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ABSTRACT

This study presents data relevant to the expression of PROPOSITIONS in the Shuswap language. The data were collected on the Dog Creek reservation in August, 1981.

A PROPOSITION is the semantic structuring of a NARRATED EVENT. PARTICIPANTS which are CENTRAL to the EVENT may change their status with respect to their centrality or peripherality to the PROPOSITION.

In chapter 1 a PROPOSITIONAL configuration for Shuswap is presented. The PARTICIPANT ROLES in the language are exemplified and a graded scale of roles is proposed, based on the degree of involvement in the EVENT.

Chapter 2 presents some basic phenomena of Shuswap that can be used as evidence for changes of status of the PARTICIPANT ROLES in the PROPOSITION. Word order, case marking, pronominal marking and transitive marking are available as arguments to establish the centrality or peripherality of the PARTICIPANT ROLES to the PROPOSITION.
Chapter 3 is a discussion of constructions in which PERIPHERAL TO EVENT ROLES become CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. This is termed advancement. Two types of advancement are considered: BENEFACTIVE and RELATIONAL. BENEFACTIVE and RELATIONAL advancement have a register on the predicate that indicates a PARTICIPANT that is PERIPHERAL TO EVENT has become CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. There are also constructions in Shuswap in which CENTRAL TO EVENT ROLES become PERIPHERAL to the PROPOSITION. This is termed demotion. Two types of demotion are demonstrated in Passive and Antipassive constructions.
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**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

These abbreviations are used in the glosses of the Shuswap data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aut</td>
<td>autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compl</td>
<td>completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cust</td>
<td>customary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encl</td>
<td>enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evid</td>
<td>evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excl</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fctrl</td>
<td>full control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imp</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel</td>
<td>relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep</td>
<td>reportative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>res</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

0. This study presents data that concern the notion of centrality and peripherality in Shuswap, a language of the Interior Salish Family, of interior British Columbia. The data was collected in August, 1981 on the Dog Creek reservation and is representative of the northern dialect of Shuswap. My principal consultant was Lilly Harry.

The study follows in general outline the semantic analyses of Bella Coola, a Coast Salish isolate of British Columbia presented by Davis and Saunders in a series of papers (1979, 1981a, 1981b, and 1984.) It is proposed that an happening in the real world called a NARRATED EVENT can be formulated as a set of PROPOSITIONS that differ in their selection of elements of the NARRATED EVENT. A particular PROPOSITION is configured as a set of elements according to their relative centrality or peripherality. This depends on a number of pragmatic factors such as the distribution of knowledge between the interlocutors, the relative saliency of the NARRATED EVENT elements in an existing discourse, or a speaker's source of knowledge. The PROPOSITION is given linguistic encoding and occurs as an
EXPRESSION in Shuswap.

It is argued that for each EVENT (predicate) in the language there is a set of PARTICIPANT ROLES that are distributed as CENTRAL TO EVENT or PERIPHERAL TO EVENT. A PARTICIPANT that is CENTRAL TO EVENT may become PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION. Similarly, a PARTICIPANT that fulfills a PERIPHERAL TO EVENT role may become CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION.

It is proposed that, in unmarked PROPOSITIONS, the centrality or peripherality of roles agrees with the inherent role rankings of its EVENT. A change in the EVENT determined centrality or peripherality of ROLES in a PROPOSITION is reflected in Shuswap by marked expression. This markedness may be manifest by the presence of a register on the predicate or by the distribution of the case marking proclitics.

0.1 PHONOLOGY

A broad phonetic transcription used in this study. The distribution of the consonants can be read from the following chart.
The inventory of the vowels is /i ê a o u e/. In the northern dialect of Shuswap /ê/ is a lax mid front vowel and /e/ is the schwa. Non-syllabic /i u/ are orthographically represented as /y w/ respectively.
FOOTNOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. I adopt the convention employed by Davis and Saunders of indicating semantic categories in the upper case.
CHAPTER 1

PROPOSITIONAL CONFIGURATIONS IN SHUSWAP

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the central concepts of the study. There is a major distinction between a NARRATED EVENT and its associated SPEECH EVENT. A NARRATED EVENT is an actual event in the real world whereas a SPEECH EVENT is the linguistic communication about the NARRATED EVENT. Because of the complexity of NARRATED EVENTS, there can be no isomorphism between a NARRATED EVENT and its encoded SPEECH EVENT. Instead the SPEECH EVENT involves a selection of elements of the NARRATED EVENT for linguistic encoding. Part of the linguistic encoding involves the formation of a PROPOSITION which contains the selected elements of the NARRATED EVENT and arranges them into a configuration according to their relative centrality to it.

There are a number of pragmatic factors that intervene in the formation of PROPOSITIONS such as the distribution of shared knowledge between interlocutors, the relative saliency of the NARRATED EVENT elements to the existing discourse, or the speakers relative confidence that an
assertion is true of the world based on the source of knowledge. There are many possible PROPOSITIONS for each NARRATED EVENT. A selection of a member of this set of PROPOSITIONS takes expression as a SPEECH EVENT.

For example, in English a single NARRATED EVENT has a set of PROPOSITIONS that differ according to a number of pragmatic factors. The following set of English expressions reflect PROPOSITIONS that are all possible contextual interpretations of a single NARRATED EVENT about an EXECUTOR named Jack who wrote a poem about Martians while sitting beside the juke box drinking brandy in Gino and Carlo's bar in North Beach in San Francisco.

1. Gino and Carlo's was the bar in North Beach where Jack wrote poetry.
2. Jack wrote poems about Martians when he drank brandy.
3. The juke box in Gino and Carlo's was so scratchy it sounded like Martian language.
4. Jack was a lush and a poet.
5. Jack was a linguist.

This set of expressions are all linguistic encodings of PROPOSITIONS formed on a single NARRATED EVENT.

The configuration of a Shuswap PROPOSITION is provided in figure 6.
The Shuswap PROPOSITION is comprised of a NUCLEUS and a PERIPHERY. The NUCLEUS consists of an EVENT and a set of PARTICIPANTS that are correlates of non-EVENT elements of the NARRATED EVENT. PARTICIPANTS fulfill ROLES in relation to the EVENT. NUCLEAR ROLES are central to the PROPOSITION. The PERIPHERY of the PROPOSITION consists of a set of PERIPHERAL ROLES.

There are a number of PARTICIPANT ROLES employed in Shuswap. These ROLES have inherent predispositions in relation to the EVENT. The EXECUTOR is the most active participant, usually one who performs some ACTION. The EXPERIENCER is the next active role, usually one who experiences an ACTION of the EXECUTOR, or as the result of some ACTION, ACTION-PROCESS, or PROCESS exists in some STATE. The EXECUTOR and the EXPERIENCER are usually central to the EVENT. There is also a set of PARTICIPANTS
that fulfill roles that are PERIPHERAL TO EVENT, such as the BENEFACITOR, GOAL, INSTRUMENT and LOCATIVE. They usually occur in the PERIPHERY of the PROPOSITION.

In this chapter I establish the inherent PARTICIPANT ROLES that operate in Shuswap EVENTS. It is assumed that in its most unmarked expression the Shuswap PROPOSITION maps PARTICIPANT ROLES with the same distribution of centrality and peripherality as is inherent to the specific EVENT. I propose a scale in which PARTICIPANTS are graded as to their centrality or integration to the EVENT.

1.1  INHERENT PARTICIPANT ROLES

Shuswap is typologically a VSO language. This designation of word order tendencies is only convenient for expository purposes. The grammatical distinction between nouns and verbs is not sharply drawn in the language. Also, the language has a relatively free word order. Under certain discourse conditions it is the nominal that occupies initial position. Below are several examples of EVENTS which occupy the initial and sole position in the utterance.

(1)  c'ẽt
c'ẽ-ẽt-0
cold-st-3
It's cold.

(2)  
ciqw  ,  
ciqw-0  
red-3  
It's red.

(3)  
sexwèpemx  
sexwepemx-0  
Shuswap-3  
He's Shuswap.

Examples 1-3 are all examples of STATIVE EVENTS. They have a CENTRAL TO EVENT EXPERIENCER. The overt expression of independent pronominals is used to provide emphasis. If the EXPERIENCER is a nominal it generally follows the STATIVE as in examples 4-6.

(4)  
c'èlt re-tmixw  
c'èlt-0 re-tmixw  
cold-st-3 det-land  
The weather's cold.

(5)  
ciqw re-speqpéq  
ciqw-0 re-speqpeq  
red-3 det-berries  
The berries are red.

(6)  
sexwèpemx re-sqèlemxw  
sexwepemx-0 re-sqelemxw  
Shuswap-3 det-man  
The man's Shuswap.

In examples 4-6 the EVENT is a STATIVE and occurs in initial position; following the STATIVE is the PARTICIPANT ROLE of EXPERIENCER. These utterances would be appropriate as responses to questions. For example 4 would
be appropriate to the question "How's the weather?" or 5 as a response to the question "How are the berries?".

The following EVENTS have PARTICIPANTS that fulfill the role of EXECUTORS.

(7)  
\[ t'\text{?ek} \]  
\[ t'\text{?ek-0} \]  
\[ go-3 \]  
He's going.

(8)  
\[ xwiselx \]  
\[ xwis-ilx-0 \]  
\[ run-aut-3 \]  
He's running.

Examples 7 and 8 are EVENTS that have third person EXECUTORS. They are responses that would be appropriate to the requests "What is he doing?". If the EXECUTOR is expressed as a nominal it generally follows the EVENT as in examples 9 and 10.

(9)  
\[ q'\text{ilye} \]  
\[ re-nuXwenuXw \]  
\[ q'\text{ilye-0} \]  
\[ re-nuXwenuXw \]  
\[ sweatbath-3 \]  
\[ det-woman \]  
The woman is sweatbathing.

(10)  
\[ xwiselx \]  
\[ re-sek'lep \]  
\[ xwis-ilx-0 \]  
\[ re-sek'lep \]  
\[ run-aut-3 \]  
\[ det-coyote \]  
Coyote is running.

The examples that have been provided are PROPOSITIONS that have one NUCLEAR ROLE, either that of EXPERIENCER in
STATIVES or that of EXECUTOR in ACTIONS. Examples 11-13 show EXECUTORS and EXPERIENCERS co-occurring in the same expression.

(11)  k'wèsns re-Xpẽ'e re-sqẽlẽnten
  k'wes-n-t-0-es re-Xpe'e re-sqlelnten
  heat-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-grandfather det-salmon
  Grandfather is heating up the salmon.

(12)  q'wlentẽs re-nďXwenųXw re-c'i?
  q'wl-n-t-0-es re-nuXwenųXw re-c'i?
  roast-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-woman det-meat/deer
  The woman is roasting meat/deer.

(13)  sp'ntẽs re-sqẽlemxw re-kenkẽknem
  sp'n-t-0-es re-sqlelemxw re-kenkeknem
  hit-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-man det-blackbear
  The man hit the blackbear.

Examples 11 to 13 all have an EVENT in initial position in the utterance; they are ACTION predicates which have the PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR, the PARTICIPANT who performs the ACTION, and EXPERIENCER, the PARTICIPANT that is affected by the ACTION. The EXECUTOR precedes the EXPERIENCER in this utterances. Examples 11 to 13 are all appropriate responses to questions that would interrogate what the EXECUTOR is doing. The PARTICIPANTS that fulfill the roles of EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER are arranged on a scale in which the EXECUTOR is more actively bound or integrated to the EVENT.
EXECUTOR EXPERIENCER

Other PARTICIPANT ROLES are available to the Shuswap speaker. Examples 14-17 demonstrate the PARTICIPANT that fulfills the role of INSTRUMENTAL.

(14) yêwem re-sqêlemxw te-stûkcen
yew-em-O re-sqelemxw te-stukcen
fish-intr-3 det-man det-dipnet
The man is fishing with a dipnet.

(15) nik'ens-nke re-tuwiwt re-lop te-suq'wmin
nik'-n-t-O-es-nke re-tuwiwt re-lop te-suq'wmin
cut-fctrl-tr-3-3-evid det-little boy det-rope
det-knife
The little one cut the rope with the knife.

(16) cq'élens-nke re-semrèw? re-tuwiwt te-swelmin?k
cq'el-n-t-O-es-nke re-semrew? re-tuwiwt
teswelmin?k
shoot-fctrl-tr-3-3-evid det-lynx det-little boy
det-rifle
The young one shot the lynx with the gun.

(17) nexet'cins te-sq'weXt re-xk'emcenêlxw
nexet'cin-n-t-O-es te-sq'weXt re-xk'emcenelxw
shut-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-foot det-door
She shut the door with her foot.

In example 14 the EVENT is the act of fishing and the man who is performing the ACTION is the EXECUTOR. There is another PARTICIPANT being expressed, that of the INSTRUMENTAL. Similarly, in examples 15 to 17 the EVENT expresses a relationship between the performer of the ACTION, the EXECUTOR and that which is affected by the
ACTION, the EXPERIENCER. In addition the PARTICIPANT ROLE of INSTRUMENT is being expressed. This extends the scale of PARTICIPANT ROLES as follows:

EXECUTOR EXPERIENCER INSTRUMENT

There is a certain amount of flexibility in the order of the participant roles due to differing contextual backgrounds. An alternate expression of example 15 is given in example 18.

(18) nik'ens-nke re-lop re-tuwiwt te-suq'wmin
     nik'-n-t-0-es-nke re-lop re-tuwiwt te-suq'wmin
cut-fctrl-tr-3-3-evid det-rope det-boy det-knife
The little boy cut the rope with the knife.
(lit. he cut it, the rope, the boy, with the knife)

Notice that in example 18 the EVENT is the same as in example 15, the action of cutting. However, the PROPOSITION is different in respect to the differing contextual saliency of the PARTICIPANTS. In examples 15 and 18 the INSTRUMENT remains in the final and peripheral position of the utterance, but there is a transposition of the roles of EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER. I propose that in example 15 the information that is shared by the speaker and the hearer is that of EXPERIENCER and INSTRUMENT, the rope and the knife respectively. Perhaps a person
encountering the condition of the rope and noticing the presence of the knife may formulate a question, "What happened to the rope?". Example 18 assumes different contextual information. The EVENT is still the cutting of the rope, however the information that is being shared is now the EXECUTOR and the INSTRUMENT, the boy and the knife. They are peripheral to the PROPOSITION. The information that is being communicated is the EXPERIENCER and the ACTION; they are CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. Notice that in example 17 the INSTRUMENT is contiguous to the EVENT, the closing of the door. It has been moved to a much more central status in the PROPOSITION.

There are a number of PARTICIPANT ROLES that have readings as LOCATIVES and DIRECTIONALS. DIRECTIONALS are demonstrated in examples 19 to 22.

(19)  nes re-XPe?e te-skwelk'welt
nes-0 re-XPe?e te-skwelk'welt
go-3 det-grandfather det-snowmountains
Grandfather is going to the snowmountains.

(20)  qwece -e te-esk'et
qwecec-0 te-esk'et
leave-3 det-Alkali Lake
He is leaving Alkali Lake.

(21)  kweuwt-nke re-sc'eq?ew1- tktn-neXlew?stn
kweuwt-0-nke re-sc'eq?ew1 tktn-neXlew?stn
drift-st-3-evi det-dugout canoe det-bridge
The dugout canoe is drifting towards the bridge.

(22)  kweuwt-nke re-sc'eq?ew1 ptek te-neXlew?stn
The dugout canoe is drifting past the bridge to the waterfall (at 127 Mile House).

Examples 19 to 22 exhibit EVENTS that have DIRECTIONALS as PARTICIPANTS. Notice that the predicates in 19 and 20 differ as to GOAL and SOURCE. Examples 21 and 22 differ in terms of their spatial pivots reflected by the glosses 'towards' and 'past'. DIRECTIONALS follow the PARTICIPANT ROLE of EXPERIENCER as demonstrated in the following scale.

<------------------------------->
EXECUTOR EXPERIENCER DIRECTIONAL

Another PARTICIPANT ROLE that can be established is that of LOCATIVE. LOCATIVES are demonstrated in examples 23-25.

(23) w?ex re-kekésu? ne-setétkwe
    w?ex-0 re-kekésu? ne-setétkwe
    be-3 det-spring salmon det-river
There are spring salmon in the Fraser River.

(24) t-xw?it re-sesép ne-sesepélp
    t-xw?it-0 re-sesep ne-sesepélp
    sup-lots-3 det-blueberries det-blueberry bush
There are lots of blueberries on the blueberry bush.

(25) kukpi? xmut ne-sq'ilye
    kukpi? xmut-0 ne-sq'ilye
    chief sitting-3 det-sweathouse
The chief is sitting in the sweathouse.
(lit. The chief is who is sitting in the
sweathouse.)

In examples 23-25 the PARTICIPANT ROLE of LOCATIVE is in final position following the EXPERIENCER. The LOCATIVE is shown on the following scale. In examples 23 and 24 the EVENT is in initial position and indicates an existential STATE and a quantity respectively. The EXECUTOR in 25 is initial position; this utterance would be an appropriate response to the question "Who is sitting in the sweatbath?". The LOCATIVE is ordered on the PARTICIPANT scale as follows.

<------------------------------------------>

EXECUTOR EXPERIENCER LOCATIVE

The PARTICIPANT ROLES of DIRECTIONAL and LOCATIVE can co-occur in utterances as demonstrated in examples 26 and 27.

(26) qw?eq-nke re-sesèp te-sesepe̱ıp ne-ñeqwlèxw
    qw?eq-0-nke re-sesepe̱ te-se̱-pe̱ıp ne-ñeqwlèxw
    fall-3-evid det-blueberries det-blueberry bush
det-ground
The blueberries fell off the blueberry bush onto the ground.

(27) qwecèc kux te-scwexmx ne-Xget'tm? ne-mùle
    qwecèc kux te-scwexmx ne-Xget'tm? ne-mùle
    leave lplexcl det-Canoe Creek det-Dog Creek
det-mule
We left Canoe Creek for Dog Creek by packtrain
(on mules).
There is a flexibility of order of the DIRECTIONALS and LOCATIVES, due to contextual factors.

1.2 SUMMARY

In this chapter it has been shown that each EVENT is structured in the PROPOSITION with a set of PARTICIPANTS that fulfill roles. I have demonstrated the participant roles of EXECUTOR, EXPERIENCER, INSTRUMENT, DIRECTIONAL and LOCATIVE. It is assumed that in neutral discourse the EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER precede the INSTRUMENTAL, DIRECTIONAL and LOCATIVE and that the following sequential ordering of PARTICIPANT ROLES is maintained.

<------------------------------------------------------------------>

EXECUTOR       EXPERIENCER       INSTRUMENT
                DIRECTIONAL
                LOCATIVE

In this chapter I have considered the arrangement of PARTICIPANT ROLES in relation to their centality or peripherality to EVENTS. In chapter 2 I consider the arguments that are available to suggest that PARTICIPANT ROLES may change their status in relation to the PROPOSITION.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. In the examples, the first line is the Shuswap sentence; the second line is a morpheme by morpheme description in Shuswap; line 3 is a morpheme by morpheme description in English; line 4 is an approximate gloss for the sentence in English.

2. As example 17 demonstrates there is a great flexibility in Shuswap. An INSTRUMENT that is ranked lower than EXECUTOR or EXPERIENCER on the PARTICIPANT scale is ordered in the PROPOSITION to reflect its saliency in the discourse.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I present a number of arguments that are available to determine the PROPOSITIONAL status of PARTICIPANTS.

2.1.1 WORD ORDER

In the previous chapter I established a neutral word order in Shuswap. It was suggested that in discourse neutral situations the EVENT occurred initially, followed by a series of PARTICIPANTS. The PARTICIPANTS were ordered on a graded scale based on their degree of engagement in the EVENT. Although in discourse the EVENT will be the same, there are many different readings of the way the EVENT is structured in PROPOSITIONS, due to contextual information such as what is shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. Examples 1 and 2 are equivalent formulations of a single EVENT.
Both examples 1 and 2 have the same EVENT and the same PARTICIPANTS. In both cases there is an EXECUTOR, the Indian doctor, who performed some activity. In this instance, it was an activity of 'curing' upon an EXPERIENCER, the boy. The difference between these utterances is that they are structured to assert different PROPOSITIONS. In example 1 the PROPOSITION is focusing on the activity of curing and the expression would be an appropriate response to the question "What is the Indian doctor doing to the boy?". The second PROPOSITION focuses on the EXECUTOR, the person who did the curing. This statement would be the appropriate formulation of an answer to the question "Who cured the boy?". Similarly examples 3-5 reflect different conditions of shared information in the formation of PROPOSITIONS.

(3) k'ulens re-tuwiwt re-stûkcen
k'ul-n-t-O-es re-tuwiwt re-stukcen
make-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-boy det-dipnet
The boy made the dipnet.

(4) k'ulens re-stûkcen re-tuwiwt
k'ul-n-t-O-es re-stukcen re-tuwiwt
In examples 3-5 an equivalent NARRATED EVENT has several different PROPOSITIONAL configurations. Comparing examples 3 and 4 demonstrates that word order is highly flexible. The situating of an EXPRESSION in a context is essential. If there are two animate PARTICIPANTS fulfilling roles in relation to an EVENT, there are a number of devices available to provide the appropriate interpretation. Generally the EXECUTOR will precede the EXPERIENCER although this is not entirely clear. Other strategies such as the use of passive and antipassive constructions are available. It is context that mediates all of the PROPOSITIONAL expressions.

One important point is that although requests for information interrogatives are being heavily used to provide contextual situations for utterances, they are not the only ones. Requests for information interrogative constructions are fairly straightforward in terms of the speech situation but there are other less direct situations, such as requests for confirmation, and the
foregrounding of salient information. This figures more prominently in contextual situations in Shuswap which result in less easily identifiable structural correlates to English such as cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions. I provide several examples of PROPOSITIONS in which the PARTICIPANT ROLES take shifting relations to the centrality of the PROPOSITION. There will be more to say about the relation of word order to this phenomenon later.

(6) qeqninmen re-nʌXwenuXw ex te-secinmes qeqnim-0-en re-nʌXwenuXw ex te-secinem-w-es hear-3-1 det-woman be det-sing-dep-3
I am hearing the woman singing.

(7) qeqninmen ex re-secinmes te-nʌXwenuXw qeqnim-0-en ex re-secinem-w-es te-nʌXwenuXw hear-3-1 be det-sing-dep-3 dep-woman
I heard that the woman can sing.

(8) qeqninmen ex te-secinmes re-nʌXwenuXw qeqnim-0-en ex te-secinem-w-es re-nʌXwenuXw hear-3-1 be det-sing-dep-3 dep-woman
I heard her singing.

The three utterances take different PROPOSITIONAL structures based on the different word orders of the PARTICIPANT ROLES. The glosses for the 3 examples were offered as approximate English equivalents to the Shuswap utterances. Example 6 stresses the EXPERIENCER, the woman, and it was accepted that this would be an appropriate answer to the question "Whom do you hear singing?". Example 8 was offered as preferrable to 6 and is an appropriate formulation to the question "What is she
doing?". The relative word order and concomitant grammatical devices then signal different salient features of the discourse.

2.1.2 CASE MARKING

Shuswap nominals are preceded by proclitic elements that function syntactically as case markers. Shuswap distinguishes two series of case markers based on their status within the PROPOSITION: NUCLEAR ROLES are CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION and are marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. PERIPHERAL ROLES are PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION and are marked with NON-NUCLEAR case markers. The case marking paradigm for Shuswap proclitics is is given in chart 1.

(1) visible invisible unrealized
    nuclear roles re- le- ke-
    non-nuclear roles te-/tk- t'k-

The choice of determiners is mediated by deictic and pragmatic factors. The various uses of the determiners are demonstrated in examples 2-5.

(2) me? k'ulens re-mexéxye?
    me? k'ul-n-t-0-es re-mexexye?
    exp make-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-basket
She's going to make the basket.

(3) m-piqwen le-mexëxye?
m-piqw-n-t-0-en le-mexexye?
compl-look-fctrl-tr-0-1 det-basket
I looked at the basket.

(4) k'ulem te-mexëxye?
k'ul-em-0 te-mexexye?
make-intr-3 det-basket
She's made a basket.

(5) me? k'ulem-ekwe tek-mexëxye?
me? k'ul-em-0-ekwe tek-mexexye?
exp make-intr-3-rep det-basket
She's going to make a basket.

The NUCLEAR ROLE proclitic / re- / is used in reference to nominals that are in view of the speaker or in discourse focus (2). An additional nuclear role proclitic / le- / is used with nominals that are not in view of the speaker or in reference to deceased relatives and mythological beings. It is also used in reference to events in the completive aspect (3). The proclitic / le- / is optionally used in place of the / re- / when the deictic or pragmatic circumstances are appropriate. The NON-NUCLEAR RCLE proclitics / te- / and / tk- / are used to refer to unspecified nominals (3 and 4) and have a wide range of functions correlated with the peripheral status of PARTICIPANT ROLES in the PROPOSITION.

Corresponding to the NUCLEAR and NON-NUCLEAR determiners that are marked for the deictic status of visibility, there
is a set of determiners that occur in negative, conditional and interrogative constructions.

(6) kenm k-sk'wenx re-?êk'wen
    kenm-0 k-s-k'we-n-t-0-ex re-?ek'wen
    do-3 det-?-taste-fctrl-tr-3-2 det-salmon eggs
    Have you ever tasted fermented salmon eggs?

(7) swéty? t'k-scunx me? geyép
    swety?-0 t'k-s-cun-n-t-0-ex me? gey-ep-0
    who-3 det-?-say-fctrl-tr-3-2 exp angry-res-3
    Who (do you say) is going to get angry?

(8) ex k-kenmûxw
    ex-0 k-kenm-w-ex
    be-3 det-do-dep-2
    What are you doing?

(9) ta? k-sclXemstês
    ta?-0 k-s-c-1X-em-s-t-0-es
    neg-3 det-?-cust-know-intr-caus-tr-3-3
    He doesn't know.

Examples 6-8 demonstrate the use of the / k- / proclitic in interrogative constructions. An example of a negative construction is given in 9. This proclitic is termed an 'Unrealized' in this study.

Case markers are used to reference the status of PARTICIPANT ROLES within the PROPOSITION. NUCLEAR ROLES are those that are CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION, whereas NON-NUCLEAR ROLES are PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION. It should be noted that there are potential changes of status of PARTICIPANTS: a PARTICIPANT that is CENTRAL TO EVENT can be PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION. Similarly, a PARTICIPANT
that is PERIPHERAL TO EVENT can be CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. Case-marking is available as evidence of a change of this status.

The following examples demonstrate the usage of these case markers in constructions in which it is assumed that there is no change in status between the EVENT and the PROPOSITION. The initial position of the predicate makes it plausible that this is the force of the discourse.

(10) ciqw re-speqpeq
    ciqw-0 re-speqpeq
    red-3 det-berries.
The berries are red.
    (lit. Red are the berries.)

(11) q'ilye re-nuXwenuXw
    q'ilye-0 re-nuXwenuXw
    sweatbath-3 det-woman
    The woman took a sweatbath.

(12) xwiselx re-sek'lep
    xwis-ilx-0 re-sek'lep
    run-aut-3 det-coyote
    The coyote is running.

Examples 10-12 are all EVENTS which assume one PARTICIPANT. In 10 the EVENT is a STATIVE and the PARTICIPANT is an EXPERIENCER. Examples 11 and 12 have EVENTS that are ACTIONS and have PARTICIPANTS that are EXECUTORS. Several examples of EVENTS that semantically have both EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER PARTICIPANTS are repeated in examples 13-15.
Examples 13-15 all have the EVENT in initial position followed by the EXECUTOR and then by the EXPERIENCER. Notice that both the PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER are marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case marker /re-/. Several other PARTICIPANT ROLES have been demonstrated. Below are examples of the INSTRUMENTAL, the DIRECTIONAL and the LOCATIVE.

(16) me? geyép te-swelmin?ks
me? gey-ep-0 te-swelmin?k-s
exp angry-res-3 det-rifle-3poss
He's going to get angry about his rifle.

(17) nik'ens-nke re-tuwïwt re-lop te-suq'wmin
nik'en-t-0-es-nke re-tuwïwt re-lop te-suq'wmin
cut-fctrl-tr-3-3-evid det-child det-rope det-knife
The little boy cut the rope with the knife.

Examples 16 and 17 demonstrate the INSTRUMENTAL case. In
16 the EVENT has the PARTICIPANTS of EXPERIENCER and INSTRUMENT. Example 17 has an EVENT in which the act of cutting has the PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR, EXPERIENCER, and INSTRUMENT. Notice that the INSTRUMENTAL case is marked with the NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker / te-/. Examples 18-20 demonstrate the PARTICIPANT ROLE of DIRECTIONAL.

(18) nes re-Xpê?e te-skwelk'wêlt
gos-0 re-Xpe?e te-skwelk'welt
go-3 det-grandfather det-snowmountains
Grandfather is going to the snowmountains.

(19) qwecéc te-esk'êt
qwece-0 te-esk'et
leave-3 det-Alkali Lake
He is leaving Alkali Lake.

(20) me? Xeyéyp-kn te-t?ikw
me? Xey-ep-kn te-t?ikw
exp hot-res-1 det-fire
I'm going to get hot by the fire.

Examples 18-20 demonstrate how the DIRECTIONAL is employed. Notice that the DIRECTIONAL is indicated by the same NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker as the INSTRUMENTAL. This is not the case with the LOCATIVE.

(21) me? Xeyéyp-kn ne-sq'ilye
me? Xey-ep-kn ne-sq'ilye
exp hot-res-1 det-sweathouse
I'm going to get hot in the sweathouse.

(22) c1Xemstêes re-kûkpi? ne?élye ne-Xget'tm?
c-1X-em-s-t-0-es re-kukpi? ne?elye ne-Xget'tm?
cust-know-intr-caus-tr-3-3 det-chief here
He knows the chief here at Dog Creek.

Examples 21 and 22 demonstrate the LOCATIVE. It is marked with the proclitic / ne-/. It appears that there is a generalized case marker / te-/ that marks PARTICIPANT ROLES that are PERIPHERAL TO EVENT, of which the LOCATIVE marker is a more specialized instance. Later in this study I demonstrate that the / te-/ marker extends potentially to roles that are CENTRAL TO EVENT but which are PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION.

1.3 PERSON MARKING

In the previous section I suggested that Shuswap was configured in such a way that the NUCLEUS of the PROPOSITION has potentially two NUCLEAR ROLES. This two term system is confirmed by Shuswap person marking. CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION PARTICIPANTS are referenced on the predicate. Typically, independent pronominals are only overtly expressed to provide emphasis. The subjective suffixes are given in table 1.
(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>-en</th>
<th>-et (inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kux (exclusive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>-ex</th>
<th>-ep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 3rd | -0/-es | -0 |

Examples 2-12 demonstrate how the subjective markers are employed.

(2)  
geyéyp-kn  
gey-ep-k-n  
angry-res-encl-1  
I got angry.

(3)  
geyép-k pesc'élit  
gey-ep-k-ex pesc'eít  
angry-res-encl-2 last night  
You got angry last night.

(4)  
geyép  
gey-ep-0  
angry-res-3  
He got angry.

(5)  
geyép-kp  
gey-ep-k-ep  
angry-res-encl-1plexcl  
We (inclusive) got angry.

(6)  
geyép kux  
gey-ep kux  
angry-res excl  
We (exclusive) got angry.

(7)  
geyép-kt  
gey-ep-k-et  
angry-res-encl-2pl  
You guys got angry.

(8)  
wickten re-pésekkwe
Examples 2-7 demonstrate subjective person markers in intransitive clauses; examples 8-12 demonstrate the same subject markers for transitive clauses. Third person subjects behave differently depending on whether they are in intransitive or transitive constructions; third person subjects in intransitive clauses are unmarked whereas third person subjects in transitive clauses are marked with /-es/. No examples are provided for grammatically transitive constructions with first person plural inclusive subjects. This is due to constraints on the agent hierarchy that prohibit such constructions. In order to express this co-occurrence of participants the passive is employed. Third person plural is generally unmarked.
although it can be expressed by reduplication as demonstrated in 13.

(13) wikts re-tutuïwt re-pespêseīkwê
wik-t-0-es re-tutuïwt re-pes-peseīkwê
see-tr-3-3 det-pl-boy det-pl-lake
The boys saw the lakes.

Notice that in example 13 both the EXECUTOR and the EXPERIENCER are plural and that this is indicated by reduplication. The indication of plurality is optional.

The objective markers are given in table 14.

(14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-cem-/-cel-</td>
<td>-el- (inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kux (exclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-ci-</td>
<td>-ulm-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples 15-28 demonstrate how the objective suffixes are employed.

(15) wikcen
wik-t-ci-en
see-tr-2-1
I see you.

(16) wîktelmen
wik-t-ulm-en
see-tr-2pl-1
I see you guys.

(17) wíwktěn
     wikt-0-en
     see-tr-3-1
     I see him.

(18) wíwktěrɛmɛx
     wikt-cem-ex
     see-tr-1-2
     You see me.

(19) wíktx
     wikt-0-ex
     see-tr-3-2
     You see him.

(20) wíktx kux
     wikt-ex kux
     see-tr-2 1plexcl
     You see us.

(21) wíwktɛlɛp
     wikt-cem-ep
     see-tr-1-2pl
     You guys see me.

(22) wíktp
     wikt-0-ep
     see-tr-3-2pl
     You guys see him.

(23) wíktp kux
     wikt-ep kux
     see-tr-2pl 1plexcl
     You guys see us (exclusive).

(24) wíwktɛms
     wikt-cem-es
     see-tr-1-3
     He sees me.

(25) wíkcs
     wikt-ci-es
     see-tr-2-3
     He sees you.

(26) wíkɛś
     wikt-0-es
     see-tr-3-3
     He sees him.
As seen in 2.1.2 PARTICIPANTS that are CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION are marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. It is a two term system that does not distinguish NUCLEAR ROLES. This is resolved by the person marking suffixes which reference NUCLEAR ROLES, and distinguish between them.

2.4 TRANSITIVE MARKING

An additional argument that is available to distinguish NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS from PERIPHERAL PARTICIPANTS is transitivity marking. Grammatically intransitive constructions have one NUCLEAR PARTICIPANT whereas transitive constructions have two NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS. The presence of the suffix /-t-/> can be correlated with transitivity as shown in the following examples.
(1) q'ilye re-nuXwenuXw
    q'ilye-0 re-nuXwenuXw
sweatbath-3 det-woman
The woman is taking a sweatbath.

(2) nes re-Xp̓e te-skwelk'welt
    nes-0 re-Xp̓e te-skwelk'welt
go-3 det-grandfather det-snowmountains
Grandfather is going to the snowmountains.

(3) qwelntēs re-nuXwenuXw re-c'ī?
    qwel-n-t-0-es re-nuXwenuXw re-c'ī?
roast-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-woman det-meat
The woman is roasting the meat.

(4) sp'entēs re-sq̓elemxw re-kenk̓e̓knem
    sp'-n-t-0-es re-sq̓elemxw re-kenk̓e̓knem
hit-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-man det-blackbear
The man hit the blackbear.

Examples 1-2 and 3-4 contrast as to the presence of the
/ -t-/ marker. It is absent in examples 1 and 2 which are
intransitive constructions and present in examples 3 and 4
which are transitive constructions. It therefore is
correlated with transitivity and provides an additional
argument for detecting the presence of two NUCLEAR ROLES.

2.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have provided several arguments that are
available to identify the status of PARTICIPANT ROLES in
relation to the centrality or peripherality of the
PROPOSITION. Word order, case-marking, pronominal marking
and transitive marking are available as evidence to
determine this status.
1. The approximate English glosses were provided by Mary Palmantier of Dog Creek.

2. Several phonological processes intervene to obscure the surface forms: the reduction of unstressed schwa and a cluster reduction of /-k-x/ to /-k/. The enclitic /-k/ occurs with first and second person subjects in intransitive clauses. It is possibly an independent marker.
3.0 INTRODUCTION

Several arguments have been presented that can be used to determine the status of a PARTICIPANT ROLE within the PROPOSITION. The behaviour of case marking, person marking and transitive marking provide evidence that Shuswap has a two term system of PARTICIPANT ROLES as part of the NUCLEUS of the PROPOSITION. The roles that are CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION may or may not be the same roles that are CENTRAL TO EVENT. In this chapter I present several constructions that demonstrate a change in status between the EVENT and the PROPOSITION. Another argument is introduced that is available as evidence that there is a change of status of PARTICIPANT ROLES when mapping the NARRATED EVENT into a PROPOSITION, based on pragmatic factors.

3.1 ADVANCEMENTS

In this section I discuss the status of inherently
PERIPHERAL TO EVENT ROLES that assume a centrality in relation to the PROPOSITION. Two types of advancement are evident in Shuswap. BENEFACTIVE and RELATIONAL advancement are accompanied by a register of the advancement to a CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION ROLE.

3.1.1 BENEFACTIVE ADVANCEMENT

It has been shown that the expression of EVENTS and the PARTICIPANT ROLES inherent to the EVENT are mapped onto PROPOSITIONS. PROPOSITIONS are configured in such a manner as to distinguish between a two term system of roles that are CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION and a set of PARTICIPANTS that are PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION. PARTICIPANTS that are semantically and cognitively CENTRAL TO EVENT may be expressed as NUCLEAR ROLES that are central or peripheral to the PROPOSITION. The same change of status is available for PERIPHERAL ROLES. I first present an example of a construction in which there is no change in status between the EVENT and the PROPOSITION.

(1) k'ulens re-stůkcen
k'ul-n-t-0-es re-stukcen
make-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-dipnet
He made the dipnet.

In example 1 the EVENT is the act of making a particular
object; the EVENT has the PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR, the person that performed the act of making, and EXPERIENCER, that which was made. It is assumed that example 1 expresses a PROPOSITION that would be an appropriate response to the question "What did he do?" and that the PARTICIPANTS that are being expressed as CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION are the same PARTICIPANTS that are CENTRAL TO EVENT. The predicate has transitive marking and the PARTICIPANTS are a third person pronominal EXECUTOR and a third person EXPERIENCER. Both PARTICIPANTS are marked on the predicate. Overt pronominals are only expressed in Shuswap to provide emphasis, whereas nominals are typically expressed. The EXPERIENCER, 'the dipnet' is expressed and is marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. The next example introduces a third PARTICIPANT into the EVENT.

(2) k'ulxc te-stůkcen
k'ul-ksi-t-0-es te-stukcen
make-ben-tr-3-3 det-dipnet
He made for him a dipnet.

In example 2 the EVENT is the same as in example 1 with the exception that it has an additional PARTICIPANT, that of the BENEFACTIVE. However the PROPOSITION is not the same. Notice that the EXPERIENCER, 'the dipnet', is not case-marked for the status of NUCLEAR ROLE; it is preceded by the NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. The EXECUTOR and the
BENEFACTOR are both pronominals. Because independent pronominals are only used for emphasis, in the above examples it is not possible to determine the status of the BENEFACTOR. Example 3 however provides evidence that the BENEFACTOR has advanced to the status of CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION.

(3)  
m-stêt?excms te-XwuXw?û?s  
m-ste?-xi-cem-es te-XwuXw?u?s  
compl-drink-ben-1-3 det-beer  
She drank for me the beer.

In example 3 the EVENT is the act of drinking and has the inherent PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR, the person doing the drinking, and EXPERIENCER, that which was drank, in this example the beer. Additionally there is a BENEFACTOR. The EXECUTOR is a third person pronominal and is therefore not expressed; the EXPERIENCER, the beer is marked with the NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker showing that it has changed its status to PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION. Crucially the BENEFACTOR is a first person pronominal and is marked on the predicate of the construction. Only CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION PARTICIPANTS are referenced on the predicate so that the BENEFACTOR has advanced from a peripheral relation to the EVENT to a central relation to the PROPOSITION. The suffix /-xi-/ is a register of BENEFACTIVE advancement.
Perhaps the term BENEFACTIVE is not entirely appropriate. It is quite easy to get a malefactive interpretation from example 3 that could be glossed as 'She drank the beer on me.' I provide additional examples of the BENEFACTIVE.

(4) tuwilc cûcn?emxcems te-qwelwält
tuwiwt cun?-em-xi-t-cem-es te-qwelwalt
boy show-intr-ben-tr-1-3 det-cave
The boy was who showed me the cave.

(5) xwic'xte le-?Xpê?e te-sqélten
xwic'-xi-t-e le-?-Xpe?e te-sqelten
show-ben-tr-imp det-2poss-grandfather det-salmon
Go show your grandfather the salmon.

(6) ¿iïgwxtı tek-stúkcens
¿iïgw-xi-t-0-en tek-stukcen-s
lose-ben-tr-3-1 det-dipnet-3poss
I lost on him his dipnet.

Examples 4–6 are all consistent. The EXECUTOR and the BENEFACTIVE are referenced on the predicate which is registered with the advancement marker /-xi-/.

The EXPERIENCER is case-marked with the NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker /te-/ which is evidence that it has had a change of status to the periphery of the PROPOSITION. This type of construction is productive in Shuswap.

3.1.2 RELATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

There is a second set of constructions that parallel the advancement of the BENEFACTIVE to the NUCLEUS of the
PROPOSITION. In the following examples there is no change of status of the PARTICIPANTS between their status in the EVENT and their status in the PROPOSITION.

(1) m-nes te-skwelk'welt
m-nes-0 te-skwelk'welt
compl-go-3 det-snowmountains
He is going to the snowmountains.

(2) qwenên re-scmêmelt t'k-pwumêke?
qwen-0 re-scmemelt t'k-pwumeke?
want-3 det-children det-drum
The children want a drum.

(3) xwiselx-nke te-xtumêlxw
xwis-ilx-0-nke te-xtumêlxw
run-aut-3-evid det-store
He ran towards the store.

Examples 1-3 are all Intransitive constructions with the EVENT taking either an EXECUTOR, as in the activities of 'going' or 'running', or an EXPERIENCER in the case of 'wanting'. The predicate is referenced with a member of the set of subject markers. In all three examples the marker is / -0- / which is typical of third person subjects in intransitive constructions. Nominals that are either EXECUTORS or EXPERIENCERS are marked with a member of the set of NUCLEAR ROLE case markers, as in example 2. Finally, those roles that are PERIPHERAL TO EVENT are marked with the NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. In these examples they have the role of either DIRECTION or GOAL. It is assumed that the status of the roles in relation to the EVENT is the same as their role in relation to the
PROPOSITION. Examples 4–6 express the same EVENTS; however they differ in the PROPOSITIONAL status of the PARTICIPANT ROLES.

(4) nēsmins re-nūXwenuXw
    nes-min-n-t-0-es re-nuXwenuXw
    go-rel-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-woman
He went towards the woman.

(5) qwenmins re-snewt ke-ckwinek
    qwen-min-n-t-0-es re-snewt ke-ckwinek
    want-rel-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-snewt det-bow
Snewt wants a bow.

(6) xwislxmens re-nc'e?sqēXe?
    xwis-ilx-min-n-t-0-es re-nc'e?sqēXe?
    run-aut-rel-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-horse
He ran after the horse.

Formally, examples 4–6 are grammatically Transitive constructions; they are all marked with the / -t- / suffix that references Transitive constructions. They parallel examples 1–3. The PARTICIPANTS that are marked as DIRECTIONALS or GOALS in 1–3, and which have NON–NUCLEAR ROLE case marking, now have NUCLEAR ROLE case marking, and show a more central involvement of the GOAL in the PROPOSITION. They are now CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION and are accompanied by the marker / -min- / which precedes the transitive marker. The form / -min- / is a register of 2 RELATIONAL advancement. Examples 7–9 demonstrate further uses of this form.
(7) t-sixwmens re-XweXw?ú's ne-łęqwlexw
t-sixw-min-t-0-es re-XweXw?ú's ne-łęqwlexw
sup-pour-rel-tr-3-3 det-beer det-ground
He spilled the beer on the ground.

(8) ceq'mins re-seq'wmin?
ceq'-min-t-0-es re-seq'wmin?
throw-rel-tr-3-3 det-knife
He threw the knife.

(9) geyepmins re-scmémelt
gey-ep-min-t-0-es re-scmémelt
angry-res-rel-tr-3-3 det-children
He got angry at the children.

The advancement of EVENT PERIPHERAL ROLES to CENTRAL TO
PROPOSITION status is registered with the marker / -min- /.
This analysis is supported by several arguments;
constructions of this type are systematically marked as
transitive with the / -t- / marker. Secondly the
PERIPHERAL TO EVENT PARTICIPANTS are marked with the
NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. Finally the PERIPHERAL TO EVENT
PARTICIPANTS are referenced on the predicate.
Constructions of this type show a great flexibility in
providing contextual information, as demonstrated in
examples 10 and 11.

(10) m-sixwens re-séwîkwe
m-sixw-n-t-0-es re-séwîkwe
compl-spill-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-water
He spilled the water.

(11) m-sixwmens re-séwîkwe
m-sixw-mi-n-t-0-es re-séwîkwe
compl-spill-rel-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-water
He accidently spilled the water.
The contextual circumstances that provide an appropriate background to the utterances demonstrated in 10 and 11 are very complex and interesting.

3.2 DEMOTIONS

In the last section it was demonstrated that PERIPHERAL TO EVENT ROLES can, under the appropriate contextual conditions, advance and become CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. This section presents passive and antipassive constructions in which CENTRAL TO EVENT ROLES are demoted to PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION status.

3.2.1 PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Passive constructions are used productively in Shuswap. They are often employed to maintain the centrality of focus in discourse. The passive is also used where there is a prohibition against first person plural inclusive forms occurring in transitive constructions. Grammatically, a passive construction is intransitive, an EVENT type that takes a single NUCLEAR ROLE PARTICIPANT. The PARTICIPANT of EXPERIENCER in transitive clauses, is accorded full status in the PROPOSITION with a concomitant demotion of
the EXECUTOR, to the periphery of the PROPOSITION. The object is referenced on the predicate which is then intransitivized. Active and passive pairs are demonstrated in examples 1-5.

(1) Xgèlemx XweXweystês re-sc'ipeq
Xgelemx Xwe-Xwey-s-t-0-es re-sc'ipeq
fox red-love-caus-tr-3-3 det-skunk
Fox is who loves skunk.

(2) XweXweystêm re-Xgèlemx te-sc'ipeq
Xwe-Xwey-s-t-em-0 re-Xgelemx te-sc'ipeq
red-love-caus-tr-intr-3 det-fox det-skunk
Fox is being loved by skunk.

(3) kukpi? XweXweystês re-nûXwenuXw
kukpi? Xwe-Xwey-s-t-0-es re-nûXwenuXw
chief red-like-caus-tr-3-3 det-woman
The chief is who is praising the woman.

(4) XweXweystêm re-nûXwenuXw te-kukpi?
Xwe-Xwey-s-t-em-0 re-nûXwenuXw te-kukpi?
red-like-caus-tr-intr-3 det-woman det-chief
The woman was being praised by the chief.

(5) XweXweystêm te-kukpi? re-nûXwenuXw
Xwe-Xwey-s-t-em-0 te-kukpi? re-nûXwenuXw
red-like-caus-tr-intr-3 det-chief det-woman
The woman was being praised by the chief.

Examples 1 and 3 are active constructions. The corresponding passive forms are demonstrated in examples 2 and 4. In the passive forms the PARTICIPANT of EXECUTOR is now moved to the periphery of the PROPOSITION. The construction is grammatically intransitive; it is intransitivized by the marker / -em-/. Furthermore there is only one person referenced on the predicate. Finally
the EXECUTOR is case-marked with a NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. Example 5 demonstrates that the contextual readings of these constructions can be quite subtle. In the following examples I provide several passive constructions to show that the object is referenced on the predicate and that the predicate is intransitive.

(8) wîwkcelm te-pesXêXnem
    wîk-t-cem-em te-pesXeXnem
    see-tr-1-intr det-Chilcotin Indian
    I was seen by the Chilcotin Indian.

(9) wîkte'em kux te-pesXêXnem
    wîk-t-0-em kux te-pesXeXnem
    see-tr-3-intr excl det-Chilcotin Indian
    We were seen by the Chilcotin Indian.

Example 8 demonstrates the passive equivalent of an active construction with a first person EXPERIENCER. Example 9 is a passive construction with a first person plural EXPERIENCER for which there is no corresponding active equivalent.

The passive, then, provides a strategy by which under certain grammatical and contextual conditions the EXECUTOR is see as PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION, with the EXPERIENCER assuming the sole NUCLEAR ROLE in an intransitive construction.

3.2.2 ANTIPASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
Passive constructions are derived intransitive constructions that result in an EXPERIENCER being accorded the sole responsibility of NUCLEAR ROLE whereas the EXECUTOR assumes a PERIPHERAL ROLE in the PROPOSITION. In Antipassive constructions it is the EXPERIENCER that becomes PERIPHERAL to the PROPOSITION. I demonstrate the Antipassive and their correlative Active constructions.

(1) ḵwe4 wikc re-steqt'eq
    ḵwe4 wik-t-0-es re-steqt'eq
    ḵwe4 see-tr-3-3 det-blanket
Iswe4 sees the blanket.

(2) ḵwe4 wikem te-steqt'eq
    ḵwe4 wik-em-0 te-steqt'eq
    ḵwe4 see-intr-3 det-blanket
Iswe4 sees a blanket.

(3) k'ulens re-mexëxye?
    k'ul-n-t-0-es re-mexëxye?
    make-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-basket
She made the basket.

(4) me? k'ulem-ekwe tek-mexëxye?
    me? k'ul-em-0-ekwe tek-mexëxye?
    exp make-intr-3-rep det-basket
She's going to make a basket.

(5) mel m-Xwentês re-sqëlten
    mel m-Xwe-n-t-0-es re-sqëlten
    already compl-dry-fctrl-tr-3-3 det-salmon
She already dried the salmon.

(6) ex re-Xwûmes te-sqëlten
    ex re-Xwe-em-w-es te-sqëlten
    be det-dry-intr-dep-3 det-salmon
She is drying salmon.
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Examples 1, 3 and 5 demonstrate Active constructions in which the EVENT has the PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER. Both the EXECUTOR and the EXPERIENCER are encoded as CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION; they are referenced on the predicate and are case-marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case marker. Examples 2, 4 and 6 demonstrate the equivalent Antipassive constructions. The NARRATED EVENT is exactly the same; however a different PROPOSITION is being stated. The EXECUTOR is marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case marker and is referenced on the predicate: it is CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. The EXPERIENCER however is no longer CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION, it has assumed a PERIPHERAL ROLE. For example, the Antipassive construction in example 4 has an EVENT, the making of a basket which has the PARTICIPANTS of EXECUTOR, the pronominal form 'she' and EXPERIENCER, the basket. However the basket is not encoded as CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. The predicate is marked with the intransitive suffix /-em-/ and references only the EXECUTOR. The EXPERIENCER is marked with the NON-NUCLEAR ROLE case marker which is consistent with PERIPHERAL ROLES. This utterance would be appropriate when the EVENT is the salient feature, stressing the activity of 'making', whereas the actual thing that is being made is PERIPHERAL. Perhaps the gloss, 'She is basket-making' more appropriately captures the sense of this construction. The Antipassive construction then is yet another way of
stressing how PARTICIPANTS can assume a central or peripheral responsibility within the PROPOSITION depending on the contextual situation.

3.3 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have demonstrated several types of constructions in which there is a change of status of EVENT PARTICIPANT ROLES in relation to the PROPOSITION. PERIPHERAL TO EVENT PARTICIPANTS may under the appropriate contextual conditions assume a CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION status. This is termed advancement. Evidence that a PERIPHERAL TO EVENT PARTICIPANT is now behaving as CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION is available from several sources: the role is now case-marked with the NUCLEAR ROLE case-marker; it is also referenced by person marking and transitive marking.

Two types of advancement were demonstrated: BENEFACTIVE and RELATIONAL. BENEFACTIVE and RELATIONAL advancement have a register on the predicate that can be correlated with the CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION advancement of a PERIPHERAL TO EVENT PARTICIPANT.

As opposed to advancement, there are CENTRAL TO EVENT ROLES that are demoted to the periphery of the PROPOSITION. This is demonstrated in passive and antipassive constructions.
In the passive, a grammatically transitive construction with an EXECUTOR and an EXPERIENCER is intransitivized. The EXPERIENCER assumes the only CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION ROLE, whereas the EXECUTOR is demoted to the periphery of the PROPOSITION. The Antipassive is also a derived construction that results from a Transitive construction becoming intransitive. In this case it is the EXPERIENCER that is demoted and accorded peripheral status in the PROPOSITION.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. Carlson (1980) has identified a malefactive marker in Spokane.

2. The form / -mi- / has a suggestive resemblance to the instrumental suffix / -min?- / such as in the following forms: / swelmin?k / 'rifle' and / suq'wmin / 'knife'.

3. Thompson (1979) and Saunders and Davis (1982) have written important papers on the category of control in Salish. Examples 10 and 11 have glosses that suggest that control is involved. Shuswap has fairly clear examples of full control indicated by the marker / -n- / and limited control indicated by the marker / -nwen?- / with an intransitive form / -nwelln- / . In closely related Interior Salish languages there is also the category of no control or out of control. This is formed by the strategy of reduplication. See Carlson and Thompson (1981). Kuipers (1974) p. 138 has the following example:

   pepēn   'He found (something)'.

This reduplicated form may be an example of an out of control expression. It contrasts with:

   penmins   'He found it.'

   -n which the EXPERIENCER is more directly involved in the action.

4. It is possible to have two advancement registers on the predicate. When this is the case the RELATIONAL precedes the BENEFACTIVE. Kuipers (1974) p. 159 provides the following example:

   tw?kemîxc 'He sells it to somebody.'

Unfortunately the expression does not have overt nominals so that the relative status of RELATIONAL and the BENEFACTIVE can be assessed. A hypothesis based on the order of the forms might
suggest that first the RELATIONAL advances and that it is then demoted when the BENEFACTIVE advances.

5. /-cem-/ dissimilates before bilabials.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

This study is a contribution to the description of Shuswap. It adds to the research of Gibson (1973) and Kuipers (1974) and indicates some possible directions for a pragmatic study of the language.

It is argued that the notions of centrality and peripherality are important concepts in the expression of PROPOSITIONS in the Shuswap language. A ranked scale of PARTICIPANTS is proposed that indicates the degree of integration of the PARTICIPANTS in the EVENT. Several constructions are exemplified that demonstrate the change in status of PARTICIPANTS from CENTRAL TO EVENT to PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION or from PERIPHERAL TO EVENT to CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION. The distribution of case marking proclitics and person marking on the predicate are available as evidence of the change of status of PARTICIPANTS. Two types of advancement are shown: BENEFACITIVE and RELATIONAL advancement. These types of advancement are accompanied by a register of the CENTRAL TO PROPOSITION status of a PERIPHERAL TO EVENT PARTICIPANT. Also, there are constructions in which a
CENTRAL TO EVENT PARTICIPANT is demoted to PERIPHERAL TO PROPOSITION status. This is exemplified by PASSIVE and ANTIPASSIVE constructions.

The study contributes to an understanding of the pragmatics that operate in the expression of PROPOSITIONS in the Shuswap language.
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