

The Double Life of Halkomelem Reflexive Suffixes

Donna B. Gerdtz
Simon Fraser University

1. Introduction¹

This paper discusses reflexives in Halkomelem, a Salishan language spoken in southwestern British Columbia. Halkomelem has two reflexive suffixes: *-θət* 'reflexive' (1), and *-namət* 'limited control reflexive' (2).²

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (1) | <i>q̣ayθət</i> | 'kill self' |
| | <i>čəỵx̣"θət</i> | 'dry self' |
| | <i>ləx̣"əθət</i> | 'cover self' |
| | <i>laləmθət</i> | 'look after self' |
| | <i>xiq̣əθət</i> | 'scratch self' |
| (2) | <i>q̣aynámət</i> ³ | 'kill self accidentally' |
| | <i>q̣"əq̣"námət</i> | 'hit self accidentally' |
| | <i>q̣ańámət</i> | 'manage to get self in with them' |
| | <i>yəx̣"námət</i> | 'manage to set self free' |
| | <i>?əḳ"námət</i> | 'hook self accidentally' |

The above examples illustrate what I refer to as **core reflexives**, which are discussed in section 2. They are used in constructions in which the patient (or other suitable argument) is semantically coreferent to the subject of the clause. In such cases, the reflexive transparently means 'self'.

In section 3, I discuss examples with reflexive suffixes appearing in environments where transitive objects cannot. In these cases, the meaning deviates from the standard 'self' meaning of core reflexives. In this use, which I referred to as **grammaticized reflexives**, the suffixes do not affect argument structure, but rather have an aspect-like meaning. The reflexive is used as an inchoative (4a) and the limited control reflexive means 'manage to' (4b).

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------|----------------|
| (4) | a. | <i>?ayəmθət</i> | 'get slow' |
| | b. | <i>nəmńámət</i> | 'manage to go' |

I show that core and grammaticized forms are distributionally distinct. Core reflexives and reciprocals appear only on process unaccusatives, while grammaticized reflexives appear on

other verb classes, including unergative verbs and states.

In section 4, I turn to a discussion of examples like (5), which involve a reflexive causative marked by the suffix *-stənamət*.

(5) ?iməšstənámət ‘manage to make self walk’/ ‘pretend to walk’

These reflexive causatives can have both a core meaning of ‘manage to make self’ and a grammaticized meaning of ‘pretend’. The suffix when it takes the second meaning shows a much wider range of occurrence than the first and furthermore, appears on bases that do not normally form causatives.

XXXX

2. Core Reflexives and Reciprocals

In Halkomelem reflexive constructions, the patient (or other suitable argument) is semantically coreferent to a clausemate subject antecedent:

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------------|----------------------|---|
| (6) | <i>ni?</i> | <i>cən</i> | <i>ləxʷə-θət.</i> | ‘I covered myself.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | <i>č</i> | <i>ləxʷə-θət.</i> | ‘You (sg.) covered yourself.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | <i>ct</i> | <i>ləxʷə-θət.</i> | ‘We covered ourselves.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | <i>ce:p</i> | <i>ləxʷə-θət.</i> | ‘You (pl.) covered yourselves.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | | <i>ləxʷə-θət.</i> | ‘He/she/it/they covered self.’ |
| | | | | |
| (7) | <i>ni?</i> | <i>cən</i> | <i>kʷələš-námət.</i> | ‘I accidentally shot myself.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | <i>č</i> | <i>kʷələš-námət.</i> | ‘You (sg.) accidentally shot yourself.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | <i>ct</i> | <i>kʷələš-námət</i> | ‘We accidentally shot ourselves.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | <i>ce:p</i> | <i>kʷələš-námət</i> | ‘You (pl.) accidentally shot yourselves.’ |
| | <i>ni?</i> | | <i>kʷələš-námət.</i> | ‘He/she/it/they accidentally shot self.’ |

The reflexive and reciprocal suffixes, which are undifferentiated for person or number, appear in the same place in the verb morphology as the transitive object suffixes. Nevertheless, reflexive constructions are surface intransitive, as evidenced, for example, by the lack of third person ergative agreement (Gerds 1988a).^{4,5}

- (8) *ni?* *kʷələš-θət* *kʷəθə* *swəýqe?*
 aux shoot-tr+ref det man
 ‘The man shot himself.’

- (9) *niʔ kʷələš-námət kʷθə swəýqeʔ.*
 aux shoot-l.c.tr+ref det man
 ‘The man accidentally shot himself.’

Throughout this paper I refer to these suffixes as *-θət*, and *-námət*, as these are the forms most often seen in the data. However, the morphophonological evidence shows that these are forms composed of at least two parts.⁶ The first part is a transitive suffix, *-t* or *-n*, and the second part is a reflexive pronominal form. Transitivity is overtly marked on verbs by one of three suffixes: the general transitive suffix *-t*, the limited control suffix *-n*, or the causative suffix *-st*, which is discussed in section 4.⁷ The first two suffixes are illustrated in (10) and (11):

- (10) a. *niʔ qʷaqʷ-ət-as tə steniʔ ʔə kʷθə sqáməl.*
 AUX club-TR-3ERG DET woman OBL DET paddle
 ‘He clubbed the woman with the paddle (on purpose).’
- b. *niʔ qʷaqʷ-nəxʷ-as tə steniʔ ʔə kʷθə sqáməl.*
 AUX club-L.C.TR:3OBJ-3ERG DET woman OBL DET paddle
 ‘He accidentally clubbed the woman with the paddle.’
- (11) a. *niʔ cən lem-ət θə steniʔ.*
 AUX 1SUB see-TR DET woman
 ‘I looked at the woman.’
- b. *niʔ cən lam-nəxʷ θə steniʔ.*
 AUX 1SUB see-L.C.TR:3OBJ DET woman
 ‘I saw the woman.’

The general transitive is illustrated in the (a) examples. The limited control transitive, which is used to express an action that is performed unintentionally, accidentally, or with difficulty, is illustrated in the (b) examples.

The majority of verb roots in Halkomelem are patient-oriented unaccusatives (Gerds 1991, Hukari 1976, Gerds and Hukari 1998), for example, *qʷəl* ‘to bake’ (as in ‘the bread bakes’) and *kʷes* ‘to burn’ (as in ‘the house burns’). There are about one thousand verb roots of this type in Halkomelem, and they consistently form transitives with *-t* and *-n*. These verb roots also always form reflexives whenever the semantics is plausible. The examples in (12)–(14) are illustrative of the Halkomelem verbal paradigm.

- (12) *kʷes* ‘burn’, *kʷesət* ‘burn it’, *kʷəsənəxʷ* ‘burn it accidentally’, *kʷesəθət* ‘burn self’,
kʷesnámət ‘burn self accidentally’
- (13) *qʷaqʷ* ‘get clubbed’, *qʷaqʷət* ‘club it’, *qʷəqʷənəxʷ* ‘club it accidentally’, *qʷaqʷəθət*
‘club self’, *qʷəqʷnámət* ‘club self accidentally’
- (14) *ʔakʷ* ‘get hooked, snagged, hung up’, *ʔakʷət* ‘hook it’, *ʔakʷənəxʷ* ‘manage to hook it’,
ʔakʷəθət ‘hook self’, *ʔəkʷnámət* ‘hook self accidentally’

3. Grammaticized Reflexive

All of the examples of reflexives discussed so far have transitive counterparts in which the subject and object are distinct. In this section, I discuss examples of reflexive suffixes appearing in environments in which transitive suffixes cannot appear. This might at first seem paradoxical, since I have claimed above that the first element of the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes is a transitive marker. However, based on the examples brought up in this section, I claim that the combination of transitive suffix and reflexive or reciprocal suffix has been reanalyzed into a single suffix. This suffix has a grammaticized meaning that is more aspectual than referential in nature.

3.1 The Reflexive as Inchoative

As discussed above, the majority of verb roots in Halkomelem are process unaccusatives, for example, *qʷəl* ‘to bake’ (as in ‘the bread bakes’) and *kʷes* ‘to burn’ (as in ‘the house burns’), and these always have transitive counterparts, for example, *qʷəl-ət* ‘to bake it’, and *kʷes-t* ‘to burn it’. In addition, we find that the reflexive suffix can sporadically appear on another type of unaccusative verb, namely statives, and in this case, as in many languages of the world, the reflexive suffix takes on the meaning of inchoative, that is, change of state.⁸

(15)	<i>ʔayəm</i>	‘slow’	<i>ʔayəmθət</i>	‘get slow’
	<i>θi</i>	‘big’	<i>θiθát</i>	‘get big’
	<i>q̄i:ləm</i>	‘old’	<i>q̄i:ləmθət</i>	‘get old’
	<i>scəwét</i>	‘adept, clever’	<i>scəwátθət</i>	‘become clever’
	<i>ʃeʃ</i>	‘stormy’	<i>ʃaʃθət</i>	‘get stormy’
	<i>ʃəʃ^w</i>	‘hard’	<i>ʃəʃ^wθát</i>	‘get hard’
	<i>stɛl̥p̥</i>	‘floppy’	<i>təl̥p̥θət</i>	‘go flat (a tire)’
	<i>ʃam</i>	‘be enough’	<i>ʃaməθət</i>	‘ease up a little (e.g. widthwise)’
	<i>ʔayáʔθ</i>	‘sharp’	<i>ʔayáʔθθət</i>	‘get sharp’
	<i>ʔiyəs</i>	‘happy’	<i>ʔiyəsθət</i>	‘get happy’
	<i>qəʃ</i>	‘be lots’	<i>qəʃθát</i>	‘get to be lots’, ‘be too many’

The use of the reflexive here is unexpected from a structural point of view, since there are no corresponding transitive forms which can serve as a basis for the reflexives. The forms in the first column cannot appear with the transitive suffix *-t*, examples like **ʔayəmət* ‘slow it’, **θit* ‘big it’, **q̄i:ləmət* ‘old it’, etc. are all ill-formed. However, if we propose that the combination of transitive plus reflexive in these examples has undergone reanalysis to form a single suffix meaning ‘inchoative’ in cases like (15), then the lack of a transitive counterpart is not an issue. In other words, a form like *ʔayəmθət* does not have the structure in (16a), but rather the structure in (16c), which derives from the reanalysis of the structure in (16b).

(16)	a. [[[ʔayəm] t] sat]	[[[slow] transitive] reflexive]
	b. [ʔayəm [t + sat]]	[slow [transitive + reflexive]]
	c. [ʔayəm [θət]]	[slow [inchoative]]

Since the reanalyzed form has the grammaticized meaning of ‘inchoative’, it should only occur on states, as in (15), and not in transitive contexts. Thus, the reflexive and inchoative uses of *-θət* occur on distinct verb classes.

We have seen that the reflexive suffix is used in two ways, as a core reflexive meaning ‘self’ and as an inchoative. The question arises, which is the original use of the suffix and which is the innovative or secondary use? Based on the fact that the reflexive morphology patterns with the transitive objective morphology, I claimed above that the core use was original. Furthermore, it is easy to see how this usage could extend to a more aspectual use such as the inchoative. The transitive element of the suffix is obscured by morphophonological fusion. In addition, although reflexive constructions involve two argument structure positions, they are syntactically

intransitive and thus have no additional inflectional requirements beyond those of a stative or other verbs that have a single argument structure position. Positing the opposite history, that the inchoative became a reflexive, is more problematic and contrary to other cases in the grammaticization literature.

A second argument that the core reflexive is the primary use of the suffix is based on productivity. As mentioned above, the majority of verb roots in Halkomelem are process unaccusatives that allow transitive counterparts formed with the transitive suffix *-t*. In addition, whenever the semantics is plausible, a core reflexive counterpart is possible. In contrast, the inchoative use of reflexive is fairly rare. Although probably not exhaustive, the list in (15) includes most of the forms in my data. Inchoative forms are more normally represented by the prefix *xʷə-*, as in the following examples taken from Hukari and Peter (1995):

- (17) a. *xʷəqáqíʔ* 'get sick'
xʷəʔəxʷíń 'become small'
xʷəxʷátəs 'get heavy'
xʷəkʷámkʷám 'get strong'
xʷəsiʔem 'become important, respected'
xʷəstátés 'get near'
xʷəxʷθíqən 'get loud'
- b. *xʷəxʷánčənəm* 'start running'
xʷəʔíməš 'start walking'
xʷəqʷáqʷəl 'start talking'
- c. *xʷənéʔənt* 'become evening'
xʷəšnéʔəm 'become a shaman'
xʷəsʰíʔʰqət 'turned into a child'

The inchoative prefix is used on a variety of categories, including stative verbs (17a), unergative verbs (17b), and nouns (17c). Further research is needed to determine the distinction between the two Halkomelem inchoatives. Relevant to this paper is the point that the inchoative use of the reflexive suffix is a relatively limited phenomenon.

3.2 The 'Manage to' Use of the Limited Control Reflexive

We have seen above that the limited control reflexive *-namət* can carry the meaning of performing an action on oneself unintentionally, accidentally, or with difficulty. This suffix also productively occurs on unergative verbs, that is, intransitive verbs whose single argument is prototypically an animate agent that is in control of the action. Unergative verbs in Halkomelem

include verbs of activity and motion (Gerdt 1991). When *-namət* appears on an unergative verb, it carries the meaning ‘manage to’, that is, to succeed in performing an action despite difficulty. Here are just some of the many examples of this use of *-namət*:

- | | | |
|------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (18) | <i>ʔəttənnámət</i> | ‘manage to eat’ |
| | <i>ya:ysnámət</i> | ‘manage to work’ |
| | <i>ʔakʷnámət</i> | ‘manage to come home’ |
| | <i>nəqəmnámət</i> | ‘manage to dive’ |
| | <i>ʃaqʷəlnámət</i> | ‘manage to get across’ |
| | <i>ʃʷčənəmnámət</i> | ‘manage to run’ |
| | <i>te:mnámət</i> | ‘manage to call’ |
| | <i>ʔiləmnámət</i> | ‘manage to sing’ |
| | <i>ʔiwʔəlnámət</i> | ‘manage to pray’ |
| | <i>ʔxʔiləšnámət</i> | ‘manage to stand’ |
| | <i>ca:mnámət</i> | ‘manage to go up into the mountains’ |
| | <i>ʔaxʷnámət</i> | ‘manage to go down to the beach’ |
| | <i>ʔənəxʷnámət</i> | ‘manage to stop’ |

In Halkomelem, unergative verbs generally do not form transitives or reflexives:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| (19) | <i>ʔəttən</i> | ‘eat’ | <i>*ʔəttənt</i> | ‘eat it’ ⁹ | <i>*ʔəttənθət</i> | ‘eat self’ |
| | <i>ya:ys</i> | ‘work’ | <i>*ya:yst</i> | ‘work it’ | <i>*ya:ysθət</i> | ‘work self’ |
| | <i>qʷəyaləš</i> | ‘dance’ | <i>*qʷəyaləšt</i> | ‘dance it’ | <i>*qʷəyaləšθət</i> | ‘dance self’ |

Thus, we see that there are no corresponding transitive or reflexive forms for the examples in (18). As in the case of the grammaticized use of the reflexive discussed in the previous section, this is not a puzzle if we assume that the limited control transitive suffix and the reflexive suffix have undergone reanalysis into a single morpheme *-namət* with the grammaticized meaning of ‘manage to’.

4. The Reflexive Causative

We have seen examples above of the general transitive and the limited control transitive suffixes in Halkomelem. A third type of transitive suffix is the causative *-st-*, illustrated in the following example:

- (20) niʔ cən ʔiməš-stəx* tʰə swiwləs
 aux lsub walk-cs+tr+3obj det boy
 'I made the boy walk.'

So far, I have been unable to find an example in which the causative is followed by the plain reflexive:¹⁰

- (21) *niʔ cən l̥xiləš-s-θət
 aux lsub stand-cs-tr+ref
 'I made myself stand up.'

When queried about data like (21), several speakers said it was illogical to make yourself do something. Rather one would use examples like (22) and (23), with a limited control reflexive taking the meaning of 'manage'.

- (22) niʔ cən l̥xiləš-námət
 aux lsub stand-l.c.tr+ref
 'I managed to stand up.'

- (23) niʔ cən ʔəltən-əstənámət
 aux lsub eat-cs+l.c.tr+ref
 'I managed to feed myself.' / 'I managed to make myself eat.'

However, the suffix combination *-stənámət* is most frequently glossed 'pretend'. So one interpretation of (23) is 'I pretended to eat', i.e. 'I just shoved the food around on my plate.' Other examples include:

- (24) ʔiməš-stənámət 'manage to make self walk' / 'pretend to walk'
 ʔitət-stənámət 'pretend to sleep'
 səwq̄-stənámət 'pretend to look for something'
 xʷiyəné:m̄-stənámət 'pretend to listen'
 ʔakʷ-stənámət 'manage to get self to go home' / 'pretend to go home'

Previously, I have made claims about Halkomelem causatives (Gerds 1988a, 1995) that can be summarized as follows:

- (25) Restrictions on causatives:

- (a) **Intransitive Base Condition:** Causatives are only formed on intransitive bases.
- (b) **Causative Passive Ban:** Causatives cannot be formed on passive bases.
- (c) **Double Causative Ban:** Double causatives do not exist.

The purpose of the restrictions in (25) was to allow for the grammatical examples of causatives in Halkomelem while ruling out some bad combinations of causatives with certain other morphology. The Intransitive Base Condition was designed to allow causatives formed on intransitive bases (20), while ruling out those formed on transitives (26).¹¹

- (26) *ni? cən qʷəl-ət-stəxʷ ɬə sléni? (?ə) kʷθə səplíl
 aux lsub bake-tr-cs+tr+3obj det woman obl det bread
 'I had the woman bake the bread.'

The Causative Passive Ban captures the generalization that derived intransitives such as antipassives (27) and reflexives (28) can serve as bases for causatives, while passives (29) cannot.

- (27) ni? cən qʷəl-əm-stəxʷ θə sléni? ?ə tʰə səplíl
 aux lsub bake-intr-cs+3obj det woman obl det bread
 'I made the woman bake the bread.'

- (28) ni? cən kʷələš-θət-stəxʷ ɬə Mary
 aux lsub shoot-tr+ref-cs+3obj det M.
 'I made Mary shoot herself.'

- (29) *ni? cən qʷəl-ət-əm-stəxʷ tʰə səplíl ?ə θə sléni?
 aux lsub bake-tr-intr-cs+tr+3obj det bread obl det woman
 'I made the bread be baked by the woman.'

The Double Causative Ban prohibits double causatives, that is, forms that would contain two causative markers, such as:

- (30) *ni? cən nəʔém-st(əxʷ)-stəxʷ ɬə Mary (?ə) kʷθə púkʷ-s
 aux lsub go-cs+tr-cs+(3obj)+tr+3obj det M. obl det book-3pos
 'I had Mary take her book.'

Causatives like (30) are also ruled out by the Intransitive Base Condition since the causative base on which the second causative is formed is transitive.

Returning now to reflexive causatives, we see that it can be used on a wider range of bases than the plain causative, as has been pointed out by Leslie (1979:38-40). In violation of the Intransitive Base Condition, a transitive can serve as the base:

(31) pas-ət-stənámət (Leslie 1979, 39: 110a)
hit-tr-cs+l.c.tr+ref
'pretend to hit him'

(32) ni? cən kʷən-ət-stənámət
aux lsub take-tr-cs+l.c.tr+ref
'I pretended to take it.'

(33) mi? č pe? temə-θamš-stənámət
aux 2sub certain call-tr+lobj-cs+l.c.tr+ref
'Come just pretend that you are telephoning me.'

Leslie also points out that a passive can serve as a base:

(34) ʔiqʷ-əs-θeləm-stənámət (Leslie 1979, 38:106)
punch-face-tr+lobj-intr-cs+l.c.tr+ref
'He pretended to hit me in the face.'

(35) ni? kʷən-ət-əm-stənámət ʔə-ʃ John
aux take-tr-intr-cs+l.c.tr+ref obl-det John
'John pretended to take it.'

(36) ni? ʔə čəwə-θa:m-stənámət ʔə-ʃ John
aux quest help-tr+2obj-cs+l.c.tr+ref obl-det John
'Did John just pretend to help you?'

These data violate the Causative Passive Ban. They also show that the causative + reflexive is different from the non-reflexive causative, since the latter does not allow passive bases.

Furthermore, one can find examples where a causative suffix appears inside *-stənámət*:

(37) ni? cən ʔəltən-stəxʷ-əstənámət tə sqʷəméy.
aux lsub eat-cs-cs+l.c.tr+ref det dog
'I pretended to feed the dog.'

So we see that data with *-stənamət* also violate the Double Causative Ban.

The above data are problematical for the conditions on causatives since in each case a reflexive form of a causative is allowed where the plain causative is ungrammatical. In Gerdtz (1995), I proposed abandoning the conditions on causatives in favor of a valence counting view of causatives that would allow the subsequent cancellation of an argument via a reflexive rule to “save” an otherwise prohibited reflexive. However, the view of a grammaticized suffix allows for a more elegant account. The restrictions on causatives hold, but only on core cases. In the relevant cases, those that mean ‘pretend’, I propose that *-stənamət* has grammaticized into a single suffix that has does have any effect on argument structure. Rather the semantic role associated with ‘pretend’, i.e. the ‘pretender’, is linked to the main clause agent role of the base. We see that agent, not subject, is relevant to the rule because of the meanings of the examples involving passive in (34-36). Furthermore, the examples with *-stənamət* following a causative in (37) show that the main clause agent (the causer), not the agent associated with the verb base (the causee), is the ‘pretender’.¹²

5. Conclusion

We have seen that the Halkomelem reflexive suffixes are composed of two elements, a transitive suffix and a referential suffix. We see the function of each of these elements when we study their use in core constructions, that is, in cases where they appear in reflexive constructions with a transparent meaning of ‘self’. The transitive suffix indicates that the predicate has (at least) two semantic arguments. Furthermore, transitive suffixes in Halkomelem indicate the degree of control of the agent over the action. The general transitive suffix *-t* indicates transitivity with the implication of control by an animate agent, while the suffix *-n* signals lack of control, that is, that the action was done unintentionally, accidentally, or with great difficulty. Furthermore the suffix *-st* indicates causative. The referential suffixes provide the meaning of ‘reflexive’. Also, the reflexive suffixes reduce the transitivity of the clause. The morphosyntactic evidence shows that reflexive constructions are syntactically intransitive.

Given that the first element of each reflexive suffix is a transitive marker, we might expect that reflexive suffixes would never appear on forms that do not have transitive counterparts. However, we find examples of this type for both suffixes. The two elements of a reflexive suffix, I claim, undergo reanalysis into a unit which takes on a grammaticized meaning. The reflexive *-θət* means ‘inchoative’, the limited control reflexive *-namət* means ‘manage to’, and the limited control reflexive causative *-stənamət* means ‘pretend’.

The chart in (38) summarizes the differences between the core (A) and the grammaticized (B) uses of the reflexive suffixes with respect to meanings and verb classes..

(38) Form/Meaning	Base Verb Class
Reflexive <i>-θət</i>	
A: action on self	process unaccusatives
B: inchoative	states
Limited control reflexive <i>-namət</i>	
A: accidental action on self	process unaccusatives
B: 'manage to'	unergatives
Reflexive Causative <i>-stənamət</i>	
A: manage to make self do action	unergatives
B: 'pretend'	any

In their core use, the reflexive suffixes productively appear on verb forms that can take transitive suffixes, namely the process unaccusatives, and always straightforwardly mean 'self'. The grammaticized suffixes appear only sporadically, on verb forms where the *-t* transitive suffix is impossible, such as unergatives and statives, and they have meanings that are more aspectual than referential.

(2) **Properties of Core use of a suffix:**

- i. usually effects argument structure (transitivizing or intransitivizing)
- ii. internal morphology compositional
- iii. corresponding intermediate forms are always available
- iv. restrictions on the base apply to restrictions on the complex form
- v. general: it applies to all available bases

(3) **Grammaticized or Extended use of a suffix.**

- i. aspectoidal rather than argument structure effect (has no effect on transitivity)
- ii. pieces restructured into a single suffix with no internal bracketing
- iii. corresponding intermediate forms are often illegal
- iv. restrictions on the base do not apply to the complex form
- v. sometimes limited: it applies to only some available bases

What this paper has shown is that a crucial aspect of the study of reflexives is the documentation of what verb bases or other suffixes the reflexive can combine with, under what

meanings. This is an aspect of the topic that has been largely overlooked since much of the literature on reflexives addresses languages that use independent pronouns or clitics for these functions. Hence, the research has focussed on conditions on antecedents stated in terms of binding domains, word order, and grammatical relation hierarchies. Halkomelem reflexives, which allow only clausemate subject antecedents, are of little interest in that respect. However, we have seen that the notion of verb class, especially the difference between unergatives, process unaccusatives, and statives, is relevant to the analysis of Halkomelem reflexives.

Notes

¹I am deeply indebted to all the speakers of the Island dialect of Halkomelem (Hə́lqəmíṅəh) who have supplied data and judgments. The majority of the data here come from the late Wilfred Aleck, the late Arnold Guerin, Margaret James, Dora Sampson, Steve Sampson, Sr., Bill Seward, and Theresa Thorne. I hope to have reported their opinions accurately. My research on Halkomelem has been supported by grants from the Jacobs Research Fund, the Phillips Fund, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the President's Research Fund, Simon Fraser University. Many thanks to Charles Ulrich for editorial assistance. Thanks to the participants of WAIL for their comments and questions.

²The presented paper also discussed reciprocals, but I excluded them here due to space limitations.

³I do not mark primary stress when it falls on the first syllable, the most common location of stress in Halkomelem. Otherwise it is indicated by an acute accent.

⁴The following abbreviations are used in glossing the Halkomelem examples: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, aux = auxiliary, ben = benefactive, comp = complementizer, con = connective, cont = continuative, cs = causative, det = determiner, erg = ergative, fut = future, int = interrogative, intr = intransitive, l. c. = limited control, obj = object, obl = oblique, pl = plural, sg = singular, sub = subject, ssub = subordinate subject, rec = reciprocal, ref = reflexive, tr = transitive.

⁵Gerdts (1989) gives a Relational Grammar analysis of Halkomelem reflexives involving multiattachment and cancellation.

⁶Gerdts (to appear) discusses this in detail.

⁷The causative suffix *-st* probably consists of a causative suffix *-s* and the transitive suffix *-t*.

⁸The reflexives suffix can also appear on nouns and in this case takes on the meaning of 'acting like', as in *ʔiʔʔqəlθət* 'acting childish', *xʔalməxʔθət* 'acting like a First Nations person', *spəpéʔəθθət* 'acting like a bear.' Van Eijk (1988) discusses this use of the equivalent form in Lillooet, an Interior Salish language.

⁹There are two verbs 'eat' in Halkomelem: intransitive *ʔələn* and transitive *təyʔ-t*.

¹⁰Compare the Lillooet data in van Eijk (1988). See (57) below.

¹¹Gerdts (1988a, 1991) details further restrictions on causatives. Not all intransitives form causatives.

¹²Halkomelem desideratives and motion auxiliaries also show semantic linking of this type (Gerdts 1988b).

References

- Gerds, Donna B. 1988a. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1988b. Semantic Linking and Relational Structure in Desideratives, *Linguistics* 26, 843–872.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1989. Relational Parameters of Reflexives: the Halkomelem Evidence. In D. Gerds and K. Michelson (eds), *Theoretical Perspectives on Native American Languages*, 259–280. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1991. Unaccusative Mismatches in Halkomelem Salish, *International Journal of American Linguistics* 57:2, 230–250.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1995. Halkomelem Causatives Revisited, *Papers for the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, University of Victoria.
- Gerds, Donna B. to appear. Combinatory Restrictions on Halkomelem Reflexives and Reciprocals, in Zygmunt Frajzyngier, ed. *Reciprocals: Forms and Functions*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Gerds, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari. 1998. Inside and Outside the Middle. *Papers for the 33rd International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*, 166–220.
- Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. Transitivity in Halkomelem. *Working Papers for the 11th International Conference on Salishan Languages*, Seattle, Washington.
- Hukari, Thomas E., editor, and Ruby Peter, associate editor. 1995. *Hul'qumi'n'um' Dictionary*. Cowichan Tribes, Duncan, British Columbia.
- Leslie, Adrian R. 1979. *A Grammar of the Cowichan Dialect of Halkomelem Salish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Victoria.
- van Eijk, Jan P. 1988. Lillooet Forms for 'Pretending' and 'Acting Like'. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54, 106–110.

The Double Life of Halkomelem Reflexive Suffixes

Donna B. Gerdts
Simon Fraser University

1. Introduction¹

This paper discusses reflexives in Halkomelem, a Salishan language spoken in southwestern British Columbia. Halkomelem has two reflexive suffixes: *-θət* 'reflexive' (1), and *-namət* 'limited control reflexive' (2).²

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (1) | <i>qayθət</i> | 'kill self' |
| | <i>čəy'x'θət</i> | 'dry self' |
| | <i>lax'əθət</i> | 'cover self' |
| | <i>laləmθət</i> | 'look after self' |
| | <i>xiqəθət</i> | 'scratch self' |
| (2) | <i>qaynámət³</i> | 'kill self accidentally' |
| | <i>q'əq'námət</i> | 'hit self accidentally' |
| | <i>qanámət</i> | 'manage to get self in with them' |
| | <i>yəx'námət</i> | 'manage to set self free' |
| | <i>ʔək'námət</i> | 'hook self accidentally' |

The above examples illustrate what I refer to as **core reflexives**, which are discussed in section 2. They are used in constructions in which the patient (or other suitable argument) is semantically coreferent to the subject of the clause. In such cases, the reflexive transparently means 'self'.

In section 3, I discuss examples with reflexive suffixes appearing in environments where transitive objects cannot. In these cases, the meaning deviates from the standard 'self' meaning of core reflexives. In this use, which I referred to as **grammaticized reflexives**, the suffixes do not affect argument structure, but rather have an aspect-like meaning. The reflexive is used as an inchoative (4a) and the limited control reflexive means 'manage to' (4b).

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------|----------------|
| (4) | a. | <i>ʔayəmθət</i> | 'get slow' |
| | b. | <i>ne'námət</i> | 'manage to go' |

I show that core and grammaticized forms are distributionally distinct. Core reflexives and reciprocals appear only on process unaccusatives, while grammaticized reflexives appear on