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Constituent order plays no role in the disambiguation of grammatical relations in Sahaptin, a language native to the southern plateau of the Pacific Northwest of the United States. Grammatical relations nevertheless are as relevant as in any “configurational” language, being distinguished instead by pronominal affixes and nominal case marking. Alignment is mostly nominative-accusative but with limited ergative case. The verb is inherently intransitive, transitive, or ditransitive, and valence changing mechanisms mediate via inverse voice, external possession, dative shift, applicatives, causatives, and subject raising.
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Sahaptin is an American Indian language of the middle regions of the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest.¹ Sahaptin I and Nez Perce, though closely related, are not mutually intelligible. The two languages constitute the Sahaptian language family.²

Table 1. The Sahaptian language family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Sahaptian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahaptin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of fairly divergent Sahaptin dialects which fall within three larger clusters: Columbia River (Umatilla, Tenino, Celilo, etc.); Northwest (Klickitat, Yakima, etc.); Northeast (Priest Rapids, Walla Walla, Palouse, etc.).³

¹ Published Sahaptin grammars include Jacobs (1931) and Rigsby and Rude (1996), and published NW texts are found in Jacobs (1929, 1934, 1937). Most examples in this paper are taken from texts. I wish to thank Inez Spino Reves, a Umatilla speaker, for the Columbia River (CR) examples, and Elizabeth Wocatsie Jones, a deceased Walla Walla speaker, for the Northeast (NE) examples.

² On the relationship between Sahaptin and Nez Perce, see Aoki (1962); Rigsby (1965); Rigsby and Silverstein (1969); Rude (1996b, 2006). Sahaptian is more distantly connected to Plateau Penutian, which includes Klamath and Molala (Aoki 1963; Rude 1987; Pharris 2006), and which in turn is reputed to be part of Penutian (DeLancey and Golla 1997; Mithun 1999).

³ The Northern dialects accord with Nez Perce in the frequency of long vowels derived from VCV, and the Northeast dialects accord further in preserving the glottal stop between vowels and word finally. Palatalization is most extensive in the Columbia River dialects. Independent pronouns variously exhibit a
This paper describes the expression of transitivity in Sahaptin. First some theoretical preliminaries are addressed, next the Sahaptin morphology of transitivity and core grammatical relations is described, and then the behavioral rules (valence changing mechanisms) that reference those core grammatical relations. Lastly some overall conclusions are drawn. The paper employs generalist criteria—valence theory, semantic roles, syntactic primitives, prototype semantics—from a typological-functionalist perspective.

1. Theoretical preliminaries.

This section distinguishes between semantic and syntactic transitivity, discusses the typology of alignment strategies, and diagnoses Sahaptin as having a word order conditioned not by syntax but rather by pragmatics.

1.1. Semantic transitivity.

Part of the meaning of a verb is its inherent “valence”, i.e., the number of arguments specified in its meaning. Thus, for example, “die” specifies a single argument, “kill” two arguments, and “give” three arguments. Each argument relates to the verb via a semantic role (Table 2), i.e., “die” implies a patient, “kill” an agent and a patient, and “give” an agent, dative, and patient. These three semantic roles are called actant relations in Dependency Grammar (Tesnière 1988), and core relations in Relational Grammar (Perlmutter 1983, Perlmutter and Rosen 1984, Postal 1982, Johnson and Postal 1980, Postal and Joseph 1990). This paper follows most closely the framework in Givón (2001). Modern functional grammars view transitivity within what is called Prototype Theory, where some of its features (causation, affectedness, individuation, humanness) may be more central than others and might be seen as gradient or turned off completely depending on context.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>conscious cause of an event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>conscious involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>neither of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that meteorological verbs have zero valence, that intransitive verbs can encode any semantic role and transitive verbs varying configurations of semantic roles, there are the eight types of semantic transitivity illustrated with Sahaptin examples in Table 3.

final i or y in the Columbia River dialects and a final k in the Northern dialects. There are grammatical differences (e.g., the pronominal á- is closer to a true obviative in the Northwest dialects) and lexical differences (e.g., NW pāťká, NE tĭlpí, CR lāmtis, NP /husus/ ‘head’).

Prototype theory has developed from the research of Eleanor Rosch, as in, e.g., Rosch (1975), and from ideas put forth in Berlin and Kay (1969), Hopper and Thompson (1980), and Lakoff (1987).

For further description, see Givón (2001). For early expositions of semantic case theory, see Gruber (1965) and Fillmore (1968).

Table 3. Eight Species of Semantic Transitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ðúx'úxùn ‘rain’</td>
<td>wáyti ‘run’</td>
<td>anáwi ‘be hungry’</td>
<td>áyáwi ‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>Agent, Patient</td>
<td>ðúx’áyáwi ‘kill’</td>
<td>ískawk ‘frighten’</td>
<td>qínun ‘see’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditransitive</td>
<td>Agent, Dative, Patient</td>
<td>ní ‘give’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sahaptin does not have labile verbs (such as English *break*) with intransitive and transitive tokens. Rather, verbs have invariant semantic transitivity: they are intransitive, mono-transitive, or ditransitive. Thus *tkúma* ‘camp to dig roots’ is intransitive but *ðní* ‘dig roots’ is transitive (e.g., *ðáwš* is in an oblique case in *a* below and in the objective-accusative case in *b*).6

(1)  

a. pa-tkúman-a ðáwš-yaw
    3NOM.PL-camp.dig-PST cous-ALL
    ‘they camped to dig for cous’

b. pa-ðní-ya ðáwš-na
    3NOM.PL-dig.roots-PST cous-ACC
    ‘they dug cous’

Verbs of speaking must be distinguished as to whether they are mono- or ditransitive. Thus *síñwi* ‘talk, speak’ is mono-transitive (that which is spoken is the direct object) and *ínn* ‘say, tell’ is ditransitive’ (the semantic dative is the direct object). The clauses in *a* and *b* below are examples of the Dative Shift (§3.3.).

(2)  

a. á-síñwi-ya=aš síñwit-na
    OBV-speak-PST=1SG word-ACC
    ‘I spoke words’

---

b. áw-inn-a=aš iŵînš-na, […]
OBV-speak-pst=1SG man-ACC
‘I said to the man, “…”

c. íkʷ ak kaalás-nan i-ʔín-a iŵînš
that raccoon-ACC 3NOM-say-pst man
‘the man said that to the raccoon’ (Jacobs 1937:2.5.3, pg. 190)

1.2. Syntactic alignment.

Grammatical relations are formal categories rooted in the syntactic universals of Table 4 (Dixon 1994) which mediate between semantic relations (Table 2) and criteria such as perspective, focus, and topicality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>The single argument in an intransitive clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The argument highest on the accessibility hierarchy in a transitive clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>The argument lowest on the accessibility hierarchy in a transitive clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core semantic relations (Table 2) are “aligned” with syntactic relations within the typologies pictured in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative-</td>
<td>Ergative-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute-</td>
<td>Ergative-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative-</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis assumes the syntactic primitives in Table 5 which, for A and O, assumes the accessibility hierarchy in Table 6.

---

7 The orthography in the examples taken from the Northwest texts of Melville Jacobs has been normalized to match that from Umatilla (CR) and Walla Walla (NE), and so nothing should be made of the phonetics/phonology in these examples.
8 For pioneering work on topicality and transitivity, see Li (1976), Hopper and Thompson (1980), and Givón (1983).
9 Relational Grammar, as in Perlmutter (1983), avoids any semantic associations and labels the elements of the Accessibility Hierarchy “1”, “2” and “3”. These are defined as primitives with no other characterization than their behavior within and across languages. In other formalist theories one finds variously “thematic relations” and “theta roles” (or “θ-roles”). See Harley (to appear).
Table 6. Accessibility hierarchy

| Agent ⊂ Dative ⊂ Patient |

The traditional noun cases thus receive a precise definition: the nominative case codes both A and S, the absolutive O and S, the accusative only O, and the ergative only A. In an Active-Stative language the more agentive S will tend to be coded as A and the less agentive as O. There is no such thing as a completely Ergative-Absolutive language—all are “split” such that the ergative case shows up only in certain persons (typically third person) or aspects (perfective). A three way alignment (Absolute-Ergative-Accusative) is extremely rare but does occur in Nez Perce and Sahaptin. In Sahaptin the ergative case is limited to third person when the direct object is first or second person.

2. Sahaptin morphological transitivity.

Grammatical relations are coded morphologically—by pronominals that prefix to the verb, second position pronominals, and nominal case suffixes.

2.1. Pronominal prefixes.

Third person core participants are coded by verbal prefixes that are sensitive to various cases.

2.1.1. Nominative pronominals.

The verbal prefixes *i-* and *pa-* are third-person nominative pronominals that occur with or without an accompanying noun in CR and NE Sahaptin.\(^{10}\)

(3)  
\[ a. \quad i\-\text{wiyánawi-ya}\]
\[ _{3}\text{NOM-arrive-PST} \]
\[ 'he/she/it \text{ arrived}' \]

\[ b. \quad i\-\text{wiyánawi-ya} \quad \text{tilaaki} \]
\[ _{3}\text{NOM-arrive-PST} \quad \text{woman} \]
\[ 'the \text{ woman } \text{ arrived}' \]

(4)  
\[ a. \quad i\-\text{qínun-a} \quad \text{wínš-na} \]
\[ _{3}\text{NOM-see-PST} \quad \text{man-ACC} \]
\[ 'he/she/it \text{ saw the man}' \quad \text{(CR)} \]

\(^{10}\) Nominative *i-* regularly deletes in rapid speech before a glottal stop: thus *i\-áníya ~ aniya* ‘he/she/it made’ (in this orthography the glottal stop is not written word initially).
b. tiłaaki i-ţi’nun-a winš-na
   woman 3NOM-see-PST man-ACC
   ‘the woman saw the man’ (CR)

(5)  a. pa-wiyánawi-ya
    3NOM.PL-arrive-PST
    ‘they arrived’

b. pa-wiyánawi-ya awinš-ma
    3NOM.PL-arrive-PST men-PL
    ‘the men arrived’

(6)  a. pa-ţi’nuna tiłaaki-na
    3NOM.PL-see-PST woman-ACC
    ‘they saw the woman’ (CR)

b. awinš-ma pa-ţi’nun-a tiłaaki-na
    men-PL 3NOM.PL-see-PST woman-ACC
    ‘the men saw the woman’ (CR)

In Melville Jacobs’ Northwest Shapatin texts, third-person nominative is also sometimes coded by zero:

(7)  a. ku Ø-wiyánawi-ya
    and 3NOM-arrive-PST
    ‘and he arrived’ (Jacobs 1929:220:15)

b. kúuk áswan Ø-túti-ya
    then boy 3NOM-stand-PST
    ‘then the boy stood up’ (Jacobs 1937:8.3.1, pg 14)

(8)  a. áw Xîks Ø-wii-nâčik-ta tkʷátat
    now soon 3NOM-running-bring-FUT food
    ‘soon now he will bring food on the run’ (Jacobs 1937:6.8.4, pg. 10)

b. ikuunák Spilyáy Ø-tamánwi-ya tkʷínat-nan áyat-nan
    that.very.ACC Coyote 3NOM-institute-PST Chinook.salmon-ACC woman-ACC
    ‘Coyote ordained that very Chinook salmon woman’ (Jacobs 1929:225:8)

2.1.2. The obviative (or absolutive) pronominal.

The pronominal á- (áw- before an orthographic vowel) codes the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb.
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(9)  

   a.  ýkʷin=xì  á-wiyanawi-ya 
      that.ALL=same OBV-arrive-PST
      ‘he arrived at the same place’ (Jacobs 1929:205:10)

   b.  pàalay  á-wiyanawi-ya xʷísat ku pá-?in-a 
      unbeknownst OBV-arrive-PST old.man and INV-say-PST
      ‘unbeknownst an old man arrived and said to him …’ (Jacobs 1929:200:2–3)

(10)  

   a.  á-šapni-ya  Kʷayawiyáy 
      OBV-asl-PST Cougar
      ‘Cougar asked him’ (Jacobs 1937:2.31.4, pg. 123)

   b.  áw  xʷísat-nan  á-šapni-ta-k 
      now old.man-ACC OBV-asl-PRP-IMP
      ‘now go ask the old man!’ (Jacobs 1937:12.1.1, pg. 20)

In a transitive clause á-, as above, optionally references the object (b below) or i- the subject (a).

(11)  

   a.  i-ʔiyatnan-a  kaalás  Kʷaalí-in 
      3NOM-kill-PST raccoon dangerous.being-ACC
      ‘raccoon killed the dangerous being’ (Jacobs 1937:2.2.4, pg. 189)

   b.  á- wpín-p-a  Kʷayawiyáy  Kʷaalí-yín-an 
      OBV-grab-PST Cougar dangerous.one-DU-ACC
      ‘Cougar grabbed the two dangerous ones’ (Jacobs 1937:2.32.1, pg. 123)

Similarly, in an intransitive clause, á- competes with i- (and zero). The pronouns i- and zero seem to reference more topical subjects (Rude 1988a). Thus, in the second clause in the following example, i- references the primary topic (topical object) of the inverse in the first clause (see §2.1.3. below).

(12)  

   pà-wiyanawi-yuun-a  xʷísat-nan  ʔi-láʔiiša 
      INV-arrive-DIR-PST old.man-ACC 3NOM-lie.PRS
      ‘he reached the old man. He [the old man] is lying there’ (Jacobs 1929:235:6)

In intransitive clauses, á- serves to designate a secondary topic and thus functions to encode “fourth person”. For example, the secondary topic, which is the subject coded by the inverse pà- in the second clause in the following example, is coded by á- in the first clause.

(13)  

   pàalay  á-wiyanawi-ya  xʷísat ku pá-ʔin-a
      unbeknownst OBV-arrive-PST old.man and INV-say-PST
      ‘unbeknownst an old man arrived and said to him …’ (Jacobs 1929:200:2–3)

Obviative á- also can express agreement with the possessor in an intransitive clause (see also §3.5):

(14) źiwús-pa  á-wa  naţanás x*isaat-nimí
    creek-LOC ÒBV-be.PRS fish.trap old.man-GEN
    ‘the old man’s fish trap is in the creek’ (Jacobs 1929:184:19)

(15) á-wač-a páxnav páp-ma t-tmayí-ma Yixaya-nmí
    ÒBV-be-PST five.HUM daughter-PL RDP-maiden-PL Beaver-GEN
    ‘Beaver had five unmarried daughters’ (Jacobs 1929:178:12–13)

(16) i-wač-á  iwínš,
    3NOM-be-PST man
    ‘there was a man,
    á-wač-a isxíp  watáy.
    ÒBV-be-PST younger.brother weasel
    ‘the weasel was his younger brother.’

Watáya isxíp  á-wač-a  x*aayama-nmí
Weasel younger.brother ÒBV-be-PST eagle-GEN
‘Weasel was the younger brother of the eagle’ (Jacobs 1937:11.1.1, pg. 17)

In CR and NE Sahaptin (as also in cognate construction in Nez Perce), intransitive á- always codes a possessor (Rude 1999).

(17) a.  á-wiyanawi-ya miyánaš
      ÒBV-arrive-PST child
      ‘her child arrived’ (CR & NE)

b.  á-wiyanawi-ya tilaaki-nmí  miyánaš
    ÒBV-arrive-PST woman-GEN child
    ‘the woman’s child arrived’ (CR & NE)

Also in CR and NE Sahaptin (as also in Nez Perce) á- occurs in transitive clauses only when the subject is first or second person:

(18) a.  á-qinun-a=aš
      ÒBV-see-PST=1SG
      ‘I saw him’ (CR)

b.  á-qinun-a=aš  x*isaat-na
    ÒBV-see-PST=1SG old.man-ACC
    ‘I saw the old man’ (CR)
2.1.3. Direct – Inverse.

The pronominal prefix *pá-* codes a semantic inverse (second to first-person transitivity) and a pragmatic inverse (third person to topical third person transitivity), for which see Rude (1994):

(19)  
   a.  *pá-ñinun-a* = *nam*
       INV-see-PST = 2SG
       ‘you saw me’ (CR & NW)
   
   b.  *pá-ñinun-a*
       INV-see-PST
       ‘he saw him/her/it (TOP)’ (CR & NW)

In the pragmatic contrast (third person on third person), the topic in the direct is the syntactic A and the topic in the inverse is the syntactic O.

(20)  
   a.  *Direct*  
       *tilaaki-na*  *i-ñinun-a*  *wínš-∅*  
       woman-ACC 3NOM-see-PST man-ABS
       ‘the man saw the woman’ (CR)
   
   b.  *Inverse*  
       *tilaaki-na*  *pá-ñinun-a*  *wínš-in*  
       woman-ACC INV-see-PST man-ASSOC
       ‘the man saw the woman’ (CR)

The associative case also conditions verbal agreement (if human)—plural agreement, as with *pa*- in the following.\(^{11}\)

(21)  
   *tilaaki pa-wiyánawi-ya*  *wínš-in*  
   woman 3NOM. PL-arrive-PST man-ASSOC
   ‘the woman arrived with the man’ (CR)

The contrastive discourse functions of the Sahaptin direct and inverse are suggested by the following, where nominative *i*- is anaphoric with the nominative subject of the

\(^{11}\) The associative case and dual number are both marked with *-in*. The difference can be seen in a word like NE *tæñųcímt* ‘boy’ with suppletive plural stem (*amúis* as in *amúisma* ‘boys’; *amúisín* ‘two boys’):

   (i)  *tæñųcímint* pawiyánawiya *tilaaki* ‘the woman arrived with a boy’ (NE)
   (ii) *amúisín* pawiyánawiya ‘two boys arrived’ (NE)

Comparison with Nez Perce indicates that the associative was historically an extension of the past participle with nominal function (‘having, with’ as in ‘(blue) eyed’, ‘(bushy) tailed’, etc.). The Sahaptin dual may be an extension of the associative—there is no dual in Nez Perce. See Rude (1997b).
preceding clause (a) and where inverse pá- continues the nominative referent of the preceding clause as direct object (b):

(22) a. Direct
    waapanlá-an i-ḏínun-a ku i-ʔíʔiyawi-ya paanáy
    grizzly.bear-ACC 3NOM-see-PST and 3NOM-kill-PST 3ACC.SG
    ‘he saw a grizzly and he killed it’ (CR)

    b. Inverse
    waapanlá-an i-ḏínun-a ku pá-ʔíʔiyawi-ya
    grizzly.bear-ACC 3NOM-see-PST and INV-kill-PST
    ‘he saw a grizzly and it killed him’ (CR)

There is also a special pragmatic inverse (CR patá-; NE paʔá-) \(^{12}\) when the subject is plural:

(23) a. patá-ḏínun-a
    INV.PL-see-PST
    ‘they saw him/her/it’ (CR)

    b. paʔá-tuuk-a
    INV.PL-see-PST
    ‘they saw him/her/it’ (NE)

2.2. Second position pronominals.

First and second person core arguments are obligatorily coded by the second position pronominals listed in Table 7. These map core grammatical relations but are not sensitive to case. Thus, first person =naš specifies a subject or a direct object. Disambiguation comes via the pronominal prefix (e.g., nominative i- versus obviative á- in c and d below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Exclusive</th>
<th>=naš</th>
<th>=nataš</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td>=na</td>
<td>=nan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>=nam</td>
<td>=pam</td>
<td>=pat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>=maš</td>
<td>=mataš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) For a discussion of the NW equivalent, see description of =pat and á- in §2.2. below.

\(^{13}\) The pronominals variously reduce in the dialects. The first-person inclusive is =nan in NW Sahaptin and =na in CR and NE Sahaptin. Third-person =pat occurs only in NW Sahaptin.
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(24) a. =nas as S wiyánawi-š=naš
    arrive-PF=1SG
    ‘I have arrived’

b. =nas as A á-šapni-š=naš
    OBV-ask-PF=1SG
    ‘I have asked him/her/them’

c. =nas as O i-šápni-š=naš
    3NOM-ask-PF=1SG
    ‘he/she has asked me’

The complex proninals (=maš and =mataš) code first- on second-person transitive action:

(25) a. áw=maš þúxs-ta
    now=1/2SG kiss-FUT
    ‘now I shall kiss you (sg.)’

b. šápni-š=mataš
    ask-PF=1/2PL
    ‘I have asked you (pl.)’

Second- on first-person transitive action is indicated by the semantic inverse (see §2.1.3. above):

(26) a. pá-šapni-š=nam
    INV-ask-PF=2SG
    ‘you have asked me’

b. áw=nam pá- ŋyaš-š
    now=2SG INV-find-PF
    ‘now you have found me’ (Jacobs 1937:5.3.2, pg. 8)

Sahaptin independent pronouns, such as the Klickitat personal pronouns in Table 8, inflect for case and number (personal, interrogative, and demonstrative). The personal pronouns mostly serve a contrastive function when used redundantly (i.e., with a second position pronominal), as ín ‘I’ and ína ‘me’ in the Umatilla examples below.

(27) a. ku=$ ín á-ğinun-a tîlaaki-na
    and=1SG I OBV-see-PST woman-ACC
    ‘and I saw the woman’ (CR)
b. ku=§ ína i--Allow от-a
and=1SG me 3NOM-see-PST woman-ERG
‘and the woman saw me’ (CR)

Table 8. Personal Pronouns in Klickitat Sahaptin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>₂ɪn̲k</td>
<td>namã̱k</td>
<td>napiinâk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>₂iimã̱k</td>
<td>niimanã̱k</td>
<td>napiininâk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>n̲ mmap̲, inm̲</td>
<td>niim̲</td>
<td>napiinanm̲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>₂ɪm̲k</td>
<td>imã̱k</td>
<td>imiinîn̲k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>₂iimã̱k</td>
<td>iimanã̱k</td>
<td>imiininâk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>₂iim̲m̲</td>
<td>iimam̲m̲</td>
<td>imiinanm̲m̲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>p̲ ³̲n̲k</td>
<td>pmã̱k</td>
<td>piinîn̲k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>p̲iimã̱k</td>
<td>piimanã̱k</td>
<td>piininâm̲n̲k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>p̲iim̲m̲</td>
<td>piim̲m̲</td>
<td>piim̲inanm̲n̲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A first- or second-person oblique argument is represented by an independent personal pronoun and there is no accompanying second position pronominal (which is obligatory for core arguments). The oblique cases shown in Table 9 suffix to independent pronouns in the genitive.

Table 9. Oblique pronominal cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-mîn</td>
<td>-mîn</td>
<td>-mînk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td>-lêy̱k</td>
<td>-lêy̱k</td>
<td>-kaldy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>-yaw̱y̱k</td>
<td>-yûuk</td>
<td>-yûuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-kn̲m̲</td>
<td>-kn̲m̲</td>
<td>-kn̲m̲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versative</td>
<td>-kan̲</td>
<td>-kan̲</td>
<td>-kan̲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>-p̲ày̱n</td>
<td>-p̲ày̱n</td>
<td>-p̲ày̱nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28) a. pa-win-ān̲-n̲ım̲-kan
3NOM-go-PST mine-VRS
‘they went toward me’ (CR)

These stressed suffixes generally attach to second- and third-person genitive pronouns (Table 8), whereas first-person genitive pronouns generally take the unstressed suffixes in Table 10. Personal pronouns are put in the genitive before suffixing an oblique case marker.
b. qaʔáw=ča i-wá inmí-yaw
lightweight=MOD 3NOM-be.PRS mine-ALL
‘he is lighter weight than I’ (NE, Jacobs 1931:130)

c. ku=tya-š aw kú átxun-ša imi-kíiín
and=MOD now and worry-HAB.PRS yours-INST
‘but then I worry about you’ (CR)

d. pinmín timná i-čáxilp-ša imaami-yawáy
3GEN.SG heart 3NOM-open-IMPV.PRS yours.PL-ALL
‘he is opening his heart to you’ (CR)

In NW Sahaptin =pat co-occurs with á- in a direct construction and with i- (or ∅-) in a pragmatic inverse. NW =pat does not occur in intransitive clauses.

(29)  

a. Direct
kúuk=pat i-nánan-a
then=3PL 3NOM-bring-PST
‘then it brought them’ (Jacobs 1929:216:14)

b. Inverse
ku=pat á-qínun-a
and=3PL OBV-see-PST
‘and they saw him’ (Jacobs 1929:211:8)

c. Inverse
áw=pat ∅-twána-ša
now=3PL 3NOM-follow-HAB.PRS
‘now she keeps following them’ (Jacobs 1937:12.13.5, pg. 23)

2.3. Noun case.

Sahaptin has noun cases as in Table 10. The absolute (zero suffix) specifies a nominative case (also a “chômeur”, see §3.3., note 20), accusative -na (NW -nan) marks a direct object, and ergative -nim suffixes only to third person singular nominals when the direct object is first or second person. As such, the ergative is a marker of syntactic transitivity: it is sensitive to the direct object. The accusative case is optional with non-human nouns. Note that, when neither noun is case marked, disambiguation is via semantics, i.e., in see (boy, house) in c below the boy is more likely to do the seeing.
Table 10. Noun case in Columbia River Sahaptin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonhuman</th>
<th>Human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE CASES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>-∅</td>
<td>-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>-nim</td>
<td>-nim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-maaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBLIQUE CASES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-(n)mí</td>
<td>-maamí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-maamíyay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>-yaw</td>
<td>-maamíyaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-kni</td>
<td>-maamíkni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versative</td>
<td>-kan</td>
<td>-maamíkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>-pa</td>
<td>-maamípa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>-maamíki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30)  

a. ku i-wiyánawi-ya áswan-∅  
and 3NOM-arrive-PST boy-ABS  
‘and the boy arrived’ (CR)

b. ku i-ţińun-a áswan-∅ tilaaki-na  
and 3NOM-see-PST boy-ABS woman-ACC  
‘and the boy saw the woman’ (CR)

c. ku i-ţińun-a áswan-∅ niit(-na)  
and 3NOM-see-PST boy-ABS house(-ACC)  
‘and the boy saw the house’ (CR)

(31)  

a. ku=š i-ţińun-a tilaaki-nim  
and=1SG 3NOM-see-PST woman-ERG  
‘and the woman saw me’ (CR)

b. ku=š a-ţińun-a tilaaki-na  
and=1SG OBV-see-PST woman-ACC  
‘and I saw the woman’ (CR)

If the possessor of the object is coreferential with the subject, there is no accusative case marking on the object—even if the object is human, as in (32). Otherwise lack of case marking can indicate an object of low topicality (if nonhuman).  

15 Principal dialect differences are the NW accusative -nan and the N Sahaptin ablative -knik.

(32) ku i-yáxn-a tìlaaki-∅ (pinmín) miyánaš-∅ and 3NOM-find-PST woman-ABS 3GEN.SG child-ABS ‘and the woman found her child’ (CR)

(33) i-walápaličaša-ša tamám-∅ likúuk 3NOM-incubate-IMPV.PRS egg-ABS chicken ‘the chicken is incubating eggs’ or ‘the chicken is incubating her eggs’ (NE)

(34) áw ík“ak i-wiyának“-a iníít-∅ hmáma now that 3NOM-leave-PST house-ABS old.woman ‘now that old woman left her house’ (Jacobs 1937:2.5.2, pg. 190)

When an object is a kin term and its possessor is coreferential with a third-person subject, the kinship term is case marked accusative with -pa:

(35) ku i-qínun-a áswan-∅ pčá-pa and 3NOM-see-PST boy-ABS mother-ACC ‘and the boy saw his mother’ (CR)

In CR and NE Sahaptin third-person subject-verb agreement is with nominative i- (as in the above examples). In NW Sahaptin, however, third-person object-verb agreement is also possible with á-:


(37) ku á-waywayn-a x“ísaat-nan iwínš-∅ and OBV-call.out-PST old.man-ACC man-ABS ‘and the man called out to the old man’ (Jacobs 1929:235:21)

Ergative -nim also co-occurs with accusative =pat ‘them’ in NW Sahaptin:

(38) i-šaptayáša=pat x“ísaat-nim 3NOM-deceive-IMPV.PRS=3PL old.man-ERG ‘the old man is deceiving them’ (Jacobs 1929:235:9)

2.4. Constituent order in Sahaptin.

Transitive clauses where both arguments appear as nouns are relatively rare in actual discourse. Nevertheless a superficial perusal of 187 pages of Northwest Sahaptin texts (Jacobs 1929, 1937) revealed 147 examples (Table 11 - see representative examples in Table 12). The fact that all six of the word orders in Table 11 are possible shows that

---

16 This construction, in which there is a direct object nominal yet no grammatical sensitivity to it (noun case marking, verbal agreement), can be called an antipassive. See Polinsky (2008a).
Sahaptin has a non-configurational syntax inasmuch as, at least in most of its dialects, the semantic agent and patient are never distinguished by word order.\textsuperscript{17}

Table 11. Distribution of Word Order patterns in NW Sahaptin texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no noun case marking</th>
<th>accusative noun case marking</th>
<th>inverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>obviative</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Ø-</td>
<td>i-Lpa-</td>
<td>á-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also a Noun Phrase is not rigidly definable because a noun and its modifier can be discontinuous, as in the following examples taken from texts.

(39)  a áw=naš ínk nimí wá-ta áyat
now=1SG I my be-FUT woman
‘now I shall have my woman’ (Jacobs 1929:224:9–10)

b áw=maš šiyíx ani-yani-ta inín
now=1/2 good make-APL-FUT horn
‘now I shall make you good horns’ (Jacobs 1937:1.16.1, pg. 116)

(40) áw kúuk á-tkʷati-ini-čan-a tamám Spilyáy Xališya-man
now then OBV-eat-APL-HAB-PST egg Coyote Wolf-ACC.PL
‘now then Coyote would eat the Wolves’ eggs’ (Jacobs 1937:32.14.1, pg. 82)

(41) á-tamaynač-ta=nam tkʷático-ta wáwnakʷšaš-yaw áwtni-na
OBV-put.inside-FUT=2SG food-ACC your-ALL body-ALL tabooed-ACC
‘you will put the tabooed food into your body’ (CR)

(42) a=pat kʷnímk i-nánan-a áyat-nim
REL=3PL that.ERG 3NOM-bring-PST woman-ERG
‘that woman who brought them’ (Jacobs 1929:218:19–20)

(43) ikuunák Spilyáy tamánwi-ya tkʷínat-nan áyat-nan
that.ACC Coyote legislate-PST Chinook.salmon-ACC woman-ACC
‘Coyote ordained that Chinook salmon woman’ (Jacobs 1929:225:8)

\textsuperscript{17} For the concept of nonconfigurationality, see Hale (1989). It is a concession to the fact that there are languages where the syntax cannot be described as arising from constituent order.

Word order, as in any “free” word order language, is not random. It just does not distinguish subject from object; rather, it serves referential and pragmatic functions.  

Table 12. Variant word orders in Klickitat Sahaptin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Inverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku áw kúuk i-šáx̱k-a xʷayamá tkní and now then 3NOM-cut-PST eagle rope ‘and now then eagle cut the rope’ (Jacobs 1929:210:1)</td>
<td>kúuk páʔilamayka áyat-in iwínš-nan then INV-hide-PST woman-ASSOC man-ACC ‘then the woman hid the man’ (Jacobs 1937:16.9.5, pg. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S V O</td>
<td>S V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kúuk xʷášxʷay i-wín-p-a ḥax̱̦̑̓p̱̦̑̓m̱̦̑̓ then bluejay 3NOM-take-PST knife ‘then bluejay took the knife’ (Jacobs 1929:216:16)</td>
<td>iwínat-in pá-nakwinan-a iwínš-nan deer-ASSOC INV-bring-PST man-ACC ‘the deer brought the man’ (Jacobs 1937:7.2.1, pg. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O V S</td>
<td>O V S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku tiskáy áyat-nan á-xtwayni-čan-a and skunk woman-ACC OBV-talk-HAB-PST sčát-pa night-LOC ‘and Skunk would talk to the woman at night’ (Jacobs 1929:207:11–12)</td>
<td>ší-yin nakálas-an pá-paχ̱i-ya who-ASSOC my.MoMo-ACC INV-steal-PST ilkʷš fire ‘who stole the fire from my grandmother?’ (Jacobs 1937:2.11.1, pg. 119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O S V</td>
<td>O S V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-nán-á áyat xʷayamá 3NOM-carry-PST woman eagle ‘the eagle carried away his woman’ (Jacobs 1929:208:14)</td>
<td>pá-nan-a áyat-nan wiyapṉ-in INV-carry-PST woman-ACC elk-ASSOC ‘the elk carried away the woman’ (Jacobs 1937:3.1.6, pg. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O V S</td>
<td>O V S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O S V</td>
<td>O S V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 This is not to say that word order is not being invoked to distinguish grammatical relations among some speakers today, but rather that this applies in the published data and in other data available to the author. For a study of the function of word order in Nez Perce, see Rude (1992b), and for a cross linguistic study, see Dryer (2008).

19 To assuage suspicions that the direct-inverse voice distinction might be sensitive to word order, here as also in Table 11 the data is divided as to direct and inverse, for which see §2.1.3.
3. Valence changing mechanisms.

“Valence changing” refers to the instantiation of a syntactic category (S, A, O) in a non-prototypical grammatical relation, generally described as “advancement/promotion” and “demotion” in dependency grammars (see for example, Perlmutter 1980, Gerdts [to appear]). Below are described valence reducing mechanisms (reflexive, reciprocal, passive) and constructions where various advancements apply (ditransitives, applicatives, external possession, causatives, complementation).

3.1. Reflexives and reciprocals.

The reflexive (sg. piná-; pl. pamá- [NW piimá-]) and reciprocal (pápa-) are sensitive to the O of a transitive verb—neither are triggered by an oblique object. Both constructions are syntactically intransitive.

(44)  a. piná-ṁun-a
RFL.SG-see-PST
‘he saw himself’ (CR & NW)

b. piná-ṁun-a=aš
RFL.SG-see-PST=1SG
‘I saw myself’ (CR & NW)

(45)  a. pamá-ṁun-a
RFL.PL-see-PST
‘they saw themselves’ (CR)

b. pamá-ṁun-a=ataš
RFL.PL-see-PST=EXC.PL
‘we saw ourselves’ (CR)

(46)  a. pápa-ṁun-a
RCP-see-PST
‘they saw one another’ (CR)

b. pápa-ṁun-a=na
RCP-see-PST=INC.PL
‘we saw one another’ (CR)

3.2. Passive.

The passive is fairly rare in Sahaptin and much resembles the English passive in that the main verb is a past participle (marked by the suffix -i; NE -i) and the copula (wá, wač-) serves as the finite verb. The O is a nominative subject and the A is completely suppressed.

(47) ku á-wač-a wáwisas aní-yi ʰi pii-nmí
and 1SG-OBV-be-PST rope make-PP intestine-GEN
‘and his rope was made of intestine’ (CR)

(48) ana pmá pa-wá sapsíʔ an-í
REL 3NOM.PL 3NOM.PL-be.PRS teach-PP
‘they who are taught’ (NE)

(49) ku= nam ʰim=ʔa wá-ta watáy waník-i
and=2SG 2NOM.SG=too be-FUT weasel name-PP
‘and you too will be named “weasel”’ (Jacobs 1937:11.13.1, pg. 20)

3.3. Ditransitives.

Here it is necessary to distinguish the two objects of ditransitive verbs and thus expand
the syntactic primitives of Table 4. I label these D and P (for Dative and Patient), which
increases our syntactic primitives to five (as in Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13. Syntactic primitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three species of transitivity with corresponding syntactic primitives are charted in
Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Valence and Syntactic Primitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three core semantic relations of Table 2 (Agent, Dative, Patient) express valence in
the prototypic ditransitive verb. This gives rise to the two primary alignment typologies
of Table 15. 20

20 For these typologies see Dryer (1985), Blansitt (1986), Haspelmath (2005), and Malchukov et al. (2007).
Thus, Sahaptin appears to exhibit a Primary-Secondary strategy wherein O and D are case marked with accusative -na (NW -nan) and P is a secondary object with zero case marking.

(50)  

a. áswan i-ţi̇n̄un-a tilaaki-na  
    boy 3NOM-see-PST woman-ACC  
    ‘the boy saw the woman’ (CR)

b. áswan i-ní-ya tilaaki-na ḫaḵáy-k”-∅  
    boy 3NOM-give-PST woman-ACC money-ABS  
    ‘the boy gave the woman the money’ CR)

(51) i-sáyp-a tk’átat-∅ náxš-nan iwínš-nan  
    3NOM-fed-PST food-ABS one-ACC man-ACC  
    ‘she fed a man the food’ (Jacobs 1937:2.8.1, pg. 190)

Perhaps the best way to view the Sahaptin Primary-Secondary alignment is as an almost obligatory Dative Shift (Rude 1992a). If P is first or second person (which of course is rare in discourse) then Dative Shift is blocked. Thus in the following examples the direct objects are coded by second position pronominals (=aš ‘me’ and =nam ‘you’) and the indirect objects by oblique personal pronouns (imiyáw ‘to me’ and imiyawáy ‘to you’):

(52)  

a. pa-ní-ya=aš imí-yawáy  
    3NOM.PL-give-PST=1SG yours-ALL  
    ‘they gave me to you’ (CR)

b. pa-ní-ya=nam imí-yaw  
    3NOM.PL-give-PST=2SG mine-ALL  
    ‘they gave you to me’ (CR)

If P is not first or second person but nevertheless human, Dative Shift is optional. When Dative Shift occurs, P is demoted (as in b below where wínš ‘man’ is in the absolute case).21

21 This would be a chômeur in terms of Relational Grammar (see Perlmutter (1980, 1983)).
(53)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a. Unshifted} \\
\text{wínš-na} & \text{ pá-’tayman-a inmí-yaw} \\
\text{man-ACC INV-sell-PST} & \text{ mine-ALL} \\
& \text{‘he sold a man to me’ (CR)} \\
\text{b. Shifted} \\
\text{wínš=naš itáyman-a} & \text{22} \\
\text{man=1SG 3NOM.sell-PST} & \text{‘he sold me a man’ (CR)} \\
\end{align*} \]

(54)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a. Unshifted} \\
\text{ašwaníya-an pa-ní-ya miyuux-mí-yaw} \\
\text{slave-ACC 3NOM.PL-give-PST chief-GEN-ALL} & \text{‘they gave a slave to the chief’ (CR)} \\
\text{b. Shifted} \\
\text{ašwaníya pa-ní-ya miyuux-na} \\
\text{slave 3NOM.PL-give-PST chief-ACC} & \text{‘they gave the chief a slave’ (CR)} \\
\end{align*} \]

And if P is nonhuman (as it is in the vast majority of instances) then Dative Shift is obligatory—thus making Sahaptin look like it has a Primary-Secondary object alignment. The first example below is ungrammatical.\(^{23}\)

(55)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{*tímaš-na pa-ní-ya tilaaki-nmí-yaw} \\
\text{book-ACC 3NOM.PL-give-PST woman-GEN-ALL} & \text{‘they gave a book to the woman’ (CR)} \\
\end{align*} \]

(56)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{tímaš pa-ní-ya tilaaki-na} \\
\text{paper 3NOM.PL-give-PST woman-ACC} & \text{‘they gave the woman a book’ (CR)} \\
\end{align*} \]

3.4. Applicatives.\(^{24}\)

There are two primary mechanisms in Sahaptin that advance a semantically oblique argument to direct object: the applicative and the directive. The applicative attaches to transitive verbs with two suffixes, -(a)ni and -(a)yi. The first occurs in NW Sahaptin, the second in CR Sahaptin, and in NE Sahaptin -(a)ni occurs before a vowel and -(a)yi before a consonant.\(^{25}\) The applicative shifts a semantic benefactive or possessive argument to

\(^{22}\) Nominative i- regularly deletes before the glottal stop, i.e., itáymana represents i’tiáymana where i- has deleted.
\(^{23}\) See Rude (1992a) and Rude (1997a) for examples.
\(^{24}\) See Polinsky (2008b) and Peterson (2007).
\(^{25}\) For evidence that both morphemes trace historically from a verb ‘give’, see Rude (1991).
direct object with the consequent demotion of the O. The object of the applicative is subject to all morphology of transitivity. It is coded by the obviative (á-‘him/her/it/them’):

(57)  
a.  á-sapakʷltik-ayi-k núšnu  
    OBV-wipe-APL-IMP nose  
    ‘wipe his/her nose!’ (CR)

b. šaqunk-í=nam á-kʷ-ayi-ta tílpí  
    behead-PP=2SG OBV-do-APL-FUT head  
    ‘you will cut off his/her head’ (NE)

c. kí=nam kʷná á-yaŋaynak-ayi-ta xáwš  
    FUT=2SG there OBV-pour.in-APL-FUT cous  
    ‘you’ll pour the cous in there for them’ (NE)

The second position pronominals (=naš ‘me’, =na ‘us’), independent accusative pronouns (náaman ‘us’), and the ergative nominal case (-nim), which inflects 3rd person only when the direct object is 1st/2nd person, are all sensitive to the object promoted by the applicative:

(58) áw=naš i-čáxįłp-ayi-ša-m-š  
    now=1/2 3NOM-open-APL-IMPV-CSL-PRS me door  
    ‘now he is opening the door for me’ (CR)

(59) kʷnim=na i-wáaćaquk-ayi-ša náaman tiičám naami-nim sinwit-nim  
    that.ERG=INC 3NOM-secure-APL-IMPV.PRS us land our-ERG word-ERG  
    ‘those words of ours secure the land for us’ (CR)

(60) kúuš=xi=na náaman i-naknúwi-yayi-ša wáwnakʷšaš čúuš-nim  
    thusly=same=INC us 3NOM-take.care.of-APL-IMPV.PRS body water-ERG  
    ‘in the same way the water is taking care of our bodies’ (CR)

The applicative object (‘you’) is coded within the complex second position pronominals (=maš ‘I … you’):

(61)  
a.  áw=maš ani-yani-ta tanú  
    now=1/2 make-APL-FUT spear  
    ‘now I shall make you a spear’ (Jacobs 1937:16.12.2, pg. 31)

b. ku=maš ník-ani-ta  
    and=1/2 put-APL-FUT  
    ‘and I will put it away for you’ (Jacobs 1937:2.18.2, pg. 121)
A topical applicative object feeds the inverse (with singular subject \textit{pá}- and plural subject \textit{patá} or \textit{=pat} plus \textit{á}-):

(62)  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{ku=nam pá-šač\textit{čk}}-\textit{ani}-ta pálka}
  \textit{and=2SG INV-cut-APL-FUT head}\n  \textit{‘you will cut off my head’} (Jacobs 1929:232:7)
  
  \item \textit{áw=nam pá-\textit{?ani-yani}-ta wásas}
  \textit{now=2SG INV-make-APL-FUT canoe}\n  \textit{‘now you will make me a canoe’} (Jacobs 1937:16.18.2, pg. 32)
  
  \item \textit{pá-č\textit{ačìlp}}-\textit{ani}-ya pčiš
  \textit{INV-open-APL-PST door}\n  \textit{‘she opened the door for him’} (Jacobs 1937:16.2.1, pg. 28)
  
  \item \textit{áw kúuk pá-wač\textit{čk}}-\textit{ani}-ya pálka \textit{Lučayáy-nan}
  \textit{now then INV-chop-APL-PST head Fox-ACC}\n  \textit{‘now then he chopped off Fox’s head’} (Jacobs 1929:233:3–4)
  
  \item \textit{kuk pá-win\textit{p}}-\textit{ani}-ya xúxux-in áčaš
  \textit{and INV-get-APL-PST buzzard-ASSOC eye}\n  \textit{‘and buzzard got his eyes’} (Jacobs 1937:36.3.3, pg. 89)
  
  \item \textit{patá-\textit{?ani-yayi}}-ya
  \textit{INV.PL-make-APL-PST}\n  \textit{‘they made it for him/her’} (CR)
  
  \item \textit{ku=pat á-tk\textit{w}}-\textit{ati-ini}-ya čáax\textit{č} táwaš
  \textit{and=3PL OBV-eat-APL-PST all roast}\n  \textit{‘and they ate up all his roast’} (Jacobs 1937:32.6.2, pg. 81)
\end{enumerate}

And the reflexives and reciprocal are sensitive to the semantic oblique that has been advanced to direct object via the applicative.

(63)  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{piná-\textit{?ikiik}}-\textit{ayi-k núšnu}
  \textit{RFL.SG-clean-APL-IMP nose}\n  \textit{‘clean your nose!’} (CR)
  
  \item \textit{tútani\textit{k}} \textit{pamá-šač\textit{čk}}-\textit{ani}-ya
  \textit{hair RFL.PL-cut-APL-PST}\n  \textit{‘they cut their own hair’} (NE)
\end{enumerate}
c. \(\text{pápa-}^2\text{ani-yayi-ya}=\text{ataš wápas}\)
\(\text{RCP-make-APL-PST=}\text{EXC.PL basket}
\)
\(\text{‘we made one another baskets’ (CR)}\)

The Directive is marked by a verbal suffix (CR -awa; N -uun) and advances an oblique semantic goal. The following contrast the intransitive \(\text{wiyánavi} \text{‘arrive’} \) with oblique goal \((x^\text{wisaatnimiyaw} \text{‘to/at the old man’})\) and the directive \((\text{wiyánawiyuun} \text{‘arrive at’})\) with direct object \(x^\text{wisaatnan} \text{‘old man’}\.\)

(64)  
\(a. \text{Without directive}
\(\text{ík}^\text{wín}=\text{xi xisaat-nimí-yaw i-wiyánavi-ya}\)
\(\text{that.ALL=same old.man-GEN-ALL 3NOM-arrive-PST}
\)
\(\text{‘similarly he arrived at that old man’ (Jacobs 1929:201:8)}\)

\(b. \text{With directive}
\(\text{pá-wiyanawi-yuun-a xisaat-nan}\)
\(\text{INV-arrive-DIR-PST old.man-ACC}
\)
\(\text{‘he arrived at the old man’ (Jacobs 1929:235:6)}\)

The reflexive provides evidence for the objecthood of the goal.

(65)  
\(a=\text{š kúuš piná-}\text{²titaman-awa-šan-a}\)
\(\text{REL=1SG thusly RFL.SG-read-DIR-IMPV-PST}
\)
\(\text{‘as I was reading to myself’ (CR)}\)

The reciprocal also provides evidence for the objecthood of the directive goal.

(66)  
\(a. \text{pápa-}\text{²li-yuu-ša=pam}\)
\(\text{RCP-bet-DIR-IMPV.PRS=}\text{2PL}
\)
\(\text{‘you’re betting against each other’ (NE)}\)

\(b. \text{pápa-wiyanawi-yawa-šan-a}\)
\(\text{RCP-arrive-DIR-HAB-PST}
\)
\(\text{‘they used to visit one another’ (CR)}\)

The directive also advances a goal to a transitive verb, thus creating a ditransitive verb.

(67)  
\(a. \text{Without directive}
\(\text{tk}\text{²átat-na pa-náčič-a miyanaš-mí-yaw}\)
\(\text{food-ACC 3NOM.PL-bring-PST child-GEN-ALL}
\)
\(\text{‘they brought food to the child’ (CR)}\)

b. With directive

\[ tkʷátat \text{pa-náčič-awan} \text{ miyánaš-na} \]

food 3NOM.PL.-bring-DIR-PST child-ACC

‘they brought the child food’ (CR)

There is also a semi-productive associative advancement marked by verbal suffix (CR -twana; NE -twaa; NW -twiin).\(^{26}\) Compare the direct object in \(b\) (inmína miyánašna ‘my child’) with the oblique object in \(a\) (inmíki wišaaníktki ‘with my treasure’).

\[(68)\]

\( a = \text{pam} \text{ imá} = \text{ljíwi-šan-a inmí-ki wišaaníkt-ki} \]

REL=2PL 2NOM.PL play-IMPV-PST mine-INST treasure-INST

‘you who were playing with my treasure’ (CR)

\( b = \text{á-ljíwi-twana-šan-a inmí-na miyánaš-na} \)

OBV-play-ASSOC-IMPV-PST mine-ACC child-ACC

‘I was playing with my child’ (CR)

Though perhaps not as productive, the Sahaptin associative advancement functions the same as the applicatives.

### 3.5. External possession.

The possessor of an intransitive subject is optionally advanced to subject (called external possession).\(^{27}\) First and second person external possessors are marked by the second position pronominals and 3\(^{rd}\) person external possessors by the obviative pronominal (Table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. External possessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the asymmetry (compare Table 7, repeated below as Table 17): the nominative/accusative pronominals (=naš, =nataš, and =na) mark first-person possessors and the complex pronominals (=maš and =mataš) mark second-person possessors.\(^{28}\)

---


\(^{27}\) See Rude (1999).

\(^{28}\) That =maš and =mataš serve different functions depending on the inherent transitivity of a verb provides a test for that inherent transitivity, e.g., kumaš kʷá ljiwiča ‘and yours will play there’ versus kumaš áw wilálačkʷa ‘and now I will leave you’.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=naš</td>
<td>=nataš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>=nan</td>
<td>=pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>=nam</td>
<td>=pat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>=maš</td>
<td>=mataš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though an external possessor has properties of an intransitive subject, a possessor noun or independent pronoun remains in the genitive case.

(69)  
\(a\). Internal possession  
i-wiyánawi-ya inmí pšít  
3NOM-arrive-PST 1GEN.SG father  
‘my father arrived’

\(b\). External possession  
wiyánawi-ya=aš (inmí) pšít  
arrive-PST=1SG 1GEN.SG father  
‘my father arrived’

c. Internal possession  
wač-á=taš iimínk pšít  
be-PST=EXC.PL 2GEN.SG father  
‘ours was your father’ (Jacobs 1937:31.30.2, pg. 77)

d. External possession  
iimínk=maš wá tiičám  
2GEN.SG=2GEN.SG be.PRS land  
‘it is your land’ (Jacobs 1937:8.2.4, pg. 13)

A third-person possessor is advanced to subject with the obviative pronominal ā-/áw- (see §2.1.2. above).

(70)  
\(a\). Internal possession  
i-wiyánawi-ya (pínmín) pšít  
3NOM-arrive-PST 3GEN.SG father  
‘his/her father arrived’

---

29 The pronominals variously reduce in the dialects. The first person inclusive is =nan in NW Sahaptin and =na in CR and NE Sahaptin. Third person =pat occurs only in NW Sahaptin.
b. External possession

\[
\text{ā-wiyanawi-ya (pinmín) pštít} \\
\text{OBV-arrive-PST 3GEN.SG father} \\
\text{‘his/her father arrived’}
\]

External possession of objects is expressed by the applicative (see §3.4. above).

(71)  

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{a. Internal possession} \\
\text{i- qednun-a (pinmín) miyánash} \\
\text{3NOM-see-PST 3GEN.SG child} \\
\text{‘she saw her (own) child’ (CR)}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{b. External possession} \\
\text{i- qednw-ayi-ya (paanáy) miyánash} \\
\text{3NOM-see-APL-PST 3ACC.SG child} \\
\text{‘she saw her (someone else’s) child’ (CR)}
\end{enumerate}

Access to external possession is denied those kinship terms with possessor affixes (a) and possessors coded by independent pronoun with accusative concord with a head noun (b).

(72)  

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{a.} \\
\text{i- qednun-a nayáyasa-an} \\
\text{3NOM-see-PST my.OBR-ACC} \\
\text{‘he saw my elder brother’ (CR)}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{b.} \\
\text{ā-twana-ta=aš naami-na pótna} \\
\text{OBV-follow-FUT=1SG our-ACC OSI-ACC} \\
\text{‘I will follow our older sister’ (CR)}
\end{enumerate}

3.6. Causatives.

Sahaptin has a morphological (as opposed to periphrastic) causative (Rude 1997a). It is a valence changing mechanism that turns intransitive verbs into transitive verbs, and transitive verbs into ditransitive verbs. The higher, causative agent \(A_1\) is subject and, if the lower predicate is intransitive, its S becomes the direct object and has all the behavioral characteristics of any other object. Table 18 illustrates the semantic structure with syntactic primitives for the three types of causative construction. The productive causative prefix is şapá-, and like all morphological causatives its force varies over the full range of periphrastic causatives (‘cause’, ‘make’, ‘have’, ‘let’, etc.). Note how in each of the following examples the subject of the lower predicate is treated as the direct object.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{30} See Song (2008) for a typological analysis of causatives.}\]

Table 18. The Causative and syntactic primitives\(^{31}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>CAUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A(_1)  V</td>
<td>A(_1)  V</td>
<td>A(_1)  V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intransitive)</td>
<td>(mono-transitive)</td>
<td>(ditransitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>A(_2) O</td>
<td>A(_2) D P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(73) ku kʷiiní́ Xáaxʷ wáxwayčit-na pá-šapa-yawayna-šan-a
and that.ASSOC all bridge-ACC INV-CAUS-washout-IMPV-PST
‘and that was causing the bridge to wash out completely’ (CR)

(74) ku=ší i-šapá-waša-čan-a kúsí-pa
and=1SG 3NOM-CAUS-ride-HAB-PST horse-LOC
‘and he used to have me ride on the horse’ (CR)

(75) a. ku pá-šapa-tkʷaaxap-a
and INV-CAUS-walk.between-PST
‘and he had her walk between’ (CR)

b. kúsí pa-šapá-wayxtí-ta
horse 3NOM.PL- CAUS-run-FUT
‘they will have their horses run’ (CR)

When the lower verb is transitive its A\(_2\) (see Table 18) is typically the direct object and the other argument is demoted and its noun put in the absolute. This is equivalent to a Dative Shift.

(76) á-šapa-tkʷata-ta=ataš twáyxí
OBV-CAUS-eat-FUT=EXC.PL soup
‘we’ll have them eat soup’ (CR)

(77) ku=taš kʷná á-šapa-χni-šan-a χáwś
and=EXC.PL there OBV-CAUS-did.roots-IMPV-PST cous
‘and there we were having them dig cous’ (CR)

(78) may-kʷáanik=nam pá-šapa-kʷyam-ta imůn tamánwit
more-that.way=2SG INV-CAUS-believe-FUT your law
‘you will cause me to believe your law the more’ (CR)

(79) Xʷaamayáy-in miyánaš-ma pá-šapa-wxín-a kʷaaná tłaaki-na
Eagle-ASSOC child-PL INV-CAUS-lose-PST that.ACC woman-ACC
‘Eagle made that woman lose her children’ (CR)

\(^{31}\) Compare Table 14 for the three types of transitivity.

(80) kũuk áyat miyánaš-nan á-šapa-winp-a íšat-knik níkʷíš ku íšat-knik yápaas
then woman child-ACC OBV-CAUS-hold-PST side-ABL meat and side-ABL grease
‘then the woman had the child hold the meat on one side and the grease on the other’
(Jacobs 1937:31.10.3, pg. 72)

(81) líxs iksíks-nan láymut-nan líx tamám á-šapa-winp-a
single little.SG-ACC youngest-ACC single egg OBV-CAUS-hold-PST
‘he made the little youngest one hold the last egg’ (Jacobs 1937:31.41.4, pg. 79)

If the O of the lower predicate is human then Dative Shift is optional. Note that in the unshifted example (a below) the lower agent is case marked dative—the same as the D in ditransitive clauses (see §3.3. above).

(82) a. Unshifted

patá-šapa-wawyan-a miyánaš-na wawyala-nmí-yaw
INV.PL-CAUS-whip-PST child-ACC whipman-GEN-ALL
‘they had the child whipped by the whipman’ (CR)

b. Shifted

patá-šapa-wawyan-a miyánaš wawyala-an
INV.PL-CAUS-whip-PST child whipman-ACC
‘they had the whipman whip the child’ (CR)

The nonshifted object noun can retain its case marking (e.g., paamanáy ‘them’ in the following). For behavioral evidence that this argument is not the grammatical object, see Rude (1997a).

(83) pa-šapá-ţx-taţna=nam paamanáy
3NOM.PL- CAUS-remember-COND=2SG them
‘they can cause you to remember them’ (CR)

The following posed in direct elicitation required a human patient (“eat a person up”), this because the unshifted oblique (winšmíyaw) requires a human patient (i.e., shifting does not occur unless the patient is human).

(84) winš-mí-yaw patá-šapa-tkʷatan-a
man-GEN-ALL INV.PL-CAUS-eat-PST
‘they had the man “eat a person up”’ (CR)

The oblique kʷaalinímíyaw in the next example similarly codes the lower agent and, though the inverse pá- is normally expected in second- on first-person transitivity (see §2.1.3.), the oblique noun means the Dative Shift has not occurred and the patient is human, i.e., ‘me’.
Though rare in texts, native speakers readily allow the causative with ditransitive verbs. This means a four-place predicate (Agent₁, Agent₂, Dative, Patient). Morphological and behavioral criteria specify just one grammatical object in Sahaptin, and in ditransitive causatives the object can be any one of the three arguments of the lower predicate providing it is human (or personified). In the following, the agent is subject and the patient and dative are obliques.

(86) tú-yay=nam pā-šapa-ni-ya útpas pšwa-nmí-yaw
what-GEN=2SG INV-CAUS-give-PST blanket rock-GEN-ALL
'why did you make me give a blanket to the rock' (Jacobs 1937:1.11.2, pg. 114)

3.7. Subject Raising.

The verb in a complement clause is nominalized with -t (also -t plus allative -yaw in object complements). The S or A of the subject complement is a possessor, which may be internal (as in a below where subject agreement in the main verb is with nominative i-) or external (as in b where subject agreement is with obviative á-).

(87) a. Internal possession
   ana kú i-wiyánaqįta pinmiin ttáwax-t
   REL and 3NOM-finish-FUT 3SG.GEN grow-N
   ‘when her growing will be finished’ (CR)

   b. External possession
   kʷáy á-wač-a săpsikʷa-t nčinči-ma-amí
   that OBV-be-PST teach-N elders-PL-GEN
   ‘that was the elder’s teaching’ (CR)

The direct object in a complement retains its accusative noun case marking if human—accusative noun case marking is optional otherwise.

(88) i-wač-á áwtn-i miyánaš-ma-aman čáw nákwnia-t
3NOM-be-PST taboo-PP child-PL-ACC NEG take-N
‘it was tabooed not to take the children’ (CR)

(89) ana mįš maynį naknúwi-t i-wač-á kúsi-ma-aman
REL how that.way take.care-N 3NOM-be-PST horse-PL-ACC
‘however that it was to take care of the horses’ (CR)
Transitivity in Sahaptin


(90) ku i-wá atfúk kʷaαná nákpní-t waničt-na
and 3Nom-be.PRS difficult that.Acc bring.out-N name-Acc
‘and it is difficult to bring out that name’ (CR)

In each of the following examples the S or A of the complement is “raised” to direct
object of the main or tensed verb, as expressed by a second position pronominal (=atas
‘us’), an obviative pronominal (áw- ‘them’), an independent pronoun (paanáy ‘him/her’),
or a noun with accusative case marking (inmímaaman nčínčimaaman ‘my elders’).

(91) pa-sápsiʔ-a-san-a=atas tkʷátat aní-t naknúi-t-ay ánîm-ay
3Nom.PL-teach-IMPV-PST=1Exc.PL food make-N keep-N-BEN winter-BEN
‘they were teaching us to make food for winter keeping’ (CR)

(92) áw-awt-ta=nam wína-t ana kʷná pa-páyuum-ša
Obv-taboo-FUT=2SG go-N REL there 3Nom.PL-celebrate-IMPV.PRS
‘you will taboo them going where they are celebrating’ (CR)

(93) pa-wiyáŋk-a paanáy wína-t
3Nom.PL-block-PST 3Acc.SG go-N
‘they blocked him going’ (CR)

(94) kʷáʔ=š kʷíl á-ykin-šan-a inmí-ma-aman nčínči-ma-aman sínwi-t-yaw
that=1SG that.much Obv-hear-HAB-PST my-PL-ACC big,PL-PL-ACC speak-N-All
‘that much I used to hear my elders speak’ (CR)

The raised subject is optionally advanced as external possessor via the applicative.32

(95) ača=š=ta kú píním kʰaʔʷ i-šúkʷ-ayi-ša-m-š
Because=1SG=MOD and 3Erg.SG all 3Nom-know-APL-IMPV-CSL-PRS Rfl.SG-ready-N
‘because he knows all my getting myself ready’ (CR)

(96) pà-ʔín-ani-ya íči ḳ́m náwcak-t-yaw
Inv-see-APL-PST this mouth open-N-All
‘it saw this mouth of his open up’ (Jacobs 1937:1.6.6, pg. 113)

When the verb in the object complement is transitive there are two potential objects and
Subject Raising becomes analogous to the Dative Shift. Note that, just as in the causative
(§3.6.), the nonshifted A is case marked oblique (with -yaw). Unlike with ditransitives
and causatives, however, the Dative Shift is optional whether or not the patient is human.
The following are from Rude (1997a).

32 If external possession in the complement feeds the applicative in the main verb, then there should be no
examples where the verb in the object complement is transitive (i.e., there is no external possession of a
transitive subject). Unfortunately the author’s informants are now too elderly or too hard of hearing to test
this theory.

(97)  
\[a. \text{Unshifted} \]

\[
i \text{-t}\xi\text{̣-ša} \quad \text{inmī-yaw kī³lawi-t núsux-na} \\
3\text{NOM-want-IMPV.PRS mine-ALL taste-N salmon-ACC}
\]

‘he wants me to taste the salmon’ (NE)

\[b. \text{Shifted} \]

\[
i \text{-t}\xi\text{̣-ša}=\text{aš} \quad \text{kī³lawi-t núsux} \\
3\text{NOM-want-IMPV.PRS=1SG taste-N salmon}
\]

‘he wants me to taste the salmon’ (NE)

Also, as in the causative, Subject Raising does not preclude accusative noun case marking of the lower O. Disambiguation, if not explicit in the grammar, is via common sense (semantics/pragmatics).\(^{33}\)

(98) \[
\text{á-sapsi}^{\text{̣}}\text{-a-sa}=\text{atas} \quad \text{tk³átat-na nákniknik-t} \\
\text{OBV-teach-IMPV.PRS=1PL.EXC food-ACC take.around-N}
\]

‘we are teaching them to take the food around’ (CR)

(99) \[
\text{tīlaaki-na} \quad \text{pā-wálimsi}^{\text{̣}}\text{-a-šan-a wiyím-k-t-yaw pyaži-na} \\
\text{woman-ACC 3NOM.PL-watch-IMPV-PST peel-N-ALL bitterroot-ACC}
\]

‘they are watching a woman peel the bitterroot’ (NE)

(100) \[
\text{á-t}\xi\text{̣-ša}=\text{aš} \quad \text{pyaži-na tk³áta-t} \\
\text{OBV-want-IMPV.PRS=1SG bitterroot-ACC eat-N}
\]

‘I want him to eat bitterroot’ (CR)

(101) \[
\text{pə-t}^{\text{̣}}\text{sapsi}^{\text{̣}}\text{-an-xa} \quad \text{šúwa-t naknúwi-t nik³ít-na} \\
\text{INV.PL-teach-HAB.PRS butcher-N take.care.of-N meat-ACC}
\]

‘they teach them to butcher, to take care of the meat’ (CR)

(102) \[
\text{pəmə-wño-wuwa-ša} \quad \text{wištáyama-t naamí-na pát-na} \\
\text{RFL.PL-make.ready-IMPV.PRS meet-N our-ACC older.sister-ACC}
\]

‘they are readying themselves to meet our older sister’ (CR)

If only one object is coded it might be, depending on context, either the A or the O.

(103) \[
\text{pə-}^{\text{̣}}\text{lây}^{\text{̣}}\text{-n-a}=\text{ataš} \quad \text{xní-t-yaw} \\
3\text{NOM.PL-angrily.forbid-PST=1EXC.PL dig.roots-N-ALL}
\]

‘they angrily forbade us to dig roots’ (CR)

\(^{33}\) For examples with behavioral tests (reflexivization, passivization, etc.) showing that the raised A is the grammatical object, see Rude (1997a).

When no object is indicated, the interpretation is that the subject of the two verbs are coreferent, what I refer to as “equi-subjects”.

(105) a. ku kúuk i- Kháwšx-n-a wánp-t and then 3NOM-stop-PST sing-N ‘and then he stopped singing’ (Jacobs 1937:11.2.2, pg. 17)

b. ana kú úyi-xa wánp-t REL and 3NOM.begin-HAB.PRS sing-N ‘when he begins to sing’ (CR)

c. pa-tmíyun-a wana-páyn aní-t 3NOM.PL-decide-PST river-along make-N ‘they decided to make [it] along the river’ (CR)

Inceptive -?uyí, cessative -naǫi, and desiderative -ať’a all compound with a nominalized stem in equi-subject constructions, forming a single clause syntactically.

(106) a. pa-tk’á-ta-?uyí-ša 3NOM.PL-eat-N-start-IMPV.PRS ‘they are starting to eat’ (CR)

b. pa-wiyánawi-t-naǫi-ya 3NOM.PL-arrive-N-finish-PST ‘they finished arriving’ (CR)

c. patá-?ani-t-ať’a-ša níit-na INV.PL-make-N-want-IMPV.PRS house-ACC ‘they are wanting to build the house’ (CR)

As seen in the last example, the semantic patient patient of ‘make’ is syntactically the direct object of the clause and thus has accusative noun case marking.

4. Conclusion.

This paper shows that transitivity and core grammatical relations are categories just as valid in a language where they cannot be described on the basis of constituent

34 Ordinarily ‘want’ with equi-subjects is expressed by the desiderative (see below).
35 My Umatilla informant, Inez Spino Reves, does not convert an obstruent into an ejective when a glottal stop follows.

order as they are in a language where they can be so described. Sahaptin word order serves mostly a pragmatic function and fails to identify grammatical relations. Rather, grammatical relations are identified morphologically or semantically, by means of agreement markers, which appear in second position or as verbal prefixes, and noun case markers. Shapatin has a three-way alignment with absolute, accusative and ergative nominal cases. Ergativity is split by person, with one nominal case for the non-prototypical third person that acts on first/second person and another nominal case for the non-prototypical third person that acts on a topical third person. In sum, according to the typology set forth in Nichols (1986), Sahaptin should be described as more or less equally head- and dependent-marking.\(^\text{36}\)

There is little lability in Sahaptin, for other than \(k\)ú ‘go, do’, verbs are inherently intransitive, mono-transitive, or ditransitive and should be so labeled in the lexicon. However, there are directive and applicative constructions in the three Plateau Penutian languages for which we have adequate description (Barker 1963, 1964; Rude 1988b; Pharris 2006), and which derive from verbal compounds, e.g., the applicative traces to ‘give’ in Sahaptian, in Klamath and in Molala (Rude 1991, Pharris 2006). The situation is typologically and possibly genetically connected to Uto-Aztecan (Rude 1996a, 2000). Other valence changing mechanisms include inverse voice, external possession, causatives, and subject raising.
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\(^{36}\) The distantly related Klamath is primarily a dependent-marking language. The Klamath verb lacks pronominal affixes but is nevertheless sensitive to an absolutive case via suppletion (singular versus plural/distributive) and classificatory prefixes (see Rude 1987).
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