RECIPROCALS

FORMS AND FUNCTIONS

Edited by

ZYGMUNT FRAJZYNGIER
TRACI S. CURL

Combinatory restrictions on Halkomelem reflexives and reciprocals

DONNA B. GERDTS

Simon Fraser University

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: *-θət* 'reflexive' (1), *-namət* 'limited control reflexive' (2), and *-təl* 'reciprocal' (3).[1]

(1)	*q̓ayθət*	'kill self'
	c̓əy̓x̌ʷθət	'dry self'
	ləx̌ʷəθət	'cover self'
	laləmθət	'look after self'
	x̌iq̓əθət	'scratch self'

(2)	*q̓aynámət*	'kill self accidentally'
	q̓ʷəq̓ʷnámət	'hit self accidentally'
	q̓añámət	'manage to get self in with them'
	yəx̌ʷnámət	'manage to set self free'
	ʔək̓ʷnámət	'hook self accidentally'

(3)	*c̓awətəl*	'help each other'
	ʔik̓ʷətəl	'separate from each other'
	maləq̓ʷtəl	'mix with each other'
	łic̓ətəl	'cut each other'
	x̌iq̓ətəl	'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 Salish 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 GRAMMATICIZED 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.   *ʔayəmθət*   'get slow'
     b.   *neɬnámət*   'manage to go'
     c.   *ʔəltəntəl*   'eat together'

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

(5)   *niʔ cən*   *ləx̌ʷə-θət.*   'I covered myself.'
     niʔ č   *ləx̌ʷə-θət.*   'You (sg.) covered yourself.'
     niʔ ct   *ləx̌ʷə-θət.*   'We covered ourselves.'
     niʔ ce:p   *ləx̌ʷə-θət.*   'You (pl.) covered yourselves.'
     niʔ   *ləx̌ʷə-θət.*   'He/she/it/they covered self.'

(6)   *niʔ cən*   *kʷələš -námət.*   'I accidentally shot myself.'
     niʔ č   *kʷələš -námət.*   'You (sg.) accidentally shot yourself.'
     niʔ ct   *kʷələš -námət*   'We accidentally shot ourselves.'
     niʔ ce:p   *kʷələš -námət*   'You (pl.) accidentally shot yourselves.'
     niʔ   *kʷələš -námət.*   'He/she/it/they accidentally shot self.'

(7)   *niʔ ct*   *ćawə-təl.*   'We helped each other.'
     niʔ ce:p   *ćawə-təl.*   'You (pl.) helped each other.'
     niʔ   *ćawə-təl.*   '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).[2] Causatives are discussed in Section 2.2. The first two suffixes are illustrated in (8) and (9):

(8) a. ni? q̓ʷaqʷ-ət-əs   ɬə   sɬeni? ʔə kʷθə sq̓əməl.
        AUX club-TR-3ERG DET woman OBL DET paddle
        'He clubbed the woman with the paddle (on purpose).'

   b. ni? q̓ʷəqʷ-nəxʷ-əs   ɬə sɬeni? ʔə kʷθə sq̓əməl.
        AUX club-L.C.TR:3OBJ-3ERG DET woman OBL DET paddle
        'He accidentally clubbed the woman with the paddle.'

(9) a. ni? cən lem-ət θə sɬeni?.
        AUX ISUB see-TR DET woman
        'I looked at the woman.'

   b. ni? cən ləm-nəxʷ   θə sɬeni?.
        AUX ISUB see-L.C.TR:3OBJ DET woman
        'I saw the woman.'

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

The majority of verb roots in Halkomelem are patient-oriented unaccusatives (Gerdts 1991, Hukari 1976), for example, q̓ʷəl 'to bake' (as in 'the bread bakes') and k̓ʷes '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) k̓ʷes 'burn'; k̓ʷesət 'burn it'; k̓ʷəsnəxʷ 'burn it accidentally'; k̓ʷesəθət 'burn self'; k̓ʷesnámət 'burn self accidentally'; k̓ʷestəl 'burn each other'

(11) həlí 'be alive'; həlít 'bring it to life'; həlínxʷ 'manage to save its life'; həlíθət 'save self'; həlinámət 'manage to save self'; həlítəl 'save each other'

(12) məq̓ 'get full of food'; məq̓ət 'fill him/her up'; məq̓nəxʷ 'swallow it accidentally'; məq̓əθət 'fill self up'; məq̓námət 'manage to fill self up'; məq̓átəl 'fill each other up'

(13) ʔiyéʔq 'change'; ʔiyéʔqt 'change it'; ʔiyéʔqnəxʷ 'get it changed'; ʔiyáʔqθət 'change places with someone'; ʔiyeʔqnámət 'manage to change places with someone'; ʔiyáʔqtəl 'change with each other'

(14) q̓ʷaqʷ 'get clubbed'; q̓ʷaqʷət 'club it'; q̓ʷəqʷnəxʷ 'club it accidentally'; q̓ʷaqʷəθət 'club self'; q̓ʷəqʷnámət 'club self accidentally'; q̓ʷəqʷətəl 'club each other'

(15) ʔak̓ʷ 'get hooked, snagged, hung up', ʔak̓ʷət 'hook it', ʔak̓ʷnəxʷ 'manage to hook it', ʔak̓ʷəθət 'hook self', ʔak̓ʷnámət 'hook self accidentally', ʔak̓ʷtəl 'get hung up with each other'

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

Throughout this paper I refer to these suffixes as -θət, -namət, and -təl, 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 pronominal form.[3] In fact, Gerdts (1988b) gives the following template for Halkomelem verb morphology:[4]

(16)
−1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
prefixes	root +aspect	applicative suffixes; lexical suffixes	transitivity suffixes	object suffixes; reflexive suffixes; reciprocal suffix	subject suffixes

The suffixes -θət, -namət, and -təl are actually portmanteau forms consisting of combinations of +2 and +3 morphemes. In this regard, the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes are identical to the pronominal object suffixes, which are also portmanteau forms. See, for instance, the examples in (17) with first person objective suffixes.

(17) a. ni? q̓ʷaqʷ-əθámš-əs   ɬə sɬeni?.
        AUX club-TR:1OBJ-3ERG DET woman
        'The woman clubbed me (on purpose).'

   b. ni? q̓ʷəqʷ-námš-əs   ɬə sɬeni?.
        AUX club-L.C.TR:1OBJ-3ERG 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.

(18)

		Objects	T- objects	N-objects
	1SG	*-saṁš*	*-θaṁš*	*-naṁš*
	2SG	*-samə*	*-θamə*	*-namə*
	3SG/PL	Ø	*-t*	*-nexʷ*
	1PL	*-aĺxʷ*	*-taĺxʷ*	*-naĺxʷ*
	2PL	*-alə*	*-talə*	*-nalə*
	REF	*-sat*	*-θat*	*-namət*
	REC	*-al*	*-tal*	–

We see that the reflexive forms pattern with the the first and second person singular forms. In T-objects, the sequence of /t + s/ is realized as *θ*. This is a morphophonemic process occurring only in the context of the pronominal paradigm. Elsewhere, *ts* sequences are permitted, for example, in *hiṁat-s* 'his/her costume' and *šxʷitət-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 *qəx̌θát* 'get to be lots', *ṗəłtál* 'sobered each other up', and *x̌əłtál* 'hurt each other'. When unstressed, the vowel reduces to schwa.[5] Furthermore, the vowel of the reflexive and reciprocal triggers vowel harmony, changing an *e* in the stem to *a*.

(19)

łen	'be out of sight'	*ła:nθat*	'conceal self'
xʷeʔ	'decrease'	*xʷaʔθat*	'cut one's weight down'
ʔeɬʷθət	'wipe it'	*ʔaɬʷəθat*	'wipe self'
ʔeɬʷθət	'wipe it'	*ʔaɬʷətəl*	'wipe each other'
ćewət	'help him/her'	*ćawətəl*	'help each other'
lemət	'look at him/her'	*lamtəl*	'look at each other'

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

Determining the underlying form for the limited control suffix *-namət* 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 *ns* sequences are otherwise allowed, as in *men-s* 'his/her father'. So the form *at* rather than *sat* is expected for limited control. The *am* is still unaccounted for. We notice, however, that the third person form *nexʷ* 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 /nem + sat/, vowel harmony, reduction of the unstressed vowel to *ə*, and deletion of the *s* in the context of limited

control would yield *namət*. 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 *ət* derives from the reflexive pronoun.

To summarize, I have argued that the forms *-θət* 'reflexive' , *-namət* '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 portmanteau 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 absolutive (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) *niʔ ʔiməš kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ.*
   AUX walk DET man
   'The man walked.'

(21) *niʔ kʷələš-t-as   kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ kʷθə speʔəθ.*
   AUX shoot-TR-3ERG DET man   DET bear
   'The man shot the bear.'

(22) *niʔ kʷələš-θáṁš-as   kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ.*
   AUX shoot-TR:1OBJ-3ERG 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 absolutives, 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) *niʔ kʷələš-θət(*-əs)   kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ.*
   AUX shoot-TR:REF-3ERG DET man
   'The man shot himself.'

(24) *niʔ kʷələš-namət(*-əs)   kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ.*
   AUX shoot-L.C.TR:REF-3ERG DET man
   'The man accidentally shot himself.'

(25) *ʔiʔ ha:qʷə-tə́l(*-əs)   tə sqʷəmqʷəméy̓.*
     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 Gerdts (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 kʷələš-t-əs   kʷθə John kʷθə speʔəθ.*
     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) *niʔ kʷələš-θət   kʷθə John.*
     AUX shoot-TR:REF DET John
     'John shot himself.'

(28) *niʔ kʷələš-namət   kʷθə John.*
     AUX shoot-L.C.TR:REF DET John
     'John accidentally shot himself.'

(29) *niʔ ćawə-təl kʷθə John ʔiʔ Bob.*
     AUX help-REC DET John and Bob
     'John and Bob helped each another.'

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*. Gerdts (1988b) has shown that Halkomelem causatives can be formed on intransitive bases (30), but not on transitive bases (31):[7]

(30) *niʔ cən ʔiməš-stəxʷ   tθə swiẃləs.*
     AUX ISUB walk-CS:TR:3OBJ DET boy
     'I made the boy walk.'

(31)**niʔ cən q̓ʷəl-ət-stəxʷ   tə słeniʔ (ʔə) kʷθə səplíl.*
     AUX ISUB bake-TR-CS: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) *niʔ cən kʷələš-θət-stəxʷ   tə Mary.*
     AUX ISUB shoot-TR:REF-CS:3OBJ DET Mary
     'I made Mary shoot herself.'

(33) *ʔiʔ cən ha:qʷə-təl-stəxʷ   tə sqʷəmqʷəméy̓.*
     AUX ISUB smell:CONT-TR:REC-CS:3OBJ 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 causer 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)

łićaθət	'cut self'	*łićaθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her cut self'
qiq̓əθət	'bind self'	*qiq̓əθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her bind self'
ćəy̓xʷθət	'dry self'	*ćəy̓xʷθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her dry self'
x̌iq̓əθət	'scratch self'	*x̌iq̓əθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her scratch self'
haqʷəθət	'smell self'	*haqʷəθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her smell self'
q̓ik̓ʷəθət	'bite self'	*q̓ik̓ʷəθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her bite self'
ʔaɬəθət	'wipe self'	*ʔaɬəθətstəxʷ*	'make him/her wipe self'

(35)

ćawətəl	'help each other'	*ćawətəlstəxʷ*	'make them help e.o.'
ći:təl	'thank e.o.'	*ći:təlstəxʷ*	'make them thank e.o'
ɬ̓ek̓ʷətəl	'shine light on e.o.'	*ɬ̓ek̓ʷətəlstəxʷ*	'make them shine light on e.o.'
x̌iq̓ətəl	'scratch e.o.'	*x̌iq̓ətəlstəxʷ*	'make them scratch e.o.'
haqʷətəl	'smell each other'	*haqʷətəlstəxʷ*	'make them smell e.o.'
łićətəl	'cut each other'	*łićətəlstəxʷ*	'make them cut e.o.'
ʔik̓ʷətəl	'separate from e.o.'	*ʔik̓ʷtáləstəxʷ*	'make them separate from each other'
łišətəl	'bite each other'	*łišətəlstəxʷ*	'make them chew e.o. up'

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.[8]

The two elements of the Halkomelem reflexive and reciprocal suffixes might seem contradictory; these suffixes are both transitivizers and intransitivizers. However, the transitivizing 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 intransitivizing 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 (Gerdts 1989a) similarly shows stacked morphology: a transitive suffix *-t* is followed by an intransitivizing suffix *-əm*, as seen by comparing the active clause in (36a) with the corresponding passive in (36b).

(36) a. *niʔ kʷəlaš-t-əs kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ kʷθə speʔəθ.*
AUX shoot-TR-3ERG DET man   DET bear
'The man shot the bear.'

b. *niʔ kʷəlaš-t-əm kʷθə speʔəθ ʔə kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ.*
AUX shoot-TR-INTR DET man   OBL DET man
'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 transitivizing and an intransitivizing 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 Gerdts (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.[9] 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 Gerdts (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 *ʔə*.

(37) *niʔ ʔa:m-əs-θámš-əs ʔə kʷθə pukʷ.*
AUX give-GOAL-TR:IOBJ-3ERG OBL DET book
'He gave me the book.'

(38) *niʔ q̓ʷəl-əɬc-θámš-əs ʔə kʷθə sce:ɬtən.*
AUX bake-BEN-TR:IOBJ-3ERG OBL DET salmon
'He baked the salmon for me.'

The suffix *-əs*, which appears as *-əs* when it is unstressed, marks the goal applicative, while the suffix *-ɬc* marks the benefactive applicative.[10] Additional examples of these suffixes are given in (39) and (40):

(39)
ʔeʔəm	'give'	*ʔa:məst*	'give it to him/her'
xʷayəm	'sell'	*xʷayəməst*	'sell it to him/her'
ʔiw̓-	'instruct'	*ʔiw̓əst*	'show it to him/her'
yəθ-	'tell'	*yəθəst*	'tell him/her about it'
k̓ʷəɬ	'spill'	*k̓ʷɬəst*	'throw liquid on him/her'

(40) q̓ʷələt   'bake it'   q̓ʷələłcət   'bake it for him/her'
     θəyt   'fix it'   θəyəłcət   'fix it for him/her'
     x̌ələt   'write it'   x̌ələłcət   'write it for/to him/her'
     kʷənət   'take it'   kʷənəłcət   'take it for him/her'
     p̓ełθət   'sew it'   p̓ełθəłct   'sew it for him/her'

As the data in (41) and (42) show, the reflexive suffix -θət cannot follow an applicative suffix.

(41)*niʔ   cən   q̓ʷəl-əłc-θət.
     AUX 1SUB bake-BEN-REFL
     'I cooked it for myself.'

(42)   *ʔa:məsθət   'give it to self'
     *ʔiwəsθət   'show it to self'
     *yəθəsθət   'tell self about it'
     *θəyəłcθət   'fix it for self'
     *p̓ełθəłcθət   'sew it for self'

Thus, we see the reflexive cannot refer to a goal or benefactive. The generalization is expressed in (43).[11]

(43) The reflexive -θət can only refer to a theme nominal.

However, as pointed out in Gerdts (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 -əm appears instead of the transitive suffix.

(44) niʔ   cən   q̓ʷəl-əłc-əm.
     AUX 1SUB bake-BEN-INTR
     'I cooked it for myself.'

(45) ʔiləqəłcəm   'buy it for self'
     q̓iẃəłcəm   'hang it for self'
     θəyəłcəm   'fix it for self'
     łq̓ʷəłcəm   'break it for self'
     łθx̌əłcəm   'wash it for self'

The suffix -əm, 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.[12] 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) nem   č   ʔiləq-əłc-əm.
     go   2SUB buy-BEN-INTR
     'Go buy it for me!'

Thus, the object cancellation contruction 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 Gerdts (1989b) notes, object cancellation is not clause-bounded. The cancelled object can be coreferential with the main clause subject if the main clause contains a speech-act verb, as in the following example:

(47) cse-t   cən   ceʔ   łə   słeniʔ   ʔəẃ   q̓ʷəl-əłc-əm-əs   ʔə   kʷθə
     tell-TR 1SUB FUT DET woman COMP bake-BEN-INTR-3SSUB OBL DET
     sce:łtən.
     salmon
     '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 clausemate subject:

(48)*cse-t   cən   ceʔ   łə   słeniʔ   ʔəẃ   q̓ʷəl-əłc-θət-əs   ʔə
     tell-TR 1 SUB FUT DET woman COMP bake-BEN-TR:REF-3SSUB OBL
     kʷθə sce:łtən.
     DET salmon
     'I'm telling the woman to bake the salmon for me.'

(49)*cse-t   ct   ceʔ   łə   słeniʔ   ʔəẃ   q̓ʷəl-əłc-təl-əs   ʔə
     tell-TR 1PLSUB FUT DET woman COMP bake-BEN-TR:REC-3SSUB OBL
     kʷθə sce:łtən.
     DET salmon
     '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) niʔ cən   q̓ʷəl-əłc-námət.
   AUX 1SUB cook-BEN-L.C.REF
   'I managed to cook for myself.'

(51) niʔ ct   q̓wəl-əłc-təl.
   AUX 1PL cook-BEN-TR:REC
   '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) niʔ ʔə č   ʔiləq-əłc-námət?
   AUX INT 2SUB buy-BEN-L.C.REFL
   'Did you manage to buy it for yourself?'

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

(53) ʔa:məstəl   'give it to each other'
  ʔiwəstəl   'show it to each other'
  ʔa:łcətəl   'ask each other for it'
  p̓et̓ᶿəłctəl   'sew it for each other'
  ʔiləqəłctəl   '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 cancellation 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.[13] Some lexical suffixes and the corresponding free nouns in Halkomelem are given in (54):

(54) -as   'face, round object'   sʔaθəs   'face'
  -cəs   'hand, finger'   celəš   'hand'
  -šən   'foot, leg'   sx̌eñə   'foot'
  -ʔex̌ən   'arm, wing'   ɫelə   'arm, wing'
  -wil   'rib, vessel'   ləwəx̌   'rib'

-θən   'mouth, edge'   θaθən   'mouth'
-ewtxʷ   'building, room'   leləm̓   'house'
-əyəł   '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) łiw̓iʔəł-éw̓txʷ   'church' (pray + building)
  ɫaləm̓-əłp   'wild cherry tree' (wild cherry + plant)
  ʔitət-ə́lwət   'pajamas' (sleep + clothing)
  təməł-ə́psəm   'woodpecker' (ochre + neck)
  q̓ʷłey̓-šən   'shoe' (log + foot)
  šeləm-cəs   'ring' (encircle + finger)

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

(56) q̓ʷs-ey̓ən   'set a net' (throw out + net)
  səw̓q̓-iw̓s   'search for a lost person' (seek + body)
  ɫəc̓-ə́lqən   'shear wool' (cut + hair)
  q̓ʷəm-əw̓s   'pluck a bird' (pluck + body)
  t̓ᶿx̌ʷ-eʔł   'wash diapers' (wash + flexible material)
  p̓t̓ᶿ-əlməxʷ   'milk a cow' (wring out + breast)

Lexical suffixation 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 notional 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) niʔ yəq̓ʷ-əlcəp łə   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 notional possessor is the syntactic object of the clause.

(58) *niʔ   tši-ʔqʷ-t-əs   łə   słeniʔ   kʷθə sqʷəméy̓.*
     AUX comb-hair-TR-3ERG DET woman DET dog
     'The woman combed the dog's hair.'

(59) *niʔ   ʔə č   θəy-eʔł-θámš?*
     AUX INT 2OBJ make-flexible.material-TR:1OBJ
     '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 *-θət* (60a, 61a); instead they use a middle construction, based on the general intransitive suffix (60b, 61b).[14]

(60) a. **niʔ   cən   ɫ̓əx̌ʷ-šé-θət.*
     AUX 1SUB wash-foot-TR:REFL
     'I washed my feet.'

     b. *niʔ   cən   ɫ̓əx̌ʷ-šén-əm.*
     AUX 1SUB wash-foot-INTR
     'I washed my feet.'

(61) a. **niʔ   ʔəx̌-ayθí(n)-θət.*
     AUX scrape-CON:mouth-TR:REFL
     'He shaved.'

     b. *niʔ   ʔəx̌-ayθín-əm.*
     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) *ʔeʔłθ-šə-t*   'wiping his/her feet'   *ʔeʔłθ-šən-əm̓*   'wiping one's feet'
     šk̓ʷ-əyəł-t   'bathe his/her baby'   *šk̓ʷ-əy̓ł-əm*   'bathe one's baby'
     ləmš-ən̓ə-t   'braid his/her hair'   *ləmš-ən̓ə-m*   'braid one's hair'
     sew̓q̓-əw̓tx̌ʷ-t   'looking for a house   *sew̓q̓-əw̓tx̌ʷ-əm̓*   'looking for a
          for him/her'   house for oneself'

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

(63) *seʔ-šén-əm*   'raise one's foot'
     seʔ-cs-əm   'raise one's hand'
     ɫ̓əx̌ʷ-cs-əm   'wash one's hands'
     łic̓-áʔqʷ-əm   'get a haircut'
     tš-iʔqʷ-əm   'comb one's hair'

     łq̓ʷ-elčə-m   'cut one's hair'
     x̌ʷɫ̓əł-qín-əm   'quench one's thirst'
     ɫ̓θx̌ʷ-əlnəs-əm   'brush one's teeth'
     q̓p-as-əm   'assemble, gather face to face'
     x̌ʷʔəɫ̓θ-əlqsən-əm   'wipe one's nose'

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) *x̌ʷɫəx̌ʷəw̓ –iʔc-námət*   'manage to wash one's back'
     x̌ʷłiq̓ʷ-əs-námət   'manage to punch oneself in the face'

(65) *kʷənə-cəs-təl*   'hold hands'
     ləmš -ən̓ə-təl   'braid each other's hair'
     x̌ʷɫ̓əɫ̓q̓ʷ-ás-təl   'boxing' (punch + face)
     x̌ʷƛ̓əy̓kʷ-əs-təl   'wink eye at each other'
     x̌ʷθq̓ʷ-as-təl   'meet each other face to face'
     x̌ʷmək̓ʷə-θə-təl   'kiss each other's mouths'
     x̌ʷłix̌ -əs-təl   '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 Gerdts (1981), then the external possessor originates as the possessor of the theme and ascends to the object position.[15] 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 *-θət* 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)	Simple transitives	Applicatives	Lexical suffixes
Reflexives	yes	no	no
Limited control reflexives	yes	yes	yes
Reciprocals	yes	yes	yes

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.[16] Thus, constraint (43) rules out reflexives in these constructions, though reciprocals and limited controlled reflexives are allowed. Second, Gerdts and Hinkson (1996) hypothesize that the applicative markers are actually lexical suffixes. The goal applicative suffix, -as, is the lexical suffix for 'face'. Forms 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 grammaticized 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 -θət, but applicative clauses use object cancellation (67), and clauses with lexical suffixes use a middle construction (68).

(67) niʔ   cən   q̓ʷəl-ətc-əm.
     AUX ISUB bake-BEN-INTR
     'I cooked it for myself.'

(68) niʔ   ʔəx̌-ay-θín-əm.
     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-t   cən   ceʔ   ɬə   sɬeniʔ   ʔəẁ   tš-iʔqʷ-əm-əs.
     tell-TR ISUB FUT DET woman COMP 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.[17]

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 -θət has the grammaticized meaning of 'inchoative' (Section 4.1). The limited control reflexive -namət has the grammaticized meaning of 'manage to' (Section 4.2). The reciprocal -təl 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, q̓ʷəl 'to bake' (as in 'the bread bakes') and k̓ʷes 'to burn' (as in 'the house burns'), and these always have transitive counterparts, for example, q̓ʷəl-ət 'to bake it', and k̓ʷes-t '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 statives, and in this case, as in many languages of the world, the reflexive suffix takes on the meaning of inchoative, that is, change of state.[18]

(70) ʔayəm   'slow'   ʔayəmθət   'get slow'
     θi   'big'   θiθát   'get big'
     q̓i:ləm 'old'   q̓i:ləmθət 'get old'
     scəẃét 'adept, clever'   scəẃátθət 'become clever'
     x̌eƛ̓   'stormy'   x̌aƛ̓θət   'get stormy'
     ƛ̓əx̌ʷ   'hard'   ƛ̓əx̌ʷθát   'get hard'
     sɬeɬp̓   'floppy'   ɬəɬp̓θət   'go flat (a tire)'

λ̓am	'be enough'	λ̓aməθət	'ease up a little (e.g. widthwise)'
ʔayáʔθ	'sharp'	ʔayáʔθθət	'get sharp'
ʔiyəs	'happy'	ʔiyəsθət	'get happy'
qəx̌	'be lots'	qəx̌θát	'get to be lots', 'be too many'

The use of the reflexive here is unexpected from a structural point of view, since there are no corresponding transitive forms *which* can serve as a basis for the reflexives. The forms in the first column cannot appear with the transitive suffix -*t*; examples like **ʔayəmət* 'slow it', **θit* 'big it', **q̓i:ləmət* 'old it', etc. are all ill-formed. However, if we propose that the combination of transitive plus reflexive in these examples has undergone reanalysis to form a single suffix meaning 'inchoative' in cases like (70), then the lack of a transitive counterpart is not an issue. In other words, a form like *ʔayəmθət* does not have the structure in (71a), but rather the structure in (71c), which derives from the reanalysis of the structure in (71b).

(71) a. [[[ʔayəm] *t*] *sat*]   [[[slow] transitive] reflexive]
     b. [ʔayəm [*t* + *sat*]]   [slow [transitive + reflexive]]
     c. [ʔayəm [*θat*]]   [slow [inchoative]]

Since the reanalyzed form has the grammaticized meaning of 'inchoative', it should only occur on states, as in (70), and not in transitive contexts. Thus, the reflexive and inchoative uses of -*θət* occur on distinct verb classes.

We have seen that the reflexive suffix is used in two ways, as a core reflexive meaning 'self' and as an inchoative. The question arises, which is the original use of the suffix and which is the innovative or secondary use? Based on the fact that the reflexive morphology patterns with the transitive objective morphology, I claimed above that the core use was original. Furthermore, it is easy to see how this usage could extend to a more aspectual use such as the inchoative. The transitive element of the suffix is obscured by morphophonological fusion. In addition, although reflexive constructions involve two argument structure positions, they are syntactically intransitive and thus have no additional inflectional requirements beyond those of a statives or other verbs that have a single argument structure position. Positing the opposite history, that the inchoative became a reflexive, is more problematic and contrary to other cases in the grammaticization literature.

A second argument that the core reflexive is the primary use of the suffix is based on productivity. As mentioned above, the majority of verb roots in Halkomelem are process unaccusatives that allow transitive counterparts formed with the transitive suffix -*t*. In addition, whenever the semantics is plausible, a core reflexive counterpart is possible. In contrast, the inchoative use of reflexive is fairly rare. Although probably not exhaustive, the list in (70) includes most of the forms in my data. Inchoative forms are more normally represented by the prefix *x̌ʷə-*, as in the following examples taken from Hukari and Peter (1995):

(72) a.   x̌ʷəq̓áq̓iʔ   'get sick'
       x̌ʷəʔəx̌ʷín   'become small'
       x̌ʷəx̌ʷátəs   'get heavy'
       x̌ʷək̓ʷámk̓ʷam   'get strong'
       x̌ʷəsíʔem   'become important, respected'
       x̌ʷəstətés   'get near'
       x̌ʷəx̌ʷθíqən   'get loud'
    b.   x̌ʷəx̌ʷáňčənəm   'start running'
       x̌ʷəʔímaš   'start walking'
       x̌ʷəq̓ʷáq̓ʷəl̓   'start talking'
    c.   x̌ʷənéʔənt   'become evening'
       x̌ʷəšnéʔəm   'become a shaman'
       x̌ʷəsλ̓íʔλ̓qəl   'turned into a child'

The inchoative prefix is used on a variety of categories, including stative verbs (72a), unergative verbs (72b), and nouns (72c). Further research is needed to determine the distinction between the two Halkomelem inchoatives. Relevant to this paper is the point that the inchoative use of the reflexive suffix is a relatively limited phenomenon.

4.2. *The 'manage to' use of the limited control reflexive*

We have seen above that the limited control reflexive -*namət* can carry the meaning of performing an action on oneself unintentionally, accidentally, or with difficulty. This suffix also productively occurs on unergative verbs, that is, intransitive verbs whose single argument is prototypically an animate agent that is in control of the action. Unergative verbs in Halkomelem include verbs of activity and motion (Gerdts 1991). When -*namət* appears on an unergative verb, it carries the meaning 'manage to', that is, to succeed in performing an action despite difficulty. Here are just some of the many examples of this use of -*namət*:

(73) ʔəłtənnámət   'manage to eat'
     ya:ysnámət   'manage to work'
     q̓ʷəyələšnámət   'manage to dance'
     ɬak̓ʷnámət   'manage to come home'
     ṗək̓ʷnámət   'manage to come to the surface'
     nəqəmnámət   'manage to dive'
     šaq̓ʷəlnámət   'manage to get across'
     tecəlnámət   'manage to get here'
     təsnámət   'manage to get there'
     ləmc̓elsnámət   'manage to pick (berries)'

x̌ʷčenəmnámət	'manage to run'
te:mnámət	'manage to call'
ɬiləmnámət	'manage to sing'
ɬiẃiʔəɬnámət	'manage to pray'
xʷiyəne:ṁnámət	'manage to listen'
qʷəlnámət	'manage to speak'
ʔəmətnámət	'manage to sit down'
ɬx̌iləšnámət	'manage to stand'
ca:mnámət	'manage to go up into the mountains'
ɬax̌ʷnámət	'manage to go down to the beach'
ʔənəx̌ʷnámət	'manage to stop'

The extension of *-namət* to intransitive verbs is reminiscent of what has been re-ferred to as the 'fake reflexive' phenomenon in English. As Levin (1993) and others have noted, resultative constructions are generally limited to transitive (*We painted the town red*) or unaccusative (*The can squashed flat*) contexts. Unergatives do not straightforwardly serve as a base for resultatives (*She danced silly*). However, an unergative can form a resultative if it is turned into a fake reflexive:

(74) The children danced themselves silly.
      He laughed himself blue in the face.
      Mary ran herself ragged.
      John cried himself to sleep.

Such expressions are not true reflexives, since they do not appear except in resultatives:

(75) *The children danced themselves.
      *He laughed himself.
      *Mary ran herself.
      *John cried himself.

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

(76) ʔəɬtən 'eat'   *ʔəɬtənt 'eat it'[19] *ʔəɬtənθət 'eat self'
      ya:ys   'work'   *ya:yst   'work it'   *ya:ysθət   'work self'
      q̇ʷəyələš 'dance' *q̇ʷəyələšt 'dance it'   *q̇ʷəyələšθət 'dance self'

Thus, we see that there are no corresponding transitive or reflexive forms for the examples in (73). As in the case of the grammaticized use of the reflexive discussed in the previous section, this is not a puzzle if we assume that the limited control transitive suffix and the reflexive suffix have undergone reanalysis into a single morpheme *-namət* with the grammaticized meaning of 'manage to'.

Additional evidence for a grammaticized form *-namət* meaning 'manage to' comes from double reflexive examples:

(77) ɬa:nθət 'conceal self'   ɬa:nθətnámət 'manage to conceal self'
      θx̌ʷaθət 'take self out of sight'   θx̌ʷaθətnámət 'manage to take self out of sight'

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

(78) ʔiyəsθət 'get happy'   ʔiyəsθətnámət 'manage to cheer up'
      q̇i:ləmθət 'get old'   q̇i:ləmθətnámət '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 *-namət*, but semantically it patterns with unergatives, since the resulting form does not have a referential mean-ing.

Clearly, more research on the semantics of *-namət* 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 counter-parts with the general transitive suffix *-t*. They also form reciprocals with *-tal*, pro-vided 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 recip-rocal. 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 'to-gether'. 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 col-lective meaning.

(79) a. ʔəɬtəntal   'eat together'
          ya:ystal   'work together'
          ʔiməštal   'walk together'
          q̇ʷəyíləštal 'dance together'
      b. ʔəmšástal   'walk around together' [*-as* 'face']
          waʔšatal   'dance together (Indian dance)' [*-šən* 'foot']
      c. ʔiyəstal   'happy together' [*-as* 'face']

None of these forms has a counterpart with the transitive suffix -t: *ʔəltənt, *ya:yst, 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 has (at least) two semantic arguments. Furthermore, transitive suffixes in Halkomelem indicate the degree of control of the agent over the action. The general transitive suffix -t indicates transitivity with the implication of control by an animate agent, while the suffix -n signals lack of control, that is, that the action was done unintentionally, accidentally, or with great difficulty. The referential suffixes, which appear in the position of object agreement suffixes, 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 the case for simple transitive actions involving an agent and a theme. However, transitive clauses of other sorts are possible in Halkomelem, including applicative constructions and external possessor constructions containing a lexical suffix, the

Salish 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. The general intransitive marker -əm appears instead of -θət following applicatives and lexical suffixes. I claim that these facts follow from a constraint in Halkomelem that restricts the reflexive to themes.

We might also expect, given that the first element of each reflexive or reciprocal suffix is a transitive marker, that reflexive and reciprocal suffixes would never appear on forms that do not have transitive counterparts. However, we find examples of this type for all three suffixes. The two elements of a reflexive or reciprocal suffix, I claim, undergo reanalysis into a unit which takes on a grammaticized meaning. The reflexive -θət means 'inchoative', the limited control reflexive -namət means 'manage to', and the reciprocal -təl means 'collective'.

The chart in (80) summarizes the differences between the core (A) and the grammaticized (B) uses of the reflexive and reciprocal suffixes.

(80)

Form/Meaning	Base verb class	t-Transitive Counterpart
Reflexive -θət		
A: action on self	Process unaccusatives	yes
B: inchoative	Statives	no
Limited control reflexive -namət		
A: accidental action on self	Process unaccusatives	yes
B: 'manage to'	Unergatives	no
Reciprocal -təl		
A: action on each other	Process unaccusatives	yes
B: collective	Unergatives, statives	no

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 straightforwardly mean 'self' or 'each other'. The grammaticized suffixes appear only sporadically, on verb forms where the -t transitive suffix is impossible, such as unergatives and statives, and they have meanings that are more aspectual than referential.

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 focussed 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 transitives 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 suffixation.

Halkomelem is a polysynthetic language with a dozen prefixes, several infixes, and over two hundred suffixes. This paper, in documenting some of the combinatory restrictions on Halkomelem affixation, is a step toward developing a theory of morphosyntax able to account for polysynthetic languages.

Acknowledgements

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, CON = connective, CONT = continuative, CS = causative, DET = determiner, ERG = ergative, FUT = future, INT = interrogative, INTR = intransitive, L.C. = limited control, OBJ = object, OBL = oblique, PL = plural, REC = reciprocal, REF = reflexive, SG = singular, SUB = subject, SSUB = subordinate subject, TR = transitive.
2. The causative suffix -st probably consists of a causative suffix -s and the transitive suffix -t.
3. Another form, the reflexive causative, -stənamət, which can mean 'manage to make self do something' or 'pretend to do something', is not discussed here. See Gerdts (1995).
4. This chart only covers basic forms. In other forms, such as passives or causatives based on reflexives, the transitivizing and intransitivizing suffixes stack up in complex ways that are difficult to represent in the template format.

5. I do not mark primary stress when it falls on the first syllable, the most common location of stress in Halkomelem. Otherwise it indicated by an acute accent.
6. The passive, antipassive, or cleft equivalent of this clause could be used to bypass the constraint against proper noun ergatives.
7. Gerdts (1988b, 1991) details further restrictions on causatives. Not all intransitives form causatives. To express causatives on notional transitives, an antipassive base is used.
8. Gerdts (1989b) gives a Relational Grammar analysis of Halkomelem reflexives involving multiattachment and cancellation, following Rosen's (1988) analysis of Italian reflexives.
9. Actually, this generalization is stated more precisely making use of the Relational Grammar notion of multiattachment. The restriction in RG terms is that transitive marking occurs where there is a nominal heading both a 2-arc and a final term arc.
10. Gerdts (1988b) also discusses two other applicative constructions, involving stimuli and directionals.
11. Gerdts (1988b) couches this generalization in Relational Grammar. The reflexive can only refer to an initial 2, not a 2 that arises from 3-to-2 or BEN-to-2 advancement.
12. As Gerdts (1988b) points out, antipassives of applicative constructions are not possible in Halkomelem. So the translation 'I cooked it for someone' is not available for (44).
13. If there is a resemblance, as in the case of 'face' and 'mouth' in (57), it is because the noun contains the lexical suffix.
14. The final -n of a lexical suffix is deleted before a suffix starting with the transitive -t.
15. Alternatively, we could posit that the external possessor is semantically an oblique nominal—the affectee (Farrell 1994). This nominal would then advance to object position in the same fashion as goal and benefactive applicatives. Under this analysis, the affectee is not the theme and therefore could not be reflexivized, per (43).
16. It does not matter whether the rules deriving applicative objects and external possessors as objects are considered lexical or syntactic, since the condition in (43) is stated in terms of thematic roles.
17. Gerdts (1993) proposes that applicatives and reflexives are mutually exclusive in Halkomelem because the first requires linking an object position, while the second requires the cancellation of the object position. This would be a coding conflict. A comparison of similar constructions across languages would be necessary in order to substantiate this proposal.
18. The reflexive suffix can also appear on nouns and in this case takes on the meaning of 'acting like', as in λi?λ̓q̓əłθət 'acting childish', x̌ʷəlmax̌ʷθət 'acting like a First Nations person', spəpéʔəθθət 'acting like a bear.' Van Eijk (1988) discusses this use of the equivalent form in Lillooet, an Interior Salish language.
19. There are two verbs 'eat' in Halkomelem: intransitive ʔəłtən and transitive ləy̓x̌ -t.

References

Brugman, Claudia. To appear. Metaphor in the Elaboration of Grammatical Categories in Mixtec.

Farrell, Patrick. 1994. *Thematic Relations, Relational Networks, and Multistratal Representations*. New York: Garland.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1981. A Syntactic Analysis of Lexical Suffixes in Halkomelem Salish. Paper presented at the 7th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.

———— 1988a. "A nominal hierarchy in Halkomelem clausal organization". *Anthropological Linguistics*, 30.1: 20–36.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1988b. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland.
—— 1989a. "Object agreement in the Halkomelem Salish passive: A morphological explanation". In M. R. Key and H. Hoenigswald (eds.), *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics: In remembrance of Stanley Newman* (Contributions to the Sociology of Language). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 185–200.
—— 1989b. "Relational parameters of reflexives: the Halkomelem evidence". In D. Gerdts and K. Michelson (eds.), *Theoretical Perspectives on Native American Languages*. New York: State University of New York Press, 259–80.
—— 1991. "Unaccusative mismatches in Halkomelem Salish". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 57(2): 230–50.
—— 1993. "Mapping Halkomelem grammatical relations". *Linguistics* 31: 591–622.
—— 1995. Halkomelem causatives revisited. Paper presented at the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, University of Victoria.
—— and Mercedes Q. Hinkson. 1996. "Salish lexical suffixes: A case of decategorialization". In A. Goldberg (ed.), *Proceedings of the Conference on Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*. Stanford, California: CSLI, 163–76.
Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. "Transitivity in Halkomelem". *Working Papers for the 11th International Conference on Salishan Languages*, Seattle, Washington.
—— and Ruby Peter (eds). 1995. *Hul'qumi'num Dictionary*. Cowichan Tribes.
Kemmer, Suzanne. 1997. Reciprocals and their semantic affinities: Where unity meets multiplicity. Paper presented at the Symposium on Reflexives and Reciprocals, University of Colorado, Boulder.
Leslie, Adrian R. 1979. A grammar of the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem Salish. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Victoria.
Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1985. "Multiple uses of reciprocal constructions". *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 5: 19–41.
—— To appear. "Reciprocals and related meanings in To'aba'ita". In V. Nedjalkov and A. Guentcheva (eds.), *Typology of Reciprocal Constructions*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
MacLaury, Robert E. 1989. "Zapotec body-part locatives: Prototypes and metaphoric extensions". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 55: 119–54.
Newman, Stanley. 1979. "The Salish object forms". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45.4: 299–308.
Rosen, Carol G. 1988. *The Relational Structure of Reflexive Clauses: Evidence from Italian*. New York: Garland.
van Eijk, Jan P. 1988. "Lillooet forms for 'pretending' and 'acting like'". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54, 106–10.