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1. Introduction

This paper discusses reflexives and reciprocals in Halkomelem, a Salishan language spoken in southwestern British Columbia, Canada. Halkomelem has three reflexive and reciprocal suffixes: -bat ‘reflexive’ (1), -namat ‘limited control reflexive’ (2), and -tal ‘reciprocal’ (3).¹

(1) ḍaɣbat  ‘kill self’
  ḍaɣbat ‘dry self’
  ḍaɣbat ‘cover self’
  ḍaɣbat ‘look after self’
  ḍaɣbat ‘scratch self’

(2) ḍaɣdnamat  ‘kill self accidentally’
  ḍaɣdnamat ‘hit self accidentally’
  ḍaɣdnamat ‘manage to get self in with them’
  ḍaɣdnamat ‘manage to set self free’
  ḍaɣdnamat ‘hook self accidentally’

(3) čaʔawatəl  ‘help each other’
  ʔiʔawatəl  ‘separate from each other’
  ʔaʔawatəl  ‘mix with each other’
  ʔaʔawatəl  ‘cut each other’
  ʔaʔawatəl  ‘scratch each other’

The above examples illustrate what I refer to as “core” reflexives and reciprocals. 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 or reciprocal transparently means "self" or "each other".

The first two sections of this paper focus on core reflexives and reciprocals from the viewpoint of semantic, morphological, and syntactic transitivity. In Section 2, I show that each reflexive and reciprocal suffix is composed of a transitive element plus a referential element. It is therefore not surprising that core reflexives and reciprocals occur on the same verb bases that transitive suffixes do, namely process unaccusatives. Nevertheless, Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions, like those in many of the world’s languages, are syntactically intransitive. Thus, the Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal suffixes are both transitivizers and intransitivizers. The transitivizing element allows for two arguments in the predicate’s semantic argument structure. The intransitivizing element decreases the valence to a single argument in the syntactic structure.

Given that the first element of each reflexive or reciprocal suffix is a transitive suffix, we might expect that reflexive and reciprocal counterparts would be available for every transitive construction of the language, as long as the meaning of reflexive or reciprocal would make sense for the action. Furthermore, we might expect that reflexive and reciprocal suffixes could only be used when a transitive counterpart was possible. We find that the Halkomelem data, in fact, counter-exemplify both of these expectations.

Section 3 discusses counterexamples of the first type. For simple transitive actions involving an agent and a patient, it is indeed the case that counterparts with the three reflexive and reciprocal suffixes are possible. However, transitive clauses of other sorts are possible in Halkomelem, including applicative constructions and external possessor constructions containing a lexical suffix, the Nahuatl equivalent of noun incorporation. In these constructions we find that reflexives differ from reciprocals and limited control reflexives, since the latter can appear following applicatives and lexical suffixes, but the former cannot. I account for these facts with a constraint that restricts reflexives to themes.

In Section 4, I discuss examples with reflexives or reciprocal suffixes that systematically violate the generalizations made concerning core reflexives and reciprocals in Section 2. I show examples of reflexives and reciprocals appearing in environments in which the transitive suffixes cannot. However, in each case the meaning deviates from the standard ‘self’ or ‘each other’ meaning of core reflexives. In this use, which I refer to as grammatized reflexives and reciprocals, the suffixes do not affect argument structure, but rather have an aspect-like meaning. The reflexive is used as an inchoative (4a), the limited control reflexive means ‘manage to’ (4b), and the reciprocal is a collective (4c).

(4) a. *uyanmëst "get slow"
b. *nenëmätst "manage to go"
c. *talëntat "eat together"

I show that core and grammatized forms are distributionally distinct. Core reflexives and reciprocals appear only on process unaccusatives, while grammatized reflexives and reciprocals appear on other verb classes, including unergative verbs and states.

I conclude that a detailed discussion of Halkomelem reflexives and reciprocals needs to illustrate the different uses and meanings of the suffixes, taking the verb class of the base into consideration. I also make generalizations about which suffixes can occur before and after the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes. Combinatorial restrictions on affixation are an important feature of the grammar of a polysynthetic language such as Halkomelem.

2. Core reflexives and reciprocals

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

(5) nil? can 1xst-ñat. ‘I covered myself.

nil? če 1xst-ñat. ‘You (sg.) covered yourself.’

nil? ct 1xst-ñat. ‘We covered ourselves.’

nil? cę:p 1xst-ñat. ‘You (pl.) covered yourselves.’

nil? 1xst-ñat. ‘He/she/it they covered self.’

(6) nil? can k’saš-ñamät. ‘I accidentally shot myself.

nil? če k’saš-ñamät. ‘You (sg.) accidentally shot yourself.’

nil? ct k’saš-ñamät. ‘We accidentally shot ourselves.’

nil? cę:p k’saš-ñamät. ‘You (pl.) accidentally shot yourselves.’

nil? k’saš-ñamät. ‘He/she/it they accidentally shot self.’

(7) nil? ct čawa-tal. ‘We helped each other.’

nil? cę:p čawa-tal. ‘You (pl.) helped each other.’

nil? čawa-tal. ‘They helped each other.’

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, as discussed in Section 2.1. Like the object suffixes, they consist of a combination of two elements: a transitive suffix and a referential suffix. Nevertheless,
Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions are syntactically intransitive, as discussed in Section 2.2. I summarize the morphosyntactic structure of reflexive and reciprocal constructions in Section 2.3.

2.1. Transitivity and reflexives and reciprocals

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 (Hukari 1976; Leslie 1979). Causatives are discussed in Section 2.2. The first two suffixes are illustrated in (8) and (9):

(8) a. nîn čwâg’-st-ns to slèni? to k’b’ság’aml. aux club-tr:3erq det woman obl det paddle ‘He clubbed the woman with the paddle (on purpose).’
   b. nîn čwâg’-nsnts to slèni? to k’b’ság’aml. aux club-l:ct:tr:3obj-3erq det woman obl det paddle ‘He accidentally clubbed the woman with the paddle.’

(9) a. nîn čwâg’-st-ns to slèni? aux insub see-tr det woman ‘I looked at the woman.’
   b. nîn čwâg’-nsnts to slèni? aux insub see-l:ct: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), for example, čwâl ‘to bake’ (as in ‘the bread bakes’) and k’es ‘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 and reciprocals whenever the semantics is plausible. The examples in (10)–(15) are illustrative of the Halkomelem verbal paradigm.

(10) k’es ‘burn’; k’esnt ‘burn it’; k’esnsnt ‘burn it accidentally’; k’esst ‘burn self’; k’esntst ‘burn self accidentally’; k’esntst ‘burn each other’

(11) hâl ‘be alive’; hâlnt ‘bring it to life’; hâlnx ‘manage to save its life’; hâlnxst ‘save self’; hâlnxnt ‘manage to save self’; hâlnxst ‘save each other’

(12) mâj ‘get full of food’; mâjst ‘fill him/her up’; mâjnsx ‘swallow it accidentally’; mâjst ‘fill self up’; mâjnt ‘manage to fill self up’; mâjstst ‘fill each other up’

(13) čwâg’ ‘change’; čwâgst ‘change it’; čwâg’nsx ‘get it changed’; čwâg’ntst ‘change places with someone’; čwâg’ntntst ‘manage to change places with someone’; čwâg’ntst ‘change with each other’

(14) čwâg’ ‘get clubbed’; čwâgst ‘club it’; čwâg’nts ‘club it accidentally’; čwâg’ntntst ‘club self’; čwâg’ntt ‘club self accidentally’; čwâgstst ‘club each other’

(15) čwâg’st ‘get hooked, snagged, hung up’; čwâg’st ‘hook it’; čwâg’nts ‘manage to hook it’; čwâg’ntntst ‘hook self’; čwâg’ntntntst ‘hook self accidentally’; čwâg’stntst ‘get hung up with each other’

The two reflexive forms are distinguished on the basis of control: -ntst is the general reflexive and -ntntst is the limited control reflexive. Unlike the reflexive, the reciprocal -ntntst does not have a limited control counterpart.

Throughout this paper I refer to these suffixes as -ntst, -ntntst, and -ntmt, 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. The first part is a transitive suffix, -t or -n, and the second part is a reflexive or reciprocal pronoun form. In fact, Gerds (1988a) gives the following template for Halkomelem verb morphology:

(16) -t 0 +1 +2 +3 +4

prefixes root applicative transitivity aspect object suffixes; subject suffixes reflexive object suffixes; suffixes reciprocal suffix

The suffixes -ntst, -ntntst, and -ntmt are actually portmanteau forms consisting of combinations of -t and -ntntst morphemes. In this regard, the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes are identical to the pronoun object suffixes, which are also portmanteau forms. See, for instance, the examples in (17) with first person objective suffixes.

(17) a. nîn čwâg’-st-sts-ns to slèni? aux club-tr:3obj-3erq det woman ‘The woman clubbed me (on purpose).’
   b. nîn čwâg’-ntntst-ns to slèni? aux club-l:ct:tr:3obj-3erq det woman ‘The woman accidentally clubbed me.’

Comparative evidence (cf. Newman 1979) allows us to reconstruct the underlying form of the objects as given in the first column in (18). The combination of the general transitive suffix -t and the object suffixes results in the forms in the T-objects column, and the combination of the limited control transitive
suffix -n and the object suffixes results in the forms in the N-objects column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
<th>T-objects</th>
<th>N-objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-natičč</td>
<td>-θatnatičč</td>
<td>-natičč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
<td>-θatnamičč</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG/pl</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
<td>-θatnamičč</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-natičč</td>
<td>-θatnamičč</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
<td>-θatnamičč</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>-natičč</td>
<td>-θatnamičč</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-natičč</td>
<td>-θatnamičč</td>
<td>-namičč</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that the reflexive forms pattern with the first and second person singular forms. In T-objects, the sequence of θ + s/t is realized as θ. This is a morphophonemic process occurring only in the context of the pronoun paradigm. Elsewhere, is sequences are permitted, for example, in hisiur-s ‘his/her costume’ and lešteur·s ‘his/her bed’, where the third person genitive suffix s follows a noun ending in t.

The forms -θat and -tal appear with the vowel a when they are stressed, as in gəqθat ‘get to be lots’, bəθat ‘sobbed each other up’, and xəthat ‘hurt each other’. When unstressed, the vowel reduces to schw. Furthermore, the vowel of the reflexive and reciprocal triggers vowel harmony, changing an e in the stem to a.

|        | | | |
|--------| | | |
| -θatičč | 'be out of sight' | | |
| xətθatičč | 'decrease' | | |
| reθətθat | 'wipe it' | | |
| reθətθat | 'wipe it' | | |
| čeθətθat | 'help him/her' | | |
| leθətθat | 'look at him/her' | | |

In sum, the morphophonological evidence suggests that the reflexive form -θat is underlyingly θ + s/t and the reciprocal form -tal is underlyingly t + al.

Determining the underlying form for the limited control suffix -namat is less straightforward. As seen in (18), in N-objects the sequence of n + s is realized simply as n. The deletion of s after n is a morphophonemic process, since s sequences are otherwise allowed, as in meθ · s ‘his/her father’. So the form at rather than u at is expected for limited control. The au is still unaccounted for. We notice, however, that the third person form next is also problematic, since only n is expected, based on other persons. So it is clear that there are allomorphs of the limited control transitive suffix that consist of more than n. If the underlying form of the limited control of the reflexive is something like hən + s/t, vowel harmony, reduction of the unstressed vowel to a, and deletion of the s in the context of limited control would yield namat. Perhaps a study of the comparative-historical evidence on the limited control reflexive in Salishan languages will yield a more satisfactory account of the Halkomelem form. In the meantime, we can surmise that the n derives from the limited control transitive marker and the t derives from the reflexive pronoun.

To summarize, I have argued that the forms -θat ‘reflexive’, -namat ‘limited control reflexive’, and -tal ‘reciprocal’ are complex. They consist of a transitive suffix followed by a suffix marking reflexive or reciprocal objects. These suffixes are fused together morphophonemically to function as a postmaneau morph (as indicated by the use of : in glosses) paralleling other forms in the object paradigm.

2.2. Final intransitivity

As in many languages of the world, the Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions are syntactically intransitive. This section presents several arguments for this claim. First, the agent exhibits absorptive (as opposed to ergative) agreement, indicating that it is the subject of an intransitive rather than a transitive clause. Compare the intransitive clause in (20) with the transitive clauses in (21) and (22).

(20) mɨt ʔiməx kʷə swəjəgə.

AUX walk DET man

'The man walked.'

(21) mɨt kʷoʃə-t-as kʷə swəjəgə kʷə speθə.

AUX shoot-TR-erg DET man DET bear

'The man shot the bear.'

(22) mɨt kʷoʃə-tθatθatθə-sx kʷə swəjəgə.

AUX shoot-TR-erg DET man

'The man shot me.'

Third person ergatives, that is, subjects of transitives, determine ergative agreement, as in the transitive clauses in (21) and (22). Third person absolutes, that is, subjects of intransitive clauses, do not, as (20) shows. We see that reflexive and reciprocal constructions with third person subjects do not allow ergative agreement:

(23) mɨt kʷoʃə-tθatθatθə-sx kʷə swəjəgə.

AUX shoot-TR-erg DET man

'The man shot himself.'

(24) mɨt kʷoʃə-naməθatθatθə-sx kʷə swəjəgə.

AUX shoot-L.C.TR-erg DET man

'The man accidentally shot himself.'
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(25) ʔii ʔaʔ q’a-xad(k*–xs) to sq’ awaq’ amey.
   AUX smell:CONT-TR:REC-3ERG DET dogs
   'The dogs are smelling one another.'

This follows from an analysis positing syntactic intransitivity for Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions.

Also, as discussed in Gerds (1988a), many speakers of Halkomelem have a ban against clauses where the final ergative is a proper noun, so (26) is ungrammatical.6

(26)*niʔ ʔaʔ q’alʔ-ta-x k’ʔa John k’ʔa spezʔa.
   AUX shoot:TR-3ERG DET John DET bear
   'John shot the bear.'

But speakers with this constraint have no difficulty in producing reflexive and reciprocal constructions with proper noun subjects:

(27) ʔiʔ ʔaʔ q’alʔ-yaʔ k’ʔa John.
   AUX shoot:TR:REF DET John
   'John shot himself.'

(28) ʔiʔ ʔaʔ q’alʔ-namʔ, k’ʔa John.
   AUX shoot:L.C.TR:REF DET John
   'John accidentally shot himself.'

(29) ʔiʔ ʔaʔ q’alʔ-taʔ k’ʔa John ʔiʔ Bob.
   AUX help:REC DET John and Bob
   'John and Bob helped each other.'

This provides evidence that the subject must be absolutive, not ergative, which follows from the intransitivity of the clause.

Furthermore, forms derived from reflexive and reciprocal suffixes can serve as bases for further derivational morphology, such as the causative suffix -st. Gerds (1988b) has shown that Halkomelem causatives can be formed on intransitive bases (30), but not on transitive bases (31):1

(30) ʔiʔ can q’ah’taʔ-sst’ ʔaʔ swiʔaʔ.
    AUX ISUB walk:CS:TR:3OBJ DET boy
    'I made the boy walk.'

(31)*niʔ can q’alʔ-taʔ-sst’ ʔaʔ stenʔ, (ʔaʔ) k’ʔa xap’iʔ.
    AUX ISUB bake:TR-CE:TR:3OBJ DET woman OBL DET bread
    'I had the woman bake the bread.'

Halkomelem reflexives (32) and reciprocals (33) parallel intransitives in this respect, since they can serve as bases for causatives:

(32) ʔiʔ can k’ʔalʔ-ʔot-sst’ ʔaʔ Mary.
    AUX ISUB shoot:TR:REF-CS:3OBJ DET MARY
    'I made Mary shoot herself.'

(33) ʔiʔ can haʔ q’a-taʔ-sst’ ʔaʔ sq’amq’ amey.
    AUX ISUB smel:CONT-TR:REC-3ERG DET dogs
    'I am making the dogs smell one another.'

The speakers I have worked with have rejected causatives formed on limited control reflexives. The Halkomelem causative carries with it the meaning that the causee is instructing the causee to do something, and it would be illogical to ask someone to do something accidentally. However, causatives formed on reflexives and reciprocals are quite common. I give additional examples in (34) and (35).

(34) liʔatq’at ‘cut self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘make him/her cut self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘make him/her cut self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘bind self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘bind self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘dry self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘dry self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘scratch self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘scratch self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘smell self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘smell self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘bite self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘bite self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘wipe self’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘wipe self’

(35) caʔatst’at ‘help each other’
    caʔatst’atst’at ‘make them help e.o.’
    caʔatst’atst’at ‘make them help e.o.’
    caʔatst’atst’at ‘thank e.o.’
    caʔatst’atst’at ‘thank e.o.’
    Peʔatst’at ‘shine light on e.o.’
    Peʔatst’at ‘shine light on e.o.’
    Peʔatst’at ‘shine light on e.o.’
    Peʔatst’at ‘shine light on e.o.’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘scratch e.o.’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘scratch e.o.’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘scratch e.o.’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘scratch e.o.’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘smell each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘smell each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘smell each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘smell each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘cut each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘cut each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘cut each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘cut each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘separate from each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘separate from each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘separate from each other’
    liʔatq’atst’at ‘separate from each other’

We see then that the data from causatives, agreement, and proper noun subjects show that Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions behave syntactically as intransitive.

2.3. The structure of Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions

The evidence from the preceding two sections has shown that the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes are complex forms. The first element is a transitive marker, sig-
nalling general transitivity or limited control. The second element is a referential suffix appearing in the position of an object pronominal suffix. Unlike object suffixes, the referential suffixes cancel argument structure, and thus Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal constructions are syntactically intransitive. The Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal suffixes parallel morphological reflexives and reciprocals found in many languages. For example, the French reflexive clitic se and the Italian reflexive clitic si pattern like object pronoun clitics except for the fact that reflexive constructions are syntactically intransitive.

The two elements of the Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal suffixes might seem contradictory; these suffixes are both transitiveizers and intransitiveizers. However, the transitiveizing element allows for two arguments in the predicate’s semantic argument structure. This assures that the NP argument of the reflexive and reciprocal construction is both the agent and the theme of the transitive action. The intransitiveizing element decreases the valence to a single argument in the syntactic structure.

In this respect, reflexive and reciprocal constructions are like passive constructions. The Halkomelem passive (Gerds 1989a) similarly shows stacked morphology: a transitive suffix -i is followed by an intransitiveizing suffix -am, as seen by comparing the active clause in (36a) with the corresponding passive in (36b).

(36) a. *niʔ k'alaš-t-as ʔašawiyeʔ k'θa speʔədə.  
   AUX shoot-TR-3ERG DET man DET bear  
   ‘The man shot the bear.’

b. *niʔ k'alaš-əm speʔə də ʔašawiyeʔ.  
   AUX shoot-TR-INTR DET man DET bear  
   ‘The bear was shot by the man.’

Thus, the first suffix correlates with the semantic transitivity of the argument structure, while the second suffix correlates with the syntactic intransitivity of the construction.

We see then that passives, reflexives, and reciprocals pattern similarly in that they contain both a transitiveizing and an intransitiveizing suffix. However, they differ from other constructions that are semantically transitive and syntactically intransitive, for example, antipassives and lexical suffix constructions (see Section 3.2), which do not have transitive suffixes. As pointed out in Gerds (1989b, 1993) the generalization that distinguishes these two types of construction is that in passives, reflexives, and reciprocals either the patient or an NP coreferent to the patient is an argument of the VP in the surface syntax. The patient in antipassives and lexical suffix constructions, however, is not an argument in the surface syntax.

3. Complex transitives

The three reflexive and reciprocal constructions in Halkomelem share many properties. Nevertheless, they also differ from each other. For example, we have seen above that limited control reflexives, unlike the other two reflexive and reciprocal constructions, cannot serve as bases for causatives. In this section I point out a difference between the reflexive on the one hand and the reciprocal and limited control reflexive on the other. Drawing on data involving goal and benefactive applicatives (Section 3.1) and lexical suffixes (Section 3.2), I show that reflexives are limited to constructions where the coreferenced object is the theme, that is, the nominal playing the role of patient in a semantically transitive event. Reciprocals and limited control reflexives are possible even when the coreferenced object is not the patient.

3.1. Applicatives

As discussed in Gerds (1988b), Halkomelem goals and benefactives are expressed in applicative constructions formed by the addition of a verbal suffix, which appears before the transitive suffix. The goal (37) or benefactive (38) is the object, and hence is cross-referenced by the object agreement suffix, while the theme is an oblique nominal introduced by the all-purpose preposition ʔa.

(37) niʔ ʔa:-mort-θaməʔik as ʔa k'θa puk'ik.  
   AUX give-GOAL-TR:OBJ-3ERG OBL DET book  
   ‘He gave me the book.’

(38) niʔ ʔa:-mort-θaməʔik ʔa k'θa ʔa:ʔəli:n.  
   AUX bake-GEN-TR:OBJ-3ERG OBL DET salmon  
   ‘He baked the salmon for me.’

The suffix -as, which appears as -as when it is unstressed, marks the goal applicative, while the suffix -e marks the benefactive applicative. Additional examples of these suffixes are given in (39) and (40):

(39) ʔələm ʔa:mort ʔa k'θa ʔa:mort ʔa k'θa kə:lt.  
   ‘give’  ‘give it to him/her’  ‘sell’  ‘sell it to him/her’

(40) ʔələm ʔa:kə:lt ʔa k'θa ʔa:kə:lt ʔa k'θa ʔa kə:lt.  
   ‘instruct’  ‘show it to him/her’  ‘tell him/her about it’

kə:lt  ‘spill’  ‘throw liquid on him/her’
(40) qelot ‘bake it’ 
θeyt ‘fix it’
\(\text{καλωτ}\) ‘take it’
\(\text{πελακτ}\) ‘sew it’

As the data in (41) and (42) show, the reflexive suffix -\(\text{θατ}\) cannot follow an applicative suffix.

(41)*nil\(\text{can qel-ak-θατ}.\)
\[\text{aux isub bake-ben-refl}\]
\[\text{‘I cooked it for myself.’}\]

(42) *\(\text{ηραμαςθατ}\) ‘give it to self’
*\(\text{τρωςθατ}\) ‘show it to self’
*\(\text{πωσαθατ}\) ‘tell self about it’
*\(\text{θπελακτ}\) ‘fix it for self’

Thus, we see the reflexive cannot refer to a goal or benefactive. The generalization is expressed in (43).

(43) The reflexive -\(\text{θατ}\) can only refer to a theme nominal.

However, as pointed out in Gerdt (1989b), it is possible to express the idea of coreference between the agent and goal or benefactive by means of another construction, the object cancellation construction, in which the suffix -\(\text{αμ}\) appears instead of the transitive suffix.

(44) nil\(\text{can qel-ak-am}.\)
\[\text{aux isub bake-ben-intr}\]
\[\text{‘I cooked it for myself.’}\]

(45) nil\(\text{replocam ‘buy it for self’}.\)
\(\text{πελακαμ ‘hang it for self’}\)
\(\text{θπελακαμ ‘fix it for self’}\)
\(\text{θq-al ‘break it for self’}\)
\(\text{θπελακαμ ‘wash it for self’}\)

The suffix -\(\text{αμ}\), sometimes called the middle voice marker in the Salish literature, is a general purpose intransitive suffix that marks a wide variety of constructions, including main clause passives and antipassives. It also regularly appears with verb roots to form a verb stem, as seen in the forms for ‘give’ and ‘sell’ in (39).

Tom Hukari has pointed out to me that, to his knowledge, Halkomelem speakers can only use this construction with first person singular reference. Thus, the examples in (45) mean ‘buy it for me,’ ‘hang it for me,’ etc. This meaning is possible even when the subject is not first person, for example in the following imperative:

(46) neh c \(\text{θιςαγ-αμ}.\)
\(\text{go 2sub buy-ben-intr}\)
\[\text{‘Go buy it for me!’}\]

Thus, the object cancellation construction is not a true reflexive, but rather a logophoric construction, which refers back to the speaker, not the subject.

A second property of object cancellation is also suggestive of logophoricity. As Gerdt (1989b) notes, object cancellation is not clause-bounded. The cancelled object may be coreferential with the main subject if the main clause contains a speech act verb, as in the following example:

(47) \(\text{cse-t can cel to αννωqel-al-acm-as to k\(\text{θα}\)}\)
\(\text{tell-tr isub fut det woman comp bake-ben-intr-3sub obl det sce:lim.}\)
\(\text{salmon}\)
\[\text{‘I’m telling the woman to bake the salmon for me.’}\]

In contrast, reflexive and reciprocal constructions do not show long-distance effects. They are always controlled by a clausal subject:

(48)*\(\text{cse-t can cel to αννωqel-al-θατ-as to}
\[\text{tell-tr isub fut det woman comp bake-ben-tr-refl-3sub obl k\(\text{θα}\) sce:lim.}\]
\[\text{DET salmon}\]
\[\text{‘I’m telling the woman to bake the salmon for me.’}\]

(49)*\(\text{cse-t et cel to αννωqel-al-tal-as to}
\[\text{tell-tr 1plsub fut det woman comp bake-ben-tr-rec-3sub obl k\(\text{θα}\) sce:lim.}\]
\[\text{DET salmon}\]
\[\text{‘We’re telling the woman to bake the salmon for each other.’}\]

This array of facts shows that the object cancellation construction does not pattern with the reflexive and reciprocal constructions. That this construction occurs in the context of speech act verbs and that it may be limited to referring to the speaker in main clause contexts suggests that it is a logophoric construction rather than a true reflexive.

The above discussion shows that the reflexive cannot appear in an applicative construction (see *(41) and *(42)). Limited control reflexives and reciprocals differ from reflexives in this respect, since they can appear in applicative constructions:
(50) ni? can qd-al-alc-namat.
AUX I SUB cook-BEN-L-C.REF
‘I managed to cook for myself.’

(51) ni? ci ḥwi-al-alc-tal.
AUX I PL cook-BEN-TR.REF
‘We cooked for each other.’

Combinations of applicative and limited control reflexive are not common and are quite difficult to elicit. Speakers most commonly use a periphrastic expression to express this idea. However, the example in (52) arose in a conversational context.

(52) ni? lōr ḥilaq-al-alc-namat?
AUX INT Z SUB buy-BEN-L-C.REF
‘Did you manage to buy it for yourself?’

Combinations of applicative and reciprocal are more common. Several additional examples are given in (53).

(53) ƙo:ma:stal ‘give it to each other’
ƙiwa:stal ‘show it to each other’
ƙa:ka:stal ‘ask each other for it’
ƙe:pi:ka:stal ‘sew it for each other’
ƙilaq:ka:stal ‘buy it for each other’

We see then that reciprocals and limited control reflexives differ from plain reflexives in that the former can combine with applicatives, while the latter cannot. To express the meaning of a goal or benefactive reflexive, speakers use the object-ellipsis construction, which is probably better treated as a logophoric construction than a true reflexive.

3.2. Lexical suffixes

Salishan languages, and other indigenous languages of the Pacific Northwest, are well-known for their lexical suffixes. These are substantival suffixes that bear little or no resemblance to free-standing nominals with the same or similar meaning. Some lexical suffixes and the corresponding free nouns in Halkomelem are given in (54):

(54) -as ‘face, round object’
    -cas ‘hand, finger’
    -san ‘foot, leg’
    -tek:n ‘arm, wing’
    -wil ‘rib, vessel’
    si:i:bas ‘face’
    cewbas ‘hand’
    xweho ‘foot’
    leto ‘arm, wing’
    lawax ‘rib’

θam ‘mouth, edge’
θalθam ‘mouth’
či:i:tx ‘building, room’
le:sh ‘house’
čyel ‘baby, child’
qeq ‘baby’

The lexical suffix always has a broader, more abstract meaning than the noun. 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, berry), cultural items (canoe, net, house, clothing), and human/relational terms (people, spouse, offspring). Lexical suffixes are robustly used to form compound-like nouns:

(55) ḥi:bu:da-xwel ‘church’ (pray + building)
İą:nu: “make cherry tree” (wild cherry + plant)
pi:st:alwa: ‘pajamas’ (sleep + clothing)
ći:wa:ja:sm ‘woodpecker’ (ochre + neck)
q’le:yi:sm ‘shoe’ (log + foot)
zi:la:cm ‘ring’ (encircle + finger)

Furthermore, lexical suffixes frequently appear as part of the verb complex of a clause.

(56) q’:s-e:ya:n ‘set a net’ (throw out + net)
swa:q-xus ‘search for a lost person’ (seek + body)
tew-da:sm ‘shear wool’ (cut + hair)
q’om:ta:ts ‘pluck a bird’ (pluck + body)
P:č:či: ‘wash diapers’ (wash + flexible material)
P:č:ču:ma: ‘milk a cow’ (wring out + breast)

Lexical suffication parallels incorporation phenomena found in many languages of the world. Lexical suffixes generally refer to the theme of the clause. When the lexical suffix is the nominal object of a transitive verb, the resulting clause is intransitive. For example, the lack of ergative agreement in (57) and the presence of a proper noun subject show that the clause is syntactically intransitive.

(57) ni? yaq’-a:kap to Mary.
AUX burn-wood DET Mary
‘Mary made a fire.’

As is the case with noun incorporation in many languages, heads of possessed themes can appear as lexical suffixes. This gives rise to an external possession construction. That is, the semantic possessor appears as an argument of the verb. Thus, in (58) and (59) the nominal possessor is the syntactic object of the clause.
(58) nît tiō-řq'-t-as \lo stônît k'θta sq'mnêy.
AUX comb-hair TR-3ERP DET woman DET dog
'The woman combed the dog's hair.'

(59) nît ṭə o ʔay-e=thîškô?
AUX INT 20BJ make-flexible material TR-1OB
'Did you make my bed?'

Now let us turn to cases involving the coreference of the notional possessor and the agent of the clause. Clauses with lexical suffixes do not allow reflexives formed with the suffix -θst (60a, 61a); instead they use a middle construction, based on the general intransitive suffix (60b, 61b).11

(60) a. *nît can Pîy=sk-oθst.
AUX 1SUB wash-foot TR:REFL
'I washed my feet.'

b. nît can Pîy=sk-oθm.
AUX 1SUB wash-foot INTR
'I washed my feet.'

(61) a. *nît ʔea-yəθ(m)n-oθst.
AUX scrape-con: mouth TR:REFL
'He shaved.'

b. nît ʔea-yəθm.
AUX scrape-con: mouth INTR
'He shaved.'

Lexical suffixes with non-coreferent (third person) external possessors and coreferent external possessors are illustrated in (62):

(62) ʔeb=sk-3m-t 'wiping his/her feet'
ṣra-yaθl-1 'bathe his/her baby'
laṁś-šxa-1 'braid his/her hair'
sewq=awt-t-1 'looking for a house for him/her'

The external possession construction is extremely common in Halkomelem. I give some additional examples of coreferent external possessors in (63):

(63) sek=šen-3m 'raise one’s foot'
sek=cs-3m 'raise one’s hand'
ṣra-čšx-3m 'wash one’s hands'
tič-dîq'-3m 'get a haircut'
riss-îq'-3m 'comb one’s hair'

Furthermore, as in the case of applicative suffixes, we find that lexical suffixes can be followed by limited control reflexives (64) and reciprocals (65).

(64) x'laš=sw-θt-dnsm 'manage to wash one’s back'

(65) ʔaša-cas-šl 'hold hands'
laṁś-šh-ašl 'braid each other’s hair'
šx'pašq'-as-č-tl 'boxing' (punch + face)
šx'wān'-as-č-tl 'wink eye at each other'
šx'q'-as-č-tl 'meet each other face to face'
šx'mak'-aθa-č-tl 'kiss each other’s mouths'
šx'tîk'-as-č-tl 'paint each other’s faces'

We see then that while reflexives do not follow lexical suffixes, limited control reflexives and reciprocals do. If we assume an analysis of these constructions following Gerds (1981), then the external possessor originates as the possessor of the theme and ascends to the object position.12 Thus, the host of the possessor ascension, not the external possessor, is the theme. It follows that reflexives are banned from this construction by the constraint in (43) above, which states that the reflexive -θst can only refer to a theme nominal. Limited control reflexives and reciprocals, because they are not constrained in the manner of (43), can appear as external possessors.

3.3. Summary

The data discussed above show the following distribution of reflexive and reciprocal constructions in Halkomelem:

(66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Applicatives</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suffixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexives</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited control reflexives</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocals</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that applicatives and lexical suffixes pattern identically is not surprising for two reasons. First, the object in both applicatives and in the lexical suffix plus
external possessor construction is not the semantic theme. Rather it is a semantic oblique or possessor that has advanced or ascended to object. Thus, constraint (43) rules out reflexives in these constructions, though reciprocals and limited controlled reflexives are allowed. Second, Gerds and Hinkson (1996) hypothesize that the applicative markers are actually lexical suffixes. The goal applicative suffix, -as, is the lexical suffix for ‘face’. Fornas for ‘face’ have developed into grammatical markers in other languages, for example, in Mixtec (Brugman to appear) and Zapotec (MacLaury 1989). The benefactive suffix may be the lexical suffix for ‘belly’. The stomach is the metaphorical seat of the emotions in Halkomelem. If the applicative markers are in fact grammaticalized lexical suffixes, then the parallel behavior of applicative and lexical suffix constructions is accounted for by their common history.

We have seen above that transitive clauses form reflexives with the suffix -hö, but applicative clauses use object cancellation (67), and clauses with lexical suffixes use a middle construction (68).

(67) ni’? can ʔal-ƛ-am.
AUX ISUB bake-ben-intr
I cooked it for myself.

(68) ni’? ʔaʔ-ay-bön-am.
AUX scrape-con-mouth-intr
He shaved.

Object cancellation and middle, which are marked with the same general intransitive marker, may, in fact, be the same construction. However, we have seen that object cancellation is a logophoric construction. It may be limited to cases where the antecedent is the speaker in a simple clause or the subject of a speech act verb in a complex sentence. The middle construction is not limited in this way. It allows subjects of any person (cf. (68)), not just first person singular, and, like reflexive and reciprocal constructions, it is clause-bounded as (69) shows.

(69) cse-ci can cel to shem? ʔaʔ ti-ʔeq-am-as.
tell-TR ISUB PUT DET woman comb-hair-intr-3SSUB
I’m telling the woman to comb her hair.
‘I’m telling the woman to comb my hair.’

In (69) the external possessor cancelled by the middle is coreferential with the subject of the embedded clause, not the subject of the speech act verb. Thus, object cancellation and the middle construction may be different constructions, though clearly their shared morphology suggests a common origin.

I have accounted for the difference in behavior between general reflexives on the one hand and reciprocals and limited control reflexives on the other by positing a constraint that states that reflexives can only refer to themes. Why should reflexives be limited to themes while other reflexive and reciprocal constructions are not? I can provide no answer to this question from a Halkomelem perspective but perhaps cross-linguistic research on reflexives and reciprocals may suggest a rationale.

4. Grammaticized reflexives and reciprocals

All of the examples of reflexives, limited control reflexives, and reciprocals discussed so far have transitive counterparts in which the subject and object are distinct. In this section, I discuss examples of reflexive and reciprocal 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, and that the intermediate structure on which the reflexive and reciprocal construction is based is a transitive form. 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.

The reflexive suffix -hö has the grammaticized meaning of ‘inchoative’ (Section 4.1). The limited control reflexive -nənə has the grammaticized meaning of ‘manage to’ (Section 4.2). The reciprocal -təs has the grammaticized meaning of ‘collective’ (Section 4.3).

4.1. The reflexive as inchoative

As discussed above, the majority of verb roots in Halkomelem are process unaccusatives, for example, ʔal- ‘to bake’ (as in ‘the bread bakes’) and K̓es- ‘to burn’ (as in ‘the house burns’), and these always have transitive counterparts, for example, ʔal-at ‘to bake it’, and K̓es-at ‘to burn it’. These verb roots also always form reflexives and reciprocals whenever the semantics is plausible. In addition, we find that the reflexive suffix can sporadically appear on another type of unaccusative verb, namely stative, 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.

(70) ḋəyəm ‘slow’ ḋəyəmət ‘get slow’
bi ‘big’ bītə ‘get big’
ʔi:lam ‘old’ ʔi:laθət ‘get old’
scənət ‘adapt, clever’ scənəθət ‘become clever’
ʔex: ‘stormy’ ʔex:lət ‘get stormy’
ʔax:θ ‘hard’ ʔax:θət ‘get hard’
stəp ‘flppy’ stəpət ‘go flat (a tire)’
(72) a. x’ədədətə ‘get sick’
   x’əkəx’ətə ‘become small’
   x’əx’əx’ətə ‘get heavy’
   x’əR’ək’ətə ‘get strong’
   x’əsətə ‘become important, respected’
   x’əsətə ‘get near’
   x’əx’əx’ətə ‘get loud’

b. x’əx’əx’ətə ‘start running’
   x’əx’əx’ətə ‘start walking’
   x’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’əq’①
Additional evidence for a grammaticized form -namat meaning ‘manage to’ comes from double reflexive examples:

(77) sacleknamat ‘conceal self’ halatnamat ‘manage to conceal self’
     txelatnamat ‘take self out of sight’ txelatnamat ‘manage to take self out of sight’

The data in (77) show examples of the core use of the reflexive followed by -namat. Since the reflexive meaning is conveyed by -dat, it is clear that -namat must serve some other function. The grammaticized use of the reflexive meaning ‘inchoative’ can also be followed by -namat:

(78) dyayydat ‘get happy’ dyayydatnamat ‘manage to cheer up’
     qileknamat ‘get old’ qileknamat ‘manage to grow old’

The data in (78) show that once a state is turned into a process via inchoative, it functions like other process unaccusatives in allowing -namat, but semantically it patterns with unergatives, since the resulting form does not have a referential meaning.

Clearly, more research on the semantics of -namat and the conditions on its use is necessary. However, we can conclude that its function has extended beyond its core use as a limited control reflexive.

4.3. The reciprocal as a collective

As noted above, unaccusative verbs with process semantics have transitive counterparts with the general transitive suffix -t. They also form reciprocals with -tal, provided the action can be performed by plural agents on each other. The vast majority of verb forms that are not process unaccusatives do not allow a corresponding reciprocal. However, the suffix -tal does appear on a few verbs that are not process unaccusatives, but in these cases the meaning is not ‘each other’ but rather ‘together’. The following examples show unergative verbs (79a), unergative verbs with body part lexical suffixes (79b), and a stative verb (79c) that allow -tal with a collective meaning.

(79) a. palahtantal ‘eat together’
     yalatantal ‘work together’
     lamatal ‘walk together’
     qalyaalatal ‘dance together’

b. tamkalatal ‘walk around together’ [-a ‘face’]

   waštalatal ‘dance together [Indian dance]’ [-šan ‘foot’]

c. Iyosatal ‘happy together’ [-a ‘face’]
None of these forms has a counterpart with the transitive suffix -t: *tąltant, *yà:yt, etc.

Apparently, reciprocals taking on a collective meaning is well-attested in other languages of the world, for example, in Oceanic languages as documented by Lichtenberk (1985, to appear). It is a reasonable path for grammaticization, according to Kemmer (1997). After all, the core meaning of reciprocal is that each of the agents denoted by the plural subject is doing the same action (that is, doing something to another member of the set) at approximately the same time and, in the case of prototypical transitive verbs involving contact or closeness, in the same place. Thus, agents of reciprocals are often engaging in a transitive action collectively. Once the notion of transitivity is dropped, the reciprocal simply represents a collective activity. The reciprocal marker is then taken to signal collectivity rather than reciprocity. Of course, this would be accompanied by the reanalysis of the two suffixes into a single suffix. The process is no doubt encouraged by the fact that core reciprocals are finally intransitive in Halkomelem.

5. Conclusion

We have seen that each of the Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal suffixes is historically 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 or reciprocal constructions with a transparent meaning of ‘self’ or ‘each other’. The transitive suffix indicates that the predicate in the position of object agreement, the transitive suffix indicates that the predicate has (at least) two semantic arguments. Furthermore, transitive suffixes in Halkomelem indicate the degree of control over 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 unintentionally, accidentally, or with great difficulty. The referential suffixes, which appear in the position of object agreement, provide the meaning of ‘reflexive’ or ‘reciprocal’. Also, the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes reduce the transitivity of the clause. The morphosyntactic evidence shows that reflexive and reciprocal constructions are syntactically intransitive.

Given that the first element of each reflexive or reciprocal suffix is a transitive marker, we might expect that reflexive and reciprocal constructions would be available for every transitive construction of the language, as long as the meaning of reflexive or reciprocal would make sense for the action. We find that this is indeed reflexive or reciprocal would make sense for the action. We find that this is indeed reflexive or reciprocal would make sense for the action.

In their core use, the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes productively appear on verb forms that can take transitive suffixes, namely the process unaccusatives, and always streamword forward mean ‘self’ or ‘each other’. The grammaticalized suffixes appear only sporadically, on verb forms where the -t transitive suffix is impossible, such as unergatives and stative, and they have meanings that are more aspectual than referential.

What this paper has shown is that a crucial aspect of the study of reflexives and reciprocals is the documentation of what verb bases or other suffixes the reflexive and reciprocal 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 and reciprocals addresses languages that use independent pronouns or clitics for these
functions. Hence, the research has focused on conditions on antecedents stated in terms of binding domains, word order, and grammatical relation hierarchies. Halkomelem reflexives and reciprocals, 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 and reciprocals. In addition, we have seen that complex transitive such as applicatives and lexical suffix constructions cannot combine with all of the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes. Also we have seen that reflexives and reciprocals can themselves be bases meeting the criteria for subsequent suffocation.

Halkomelem is a polysynthetic language with a dozen prefixes, several infixes, and over two hundred suffixes. This paper, in documenting some of the combinatorial restrictions on Halkomelem affixation, is a step toward developing a theory of morphosyntax able to account for polysynthetic languages.
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Notes
1. The following abbreviations are used in glossing the Halkomelem examples: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, AUX = auxiliary, BEN = benefactive, COMP = complementizer, COM = connective, CONT = causative, CS = causative, DET = determiner, ERG = ergative, FUT = future, INT = interrogative, INF = intransitive, I.C. = limited control, OBJ = object, ORG = oblique, PL = plural, REC = reciprocal, REF = reflexive, SG = singular, SUB = subject, SUBJ = subordinate subject, TR = transitive.
2. The causative suffix -n probably consists of a causative suffix -n and the transitive suffix -t.
3. Another form, the reflexive causative, -nínamón, which can mean 'manage to make self do something' or 'pretend to do something', is not discussed here. See Gerds (1995).
4. This chart only covers base forms. In other forms, such as passive or causatives based on reflexives, the transitivizing and intransitivizing suffixes stack up in complex ways that are difficult to represent in the template format.

References
