Split ergativity in Shuswap Salish

Dwight GARDINER and Ross SAUNDERS

Simon Fraser University

0 Introduction

In this paper we wish to present a set of observations that raise interesting questions about the status of the pronominal system in Shuswap[1]. There is a form /-əs/ in Shuswap that occurs in several common syntactic constructions. It behaves as a third person marker in the grammatical system, but also appears cliticized to /-w-/ and has developed a broader function triggered by aspectual and discourse factors. This development is shared only with the closely related Thompson language (THOMPSON 1976) although Tillamook may have separately developed a similar system (NEWMAN 1980). We provide an analysis in which Shuswap is

---

[1] Shuswap is spoken on the Interior Plateau of British Columbia and is the northernmost member of the Interior Salish language family. It is a predicate-initial language with a system of pronominal person marking on the predicate. Shuswap is spoken with several minor dialectal differences. The data in this paper is representative of the Deadman's Creek/Kamloops area. We would like to thank Leslie Jules of Kamloops, Mona Jules of Chu Chua, Annie-May Jules, Sam Camille, and Basile Deneau of Skeetchestn who have helped us to understand their language. We would also like to thank Henry Davis, Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Mandy Jimmie, Dale Kinkade, Aert Kuipers, and Paul McFetridge who provided valuable comments on this paper. A version of this paper appeared in *Working Papers for the XXV International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, Vancouver, B.C., 1990.

shown to have a split ergative morphological case marking system. It is shown that this system is triggered by distinctions in person, aspect and clause type.

Shuswap /-əs/ shows up as a 3rd person pronominal agreement marker in Wh-question, focus, and relative clause constructions.

(1)   **swɛ́tẙ k-čntɛ́s**[2]
swɛ́tẙ k čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́s
who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
Whom did he punch?

(2)   **swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́məs**[3]
swɛ́tq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m-w-əs
who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom
Who punched him?

In (1), it is the argument corresponding to the Patient that is questioned and the verbal morphology is identical to declaratives (3). In (2), it is the Agent argument that is questioned. We assume that the 3rd person marker appears as /-s,-ɛ́s/ or /-əs/ depending on the phonological environment. The notional verb is grammatically intransitive, having been turned into a passive and is then extended with /-w-əs/. It is similar, but not identical to the independent clause (4) which is an impersonal passive contruction.

---

[2] The following abbreviations have been used: abs (absolutive), acc (accusative), caus (causative), cl (classifier), compl (completive), deic (deictic), emph (emphatic pronoun), erg (ergative), exp (expectational), fc (full control), hab (habitual), incompl (incompletive), irr (irrealis), inv (invisible), nom (nominative), pass (passive), qu (question), [...] (reduplication), tr (transitive).

[3] Evidence for positing the /-w-/ comes from the following:
    čnčɛ́[č]ms
    čw-n-t-sɛ́[č]ms
    hit-fc-tr-1acc-3erg
    He hit me.

The [ə] is expected to delete in unstressed environments. We therefore posit a /-w-/. This is supported by data from Thompson were the equivalent form is [-us]. Also in intransitive constructions that are not derived by passive the suffix triggers labialization.
    wʔɛx ɤ-λʾʔɛ́k-ʷ-əs
    exist det-go-incompl-3nom
    He's going.

(3)   **čntɛ́s**
        čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́s
        punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
        He punched him.

(4)   **čntɛ́m**
        čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m
        punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass
        He was punched.

The form /čntɛ́m/ can also occur in Wh-constructions.

(5)   **swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́m**
        swɛ́tq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m
        who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass
        Who was punched?

Independent impersonal passives can never be formed with /-əS/.

(6)   ***čntɛ́məs**

Focus constructions with a pronominal argument in preverbal position exhibit a similar pattern. These constructions are always emphatic.

(7)   **nwiˀs mɛˀ čntɛ́s**
        nwiˀs mɛˀ čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́s
        3emph exp punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
        He's the one whom he punched.

(8)   **nčɛ́čwəˀ luˀčnčɛ́[č]ms**
        nčɛ́čwəˀ luˀ čw-n-sɛ́[č]m-s
        Iemph deic punch-fc-tr-1acc-3erg
        I'm the one whom he punched.

(9)   **nwiˀs čntɛ́məs**
        nwiˀs čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m-w-əs
        3emph punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom
        He's the one who punched him.

(10) **nčɛ́čwə̓ čntɛ́məs**
nčɛ́čwə̓ čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m-w-əs
Iemph punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom
I'm the one who punched him.

In (7-8) the preverbal emphatic pronoun corresponds to the Patient. The verbal is identical to the corresponding non-focus clauses in (11):

(11) **čntɛ́s**   He punched him.
čnč[č]ms   He punched me.

In (9-10) the preverbal emphatic pronoun corresponds to the Agent. The predicate has been made passive and is then extended with /-w-əs/. Non-focus clauses are shown in (12).

(12) **čntɛ́s**   He punched him.
čntɛ́[t]n   I punched him.

A third construction that displays the same pattern is one that has properties resembling relative clauses.

(13) **člx̣mstɛ́[t]n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx lə-m-čntɛ́s**
c-lx̣-m-st-Ø-n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx lə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́s
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
I know the man whom he punched.

(14) **člx̣mstɛ́[t]n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx lə-m-čntɛ́x**
č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx lə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́x
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-2nom
I know the man whom you punched.

(15) **člx̣mstɛ́[t]n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx lə-m-čntɛ́məs**
č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx lə-m-čw-n-Ø-tɛ́m-w-əs
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom
I know the man who punched him.

(16) clx̣mstέ[t]n ɤ-sqέləmx lə-m-čnčís

c-lx̣-m-st-,-n ɤ-sqέləmx lə-m-čn-n-t-sís

hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-2acc-3erg

I know the man who punched you.

The relative clauses (13-14) are headed by a nominal that corresponds to the Patient internal to the clause. All of the persons are marked on the predicate of the relative. In (15-16) the relative clause is headed by a nominal that corresponds to the internal Agent. In (15) the predicate is made intransitive by passive /-έm/ and the /-w-əs/ form is added and in (16) there is a pronominal agreement suffix on the predicate corresponding to the nominal head.

These constructions can also occur without nominal heads.

(17) **člx̣mstέ[t]n lə-m-čntέs**

c-lx̣-m-st-Ø-n lə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-έs

hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg

I know whom he punched.

(18) **člx̣mstέ[t]n lə-m-čntέməs**

č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-n lə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-έm-w-əs

hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom

I know who punched him.

The pattern of person marking in relative clauses parallels that of Wh-questions and focus constructions.

Jacaltec (CRAIG 1976) a Mayan language has a similar construction in which extracted subjects[4] behave differently than objects. Transitive clause structure is shown in (19).

---

[4] The Mayan facts are described in terms of subject and object extraction. Throughout this paper we remain neutral regarding the configurational status of subject and object. The facts can alternatively be accounted for by referring to morphological case or to thematic relations such as Agent and Patient.

(19)　**xil naj ix**
　　　　saw cl/he cl/her
　　　　He saw her.

In (20-22) third person pronominal objects are extracted in question, cleft, and relative clause constructions and there is no mark on the verb.

(20)　**mac xil naj**
　　　　Who saw cl/he
　　　　Who did he see?

(21)　**ha' ix xil naj**
　　　　cleft cl/she saw cl/he
　　　　It's her that he saw.

(22)　**wohtaj ix xil naj**
　　　　I know cl/her saw cl/he
　　　　I know the woman that he saw.

In (23-25), the reference to subjects requires additional marking on the verb /x'il-ni/.

(23)　**mac x'il-ni ix**
　　　　Who saw-suffix cl/her
　　　　Who saw her?

(24)　**ha' naj x'il-ni ix**
　　　　cleft cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
　　　　It's he who saw her.

(25)　**wohtaj naj x'il-ni ix**
　　　　I know cl/he saw-suffix cl/her
　　　　I know the man who saw her.

Before turning to the syntactic properties of the Shuswap constructions we provide an overview of the pronominal system.

1.0   The Pronominal System

Person is referenced by sets of affixes and clitics that occur on the predicate. We first discuss first and second person.

Intransitive clauses are referenced for person by pronominal clitics :

(26) ƛ'ʔɛ[ʔ]k-kn
      go-1nom
      I go/went.

(27) ƛ'ʔɛk-k
      go-2nom
      You go.

(28) ƛ'ʔɛk-kt
      go-1pl incl nom
      We (including you) go.

(29) ƛ'ʔɛk-kux
      go-1pl exl nom
      We (but not you) go.

(30) ƛ'ʔɛk-kp
      go-2pl nom
      You (pl) go.

The clitic paradigm is shown in the following chart.

	Singular	Plural
1st	-kn	-kt (incl)
		-kux (excl)
2nd	-k	-kp

Transitive clauses are referenced for person by pronominal suffixes. The predicate is suffixed with /-t/ and the pronominal subject follows the object marker.

(31) **čnčέ[č]mx**
čw-n-t-sέ[č]m-x
hit-fc-tr-1acc-2nom
You punch me.

(32) **čnčín**
čw-n-t-sí-n
hit-fc-tr-2acc-1nom
I punch you.

The pronominal subjects are shown in the following chart.[5]

	Singular	Plural
1st	-(έ)n	
2nd	-(έ)x	-(έ)p

The pronominal objects are given in the following chart.

	Singular	**Plural**
1st	-s(έ)m-	-(έ)l-
2nd	-s(í)-	-(ú)lm-

First and second person are marked according to a nominative/accusative system. In intransitive clauses first and second person is supplied by clitics. In transitive clauses the first and second person markers are suffixes.

The nominative clitic paradigm behaves differently from the suffixal paradigms. Evidence that these are different paradigms comes from the question suffix /-n-/ :

(33) **m-ʎ'ˀɛk-n-k**
compl-go-qu-2nom
Did you go?

---

5 Shuswap does not permit 1st person plural ergatives. The equivalent of 'We punched him' would be expressed by a passive. An example is given in (74).

(34) **čnčín**
    čw-n˘t-sí-s-n
    hit-fc-tr-2acc-3erg-qu
    Did he hit you?

The question suffix /-n/ intervenes between the predicate stem and the subject clitic in intransitive clauses whereas it is suffixed after the pronominal objects and subjects in transitive clauses.

1.1 Third Person Marking

In this section we establish an ergative/absolutive system for third person. The behaviour of third person pronominals in intransitive clauses is shown in the following examples :

(35) **ƛ'ˀɛk-Ø**
    go-3abs
    He goes.

(36) **wik-m-Ø**
    see-middle-3abs
    He is looking.

(37) **wik-t-Ø-m**
    see-tr-3abs-pass
    He was seen.

Clauses (35-37) are intransitive and the third person marker is /-Ø/. The following clauses are transitive.

(38) **wik-t-Ø-s**
    see-tr-3abs-3erg
    He saw it.

(39) **wik-t-Ø-s ɣ-sək'lɛ́p**
    see-tr-3abs-3erg deic-coyote
    He saw the coyote.

(40) **wik-t-Ø-s ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx ɤ-sək'lɛ́p**
see-tr-3abs-3erg deic-man deic-coyote
The man saw the coyote.

Third person behaves according to an ergative/absolutive system. Subjects of transitive clauses in (38-40) are marked with /-ɛ́s,-s/, the ergative. Third person objects are marked with /-Ø-/, the absolutive, parallel to subjects of intransitive clauses (35-37).

Shuswap then has a split ergative system for person. First and second person are nominative/accusative and third person is ergative/absolutive. The common types of split systems recognized are on the basis of person marking, aspect and clausal type. Having established the presence of a split system based on person, we now turn to aspect.

1.2 Aspect

Split ergative systems frequently make a distinction based on aspect. Often in the completive aspect third person behaves as an ergative/absolutive whereas in the incompletive aspect third person behaves as a nominative/accusative. Clauses (41-43) are marked with the completive prefix /m-/.

(41) **m-ƛ'ʔɛ[ʔ]k-kn**
compl-go-1nom
I went.

(42) **m-ƛ'ʔɛk-k**
compl-go-2nom
You went.

(43) **m-ƛ'ʔɛk-Ø**
compl-go-3abs
He went.

The completives (41-43) are all independent clauses. First and second person are nominative and third person is absolutive. Incompletive constructions have the

particle /wˀɛx/ in predicate initial position and the notional verb is a dependent clause.

(44) **wˀɛx ɤ-ʎˈˀɛ[ˀ]k-ʷ-ən**
       exist deic-go-incompl-1nom
       I am going.

(45) **wˀɛx ɤ-ʎˈˀɛ[ˀ]k-ʷ-əx[uxʷ]**
       exist deic-go-incompl-2nom
       You are going.

(46) **wˀɛx ɤ-ʎˈˀɛ[ˀ]k-ʷ-ən**
       exist deic-go-incompl-3nom
       He is going.

Notice that the pronominal markers are attached to /-w-/ in (44-46) parallel to being attached to /-k-/ in (41-43).[6] The incompletive pronominal paradigm is given in the following chart.

	Singular	Plural
1st	**-w-ən**	**-w-ət**
2nd	**-w-əx**	**-w-əp**
3rd	**-w-əs**	**-w-əs**

The behaviour of third person would follow from an account of split ergativity based on aspect. In (47) the third person of the completive clause is absolutive whereas in (48) the third person subject of the incompletive clause is nominative.

(47) **m-ʎˈˀɛk-Ø**
       compl-go-3abs
       He went.

(48) **wˀɛx ɤ-ʎˈˀɛk-ʷ-əs**
       exist deic-go-incompl-3nom
       He is going.

---

[6] Phonological developments often obscure this grammatical process.

Incompletives have a strong active interpretation as shown by the derived nominals in (49-50). In (49) the predicate /k'úlməs/ is focussing on the action of 'making' and the Patient argument is an oblique. In (50) it is the action that is questioned by the form /kɛnm/.

(49) **wˀɛx ɤ-k'úlməs tə-misx '**
exist deic-make-middle-incompl-3nom deic-basket
He is making a basket./He's a basket-maker.

(50) **ˀɛx k-kɛ́nm-ux**
exist irr-do-w-2subj
What are you doing?

Constructions formed with the particle /Wˀɛx/ do not force incompletive aspectual agreement as can be seen by the following pair.

(51) **wˀɛx ɤ-píp-əm-Ø**
exist det-hunt-middle-3abs
There's a hunter around.

(52) **wˀɛx ɤ-píp-əm-w-əs**
exist det-hunt-middle-incompl-3nom
He's hunting.

Third person splits along aspectual lines with completives using an ergative/absolutive system whereas the incompletives employ a nominative/accusative system. Incompletives also exhibit behaviour paralleling subordinate clauses. We now go on to look at the status of these clauses.

1.3 Clausal Type

Split ergative phenomena often appear on the basis of clausal type. Third person marking behaves as an ergative/absolutive in independent clauses and as a nominative/accusative in subordinate clauses. Independent clauses are shown in (53-54).

(53) **ƛ'ˀɛk-Ø**
go-3abs
He goes.

(54) **wik-t-Ø-s ɤ-sək'lɛ́p**
see-tr-3abs-3erg deic-coyote
He saw the coyote.

Third person marking in independent clauses is ergative/absolutive. The subject of the intransitive clause (53) is /-Ø/, the absolutive, parallel to the object of the transitive clause (54). On the other hand the third person subject of (54) is /-ɛ́s/, the ergative.

Subordinate clauses are underlined in (55-57).

(55) **mɛˀ kəxčín tə-spəqpɛ́q ɛ qʷənɛ́nux**
mɛˀ kəx čín tə-spəqpɛ́q ɛ qʷənɛ́n-w-əx
expect give-2acc-1nom deic-berries if want-incompl-2nom
I'll give you some berries if you want.

(56) **č-pípqʷ-stn yəɤɛ́y luˀ wˀɛ́xʷəs q'ʷiyílxʷəs**
čpípqʷst-Ø-n yəɤɛ́y luˀ wˀɛ́x-ʷ-əs q'ʷiyílx-ʷ-əs
hab-watch-caus-3abs-1nom that one part exist-incompl-3nom dance-incompl-3nom
I was watching him when he was dancing.

(57) **sq'lɛ́lnəmstn luˀ yəɤɛ́y lə-səčínməs**
sq'lɛ́lnəm-st-Ø-n luˀ yəɤɛ́y lə-səčín-m-w-əs
listen-caus-3abs-1nom part that one deic-sing-middle-incompl-3nom
I was listening to him when he was singing.

The subordinate clauses are marked in the same way as incompletives, taking a member of the clitic paradigm suffixed to /-**w**-/parallel to clause (58).

(58) **wˀɛx ɤ-k'l-m-əs tə-misx**
exist deic-make-middle-w-3nom deic-basket

He is making a basket./He's a basket-maker.

The split in person marking systems can be seen in contrasting dependent clauses (59-60) which take ergative/absolutive marking with (61) which takes nominative/accusative marking.

(59) **člpmstɛ́tn ɤ-sqɛ́lmx l-m-qʷəčɛ́č**
c-lp-m-st-Ø-ɛ́[t]n ɤ-sqɛ́lmx l-m-qʷəčɛ́č-Ø
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-leave-3abs
I know the man who left.

(60) **člpmstɛ́tn ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx l-m-čntɛ́s**
c-lp-m-st-Ø-ɛ́-[t]-n ɤ-sqɛ́ləmx
l-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́s
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
I know the man whom he punched.

(61) **člpmstɛ́tn ɤ-sqɛ́lmx l-m-čntɛ́məs**
č-lp-m-st-Ø-ɛ́[t]-n ɤ-sqɛ́lmx l-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m-əs
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-3nom.
I know the man who punched him.

A split in clausal type has been reported for Halkomelem with pronominals behaving as ergative/absolutives in dependent clauses and as nominative/accusatives in subordinate clauses (GERDTS 1988). The Shuswap facts however give credence to an analysis based on aspect.

The following chart for third person displays the distribution of morphological case marking :

	Nom/Accus	Erg/Abs
Person		
Third	–	+
Non-Third	+	–
Aspect		
Completive	–	+
Incompletive	+	–
Clause Type		
Independent	–	+
Dependent	+	+
Subordinate	+	–

The chart shows a complementarity of ergative/absolutive and nominative/accusative systems for person and aspect. Clause types appear to split however, taking nominative/accusative for subordinates and agentive dependent clauses, and taking the ergative/absolutive system for non-agentive dependent clauses.

2.0   Syntactic Properties of Wh-Constructions

In this section we examine the syntactic properties of Wh-constructions. An analysis of focus constructions and relative clauses will follow from this treatment. Active and impersonal passive constructions are repeated in (62-63).

(62)   **swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́s**
swɛ́tq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́s
who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
Whom did he punch?

(63)   **swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́m**
swɛ́tq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m
who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass
Who was punched?

Both of these constructions are Patient-centered.[7] Syntactically, Wh-constructions are formed by extracting the absolutive. The Wh-question form /swɛ́tq/ occurs in pre-verbal focus. In (62) both the Agent and Patient are morphologically present whereas in (63), the Agent argument is suppressed and the clause has passive marking with /-ɛ́m/. The construction is an impersonal passive.

In (64) Patient-centered Wh-constructions are compared with independent clauses. The person markings for both sets are identical.

(64)   **swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́[t]n**   Whom did I punch?
       swɛ́tq k-čntɛx   Whom did you punch?
       swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́s   Whom did he punch?
       swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́m   Who was punched?
       čntɛ́§tçn   I punched him.
       čntɛx   You punched him.
       čntɛ́s   He punched him.
       cntɛ́m   He was punched.

The Wh-construction in (65) is Agent-centered.

(65)   **swɛ́tq k-čntɛ́məs**
       swɛ́tq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ɛ́m-w-əs
       who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-3nom
       Who punched him?

Shuswap permits absolutives to be directly questioned as in (62-63). In (65) it is the ergative that is questioned. The construction is made passive and then the form /-w-əs/ from the incompletive aspectual paradigm is suffixed to represent the Agent.

The situation is similar to the Coast Salish language Halkomelem (GERDTS 1988).

---

[7] The terms Agent-centered and Patient-centered are used in Kuipers (1974).

(66) **nəwə ni ləm-θ-amə-ʔe.nʔ**
2emph aux look-tr-2obj-1subj
It's you that I looked at.

(67) **ʔé.θə ni q'ʷàqʷ-əθ-ámʔš-əs**
1emph aux club-tr-1obj-3subj
It's me who he clubbed.

(68) **ʔé.θə ni q'ʷàqʷ-ət(*q'ʷàqʷ-ət-ʔé.nʔ)**
1emph aux club-tr
I'm the one who clubbed it.

(69) **níl lə sléniʔ ni q'ʷàqʷ-ət(*q'ʷàqʷ-ət-əs)**
3emph det woman aux club-tr
It's the woman who clubbed it.

Objects (66-67) and obliques have pronominal copies whereas subjects (68-69) do not. There is no shift in transitive marking.

In (70) Shuswap Agent-centered Wh-constructions are compared with independent clauses.

(70) **swɛ́tx̌ čnčɛ́[č]ms**   Who punched me?
     swɛ́tx̌ čnčís   Who punched you?
     swɛ́tx̌ čntɛ́məs   Who punched him?

     cnčɛ́[č]ms   He punched me.
     čnčís   He punched you.
     *čntɛ́məs/(čntɛ́s)   He punched him.

In Agent-centered Wh-constructions (70) with first and second person Patients it is clear that there is a pronominal copy of the Agent manifested as a pronominal agreement suffix on the verb. The person marking is exactly the same as in independent clauses. In the third person Agent-centered construction the form /k-čntɛ́məs/ is grammatically marked as passive and is morphologically the same as the independent clause /čntɛ́m/. There is, in addition, the /-w-əs/ ending. In Lummi,

another Coast Salish language (JELINEK 1987) the Patient-centered paradigm (71) is in all relevant respects the same as in Shuswap.[8]

(71) **cə-x̣či-t-ən**   the one that I know
      det-know-tr-1subj
      cə-x̣či-t-əx   the one that you know
      det-know-tr-2subj
      cə-x̣či-t-s   the one that he knows
      det-know-tr-3subj

In (72) the Agent-centered paradigm is given.

(72) **cə-x̣či-t-oŋəs**   the one that knows you/me
      det-know-tr-1/2obj
      cə-x̣či-t-Ø   the one that knows him
      det-know-tr-3obj

Jelinek assumes that because there is no ergative argument in the Agent-centered construction, there is no absolutive argument in the Patient-centered construction.

In (73) the corresponding Shuswap forms with Patient-centered interpretations are given.

(73) **lə-č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-ɛ́[t]n**   the one I know
      det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom
      lə-č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-ɛ́x   the one you know
      det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-2nom
      lə-č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-ɛ́s   the one he knows
      det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-3erg

In (74) forms with Agent-centered interpretations are given.

(74) **lə-č-lx̣-m-st-sɛ́[č]m-s**   the one who knows me
      det-hab-know-middle-caus-1acc-3erg

---

[8] We assume that /ə/ corresponds to /з/ in Jelinek's orthography.

lə-č-lx̣-m-st-sí-s   the one who knows you
det-hab-know-middle-caus-2acc-3erg
lə-č-lx̣-m-st-Ø-έm-w-əs   the one who knows him
det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom

In both the Patient-centered and Agent-centered paradigms, pronominal forms are fully represented. To summarize, Shuswap has the syntactic strategy of extracting absolutes in focus constructions and has innovated a mechanism based on aspect to extract ergatives. The Shuswap facts suggest that there are no gaps involved in the expression of focus.

3.0 Conclusion

Although there is strong evidence of a grammatical split in the Shuswap pronominal system, the appearance of /-əs/ as a third person Agentive in dependent clauses still requires an explanation. It has been observed (DIXON 1979) that direct/inverse grammatical systems are often mistaken for split ergative ones. One promising line of investigation would be to view the Shuswap system as reflecting an animacy hierarchy, certainly well recognized in being involved in split systems (SILVERSTEIN 1976). This line has been followed for the Coast Salish language Lummi (JELINEK and DEMERS 1983).

In Shuswap there is evidence of an animacy hierarchy with inclusive first person plural pronominal subjects. The Shuswap form for 'we saw him' occurs as a passive and has the alternate interpretation 'he was seen'.

(75) **wik-t-Ø-m**
see-tr-3abs-pass
He was seen./We (incl) saw him.

Evidence for an animacy hierarchy suggests that Shuswap may have behaviour parallel to direct/inverse person marking systems well recognized for the Athabaskan language family. Whistler (1985) has looked at direct/inverse marking in Nootkan suggesting that this person marking system typologically may be more widespread in the area. Jelinek and Demers have explored this possiblility for the Salish language Lummi (1983).

There are some intriguing similarities in the Navaho paradigms in (76-77) (JELINEK 1987) and the Shuswap paradigms in (78-79).

(76) **yiztal**   He kicked him.
       yiztal-ée   the one who was kicked...
       'ashkii yiztal   He kicked the boy.
       'ashkii yiztal-ée   the one who kicked the boy...

(77**) biztal**[9]   He got kicked by him (approx).
       biztal-ée   the one who kicked him...
       'ashkii biztal   He got kicked by the boy.
       'ashkii biztal-ée   the one who got kicked by the boy...

(78) **m-čntɛ́s**   He punched him.
       lə-m-čntɛ́m   the one who was punched...
       m-čntɛ́s ɣ-sqɛ́lmx   He punched the man.
       lə-m-čntɛ́məs ɣ-sqɛ́lmx the one who punched the man...

(79) **m-čntɛ́m**   He got punched.
       lə-m-čntɛ́məs   the one who punched him...
       m-čntɛ́m ɣ-sqɛ́lmx   The man got punched.
       m-čntɛ́m tə-sqɛ́lmx   He got punched by the man.
       lə-m-čntɛ́məs ɣ-sqɛ́lmx the one who punched the man...
       lə-mcntɛ́m tə-sqɛ́lmx   he one who got punched by the man...

The two languages have several features in common: the predicate is fully marked for person, and there is an animacy hierarchy banning certain argument co-occurrences.

Finally it should be pointed out that the behaviour of /-əs/ is not triggered strictly on grammatical grounds. It also occurs frequently in spatial and temporal deixis.

(80)   **tlˀɛ́nə mɛ́ˀ kəx-čí-n-əs**
       from this expect give-2acc-1nom-3nom
       I'll give you some from this.

---

[9] The **bi-** prefix has been argued to be a topic marker. See SPEAS (1990).

(81)   **kɛnm k-sčlpmst-Ø-έx pnhέˀnyəɤέy qʷəčέč-əs**
do irr-know-3abs-2nom when that one left-3nom
Do you know when that person left?

In (80) the predicate /kəx-čí-n/ is fully marked for its arguments and the /-w-əs/ is triggered by spatial deixis as it is with the temporal deixis in (81).

Kuipers (1974) has noted the frequent occurrence of /-əs/ in texts and that the texts often have forms with and without the suffix. This is suggestive that /-əs/ may have diverse functions in discourse styles. These properties suggest that an analysis based on aspect has some credibility. Given that /-əs/ has such strong active readings it may be functioning as a reference tracking device in discourse, somewhat akin to switch-reference systems. The Shuswap form /-əs/ appears to be what Nichols and Woodbury (1985) call an emergent linguistic category, one with "tendencies in discourse which are almost, but not quite, rigid and grammaticalized".[10]

REFERENCES

CRAIG, Colette G.
1976 "Properties of Basic and Derived Subjects in Jacaltec" in *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press.

DIXON, R. M. W.
1979. "Ergativity". *Language* 55:59-138.

GERDTS, Donna B.
1988. *Object and Absolutive, in Halkomelem Salish.* New York : Garland Publishing Inc.

JELINEK, Eloise
1987. "'Headless' Relatives and Pronominal Arguments: A Typological Perspective" in *Native American Languages and Grammatical*

---

[10] NICHOLS and WOODBURY, pg.8.

Typology: Papers from a Conference at the University of Chicago, eds. Paul D. Kroeber and Robert E. Moore. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

JELINEK, Eloise and Richard A. DEMERS
    1983. "The Agent Hierarchy and Voice in Some Coast Salish Languages". *IJAL* 49 :167-185.

KUIPERS, Aert
    1974. *The Shuswap Language.* The Hague: Mouton.

NEWMAN, Stanley
    1980. "Functional Changes in the Salish Pronominal System". *IJAL* n° 46:155-167.

NICHOLS, Johanna and Anthony C. WOODBURY
    1985. *Grammar inside and outside the clause: Some approaches to theory from the field*. Cambridge: University Press.

SILVERSTEIN, M.
    1976. "Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity" in *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, ed. R.M.W. Dixon, pp. 112-71. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.

SPEAS, Margaret
    1990. *Phrase Structure in Natural Language*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

THOMPSON, Laurence C.
    1976. "Salishan and the Northwest" in *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*, eds. L. Campbell and M. Mithun, pp. 692-765. Austin: University of Texas Press.

WHISTLER, Ken
    1985. "Focus, perspective, and inverse person marking in Nootkan", in *Grammar inside and outside the clause: Some approaches to theory*

from the field, eds. Nichols, Johanna and Anthony C. Woodbury, pp. 227-265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.