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0. Halkomelem lexical suffixes

This paper is part of on-going research into the morphosyntactic structure of lexical suffixes. I explore some properties of lexical suffixes in Halkomelem, one of twenty-three Salishan languages. Halkomelem is spoken in southwestern British Columbia in the vicinity of Vancouver and on the east coast of Vancouver Island. The data are from the Island dialect of Halkomelem (halqəmíłəm). This dialect is currently spoken by around two hundred elders.1

Lexical suffixes are suffixes that have substantival meaning. That is, they have meanings usually carried by nouns in other languages. Lexical suffixes usually bear no phonological similarity to free-standing nouns of similar meaning:2

(1)  -as ‘face, round object’  sʔəθəs ‘face’
    -cəs ‘hand, finger’  cələs ‘hand’
    -sən ‘foot, leg’  səxənə ‘foot’
    -wil ‘rib, vessel’  ləwək ‘rib’
    -θən ‘mouth, edge’  θəθən ‘mouth’
    -əwtə ‘building, room’  1ələm ‘house’
    -əyəl ‘baby, child’  qəq ‘baby’

Most Salishan languages have approximately one hundred lexical suffixes denoting body parts (hand, foot, heart, nose), basic physical/environmental concepts (earth, fire, water, wind, tree, rock), cultural items (canoe, net, house, clothing), and human/relational terms (people, spouse, child). The suffixes, especially the body part suffixes, extend to take on shape, locative, and relational meanings (Hinkson 1999) and some are grammaticized into grammatical morphemes functioning as desideratives, applicatives, etc. (Gerdts and Hinkson 1996).

One common use of lexical suffixes is to form compounds. The suffix is added to a verb or noun root to form a noun, as seen in (2).3

(2)  tiwəyəł-əwtə ‘church’ (pray + building)
    ʔiʔət-əlwət ‘pajamas’ (sleep + clothing)
    təməł-əpsəm ‘woodpecker’ (ochre + neck)
    qʷleɣ-ənə ‘shoe’ (log + foot)

Lexical suffixes also frequently appear in verb phrases. Here they can play the role of an oblique nominal adding a locative or manner meaning to the verb phrase, as illustrated in (3).
(3) q‘t-aθan 'walk along (a shore etc.)' (go along + mouth)
q‘t-néṣ 'go around end of lake' (go along + bottom)
q‘a-śiń-t 'accompany him' (accompany + foot + transitive)
q‘p-as-əm 'assemble, gather face to face' (gather + face + middle)

The commonly accepted view of lexical suffixation is that it does not alter core argument structure, as noun incorporation does, but rather it adds an adverbal or adjectival specification to the stem. For example, Anderson (1992) and Bach (1995) make this claim for the neighboring Wakashan languages. In this paper, I present evidence that runs counter to this view of lexical suffixation. I claim instead that lexical suffixes can in fact occupy argument positions in initial structure. That is, they are exactly parallel to incorporated nouns, which are attested in many languages of the world.

First, note that lexical suffices frequently appear in verb phrases carrying the role of theme, as in (4); in my corpus this use is more common than that in (3).

(4) q‘s-eýan 'set a net' (throw out + net)
səwq-iws 'search for a lost person' (seek + body)
ʃə-ściqan 'shear wool' (cut + hair)
pʰi-əlmax 'milk a cow' (wring out + breast)

In this use, lexical suffixation is functionally parallel to compounding noun incorporation (Rosen 1989, Gerdts 1998). The lexical suffixation of the theme detransitivizes the clause. This can be seen by comparing the form with the lexical suffix in (5) to the clause with a free standing nominal in (6).

(5) niʔ ʃə-k-v-əyəl ʔə Mary.
aux bathe-baby det Mary
'Mary bathed the baby.'

(6) niʔ ʃə-k-v-əl-əs ə sləniʔ/*Mary ə qeq.
aux bathe-tr-3erg det woman/*Mary det baby
'The woman/*Mary bathed the baby.

The clause in (6) is transitive and thus has a transitive suffix and ergative agreement while (5) lacks these. Furthermore, proper noun ergatives are prohibited by many speakers of Island Halkomelem, as seen in (6). But note that Mary in (5) is not subject to this prohibition; it is an absolutive nominal due to the lexical suffixation of the object.

This paper seeks to give further evidence that the lexical suffix is an argument in underlying structure, based on the combinatoric properties of lexical suffices. As seen in the basic verb template given in (7), lexical suffices occur in position 1, following the verb root.


This paper discusses three combinations of lexical suffixes with other suffixes. First, I discuss the combination of lexical suffixes with other position 1 suffixes, the applicatives. Then I discuss lexical suffixes and causative, a position 2 suffix. Finally, I discuss lexical suffixes and reflexive, a position 3 suffix.

1. Lexical suffixes and applicatives

   First, let us see how lexical suffixes interact with applicative constructions. Halkomelem has several applicative constructions, as discussed in Gerdts (1988). The benefactive applicative is illustrated in (8).

   \[(8)\]  
   
   \[ni\text{-}q\text{-}w\text{-}al\text{-}c\text{-}\theta\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\acute{\mu}\text{-}\acute{s}\text{-}\acute{\omega}\text{?} a k\text{-}\Theta\text{?}\text{ sce}\text{-}\acute{\iota}\text{-}\eta\text{.}\]
   
   aux    bake-ben-tr+1obj-3erg  obl  det  salmon
   ‘He baked the salmon for me.’

   The suffix \(-\alpha\text{lc}\)-is added to the verb root, the benefactive is the surface object, and the theme, if it is expressed, is an oblique phrase. Benefactive applicatives are totally productive. Any verb that has a simple transitive form can also have a benefactive as long the meaning makes sense. Some examples are given in (9).

   \[(9)\]  
   
   \[\text{'bake it'}\]  \[\text{'write it'}\]  \[\text{'take it'}\]  \[\text{'sew it'}\]  \[\text{'fix it'}\]
   \[\text{\textquoteleft bake it for him/her\textquoteright} \]  \[\text{\textquoteleft write it for/to him/her\textquoteright} \]  \[\text{\textquoteleft take it for him/her\textquoteright} \]  \[\text{\textquoteleft sew it for him/her\textquoteright} \]  \[\text{\textquoteleft fix it for him/her\textquoteright} \]

   It has been noted by Mithun (1984), Baker (1988), and others that the theme in the applicative construction in some languages can appear as an incorporated noun. Baker (1988) cites the following Tuscarora example from Williams (1976):

   \[(10)\]  
   
   \[\text{Wa\text{-}khe\text{-}tanar\text{-}atyat\text{-}hah\text{?}.}\]
   \[\text{PAST\text{-}1sS\text{/}3fO\text{-}bread\text{-}buy\text{-}APPL\text{/}PUNC.}\]
   \[\text{‘I bought her some bread.’}\]

   Halkomelem shows parallel facts. The theme in the applicative construction can appear as a lexical suffix:

   \[(11)\]  
   
   \[\text{\textquoteleft bathe the baby for me\textquoteright}\]
(12) ʼθxʷ-əlwaʔ-əlc-ət.
wash-clothes-ben-tr
‘Wash clothes for him/her.’

(13) ʼq̕-əwəl-əlc-ət.
tie-vessel-ben-tr
‘Tie up the canoe for him/her.’

The benefactive applicative -əlc- follows the lexical suffix.

The applicative -əlc- is used only on transitive forms. A different applicative, -meʔ- is used to form the benefactive applicative based on intransitive verbs:

(14) kʷukʷ- meʔ- t.
cook-appl-tr
‘Cook for him/her.’

The verb in (14) is an intransitive cooking action kʷukʷ ‘cook’ (from English). This contrasts with the verb in the first example in (9), ʼq̕-əlat ‘bake it’, which is a transitive cooking action, as seen by the presence of the transitive suffix -t. Note that the latter forms an applicative with the benefactive suffix -əlc-. The examples in (15) illustrate other instances where a benefactive applicative formed with -meʔ- is based on an intransitive.

(15) ʼq̕-əyɪləš ‘dance
yəːys  ‘work’
ləkələš ‘stand’
ʔəsəl  ‘paddle’
  ʼq̕-əyɪləš meʔ-t ‘dance for him/her’
  yəːys meʔ-t ‘work for him/her’
  ləkələš meʔ-t ‘stand for him/her’
  ʔəsəl meʔ-t ‘paddle for him/her’

The applicative suffix -meʔ- can not be used with lexical suffixes to form benefactives, as seen in (16). Examples like these are ungrammatical regardless of the order that the lexical suffix and the applicative appear in.

(16) *kʷ-əyəl-meʔ-θəṁs  or  *kʷ- meʔ-əyəl-θəṁs
*θxʷ-əlwaʔ-meʔ-t
*θxʷ- meʔ-əlwaʔ-t
*ʼq̕-əwəl-meʔ-t  *ʼq̕- meʔ-əwəl-t

The ungrammaticality of these data is paradoxical because, as we have argued above, lexical suffixation detransitivizes the clause. These observations lead to the conclusion that the type of applicative is selected based on the underlying structure of the clause, not its structure after lexical suffixation.

(17) Benefactive applicatives:
  a. Use -əlc- when the underlying predicate is 2-place.
  b. Use -meʔ- when the underlying predicate is 1-place.
Following our assumption that the lexical suffix is a core argument in underlying structure (name, the theme), the underlying predicate is transitive and forms benefactives as expected, with the transitive benefactive applicative -alc-.

Lexical suffixes can in fact occur with -me?- but not in its use as a benefactive. The applicative suffix -me?- is also used for applicative objects with the semantics of causal, stimuli, or direction (Gerds 1988):

(18) ęciws ‘tired’ ęciwsmeʔt ‘tired of him/her’
qel ‘believe’ qelmeʔt ‘believe him/her’
siʔsiʔ ‘afraid’ siʔsiʔmeʔt ‘afraid of him/her’
xiʔxeʔ ‘ashamed’ xiʔxeʔmeʔt ‘ashamed of him/her’
?iʔ-əs ‘happy’ (good + face) ?iʔxosmeʔt ‘happy for him/her’

For example, we see a directional use of -me?- co-occurring with lexical suffixes in (19) and (20).

(19) niʔ ct qit-əθən-meʔʔ-t.
aux lpsub walk-edge-appl-tr
‘We walked right by him as we walked along the shore.’

(20) ?iʔə ce:c:p ?əw xəʔən səʔq-iws-meʔʔ-t kʷəθə niʔ sʔikʷʔ?
aux int 2plsub comp still seek-body-appl-tr det aux nm-lost
‘Are you still searching for that lost person?’

The example in (20) contrasts with the applicative in (21), which is benefactive (in this case delegative) rather than directional in meaning.

(21) səʔq-iws-alc-θəməs č ceʔ.
seek-body-ben-tr+1obj 2obj fut
‘You will take my place in the search for the missing person.’

Note that -alc-, the transitive benefactive, is used in (21). So we see that the blocking of the co-occurrence of lexical suffix and -me?- as in the examples in (16), is not due to a morphological constraint.

To summarize, Halkomelem has two forms of benefactive: -alc- is used for base transitives, while -me?- is used for base intransitives. In examples like (10)–(13), in which a lexical suffix and a benefactive co-occur, the transitive form of the benefactive is used. What these data show is that the lexical suffix satisfies the notion of transitivity required by the transitive benefactive suffix. This follows from an analysis that posits that the lexical suffix is the theme argument in these examples.

2. Lexical suffixes and causatives

A second type of evidence that the lexical suffix is a core argument in underlying structure comes from causative constructions. The interaction of causatives and noun incorporation has been noted for many languages, including
Alutor (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Muravyova 1993). For example, we see in the
Alutor causative in (22) that the caused event ‘cutting the wood’ appears inside
the causative.

(22) gəmn-nan aqak to-n-u-svitku-vo-tk-ən.
‘I am making the son cut wood.’

We see parallel data in Halkomelem. The causative suffix -st only attaches to
intransitive bases (Gerdts 1988). Since lexical suffix constructions are
morphosyntactically intransitive, it is not surprising that lexical suffixes can
appear inside causatives:

(23) sə-Ɂɛq-stəxʷ č.
    cut-wood-caus+3obj  2sub
‘You make him chop wood.’

(24) niʔ  cən  xaʔ-éyəl-stəxʷ.
    aux  1sub  comfort-child-caus
‘I had him comfort the child.’

Notice the mirror image morphological order in Alutor and Halkomelem. The
incorporated noun and the causative are prefixal in Alutor while the lexical suffix
and causative are suffixal in Halkomelem.

Alutor also has examples of noun incorporation outside the causative. For
example in (25), the incorporated noun ‘wife’ is the causee.

    1:abs  1sg.s-wife-caus-eat-suff.aor-1sg.s  meat-instr
‘I fed my wife with meat.’

Again, Halkomelem shows parallel data. The causee in Halkomelem must be
animate (Gerdts 1988). And the data in (26) show lexical suffixes referring to
humans representing the causee. This appears outside the causative suffix.

(26) a. niʔ  ʔəmət-st-ənəq.
    aux  sit-caus-people
‘He sat the people down.’

b. niʔ  ʔim̕ət-st-ənəq.
    aux  walk-caus-people
‘He made the people walk.’

c. niʔ  ɬxiliš-st-ənəq.
    aux  stand-caus-people
‘She made the people stand up.’
In addition, Alutor shows double causatives, where causative appears before and after noun incorporation:

(27) gəm-nən akək to-n nalga-n kuww-at awo-tk-ən.
    l-erg son:abs lsg.s-caus-skin-caus-dry-suf-suf-pres-lsg.s
    'I am making my son dry a skin/skins.'

Halkomelem again has parallel data.

(28) niʔ cən ləxiliš-st-ənəq-stəxʷ.
    aux lsub stand-caus-people-caus+3obj
    'I made him stand the people up.'

(29) niʔ qəqəmaʔ-st-əyal-stəxʷ-as ə nas ə Mary.
    aux breast-caus-child-caus+3obj-3erg det nurse det Mary
    'The nurse had Mary breast-feed the child.'

We see causative morphology both before and after the lexical suffixes for 'people' (28) and 'child' (29). These lexical suffix are causees of the first causative.

Also in Halkomelem, lexical suffixes can appear both before and after causatives as in (30c) and (31c) and in the double causatives in (30d) and (31d).

(30) a. səɬəcəp
    b. səɬəcəp-stəxʷ
    c. səɬəcəp-st-ənəq
    d. səɬəcəp-st-ənəq-stəxʷ
    'cut firewood'
    'make him cut firewood'
    'make people cut firewood'
    'make him make people cut firewood'

(31) a. əxə-ənəq
    b. əxə-ənəq-stəxʷ
    c. əxə-ənəq-st-ənəq
    d. əxə-ənəq-st-ənəq-stəxʷ
    'give a potlatch' (invite + people)
    'have her give a potlatch'
    'have people give a potlatch'
    'have her have people give a potlatch'

The first lexical suffix is the theme (object) of the base verb, while the second lexical suffix represents the causee of the first causative.

The Halkomelem data thus mirror the interactions found between causatives and noun incorporation, for example in Alutor. Since the usual view of causatives is that the causee and the theme are core arguments in initial structure, these data provide evidence that the lexical suffix is a core argument.
3. **Lexical suffixes and reflexives**

A third type of evidence that the lexical suffix does not always originate as an adjunct comes from the interaction of external possession constructions and reflexives. As noted by Mithun (1984), Baker (1988), and others, many languages with noun incorporation also allow a construction in which the incorporated noun is the possessed head of a theme. This gives rise to an external possession construction, in which the semantic possessor appears as an argument of the verb, normally the object of a transitive verb or the subject of an intransitive verb. In the following example from Blackfoot (Frantz 1971), the underlying possessor ‘man’ is the surface object of the verb, while the possessed body part is an incorporated noun.

    I-break-back-him that man
    ‘I broke the man’s back.’

Halkomelem lexical suffixes similarly appear in an external possession construction. In (33), the possessed head of the theme ‘head’ appears as a lexical suffix, and the notional possessor $sqʷaméy$ ‘dog’ is the syntactic object of the clause.

(33) niʔ tší-qʷ-t-əs la slenʔiʔ kʷθə sqʷaméy.
    aux comb-head-tr-3erg det woman det dog
    ‘The woman combed the dog’s hair.’

This construction is not limited to part-whole constructions, as seen in (34) where the possessed object is ‘bed’.

(34) niʔ ᵃ ḣθə y-eʔl-θámš?
    aux int 2obj make-flexible.material-tr+1obj
    ‘Did you make my bed?’

Alternatively, it could be claimed that the ‘possessor’ is actually the theme argument of the clause, while the lexical suffix is an adverbial modifier. Under this account a more suitable translation for (33) would be ‘The woman combed the dog on the head.’ However, as I argued in Gerdts (1981), the possessor, though it inflects like a surface object, lacks the properties of a theme or underlying object.

For example, the underlying possessor cannot be reflexivized like a theme. In Halkomelem reflexives, the suffix -θet appears in the object position.

(35) niʔ kʷalaʔ-θet kʷθə swəʔqeʔ.
    aux shoot-tr-ref det man
    ‘The man shot himself.’

Other examples of reflexive verb forms are given in (36):
(40) Reflexives:
   a. Use -θat when the underlying object is coreferent with the subject.
   b. Use -əm when a derived object is coreferent with the subject.

Thus, the reflexive data provide support for the claim that the possessor is a derived object. This follows under an analysis that posits that the possessor modifies the lexical suffix in underlying structure. The lexical suffix occupies the position of head of the theme, an argument position.

4. Conclusion

We can conclude that lexical suffixes are not merely adverbial modifiers occupying non-argument positions. Lexical suffixation can internalize a core argument such as theme or causee and thus affects the argument structure of the clause. Lexical suffixation functions like compounding noun incorporation and can be ordered with other argument structure-altering rules. Moreover, we see on the basis of the reflexive data that the possessor in the external possessive construction is not the theme. This follows from an analysis that posits that the lexical suffix is the head of the theme in underlying structure.

Sapir (1911) claims that lexical suffixes cannot be regarded as incorporated nouns because they do not resemble free-standing nouns. But what we have seen here is that lexical suffixes function exactly like incorporated nouns. Lexical suffixes are simply historical nouns that have journeyed further down the grammaticalization path than the incorporated nouns found in many languages. New free-standing nouns have been invented to serve as nominals as the old noun roots became bound forms. The lexical suffix still has the functional properties and the categorial status of noun, even though its ability to function as a free-standing noun is gone.
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The following abbreviations are used in glossing the Halkomelem examples: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, appl = applicative, aux = auxiliary, ben = benefactive, comp = complementizer, caus = causative, det = determiner, erg = ergative, fut = future, int = interrogative, intr = intransitive, nm = nominalizer, obj = object, obl = oblique, pl = plural, sub = subject, ref = reflexive, tr = transitive.

2 For a discussion of the origin of lexical suffixes and their relationship to free-standing nominals see Kinkade (1998) and references therein.

3 Gerds and Hinkson (1996) have noted the ability of the lexical suffix to head a N compound and have used this as evidence that the lexical suffix has the categorial status of a noun.

4 The relative order of the incorporated noun and applicative in Tuscarora is not transparent since one is prefixal and the other suffixal. In Halkomelem, however, the lexical suffix clearly precedes the benefactive suffix.
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