Voiced and UnVoiced Intransitives in Halkomelem Salish
main session/syntax and morphology
Keywords: Salish, argument structure, valency, antipassive, voice

There are two morphemes in Halkomelem Salish that appear in morphosyntactic intransitive clauses and have been likened to antipassive morphemes: the 'activity' *-els* and the 'middle' *-m* (Gerdts and Hukari 2006) (GH).

(1)   a.   *naʔət*   *qʷəs-t-ʔs*   *t^θə*   *ƛeləm̓*   *sce:ɬtən.*
                AUX   go.in.water.TR-3ERG   DET   salted   salmon
                'She put the salted fish in water.'

    b.   *naʔət*   *qʷs-**els**   (*ʔə*   *t^θə*   *ƛeləm̓*   *sce:ɬtən*).
                AUX   go.in.water-ACT   OBL   DET   salted   salmon
                'She soaked the salted fish.

    c.   *niʔ*   *qʷs-**eʔəm**   (*ʔə*   *t^θə*   *ƛeləm̓*   *sce:ɬtən*).
                AUX   go.in.water-MID   OBL   DET   salted   salmon
                'She soaked the salted salmon.'

In (1a) we see the transitive clause, with the verb containing the transitive suffix *-t* and the third person ergative agreement marker. Example (1b) gives the activity intransitive marked by the *-els* (~*əls*) suffix while (1c) gives the middle intransitive marked by the middle suffix *-m* (*-eʔəm*, *-əm*). There is no agreement marker on the verb and the internal argument (IA) appears with an oblique marker.

        I argue that these suffixes are not detranstivizers, as proposed in GH. Instead, I consider that *-els* is a Voice head (Kratzer 1996); it is the counterpart of the transitive *-t* suffix that appears in Voice and adds a thematic role predicate and argument. Unlike *-t*, it does not assign ergative case to its specifier. It also does not license the object; thus, following Levin (2015), a P is inserted to rescue the structure.

(2a)   [$_{VoiceP}$ *pro* [$_{Voice'}$ t [$_{VP}$ [$_{v}$ qʷəs] [$_{NP}$ t^θə ƛeləm̓ sce:ɬtən]]]]   *-t* TRANSITIVE
(2b)   [$_{VoiceP}$ *pro* [$_{Voice'}$ els [$_{VP}$ [$_{v}$ qʷəs] [$_{PP}$ ʔə [$_{NP}$ t^θə ƛeləm̓ sce:ɬtən]]]]]   *-els* INTRANSITIVE
(2c)   λe[soaked(e, salmon) & AGENT(e, she)]

        The middle *-m* is a *v* head that categorizes a root and creates an (unergative) verb. The external argument (EA) is adjoined to the VP and assigned its thematic role at the C-I interface by the whole VP; <u>no VoiceP is present</u>. The IA is licensed by the insertion of P since there is no Voice head to do so.

(3a)   [$_{VP}$ *pro* [$_{VP}$ [$_{v}$ m [$_{root}$ qʷs]] [$_{PP}$ ʔə [$_{NP}$ t^θə ƛeləm̓ sce:ɬtən]]]   *-m* INTRANSITIVE
(3b)   λe[soaked(e, salmon) & AGENT(e, she)]

        My argument is as follows. First, the middle morpheme appears on a number of canonical unergative verbs (4). In addition, this morpheme also creates denominal verbs (5), supporting the notion that this morpheme is a verbalizer (5).

(4)   *šk̓ʷam̓* 'swim'   *yənəm* 'laugh'   *ċtem* 'crawl'   *xe:m* 'cry'
(5)   *patən* 'sail (n)'/*paténəm* 'sail' (v)   *wekən* 'wagon (n)'/*wekənəm* (v) 'go by wagon'

        Second, in Halkomelem, there is a difference in the theta role assigned to the subject with verbs marked with *-els* compared to those with *-m*. Galloway (1993) notes that *-els* is associated with <u>agentivity</u> but those roots suffixed *-m* are inconsistently agentive. He also shows that when *-els* and *-m* appear with the same root, the *-els* form has an agentive reading but the *-m* form does not.

(6)   *hóqw-**els*** 'smelling/sniffing'   *hóqw-**em*** 'smell, give off a smell'

        These facts follow from the analysis here; as a Voice head, *-els* introduces an agent thematic role predicate and the subject is an argument of this predicate; no variation in the interpretation of the thematic role of the EA is allowed. On the other hand, with *-m*, the subject is assigned its thematic role based on the semantics of the VP, not by a thematic role predicate. We do not expect a consistent agent thematic role to be associated with these EAs (though nothing precludes such a role).

        Third, GH observes that it is possible to use a base with either *-els* or *-m* to create a *s*-prefixed nominal based on the internal (patient) argument of the verb.

(7) *sƛ̓**cels*** 'design (n)'/ *ƛ̓cels* 'make a design (v)'   *spən̓**əm*** 'seed (n)'/*pən̓əm* 'plant, bury (v)'

It is also possible to create an instrumental noun using the *š(xʷ)*- prefix. In this case, the nominal corresponds to the EA of the verb. However, GH find that while bases with *-els* are possible, there are no instances of bases with *-m* in this construction.

(8) *sc̓atq̓ʷəls* 'grinder' *slem̓c̓əls* 'picking machine' *šxʷaxʷəkʷəls* 'sander'

This difference follows from the structural differences proposed above. The *-els* morpheme is in Voice and it introduces a thematic role predicate whose argument can be bound by the lambda operator introduced by the prefix to create the nominal interpretation. Since *-m* is postulated not to have Voice and does not introduce a thematic role predicate, there is no syntactically introduced argument to be bound by the lambda operator, disallowing nominals of this sort. Note that I follow Alexiadou and Schäfer (2006) in treating instrument external arguments as possible agents or causers.

(9) [$_{nP}$ š [$_{VoiceP}$ [$_{Voice'}$ -els [$_{VP}$ c̓atq̓ʷ]]] $\lambda x_{GEN} e[AGENT(e, x) \& grind(e)]$

　　　Fourth, GH note that "if the transitive verb exists, then an antipassive with *-els* is also possible" (185). Galloway (1993) states that "*-els* seems…to be the intransitive equivalent of the… transitivizer – (ə)t. By considering that *-els* is an alternative Voice, it is not surprising that transitive verbs, which appear with the suffix *-t*, can take *-els* as well, since both morphemes are Voice heads. GH also note that *-m* is less productive than *-els*. Here, *-m* is a derivational, closer to the root, so we expect less productivity.

　　　Fifth, it is possible for both *-els* and *-m* to appear together for some roots. Here, *-m* is closer to the root than *-els* and the reverse is ungrammatical. This follows if *-m* is a verbalizer and *-els* a Voice head, since *-m* merges first with the root to create a verb and Voice is then merged with the VP.

(10a) *q̓ʷəl-əm-els* 'barbeque' (10b) * *q̓ʷəl-els-əm*

　　　Finally, when a lexical suffix (LS) appears with a verb, there is a difference in interpretation of the possessor referent of the LS. With *-m* (11a), we get a subject reflexive interpretation but not so with *-els* (11b) nor the transitive suffix *-t* (11c); in the latter, we get a nonspecific (*-els*) or specific (*-t*) pronominal reading for the internal argument.

(11a) *kʷaxʷ-əw̓txʷ-em* 'knock on own house' (11b) *kʷaxʷ-əw̓txʷ-els* 'knock on people's houses'

(11c) *kʷaxʷ-əw̓txʷ-t* 'knock on his/her house'.

Following Wiltschko (2009), I consider the root and LS to form a compound. Summarizing, the LS supplies an existentially closed undergoer argument and a free possessor argument; this element is merged with the verb root and the resulting compound root is verbalized by the *-m* suffix Next, the subject NP adjoins to VP, saturating the possessor argument. Since this noun phrase is adjoined to the VP, it is interpreted as the EA and assigned an agent role at the interface by the VP. We get a reflexive reading.

(12a) [$_{VP}$ [$_v$ m [root + LS]]] $\lambda x \lambda e \exists y[knock(e)$ and $UND(e, y) \& house(y) \& POSS(\mathbf{x},y)]$

(12b) [$_{VP}$ NP [$_{VP}$ [$_v$ m [root + LS]]] $\lambda e \exists y[knock(e) \& UND(e, y) \& house(y) \& POSS(\mathbf{NP},y) \& agent(e, \mathbf{NP})]$

With *-els*, there is more structure. A VP is created, but the possessor argument cannot be saturated by the NP in Voice because this NP is outside of VP. Instead, a null pronoun saturates this argument within VP, becoming the internal argument; Voice then merges and a separate NP saturates the agent predicate.

(13a) [$_{VP}$ [$_v$ [root + LS]] $\lambda x \lambda e \exists y[knock(e) \& UND(e, y) \& house(y) \& POSS(\mathbf{x},y)]$

(13b) [$_{VP}$ [$_v$ [root + LS]] pro] $\lambda e \exists y[knock(e) \& UND(e, y) \& house(y) \& POSS(\mathbf{pro},y)]$

(13c) [$_{VoiceP}$ NP [$_{Voice'}$ els/t [$_{vP}$ [$_v$ [root + LS]] pro]]]

　　　$\lambda e \exists y[scratch(e) \& UND(e, y) \& foot(y) \& POSS(\mathbf{pro},y) \& AGENT(e, \mathbf{NP})]$

　　　This analysis adds a further nuance to Davis's (1997) claim that transitives and unergatives in Salish are derived by morphosyntactic operations. Here, the activity suffix is the intransitive counterpart to the transitive suffix (both are Voice morphemes) and separate from the middle which lacks Voice altogether. This analysis complicates our understanding of the AP construction; an AP morpheme does not involve internal argument reduction or demotion but can introduce an EA. In some cases (the activity), the EA is introduced through Voice similar to typical transitives but licenses the internal argument differently. In other cases (the middle), the morpheme is not involved with argument introduction or demotion but with verbalization. This analysis is similar in spirit to Wiltschko (2009), but does not need a lexical vs syntactic introduction of arguments. Finally, it posits that the EA has more than one way to be introduced into the syntax, paralleling a proposal by Tollan (2018) though implemented differently.