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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. There is a form /-ɒs/ 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 /-ǝs/ shows up as a 3rd person pronominal agreement marker in Wh-question, focus, and relative clause constructions.

(1)  swéťy k-čntës
     swéťy k čw-n-t-Ø-és
     who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
     Whom did he punch?

(2)  swéťq k-čntémǝs
     swéťq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ém-w-ǝs
     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,-és/ or /-ǝs/ depending on the phonological environment. The notional verb is grammatically intransitive, having been turned into a passive and is then extended with /-w-ǝs/. 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:
   ěněč[ě]ms
   čw-n-t-sě[ě]ms
   hit-fc-tr-1acc-3erg
   He hit me.

The [ǝ] 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.

wex t'-l''čk-''-ǝs
exist det-go-incompl-3nom
He's going.
(3) čntés
če-w-n-t-Ø-és
punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
He punched him.

(4) čntém
če-w-n-t-Ø-ém
punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass
He was punched.

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

(5) swěťq k-čntém
swěťq k-če-w-n-t-Ø-ém
who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass
Who was punched?

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

(6) *čntémøs

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

(7) nwiʔ's məʔ čntés
nwiʔ's məʔ čw-n-t-Ø-és
3emph exp punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
He's the one whom he punched.

(8) nčéčwɔʔ luʔ cnčé[ɛ]ms
nčéčwɔʔ luʔ čw-n-sé[ɛ]m-s
1emph deic punch-fc-tr-1acc-3erg
I'm the one whom he punched.

(9) nwiʔ's čntémøs
nwiʔ's čw-n-t-Ø-ém-w-øs
3emph punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-incompl-3nom
He's 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)  čntés  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)  čntés  He punched him.
čnté[t]n  I punched him.

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

(13)  člχmsté[t]n χ-sqélomx lə-m-čntés
c-lx-m-st-Ø-n χ-sqélomx lə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ės
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
I know the man whom he punched.

(14)  člχmsté[t]n χ-sqélomx lə-m-čntéx
c-lx-m-st-Ø-n χ-sqélomx lə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ėx
hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-2nom
I know the man whom you punched.

(15)  člχmsté[t]n χ-sqélomx lə-m-čntéməs
c-lx-m-st-Ø-n χ-sqélomx lə-m-čw-n-Ø-tém-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.
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-ös/ 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) 〇łx̂mstē[t]n ə-m-čntēs
     c-lx̂-m-st-Ø-n ə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ēs
     hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-
     3abs-3erg
     I know whom he punched.

(18) 〇łx̂mstē[t]n ə-m-čntēmōs
     c-lx̂-m-st-Ø-n ə-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ēm-w-ös
     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) $\lambda^{\text{1st}}e[k]k$-kn
    go-1nom
    I go/went.

(27) $\lambda^{\text{2nd}}ek$-k
    go-2nom
    You go.

(28) $\lambda^{\text{1st}}ek$-kt
    go-1pl incl nom
    We (including you) go.

(29) $\lambda^{\text{1st}}ek$-kux
    go-1pl excl nom
    We (but not you) go.

(30) $\lambda^{\text{2nd}}ek$-kp
    go-2pl nom
    You (pl) go.

The clitic paradigm is shown in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-kn</td>
<td>-kt (incl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-kux (excl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>-kp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitive clauses are referenced for person by pronominal suffixes. The predicate is suffixed with /-t/ and the pronominal subject follows the object marker.
(31) čnčé[č]mx
 čw-n-t-sé[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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-(ě)n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-(ě)x</td>
<td>-(ě)p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronominal objects are given in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-s(ě)m-</td>
<td>-(ě)l-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-s(i)-</td>
<td>-(u)lm-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-č’2čk-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) $\lambda^3$ek-$\emptyset$
go-3abs
He goes.

(36) wik-m-$\emptyset$
see-middle-3abs
He is looking.

(37) wik-t-$\emptyset$-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-$\emptyset$-s
see-tr-3abs-3erg
He saw it.

(39) wik-t-$\emptyset$-s $\gamma$-s$\text{æk'lép}$
see-tr-3abs-3erg deic-coyote
He saw the coyote.
Third person behaves according to an ergative/absolutive system. Subjects of transitive clauses in (38-40) are marked with /-ês,-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) \( m-\lambda^2\varepsilon[\text{i}]k-kn \)
compl-go-1nom
I went.

(42) \( m-\lambda^2\varepsilon k-k \)
compl-go-2nom
You went.

(43) \( m-\lambda^2\varepsilon k-\emptyset \)
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 /\textit{w}^2\textit{ε}X/ in predicate initial position and the notional verb is a dependent clause.

\begin{align*}
(44) & \quad \textit{w}^2\textit{εx \gamma-\textit{α}^n\textit{ε}[?]k-w-\textit{ϖ}} \\
& \quad \text{exist deic-go-incompl-1nom} \\
& \quad \text{I am going.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(45) & \quad \textit{w}^2\textit{εx \gamma-\textit{α}^n\textit{ε}[?]k-w-\textit{ϖ}[\textit{ux}^w]} \\
& \quad \text{exist deic-go-incompl-2nom} \\
& \quad \text{You are going.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(46) & \quad \textit{w}^2\textit{εx \gamma-\textit{α}^n\textit{ε}[?]k-w-\textit{ϖ}} \\
& \quad \text{exist deic-go-incompl-3nom} \\
& \quad \text{He is going.}
\end{align*}

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-w-\textit{ϖ}n</td>
<td>-w-\textit{ϖ}t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-w-\textit{ϖ}x</td>
<td>-w-\textit{ϖ}p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-w-\textit{ϖ}s</td>
<td>-w-\textit{ϖ}s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

\begin{align*}
(47) & \quad \textit{m-\textit{α}^n\textit{εk-Ø}} \\
& \quad \text{compl-go-3abs} \\
& \quad \text{He went.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(48) & \quad \textit{w}^2\textit{εx \gamma-\textit{α}^n\textit{εk-w-ϖ}s} \\
& \quad \text{exist deic-go-incompl-3nom} \\
& \quad \text{He is going.}
\end{align*}

\(^6\) 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) \(\w^2\text{ex} \ y-k’úlməs \ tə-misx\)
exist deic-make-middle-incompl-3nom deic-basket
He is making a basket./He's a basket-maker.

(50) \(\w^2\text{ex} \ k-kέnm-ux\)
exist irr-do-w-2subj
What are you doing?

Constructions formed with the particle /\(\w^2\text{ex}\)/ do not force incompletive aspectual agreement as can be seen by the following pair.

(51) \(\w^2\text{ex} \ y-píp-əm-Ø\)
exist det-hunt-middle-3abs
There's a hunter around.

(52) \(\w^2\text{ex} \ y-píp-əm-w-əs\)
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).
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 /-és/, the ergative.

Subordinate clauses are underlined in (55-57).

(55) \( \text{me}^2 \, \text{kəxčín} \, \text{tə-spəqəq} \, \text{e} \, q^w\text{ənénux} \)
    \( \text{me}^2 \, \text{kəx čín} \, \text{tə-spəqəq} \, \text{e} \, q^w\text{əněn-w-əx} \)
    expect give-2acc-1nom deic-berries if want-incompl-2nom
    I'll give you some berries if you want.

(56) \( \text{č-pípq}^w\text{-stn} \, \text{yərəy} \, \text{lu}^2 \, w^\text{éx}^w\text{əs} \, q^w\text{ivílx}^w\text{əs} \)
    \( \text{čpipq}^w\text{st-Ø-n} \, \text{yərəy} \, \text{lu}^2 \, w^\text{éx}^w\text{-əs} \, q^w\text{iyílx}^w\text{-əs} \)
    hab-watch-caus-3abs-1nom that one part exist-incompl-3nom
dance-incompl-3nom
    I was watching him when he was dancing.

(57) \( \text{sq'yələnəmstn} \, \text{lu}^2 \, \text{yərəy} \, lə-əčɨ́nəs \)
    \( \text{sq'yələnəm-st-Ø-n} \, \text{lu}^2 \, \text{yərəy} \, lə-əčɨ́n-m-w-əs \)
    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) \( w^\text{é}x \, \text{γ}-k'l-m-əs \, tə-misx \)
    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) \(\text{člpmstétn } \gamma\text{-sqélmx l-m-q}\text{µčęč} \)
    
    c-lp-m-st-Ø-έ[t]n γ-sqélmx l-m-qµčęč-Ø
    
    hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-leave-3abs
    
    I know the man who left.

(60) \(\text{člpmstétn } \gamma\text{-sqélmx l-m-čntéś} \)
    
    c-lp-m-st-Ø-έ[t]-n γ-sqélmx l-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ęs
    
    hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom deic-man deic-compl-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
    
    I know the man whom he punched.

(61) \(\text{člpmstétn } \gamma\text{-sqélmx l-m-čntémıς} \)
    
    č-lp-m-st-Ø-έ[t]-n γ-sqélmx l-m-čw-n-t-Ø-ém-ıς
    
    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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Nom/Accus</th>
<th>Erg/Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Third</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compleitive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompletive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) **swétq k-čntés**
    swétq k-čw-n-t-Ø-és
    who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-3erg
    Whom did he punch?

(63) **swétq k-čntém**
    swétq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ém
    who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass
    Who was punched?
Both of these constructions are Patient-centered. Syntactically, Wh-constructions are formed by extracting the absolutive. The Wh-question form /swétq/ 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 /-ém/. 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)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(64)</th>
<th>Whom did I punch?</th>
<th>Whom did you punch?</th>
<th>Whom did he punch?</th>
<th>Who was punched?</th>
<th>I punched him.</th>
<th>You punched him.</th>
<th>He punched him.</th>
<th>He was punched.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>swétq k-čnté[t]n</td>
<td>Whom did I punch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swétq k-čntéx</td>
<td>Whom did you punch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swétq k-čntés</td>
<td>Whom did he punch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swétq k-čntém</td>
<td>Who was punched?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čntéštçn</td>
<td>I punched him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čntéx</td>
<td>You punched him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čntés</td>
<td>He punched him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cntém</td>
<td>He was punched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(65)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(65)</th>
<th>Who punched him?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>swétq k-čntémæs</td>
<td>Who punched him?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swétq k-čw-n-t-Ø-ém-w-æs</td>
<td>who irr-punch-fc-tr-3abs-pass-3nom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-æs/ from the in completive 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) **ñawë ni ləm-θ-am-²e.n?**
2 emph aux look-tr-2obj-1subj
It's you that I looked at.

(67) **?é.θə ni q’wàq”-əθ-ám²ς-əs**
1 emph aux club-tr-1obj-3subj
It's me who he clubbed.

(68) **?é.θə ni q’wàq”-əℓ(*q’wàq”-əℓ-²e.n?)**
1 emph aux club-tr
I'm the one who clubbed it.

(69) **nìl lə slëni² ni q’wàq”-əℓ(*q’wàq”-əℓ-əς)**
3 emph 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) **swëty čnčé[č]ms** Who punched me?
**swëty čnčis** Who punched you?
**swëty čntéməs** Who punched him?

**cnčé[č]ms** He punched me.
**čnčis** He punched you.
***čntéməs/(čntés)** 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-čntéməs/ is grammatically marked as passive and is morphologically the same as the independent clause /čntém/. 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)  co-xči-t-ən  the one that I know  
det-know-tr-1subj  
co-xči-t-əx  the one that you know  
det-know-tr-2subj  
co-xči-t-s  the one that he knows  
det-know-tr-3subj

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

(72)  co-xči-t-ονας  the one that knows you/me  
det-know-tr-1/2obj  
co-xči-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)  lo-č-lx-m-st-Ø-έ[t]n  the one I know  
det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-1nom  
lo-č-lx-m-st-Ø-έx  the one you know  
det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-2nom  
lo-č-lx-m-st-Ø-ές  the one he knows  
det-hab-know-middle-caus-3abs-3erg

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

(74)  lo-č-lx-m-st-sέ[č]m-s  the one who knows me  
det-hab-know-middle-caus-1acc-3erg

⁸ We assume that /ɔ/ corresponds to /3/ in Jelinek's orthography.
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 /-øs/ 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) \textit{wik-ø-m}

\textit{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 possibility 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
    yiztal-ée
    'ashkii yiztal
    'ashkii yiztal-ée

He kicked him.
the one who was kicked...
He kicked the boy.
the one who kicked the boy...

(77) biztal
    biztal-ée
    'ashkii biztal
    'ashkii biztal-ée

He got kicked by him (approx).
the one who kicked him...
He got kicked by the boy.
the one who got kicked by the boy...

(78) m-čntés
    lə-m-čntém
    m-čntés γ-sqélmx
    lə-m-čntéməs γ-sqélmx

He punched him.
the one who was punched...
He punched the man.
the one who punched the man...

(79) m-čntém
    lə-m-čntéməs
    m-čntém γ-sqélmx
    m-čntém tə-sqélmx
    lə-m-čntéməs γ-sqélmx
    lə-mentém tə-sqélmx

He got punched.
the one who punched him...
The man got punched.
He got punched by the man.
the one who punched the man...
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) tl²έnə mé² 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)  \( \kappa\varepsilon\eta \, k-\varepsilon\ell p m s t-\O-\acute{\varepsilon}x \, p n h\acute{e}^2 \, n y\acute{o}r\acute{e}y \, q^w \acute{\varepsilon}\acute{\varepsilon}\acute{\varepsilon}-\acute{o}s \)

do irr-know-3abs-2nom when that one left-3nom
Do you know when that person left?

In (80) the predicate /\kappa\varepsilon-x-\acute{\varepsilon}i-n/ is fully marked for its arguments and the /-w-\acute{o}s/ is triggered by spatial deixis as it is with the temporal deixis in (81).

Kuipers (1974) has noted the frequent occurrence of /-\acute{o}s/ in texts and that the texts often have forms with and without the suffix. This is suggestive that /-\acute{o}s/ may have diverse functions in discourse styles. These properties suggest that an analysis based on aspect has some credibility. Given that /-\acute{o}s/ 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 /-\acute{o}s/ 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
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