

Benefactive and malefactive uses of Salish applicatives

Kaoru Kiyosawa
University of Victoria

Donna B. Gerdts
Simon Fraser University

ABSTRACT We survey benefactives and malefactives in Salish, a family of twenty-three languages in northwestern North America. For the most part, benefactives and malefactives are expressed via applicative constructions, which are classified into two types: redirective and relational. Redirective applicatives are formed on transitive bases, and their precise interpretation—as benefactive, delegative, or malefactive—depends upon the context of the situation and the semantics of the verb. Most transitive verbs form redirectives with benefactive meanings, but redirectives formed on transfer verbs often express malefactive meanings, especially when a source or possessor is the applied object. Relational applicatives are formed on intransitive bases. They frequently have malefactive or adversative meanings, especially with natural or psychological events, and only rarely express benefactive meanings.

1 Introduction¹

There are twenty-three Salish languages currently or historically spoken in British Columbia, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon. This paper surveys benefactives and malefactives based on primary data from the Central Salish language Halkomelem, as well as from secondary source data from nineteen other Salish languages.² Much of what we have to say about benefactives and malefactives in Salish languages is tied to the topic of applicatives. Applicative constructions are the main way to express these meanings, but they also express many other meanings as well. Salish applicatives are divided into two types, which

¹ We would like to thank the speakers of the Island dialect of Halkomelem who shared data with us, especially Arnold Guerin, Ruby Peter, and Theresa Thorne. Funding was provided by Jacobs Fund, Phillips fund, SFU, and SSHRC. Thanks also to the Salishanists who shared data and knowledge with us: Dawn Bates, David Beck, Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Ivy Doak, Brent Galloway, Dwight Gardiner, Mercedes Hinkson, Tom Hukari, Paul Kroeber, Anthony Mattina, Nancy Mattina, Timothy Montler, Nile Thompson, Jan van Eijk, Honoré Watanabe, and especially the late Dale Kinkade. Thanks to Charles Ulrich for his comments and corrections.

² In making use of data from secondary sources, we updated transcriptions to current standards and modified some morphological boundaries according to our own analysis of applicatives, and also we have added morphological boundaries when they are not provided in the original data. When the original data do not have morpheme glosses, we have provided them by using dictionaries and grammars, and by referring to other data. We have also changed some of the glosses from the original sources in order to standardize them to the abbreviations used here.

we refer to as redirectives, following Kinkade (1980:33) and relationals, following (Thompson and Thompson 1992:73). In a typical redirective applicative, a suffix is added to a transitive base to produce a semantically ditransitive form, as in (1), while in a relational applicative, a suffix is added to an intransitive base to produce a semantically transitive form, as in (2).³

(1) Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988:90)

niʔ	qʷəl-ət-c-t-əs	lə	słéniʔ	ʔə	kʷθə	səplíł.
AUX	bake-RDR-TR-3ERG	DET	woman	OBL	DET	bread

‘He baked the bread for the woman.’

(2) Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988:144)

niʔ	kʷukʷ-meʔ-θámʔš-əs.
AUX	cook-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-3ERG

‘He cooked for me.’

The morphosyntax of applicative constructions is straightforward, and both types of applicatives result in the same surface syntax: the semantically oblique NP, in this case the benefactive, is the syntactic object, and thus is licensed as a direct argument in the clause or object agreement on the verb.⁴ The comparative/historical picture of the morphology is much more complicated because of the variety of forms and the various meanings they express in the different Salish languages. Kiyosawa (2006) gives a detailed discussion of this topic.

We know a great deal about redirectives and their use to express benefactives, as detailed in section 2. A complication, however, is that most Salish languages do not have a redirective morpheme that is dedicated to a benefactive meaning per se; redirective applicatives also expresses dative⁵, source, and possessive applied objects. The interpretation of an applicative construction is often ambiguous, though the class of the base verb and the semantic context help to pinpoint the meaning. We know less about malefactives, and again no

³ The following abbreviations and symbols are used in this paper. 1: first person, 2: second person, 3: third person, ART: article, ASP: aspect, AUX: auxiliary, CLT: clitic, CS: causative, DEM: demonstrative, DET: determiner, EMPH: emphatic, ERG: ergative, FUT: future, IMP: imperative, IMPF: imperfect, INTR: intransitive, IRR: irrealis, LNK: linker, LOC: locative, LV: linking vowel, MDL: middle, NM: nominalizer, OBJ: object, OBL: oblique, PASS: passive, PAST: past, PERF: perfect, PL: plural, POSS: possessive, PRFX: (unglossed) prefix, PTC: particle, PSTN: positional, PUNCT: punctual, Q: question particle, RDR: redirective, RED: reduplication, REL: relational, REFL: reflexive, RSLT: resultative, SG: singular, ST: stative, SUB: subject, TR: general transitive, VBL: verbalizer, //...//: morphophonemic form, =...: lexical suffix.

⁴ As discussed in Kiyosawa (2006) and Gerdts and Kiyosawa (2007), applied objects in Salish applicative constructions have all the hallmarks of direct objects: they undergo passive, reflexive, reciprocal, and extraction. Although theme nominals in applicatives vary with respect to nominal marking, they lack all object properties: they never appear as object pronouns, passivize, etc.

⁵ Throughout this paper, we are using “dative” as a semantic notion, not as a case term. In fact, there is little or no case marking in Salish languages. We use dative as a convenient cover term for recipient, goal of a speech act, and goal or purpose of an action, but not goal or endpoint of a motion. Such usage follows in the tradition of Fillmore (1968), Givón (1984) *inter alia*. We refer to applicatives with dative applied objects as dative applicatives, which invokes a parallelism to the Transformational Grammar term “dative movement”. Using dative in this way is not without controversy; as our editors pointed out to us, dative is more properly limited to the discussion of case marking.

morpheme is specifically dedicated to expressing malefactive meanings. The pragmatics of the situation are crucial for distinguishing benefactive versus malefactive interpretations.

Relational applicatives and their use to express benefactive and malefactive meanings are detailed in section 3. The main use of relationals is to express psych and directional applicatives; their use to express benefactives and malefactives is much less common. One documented use of relationals is to express adversatives, which usually appear as passives.

In Salish languages, applicatives are the major means of expressing benefactives and malefactives. As discussed in section 4, other constructions, such as prepositional phrases or serial verbs are regarded as circumlocutions and would not normally be used. The one exception is that causatives are also used to express benefactives in a very limited set of cases.

We conclude with a summary of our findings in section 5. Salish languages, like many languages of the world, have no morphological forms dedicated solely to the expression of benefactives or malefactives, and therefore the speech act context must supply much of the meaning.

2 Redirective applicatives

In the redirective applicative construction, the base is transitive, and the role of direct object is “redirected” from the theme to the applied object, which is a semantically oblique NP. Compare the following Shuswap examples:

(3) Shuswap (Dwight Gardiner p.c.)

m- <i>kúl</i> -n-s	ɣ	<i>mim̓x</i> .
PERF-make-TR-3SUB	DET	basket

‘She made the basket.’

(4) Shuswap (Gardiner 1993:31)

m- <i>kúl</i> -x-t-s	ɣ	<i>núχ^wənχ^w</i>	<i>tə</i>	<i>mim̓x</i> .
PERF-make-RDR-TR-3SUB	DET	woman	OBL	basket

‘She made a basket for the woman.’

(3) is a simple transitive construction, and the agent is the subject and the theme is the object. (4) is a redirective applicative construction, and a semantically oblique NP, the benefactive, is the direct object while the theme is an oblique-marked NP.⁶ The verb in (3) is transitive and is suffixed with the general transitive suffix *-n(t)*, the third-person transitive subject determines ergative agreement, and the theme ‘basket’ is a direct object. As discussed below, the redirective construction typically involves dative, benefactive, malefactive, or possessive applied objects. Example (4) is a benefactive applicative: the verb is suffixed with the redirective suffix *-x(i)*, the benefactive ‘woman’ is the direct object, and the theme ‘basket’ appears with an oblique marker. (3) is syntactically transitive with two arguments: a subject

⁶ See Gerdts (to appear) for a detailed discuss of the syntax of ditransitive constructions in one Salish language, Halkomelem.

and a (theme) direct object. And it is also semantically transitive with two participants. (4) is syntactically transitive as well, having two direct arguments: a subject and an applied object (the benefactive). However, (4) is semantically ditransitive, with three participants: a subject, a (benefactive) applied object, and a (theme) oblique. In this case, the redirective applicative suffix has allowed an increase in the semantic valence over the sentence with only a general transitive suffix in (3).

Each Salish language has from one to three redirective suffixes. Table 1 shows data for the twenty Salish languages in our study organized by the five branches; the Interior Salish branch is further divided into two sub-branches—Northern and Southern:⁷

Table 1. Salish redirective suffixes

BRANCH		LANGUAGE	REDIRECTIVE
Bella Coola		Bella Coola	-amk
Central Salish		Comox	-ʔəm
		Sechelt	-em
		Squamish	-ši
		Halkomelem	-as, -łc
		Nooksack	-ši
		Northern Straits	-si
		Klallam	-si
		Lushootseed	-yi
		Twana	-ši
Tsamosan		Upper Chehalis	-ši, -tux ^w t, -tmi
		Cowlitz	-ši, -tux ^w t, -s
Tillamook		Tillamook	-ši
Interior Salish	Northern Interior	Lillooet	-xit
		Thompson	-xi
		Shuswap	-xi
	Southern Interior	Okanagan	-xi, -ł, -tuł
		Kalispel	-ši, -ł
		Coeur d'Alene	-ši, -ł, -tuł
		Columbian	-xit, -ł, -tuł

The concept of redirective applicative—adding a third participant as a core argument—is a very old concept in Salish. The most common redirective suffix is reconstructed for Proto-Salish as **-xi* by Kinkade (1998). It is found in all three branches, and, in fact, is the only redirective suffix in Northern Interior Salish and most of the Central Salish languages. Reflexes of this form (*-si*, *-ši*, *-xi*, *-xit*, *-yi*) appear in all but four of the languages

⁷ The following references were consulted for the information in the Tables 1 and 4 in this paper: Bates et al. (1994); Beaumont (1985); Carlson (1972, 1980); Carlson and Flett (1989); Davis and Saunders (1997); Doak (1997); Egesdal and Thompson (1998); Galloway (1997); Gerdts (1988); Hess (1967); Kinkade (1980, 1991, 2004); Kuipers (1967, 1974, 1992); A. Mattina (1994); N. Mattina (1993); Montler (1986); Thompson and Thompson (1992); Van Eijk (1997); Watanabe (2003).

(Bella Coola, Comox, Sechelt, and Halkomelem).⁸ Other suffixes have been added to the redirective system in some branches or individual languages and have usurped the functions of *-*xi* or added additional functions to the redirective applicative system.

The following sections explore the semantics of the redirective construction and, in particular, their use to express benefactive and malefactive meaning.

2.1 *Semantic roles of applied objects in redirective applicatives*

The semantic role of the applied object in the redirective applicative construction is usually dative, benefactive, source, or possessor, as elaborated in the following sections.

2.1.1 *Dative*

Salish languages express recipients as direct objects:

(5) Sechelt (Beaumont 1985:138)

yát-cí-čen-sk^wa ʔe še sʔíłten, we ʔéqíš-ax^w.
 give-TR:2SG.OBJ-1SG.SUB-FUT OBL DET food if sit.down-2SG.SUB
 ‘I’ll give you some food if you sit down.’

This is true whether the verb appears in a simple form, as in the above examples, or if it takes a redirective suffix, as in the following examples:

(6) Kalispel (Carlson 1980:25)

x^wíć-š-t-ən ɬuʔ Agnes ɬuʔ t yámǰ^weʔ.
 give-RDR-TR-1SG.SUB ART Agnes ART OBL basket
 ‘I gave a basket to Agnes.’

A typical dative applied object is a recipient of a transfer verb, such as ‘give’ (6). We use “dative” loosely, and include goals of speech acts (7) as well as goals or targets of actions in general (8)–(9):

(7) Halkomelem (Gerdt 1988:92)

ni yáθ-əs-t-əs ɬə Mary ʔə k^wθəń syays.
 AUX tell-RDR-TR-3SUB DET Mary OBL DET:2SG.POSS work
 ‘He told Mary about your job.’

(8) Cowlitz (Kinkade 2004:240)

ʔit cíǰ-tux^w-c.
 PERF show-RDR-1SG.OBJ
 ‘He showed it to me.’

⁸ The suffix in the outlier language Bella Coola is very different in form and function from redirectives in other languages, as discussed in Kiyosawa (2006).

- (9) Thompson (L. Thompson and M. Thompson 1980:28)

q̣ʷxítne.
 //q̣ʷəw̄-xi-t-Ø-enè//
 trap-RDR-TR-3SG.OBJ-1SG.SUB
 ‘I set a trap for it [a particular animal].’

2.1.2 *Benefactive*

Redirective suffixes are used to form constructions expressing a classic benefactive meaning of doing something for someone’s benefit:

- (10) Cowlitz (Kinkade 2004:234)

?it sáʔ-š-n ł tit ʒíqs̄n.
 PERF make-RDR-TR OBL DET box
 ‘He made the box for him.’

- (11) Comox (Watanabe 2003:249)

ʒəs-ʔəm-θi tʰəm ʔə tə čuý.
 punch-RDR-TR-2SG.OBJ 1SG.SUB:FUT OBL DET child
 ‘I’ll punch the kid for you.’

- (12) Halkomelem (Gerdt 1988:95)

niʔ θáy-əłc-θámš-əs ʔə kʷθə nə-snəxʷəł.
 AUX fix-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SG.SUB OBL DET 1SG.POSS-canoe
 ‘He fixed my canoe for me.’

- (13) Upper Chehalis (Kinkade 1991:10)

?it ʔəš-š-tuxʷt čn.
 PTC see/look.at-RED-RDR 1SG.SUB
 ‘I examined it for him.’

- (14) Cowlitz (Kinkade 2004:235)

?it q̣ʷałéʔ-s-c.
 PERF mark/write-RDR-1SG.OBJ
 ‘He signed [it] for me.’

- (15) Spokane (Carlson 1972: 89)

?ul-ł-cí-n.
 //wil-ł-t-si-en//
 burn-RDR-TR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.SUB
 ‘I burned it for you.’

- (16) Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:208)

k^wu səq̣-túł-t-s iʔ slíp.
 1SG.OBJ split-RDR-TR-3SUB ART wood
 ‘He split wood for me.’

- (17) Lillooet (Van Eijk 1997:115)

tx^wus-miñ-xí-c-kax^w ni n-čqáǰʔ a!
 look-REL-RDR-1SG.OBJ-2SG.SUB DET 1SG.POSS-horse PTC
 ‘Look out for my horse for me!’

- (18) Columbian (Willett 2003:139)

xə́ḳxíc ṣtámkaʔs t syáyaʔ.
 //xə́ḳ-xit-s ṣtámkaʔ-s//
 pick-RDR-3SUB daughter-3SG.POSS OBL serviceberry
 ‘S/he picked some serviceberries for her/his daughter.’

All of the suffixes in Table 1 can be used to express benefactive meanings, except for *-as* in Halkomelem and *-tmi* in Upper Chehalis, which are used only for dative applicatives. As discussed further in section 4 below, redirective suffixes are the main means for expressing benefactives in Salish languages.

2.1.2.1 *Delegative*. Besides the classic benefactive meaning of doing something for someone’s benefit, Salish redirective suffixes can also be used to express delegative meanings. Thus, the Coeur d’Alene example in (19) is glossed with two interpretations—delegative or benefactive.

- (19) Coeur d’Alene (Doak 1997:157)

níčšices x^we pilí.
 //níč-ši-t-s-es x^we pili//
 cut-RDR-TR-1SG.OBJ-3SUB DET Felix
 ‘Felix cut (wood) instead of me/in my place.’/‘Felix cut (wood) for me.’

An overlap in these two meanings is understandable, since one is often doing a favor for someone when one does a task instead of them. Languages frequently conflate these two meanings, for example, as seen by the use of *for* for both in English.

Also, our Halkomelem consultant has verified that multiple readings are available for all benefactive applicatives. Take the following, for example:

- (20) Halkomelem (Gerds, f.n.)

q̣^wəl-əlc-θamə cən ceʔ ʔə ḳ^w sce:łtən.
 bake-RDR-TR:2OBJ 1SUB FUT OBL DET salmon
 ‘I will bake some salmon for you.’

She says: “you can use this for your benefit in whatever way: for you to eat, because you are unable to do it for whatever reason, because you are too busy to do it and it needs to be done, because I am being substituted to do your job, and so on.” The precise meaning is determined by the context. However, the most normal or neutral reading in the absence of a context would be that the salmon is being cooked for the referent of the object to eat themselves rather than for the salmon to be cooked to give it to someone else to eat.

The use of redirectives on intransitive—rather than transitive—bases is rare in Salish, as discussed in Kiyosawa (2006: Chapter 5). We have found a handful of examples of benefactive applicatives formed on intransitive activity predicates:⁹

(21) Comox (Watanabe 2003:252)

payaʔ štəm t ča-čah-am-ʔəm-t-anapi.
 always 1PL.SUB CLT RED(IMPF)-pray-MDL-RDR-TR-2PL.OBJ
 ‘We will always be praying for you (pl).’

Two of these examples are translated with delegative meanings:

(22) Okanagan (N. Mattina 1993:272)

kʷu qʷəlqʷíl-x-t-s.
 1SG.OBJ talk-RDR-TR-3SUB
 ‘He talked for me (in my stead).’

(23) Okanagan (N. Mattina 1993:272)

kʷu qʷəyʷ=sqáǰaʷ-x-t-s.
 1SG.OBJ burn=dosmestic.animal-RDR-TR-3SUB
 ‘He branded for me (in my stead).’

The distinction between a classic benefactive and a delegative meaning is apparently derived from the meaning of the predicate and the context of the situation.

2.1.2.2 *Malefactive*. Salish redirectives can also be used to expressive malefactive meanings.

(24) Comox (Watanabe 2003:251)

ǰəpxʷ-aʷam-θ-as ʔə tə tʰ ǰapáy.
 break-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL DET 1SG.POSS stick
 ‘He broke my stick on me.’

(25) Thompson (L. Thompson and M. Thompson 1980:28)

máʷxtimes tə s-zélt-ep.
 //máʷ-xi-t-uy-m-es//
 break-RDR-TR-2PL.OBJ-3SUB OBL NM-dish-2PL.POSS
 ‘He broke you people’s dish.’

⁹ See also example (2) above.

- (26) Shuswap (Kuipers 1992:49)
 x-1m̥[t]=ci-x-t-s
 PRFX-close=mouth-RDR-TR-3SUB
 ‘close door on somebody’

While some examples are translated with only a benefactive reading or only a malefactive one, many examples are given more than one interpretation. Thus, whether the applied object bears the role of benefactive or malefactive often depends on the situation. Watanabe (2003:251) states, ‘the choice [between benefactive and malefactive] seems to depend on the context’, and cites examples like the following:

- (27) Comox (Watanabe 2003:251)
 čəpχ-aʔam-θ-as ʔə tə t^θ qəsnaŋ.
 dirty-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL DET 1SG.POSS dress
 ‘She dirtied my dress [on me]./She dirtied my dress for me.’

- (28) Comox (Watanabe 2003:252)
 q^wuq^wu-ʔəm-θ-as ʔə tə t^θ tiy.
 drink-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL DET 1SG.POSS tea
 ‘He drank my tea for me [when I could not finish it].’/‘He drank up my tea [on me].’

The following Shuswap example also allows two interpretations:

- (29) Shuswap (Gardiner 1993:21)
 m-sté(t)ʔə-x-t-sm-s tə χ^wəχ^wʔúʔs.
 PERF-drink-RDR-TR-1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL beer
 ‘She drank the beer for/on me.’

In sum, the choice between benefactive and malefactive readings is contextual based on the pragmatics of the situation. The same event may have different readings depending on the opinion of the speaker regarding the situation.

2.1.3 *Source*

Another use of redirective applicatives is to express source applied objects of transfer verbs such as ‘buy’ (30), ‘steal’ (31), and ‘take away’ (32):

- (30) Columbian (Kinkade 1980:33.1)
 táw-ł-n.
 buy-RDR(-TR)-1SG.SUB
 ‘I bought it from him.’

2.1.4 *Possessive*

Many, but not all, Salish languages use redirective suffixes to form possessive applicative constructions (a.k.a. “possessor ascension” or “external possession” constructions). The applied object is interpreted as the possessor of the theme NP:

(37) Comox (Watanabe 2003:252)

łəw-ʔəm-θ-as	ʔə	šə	t ^θ	apləs-uł
take.out-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB	OBL	DET	1SG.POSS	apple-PAST
	ʔə	tə	k ^w ax ^w a.	
	OBL	DET	box	

‘He took my apples from the box.’

(38) Twana (Kinkade n.d.)

k ^w əd-ší-d-čəd	ə	tə	wəqáb.
get-RDR-TR-1SG.SUB	OBL	ART	box

‘I took his box.’

Possessors cannot be objects in Salish languages unless the verb takes applicative morphology.¹¹

In examples (37) and (38), the translation indicates that the theme NP is possessed by the applied object even though no possessive marking appears on that NP. In other examples of possessive applicatives, possessive marking appears on the theme NP:

(39) Shuswap (Kuipers 1992:49)

młmalq ^w -x-t-s	tə	ci tx ^w -s.
paint-RDR-TR-3SUB	OBL	house-3POSS

‘He_i paints the/his_j house for him_j.’/‘He_i paints his_j house.’

Note that, since the same redirective suffixes are used to mark both benefactive applicatives and possessive applicatives, the applied object in examples like (39) can be interpreted as either the benefactive or the possessor.

As discussed below, the redirective suffix *-t* in Southern Interior Salish languages is best analyzed as primarily a possessive suffix. In fact, it is generally the case that possessive applicative constructions do not have simple possessor semantics, but rather have an additional semantic “kick” indicating that the possessor is affected by the action (cf. Fried 1999). So the applied object bears an additional role: dative (40), benefactive (41), malefactive (42), or source (43).

¹¹ An exception to this generalization is a construction with a lexical suffix construction—the Salish equivalent to noun incorporation—in which the semantic possessor of the lexical suffix is the object. See Gerdtz and Hinkson (2004) for a discussion of the relation of lexical suffixes, applicatives, and external possession.

- (40) Okanagan (N. Mattina 1993:277)
 k^wu c-x^wič-ł-t i-kł-lkalát.
 1SG.OBJ ASP-give-RDR-TR 1SG.POSS-IRR-bread
 ‘Give me what will be my bread.’
- (41) Kalispel (Vogt 1940:34)
 yes-u:l-ł-t-ém.
 ASP-burn-RDR-TR-INTR
 ‘I am burning it for him.’/‘I am burning his...’
- (42) Columbian (Kinkade 1980:34)
 wəlq^wátk^w-ł-c wa ʔin-lətí.
 drink-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ PTC 1SG.POSS-tea
 ‘She drank my tea (after taking it away from me).’
- (43) Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:212)
 lut k^wu a-ks-naq^w-m-ł-t-əm in-kəwáp.
 not 1SG.OBJ 2SG.POSS-FUT-steal-REL-RDR-TR-INTR 1SG.POSS-horse
 ‘Don’t steal my horse from me.’

This double layer of semantics, together with the added complication that the possessive marking often appears on the theme in possessive applicatives, leads to a confusing range of translations for many examples, as discussed in more detail in Kiyosawa (2004).

2.2 *The mapping of form and function*

It is not unusual for languages to have a single multi-purpose applicative morpheme that is used in a variety of applicative constructions such as dative, benefactive, and possessive. Languages with a single applicative include Swahili (Driever 1976), Mayan languages (Aissen 1987), and Mixean languages (Zavala 1999). However, it is also fairly common for a language to have two or more applicative morphemes, each specialized for use with applied objects in a limited range of the semantic roles. Languages that have several applicatives include Chickasaw (Munro 2000), Hakha Lai (Peterson 2007), Ilokano (Gerdts and Whaley 1993), Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980), Nez Perce (Rude 1985), Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999), Upper Necaxa Totonac (Beck 2006), and Yimas (Foley 1991).

In Salish, we can see both types of mappings: there are some general purpose applicative morphemes and some suffixes that tend to map to specific semantic roles. First we will discuss languages that have a single multi-purpose redirective suffix and then we will turn to languages that have more than one redirective suffix.

2.2.1 *Languages with one redirective suffix*

Many Salish languages have only a single redirective suffix and the applied object takes on a variety of semantic roles. For example, in Squamish, applied objects in redirective applicatives have three semantic roles: dative (a), benefactive (b), and possessor/source (c).

(44) Squamish

- a. sát-ši-t-m čáx^w ʔit.
 give-RDR-TR-PASS 2SG.SUB FUT
 ‘He’ll give it to you.’ (Kuipers 1967:303)
- b. číł-ši-t-úmuł-ka!
 put.up.high-RDR-TR-1PL.OBJ-IMP
 ‘Put it up high for us!’ (Kuipers 1967: 318)
- c. p̓íʔ-ši-t-ka ta ǰólʔtn-s!
 grab-RDR-TR-IMP DET pencil-3SG.POSS
 ‘Take that (lit. his) pencil from him!’ (Kuipers 1967:253)

In some languages, applied objects can have four semantic roles. For example, Shuswap has only one redirective suffix, *-xi*, and the semantic role of the applied object can be dative (a), benefactive (b), malefactive (c), or possessor (d):

(45) Shuswap

- a. t̓w̓kə-mí-x-t-s.
 sell-REL-RDR-TR-3SUB
 ‘He sells it to somebody.’ (Gardiner 1993:23)
- b. c-k̓^wi-k̓^wł-x-cm-e ǰk-čiʔ!
 PRFX-RED-leave.food-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-IMP IRR-meat
 ‘Leave some meat for me!’ (Kuipers 1974:222)
- c. x-lm̓[t]=ci-x-t-s
 PRFX-close=mouth-RDR-TR-3SUB
 ‘close door on somebody’ (Kuipers 1992:49)
- d. ʔ Mary wik-x-t-sm-s tə n-qéʔčə.
 DET Mary see-RDR-TR-1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL 1SG.POSS-father
 ‘Mary saw my father.’ (Gardiner 1993:22)

In sum, Salish languages that have only a single redirective suffix use it to form applicatives in which the applied object has a variety of semantic roles.

2.2.2 *Languages with more than one redirective suffix*

In contrast, when a language has more than one redirective suffix, the semantic roles associated with a certain suffix are more limited. Halkomelem illustrates this point. There are

two redirective suffixes in Halkomelem, *-as* and *-ɬc*, and the applied object is always dative with *-as*, as in (46), and always benefactive with *-ɬc*, as in (47).¹²

(46) Halkomelem

- a. niʔ ʔám-əs-t-əs kʷθə swíwłəs ʔə kʷθə púkʷ.
 AUX give-RDR-TR-3SUB DET boy OBL DET book
 ‘He gave the boy the book.’ (Gerdts 1988:115)

- b. niʔ ʔiʷ-əs-θamš-əs ʔə kʷθə qeq-s.
 AUX show-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL DET baby-3POSS
 ‘She showed me her baby.’ (Gerdts and Hinkson 2004:228)

(47) Halkomelem

- a. niʔ ləxʷ-əɬc-ət-əs.
 AUX blanket-RDR-TR-3SUB
 ‘He covered it with a blanket for him.’ (Gerdts 1988:101)

- b. niʔ ǵʷəl-əɬc-t-əs ɬə sléniʔ ʔə kʷθə səplíl.
 AUX bake-RDR-TR-3SUB DET woman OBL DET bread
 ‘He baked the bread for the woman.’ (Gerdts 1988:90)

While all of the Northern Interior languages have a single multi-purpose redirective suffix, Southern Interior languages have two or three different suffixes, each of which is used for a variety of redirective meanings. Nevertheless, as we discuss below, the redirective suffixes tend to align with applied objects bearing particular semantic roles.

At first glance, it seems that the situation in Southern Interior Salish parallels the Northern Interior one: note that reflexes of all three redirective suffixes **-xi*, *-ɬ*, and *-tuɬ* can appear in dative (48), benefactive (49), and possessive (50) applicatives.¹³

(48)

- a. Kalispel (Carlson 1980:25)
 xʷíç-š-t-ən ɬuʔ Agnes ɬuʔ t yámxʷeʔ.
 give-RDR-TR-1SG.SUB ART Agnes ART OBL basket
 ‘I gave a basket to Agnes.’

- b. Okanagan (N. Mattina 1993:277)
 kʷu c-xʷiç-ɬ-t i-kɬ-lkalát.
 1SG.OBJ ASP-give-RDR-TR 1SG.POSS-IRR-bread
 ‘Give me what will be my bread.’

¹² Although the benefactive redirective suffix *-ɬc* partially resembles *-ɬ*, the possessive redirective applicative in Southern Interior languages, Halkomelem does not use *-ɬc* for possessive applied objects.

¹³ We omit source applicatives from the discussion but include them in the summary below.

- c. Columbian (Willett 2003:137)
 yərməntúfn.
 //yəɾ-mi-tuł-t-n//
 push-REL-RDR-TR-1SG.SUB
 ‘I pushed it to her/him.’
- (49) a. Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:211)
 kaʔkíc-x-t-m-ən t a-kł-qaʔxán.
 find-RDR-TR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.SUB OBL 2SG.POSS-FUT-shoes
 ‘I found you some shoes.’
- b. Spokane (Carlson 1972: 89)
 ʔul-ł-cí-n.
 //wil-ł-t-si-en//
 burn-RDR-TR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.SUB
 ‘I burned it for you.’
- c. Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:208)
 k^wu səq̣-túł-t-s iʔ slíp̣.
 1SG.OBJ split-RDR-TR-3SUB ART wood
 ‘He split wood for me.’
- (50) a. Coeur d’Alene (Doak 1997:167)
 mé^{ʔw}šic.
 //me^{ʔw}-ši-t-Ø-s//
 break-RDR-TR-3OBJ-3SUB
 ‘He broke something that belongs to another.’
- b. Columbian (Kinkade 1980:34)
 má^{ʔw}-ł-c-x^w ʔin-łkáp.
 break-RDR(-TR)-1SG.OBJ-2SG.SUB 1SG.POSS-pot
 ‘You broke my pot.’
- c. Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:211)
 ʔiʔ c-ən-ʔúłx^w pit, uł uk-túł-t-s
 as.soon.as ASP-LOC-come.in Pete and see-RDR-TR-3SUB

 iʔ tətwít iʔ stətqánaʔk-s.
 ART boy ART pistol-3SG.POSS
 ‘As soon as Pete came in, he saw the gun that the boy had (not necessarily the boy’s gun).’

However, there are two types of evidence that suggest that the suffixes are in fact specialized semantically. First, when we look more closely at a sample of data, we find that

Also, we find that in Columbian the applied object is benefactive in the redirective constructions with reflexes of **-xi* in (a), while it is dative in the *-tuł* redirective constructions in (b).

(53) Columbian (Willett 2003:136, 137)

a. $k^w\text{łn}w\text{ł}x\text{tn}$.
 // $k^w\text{u}\text{łn}=\text{wil-xit-n}$ //
 borrow=vehicle-RDR-1SG.SUB
 ‘I borrowed a vehicle for her/him.’

b. $k^w\text{łn}t\text{ú}\text{łn}$.
 // $k^w\text{u}\text{łn-tu}\text{ł-t-n}$ //
 lend-RDR-TR-1SG.SUB
 ‘I loaned it to her/him.’

Similarly, in the following Okanagan examples, we see possessive applicatives with *-ł* in (a) contrasting with benefactive applicatives with *-tuł* in (b).

(54) Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:208)

a. $k^w\text{u}$ $s\acute{ı}\acute{q}\text{-}\acute{\text{a}}\text{ł-t-s}$ $i\text{-sl}\acute{ı}\acute{p}$.
 1SG.OBJ split-RDR-TR-3SUB 1SG.POSS-wood
 ‘He split my wood.’

b. $k^w\text{u}$ $s\acute{\text{a}}\acute{q}\text{-t}\acute{u}\text{ł-t-s}$ $i\text{?}$ $sl\acute{ı}\acute{p}$.
 1SG.OBJ split-RDR-TR-3SUB ART wood
 ‘He split wood for me.’

In sum, although each redirective suffix in Southern Interior Salish languages can be used for a variety of meanings, there is nonetheless evidence that each tends to be associated with a particular semantics, and that there tends to be a single interpretation for any given combination of a verb root and a suffix. Thus the situation in languages with multiple redirective suffixes contrasts with that in languages with a single redirective suffix.

2.2.3 Summary: Benefactive as the core redirective concept

There are ten different redirective suffixes in total in the Salish languages. Only **-xi* can be reconstructed for Proto-Salish. Kiyosawa (2006) determines the core function of each applicative suffix by how frequently it appears in that function in the modern languages. She collected 447 tokens of verb plus suffix pairings from grammars and dictionaries and found the following distribution:

Table 3. Applied Objects with Redirectives

REDIRECTIVE	BENEFACTIVE	DATIVE	POSSESSOR	SOURCE	TOTAL
*- <i>xi</i>	134	58	35	6	233
8 others	83	49	70	12	214
TOTAL	217	107	105	18	447

Notice that, overall, benefactive (or, more precisely, benefactive, delegative, and malefactive) is the most common meaning for redirectives, constituting half of the sample (217 of 447 tokens). Benefactive is also the most common meaning in the data with *-*xi* (134 out of 233 tokens or 58%).

In sum, judging from the usage of its reflexes in the modern languages, Proto-Salish *-*xi* was probably associated with the semantic role of benefactive. But in many languages, its function has been extended to mark several kinds of applied objects, including datives, possessors, and sources. Thus, in these languages, its function is parallel to a general di-transitivizer, perhaps equivalent in semantic function to dative case in dependent-marking languages. Over time, other suffixes have been added to the redirective system in some branches or individual languages and these have usurped some of the functions of *-*xi*. The situation in Halkomelem is particularly interesting because it has no reflex of *-*xi*. The suffixes *-as* and *-ɪc* are most certainly innovative.¹⁶ The suffix *-as* expresses dative and *-ɪc* expresses benefactive applied objects, and the function and form and the suffixes have a one-to-one correspondence. Though the situation is not as clear-cut in Southern Interior as it is in Halkomelem, the redirective suffixes also tend to align with applied objects bearing particular semantic roles. The core function of the suffix *-ɪ* is to express a possessor as the applied object and that of the suffix *-tuɪ* is to express a dative applied object, though both suffixes are also used to express benefactives.

3 Relational applicatives

A second type of applicative construction, the relational applicative, is relevant to our discussion of benefactives and malefactives in Salish languages. A relational applicative construction adds a second argument to a clause whose non-applicative counterpart is intransitive. The resulting clause is a syntactically transitive construction in which a non-theme nominal is the direct object. Compare the intransitive construction in (55) with the applicative construction in (56):

- (55) Halkomelem (Gerdt 2004:330)
- | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|----------|
| niʔ | neṃ | kʰθə | swiwləs. |
| AUX | go | DET | boy |
- ‘The boy went.’

¹⁶ The dative suffix *-as* is grammaticalized from the lexical suffix ‘face’ (Gerdt and Hinkson 2004).

(56) Halkomelem (Gerdt's 2004:330)

niʔ	nəm-nəs-əs	kʷθə	swiʷləs	kʷθə	John.
AUX	go-REL-3SUB	DET	boy	DET	John

‘The boy went up to John.’

The clause in (55) is intransitive, while (56) is syntactically transitive, as evidenced by the third person ergative marker, and ‘John’, the goal of the motion, is the applied object. The semantic role of the applied object, goal in this case, is signaled by the relational suffix *-nəs*.

Applied objects in relational applicatives are generally not semantic arguments of the predicate but rather have an indirect (or oblique) relationship to the event. For example, contrast the intransitive clause in (57) with the relational applicative in (58):

(57) Halkomelem (Gerdt's and Kiyosawa 2005b:339)

niʔ	cən	siʔsiʔ	ʔə	kʷθə	snəxʷəł.
AUX	1SG.SUB	frighten	OBL	DET	canoe

‘I was frightened at the car.’

(58) Halkomelem (Gerdt's and Kiyosawa 2005b:339)

niʔ	cən	siʔsiʔ-meʔ-t	kʷθə	sqʷəmeʔ.
AUX	1SG.SUB	frighten-REL-TR	DET	dog

‘I was frightened at the dog.’

In both sentences, the first-person subject is the experiencer of the psychological event. In (57), the stimulus of the event is expressed as an oblique, marked with the general oblique preposition *ʔə*, but in (58) the stimulus is the applied object in a relational applicative construction, marked by the verbal suffix *-meʔ*. The example in (58) is transitive, as seen by the presence of the transitive suffix on the verb. As discussed in Gerdt's and Kiyosawa (2005a), the choice between expressing the NP as the object of a preposition or as an applied object depends on its discourse prominence and its animacy.

Each Salish language has from one to three relational suffixes, and there are a total of seven different suffixes, as given in Table 4.

Table 4. Salish Relational Suffixes

BRANCH		LANGUAGE	RELATIONAL
Bella Coola		Bella Coola	-m
Central Salish		Comox	-mi, -ni
		Sechelt	-mí, -ni
		Squamish	-miḥ, -ni
		Halkomelem	-meʔ/-miʔ, -nəs
		Nooksack	-ni
		Northern Straits	-ŋiy, -nəs
		Klallam	-ŋə, -nəs
		Lushootseed	-bi, -di, -c/-s
		Twana	-ac
Tsamosan		Upper Chehalis	-mis/-mn, -ni, -tas/-ts
		Cowlitz	-mi(s), -ni, -t(a)s
Tillamook		Tillamook	-əwi, -əs
Interior Salish	Northern Interior Salish	Lillooet	-min/-miḥ
		Thompson	-mi
		Shuswap	-m(i)
	Southern Interior Salish	Okanagan	-min
		Spokane	-mi
		Coeur d'Alene	-mi
		Columbian	-mi

The most common relational suffix is reconstructed for Proto-Salish as **-mi* by Kinkade (1998) and reflexes of this form (*-bi*, *-meʔ*, *-mi*, *-miʔ*, *-min*, *-miḥ*, *-mn*, *-mis*, *-ŋiy*, *-ŋə*, *-əwi*) appear in all but three of the languages (Bella Coola, Nooksack, and Twana). Reflexes of the suffix **-mi* are the only relational suffixes in Interior Salish languages, while most Central Salish languages and Tillamook have two relational suffixes, and Lushootseed and Tsamosan languages have three. The second most wide-spread relational suffix **-ni* (> *-di*, *-ni*) is attested in five of the Central Salish languages and in Tsamosan languages.

The following sections briefly explore the semantics of the relational construction, especially their use to express benefactives and malefactives.

3.1 *The Semantics Roles of Relational Applicatives*

In relational applicative constructions, the verb stem is usually intransitive, and the semantic role of the applied object is usually goal or direction of motion as in (59)–(60) or stimulus of a psychological or perceptual event as in (61)–(62).¹⁷

¹⁷ See Gerds (2004a, 2004b) for a discussion of Halkomelem directional applicatives. Gerds and Kiyosawa (2005b) treat psych applicatives in Halkomelem, and Gerds and Kiyosawa (2004) treat psych applicatives in Salish languages in general.

- (59) Lillooet (Van Eijk 1987:140)
 ka-ləχ^w-miŋ-c-as a χúʔ a.
 RSLT-come.up-REL-1SG.OBJ-3SUB RSLT CLT(well/so) RSLT
 ‘He came right up to me.’
- (60) Comox (Watanabe 1996:335)
 łuk^w-mi-θ-as.
 fly-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB
 ‘It’s flying towards me.’
- (61) Okanagan (A. Mattina 1994:221)
 ixíʔ ʔáyχ^w-t-mə-nt-s-ən.
 there tired-ST-REL-TR-2SG.OBJ-1SG.SUB
 ‘I am tired of you.’
- (62) Halkomelem (Gerdtts and Kiyosawa 2005b:334)
 čəq̣-meʔ-t č ceʔ k^wθə nəcəwməx^w ʔi ceʔ təcəl.
 surprise-REL-TR 2SG.SUB FUT DET visitor AUX FUT arrive
 ‘You will be surprised at the visitors when they arrive.’
- While there is a tendency for a suffix to be associated to a particular meaning within a language, across languages the same suffix is used to express various meanings. The result is that the same meaning may be expressed by different relational suffixes in different languages, for example *-mi* in (63), *-ni* in (64), and *-ac* in (65):
- (63) Sechelt (Beaumont 1985:104)
 čásχém-mí-t-á-čex^w te ʔúłqayʔ
 afraid-REL-TR-Q-2SG.SUB DET snake
 ‘Are you afraid of the snake?’
- (64) Nooksack (Galloway 1997:222)
 ʔił ʔa(s)-sí(y)ʔsayʔ-ni-θ-as.
 AUX ST-afraid-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB
 ‘He’s afraid of me.’/‘He doesn’t trust me.’
- (65) Twana (Kinkade n.d.)
 as-čípəl-ac-bəš.
 ST-fear-REL-1SG.OBJ
 ‘He’s afraid of me.’

In sum, the match of form to function in relational applicatives is complicated both within and across languages, like the situation found with the redirective applicatives.

3.1.1 *Benefactive*

Motion verbs and psychological predicates account for the majority of examples of relational applicatives. However, relational suffixes also attach to a few activity verbs to form applicatives in which the applied object is the benefactive:

(66) Halkomelem (Gerdts 1988:144)

$ni^?$ $k^wuk^w-me^?-\thetaám^?š-əs$.
AUX cook-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-3ERG
'He cooked for me.'

(67) Tillamook (Egesdal and M. Thompson 1998:253)

$də$ $s-^?isleš-əwí-t-əw$.
ART NM-sing-REL-TR-PASS
'Someone is singing for him.'

(68) Lillooet (Van Eijk 1997:125)

$k^wzús-miñ$
work-REL
'to work for, to look after'

(69) Thompsom (L. Thompson and M. Thompson 1992:75)

$k^wz=ús-m-me-ne$.
rough=face-MDL-REL(-TR)-1SG.SUB
'I work hard for him.'

(70) Halkomelem (Gerdts, f.n.)

$ya:ys-me^?-t$
work-REL-TR
'work for him/her'/'work on him/her' [e.g. a spiritualist working a cure]

Note that the preceding Halkomelem data can also have the meaning 'work on'. The same use of 'work' with a relational suffix is found in Nooksack:

(71) Nooksack (Adams et al. 2005:9)

$^?əháy-ni-t-əs$ $tə$ $i-ł$ $šáł$
work-REL-TR-3SUB ART in-PAST sick
'he will do work on the sick'

In sum, the benefactive use of the relational suffix is limited to at most a few verbs per language. For example, we have found only two in Halkomelem. Thus, these forms are best analyzed as lexicalized.

Some Salish languages make use of a second strategy to express benefactives based on intransitive verbs; they attach a redirective suffix, which by definition should attach only

to a transitive base, to activity predicates to form relational applicatives in which the applied object is a benefactive:

- (72) Lillooet (Van Eijk 1987:312)

ʔíλ̥-ə́m-xít
sing-MDL-RDR
‘to sing for someone’

- (73) Upper Chehalis (Kinkade 1991:372)

ʔit yús-š-c.
PERF work-RDR-TR:1SG.OBJ
‘He/she worked for me.’

- (74) Comox (Watanabe 1996:331)

číł-im-ʔəm-t-umuł-as Mary.
dance-MDL-RDR-TR-1PL.OBJ-3SUB Mary
‘Mary danced for us.’

- (75) Comox (Watanabe 2003:252)

payaʔ štəm t ča-čah-am-ʔəm-t-anapi.
always 1PL.SUB CLT RED(IMPf)-pray-MDL-RDR-TR-2PL.OBJ
‘We will always be praying for you (pl).’

Again, this function is highly lexicalized, appearing on at most a couple of verbs per language.

The inability of most intransitive verbs to form benefactive applicatives in Salish languages is not surprising given the cross-linguistic propensity noted by Shibatani (1996) for benefactive constructions to favor transitive bases.

3.1.2 Malefactive

While relational applicatives are used in a limited way to express benefactives, their use for malefactive meanings is much more robust. Actually, many of the psychological events expressed as relational applicatives are negative ones. Take, for example, the list of psychological predicates occurring with the suffix *-meʔ* in the Island dialect of Halkomelem. Some are positive or neutral in meaning, depending on the context: *čəqmeʔt* ‘astonished, surprised at’, *hiləkʷmeʔt* ‘happy for’, *ʔiyəsməʔt* ‘happy for’, *siʔəmməʔt* ‘respect’, *hekʷmeʔt* ‘remember’, *siwəlmeʔt* ‘sense’, *xʷθiwənməʔt* ‘think, decide about’, *štəʔe:wənməʔt* ‘think that way about’, *xʷqʷələwənməʔt* ‘think about’. However, more denote negative experiences: *siʔsiʔmeʔt* ‘afraid, frightened of’, *qelmeʔt* ‘believe (lies)’, *xiʔxəʔmeʔt* ‘embarrassed, shy of’, *kʷiləmeʔt* ‘fed up with’, *melqmeʔt* ‘forget about’, *wəwistənməqmeʔt* ‘jealous of’, *səlsəlqʷmeʔt* ‘lonely, sad for’, *leliyəqmət* ‘mad at’, *qəlmeʔt* ‘miss’, *qiləsməʔt* ‘sad for’, *səwsəwmeʔt* ‘sad for’, *lʰəyəkʷmeʔt* ‘startled at’, *kʷeləkʷmeʔt* ‘suspicious of’, *qəsməʔt* ‘tired of waiting for’, *lciwsməʔt* ‘tired of’. The

positive or negative effect of the event is determined by the denotation of the predicate; it is the subject and not the applied object that is affected.

However, in other cases, the malefactive meaning is not supplied by the verb, which does not carry a negative connotation on its own, and thus the negative effect clearly arises as a result of the relational suffix.

- (76) Comox (Watanabe 1996:337)
 q^way-mi-θi t^θəm.
 talk-REL-TR:2SG.OBJ 1SG.SUB:FUT
 ‘I’ll scold you.’
- (77) Lushootseed (Hess and Bates 2004:183)
 yəc-bí-d ti čáčas.
 tell-REL-TR DET child
 ‘She told on the boy (and made a good story of it).’
- (78) Klallam (Montler 1996:262)
 ʔəńá-nəs-əŋ cn ʔa? cə sqáǰəʔ.
 come-REL-PASS 1SG.SUB OBL DET dog
 ‘The dog came at me.’
- (79) Comox (Watanabe 1996:335)
 łag-a-θut-mi-θ-as.
 leave-LV-TR:REFL-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB
 ‘He walked/ran out on me.’/‘He ran away from me.’
- (80) Lushootseed (Hess and Bates 2004:181)
 ʔúk^wuk^w-bi-t-s.
 play-REL-TR-1SG.OBJ
 ‘They made fun of me.’
- (81) Squamish (Kuipers 1967:351)
 na qx^w=ús-mi-ńt-as-wit.
 AUX gathered=face-REL-TR-3SUB-PL
 ‘They ganged up on him.’

The malefactive use of relational suffixes has been previously noted by only two researchers. Beaumont (1985:105) says the Sechelt suffix *-ni* is used when the action performed by the subject “works to the *disadvantage* of someone else”, and Kuipers (1974:46) notes that the Shuswap suffix *-m(i)* refers to an object that is affected indirectly, superficially, or malefactively by the action. However, it becomes obvious when data are assembled from across languages.

3.1.2.1 *Source and malefaction*. Another class of verbs that form relational applicatives is the transfer predicates. In many Salish languages, transfer predicates are intransitive (often in middle or autonomous voice) rather than transitive, and thus form relational rather than redirective applicatives:

(82) Sechelt (Beaumont 1985:104)

čʷímels-ni-t-št-kʷa čems syíyaya
 borrow-REL-1PL.SUB-FUT DET:1PL.POSS friend

ʔe če ʔúpan=ús.
 OBL DET ten=round.object

‘We’re going to borrow ten dollars from our friends.’

(83) Squamish (Kuipers 1967:343)

na kʷúl(n)-ni-t-c-as.
 AUX borrow-REL-TR-1SG.OBJ-3SUB

‘He borrowed it from me.’

(84) Lushootseed (Bates et al. 1994:172)

qáda-di-d
 steal-REL-TR
 ‘steal from someone’

(85) Comox (Watanabe 2003:256)

čəwú-ni-θ-as ʔə tə t^θ tala.
 steal-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-3SUB OBL DET 1SG.POSS money

‘He stole money from me.’

As was pointed out in section 2.1.2.2 above, redirectives with source applied objects often carry a malefactive meaning. This is because the applied object is being deprived of the theme.

3.1.2.2 *Adversative with natural phenomena*. Relational applicatives can be formed on predicates (nouns or verbs) denoting natural phenomena to express an adverse effect, such as discomfort from inclement weather, on the applied object:

(86) Thompson (L. Thompson and M. Thompson 1992:74)

čʰoz-mí-nt-i-s.
 dark-REL-TR-1PL.OBJ-3SUB

‘It gets dark on us.’

- (87) Comox (Watanabe 2003:257)
 čəł-ni-θay-əmə.
 rain-REL-TR:1SG.OBJ-PASS
 ‘I got rained on.’
- (88) Halkomelem (Gerdtts and Kiyosawa 2005b:331)
 sq^wəlq^walx^w-meʔ-t-əmə
 hail-REL-TR-PASS
 ‘(he/she/it) get hailed on’
- (89) Halkomelem (Gerdtts and Kiyosawa 2005b:331)
 yəq̣-meʔ-t-əmə
 snow-REL-TR-PASS
 ‘(he/she/it) get snowed on’

One example from Lillooet shows that the relational suffix can be suffixed to a noun to convey an attack by an animal:

- (90) Lillooet (Van Eijk 1997:122)
 miχał-mín-əmə
 bear-REL-PASS
 ‘it was eaten by a bear, he was met by a bear, ran into a bear’

Relational applicatives of nature verbs tend to be used in the passive, rather than the active. Whatever the voice, the passive is agentless: the agent (or force) is part of the meaning expressed by the predicate.

There is a small set of adversative constructions in some Salish languages that have similar properties: they always appear in an agentless passive, never as an active. For example, the Halkomelem roots for ‘get drowsy’ or ‘have a nightmare’ never appear as active transitive forms (**cətχ^wt*, **χəyχayək^wəst*) but only in the passive:

- (91) Halkomelem (Gerdtts, f.n.)
 cətχ^w-θa:m ceʔ ʔəw̄ ni:x^w məq̣ ʔə θə χix^wə.
 drowsy-TR:2PASS FUT LNK AUX.2SUB full OBL DET sea.urchin
 ‘You’re going to get drowsy when you get full of the sea urchin.’
- (92) Halkomelem (Gerdtts, f.n.)
 χəyχayək^wəs-θeləmə.
 nightmare-TR:1PASS
 ‘I had a nightmare.’

- (93) Halkomelem (Gerdts, f.n.)
- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| q̇əlq̇əlɔ̇pnəctəm | ‘get a cramp’ |
| k̇ẇələtəm | ‘get diarrhea’ |
| cɛẇatəm | ‘be swollen, bloated’ |
- (94) Squamish (Kuipers 1967:83–84)
- | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| ṫuṫɬmántm | ‘be flea-ridden’ |
| čákẇntm | ‘be worm-infested’ |
| ʔiɣ̇ẇicántm | ‘be infested with maggots’ |
| čəčicántm | ‘have convulsions’ |
| ɣiɣ̇ačíʔntm | ‘have cramp in the arm’ |
| ɣəṗk̇ẇántm | ‘be in pain’ |
| ɣəṗk̇ẇíwsntm | ‘be rheumatic’ |

This is a special use of the passive. Normally, Salish passives carry no implication of adversative; that is, they are not ‘suffer’ passive constructions like those found in some Asian languages.¹⁸

3.2 *The mapping of form and function*

Even though the distribution and usage of the suffixes paints a complex picture, several generalizations emerge from the above discussion. The concept of relational applicative, i.e. adding a non-theme participant as a core argument, thereby changing an intransitive verb into a transitive verb, must be very old in Salish, probably going back to Proto-Salish. Given the robustness of the suffix **-mi*, in terms of the number of different branches that have reflexes of this suffix, the wide range of verb classes that they attach to, and the different semantic roles of the applied objects associated with them, it is likely that this morphology was associated with the relational applicative construction in Proto-Salish.

The exact nature of the semantics of Proto-Salish **-mi* can be debated. Was it a general transitivizer devoid of semantics functioning simply to license an object? Or was it associated with a particular verb class or verb classes, as reflected in the modern languages? The former would parallel its current use in the Northern Interior Salish languages. The latter would parallel its use in Central Salish languages like Halkomelem. In Halkomelem, **-mi* is more productive on psych predicates and other verbs of internal experience, and it is most commonly associated with applied objects with the semantic role of stimulus.¹⁹ In either case, the function of **-mi* has changed over time, expanding and/or contracting in its range of meaning in the various languages.

¹⁸ See the papers by Radetzky and Smith and by Tsuboi in this volume.

¹⁹ Gerdts and Hinkson (1996), approaching the problem from a Halkomelem internal viewpoint, posit the relational applicative to be *-min*, and speculate that it grammaticalized from the instrumental suffix *-min*, which was probably a lexical suffix historically. Gerdts and Kiyosawa (2005b) argue that instruments of activity verbs are semantically parallel to indirect causes or stimuli of psychological and perception predicates. Therefore, instrumental morphology came to be used for applicatives. This is also attested in Chickasaw (Munro 2000: 292).

Other suffixes that have been added to the relational system in some languages have usurped some of the functions of **-mi* or added other functions to the relational applicative system. The suffix **-ni* may originally have been associated with transfer verbs, perhaps indicating a concept like source or malefactive. Other relational suffixes have minor usage within the family, usually localized to one sub-branch.

In languages with multiple relational suffixes, there is often considerable overlap in the functions of the different relationals; there is not a one-to-one relationship between form and function. The layering of the relational applicative suffixes over time has created a complex system of relational applicatives in the modern Salish languages.

The use of relational applicatives to express benefactive meanings is limited to only a few activity verbs. Several languages use redirective suffixes instead to express such meanings. In contrast, malefactive readings of relational applicatives are widely attested. As with redirective applicatives, the malefactive meaning may be tied in with the notion of deprivation of source applied objects of transfer verbs. Negative psychological events and adverse natural phenomena are also expressed with relational applicatives. The latter often appear as agentless passives, which are used in some Salish languages to express adverse events.

4 Non-applicative expressions of benefactives

In Salish languages, applicative constructions are the usual means of expressing benefactives, though it is also possible to use periphrastic constructions (section 4.1). The only other morphological means used for expressing benefactives is the causative (section 4.2).

4.1 *Periphrastic expressions of benefactive*

Dative and benefactive redirective constructions are obligatory in the sense that there is no non-applicative equivalent in which the theme occurs as an object and the applied object occurs as an oblique NP. So, for example, the benefactive in (95) cannot be expressed as a prepositional phrase, as in (96):

- (95) Halkomelem (Gerdt, f.n.)
 ɬʷəl-əlc-θamə cən ceʔ ʔə kʷ sce:ɬtən.
 bake-RDR-TR:2OBJ 1SUB FUT OBL DET salmon
 ‘I will bake some salmon for you.’

- (96) Halkomelem (Gerdt, f.n.)
 *ɬʷəl-ət cən ceʔ kʷ sce:ɬtən ʔə ʔ nəwə.
 bake-TR 1SUB FUT DET salmon OBL DET 2EMPH
 ‘I will bake some salmon for you.’

Nevertheless, it is possible to break down the two components of the event—the effect on the theme and the transfer of possession or benefit—and express each as a separate

predicate. This can be accomplished by means of a serial verb construction as in (97) or conjoined clauses as in (98).²⁰

(97) Halkomelem (Gerdts, f.n.)

q̣^wəl-ət cən ceʔ ḳ^w sce:ltən ʃ^wteʔ ʔə ʃ̌ nəwə.
 bake-TR 1SUB FUT DET salmon go.toward OBL DET 2EMPH
 ‘I will bake some salmon for you.’

(98) Halkomelem (Gerdts, f.n.)

q̣^wəl-ət cən ceʔ ḳ^w sce:ltən ʔiʔ niʃ s-weʔ-stamə (ceʔ).
 bake-TR 1SUB FUT DET salmon and 3EMPH NM-own-CS:2OBJ FUT
 ‘I will bake some salmon and it will be for you.’

Circumlocutions can also be used to accommodate a dative and a benefactive in the same clause; Halkomelem does not allow more than one applicative suffix per verb.

(99) Halkomelem (Gerdts, f.n.)

niʔ cən ʔam-əs-t ʃəñ ten ʔə k^wθə puk^w
 AUX 1SUB give-RDR-TR DET:2POSS mother OBL DET book
 niʃ s-weʔ-stamət.
 3EMPH NM-own-CS:2OBJ

‘I gave your mother the book that is for you.’

In the above example, information about the benefactive is given as a relative clause modifying the theme.

4.2 *Causatives used as benefactives*

The causative suffix is used in a very limited set of cases to express benefactive meanings in at least two Salish languages—Bella Coola and Halkomelem. For example, the causative suffix in Bella Coola functions like a relational applicative, attaching to intransitive stems:²¹

(100) Bella Coola (Davis and Saunders 1997:28)

nuyamł-tu-s ti ʔimlk tx ti ʔimmllki: tx.
 sing-CS-3SUB ART man DEM ART boy DEM
 ‘The man made/let the boy sing.’/‘The man sang for the boy.’

²⁰ Periphrastic constructions are also available for delegative and malefactive meanings.

²¹ Zúñiga (in prep.) also mentions the benefactive use of Bella Coola causatives, citing (100).

(101) Bella Coola (Davis and Saunders 1997:75)

tx-a-tu-s mat ʔaleks ti ɣlsx^w tx.
cut-INTR-CS-3SUB Matt Alex ART rope DEM

‘Matt made Alex cut the rope.’/‘Matt let Alex cut the rope.’/‘Matt cut the rope for Alex.’

In the above examples, both benefactive and causative meanings are possible. The benefactive reading of the object with the causative suffix is not always available. According to Davis and Saunders (1997:28), it is only available for verbs that “impute the greater motility” to their objects. If the verb involves “any spontaneous, self-initiated performance”, the clause has a causative meaning only, not a benefactive (or delegative) one:

(102) Bella Coola (Davis and Saunders 1997:75)

ɣs-tu-s ti nusʔu:lɣ tx ti ʔimlk tx.
ill-CS-3SUB ART thief DEM ART man DEM

‘The thief made the man ill.’ (*‘The thief was ill in the man’s place.’)

Gerdtts and Hukari (2006) have also noted that the causative suffix in Halkomelem can be attached to a small class of transitive verbs to express a benefactive meaning. Compare the transitive (a) examples, in which the object is a source (103) or a goal (104), with the causative (b) examples, in which the object is a benefactive:

(103) Halkomelem (Gerdtts and Hukari 2006:142–3)

a. niɬ ɬwet k^wə niʔ qeʔən-t t^θəŋ silə
3EMPH who DET AUX steal-TR DET:2POSS grandparent

ʔə k^wθə sewən-s?
OBL DET lunch-3POSS

‘Who stole your grandfather’s lunch from him?’

b. nem č ceʔ qəŋ-stəx^w t^θəŋ səlsilə
go 2SG.SUB FUT steal-CS DET:2POSS grandparent(PL)

ʔə k^wθə sciŋə.
OBL DET strawberry

‘You’re going to steal some strawberries for your grandparents.’

(104) Halkomelem (Gerdtts and Hukari 2006:143)

a. calaʔɬ-t č t^θəŋ men
borrow/lend-TR 2SG.SUB DET:2POSS father

ʔə θəŋ snəx^wəl.
OBL DET:2POSS canoe/car

‘Lend your father your car.’

- b. ni? ʔə č calaʔl-stəx^w k^wθə John ʔə k^w telə?
 AUX Q 2SG.SUB borrow/lend-CS DET John OBL DET money
 ‘Did you borrow some money for John?’

The causative suffix thus functions like a redirective applicative in these examples.

A second class of examples with this use of causative involves denominal verb constructions. Halkomelem denominal verbs (Gerdtz and Hukari 2004, 2008), formed by prefixing a verbalizer such as *c-* ‘make, have, get’ or *tx^w-* ‘buy’ to a noun, can take the causative suffix, yielding a benefactive, not a causative, meaning:

- (105) Halkomelem (Gerdtz and Hukari 2004:206)

ni? c-ʔ^heleʔ-stəx^w-əs t^hə šəšiyəł-s.
 AUX VBL-heart-CS-3SUB DET elder.sibling(PL)-3sg.POSS
 ‘He made hearts for his older brothers.’

- (106) Halkomelem (Gerdtz and Hukari 2004:206)

neṃ c-šəłtən-stamš!
 go VBL-pencil-CS:1OBJ
 ‘Go get me a pencil!’

- (107) Halkomelem (Gerdtz and Hukari 2004:206)

ni? tx^w-səplil-stəx^w-əs lə sʔeni? k^wθə meṃəṃə-s.
 AUX VBL-bread-CS-3SUB DET woman DET children-3SG.POSS
 ‘The woman bought bread for her children.’

Bella Coola denominal verbs formed by prefixing a verbalizer such as *tam-* ‘make, construct’ (Nater 1984:93) also form benefactives by means of the causative suffix:

- (108) Bella Coola (Nater 1984:40)

tam-čla-tu-m-š!
 VBL-basket-CS-1SG.OBJ-IMP
 ‘Make me a basket!’

- (109) Bella Coola (Nater 1984:40)

tam-ʔak^wna-tu-ti-m.
 VBL-sea.canoe-CS-3PL.OBJ-PASS
 ‘Somebody made them a sea canoe.’

Salish denominal verb constructions are syntactically intransitive, and thus the causative suffix functions like a relational applicative in these examples.

In sum, we see that the causative suffix functions, at least in a limited way, as a benefactive suffix in Bella Coola and Halkomelem. For causative and applicative constructions to

share morphology is not unexpected because both involve valence-increasing operations (from intransitive to transitive, or from transitive to ditransitive). Further, both take non-theme objects: the causee and the benefactive respectively. Causees in many languages, like most applied objects in Salish languages, tend to be higher animates. In fact, in some languages, e.g. Hualapai (Ichihashi-Nakayama 1996), Mapudungun (Zúñiga this volume) Orizaba Nahuatl (Tuggy 1996), and Olutec (Zavala 2000), the same suffix can be used for both causative and applicative constructions.

5 Conclusion

Evaluating events as benefactive or malefactive is a central part of the human experience, and thus languages have a way of encoding this information. The usual means for expressing them in Salish languages is with applicative constructions, in which the affected person is cast as a clausal argument. Periphrastic expressions of benefaction and malefaction are rare and considered circumlocutions (cf. section 4.1). Kiyosawa (2006) gives a thorough treatment of the form and function of the applicative suffixes found in twenty Salish languages. Applicative constructions can be grouped into two types. Redirective applicatives are formed on transitive bases and have dative, benefactive, source, and possessive applied objects (section 2.1). Relational applicatives are formed on intransitive bases and have stimulus, goal, benefactive, and malefactive applied objects (section 3.1). Each Salish language has at least one redirective suffix and one relational suffix. Only two applicative suffixes can be reconstructed for Proto-Salish: the redirective **-xi* and the relational **-mi*. The other suffixes have been innovated in sub-branches or individual languages. The innovated applicatives usurp or augment the functions of the two Proto-Salish applicatives, yielding a complex picture in the modern languages.

Most redirective suffixes allow the addition of a benefactive applied object to a transitive event. In fact, as discussed in section 2.2.3, benefactive was probably the central meaning of the Proto-Salish redirective suffix **-xi*. Its use then spread to other types of applied objects. Only half of the Salish languages use applicatives for possessive applied objects (section 2.1.4). Some branches have added new redirective suffixes for this purpose. Possessive applicatives in Salish usually carry an extra semantic “kick”: the possession (or deprivation of possession) of an object connotes a positive or negative effect on the possessor. This leads to a confusing range of translations for each example.

Adding benefactive applied objects to transitive verbs is robustly attested in all Salish languages and seems to be generalized across all verb classes. The situation with intransitive verbs is more limited (see section 3.1.1). Only a handful of activity verbs, with meanings like “sing for”, “pray for”, and “work for”, are used in this way. Some languages use relational suffixes, some use redirective suffixes, and at least one, Bella Coola, uses a causative suffix (see section 4.2) for these meanings. Moreover, a single language may use different suffixes on different verbs. Therefore, the benefactive forms of intransitive verbs seem to be lexicalized.

The precise interpretation of a redirective applicative—benefactive, delegative, or malefactive—is supplied by the context (see section 2.1.2). Verb class semantics also contributes to the meaning. For example, transfer verbs with source applied objects (appearing

with translations like “steal”, “take from”, etc.) often carry the connotation of deprivation and hence malefaction (see section 2.1.3). The situation with transfer verbs is complicated by the fact that many Salish languages cast transfer verbs as formally intransitive constructions, for example, in middle or autonomous voice. In this case, they tend to use a relational rather than a redirective applicative to express the source (see section 3.1.2.1). The relational suffix **-ni*, which appears in two branches, seems in particular to be linked to source and malefactive applied objects.

While benefactive meanings with relational applicatives are quite rare, malefactive meanings are more widely attested. Judging from its behaviour in Central Salish, the Proto-Salish relational suffix **-mi* was probably most closely tied with the notion of the stimulus in a psychological predicate, often with a negative meaning. Especially in the case of speech act verbs, we see that the relational suffix adds a malefactive meaning (see section 3.1.2). Also observed is the wide-spread use of relational suffixes to express the adverse effect of natural phenomena (see section 3.1.2.2). These constructions are frequently cast in the passive voice and thus tie in with a small set of agentless passives with negative effect found in some Salish languages.

In conclusion, expressing benefactive and malefactive meanings in Salish languages is a complex topic because no single morphological form is used to indicate them, and furthermore they are not morphologically differentiated from each other. However, compiling and examining benefactive and malefactive examples has proven to be an insightful exercise in understanding the use, history, development, and limits of the Salish applicative system.

References:

- Adams, G, Galloway, B. and Renteria, C. 2005. “A Nooksack story from 1956, how to become an Indian doctor”. *Papers for the 40th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 16:1–31.
- Aissen, J.L. 1987. *Tzotzil Clause Structure*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Bates, D, Hess, T. and Hilbert, V. 1994. *Lushootseed Dictionary*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Beaumont, R.C. 1985. *She Shashishalhem, the Sechelt Language: Language, Stories and Sayings of the Sechelt Indian People of British Columbia*. Penticton, British Columbia: Theytus Books.
- Beck, D. 2006. “Control of agreement in multi-object constructions in Upper Necaxa Totonac”. In *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the Languages of the Americas*, A. Fujimori and M.A.R. Silva (eds.), Vancouver: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Carlson, B.F. 1972. *A Grammar of Spokane: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii, Manoa, Hawaii.
- Carlson, B.F. 1980. “Two-goal transitive stems in Spokane Salish”. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:21–26.
- Carlson, B.F. and Flett, P. 1989. *Spokane Dictionary, Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6. Missoula: University of Montana Press.

- Davis, P.W. and Saunders, R. 1997. *A Grammar of Bella Coola, Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 13. Missoula: University of Montana Press.
- Doak, I.G. 1997. *Coeur d'Alene Grammatical Relations*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Donohue, M. 1999. *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*, Grammar Library Series No. 20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Driever, D. 1976. *Aspects of a Case Grammar of Mombasa Swahili, Hamburger Philologische Studien* 43. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Egesdal, S.M. and Thompson, M.T. 1998. "A fresh look at Tillamook (Hutéyu) inflectional morphology". In *Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs* 107, E. Czaykowska-Higgins and M.D. Kinkade (eds.), 235–273. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1968. "Lexical entries for verbs." *Foundations of Language* 4:373–393.
- Foley, W. 1991. *The Yimas Language of New Guinea*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fried, M. 1999. "From interest to ownership: A constructional view of external possessors". In *External Possession and Related Noun Incorporation Phenomena, Typological Studies in Language* 39, D.L. Payne and I. Barshi (eds.), 137–163. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Galloway, B.D. 1997. "Nooksack pronouns, transitivity, and control". *Papers for the 32nd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 197–243. Port Angeles, Washington.
- Gardiner, D. 1993. *Structural Asymmetries and Pre-verbal Positions in Shuswap*. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia.
- Gerdts, D.B. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Gerdts, D.B. 2004. "Halkomelem directional applicatives". *Papers for the 39th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 14:189–199.
- Gerdts, D.B. to appear. "Ditransitive constructions in Halkomelem Salish: A direct object/oblique object language". In *Studies in Ditransitive Constructions: A Comparative Handbook*, A. Malchukov, M. Haspelmath, and B. Comrie (eds.), Berlin: Mouton.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Hinkson, M. 1996. "Salish lexical suffixes: A case of decategorialization". In *Proceedings of the Conference on Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*, A. Goldberg (ed.), 163–176. Stanford, California: CSLI.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Hinkson, M. 2004. "The grammaticalization of Halkomelem 'face' into a dative applicative suffix". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70:227–250
- Gerdts, D.B. and Hukari, T.E. 2004. "Halkomelem denominal verbs". *Papers for the 39th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 14:201–214.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Hukari, T.E. 2006. "Classifying Halkomelem causatives". *Papers for the 41st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 18:129–145.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Hukari, T.E. 2008. "Halkomelem denominal verb constructions". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 74.4:489–510.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Kiyosawa, K. 2004a. "Psych predicates and applicatives in Salish". *Proceedings of the 2003 Annual CLA Conference, Département de linguistique et de didactique des langues, Université du Québec à Montréal*, 73–84.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Kiyosawa, K. 2004b. "Salish psych applicatives". *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on American Indigenous Languages. SBPL* 14:28–42.

- Gerdts, D.B. and Kiyosawa, K. 2005a. "Discourse functions of Salish applicatives". *Papers for the 40th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 16:98–124.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Kiyosawa, K. 2005b. "Halkomelem psych applicatives". *Studies in Language* 29.2:329–362.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Kiyosawa, K. 2007. "Combinatorial properties of Salish applicatives". *Papers for the 42nd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 20:176–219.
- Gerdts, D.B. and Whaley, L. 1993. "Kinyarwanda Multiple Applicatives and the 2-AEX". In *Papers from the Twenty-Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, C. Costas et al. (eds.), University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 186–205.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction, Volume I*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hess, T.M. 1967. *Snohomish Grammatical Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- Hess, T. and Bates, D. 2004. "Lushootseed applicatives and their ilk". In *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honor of M. Dale Kinkade, Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 17, D.B. Gerdts and L. Matthewson (eds.), 172–196. Missoula: University of Montana Press.
- Ichihashi-Nakayama, K. 1996. "The "applicative" in Hualapai: Its functions and meanings". *Cognitive Linguistics* 7.2:227–239.
- Kimenyi, A. 1980. *A Relational Grammar of Kinyarwanda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kinkade, M.D. 1980. "Columbian Salish -xí, -ł, -túł". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:33–36.
- Kinkade, M.D. 1982. "Transitive inflection in Moses-Columbian Salish". *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 7:49–62.
- Kinkade, M.D. 1991. *Upper Chehalis Dictionary, Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 7. Missoula: University of Montana Press.
- Kinkade, M.D. 1998. Comparative Salish seminar. Unpublished course notes, University of British Columbia.
- Kinkade, M.D. 2004. *Cowlitz Dictionary and Grammatical Sketch, Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18. Missoula: University of Montana Press.
- Kinkade, M.D. no date. Unpublished Twana field notes (June 1972).
- Kiyosawa, K. 2004. "The distribution of possessive applicatives in Interior Salish Languages". *Papers for the 39th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 14:241–252.
- Kiyosawa, K. 2006. *Applicatives in Salish Languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia.
- Kuipers, A.H. 1967. *The Squamish Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 73.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Kuipers, A.H. 1974. *The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 225.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Kuipers, A.H. 1992. "The Shuswap complex transitivizers". *Papers for the 27th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 49–53, Kamloops, British Columbia.
- Mattina, A. 1994. "-tułt, and more on Okanagan transitive forms: A working paper". *Papers for the 29th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 204–231, Pablo, Montana.

- Mattina, N. 1993. "Some lexical properties of Colville-Okanagan ditransitives". *Papers for the 28th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 265–284, Seattle, Washington.
- Montler, T.R. 1986. *An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish, Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4*. Missoula: University of Montana Press.
- Montler, T.R. 1996. "Some Klallam paradigms". *Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 257–263, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Munro, P. 2000. "The leaky grammar of the Chickasaw applicatives". *Papers from the Regional Meetings, Chicago Linguistic Society 36*, 285–310.
- Nater, H. F. 1984. *The Bella Coola Language*. Mercury Series Paper 92. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, Canadian Ethnology Service.
- Peterson, D.A. 2007. *Applicative Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Radetzky, P. and Smith, T.Y. xxxx. "An areal and typological study of benefactive and malefactive constructions". This volume.
- Rude, N. 1985. *Studies in Nez Perce Grammar and Discourse*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Shibatani, M. 1996. "Applicatives and Benefactives: A Cognitive Account." In *Grammatical Constructions: Their Form and Meaning*, M. Shibatani and S.A. Thompson (eds.), 157–194. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thompson, L.C. and Thompson, M.T. 1980. "Thompson Salish // -xi//". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:27–32.
- Thompson, L.C. and Thompson, M.T. 1992. *The Thompson Language, Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8*. Missoula: University of Montana Press.
- Tsuboi, E. xxxx. "Semantics of benefactive constructions". This volume.
- Tuggy, D. 1996. "Dative-like constructions in Orizaba Nahuatl". In *The Dative, vol. 1: Descriptive studies, Case and Grammmatical Relations across Languages, 2*, W.V.Belle and W.V. Langendonck (eds.), 407–452. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Eijk, J.P. 1987. *Dictionary of the Lillooet language*, University of Victoria, Victoria B.C.
- Van Eijk, J.P. 1997. *The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Vogt, H. 1940. *The Kalispel Language: An Outline of the Grammar with Texts, Translations, and Dictionary*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo.
- Watanabe, H. 1996. "Sliammon (Mainland Comox) transitive constructions with -ʔəm, -ni, and -mi". *Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*, 327–338, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Watanabe, H. 2003. *A Morphological Description of Sliammon, Mainland Comox Salish, with a Sketch of Syntax*. Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim Publication Series A2-040. Osaka: Osaka Gakuin University, Faculty of Informatics.
- Willett, M.L. 2003. *A Grammatical Sketch of Nxa'amxcin (Moses-Columbia Salish)*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Victoria, British Columbia.
- Zavala, M.R. 1999. "External possession in Oluta Popoluca (Mixean): Applicatives and incorporation of relational terms". In *External Possession. Typological Studies in Language 39*, D.L. Payne and I. Barshi (eds.), 339–372. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zavala, R. 2000. *Inversion and Other Topics in the Grammar of Olutec (Mixean)*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Zúñiga, F. xxxx. "Benefaction and malefaction in Mapudungun". This volume.

Zúñiga, F. In preparation. "Towards a typology of benefactives and malefactives".