Overview

We argue that overt 30bj marking is the elsewhere case in three Central Salish languages, and that null 30bj marking is conditioned by a specific transitive suffix.

- Counter to traditional analysis of uniform Ø 30bj across the Salish languages (Newman 1978; Kroeber 1999).
- Building on overt 30bj analyses proposed for:
  - Upriver Halkomelem (Galloway 1977, Wiltschko 2003)
  - Squamish (Jacobs 2011)
  - Comox-Sliammon (Mellesmoen 2017)
- See also Gerds (1989) on passive object suffices.

Transitivity in Salish

- Transitive verbs in Salish are marked overtly with a transitive suffix (Kroeber 1999).
- The transitivity is followed by object agreement morphology, which is followed by subject agreement (when present).
- Transitive objects also encode agent control: the ability of an agent to influence the outcome of an event (Thomp-son 1979, 1985).

(3) Control Transitive in Comox-Sliammon

\[ \text{Yäp̓-čitxʷxʷ-an} \]

all break-control 30bj 3sg.erg.

'I deliberately broke all the eggs'

(2) Limited Control Transitive in Comox-Sliammon

\[ \text{Yäp̓-čitiy-an} \quad kʷəɬf}t \]

always break-lctr-control 30bj 3erg.

plates

'I am always (accidentally) breaking the plates.'

We observe two types of allomorphy:

- The form of the transitive may be conditioned by the following object suffix (Green cells).
- The form of an object suffix may be conditioned by the preceding transitive (Gray cells and Blue cells).

These types of allomorphy are distributed differently across the three languages in (4).

- This indicates that these different types of allomorphy are independent of one another.
- Transitive allomorphy is limited to Central Salish whereas the object suffix allomorphy is found across the family.

3rd person allomorphy

- Our analysis posits two types of 3rd person object agreement: one null and one overt (-əxʷ).
- We argue that the null form is the conditioned allomorphy and the overt variant is the elsewhere morpheme.

Two arguments for Ø marking being the conditioned allomorph.

1. The morpheme -əxʷ appears in a wider set of contexts than null marking.
2. 1sg/2sg object suffixes also have conditioned allomorphs after the control transitive in Squamish and Comox-Sliammon.

Object suffix allomorphy after ctr is a more general property of the system.

Object agreement paradigms

The table below presents our analysis of object agreement paradigm for three types of transitisizers: control (ctr), limited control (lctr), and causative (caus):

(4) Transitisizers and Object Suffixes in three Central Salish languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halkomelem (Hk)</th>
<th>Squamish (Sq)</th>
<th>Comox-Sliammon (Cx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control (ctr)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Limited Control (lctr)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Causative (caus)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>-dx</td>
<td>-dx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>-omè</td>
<td>-umè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>-olè</td>
<td>-umèl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3obj</td>
<td>-s-t</td>
<td>-s-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We make the following assumptions regarding the syntax and morphology of object agreement:

- Transitisizers and object agreement realize features of v. Agree copies φ-features of the object onto v.

The φ-features on v are fissioned into an Agr node in the morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993).

Agr node is realized as the agreement suffix.

(6) Squamish ctr with 1pl.obj

a. Syntax:

\[ \text{y} \quad [\text{v}_{\text{ctr}}, \text{v}_{\text{lctr}}] \quad \rightarrow \text{v}_{\text{ag}}(\text{v}_{\text{ag}}) \]

b. Morphology:

\[ \text{y} \quad \rightarrow \text{v} \quad \text{v}_{\text{ag}}(\text{v}_{\text{ag}}) \quad \text{t-umul} \]

Given this analysis of object agreement, v and Agr are extremely local to one another.

→ The form of v can be conditioned by Agr.

→ The form of Agr can be conditioned by v.

We propose that there are only two types of VI rules for Agr nodes in these languages, shown in (7).

(7) Types of Agr VI

a. \[ \text{Agr}_{\text{y}}(\text{y}) \rightarrow \text{X} \quad (\text{unconditioned}) \]

b. \[ \text{Agr}_{\text{y}}(\text{y}) \rightarrow \text{Y} / [\text{v}_{\text{ag}}(\text{v}_{\text{ag}})] \quad (\text{conditioned}) \]

For 3rd person object agreement:

- X = overt allomorph (-əxʷ)
- Y = null allomorph

Salish internal

We offer new support for idea that (Central) Salish has overt 3rd person object agreement.

Theoretical

When an overt form contrasts with a null form, the default need not be the null form. That is, the default need not be the least phonologically marked form (contra Waugh and Lafford 2008 on tense).
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