

10 Three Doubling Constructions in Halkomelem

Donna B. Gerds

10.1 Introduction

Perhaps one of the most important legacies of the theory of Relational Grammar is the recognition that argument structure positions such as subject and object are highly constrained in both their semantics and their syntax. The Stratal Uniqueness Law (Perlmutter and Postal 1983) limits the positions associated with a single verb to one each of the term relations (subject, object, and indirect object). Furthermore, the Motivated Chômeage Law (Perlmutter and Postal 1983) stipulates that a nominal cannot give up its status as an argument unless some other nominal is brought in to occupy that position. This highly constrained view of “rule interaction” has held up well to various empirical challenges, and has been incorporated into most modern theories of syntax.

One class of constructions that Relational Grammar handles quite elegantly involves the arrival of an NP to an object position—advancements (as in applicatives), unions (as in causatives), and ascensions (as in subject-to-object raising). The new object usurps the object relation, placing the notional object (the patient) *en chômeage*, thus providing an empirical basis for the Motivated Chômeage Law. However, another class of constructions has proven problematic for a theory of chômeage: in antipassive constructions not only does the notional object not occupy the object position, but neither does any other NP, and thus the surface syntax of an antipassive construction is intransitive.

We can see this by comparing a transitive clause (1a) with an antipassive clause (1b) in Halkomelem, a Salish language spoken by around one hundred elders in southwestern British Columbia:¹

- (1) a. naʔət qʷəs-t-əs t⁰ə ʔeləm̓ sce:ltən.
AUX go.in.water-TR-3ERG DT salted salmon
‘He/she put the salted fish in water.’

- b. naʔət q^ws-els ʔə t⁰ə ʔeləm̄ sce:ftən.
 AUX go.in.water-ACT OBL DT salted salmon
 'He/she soaked the salted fish.'

As Gerds (1988) points out, the object in a transitive clause appears as a simple DP as in (1a), not as an oblique-marked DP (with the oblique preposition ʔə) as in (1b). Furthermore, Halkomelem verb morphology transparently represents the difference between transitive and intransitive clauses: (i) the third-person ergative in (1a) determines agreement (-əs), but the third-person absolutive in (1b) is zero-marked; and (ii) the transitive verb in (1a) is overtly marked by a transitive suffix (-t), while the intransitive verb in (1b) is marked instead with the antipassive suffix (-els).

The seemingly unmotivated chômeage of an object is not limited to antipassive constructions. In this chapter, I discuss three additional constructions in which the notional object appears as an oblique-marked DP rather than as the syntactic object. These are constructions with lexical suffixes (2), denominal verbs (3), and cognate objects (4).

- (2) nem̄ č nəw̄=əlcəp ʔə k^wθə sya!
 go 2SUB bring.in=firewood OBL DT firewood
 'Go bring in the firewood!'
- (3) nem̄ cən c-k^wəmləx^w ʔə k^wθə ʔpeý k^wəmləx^w.
 go 1SUB VBL-get.roots OBL DT cedar root
 'I'm going to get cedar roots.'
- (4) ʔiləm cən ceʔ ʔə k^w s-ʔiləm.
 sing 1SUB FUT OBL DT N-sing
 'I will sing a song.'

What these three types of examples have in common is that an element inside the predicate is doubled by the head noun in the oblique-marked DP. Thus I refer to these collectively as "doubling" constructions.

Before turning to these constructions, I first review in section 10.2 some examples of what would be considered in RG terms to be the motivated chômeage of an object NP. I briefly illustrate the properties of the final object versus the chômeurized object, which appears as an oblique-marked DP, in several constructions. A key piece of evidence is extraction: chômeurized objects are extracted differently from both direct objects and oblique nominals. In section 10.3, I turn to a discussion of the syntax and semantics of doubling constructions, showing that the oblique-marked DPs in these constructions align with the chômeurized objects discussed in section 10.2. Examination of these constructions leads to the conclusion that objects may be chômeurized not only if another NP takes on the object role, but also if there is some predicate-internal reference to the nominal. I briefly explore the limits of the

phenomena that fall under this umbrella in section 10.4, where I return to the issue of antipassive constructions. I conclude with some brief remarks on the syntax and semantics of doubling constructions and their implications for the morphology-syntax interface in section 10.5.

10.2 Extra Objects

Halkomelem Salish is, in the parlance of Mapping Theory, a 2-MAP language (Gerdtz 1992, 1998b). That is, at most two positions are morphosyntactically licensed in the surface syntax. In Halkomelem monotransitive clauses, the agent and patient will link to the two MAPs.

- (5) niʔ q̣ʷaqʷ-ət-əs t⁰ə swəỵqeʔ t⁰ə speʔəθ.
 AUX club-TR-3ERG DT man DT bear
 'The man clubbed the bear.'
- (6) niʔ cən q̣ʷaqʷ-ət t⁰ə speʔəθ.
 AUX 1SUB club-TR DT bear
 'I clubbed the bear.'
- (7) niʔ q̣ʷaqʷ-əθamš-əs t⁰ə swəỵqeʔ.
 AUX club-TR:1OBJ-3ERG DT man
 'The man clubbed me.'

This means that any clause has at most two direct arguments, which in Halkomelem are determiner phrases (DPs) or their equivalent in subject or object pronominal marking.²

But what happens when there are more than two NPs competing for the MAPs, as for example in ditransitives (8), benefactive applicatives (9), or causatives based on transitive verbs (10)?

- (8) nem̄ cən sam̄-əs-t ɬə steniʔ ʔə θə nə snəxʷəl.
 AUX 1SUB sell-DAT-TR DT woman OBL DT 1POS canoe
 'I'm going to sell my car to the woman.'
- (9) niʔ q̣ʷəl-ət-t-əs ɬə nə ten ɬə steniʔ ʔə kʷθə səplil.
 AUX bake-BEN-TR-3ERG DT 1POS mother DT woman OBL DT bread
 'My mother baked the bread for the woman.'
- (10) nem̄ cən məkʷ-stəxʷ t⁰ə sʰiʔʰqəl ʔə t⁰ə q̣əyem̄ən, nem̄ ʔə t⁰ə kʷaʰkʷa
 go 1SUB pick.up-CS DT child OBL DT shell go OBL DT salt.water
 cəwmən.
 seashore
 'I'm going to get the boy to pick up seashells by the seashore.'

Halkomelem is what Dryer (1986) calls a primary/secondary object language. In cases of competition, the patient always loses the object slot to some other nominal. Thus, in examples like those above, the dative (8), benefactive (9), or causee (10) is a direct argument, which appears as a DP, as in the above examples, or a pronominal object, as in the following:

- (11) ni? ʔam-əs-θamš-əs ʔə kʷθə pukʷ.
 AUX give-DAT-TR:1OBJ-3ERG OBL DT book
 'He gave me the book.'
- (12) ni? qʷəl-ət-θamš-əs ʔə kʷθə sce:ltən.
 AUX bake-BEN-TR:1OBJ-3ERG OBL DT salmon
 'He baked the salmon for me.'

The patient, on the other hand, is framed as an oblique-marked DP.

Extraction, which is used in a variety of constructions, including relative clauses, *wh*-questions, clefts, and pseudo-clefts, provides additional evidence for the difference between the direct argument and the oblique-marked extra object in applied constructions.³ As the following example shows, objects are extracted without the addition of any morphology to the verb:

- (13) a. ni? č lem-ət kʷθə swəyqeʔ.
 AUX 2SUB look.at-TR DT man
 'You looked at the man.'
- b. nił kʷθə swəyqeʔ [niʔ ləm-ət-əxʷ].
 3PRO DT man AUX look.at-TR-2SSUB
 'It's the man that you looked at.'

As the following examples show, applied objects can also be extracted with no additional morphology:

- (14) swiwləs kʷθə niʔ ʔam-əs-t-əs ʔə kʷθə pukʷ.
 boy DT AUX give-DAT-TR-3SSUB OBL DT book
 'It's a boy that he gave the book to.'
- (15) łwet kʷə niʔ qʷəl-ət-t-əxʷ ʔə kʷθə səplilʔ
 who DT AUX bake-BEN-TR-2SSUB OBL DT bread
 'Who did you bake the bread for?'
- (16) łwet ceʔ kʷə neŋ məkʷ-stəxʷ-əxʷ ʔə tʰə qəyemənʔ
 who FUT DT go pick.up-CS-2SSUB OBL DT shell
 'Who are you going to have pick up the shells?'

In contrast, the extra object can only be extracted via nominalization; the verb has a nominalizing prefix *s-* and the subject is expressed as a possessor:

language. In case
nominal. Thus,
(10) is a direct
nominal object,

relative clauses,
the difference
applied con-
out the addi-

with no addi-

verb has

- (17) nił k^wθə puk^w ni? s-ʔam-əs-t-s k^wθə swiwləs.
3PRO DT book AUX N-give-DAT-TR-3POS DT boy
'It's the book that he gave the boy.'
- (18) snəx^wəl k^wθə ni? s-θəy-əlc-t-s k^wθə swəyqeʔ.
canoe DT AUX N-fix-BEN-TR-3POS DT man
'A canoe is what he fixed for the man.'
- (19) stem ʔalə k^wə ni? ʔən s-mək^w-stəx^w t⁰ə sʔiʔʔqəʔ?
What INQU DT AUX 2POS N-pick.up-CS DT child
'What did you have the child pick up?'

Direct extraction of the oblique-marked DP is ungrammatical:

- (20) *nił k^wθə puk^w ni? ʔam-əs-t-əs k^wθə swiwləs.
3PRO DT book AUX give-DAT-TR-3SSUB DT boy
'It's the book that he gave the boy.'

Not only do extra objects contrast with direct objects, they also contrast with true obliques. Like extra objects, true obliques are marked with the preposition ʔə:

- (21) ni? cən q^waq^w-ət ʔə k^wθən ʃapəl-əl.
AUX 1SUB club-TR OBL DT:2POS shovel-PST
'I hit him with your shovel.'
- (22) yaθ ʔəw yə-x^waŋčənəm ʔə tənə ʃe:ɬ.
Always LNK SER-run(IMPF) OBL DM road
'He always ran on that road.'

They are also extracted via nominalization.

- (23) nił k^wθə ʔən-ʃapəl-əl ni? nə ʃ-q^waq^w-ət.
3PRO DT 2POS-shovel-PST AUX 1POS N.O-club-TR
'It's your shovel that I clubbed it with.'
- (24) nił tənə ʃe:ɬ yaθ ʔəw ʃ-x^waŋčənəm-s.
3PRO DM road always LNK N.O-run-3POS
'It's this road that he always runs on.'

However, the nominalizing prefix used in oblique extraction is the prefix ʃ(x^w)- and not s-.⁴

In summary, there are two types of extraction in Halkomelem: direct extraction, which is used for the extraction of objects, and extraction through nominalization, which is used for oblique-marked DPs. Thus, the conditions for extraction can be summarized as follows:

- (25) a. Objects are directly extracted.
b. Oblique-marked DPs are extracted via nominalization.

- i. Nominalization with *s-* is used to extract extra objects (themes of ditransitives, patients of causatives, etc.).
- ii. Nominalization with $\mathcal{S}(x^w)$ - is used to extract obliques (location, direction, instrument, manner, stimulus).

Following the terminology of Gerdts and Hukari (forthcoming), I refer to oblique-marked DPs of type i as oblique objects, thus distinguishing them from oblique-marked DPs of type ii, which I refer to simply as obliques.

As summarized in table 10.1, case marking and extraction taken together can be used to distinguish the three types of nonsubject nominals in Halkomelem.

10.3 Doubling Constructions

The constructions that I have discussed so far (ditransitives, applicatives, and causatives) are fairly typical of those found in many of the world's languages, especially in what Gerdts (1992) refers to as 2-MAP languages. But now the plot thickens. Halkomelem has many polysynthetic properties, including robust verbal affixation. Besides verbal affixes for transitives, applicatives, causatives, reflexives, reciprocals, middles, and desideratives, Halkomelem also has lexical suffixes (Gerdts 2003), which are suffixes that function like incorporated nouns, and verbalizing prefixes used to create denominal verbs (Gerdts and Hukari 2008).⁵

In many of the constructions formed with these affixes, not only is reference made to the nominal within the predicate complex, but often there is a freestanding DP making more precise reference to the same nominal. Thus, Halkomelem frequently shows "doubling" effects. The freestanding DP is typically packaged as an oblique-marked phrase—more precisely, an oblique object.

In this section, I show three constructions with doubling—lexical suffixes in section 10.3.1, denominal verbs in 10.3.2, and cognate objects in 10.3.3.

10.3.1 Lexical Suffixes

Halkomelem, like other Salish languages, has approximately one hundred lexical suffixes—suffixes with the meanings of nouns. Most of these bear little or no resemblance to freestanding nouns of the same or similar meaning:

Table 10.1
Properties of objects and obliques in Halkomelem

	Objects	Oblique objects	Obliques
Case marking	zero	preposition ?ə	preposition ?ə
Extraction	direct	via nominalization with <i>s-</i>	via nominalization with $\mathcal{S}(x^w)$ -

(26)	qələm̄	'eye'	=aləs	'eye'
	sxəñə	'foot'	=šən	'foot, leg'
	teləw̄	'arm, wing'	=eχən	'arm, wing'
	leləm̄	'house'	=ełtx ^w	'building, room'
	qeɣ	'baby'	=eyəł	'baby, child'
	celəš	'hand'	=cəs	'hand, finger'

In a few cases, however, the suffix is clearly a truncated form of the noun:

(27)	θaθən	'mouth'	=(a)θən	'mouth, edge'
	məqsən	'nose'	=əqsən	'nose, point'
	təpsəm	'neck'	=əpsəm	'neck'
	təməx ^w	'land'	=məx ^w	'land, group of people'

So the generally held view is that lexical suffixes originated as N roots that occurred frequently in compounds, which were subsequently reduced to bound forms and later degraded to suffixes (Gerdtz and Hinkson 1996; Kinkade 1998).

Lexical suffixes commonly appear in complex predicates. That is, they are attached to a verb stem, and the resulting compound functions syntactically as the main predicate of a clause (Gerdtz 2003). One function of lexical suffixes is to refer to the patient of a semantically transitive verb:

(28)	šk ^w =əyəł	bathe=baby	'bathe a baby'
	sq̄=əlcəp	split=firewood	'split firewood'
	q ^w s=eýən	dip.into.water=net	'set a net'
	səw̄q̄=iw̄s	seek=body	'search for a lost person'
	lə=əlqən	cut=hair	'shear wool'

The clause can be syntactically intransitive, as can be seen by comparing the lexical suffix constructions in the (a) examples in (29)–(30) to the corresponding transitive clauses in the (b) examples in (29)–(30).⁶

- (29) a. ni? šk^w=əyəł lə sleni?
 AUX bathe=baby DT woman
 'The woman bathed the baby.'
- b. ni? šak^w-ət-əs lə sleni? lə qeɣ.
 AUX bathe-TR-3ERG DT woman DT baby
 'The woman bathed the baby.'
- (30) a. ?i: səq̄=əlcəp k^wθəñ məñə?
 AUX:Q split(IMPF)=firewood DT:2POS offspring
 'Is your son chopping wood?'
- b. ?i: seq̄-t-əs k^wθəñ məñə t⁰ə syał?
 AUX:Q split(IMPF)-TR-3ERG DT:2POS offspring DT firewood
 'Is your son splitting the firewood?'

The (b) clauses are transitive and thus their predicates have the *-t* transitive suffix and third-person ergative agreement, while the (a) clauses lack these. Furthermore, NPs in argument positions are always preceded by a determiner in Halkomelem.⁷ In this respect, lexical suffixation parallels the type of noun incorporation that has become known in the literature as compounding noun incorporation (S. Rosen 1989; Gerds 1998a). We see this for example in Chukchee (Muravyova 1998, 524–525):

- (31) a. gəm-∅ tə-wala-mna-∅-gʔak.
 1-ABS 1SG.S-knife-sharpen-AOR-1SG.S
 'I sharpened the knife.' (Lit. 'I knife-sharpened.')
- b. gəm-nan walə-∅ tə-mne-∅-gʔen.
 1-ERG knife-ABS:SG 1SG.S-sharpen.AOR-3SG.O
 'I sharpened the knife.'

The example of noun incorporation in (31a) is transparently intransitive, while the corresponding clause in (31b) is transitive, as seen by the difference in case marking on the subject.

Nevertheless, lexical suffixes can be doubled with a freestanding DP, which appears as an oblique-marked DP:⁸

- (32) nem̄ č θəy=eʔ tʰəñ šxʷʔamət!
 go 2SUB fix=fabric OBL DT bed
 'Go make your bed!'
- (33) nem̄ cən tʰw=e:n tʰə stʰeqən.
 go 1SUB cut.off=plant OBL DT bulrush
 'I'm going to cut down the bulrushes.'
- (34) nem̄ cən łəlq=ətʰeʔ tʰə ləmətulqən.
 go 1SUB soak=fibre OBL DT wool
 'I'm going to dye the wool.'

Often the semantics of such constructions involves a hyponymous relationship between the lexical suffix and the DP: the lexical suffix refers to the nominal's type, while the DP refers to a particular instantiation. In this respect, lexical suffixation parallels classifying noun incorporation; see the following Mohawk example (Mithun 1984, 870):

- (35) Tohka niyohserá:ke tsi nahe' sha'té:ku ní:kú:ti. rabahbót
 several so.it.year.numbers so it.goes eight of.them bullhead
 wahu-tsy-ahní:nu ki rake'niha.
 he-fish-bought this my.father
 'Several years ago, my father bought eight bullheads.'

The extraction evidence shows that the oblique-marked DP is an oblique object: it extracts via nominalization with the prefix *s-*.

itive suffix and
hermore, NPs
halem.⁷ In this
at has become
n 1989; Gerds
525):

ive, while the
case marking

DP, which

ationship be-
ominal's type,
al suffixation
mple (Mithun

que object: it

- (36) nił t⁰əñ šx^w?amət ni? nə s-θəy=e?ł.
3PRO DT bed AUX 1POS N-fix=fabric
'It's your bed that I made.'
- (37) nił t⁰ə st⁰eqən ?i nə s-t⁰q^w=e:n.
3PRO DT bulrush AUX 1POS N-cut.off=plant
'It's the bulrush that I am cutting.'
- (38) nił ce? tə?i ləmətulqən nə s-təlq=ət⁰e?
3PRO FUT DT wool 1POS N-soak=fibre
'It's that wool that I will dye.'

We see then that the oblique-marked DP doubling the lexical suffix behaves like the extra object in a semantically ditransitive construction in Halkomelem.

10.3.2 Denominal Verbs

Some intransitive verbs in Halkomelem, such as *ł-tih* 'drink tea', *c-tiqiw* 'have/get a horse', or *tx^w-lələm* 'buy a house', are composed of a noun base (e.g., *tih* 'tea', *stiqiw* 'horse', *lələm* 'house') and a verbalizing prefix (*ł-* 'eat, drink, partake', *c-* 'have, get, make', *tx^w-* 'buy').⁹ These forms appear in a denominal verb construction, where the patient of a transitive event corresponds to the head of the denominal verb (Gerds and Hukari 2008).

- (39) ?ewe:č ł-tih-əx^w?
NEG:Q:2SUB VBL-tea-2SSUB
'Won't you take tea?'
- (40) ?i ?ə yəx^w ?əw c-tiqiw k^wθəñ səlsilə?
AUX Q SUP LNK VBL-horse DT:2POS grandparent(PL)
'Do you suppose your grandparents still have horses?'
- (41) ni? tx^w-lələm k^wθə nə stiwən.
AUX VBL-house DT 1POS nephew
'My nephew bought a house.'

The Halkomelem denominal verb construction is syntactically intransitive, as seen by comparing (41) above to the corresponding transitive clause in (42).

- (42) ni? ?iləq-ət-əs k^wθə nə stiwən k^wθə lələms.
AUX buy-TR-3ERG DT 1POS nephew DT house-3POS
'My nephew bought his house.'

The clause in (42) exhibits both transitive marking and ergative agreement, while the clause in (41) does not.

Nevertheless, denominal verbs can be doubled with an oblique-marked DP.

(43) ni? cən ɬ-səplil ?ə kʷ pəpam səplil.
 AUX 1SUB VBL-bread OBL DT swelling.up bread
 'I ate some yeast bread.'

(44) nem cən ɬ-pəʎəm ?ə kʷθə menthol s-pəʎəm.
 go 1SUB VBL-smoke OBL DT menthol N-smoke
 'I'm going to smoke a menthol cigarette.'

(45) nem cən c-kʷəmləxʷ ?ə kʷθə ʃpey kʷəmləxʷ.
 go 1SUB VBL-get.roots OBL DT cedar root
 'I'm going to get cedar roots.'

The oblique NP serving as the doubled object is an oblique object: it is extracted via nominalization with the prefix *s-*.

(46) niɬ kʷθə pəpam səplil ni? nə s-ɬ-səplil.
 3PRO DT swelling.up bread AUX 1POS N-VBL-bread
 'It's yeast bread that I ate.'

(47) niɬ kʷθə menthol s-pəʎəm ni? nə s-ɬ-pəʎəm.
 3PRO DT menthol N-smoke AUX 1POS N-VBL-smoke
 'It's a menthol cigarette that I smoked.'

(48) niɬ kʷθə ʃpey kʷəmləxʷ ni? nə s-c-kʷəmləxʷ.
 3PRO DT cedar root AUX 1POS N-VBL-get.roots
 'It's cedar roots that I got.'

Semantically, there is often some overlap—but not complete identity—between the nominal base of the denominal verb and the oblique-marked DP.¹⁰ True doubling is not possible, because this would be semantically vacuous. Rather, the DP gives some more precise detail about the N serving as the verb base. For example in (49), the determiner *θə* identifies the DP as feminine.

(49) c-sisələ tʰəwniɬ ɬətam ?ə θə sisələ-s.
 VBL-grandparent(DIM) DT:LNK:3PRO wren OBL DT grandparent(DIM)-3POS
 'Wren had a grandmother.'

Also, we see that in (50) the DP includes an N modifier *sqʷi:lməxʷ* 'blackberry' of the head *pay* 'pie'.

(50) nem ɬ-pay ?ə kʷθə sqʷi:lməxʷ pay ni? sčəce? ?ə kʷθə lətem.
 go VBL-pie OBL DT blackberry pie AUX on OBL DT table
 'Go and have the blackberry pie that's on the table.'

The parallels between lexical suffix constructions and denominal verb constructions are obvious. Both involve an element within the verb complex that is doubled with an oblique object that overlaps with it semantically.

10.3.3 Cognate Objects

Nouns formed from verbs by means of the addition of the prefix *s-* are quite common in Halkomelem. One major pattern is nouns formed from unergative verbs (verbs that are intransitive and whose sole argument is an agent). The meaning of the noun is the concrete or abstract thing that is associated with the event denoted by the verb.¹¹

(51) q ^w al	'speak'	sq ^w al	'speech, words'
t̄iləm	'sing'	st̄iləm	'song'
t̄iwiʔət	'pray'	st̄iwiʔət	'prayer'
ya:m	'order (v.)'	syam	'order (n.)'
yays	'work (v.)'	syays	'work (n.)'
ʔəltən	'eat' ¹²	sʔəltən	'food'

None of the verbs in (51) allow the addition of the transitive suffix *-t* (**q^walt*, **t̄iləmət*, **t̄iwiʔəlt*, **ya:mt*,¹³ **yayst*, **ʔəltənət*), and they cannot appear in transitive clauses with a DP object. Nevertheless, Halkomelem allows such intransitive verbs to appear in semantically transitive clauses in which the patient is expressed as an oblique-marked DP, which can be cognate with the verb itself:

(52) t̄iləm cən ceʔ ʔə k^w s-t̄iləm.
sing 1SUB FUT OBL DT N-sing
'I will sing a song.'

(53) niʔ cən yays ʔə θə nə s-yays.
AUX 1SUB work OBL DT 1POS N-work
'I worked on my work.'

(54) t̄iwiʔət cən ceʔ ʔə k^wθə s-t̄iwiʔət ʔə tənə st̄eʔ ʔə t⁰eý.
pray 1SUB FUT OBL DT N-pray OBL this now OBL that
'I will say the prayer now.'

Crosslinguistically, languages differ as to whether they frame the cognate object as an argument or an adjunct (see Nakajima 2006 and the references there). Halkomelem has the ideal means for representing cognate objects—the oblique object, which has the semantics of an object but the syntax of a nonargument. Cognate objects are oblique objects: they extract via nominalization with the prefix *s-*.

(55) nił t̄ə nə s-t̄iləm [nə s-t̄iləm ceʔ].
3PRO DT 1POS N-sing 1POS N-sing FUT
'It is my song that I will sing.'

(56) nił t̄ə nə s-q^wal [nə s-q^wal ceʔ].
3PRO DT 1POS N-speak 1POS N-speak FUT
'It's my speech that I will speak.'

- (57) niŋ kʷθə nə s-tiwiʔət [nə s-tiwiʔət ceʔ ʔə tənə si'eʔ ʔə t⁰eɣ].
 ' 3PRO DT 1POS N-pray 1POS N-pray FUT OBL this now OBL that
 'It's my prayer I am going to say now.'

In these extraction examples, the predicate is a doppelgänger of the noun: the verb is nominalized with the *s-* prefix and so it exactly matches the noun that is derived from the verb with the same *s-* nominalizer.

The cognate object construction is the opposite of the denominal verb construction in the sense that the verb is more basic morphologically and the noun is derived. But semantically the two constructions are parallel: as in the denominal verb construction, oblique-marked DPs in the cognate object construction allow not only determiners, which anchor the NP in time and space, but also modifiers, which help establish the particular instantiation of the nominal:

- (58) qʷal cən ceʔ ʔə kʷ ʔəxʷiŋ s-qʷal.
 speak 1SUB FUT OBL DT little N-speak
 'I will give a little speech.'

Moreover, the noun need not be one that is morphologically derived from the verb, as long as it satisfies the selectional restrictions of the verb.

- (59) niʔ ʔəltən θə steniʔ ʔə kʷθə səplil.
 AUX eat DT woman OBL DT bread
 'The woman ate the bread.'
- (60) nem cən ya:m ʔə kʷ qʷteɣsən nem ʔə t⁰ə qʷteɣsən=eŋtxʷ.
 go 1SUB order:MID OBL DT shoe go OBL DT shoe=building
 'I am going to order shoes from the shoe store.'
- (61) niʔ cən filəm ʔə ɬə nə syəwən.
 AUX 1SUB sing OBL DT 1POS spirit.song
 'I sang my spirit song.'

In this respect, patients of intransitive verbs are no different than patients of transitive verbs.

In sum, what we see is that the cognate object construction belongs to a larger class of constructions—clauses with transitive semantics but intransitive syntax. This observation raises the broader issue of where to draw the line between doubling constructions and other syntactically intransitive clauses in Halkomelem, which in turn leads us to a discussion of antipassives.

10.4 Antipassive as a Case of Doubling?

Antipassives in Halkomelem (Gerdtz and Hukari 2000b, 2005), as mentioned in the introduction, show this same pattern: they are semantically transitive since they in-

volve an agent and a patient but are syntactically intransitive, as seen by comparing the transitive clauses in the (a) examples in (62)–(63) with their antipassive counterparts in the (b) examples in (62)–(63):

- (62) a. ni? təm-ət-əs t⁰ə sləwəy.
 AUX pound-TR-3ERG DT cedar.inner.bark
 ‘He/she pounded on the inner bark of the cedar.’
 b. ni? təm-els ?ə t⁰ə sləwəy.
 AUX pound-ACT OBL DT cedar.inner.bark
 ‘He/she pounded on the inner bark of the cedar.’
- (63) a. xəl-ət č t⁰əñ sne.
 write-TR 2SUB DT:2POS name.
 ‘Write your name.’
 b. ni? ?ə č wəl xəl-els ?ə k^wθə nə pipə?
 AUX Q 2SUB already write-ACT OBL DT 1POS paper?
 ‘Did you write my letter/form already?’

The patient in the antipassive, if it is expressed, appears as an oblique-marked DP, which tests to be an oblique object: it extracts via nominalization with the prefix *s-*.

- (64) stem k^wə ni? ?əñ-s-xəl-els?
 what DT AUX 2POS-N-write-ACT
 ‘What did you write?’

Unlike the three cases of doubling discussed in section 10.3, antipassives lack a precise reference to the nominal within the predicate complex; the only predicate-internal morphology in the above examples is the suffix *-els*, which Gerdts and Hukari (2000b) label as the “activity” suffix because it often adds a sense of habitual or routine activity to the event. This suffix is attached only to lexically transitive bases, so there is always some patient implied. In some cases the semantics of an unexpressed patient can be filled in via a cultural default:

- (65) q̄pels ‘collect’ [when going around collecting money]
 wənels ‘throw’ [when throwing out money or blankets in the bighouse]
 l̄q̄els ‘lay (it) down’ [when making a down payment or donating blankets]
 yəq^wels ‘burn’ [ritual burning of the clothes of the deceased]
 pepək^wəls ‘smoking’ [when smoking salmon for storing]
 l̄əyq̄els ‘push down’ [when kneading bread]
 yək^wels ‘break’ [when breaking old plates in ceremony for black faces]
 ləw̄els ‘(shaman) working a cure’, ‘escape being guessed right on’ [in the bone game]

Examples like these show that perhaps the best way to conceive of the antipassive morphology is that it functions like nonspecific object marking: it sketches the presence of a patient without giving it a role in the argument structure.

This view of antipassive morphology fits well with examples of Halkomelem antipassives in which there is an oblique object with the nonspecific determiner (*kʷ*), which evokes a generalized event with a nonindividuated patient, as is characteristic of antipassives in many languages (see Cooreman 1994 and the references there).

(66) ?i: čekʷx-əls θə́n mə́nə ?ə kʷ sqəw?
 AUX:Q fry(IMPF)-ACT DT:2POS child OBL DT fry.bread
 'Is your daughter frying bread?'

(67) nem̄ iʰəm̄q-els ?ə kʷ q̄p̄əneʔtən!
 go snip-ACT OBL DT ribbon
 'Go and snip a piece of ribbon!'

However, the nonspecific patient effect of the antipassive verb can be overridden; a specific patient anchored to a particular event in time and space can be expressed as an oblique object.

(68) niʔ čə yəkʷ-els ?ə tʰə nə šel.
 AUX CONF break-ACT OBL DT 1POS door
 'He broke down my door.'

(69) nem̄ cən ?əʔq-els ?ə ɬə nə telə tən̄niʔ ?ə ɬə telewtxʷ.
 go 1SUB out-ACT OBL DT 1POS money from OBL DT bank
 'I am going to take my money out of the bank.'

(70) ?i cən ləm̄-els ?ə tʰən̄ sʔitʰəm̄.
 AUX 1SUB hem(IMPF)-ACT OBL DT.2POS dress
 'I am hemming your dress.'

The predicate signals that there is some patient involved, one that is intricately linked to the semantics of the verb, and the oblique phrase gives a more detailed statement of what that patient is. This might at first seem paradoxical, but it is exactly the type of double layer of semantics that is exhibited by the doubling constructions discussed above. Thus, antipassives can be seen to be both syntactically and semantically similar to doubling constructions.

10.5 Conclusion: The Syntax and Semantics of Doubling

A defining characteristic of polysynthesis is that reference to a nominal can be made within the predicate complex. Not only can grammatical features such as the person, number, and gender of the nominal be referenced by verb agreement in a head-

the antipassive
 es the pres-

omelem anti-
 erminer (*kʷ*),
 characteristic
 es there).

overridden; a
 expressed as

cately linked
 ed statement
 ctly the type
 ns discussed
 semantically

can be made
 the person,
 in a head-

marking language, but sometimes the nominal semantics itself can be referenced, either vaguely, as in the case of classificatory constructions, or more precisely, as in the case of denominal verbs. Nevertheless, what does not seem to appear within the predicate complex is reference to a nominal's deixis—its location in time and space. This is accomplished by means of the determiner element within a DP.¹⁴

Moreover, while predicate-internal morphology can only be used to refer to the nominal's type in a generalized way, the doubled external phrase can be used to express the particular kind or instantiation of a nominal. We see that the four constructions discussed above—lexical suffixes, denominal verbs, cognate objects, and activity antipassives—all have this characteristic. The external DP is used to elaborate more specifically the nominal sketched (either vaguely or more precisely) within the predicate. Furthermore, all of these constructions share a common property: the nominal sketched by the predicate is its internal argument (i.e., in the above examples, the patient of a semantically transitive verb).

The Halkomelem data raise the issue of the boundary between doubling constructions and other semantically transitive constructions, a topic that deserves further exploration. Suffice it to say that, in contrast to doubling constructions and antipassives, regular transitive sentences do not invoke a double layer of semantics, at least in Halkomelem. For example, third-person patients, although they are zero-marked and thus do not distinguish gender or number, nonetheless imply a specific object.

(71) *niʔ cən kʷən-ət.*

AUX 1SUB take-TR

'I took him/her/it/them/*something.'

Why would a language allow doubling constructions when fully transitive clauses without an extra predicate-internal element are available in most cases? In an ergative language such as Halkomelem, the answer seems clear: transitive clauses are reserved for events where the object has a high degree of discourse salience and semantic individuation. Intransitive constructions are used when the emphasis is on the event itself rather than the patient of the event, or where the patient of the event is integral to defining the action.

How do the Halkomelem constructions discussed relate to the starting point of the chapter—the legacy of Relational Grammar with respect to the Stratal Uniqueness Law and the Motivated Chômeage Law? The Stratal Uniqueness Law, since it refers only to nominal arguments *per se*, is only relevant to doubling constructions if there is some presumption that the element within the predicate originates as an argument NP, as, for example, in the head movement analysis of noun incorporation in Baker 1988. If, on the other hand, the predicate-internal reference to the nominal is considered to originate as part of the predicate, then Stratal Uniqueness is irrelevant to doubling constructions.

The more serious challenge is to the Motivated Chômage Law. One approach is to assume that if the internal argument nominal is referred to by predicate-internal morphology, then the language may consider the object position to have been filled (or in Case-theoretic terms, Accusative case is absorbed), resulting in a surface intransitive clause. We see this in the case of morphological reciprocals and reciprocals crosslinguistically, which differ in this respect from object agreement morphology, as first pointed out by Perlmutter (1969). But as Chung and Ladusaw (2004) point out, predicate-internal reference to the nominal serves to restrict it but not necessarily to saturate it. Additional semantic facts relating to the nominal may be expressed in a freestanding DP. Since languages vary as to whether the presence of predicate-internal morphology results in intransitive syntax, they vary as to whether this DP is framed as a direct object or an adjunct.

Halkomelem has a ready-made strategy for expressing such DPs: they are oblique objects, as evidenced by the extraction data. Motivated chômage strictly defined would require the oblique object to be chômeurized by another NP. But what we see in the case of predicate-internal nominal morphology is that the internal argument can be self-chômeurizing. Or to put it another way, predicate-internal morphology referencing the nominal is a sufficient (though in some languages not a necessary) condition for the detransitivization of the clause.¹⁵

At the end of the day, since none of the doubling constructions, nor antipassive for that matter, involve the arrival of a new nominal to usurp the relation of the patient, it is easiest to claim that there is no actual chômage and therefore the Motivated Chômage Law is irrelevant. Not all "case-absorbing" constructions therefore relate to realignments in argument structure.

Notes

1. Data are given with symbols often used for Native American languages. Glottalization is marked with an apostrophe over the consonant, and labialization with a superscript *w*. The alveolar fricative is represented as *ʃ*, the uvular fricative as *χ*, and the lateral fricative as *ʎ*. The affricates are represented as *tʰ* (dental), *c* (alveolar), *ç* (palatal), and *ʎ* (lateral).

The following abbreviations are used in glossing the data: ABS: absolutive, ACT: activity, AOR: aorist, AUX: auxiliary, BEN: benefactive applicative suffix, CONF: confirmative, CS: causative, DAT: dative applicative suffix, DIM: diminutive, DM: demonstrative, DT: determiner, ERG: ergative, FUT: future, IMPF: imperfective, INQU: inquisitive, LNK: linker, MID: middle, N: nominalizer, NEG: negative, O: object, OBJ: object, OBL: oblique, PL: plural, POS: possessive, PRO: pronoun, PST: past, Q: question, S: subject, SER: serial, SG: singular, SSUB: subordinate subject, SUB: subject, SUP: suppositive, TR: transitive, VBL: verbalizer, VPX: lexical prefix.

2. Halkomelem does not allow bare NPs in argument positions, though bare NPs appear as predicate nominals, appositives, and vocatives.

3. Gerdts 1988, 59ff discusses the structure of extractions and the nominalizations on which oblique extractions are based.
4. More precisely, there is an oblique prefix *x^w*- preceded by the nominalizing prefix *s*-. The *s*- changes to *š*- before *x^w*, and the *x^w* is lost (in Island Halkomelem dialects), except before glottal stop.
5. See Gerdts 1998a for a comparison of noun incorporation, lexical suffixation, and denominal verbs.
6. Lexical suffix constructions can also be transitive. For discussion, see Gerdts 2003 and Gerdts and Hinkson 1996, 2004a, 2004b.
7. See note 2.
8. Lexical suffix constructions of the classificatory type are also possible (Gerdts and Hinkson 1996, 2004a, 2004b). These constructions are surface transitives and the patient is the direct object.

(i) ʔəw̄ hay k^ws x^w-t⁰əš^w=wil-t ct t⁰ə læpat ʔi t⁰ə laʔθən.
 LNK only DT VPX-wash=vessel-TR 1PL.SUB DT pot and DT dishes
 'We only wash pots and plates.'

I do not discuss these constructions further here due to lack of space. The other doubling constructions discussed here do not have transitive counterparts.

9. The nominal prefix *s*- is omitted after *c*- and *l*- but not after *tx^w*- and *š*-. Thus I conclude that a phonological rule of cluster simplification is at work in the former cases rather than a morphological restriction that requires the base to be a root.
10. Gerdts and Hukari (2008) argue that the base is an NP rather than an N.
11. See Gerdts 1991, 2006, as well as Gerdts and Hukari 2000a for a discussion of the unergative/unaccusative distinction in Halkomelem.
12. The verb *ʔəttən* is used strictly as an intransitive verb. The patient, if there is one, is always an oblique object. Halkomelem also has a transitive verb for 'eat', *ləyχt*.
13. The root in this verb also occurs with the transitive suffix to form a semantically ditransitive verb *ya:t* 'order someone to do something'.
14. Several scholars have observed that incorporated nouns lack deictic properties. Farkas and de Swart (2003) note the semantic similarity between incorporated nouns and bare NPs.
15. Various accounts within Relational Grammar have been offered to explain the surface intransitivity of noun incorporation constructions and their ilk. Gerdts (1979), following a suggestion of Postal (1977), claims that noun incorporation constructions involve antipassive and thus incorporation is simply a way of packaging an object-chômeur. This analysis proved unhelpful for cases of classifying noun incorporation, since they show no evidence of detransitivization.

Alternatively, Gerdts (1987) suggests a multiattachment analysis parallel to the analysis given for reflexives (C. Rosen 1988). Detransitivization in compounding noun incorporation results from cancellation of the multiattached object arc. Surface transitivity in classifying noun incorporation results from the birth of an object arc. However, the multiattachment analysis does not accommodate the type of constructions discussed here, which are surface intransitive but nevertheless have a freestanding DP.

References

- Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Chung, Sandra, and William A. Ladusaw. 2004. *Restriction and saturation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cooreman, Ann. 1994. A functional typology of antipassives. In B. A. Fox and P. J. Hopper, eds., *Voice: Form and function*, 49-88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antipassive. *Language* 62(4):808-845.
- Farkas, Donka F., and Henriëtte de Swart. 2003. *The semantics of incorporation: From argument structure to discourse transparency*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1979. Object incorporation and transitivity. Paper presented at the 43rd International Conference of Americanists, Vancouver, BC.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1987. A union analysis of noun incorporation. Paper presented at the Third Biennial Conference on Relational Grammar, University of Iowa.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1988. *Object and absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1991. Unaccusative mismatches in Halkomelem Salish. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 57:230-250.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1992. Morphologically-mediated relational profiles. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 18:322-337. University of California, Berkeley.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1998a. Incorporation. In Andrew Spencer and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds., *The handbook of morphology*, 84-100. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 1998b. Mapping Halkomelem voice. In E. Czaykowska-Higgins and M. D. Kinkade, eds., *Studies in Salish linguistics: Current perspectives*, 303-323. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 2003. The morphosyntax of Halkomelem lexical suffixes. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69:345-356.
- Gerdts, Donna B. 2006. Argument realization in Halkomelem: A study in verb classification. In *Proceedings of WSCLA XI, University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 19:61-81.
- Gerdts, Donna B., and Mercedes Q. Hinkson. 1996. Salish lexical suffixes: A case of decategorialization. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*, 163-176. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Gerdts, Donna B., and Mercedes Q. Hinkson. 2004a. The grammaticalization of Halkomelem FACE into a dative applicative suffix. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70(3):227-250.
- Gerdts, Donna B., and Mercedes Q. Hinkson. 2004b. Salish numeral classifiers: A lexical means to a grammatical end. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 57:247-279.
- Gerdts, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari. 2000a. The dual structure of Halkomelem motion verbs. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on American Indigenous Languages 2000, Santa Barbara Working Papers in Linguistics* 10:33-46.

- Gerds, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari. 2000b. Stacked antipassives in Halkomelem Salish. In *Papers for the International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages* 35:95–106. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Gerds, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari. 2005. Multiple antipassives in Halkomelem Salish. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Special Session*, University of California, Berkeley, 51–62.
- Gerds, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari. 2008. Halkomelem denominal verbs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 74:489–510.
- Gerds, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari. Forthcoming. *Halkomelem*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1998. Origins of Salishan lexical suffixes. In *Papers for the International Conference on Salish and and Neighboring Languages* 33:266–295. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60:847–894.
- Muravyova, Irina A. 1998. Chukchee (Paleo-Siberian). In Andrew Spencer and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds., *The handbook of morphology*, 521–538. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nakajima, Heizo. 2006. Adverbial cognate objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37(4):674–684.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1969. Derived intransitivity in syntax. Paper presented at the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Perlmutter, David M., and Paul M. Postal. 1983. Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. In D. M. Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in relational grammar 1*, 81–128. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1977. Antipassive in French. *Linguisticae Investigationes: Revue Internationale de Linguistique Francaise et de Linguistique Generale* 1:333–374.
- Rosen, Carol G. 1988. *The relational structure of reflexive clauses: Evidence from Italian*. New York: Garland.
- Rosen, Sarah Thomas. 1989. Two types of noun incorporation: A lexical analysis. *Language* 65:294–317.

Hypothesis A / Hypothesis B

Linguistic Explorations in Honor of
David M. Perlmutter

Edited by
Donna B. Gerdts, John C. Moore, and Maria Polinsky

Contents

Contributors ix
Preface xiii
My Path in Linguistics xvii
David M. Perlmutter

- 1 **Depictives and Serialization in Tzotzil** 1
Judith Aissen
- 2 **Prolegomenon to Any Future Typology of Impersonal Sentences** 19
Leonard H. Babby
- 3 **Romanian as a Two-Gender Language** 41
Nicoleta Bateman and Maria Polinsky
- 4 **1-handed PERSONs and ASL Morphology** 79
J. Albert Bickford
- 5 **Six Arguments for *Wh*-Movement in Chamorro** 91
Sandra Chung
- 6 **On the Existence (and Distribution) of Sentential Subjects** 111
William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky
- 7 **Syntax and Semantics of Polish Emotion Verbs: A Corpus Study** 129
Katarzyna Dziwirek
- 8 **Term Relations and Relational Hierarchies** 151
Patrick Farrell

- 9 **Constraints on Verb Stem Stacking in Southern Tiwa** 173
Donald G. Frantz
- 10 **Three Doubling Constructions in Halkomelem** 183
Donna B. Gerdtz
- 11 **Origins of Differential Unaccusative/Unergative Case Marking: Implications for Innateness** 203
Alice C. Harris
- 12 **Underlying and Surface Grammatical Relations in Greek *consider* Sentences** 221
Brian D. Joseph
- 13 **French Inchoatives and the Unaccusativity Hypothesis** 229
Géraldine Legendre and Paul Smolensky
- 14 **On the Analytic Expression of Predicates in Meskwaki** 247
Philip S. LeSourd
- 15 **Unpassives of Unaccusatives** 275
Joan Maling
- 16 **Semantic and Syntactic Subcategorization in Seri: Recipients and Addressees** 293
Stephen A. Marlett
- 17 **Impersonals in Irish and Beyond** 323
James McCloskey
- 18 **Does Spatial Make It Special? On the Grammar of Pointing Signs in American Sign Language** 345
Richard P. Meier and Diane Lillo-Martin
- 19 **Object-Controlled Restructuring in Spanish** 361
John Moore
- 20 **Against All Expectations: Encoding Subjects and Objects in a New Language** 383
Carol A. Padden, Irit Meir, Wendy Sandler, and Mark Aronoff
- 21 **Clitic Placement in Romance: A Phase-Theoretic Approach** 401
Eduardo P. Raposo

22 **Missing Obliques: Some Anomalies in Ojibwe Syntax** 427
Richard A. Rhodes

23 **Modeling the Mapping from "Conceptual Structure" to Syntax** 457
Annie Zaenen

Publications of David M. Perlmutter 475

Author Index 481

Subject Index 487