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PROMOTION AND TOPICALITY OF NEZ PERCE OBJECTS
Noel Rude
University of Oregon

The Nez Perce are indigenous to the plateau lands of the northwestern United States. They are famous for the Appaloosa horse, and for Chief Joseph, the "Red Napoleon" who gained international attention in the 1880s for his astonishing victories and escapes from several United States armies. Army strategists still study his tactics. In final defeat Chief Joseph was not bitter. His surrender speech lives on as a classic in American literature.

The Nez Perce language belongs to the Sahaptian language family, which has been linked with Penutian. Both Yakima and Umatilla are Sahaptian languages. Penutian is the most widespread language phylum in the Western Hemisphere, embracing, if valid, not only various languages in the western United States, but even Mayan in Central America and Araucanian in Chile. Today Nez Perce survives among a rapidly dwindling number of older people scattered on several reservations in the states of Idaho, Oregon and Washington. There are, fortunately, two fine collections of texts: Phinney (1934) and Aoki (1979). These as well as the insights of my informant Zelma Minthorn have provided the data for this paper.

Although this paper proposes to deal with the Nez Perce direct object, it will be necessary to comment on the subject as well. This is because the nature of the direct object is reflected in the coding strategies of the subject. The first section of the paper looks at the structural properties of both subject and object. Next follows a structural description of various promotional and demotional strategies, and then in the conclusion are some comments on the function of the direct object.

1. Syntactic constructions.

1.1. Subject.

1.1.1. General characteristics. Subjects in Nez Perce have obligatory number agreement on the verb in certain aspecral suffixes, as the following examples show. Person has nothing to do with the selection of the morphemes that index subject number agreement. Note that subject-verb agreement for number is with a nominative subject; a transitive verb agrees with the semantic agent, not the patient.

1) Intransitive verb, first person subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kúuse</td>
<td>kúsíix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I am going'</td>
<td>'We are going'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Intransitive verb, third person subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hikúuse</td>
<td>hikúsíix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'He3 is going' | 'They are going'

3) Transitive verb, first person subject

Singular                      Plural
'I am biting it'             'We are biting it'

4) Transitive verb, third person subject

Singular                      Plural
péeke?nipse                   péeke?nipsíx
'He is biting it'             'They are biting it'

There are several aspectual suffixes that do not inflect for number. Whenever they occur, a prefix pe- is optionally available to mark the plurality of the subject. Once again agreement is with a nominative subject. For the following examples deletion of pe- would be necessary if the subjects were singular.

5) Intransitive verb

First person                  Third person
pekúuye                      hipekúuye
'We went'                    'They went'

6) Transitive verb

First person                  Third person
?epeke?nípe                   péepeke?nipes
'We bit it'                   'They bit it'

The syntactic subject in Nez Perce is that argument that obligatorily triggers number agreement in the verb via the suffixes -se/-siix, etc., as well as optional plural agreement with the prefix pe- in just those situations where the aspectual suffix does not encode number.

1.1.2. Intransitive clauses.

1.1.2.1. Subject-verb agreement. Every finite verb in Nez Perce obligatorily indexes the person of its subject. Different morphology is involved, however, depending on whether the verb is transitive or intransitive. In the intransitive clause third person subjects trigger verbal agreement via the prefix hi-, first and second person via zero marking. The following four examples are given to illustrate subject-verb agreement for person in intransitive clauses.

7) Ø-kúuye                   8) weéet Ø-kúuye
  1NOM-went                    QUESTION 2NOM-went
    'I went'                     'Did you go?'

9) híkuüye                   10) weéet híkuüse
  3NOM-went                     QUESTION 3NOM-be going
    'He went'                       'Is he going?'

1.1.2.2. NP case marking for subject. Nez Perce marks the case roles of NPs via a set of about 20 different suffixes, the subject of an intransitive verb being the unmarked case. Although it will not be dealt with in this paper, it is worth noting that word order is extremely variable in Nez Perce; all possible word orders are
encountered in the texts. Independent pronouns such as occur in the examples below are optional (the conditions on their use will not be dealt with in this paper). They are included here as examples of the non-case marked NP subjects of intransitive verbs.

11) ?fín-Ø Ø-páyyna \textit{\textit{watíisx}}
\quad \text{I 1NOM-arrived yesterday}
\quad 'I arrived yesterday'

12) Aoki 3:34
\quad \textit{kaa hi?lwáaxwágca \textit{\textit{?ipí}}}
\quad \text{and 3NOM-be screaming she}
\quad 'And \textit{she} is screaming'

13) Phinney 12:16-17
\quad \textit{kii waawa-Ø hiwételume \textit{\textit{náaxcipx hiháypx}}}
\quad \text{here mosquito 3NOM-dipped head one-into pail-into}
\quad 'Here Mosquito dipped his head into a pail'

\subsection{1.1.3. Transitive clauses.}

\subsubsection{1.1.3.1. Subject-verb agreement.} Subject-verb agreement for person is obligatory for every finite verb in Nez Perce. The same agreement prefixes discussed in 1.1.2.1. above sometimes index the subject in a transitive verb, other times a different set of prefixes are used: \textit{pée-} for third person, and \textit{?e-} for first and second person.\footnote{The factors that determine this choice will be dealt with later. Suffice it to note that it is entirely the nature of the object and not the subject that conditions the special subject-verb agreement prefixes of transitive verbs.} Subject-verb agreement for number, as discussed in section 1.1.1., treats the semantic agent of a transitive clause the same as the subject of an intransitive clause. The prefixes \textit{pée-} and \textit{?e-}, however, agree only with agentive/experiencer subjects in certain transitive clauses. In view of this I shall refer to them as \textit{ergative} (or \textit{ERG}). They are not strictly semantic markers. Their occurrence is conditioned by the syntactic and/or pragmatic nature of the direct object (to be discussed later), and hence \textit{ergative} is a more accurate term than \textit{agent}. But I use this term at the risk of confusing the reader. It must be realized that Nez Perce has no corresponding "absolutive" case. Nez Perce is not an ergative language in the classical sense, where the ergative case stands in counterdistinction to an absolutive case in which the semantic accusative of a transitive verb is encoded the same as the subject of an intransitive verb. Nez Perce, rather, has a nominative subject that links the semantic agent of a transitive verb with the subject of an intransitive verb. And then, in addition, the subject of a transitive verb often triggers ergative agreement via \textit{pée-/?e-}. Although the subjects of transitive and intransitive verbs are in this way distinguished in Nez Perce, the accusative object of a transitive verb and the subject of an intransitive verb are not linked by an absolutive case in the language. Since the morphemes \textit{hi-/?ó-} (discussed in 1.1.2.1. above) must be prefixed to a transitive verb when \textit{pée-/?e-} are not, they will therefore be designated as \textit{nominative} (or \textit{NOM}) in this paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINATIVE</th>
<th>ERGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd person</td>
<td>ðØ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>hi-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Subject-verb agreement prefixes for person.

In the following examples, subject-verb agreement for person is contrasted in intransitive and transitive clauses.

14) First person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø-kúuye</td>
<td>ð?épéexwiye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NOM-went</td>
<td>1ERG-stole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I went'</td>
<td>'I stole it'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Third person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hikúuye</td>
<td>péepeeexwiye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NOM-went</td>
<td>3ERG-stole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'He went'</td>
<td>'He stole it'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3.2. NP case marking for subject. A subject NP that has ergative agreement in a transitive verb is also itself case marked with the ergative suffix -nim/-nm. In example 16 xáxaac 'grizzly bear' is the unmarked subject of an intransitive verb in contrast with 17 where the same noun is the subject of a transitive verb and is consequently case marked ergative. There is concord in case marking between adjectives and a head noun in Nez Perce, as is observable in the ergative NP in 17.

16) kaa híxíičemne xáxaac and 3NOM-became angry grizzly
'And Grizzly Bear became angry'

17) péexe himeqíisnim cikawíisnim xáxaasnim 3ERG-saw big-ERG horrible-ERG grizzly-ERG
'The big horrible grizzly bear saw him'

The ergative case is limited to third person subject NPs in Nez Perce.6 Independent pronouns for first or second person never inflect for the ergative case. Compare the following: in 18 there is no distinction between núun 'we' in the intransitive and the transitive clause, but in 19 ?ipí 'he/she/it' is the subject in the intransitive clause, while the ergative ?ipn'ím is the subject in the transitive clause.

18) First person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>núun ø-pekuuye</td>
<td>núun ?epéeexwiye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we 1NOM-PL-went</td>
<td>we 1ERG-PL-stole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'We went'</td>
<td>'We stole it'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) Third person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ipí hikúuye</td>
<td>?ipn'ím péepeeexwiye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he 3NOM-went</td>
<td>he-ERG 3ERG-stole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'He went'</td>
<td>'He stole it'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Nez Perce case suffix -nim, in accord with many ergative languages, is also the genitive marker. Below are two examples of genitive constructions. Note that, although first and second person pronouns never inflect for the ergative case, they do for the genitive, as in 20.

20) nūunim wéetes we-GEN land 'our land'

21) háamanm csíqáamqal man-GEN dog 'the man's dog'

In a genitive construction the head (or possessed) noun is never itself case marked ergative, as, for example, píke 'mother' is not in 22 below.

22) háamanm píke péexne man-GEN mother 3ERG-saw 'The man's mother saw him'

1.2. Direct object. We have already noted two peculiarities of the Nez Perce direct object: the fact that it is the grammaticalization of the direct object (not the subject) that determines ergative subject-verb agreement and also ergative NP case marking. There are three other grammatical characteristics of the direct object to consider: NP case marking for direct object, the peculiar treatment of first and second person direct objects, and plural object-verb agreement.

1.2.1. NP case marking for direct object. Direct object NPs are case marked with the suffix -ne. Unlike ergative NP case marking, this includes all independent pronouns, even first and second person. The next three examples exhibit overt direct object NPs case marked with -ne. Examples 24 and 25 illustrate case concord between adjective and noun.

23) Phinney 145:11-12
kii pēetenweme qiiwne ?iceyéeyenm now 3ERG-talked with old man-OBJ coyote-ERG 'Now Coyote talked with the old man'

24) Aoki 3:2-3
?ipn̓m póopciyawnahx ?inekíx titlúune ?imeesne he-ERG 3ERG-would kill even big-OBJ deer-OBJ 'He would kill even a big deer'

25) Aoki 3:45
?se ?awýaxn̓o'qa ku?spé wexweg̓ene titlúune you 2ERG-can find places-in frog-OBJ big-OBJ 'You can find a big frog in these places'

1.2.2. First/second person direct objects. One peculiarity of the high topicality of first and second person is manifested by both subject and direct object in Nez Perce: both deflect ergative marking. While first and second person NPs are never marked ergative, first and second person direct objects prohibit ergative subject-verb agreement. In example 26 below the nominative pronoun ?ín 'I' has ergative agreement in the verb with ?a-, while the nominative subject agreement with q̓- in the transitive verb in example 27 is due to there
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINATIVE</th>
<th>ERGATIVE/GENITIVE</th>
<th>DIRECT OBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'I'</td>
<td>?ín</td>
<td>?ínim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'he/she/it'</td>
<td>?ipí</td>
<td>?ipním</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'man'</td>
<td>háama</td>
<td>háamanm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'coyote'</td>
<td>?iceyéeye</td>
<td>?iceyéeyenm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'old woman'</td>
<td>?áatway</td>
<td>?áatwaynim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'old man'</td>
<td>qíiwn</td>
<td>qíiwnm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'child'</td>
<td>miyá?c</td>
<td>miya?ásnim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Examples of the Nez Perce subject/direct object cases.

being a second person direct object. The nominative subject-verb agreement with hi- in 28 is due to a first person direct object. Note that the independent pronoun is case marked as a direct object with -ne in 28, and that in 29, even though having nominative agreement in the verb, the subject NP is marked ergative with -nim. This combination of nominative subject-verb agreement and ergative case marking on the NP can only be caused by a first or second person direct object. It is interesting to observe in comparing 26, 27 and 29 that the existence of a grammatical direct object is marked, but only once in the clause, either by NP case marking or by ergative subject-verb agreement.

26) ?ín ?atáamyana
    I 1ERG-hit
    'I hit him'

27) ?ín õ-táamyana
    I INOM-hit
    'I hit you'

28) ?íne hitáamyana
    I-OBJ 3NOM-hit
    'He hit me'

29) hitáamyana ?áatwaynim
    3NOM-hit old woman-ERG
    'The old woman hit me'

1.2.3. Plural direct object agreement in verb. The verb in Nez Perce optionally agrees with a plural direct object by prefixing nées-. Just as with plural subject-verb agreement (section 1.1.1. above), plural direct object agreement in the verb is also indifferent to person. For example, compare the following.

30) ?anáastaamyana
    1ERG-PL-hit
    'I hit them'

31) õ-náastaamyana
    1NOM-PL-hit
    'I hit you all'

In 30 above náas- agrees with a plural third person direct object, and in 31 the same morpheme agrees with a plural second person direct object. In 31 the second person direct object has deflected ergative subject-verb agreement, in accordance with the principles outlined in 1.2.2. above. Table 3 below gives in paradigm form all the subject/direct object verbal agreement prefixes discussed so far. Subject-verb agreement for person is represented horizontally and verbal agreement for plural subject/direct object is shown vertically. The prefix pée-, as is observable in table 3, does not co-occur with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO PLURAL SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT PREFIX</th>
<th>PLURAL SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT WITH pe-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL DIRECT OBJECT VERBAL AGREEMENT</td>
<td>PLURAL DIRECT OBJECT VERBAL AGREEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH nées-</td>
<td>WITH nées-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 NOM ø-</td>
<td>ø-nées-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 ERG ø-</td>
<td>ø-pe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NOM ø-</td>
<td>ø-pénéées-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ERG ø-</td>
<td>ø-pénéées-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Argument agreement in Nez Perce verbal prefixes.

nées-. Plural direct object verbal agreement with nées- causes demotion of ergative subject-verb agreement when the subject is third person; it does not when the subject is first or second person. This demotion, however, never carries over to the subject NP, as can be seen in example 33 below. Example 32 illustrates the absence of ergative marking on non-third person NPs (see also examples 18 and 19 as well as section 1.2.2. above), but its occurrence in the form of the subject-verb agreement prefix øe-. Example 34 has ergative marking on both the subject NP and the verb, both subject and direct object being third person (in contrast to 33 where nées- precludes the co-existence of the third person ergative subject-verb agreement prefix pée-.

32) ţin ?enéeshexne walásna
   I 1ERG-PL-saw knife-OBJ
   'I saw the knives'

33) ţinpimiento hinéeshexne walásna
    he-ERG 3NOM-PL-saw knife-OBJ
    'He saw the knives'

34) ţinpimiento péeexne walásna
    he-ERG 3ERG-saw knife-OBJ
    'He saw the knife'

2.0. Promotion to direct object. In this section I am going to describe the structural devices by which a non-patient object can be promoted to direct object. It is clear that this is controlled, in some cases at least, by discourse considerations. Comment, however, on any discourse motivations for the optional promotions will, for the most part, have to be deferred till the concluding section of this paper.

2.1. Dative promotion. The human (conscious) participant object of a ditransitive verb must obligatorily appear as the direct object. The semantic patient is therefore demoted from the direct object; if it occurs as a surface NP it is never case marked. In examples 35, 36, 37 and 39 below the semantic patient is a surface argument, and in none of these examples is it case marked as a direct object. In 37, 38 and 39 the semantic dative is a surface NP and in each case
is marked as a direct object. The ergative subject-verb agreement in 35, 37 and 38 co-occurs with third person direct objects, which in each case is the recoverable or surface semantic dative. Note that in 39 it is the first person dative object ?íine 'me' that demotes the ergative subject-verb agreement to the nominative hi-. In 36 náač- agrees with a plural dative object (keléemet could be either singular or plural). In 40 náas- agrees with títòoqana 'the Indians', the animate source from which the horses were stolen.

35) Aoki 18:61  
?awyáñimta?ko?qa meexsem  
1ERG-could show mountain  
'I could show him the mountain'

36) Aoki 13:38  
wéétu hináačniqana keléemet  
not 3NOM-PL-gave pipe  
'He did not give the pipe to them'

37) Phinney 145:7-8  
kaa ?ee weétu ca?á? yiıyewísne ?ewníise páhap  
and you not rightly poor one-OBJ 2ERG-give daughters  
'And it is not right for you to give your daughters to such a poor one'

38) Phinney 31:2  
kawó? háamanm péene ?áatwayna  
then man-ERG 3ERG-said old woman-OBJ  
'Then the man told the old woman, "..."

hi?níye ?íine le?éptit wax náaqc wa?wálam  
3NOM-gave I-OBJ twenty and one trout  
'He gave me twenty-one trout'

40) Aoki 17:9  
síkem títòoqana hináaspaxwiqana  
horse Indian-OBJ 3NOM-PL-stole  
'He stole horses from the Indians'

2.2. Benefactive promotion. When the dative/benefactive status of an object is not implicit in the semantics of the verb, then a special verbal suffix is required and this animate participant is promoted to direct object.9 In the texts benefactive promotion is just as obligatory as dative promotion. There is a benefactive NP suffix in Nez Perce, however. But in texts it only occurs in such verbless environments as in 42 below, or with abstract NPs as in 41.10

41) Phinney 115:6  
héénéku? Ø?-?ínikéíim watísksi?ayn  
again 2NOM-put-BEN-IMP.11 tomorrow-for  
'Put it for me again for tomorrow'

42) Aoki 14:5  
... čálawí tá?c síkáamayn  
if good horse-for  
'... if good for the horses'
The benefactive verbal suffix -éni in 41 above does not promote 'tomorrow' to direct object. Rather, it marks the promotion to direct object of the conscious participant 'me', whose first person status is the reason for the nominative subject-verb agreement. In each of the following 5 examples -- all of which have the benefactive verbal suffix -- the semantic patient is a surface NP, and in none of them is it the direct object of the verb. The plural direct object agreement prefix neéč- in 46 agrees with the benefactive (even though the semantic patient is also plural). In 47 a first person benefactive direct object has demoted ergative subject-verb agreement from ?a- to Ø- (as in 41 above), just as a first or second person direct object would do to a normal transitive verb.

43) Phinney 142:13-14
qágca?cpim tápanyáya timúuni ?iméesnim tupé?snim
grandmother-ERG 3ERG-make-BEN-ASP bow deer-GEN rib-GEN
'The grandmother made him a bow of deer's rib'

44) Phinney 137:14
wáaqit kix ?ewí?enis yú?snex tuyé
therefore let me 1ERG-shoot-BEN-ASP poor one-OBJ pheasant
'Therefore, let me shoot a pheasant for the poor one'

45) Phinney 315:13-14
?e héptenu?13 sámx pitíňine
1ERG-get-BEN-go-ASP clothing girl-OBJ
'I will go get clothing for the girl'

46) Phinney 325:15
?eneécinpeñiy kúusx kaa sóóx
2ERG-PL-get-BEN-IMP bowl and spoon
'Get for them the bowl and spoon'

47) Phinney 151:14
?iniit do? himéeqis Ñ-hanyánim
lodge very large 2NOM-make-BEN-IMP
'Make a very large lodge for me'

2.3. Genitive promotion. The same verbal suffix used for benefactive promotion also serves for genitive promotion. Genitive promotion is at least partially optional (as will be seen later in the discussion of the antipassive). It applies to either alienable or inalienable possession. In both 51 and 52 neéš- agrees with a plural genitive of alienable possession.

48) Aoki 20 (1, 2) 1
?ecuwkwenėyse ?ipné timíňe
1ERG-know-GEN-ASP he-OBJ heart
'I know his heart'

49) Aoki 17:138
kimet kaa póopciyawna?ysana kúxsne miya?c
then and 3ERG-kill-GEN-ASP Cook-OBJ child
'Then they killed Cook's son'
50) Aoki 4:29
  kaa núusnu peétqe?npe?nye  xáxaasna
  and nose 3ERG-grab-GEN-ASP grizzly-OBJ
  'And he grabbed grizzly bear's nose'

51) Phinney 96:13
  ku’us hinëeskiyë?nye  ?ôypaaxat talátat
  thus 3NOM-PL-do-GEN-ASP all five cedar sticks
  'Thus he did to all five of their cedar sticks'

52) Phinney 323:7
    xaláp hinëeskiyë?nye14
    open 3NOM-PL-do-GEN-ASP
    'She opened theirs (the door)'

The suffix -nim does mark a genitive noun in a demoted object NP. For example, in 53 below genitive promotion has occurred. But ?imeesnim 'the deer's' has not been promoted to direct object, it being marked with -nim instead of -ne. The plural (there is verb agreement with nàas-) direct object recoverable from context is 'the wolves'.

53) Phinney 267:6-7
  ku?skí hinaásyogopnày'sa  ?imeesnim píips teqquénixt
  thus 3NOM-PL-eat heartily-GEN-ASP deer-GEN bone leftover
  'Thus he eats their (the wolves') leftover bones of the deer with much gusto'

2.4. Locative promotions.

2.4.1. Directional dative promotion. A directional dative is promoted to direct object by the verbal suffix -yyú/-núu, as in 55 below, where the verb has been transitivized by it. The same verb with intransitive morphology is contrasted in 54.

54) Aoki 1:7
    waáqi kaa hiixićemne  xáxaac
    now and 3NOM-be angry-ASP grizzly
    'Now Grizzly Bear got angry'

55) Phinney 113:9
    kaa ?áatwaynim  komác peexícemnúuye  têxtéxne
    and old woman-ERG terribly 3ERG-be angry-DIR-ASP locust-OBJ
    'And the old woman became terribly angry at Locust'

Directional dative promotion with the verb kuu- 'go' is often idiomatic for 'to marry', as in 57 below. In 56 there is no promotion; the clause is intransitive.

56) Aoki 18:3
    sooyâapoo kawa go? mešxeemx hípekuýë
    whiteman then quite mountain-to 3NOM-PL-go-ASP
    'The whiteman had gone to the mountains'

57) Aoki 11:1 (title of a "true" tale)
    ?awanín̓m  pêekiyyuusə  wexpúusə
    widow-ERG 3ERG-go-DIR-ASP rattlesnake-OBJ
    'Widow marries a rattlesnake'
Genitive promotion takes over directional dative promotion, as can be seen in 58 below. The morpheme for benefactive/genitive promotion is suffixed to the verb after the locative suffix -yu'-/nu'.

58) Phinney 229:4

\[\text{kaa waqoʔ wepteesne simes pexyuʔ eysene wexwegénm}\]
and now eagle-OBJ bad ERG-go-DIR-BEN-ASP frog-ERG

'And now the frog went to Eagle's bed'

Directional dative promotion is optional (its motivation will be speculated on later). The promotion of directional datives has not occurred in 60, 61 and 62 below.

59) Aoki 9:106

\[\text{kawoʔ hickilíne yúʔc}\]
then 3NOM-went home poor

'Then the poor thing went home'

60) Phinney 151:2-3

\[\text{kawoʔ hickilíne pisítx}\]
then 3NOM-went home father-to

'Then she went home to her father's'

61) Phinney 82:3

\[\text{metu kawoʔ hikúuye cháxaacpx}\]
but then 3NOM-went grizzly-to

'Nevertheless she went to Grizzly Bear's (lodge)'

62) Phinney 270:13-14

\[\text{kii hikúuye pisítx}\]
now 3NOM-went father-to

'Now she went to her father's'

In example 63 there are two clauses; in the first the directional marking is on the independent pronoun 'iméémx 'to you all', in the second clause the same referent has been promoted to direct object by the suffix -nóo and consequently there is plural direct object verbal agreement via nas-.

63) Aoki 13:19-20

\[\text{calawí lemtúus haʔácnsa \( ?\text{iméémx} \).}\]
if enemy 3NOM-enter-ASP of you all-to

\[\text{hinaspaynoósana imemlemtúusnim \( \ldots \) }\]
3NOM-PL-arrive-DIR-ASP your-enemy-ERG

'If an enemy comes in to you, your enemy comes to you, ...'

2.4.2. Allative promotion. Inanimate allative objects can also be optionally promoted to direct object. The following two examples contrast the allative case of the noun (example 64) with promotion to direct object of an allative object (in 65), both with the same verb kuu- 'go'.

64) Aoki 17:43-44

\[\text{kala \( \bar{\text{g}}-\text{kusíix \ yáwwinmax}\).}\]
just 1NOM-go-ASP Rapid River-to

'We are just going to Rapid River'
65) Phinney 103:11-12
metu weetu? ?aalaana tamawin qatat peexyuusinm
but not fire-OBJ too near 3ERG-go-DIR-ASP
'But they are not coming too close to the fire'

The following two examples make the same contrast with the verb
páay- 'arrive'.

66) Aoki 2:2
kíímet hipapáyna himeqíispe hiqíípe
then 3MOM-PL-arrive-ASP big-LOC bench-LOC
'Then they arrived at a big bench (of the river)'

67) Aoki 12:21
kíímet papaynóoma kíínu? texpe?éme
then 3ERG-arrive-DIR-ASP here prairie-OBJ
'Then he came here to the prairie'

In example 68 there are two locative objects, one of which has been
promoted to direct object. In 69 the promoted direct object is
evidently the 'whiteman' who is in the house, since ?iniítx 'to the
house' has not been promoted.

68) Phinney 78:2-3
kíímet koná petqep?niyuuye téekinpe ?iniíne
then 3ERG-suddenly come-DIR-ASP meadow-LOC lodge-OBJ
'Then he suddenly came upon a lodge in a little meadow'

69) Aoki 17:48-49
kíí kííye ?iniítx ekiyúsíx
now we house-to 1ERG-go-DIR-ASP
'Now we are going to the house to him'

It is not entirely clear at this preliminary stage exactly what the
motivation for locative promotion is. Any perusal of the texts,
however, reveals that unpromoted animates are very rare and that
promoted inanimates are also somewhat rare. As we have seen, on
occasion even the highly topical first and second person independent
pronouns are not promoted to direct object. Here is another example.

70) Phinney 79:6-7
kala kunku? ?ínínpx himamóotosxísix
just always my-to 3NOM-consider superior-ASP
'Just always they are considering themselves superior to me'

2.4.3. Ablative promotion. Aoki (1970, page 97) lists a verbal suffix,
-(n)áapiik, and an example sentence in which it has marked the promotion
of an ablative argument to direct object.

71) Aoki (1970) 97
kalo? ?áméipáaswisiga kaa hinawaka?yákáapiiksa
just 1ERG-disobey-ASP and 3NOM-PL-fly-ABL-ASP
'We just disobeyed her (our mother) then she flew away from us'

Aoki contrasts weeke?ykse 'I am flying' as an example of the same
verb without ablative promotion. The following two examples have
unpromoted ablative nouns, which in Nez Perce suffix -(p)kíñix.
Note that the unpromoted NP in 72 below is highly animate.

72) Aoki 13:19
    keleemet miyóoxatopkiniix hisepéelkiliicine
    pipe chief-ABLATIVE 3NOM-pass around-ASP
    'Starting from the chief they passed the pipe around'

73) Phinney 41:6
    hipawspáyxtoqa meqséemkinix
    3NOM-PL-move back-ASP mountains-ABLATIVE
    'They moved back from the mountains'

2.4.4. Additional locative promotions. Among the verbal suffixes listed on pages 93-103 of Aoki 1970 are those that we have just discussed involving the various promotions to direct object. Aoki also lists there several suffixes that we have not yet discussed that concern the semantics of the direct object. These include -(n)áatk 'as the direct object passes by', -ča 'over the direct object', -éece 'on/upon the direct object', -so? 'against the direct object', and -(n)úukini 'as the direct object approaches'. Often these suffixes merely add semantic detail to the direct object of an already transitive verb. Sometimes, however, they are involved in transitivizing an intransitive verb. The following examples that involve promotions to direct object are from Aoki 1970, unless otherwise noted. The verbs hi- 'say, tell' in 74 and wehí- 'bark' in 77 can also take dative direct objects without these promotional suffixes. I have not yet found a clear example of promotion involving -éece.

74) -(n)áatk promotion
   a. ku'stiit koná hihine héeneku?
      same there 3NOM-say-ASP again
      'She said the same thing again'
   
   b. Phinney 53:8-9
      ku'stiit koná páa-ø-natka héeneku?
      same there 3ERG-say-PASSING-ASP again
      'She said the same thing to him as he passed again'

75) -ča promotion
   a. huuxelece
      3NOM-roll-ASP
      'It is rolling'
   
   b. páhoxalčasa
      3ERG-roll-OVER-ASP
      'It is rolling over him'

76) -so? promotion
   a. ø-wistokáhsasa
      1NOM-shoot upward-ASP
      'I shoot upward'
   
   b. ?awstokáhsosa
      1ERG-shoot upward-AGAINST-ASP
      'I shoot upward against someone'

77) -(n)úukini promotion
   a. hiwehne ciqágamqal
      3NOM-bark-ASP dog
      'The dog barked'
Some of these locative suffixes can co-occur with simple directional promotion via -yúu/-núu. In 78 the verb níkeex- 'draw back a bow' occurs with simple directional promotion, and in 79 this already transitivized verb (nikeexnúu- 'draw back a bow at') has the additional suffix -aatak 'as the direct object passes by'.

78) Phinney 37:13
hinkeexnúuse
3NOM-draw-DIR-ASP
'He draws back his bow at me'

79) Phinney 37:11
kaa wáago? céepki paankaaxnóo-aatak
and now arrow-INST 3ERG-draw-DIR-PASSING-ASP
'And now with an arrow he drew back his bow at her as she went past'

2.5. Associative promotion. Nez Perce has an associative case that is distinct from the instrumental. A noun in the associative case suffixes -(n)lin, as in 80 below, while in the instrumental case -ki is suffixed, as in 81.

80) Phinney 45:12
métu konó? hiwgsu'úce ?iceyéeye sooxíin
but there 3NOM-sit-SG-ASP coyote spoon-ASSOC
'But there Coyote sits with the spoon'

81) Phinney 21:7
walácki peetqeseweyne
knife-INSTR 3ERG-quickly cut-ASP
'He cut it quickly with the knife'

In the texts most examples of the associative case involve animates. When an inanimate is in the associative case, as in 80 above, subject-verb agreement is singular, while with an animate there is plural subject-verb agreement, as in the following two examples.15

82) Phinney 261:13
kálá qaaca?ciin hitéemksix
just grandmother-ASSOC 3NOM-barbecueue-PL-ASP
'He is just barbecuing it with his grandmother'

83) Phinney 10:2
hitééwyecine qaaca?ciin wáawa
3NOM-dwell-PL-ASP grandmother-ASSOC mosquito
'Mosquito was living there with his grandmother'

The associative case is optionally promoted to direct object in Nez Perce via the verbal suffix -twe, as in 84 below. Example 85 contrasts the same verb without a promotion to direct object of an associative NP.

84) Phinney 154:6
kaa wáago? pehétpim péewyeetwene kálá
and now sister-ERG 3ERG-move-ASSOC-ASP just
'And now her sister just went with her'
85) Phinney 480:11
  ?iy, kāła ku? ?ituů hiwáyaga
  oh just something 3NOM-move-ASP
  'Oh, just something was moving'

3.0. Constructions involving adjustments in both subject and direct object.

3.1. The antipassive. The antipassive in ergative languages has been described as the reverse mechanism of the passive. While the passive promotes a direct object to subject, the antipassive promotes the ergative to absolutive case. In both mechanisms there is demotion -- in the passive it is the agent that gets demoted and in the antipassive it is the patient. Also, there is in both mechanisms a detransitivization of the verb. Now, since there is no absolutive case in Nez Perce, the Nez Perce antipassive cannot involve a promotion to it. But it does involve the loss of all ergative marking in the clause. The ergative subject becomes a nominative subject (with nominative subject agreement) and the direct object is demoted in the sense that it no longer controls ergative marking in the clause, nor is it ever case marked as a direct object NP. The antipassive clause resembles an intransitive clause in that its verb has the same kind of subject agreement, and also in that the subject NP is not case marked. This antipassive, instead of being the Nez Perce answer to the passive in European languages, is really the reverse or undoing of the Nez Perce object promotion strategies.

As we have seen (section 1), it is the existence of (or promotion to) direct object that controls ergative marking in the clause in Nez Perce. It is not the nature of the subject. Conversely, the antipassive must be viewed as the demotion of the direct object. It is the nature of the direct object (whether semantic or pragmatic) that triggers antipassive in Nez Perce. It is never the nature of the subject.

Aoki (1970, page 106) describes one of the functions of the constructions that I am calling the antipassive. He contrasts the following.

86) ña’mé’ìsa miya’asna
  ŠERG-hear-ASP child-OBJ
  'I hear a child'

87) ŋ-mi’ìsa miya’c
  1NOM-hear-ASP child
  'I hear my child'

The following examples show the possessor of the direct object as coreferential with the subject by use of the antipassive construction.

88) Phinney 306:6-7
  kawd? hiteméetegelike ?il?pílp cíickan ?iceyéeye
  then 3NOM-spread out-ASP red blanket coyote
  'Then Coyote spread out his red blanket'

89) Phinney 137:4
  x̂axaac wáaqo’ súu’um hitwíixne
  grizzly now master 3NOM-follow-ASP
  'The grizzly now followed his master'
90) Phinney 83:12
hiwéwlqse colakstint xaαac
3NOM-want-ASP hand-drum grizzly
'Grizzly wants his hand-drum'

A genitive pronoun coreferential with the subject may show up in the
object NP, as in 91 below. Since this necessitates the antipassive
construction, the genitive is therefore not promoted to direct
object (example 48 is repeated again from above as 92 below for
comparison).

91) Aoki 10:14
łamlamatki piθiθin hiʔcesuʔupe ʔipnįm samŋ
quickly girl 3NOM-cut-ASP she-GEN shirt
'Quickly the girl cut her shirt'

92) Aoki 20 (1, 2) 1
ʔecuíkweneŋye ʔipnį timėną
1ERG-know-GEN-ASP he-OBJ heart
'I know his heart'

The Nez Perce antipassive also seems to serve the function of coding
a non-specific or generic direct object. The criterion seems not to
be the semantic specificity of the referent, but the relevance to
the discourse of its specificity (see Givón 1982). The following
examples of antipassive constructions appear to involve just such
situations. Although in both cases there actually is a logical
referent, in neither does this fact have any pragmatic relevance.

93) Aoki 5:96-97
 sóøx hiweyeʔnpixneme himéeeqis
spoon 3NOM-leaving pick up-ASP big
'As she left, she picked up a big spoon'

94) Phinney 145:1-2
 kii heenikuu céeq hiʔnįpe háacwal
now again arrow 3NOM-take-ASP boy
'Now the boy again took an arrow'

When any antipassive clause contains a genitive noun in the direct
object, the genitive noun will not be promoted, but will have the
genitive suffix -nim/-nm/-m. The following is an example (but I am
not sure why 'the woman's advice' should have been demoted).

95) Phinney 30:7
hittuolaya ʔayatom tiwįyext
3NOM-forget-ASP woman-GEN advice
'He forgot the woman's advice'

The mechanisms of promotion to direct object must be viewed as feeders
to the antipassive. The following two examples of the antipassive
involve, respectively, dative promotion and directional dative
promotion. Dative promotion requires no verbal suffix, it being
obligatory in all cases.
96) Phinney 17:6
kála ?iweepne sáqsín hiníigana
just wife pitch 3NOM-give-ASP
'He would just give his wife pitch gum'

97) Phinney 327:16-17
kaa píística hinaxpaykóoya sítëqs
and father 3NOM-bring-DIR-ASP liver
'And she brought her father the liver'

3.2. The passive. Nez Perce has a passive construction that totally denotes the ergative case and promotes the direct object to subject. The copulas wee- 'be' or wicée- 'become' are introduced in the passive clause to code tense/aspect and subject-verb agreement, and the main verb suffixes -(n)iin/-yiin. Compare the following.

98) Phinney 173:7-8
walímceepki pee?wuye
arrow-INSTR 3ERG-shoot-ASP
'He shot her with an arrow'

99) Phinney 175:6
?ewyiín híwes
shoot-STATIVE 3NOM-be-ASP
'She is shot'

The mechanisms of direct object promotion must also be viewed as feeders to the passive construction. Numerous examples exist in the texts of the promotion to subject of a dative direct object. But it has been extremely difficult to find examples of other semantic cases being so promoted by the passive. I am awaiting the opportunity to check out this prediction with an informant. Previous checks with my informant have revealed the unacceptability of the semantic patient in a bitransitive clause ever being promoted to subject, this being predictable due to the obligatory status of dative promotion in Nez Perce. The following are examples from texts of dative promotion feeding the passive rule.

100) Aoki 12:2-3
ke yo?má híwsoíne we?níkíín matápioo
which those 3NOM-be-PL.ASP name-STATIVE
'... those which were named Matápioo'

101) Aoki 15:30
kaa konímyawa híwca?níqa temcúukweníñ
and of that reason 3NOM-become-PL.ASP teach-STATIVE
'And for that reason they used to be taught it'

102) Aoki 19:2-3
kie ?éetx 0-pewcéeyu? wiisephínewíñ wéetes
here you all 2NOM-PL-become-ASP allot-STATIVE land
'Here you all will be allotted land'

3.3. The impersonal passive. A non-referential subject can still have ergative agreement in the verb if there is a direct object. In such cases number agreement is singular although the English impersonal 'they' often occurs as the translation in the texts. The
following two examples contrast subject demotion; in the first example (103) via the impersonal passive, in the second (104) via the passive.

103) Phinney 153:16-17
   wáaqo? ku? míne pëetulelipyiiksene häacwala
   already somewhere 3ERG-trample under-SG.ASP boy-OBJ
   'Already somewhere they have trampled the boy under'

104) Phinney 154:2-3
   ku? míne ?ée kāla háama tuléelipiikin ø-weep8
   somewhere you just husband trample under-STATIVE 2NOM-be-ASP
   'Somewhere your husband is just trampled under'

4.0. Concluding remarks. The broad range of semantic roles that can be promoted to direct object in Nez Perce suggests a strong correlation between syntactic form and pragmatic function. The frequent promotion of animates over inanimates, and of highly specific over non-specific participants argues for the high topicality status of the Nez Perce direct object (see Givón 1976 and Silverstein 1976). The obligatory promotions all involve conscious participants: datives, benefactives, genitives. This phenomenon that allows for the promotion to direct object of a wide variety of semantic cases has been observed in several distinct languages and language groups (for references see chapter 4 of Givón 1979 and chapter 5 of Dik 1980).

Heath (1976) considers seven functions of antipassive constructions. Among these are the constructions in Australian languages that promote the ergative case to absolutive so as to permit coreferentiality with the absolutive subject of a preceding clause, "category-linked" antipasses which apply only to specific tense, aspect, and/or modal categories, and antipasses that function to demote "indefinite, obvious, or insignificant" direct objects. Category-linked antipasses seem to be an areal feature of the diverse ergative languages found from the Pyrenees to the Himalayas. The Sumerian antipassive, for example, is believed to have marked the imperfective aspect, the ergative construction having been reserved for the perfective (Michalowski 1980). The Nez Perce antipassive functions as a demotion of the direct object, similar to Heath's characterization of antipassive constructions in English, Uto-Aztecan, and Eskimo. The antipassive serves the opposite function in Nez Perce to that of the direct object promotions. Pragmatically irrelevant (see Givón 1982) direct objects are demoted.

Nez Perce thus presents a clear case where the ergative construction is entirely dependent on the (discourse) status of the direct object, not the subject. The "impersonal passive" (see section 3.3), which encodes non-referential subjects, employs ergative subject-verb agreement when the direct object is pragmatically relevant. At the very least this shows that transitivity marking must consider the relative weights of subject and direct object (see Hopper and Thompson 1980, and Givón 1981). Further comment on the pragmatics of subject and direct object in Nez Perce must await a more detailed analysis of the available texts.
FOOTNOTES


2 For the examples cited in this paper I have normalized the orthographies of Pinney and Aoki, using Aoki's system except for indicating vowel length by writing the vowel letter twice.

3 Nez Perce has no grammatical gender, but to simplify matters I translate 'he' rather than 'he/she/it'. In examples cited from texts the translation will be determined by context.

4 The conditioning factors in the optionality of the plural markers pe- and nees- will not be dealt with in this paper. But it is to be expected that discourse factors such as are discussed in the conclusion to this paper are involved.

5 The vowel e [æ] alternates with a, and u with o, in accordance with the much discussed Nez Perce vowel harmony. For a description see Aoki (1970). It should also be noted that pe- prefixed to a stem with initial we(e) results in půu, and pe- + wa(a) similarly results in póo. A phonological rule regularly converts ewe into uu and awa into oo.

6 See Silverstein (1976) for a universal hierarchy that predicts this split ergative system.

7 See Givón (1980) where the ergative case is shown to arise either from genitive marking or agent marking in passive constructions.

8 A subject NP that contains a genitive has subject-verb agreement with that genitive, rather than with the head noun. Subject-verb agreement for person, however, is in accordance with the following paradigm, as opposed to that in table 1 of this paper (cf. also Aoki 1970, page 106).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd person</td>
<td>ŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>?e-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 The usual allomorph of the benefactive suffix, -(e)n(i), is evidently the historical result of a serialization with the simple verb stem ?enî- 'give'. Thus ?ewî- 'shoot' + ?enî- 'give' becomes ?ewî?enî- (as in example 44) and means 'shoot it for someone'.

10 My informant, a relatively young speaker, will permit -?ayn to mark the promoted benefactive object NP in a clause such as the following. Whether this is an innovation under the influence of English or merely some peculiarity that has yet to surface in the texts is not now apparent.

walc páanyåhya náama?ayn  knife 3ERG-make-BEN-ASP man-for 'He made the knife for the man'

11 In this paper, whenever a suffix is underlined such that the final aspectual or imperative suffix of the verb is left dangling, I will merely note the left-over suffix as ASP or IMP without further refinement.
The ergative suffix -pim, in contrast to -nim, has the added value of an honorific.

The morpheme -te 'go in order to do something' is suffixed after the benefactive suffix. It is not itself a promotional suffix. It always refers to the subject of the clause, be the verb transitive or intransitive.

A restricted class of punctual verbs occur with auxiliary kuu-'do, go'; for example: xalap 'open', yekep 'close', likip 'touch', kupip 'break', etc.

The distinction between animates and inanimates being made by number agreement in the verb also applies to reciprocals. Compare Aoki (1970), page 90.

See the index to Dixon (1980) for the Australian antipassive, and Kalmár (1979) for the Eskimo version.
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