writes (the letters) and **delivers them**’.

(5a) *lut k<sup>w</sup>u iə k-s-ḡáḡ-ənt-p.* ‘You don’t **have to pay me**’.

(5b) *lut iə c-ḡàḡ-əst-s iʔ c-x<sup>w</sup>əl-x<sup>w</sup>ilt-s.* ‘**He never paid** his debts’.

(6a) *wayʔ t anwiʔ mi ʔùm-ənt-x<sup>w</sup> iʔ k-s-k<sup>w</sup>án-ʔq-tət.* ‘Name what you think we should plant’.

(6b) *iəx<sup>w</sup> axaʔ c-ḡʔáx<sup>w</sup>, stiḵ mət ʔaʔ c-ʔúm-st-s-əlx, táymətrin.*  
‘That’s the kind that shines, **they have a name for it**, diamond ring’.<sup>6</sup>

and the other secondary. In fact I have found some roots occurring only in one or the other paradigm, but not in both. These cases can be either exceptional, and/or possibly due to semantic incompatibility of the root with one of the two suffixes, or accidental. In the latter case more data are expected to turn up roots in both paradigms. A calculation based on a concordance of about 20,000 words of running text shows that out of approximately 1,000 roots 117 participate in transitive constructions each at least five times. Of these, 97 roots occur with *-nt* and 48 with *-st*; 31 occur with both *-nt* and *-st*; 66 occur with *-nt* but not *-st*; 17 occur with *-st* but not *-nt*.

<sup>6</sup> Although I do not expect a morphological class to match perfectly regularly a given semantic notion, I think nevertheless it is important to try to describe and characterize productive functions as accurately as possible. It might be of interest, therefore, to note that Reichard (1938:582) analyzes the cognate Coeur d’Alene forms as customary: “The

TABLE 3  
-ĒT PARADIGM

Subject	Object			
	1sp	2sp	3s	3p
1s		- <i>h-s-(i)n</i>	- <i>h-(i)n</i>	- <i>h-(i)n-əlx</i>
2s	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -h-(i)x<sup>w</sup></i>		- <i>h-(i)x<sup>w</sup></i>	- <i>h-(i)x<sup>w</sup>-əlx</i>
3s	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -h-(i)s</i>	- <i>h-s-(is)</i>	- <i>h-(i)s</i>	- <i>h-(i)s-əlx</i>
1p		- <i>h-s-(i)t</i>	- <i>h-(i)m</i>	- <i>h-(i)m-əlx</i>
2p	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -h-(i)p</i>		- <i>h-(i)p</i>	- <i>h-(i)p-əlx</i>
3p	<i>k<sup>w</sup>u -h-(i)s-əlx</i>	- <i>h-s-(is)-əlx</i>	- <i>h-(i)s</i>	- <i>h-(i)s-əlx</i>
ldf			- <i>h-(i)m</i>	- <i>h-(i)m-əlx</i>

1.1.3. The third and fourth paradigms, marked by *-h* and *-x(i)t* respectively, are ditransitive and include explicit reference to an actor, a primary goal (usually the recipient), and a third-person secondary goal (usually the direct object).<sup>7</sup> Person reference in these paradigms parallels that of the transitives. Except for 2p objects, *-h* ditransitives use the same suffixes and particles as *-nt* transitives; *-x(i)t* ditransitives use the same suffixes and particles as *-st* transitives. The *-h* paradigm is represented schematically in table 3 and the *-x(i)t* paradigm in table 4.

Corresponding to the simple transitive (3a) *x<sup>w</sup>ič-ənt-s-ən* 'I endow you', the ditransitives (3b) *x<sup>w</sup>ič-əxt-m-ən* and (3c) *x<sup>w</sup>ič-əh-s-ən*, both translated 'I give you something, I endow you with something', add reference to a third-person secondary goal. The difference between *-x(i)t* and *-h* ditransitives is one of focus: *-x(i)t* ditransitives mean 'X does Y for Z', *-h* ditransitives 'X does Y for Z'. This difference is marked formally in the secondary goal complement which, unless the object is clearly understood in context, is expressed and follows the predicate: *-x(i)t* ditransitives require that the secondary goal complement be marked by the proclitic *t*, while *-h* ditransitives never do:

customary transitive is formed as follows: customary prefix (äts-)stem-customary suffix (-stm)-object pronoun-subject pronoun." In Cv, *-st* transitives nearly always occur with *c-* 'actual', but the term customary seems too restrictive and would not apply to such examples as:

(7a) *ăł-p-st-is-əlx axa? i? təm-təmni?* 'They stopped (kicking) the corpse'.

For a different analysis of the functions of *-nt* and *-st* in Ok, see Hébert (1979).

<sup>7</sup> The cognate Spokane affixes are discussed by Carlson (1980).

TABLE 4  
-X(I)T PARADIGM

Subject	Object			
	1sp	2sp	3s	3p
1s		-x(i)t-m-ən	-x(i)t-ən	-x(i)t-n-əlx
2s	k <sup>w</sup> u -x(i)t-x <sup>w</sup>		-x(i)t-x <sup>w</sup>	-x(i)t-x <sup>w</sup> -əlx
3s	k <sup>w</sup> u -x(i)t-s	-x(i)t-əm-s	-x(i)t-s	-x(i)t-s-əlx
1p		-x(i)t-əm-t	-x(i)t-əm	-x(i)t-m-əlx
2p	k <sup>w</sup> u -x(i)t-p		-x(i)t-p	-x(i)t-p-əlx
3p	k <sup>w</sup> u -x(i)t-s-əlx	-x(i)t-əm-s-əlx	-x(i)t-s-əlx	-x(i)t-s-əlx
Idf			-x(i)t-əm	-x(i)t-m-əlx

(2c) k<sup>w</sup>ùl-əxt-x<sup>w</sup> i? t kt-cítx<sup>w</sup>-s. 'You make a house for him'.

(2d) k<sup>w</sup>ùl-əht-x<sup>w</sup> i? s-ən-kt-ča?-sqáxa?. 'You fix a horse for him'.<sup>8</sup>

(3b) x<sup>w</sup>ič-əxt-x<sup>w</sup> i? t k-s-qláw-s. 'You give him some money'.

(3c) x<sup>w</sup>ič-əht-x<sup>w</sup> i? s-qláw. 'You give him some money'.

The focus on the primary goal implied by the -x(i)t predicates is thus manifested in the morphology of the secondary goal complement. The complements of (2c) and (3b) are possessives coreferential with the direct goal, in the unrealized aspect. The more accurate literal translations:

(2c) 'You make for him what will be his house'

(3b) 'You give him what will be his money'

show how -x(i)t ditransitives focus on the primary goal, in contrast to the focus on the secondary goal of -ht ditransitives:

(2d) 'You prepare (saddle . . .) a horse for him'.

(3c) 'You give him some money'.

If no secondary goal complement follows a ditransitive predicate, it is because context makes it clearly understood:

(3d) axâ? in-cq-ilən, i? k<sup>w</sup>u x<sup>w</sup>ič-əxt-x<sup>w</sup>. 'This is my arrow, the one you gave me'.

(3e) way xàs-t a-s-ql-íps, way k<sup>w</sup>u n-q<sup>w</sup>əñ-mi-nt k<sup>w</sup>u x<sup>w</sup>ič-əht. 'Your scarf is beautiful, be nice and give it to me'.

<sup>8</sup> Whatever complex of semantico-syntactic features differentiates 'house' from 'horse' (e.g., "completable"), it does not govern the use of the proclitic *t*. Note the next pair of examples.

In addition to the secondary goal complement expansions of ditransitives just discussed, it is possible to add primary goal and actor complements. A primary goal complement (placed before or after the predicate) must be coreferential with the object pronoun suffix. It is expressed less commonly with the participant persons (first and second persons):

(8) *axa? i? k-s-čəx<sup>w</sup>-xít-əm-t, lʔiw: . . .* ‘This is what we’re going to tell you, father: . . .’

than in the nonparticipant (third) person:

(3f) *x<sup>w</sup>íč-əxt-s i? s-q<sup>w</sup>siʔ-s t k-s-qláw̄-s.* ‘He gave him some money’.

(3g) *i? s-xʔim-t-wisxən x<sup>w</sup>íč-əht-əm s-əmχikəñ.* ‘He gave the longest (arrow) to Grizzly’.

An actor complement must be coreferential with the subject pronoun suffix and must be marked by the agentive proclitic *t*. When the actor is expanded by a complement, the predicate remains in one of the participant (I, you, we) definite persons:

(3h) *t incà? mi x<sup>w</sup>íč-əht-n-əlx.* ‘I myself will give it to them’.

When the predicate is in one of the nonparticipant persons (he/she, they) and the actor is expanded in a complement, the predicate may either remain in the third-person definite subject *-(i)s*:

(9) *kən mi-p-nwítən, t swít k<sup>w</sup>u máyaʔ-t-s, ut waȳ mət n̄n̄wí? mi-p-nú-n.* ‘I’ll learn it, if anybody shows it to me, then I’ll learn it’

or be changed to the indefinite third person *-(i)m*. Actual occurrences of indefinite third-person predicates with expressed actor complements are far more common than their definite third-person counterparts:

(3i) *x<sup>w</sup>íč-əht-əm i? t s-xʔit-x.* ‘The oldest one gave it to him’.

This use of the predicate in the indefinite person (and complementized actor) is not restricted to ditransitives, but extends to all transitives:

(10) *cù-nt-əm t s-qəlt-mix<sup>w</sup>: . . .* ‘The man said to her: . . .’

(11a) *c-ʔam-st-im-əlx t n̄ícən.* ‘Wolf feeds them’.

Finally, in connection with ditransitive suffixes, I perhaps may have to add a third one, *-(t)uht*, phonetically reminiscent of *-ht*, and of unclear allomorphy. For the moment, however, I am able only to disclose its existence in Cv.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The fact that its cognates in other languages have been given some attention in the published literature prompts me to elaborate a bit. Reichard (1938:626) glosses Coeur d’Alene *-tuʔ* ‘for, in reference to’, and Kinkade (1980:34) groups Columbian *-túʔ* with other ‘redirectives’. In Cv, I have found about twenty occurrences of it in connected discourse, with nine different stems. When *-úht* is present, the predicate takes on the fairly clear connotation that the logical agent is in charge of the situation over the logical patient (X

1.2. Thus far I have given examples of forms in which a (di)transitive suffix is added directly to a root, without other intervening suffixes. The combination root + transitive suffix constitutes a simple transitive stem. There are forms, however, in which one or more suffixes intervene between the root and the transitive suffix. I call these complex transitive stems.

1.2.1. The morphologically most straightforward complex stem consists only of a root + the transitivizing suffix *-m(i)-*.<sup>10</sup> An *-m(i)-* stem in

---

intends Y to . . .). However, in the morphology of the *-úht* predicate the logical agent is sometimes the subject and sometimes the object pronoun. Thus in the following two examples the goal (set in boldface type) is also the logical patient, and the actor (marked with a single underscore) the logical agent:

(12) *axâ? i? k<sup>w</sup>ə-k<sup>w</sup>ʔi-t i? tkɬm-ilx<sup>w</sup>, ixî? k<sup>w</sup>u k-s-k<sup>w</sup>əlst-úht-x<sup>w</sup>*. 'This is the Golden Woman, the one you sent **me** after'

(13) *k<sup>w</sup>u k-s-k<sup>w</sup>ʔən-túht-s i? cq-ilən. He wants **me** to lend him the arrow*.

while the opposite case obtains in the next two examples:

(14) *k<sup>w</sup>u n-lə<sup>w</sup> -úht-x<sup>w</sup>, n-lə<sup>w</sup> -ús-ənt-x<sup>w</sup>*. '(You) do exactly as **I** tell you, do it'

(15) *k<sup>w</sup>u n-qlut-úht-x<sup>w</sup>*. '(You) follow **me**'. (*qlut* < *ql-wit*)

Therefore, it remains to be explained why the underlying agent sometimes surfaces as subject, other times as object. Although the category 'control', recently advanced by Thompson (1976), might help answer these questions, I am not yet prepared to make use of the notion. While I realize that an analysis of these (di)transitive affixes vis-à-vis 'control' would add an understanding of their semantics, my present approach is strictly formal. Since 'control' is a feature of (combinations of) morphemes, and not a morpheme itself, I delay study of it until after I have mapped out the distribution of all these morphemes. Not only the function, but also the (underlying) form of the suffix remains to be correctly induced from its several allomorphs (and attendant morphophonemic changes): *-úht* in (14) and:

(16) *lut iə k-s-miʔn-úht-s-əlx*. 'She won't be able to instruct them (differently)'.  
 -(t)úht (*-úht* or *-túht*) in (12), (15), and:

(17) *n-qəʔ-kst-úht-əm axâ? məlqnúps*. 'He put that (arrow) in Eagle's hand'.  
 -(t)úht in:

(18) *čq<sup>w</sup>əs-túht-əm*. 'She pointed to it (for him)'. (Cf. *čáq<sup>w</sup>s-ənt-əm*. 'She pointed to it'.)  
 -(n)túht (*-túht* or *-ntúht*) in (13) and:

(19a) *cqmən-túht-s*. 'He threw it at him'.  
 And *-ntúht* in:

(20) *cəh səl-mi-n axâ? in-kənp-qin-kst-(t)n, ut axâ? k-təlm-əntúht-s-ən*. 'I might lose my ring, I'll have you keep it'. (Cf. *lut k<sup>w</sup>u iə k-s-kaʔkic-ʔ-s-əlx i-k-s-tiləm*. 'They won't find for me what I'm giving them to keep'.)

<sup>10</sup> The notation in parentheses is, again, that explained in table 1, n. 1. For a discussion of the possible connections between *-m(i)-* and *-min-*, see n. 18. There are other stems that qualify as complex because they have other suffixes before *-m(i)-*. The two most common are *-t* 'stative', and *-p* 'noncontrol'. Since the presence of *-t* or *-p* in the transitive is idiosyncratic, each lexical item must be marked for this requirement, i.e., whether or not *-t/-p* will precede *-m(i)-* in the stem. Consider the following illustration of such a complex stem. The intransitive root *ʔas* 'good', which occurs in intransitive forms such as:

turn attaches the proper transitive suffix, producing a transitive form. The roots that require the addition of *-m(i)-* (immediately following them) before the transitive suffixes are inferred intransitive in contrast to those that do not, inferred transitive. The transitivization of roots with *-m(i)-* works as follows: if, for example, the root *paʔs* ‘feel (bad)’, typically occurring in intransitive forms such as:

- (24a) *kən paʔ-paʔs-ink*. ‘I feel sad’  
 (24b) *k<sup>w</sup> paʔ-paʔs-ilx*. ‘You’ll be feeling bad’  
 (24c) *kət-paʔs-əncút*. ‘She’ll get wise’

is transitivized with *-m(i)-*, then it participates fully in both *-nt* and *-st* transitive formations:

- (24d) *paʔs-mi-s iʔ kənp-qín-kst-(t)ən-s*. ‘She wishes back her ring’.  
 (Wishing refers to a psychic effort following which the ring magically returns.)  
 (24e) *lut iə c-paʔs-mi-st-x<sup>w</sup> ý an-kʔáw-mən*. ‘You never remembered (to say) your prayers’. (Saint Peter’s reproach to a rejected suppliant at Heaven’s gate.)

- (21a) *k<sup>w</sup> ɲ-xəs-k<sup>w</sup>ist*. ‘You have a pretty name’  
 (21b) *kən ɲ-xəs-t-wilx*. ‘I get well’  
 (21c) *xàs-i iʔ s-ən-kt-čət-sqáxaʔ*. ‘It’s a beautiful horse’

can be part of transitivized stems such as:

- (21d) *ɲiñwiʔ lut ɲ-xəs-t-mi-nt-x<sup>w</sup>*. ‘It won’t do you any good’.  
 (21e) *c-xəs-t-mi-st-ən*. ‘I enjoyed it’.

Another common complex stem has a lexical suffix before *-m(i)-*. One example, based on the root *xas* (*-aʔ-* infix in the root is ‘intensive’) is:

- (21f) *ɲ-xaʔs-inaʔ-m-ənt-x<sup>w</sup>*. ‘You enjoy hearing it’.

Two other examples are based on the intransitive root *wnix<sup>w</sup>*. Side by side with intransitive constructions such as:

- (22a) *way unix<sup>w</sup>*. ‘That’s true’  
 (22b) *way s-unix<sup>w</sup>-əx<sup>w</sup>*. ‘He’s telling the truth’

there occur transitivized forms with lexical suffixes + *-m(i)-*, as in:

- (22c) *way ut sic n-unx<sup>w</sup>-inaʔ-m-ənt-əm*. ‘Finally they believed him’.  
 (22d) *lut swit iə c-n-unx<sup>w</sup>-inaʔ-m-st-s*. ‘Nobody believes in it’.

What is noteworthy about all stems with lexical suffixes is that each such combination root + lexical suffix must be marked as to whether it requires *-m(i)-* before being transitivized, as many stems based on transitive roots do. For example, *siw*, a transitive root that forms the following simple transitives:

- (23a) *siw-ən*. ‘I asked it’  
 (23b) *k<sup>w</sup>u kət-siw-s*. ‘He inquired about me’

must add *-m(i)-* in combination with a lexical suffix:

- (23c) *siw-cən-m-ənt-s-ən*. ‘I called you’  
 (23d) *k-s-ən-su-cən-mi-st-s-əlx*. ‘They proposed to him (for something)’.

Similarly, the root *nixəl* 'hear', intransitive in forms such as:

(25a) *mət k<sup>w</sup> nixəl i? təl an-łx-əx-łxá-p?* 'Have you heard from your parents?'

(25b) *nixəl i? t s-qilx<sup>w</sup>*. 'The people heard'

is transitivized by *-m(i)-* and occurs with either *-nt* or *-st*, according to sense:

(25a) *cəm ɣayxàxa? təl a-k-s-x<sup>w</sup> áq<sup>w</sup>-əlqs-əm mi c-kət-nixəl-m-ənt-x<sup>w</sup> i? pə-ptwinax<sup>w</sup>*. 'Shortly after you start snoring (i.e., pretending to be asleep), you will hear the old lady (come up the stairs).'

(25b) *way c-mi-st-ix<sup>w</sup> way c-nixl-əm-st-m-ən*. 'You know I always listen to (i.e., obey) you'.

And in parallel fashion, the root *q<sup>w</sup>it* 'capable', occurring in forms like:

(26a) *nikxna? q<sup>w</sup>àsqi? q<sup>w</sup>it-č<sup>w</sup>ətt ! s-ir-iwa-xən*. 'Goodness, Blue Jay is good on snowshoes'

(26b) *ix<sup>w</sup> way anwi? k<sup>w</sup> s-q<sup>w</sup>it-č<sup>w</sup>ətt-x*. 'You can sure do wonders'

is transitivized by *-m(i)-* in such forms:

(26c) *cəm k<sup>w</sup> ɣáyx<sup>w</sup>-t, way ti xàs-t t q<sup>w</sup>it-m-ənt-s-ən*. 'You must be tired, it's best I pack you'.

(26d) *k<sup>w</sup> k-s-tkəm-ilx<sup>w</sup> mi k<sup>w</sup>u tət-c-q<sup>w</sup>it-əm-st-x<sup>w</sup>?* 'You are the woman and you want to pack me?'

I must now note that transitivized *-m(i)-* stems never participate in ditransitive (*-tt* and *-x(i)t*) constructions, even in those cases where the English translation suggests a ditransitive meaning.

1.2.2. In contrast with *-m(i)-*, which transitivizes intransitive roots (and stems), two other affixes are added to transitive roots to add special semantic notions. The first, *-nu-*, carries the implication that the activity referred to is accomplished either accidentally or after a struggle. It can be added to a root directly, after the reduplicative suffix *-(V)C<sub>2</sub>* 'developmental', or after *-p* 'noncontrol', as in:

(7b) *łl-əl-nú-nt-s*. 'She'll kill you'.

(7c) *łł-p-nú-nt-əm*. 'We can stop her'.

(27a) *k<sup>w</sup>ən-nú-n*. 'I managed to get it'.

(27b) *lut i? t s-qilx<sup>w</sup> k<sup>w</sup>u tət c-k<sup>w</sup>ən-nú-st-s*. 'Nobody can catch me'.

(27c) *k<sup>w</sup>ən-nú-t-ən*. 'I managed to take it from her'.

The semantic import of the second, *-xixm*,<sup>11</sup> is less well understood, but seems to be 'indefinite goal'. The suffix follows a transitive root and is in turn followed by *-nt* or *-tt*. Examples of the first case are very common, of the second rare:<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Comparative evidence will show whether or not the *m* is historically segmentable and what morpheme it should be assigned to.

<sup>12</sup> Even though I am unable to prove it at this time, I hypothesize that the notion

(3j) *kət-x<sup>w</sup>əč-xixm-ən*. 'I gave it away'.

(11b) *ʔamən-xixm-ənt-x<sup>w</sup>*.<sup>13</sup> 'You gave it to eat to somebody'.

(28) *səlm-xixəm-ʔt-s-ən*. 'I lost something of yours'.

2. The symmetry found in the (di)transitive predicate system is imperfectly, albeit significantly, matched in the two pseudo-intransitives *-cút* 'reflexive' and *-wix<sup>w</sup>* 'reciprocal'. I call these forms pseudo-intransitive because they are intransitive only in a gross formal way, in that they are inflected with the intransitive pronoun markers. However, this formal intransitivity is contradicted not only by the logically transitive import of these forms (*I wash myself*, *We fight each other*), but also by the peculiar fact that both *-cút* and *-wix<sup>w</sup>* are suffixed to transitive stems, that is, to stems in *-nt* and *-st*.<sup>14</sup> Similarly to the transitive predicates, the suffixation of *-m(i)-* is prerequisite with some roots.<sup>15</sup> In addition to

'indefinite' is added to a different goal according to which (di)transitive suffix follows: with *-nt* it is added to the only object; with *-t* to the goal not in focus. It may also turn out that *-xixm* is incompatible with *-st* and *-x(i)t*.

<sup>13</sup> This root has allomorphs *ʔam* and *ʔamn*.

<sup>14</sup> There are four exceptions to this distribution:

(29) *k<sup>w</sup> k-s-kət-paʔx-cút*. 'What you want to do'.

(30) *a-səx-cút*. 'Your companion'.

(31) *s-c-təx<sup>w</sup>-cút-x-əlx*. 'They're getting things to eat'.

(32) *c-k̄t-uk-cút*. 'She sees it'.

A fifth form has *-cút* following a lexical suffix:

(33) *kən k-caʔ-qnəl-cút*. 'I punched myself in the groin'.

Note that all these forms preclude a synchronic analysis of the reflexive suffix as *-sut*, or else one would have to explain the preceding *-t* (*t-sut*), which would not be easy since *-t* would have this odd distribution: it always occurs following *-n-*, *-s-*, *-t-*, *-x(i)-* (of the transitive suffixes), except in these five unexplained cases. For further discussion, see n. 18.

<sup>15</sup> Note that the distribution of the cognate suffixes in other Interior Salish languages seems to be analogous. Kuipers (1974:46) succinctly reports that in Shuswap "there is a suffix *-cut* (*my-*, *your-*, etc.)-*self* and a reciprocal suffix *-wéx<sup>w</sup>* *each other*. These suffixes, always stressed, immediately follow the transitivizer, and the whole is conjugated as an intransitive verb." Vogt (1940:58–59) lists a Kalispel suffix *-cu(t)* 'reflexive' and a suffix *-uwé(x<sup>w</sup>)* 'reciprocal', and his examples include occurrences of both after *-(m)-nt* and *-(m)-st* (*memscút* 'he plays', *cuncút* 'he goes out to get a vision'). Carlson (1972:94–95) reports that in Spokane "the suffix *// -sút//* comes after a transitive stem to form a reflexive word" and that "the suffix *// -wéʔx<sup>w</sup>//* . . . forms reciprocal words from transitive stems" giving, in both cases, examples with *-nt* and *-st*. Reichard (1938:627) reports for Coeur d'Alene "That *-sut* is a true transitive is shown by the fact that, except with rare exceptions, it is preceded by the transitivizer *-ən*." She adds that the reciprocal *-twic* (*-iwac*) "like the reflexive, usually takes the transitivizer *-ən*." Thompson and Thompson (ms.: 49–50) report that in Thompson "reflexives and reciprocal forms introduce logically transitive objects but are grammatically intransitive. Where there are alternate stems from weak roots with *-t* and *-n-t* inflection, *// -sut//* and *// -wax<sup>w</sup>//* are consistently added to the *// -n-t//* stem."

reflexive and reciprocal forms, Cv allows detransitivized stems, as described below.

Two observations can be made about the distribution and function of reflexives and reciprocals. (1) It is probably no accident that these suffixes follow only the transitive suffixes (*-nt* and *-st*) and not the ditransitive ones (*-h* and *-x(i)t*).<sup>16</sup> (2) One would expect the function of the transitives, on the one hand, and the reflexives and reciprocals, on the other, to run along parallel lines. (1) is probably a logical corollary of the nature of reflexives, which require a coreferential subject and object (and no other direct object), and of reciprocals, which exclude the coreference of subject and object but require the presence of both; (2) is subject to empirical confirmation.

2.1. Although my Cv data abound with examples of roots and stems that participate in both *-nt* and *-st* transitivization, I have had difficulty finding clear cases of a *-ncút*/*-scút* contrast.<sup>17</sup> Despite this paucity, the Cv data do suggest a reflexive system that parallels the transitive system, with *-ncút* a simple, unmarked sort of reflexive, and *-scút* the marked reflexive. The simple *-ncút* reflexives are best rendered as 'X<sub>i</sub> lays down (X<sub>i</sub>)', 'X<sub>i</sub> gets ready (X<sub>i</sub>)', etc., while the marked (purposive?) notion implied in the *-scút* reflexives can be paraphrased 'X<sub>i</sub> gets in trouble (X<sub>i</sub>) (and it's his doing)', 'X<sub>i</sub> dolls up (X<sub>i</sub>) (and it's his doing)':

(34a) *s-cək<sup>w</sup>-m-əncút-x, cək<sup>w</sup>-əm-scút*. 'They pull back, withdraw'.

(34b) *lut i-s-cək<sup>w</sup>-əm-scút*. 'I'm not playing hard to get'.

(2e) *k<sup>w</sup>l-əncút-(t)ŋ*. 'God'.

(2f) *s-k<sup>w</sup>əl-scút-s*. 'She got dressed, ready'.

(35a) *way<sup>w</sup> k<sup>w</sup>u x<sup>w</sup>il-st-s təl púlst-ən, way<sup>w</sup> ixì? ut sic kən k-təp-m-əncút*. 'He left me because I beat him, and now I'm disgusted with myself'.

(35b) *way<sup>w</sup> myat-əm anwì? k<sup>w</sup> k-təp-əm-scút*. 'You have done something awful to yourself'. (His wife to Wolf who had defecated on himself.)

2.2. I have analyzed the two sequences *-nwíx<sup>w</sup>* and *-(s)twíx<sup>w</sup>* to reflect, respectively, underlying *-nt-wíx<sup>w</sup>* and *-st-wíx<sup>w</sup>*. I cannot trace the parallelism with the reflexives further than this formal resemblance. I have at least one example of both *-nwíx<sup>w</sup>* and *-twíx<sup>w</sup>* with the same root, but the stems are different:

(36a) *ŋ-q<sup>w</sup>əl-q<sup>w</sup>əl-c(n)-nwíx<sup>w</sup>*. 'They have an argument'.

(36b) *k<sup>w</sup>u s-q<sup>w</sup>əl-q<sup>w</sup>əl-stíx<sup>w</sup>-x*. 'Let's talk!'

<sup>16</sup> For the single exception to this, see (38b) in 2.2.

<sup>17</sup> Underlying these are */-nt-cút/* and */-st-cút/* respectively.

And I can only list some examples showing the presumably unmarked *-nwix<sup>w</sup>* matching *-ncút*, and a few other examples with *-(s)twix<sup>w</sup>*:

- (37a) *k<sup>w</sup>u q<sup>w</sup>aʔ-q<sup>w</sup>aʔm-əncút*. 'We practice'.  
 (37b) *k<sup>w</sup>u q<sup>w</sup>aʔm-ənwix<sup>w</sup>*. 'We know each other'.  
 (37c) *k<sup>w</sup>u q<sup>w</sup>aʔm-ənwix<sup>w</sup>-st-x<sup>w</sup>*. 'You introduce me (to somebody)'.  
 (38a) *c-məy-əncút*. 'They tell about themselves'.  
 (38b) *məy-x(t)-twix<sup>w</sup>*. 'They talk to one another'.  
 (15d) *kən c-k<sup>w</sup>ən-k<sup>w</sup>ən-ks-əncút*. 'I grab my own hands'.  
 (15e) *k<sup>w</sup>ən-ks-ənwix<sup>w</sup>-əlx*. 'They shake hands'.  
 (15f) *kən k<sup>w</sup>ən-k<sup>w</sup>ən-twix<sup>w</sup>*. 'I grabbed her (around the waist)'.  
 (39) *c-my-stwix<sup>w</sup>-əlx*. 'They know each other'.  
 (40) *k<sup>w</sup>u k-s-χ<sup>w</sup>əl-stwix<sup>w</sup>-aʔx*. 'We'll leave each other'.

2.3. In contrast to the pseudo-intransitive suffixes (which characteristically are added to transitive stems, remain logically transitive, but are conjugated as intransitives), a Cv suffix *-mist*<sup>18</sup> added to a stem cancels any implicit reference to an object, detransitivizing the stem both logically and formally. Some examples are clear, and, if one assumes the semantic compatibility of root and stem with the suffix, point to a productive process; for example:

- (41a) *wik<sup>w</sup>-ənt-s*. 'You hide something'.  
 (41b) *wik<sup>w</sup>-mist*. 'He hid (himself)'.  
 (42a) *t-əm-st-ín*. 'I straightened it'.  
 (42b) *k<sup>w</sup> tít-mist*. 'You went straight'.

Other forms, however, suggest that the function of *-mist* is more complex. Compare the following, for example, where each *-mist*, here stressed, is paired with at least another reflexive:

- (43a) *kən ʔəckən-kst-míst*. 'I am playing'. (*ʔickən* 'play', *-kst* 'hand')  
 (43b) *c-pu-ʔəckiʔ-scút*. 'He plays with his wife'. (*pu* 'wife')

<sup>18</sup> It has been suggested that *-mist* is segmentable *-mi(n)-st*. *-mi(n)* would then be either the instrumental suffix or a stem formative. The loss of *n* before *s* is regular. *-st* would be the unstressed form of the reflexive, set up as underlying */-sut/* and, in this analysis, the same suffix *-st-* found in forms (1b), (2b), etc. I have already given one argument against an underlying Cv form */-sut/* in n. 15. There is a second argument, also phonological. According to their stress behavior roots and suffixes can be weak or strong. Given a root and a suffix of equal valence, the suffix receives the stress. While *-mi(n)* is a weak suffix because it has an unstressed form *-mən* that occurs with strong roots (and cognates *-min/* *-mən* with analogous morphophonemic behavior are found throughout the Interior languages), Cv *-cút* is always stressed. If *-st* is analyzed as the unstressed allomorph of */-sut/*, it would have the peculiarity that it loses its stress to a weak suffix. Even if one could account for the aberrant stress behavior of the complex *mi-sut* > *míst*, I see this possibility as uneconomical and counterintuitive. The historical evidence would have to be quite convincing, and while I do not deny the possibility of a historical connection between *-cut* and *-st*, for the moment I do not see the evidence as leading inevitably in that direction.

- (2g) *i-s-k<sup>w</sup>əl-kst-míst*. 'I fix myself up'.  
 (44a) *ŋ-q<sup>w</sup>əñ-q<sup>w</sup>ñá?-míst*. 'He's a beggar'.  
 (44b) *kən q<sup>w</sup>əñ-scút*. 'I did a pitiful thing'.  
 (44c) *q<sup>w</sup>əñ-q<sup>w</sup>ñ-əm-scút*. 'They're having a hard time'.  
 (45a) *k<sup>w</sup>u ti?i-əp-míst*. 'We jump'.  
 (45b) *kən ti-əp-m-əncút*. 'I jump'.

3. Colville-Okanagan exhibits a symmetric and complex (di)transitive system that includes four major suffixes (*-nt*, *-st*, *-t*, and *-x(i)t*). Each of these signals a specific relationship between the subject and the goal(s)—the language seems to take great care in specifying just what relationships obtain between the subjects and the objects of each proposition. A fifth suffix, *-(t)úht*, is surely a part of this system, adding a fifth type of relationship which, at this time, remains imperfectly understood.

The signaling of these specific relationships between subjects and objects carries into that area of the grammar I have termed pseudo-intransitive and which includes reflexive and reciprocal forms. Although they are conjugated with intransitive pronouns and otherwise behave as intransitives, these forms bear within them one of the transitive suffixes which, again, signals the kind of relationship intended between the subjects and objects of the sentence.

All these transitive and pseudo-intransitive forms are opposed to the intransitive forms of the language, thus mapping a dichotomous system. While a discussion of the intransitive system is not crucial to the understanding of the workings of its transitive counterpart, it is appropriate to point out that just as intransitive roots can be transitivized, so transitive roots and stems can be detransitivized with the suffixation of *-míst*. In these cases any reference to the (potential) object(s) of the transitive forms is removed.

Finally, it is my hope that this description will stimulate further comparative and typological study of Colville-Okanagan.<sup>19</sup>

#### REFERENCES

- CARLSON, BARRY F. 1972. A grammar of Spokane: a Salish language of eastern Washington. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.  
 ———. 1980. Two-goal transitive stems in Spokane Salish. *IJAL* 46:21–26.  
 HÉBERT, YVONNE M. 1979. A note on aspect in (Nicola Lake) Okanagan. Preprints of the Fourteenth International Conference on Salishan languages, pp. 173–209. Bellingham: Western Washington University.

<sup>19</sup> For a preliminary, but impressively thorough, survey of Interior Salish transitives, see Shapard (1980).

- HOARD, JAMES E. 1970. Problems in Proto-Salish pronoun reconstruction. Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference on Salishan Languages, Gonzaga University.
- KINKADE, M. DALE. 1980. Columbian Salish *-xí-*, *-t*, *-túʔ*. IJAL 46:33-36.
- KUIPERS, AERT H. 1974. The Shuswap Language. The Hague: Mouton.
- MATTINA, ANTHONY. 1973. Colville grammatical structure. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- NEWMAN, STANLEY. 1979. A history of the Salish possessive and subject forms. IJAL 45:207-23.
- REICHARD, GLADYS A. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. Handbook of American Indian Languages 3:517-707.
- SHAPARD, JEFFREY. 1980. Interior Salishan (di)transitive systems. Preprints of the Fifteenth International Conference on Salishan Languages, pp. 229-82. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- THOMPSON, LAURENCE C. 1976. The control system: a major category in the grammar of Salishan languages. The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages, pp. 156-76. Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum.
- \_\_\_\_\_, AND M. TERRY THOMPSON. Ms. The Thompson language.
- VOGT, HANS. 1940. The Kalispel Language. Oslo: Norske Videnskaps-Academi.
- WATKINS, DONALD A. 1970. A description of the phonemes and position classes in the morphology of Head of the Lake Okanagan (Salish). Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta.