The Expression of Noun Phrases in Halkomelem Texts

DONNA B. GERDTS

Simon Fraser University

THOMAS E. HUKARI

University of Victoria

Abstract.   This article discusses overt versus zero noun phrases in transitive clauses based on data from two Halkomelem texts. Transitive clauses with two postverbal noun phrases are relatively rare. The most common clause type is one in which the sole postverbal noun phrase is the object. This follows from the previously noted facts that topics are often subjects and that topics tend to be zero. Overt noun phrases are used to refresh or reestablish a topic and also to end a discourse segment. This helps explain the residue of examples where the sole postverbal noun phrase is the subject. Nontopic noun phrases, including objects, tend to be overt, even when they closely follow an overt expression of the same noun phrase. Certain verbs though, such as *lemət* 'look at it', seem to prefer zero objects, thus largely accounting for clauses with no overt noun phrases.

1. Introduction.   In a growing body of literature, researchers on Salish languages have presented analyses of texts from discourse, narrative, and rhetorical viewpoints. A common picture regarding the expressions of noun phrases in Salish languages has emerged. Here are the central features, which have been succinctly summarized by Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade (1998:37–43) and Kroeber (1999:37–40). All Salish languages are verb-initial. Some basically follow verb-subject-object word order, and others verb-object-subject, though many languages allow either order. Direct arguments are unmarked for case. Both third person subjects and third person objects can be zero, though (some) subjects license agreement. This leads to potential ambiguities. However, there is a strong tendency, especially in texts, to avoid clauses with two postverbal noun phrases. So, for example, Burton et al. (2001) note that in the sixty pages of Lillooet texts in Van Eijk and Williams (1981), there are only six transitive sentences with two overt noun phrases. In most languages, this is a soft constraint, but in Lushootseed, at least, it is a hard constraint (Hess 1973; Hukari 1976).[1] Furthermore, many languages prefer a single postverbal noun phrase to be the object, not the subject. This has been shown, for example, in Halkomelem (Hukari 1976), Lillooet (Van Eijk 1997:227), and Squamish (Kuipers 1967:172). This has become known as the One Noun Phrase Interpretation (ONI) condition (following Gerdts 1988b).[2] This condition is correlated with the topic effect: an ongoing topic in a discourse tends to be zero (Davis 1994; Kroeber 1995; Beck

1998a, 2000).[3] Topics in Salish languages are usually the subject (Kinkade 1990; Davis 1994; Beck 1996a, 1996b, 2000).[4] Furthermore, objects do not make good topics in Salish languages. Nonagentive noun phrases that are topical are usually expressed in clauses with alternative morphology—passive (Kinkade 1987; Boelscher 1990; Van Eijk 1997:237), nontopical ergative (Doak 1991, 1997:262–78; Kroeber 1995; Mattina 2001), or topical object constructions (Kinkade 1987, 1989, 1990; Davis 1994).

In this article, we explore some fundamental questions concerning the expression of noun phrases: When and why do overt noun phrases appear in texts? When and why do they not appear? How do voice and case aid in the presentation of noun phrases? We seek to contribute to this research by discussing the expression of noun phrases in Halkomelem, drawing on examples from texts. Over the years, we have collected over one hundred Halkomelem texts of all sorts—legends, historical accounts, cultural descriptions, autobiographies, and lectures—from dozens of speakers. Much of what we say is impressionistic, based on our experience of working with these texts.[5] Here, however, we hope to give some more concrete results by referring in detail to two particular texts collected by Hukari.

The first text is "$t^\theta\partial$ swiẃləs ni? $x^w\partial$?esx^w: The Young Man That Turned into a Seal" (MTS), told by Wilfred Sampson on 25 March 1976. The 303-sentence story tells of a young man who is captured by the seals he is hunting, lives with them, and eventually becomes a seal. The story details the various unsuccessful attempts of his family and friends to rescue him. Eventually, they kill him and bring him home. References to this text in the present article mention the sentence numbering of the manuscript version.

The second text, "qeṅ $t^\theta\partial$ q$^w\partial$ni ?ə $t^\theta\partial$ səṁšaθət: Seagull Steals the Sun" (SSS), was told by Ellen White on 8 May 1977. This 310-sentence story tells of how Seagull tricks Sun into a box, darkening the world, and the efforts of Raven and his sidekicks to get Sun released. This text is published as Hukari, Peter, and White (1977); all references to this text in the present article note the line numbers in the published version (which do not correspond to sentence divisions).[6]

Both texts were transcribed and translated by Ruby Peter and edited by Tom Hukari. They both are action-adventure stories with many different third persons entering and exiting, and thus are excellent for the purpose of a study on the expression of noun phrases. Here we focus on noun phrases in transitive clauses, limiting the discussion to clauses in which both the subject and the object are third person.[7] We have identified fifty-two clauses of this type in MTS and twenty-nine in SSS. Given the overall length of the texts, we see that transitive clauses are not all that common. Intransitive clauses far outnumber transitives and passive clauses are also quite frequent.[8]

Details concerning the expression of noun phrases in each text are given in table 1.

Table 1. Expressing Noun Phrases in Transitive Clauses

	MTS		SSS		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Subject and object are overt noun phrases	4	8%	3	10%	7	9%
Only overt noun phrase is subject	2	4%	1	3%	3	4%
Only overt noun phrase is object	28	54%	15	52%	43	53%
Both subject and object are zero	18	35%	10	35%	28	35%
Total number of clauses in which both subject and object are third person	52	100%	29	100%	81	100%

Overall, our findings are not surprising given what other researchers have said about Salish syntax. We find few clauses with two overt noun phrases. Also, a single overt noun phrase is usually the object. We develop our thoughts on the expression of noun phrases in three stages. Section 2 discusses clauses with two overt postverbal noun phrases, section 3 discusses clauses with one overt postverbal noun phrase, and section 4 discusses clauses in which neither the subject nor the object is expressed as a postverbal noun phrase. Section 5 sums up our results.

2. Two postverbal noun phrases and how to avoid them. Active transitive clauses are common in sentences that arise through elicitation via English or through sentence construction tasks, where we ask for a sentential example to illustrate a verb form. Such examples show that the basic word order is verb-subject-object (rarely verb-object-subject), and subjects and objects appear as simple determiner phrases, without any overt case marking, as in (1).

(1) *niʔ   kʷən–ət–əs   kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ kʷθə θəqiʔ.*
    AUX take-TR-3.SUB DT   man   DT   sockeye
    'The man took the sockeye.'

However, as can be seen in table 1 above, active transitive clauses with two postverbal noun phrases are extremely rare in Halkomelem texts (9 percent). In this section, we examine clauses with two postverbal noun phrases to try to determine when they are used. Also, we explore alternative means of expressing transitive clauses with two explicit noun phrases.

2.1. When are two postverbal noun phrases used? There are four examples of transitive verbs with two postverbal noun phrases in MTS. The sentence in (2) is the most straightforward example.[9]

(2) ʔəwə   kʷəʔeł   niʔ–əs   cə–stəxʷ–əs   tᶿəẃnił   səʔasəqʷt
    not   indeed   AUX-3.SUB   do-CS-3.SUB   this.one   younger.sibling

    tᶿə   šəyəł–s–əł.
    DT   older.sibling-3.POS-PST

    'The younger brother didn't do anything about his older brother.' (MTS101)

This example occurs at a point in the story where the two plot lines concerning the younger brother and the older brother come together. There also may be an element of contrast or emphasis of the relationship of the brothers to each other.[10] This would account for the use of the strong pronoun form *tᶿəẃnił* as a modifer of the subject noun phrase.[11]

      There are three examples of verb-subject-object sentences with two overt noun phrases in SSS. In two of the examples, the agent is already established as the topic, but the sentence or two immediately before the verb-subject-object clause focuses on another entity. So the verb-subject-object clause is used to re-establish the agent. Furthermore, the patient is often elaborated so that both the agent and patient are worthy of mention. For example, in (3), sentence 1 shifts away from 'the people' to 'the door' and sentence 2 comments on the darkness. Sentence 3 shifts back to the agent 'people' and elaborates on the patient 'torches'.

(3) 1 səẃ–šťewəṅ–s   tᶿə   məstiməxʷ,   "niʔ   yəxʷ   xʷ–teq–t–əṁ
       N.CN-think-3.POS   DT   person   AUX   must   PRFX-close(IMPF)-TR-PAS

      kʷθə   šeł.
      DT   door

      'And the people thought, "the door must have been closed.

   2 ṅa–a–an   ʔəẃ–łec."
      very(RL)   CN-dark

      It is so dark."'

   3 yəqʷ–t–s   tᶿə   məstiməxʷ   tᶿeỷ   x̣eɬəqt   sćešt   —ni–i–iʔ   sťe
      burn-TR-3.POS   DT   person   DEM   long(PL)   stick   AUX(RL)   like

      ʔəẃ–niːs   skʷənšətən–s   kʷs   neṁ   yə–ʔiṁəš   niʔ
      CN-AUX.3.SUB   lantern-3.POS   DT.N   go   SER-walk(IMPF)   AUX

      yə–s–ťᶿeťᶿək̇ʷ   tᶿə   yə–šťəṅe–s.
      SER-ST-light.up(RES)   DT   SER-way-3.POS

      'The people burned long sticks—like lanterns shining where they were going.' (SSS 110–14)

The other two examples involve third person demonstrative pronouns rather than full noun phrases in subject position, but arise in similar circumstances. One passage talks about 'the old people', segues to 'smoke', and then returns to people in (4). The third person demonstrative pronoun form is used to reestablish the topic.

(4) yaθ   ʔəẃ-sewq́-t-əs   tᶿəẃneʔałt   tᶿeỷ   k̓ʷiʔxʷ   syał.
    always   CN-seek(IMPF)-TR-3.SUB   this.one(PL)   DEM   pitch   wood

   'They always looked for the pitch wood.' (SSS 137)

A second example of this type, line 2 of (5), also uses the third person demonstrative form to refer to the topic 'raven' after a second participant, 'his friends', is brought into the story.

(5) 1 səẃ-həyeʔ-s   łak̓ʷ   tᶿə spa:l̓ səẃ-ʔa:-t-s   tᶿə si:yeỷə-s.
       N.CN-depart-3.POS   go.home   DT   raven   N.CN-call-TR-3.POS   DT   friend(PL)-3.POS

   'And so the raven went home. And he called his friends.'

   2 niʔ   yaθ   ʔəẃ-x̌ətəs-t-əs   tᶿəẃnił   tᶿeỷ   təẃ   si:yeỷə-s.
      AUX   always   CN-dine(IMPF)-TR-3.SUB   this.one   DEM   DL   friend(PL)-3.POS

   'He always fed his friends.' (SSS 160–62)

   In sum, it is easy to see how sentences with two postverbal noun phrases arise. Narration often switches back and forth among participants, giving rise to potential ambiguities. But, as we see from sentence 3 of (3) and from (4) above, some examples contain inanimate objects, so ambiguity is impossible. So other factors must also be at work. We discuss this further in section 3.2.3.

2.2. How to avoid using two postverbal noun phrases.   Considering how rare verb-subject-object clauses are in texts, we might surmise that Halkomelem has a low referential density (Bickel 2002). Referential density is an index of the number of overt noun phrases that occur in argument positions versus the number of argument positions that are licensed by the verbs in a text.[12] Given the number of zero noun phrases (Bickel excludes agreement affixes from the count), we would expect that referential density in Halkomelem is low, despite the large number of intransitive clauses.

   However, as we discuss in this section, Halkomelem has various strategies for expressing noun phrases referring to agents and patients without making them postverbal arguments of a transitive verb. Thus, there really is no sense of noun phrase deprivation.[13] We surmise that further study will reveal that, leaving auxiliary verbs aside, the Halkomelem ideal approximates a ratio of one verb to one noun phrase.

2.2.1. Noun phrases inside of noun phrases.   One way to increase the number of overtly expressed noun phrases without increasing the number of noun phrase arguments is by using complex noun phrase constructions that allow noun phrases inside of noun phrases, such as modification, coordination, apposition, and possession. For example, the single subject argument of the intransitive verb in (6) is composed of three noun phrases.

(6) səẃ–ɬe:l   [θəẃniɬ   q̓emi?   staləs-θ   tᶿəṅ   swiẃləs].
    N.CN-go.ashore   this.one   young.woman   spouse-3.POS   this.one   young.man

    'So the young man's wife went to shore.' (lit., 'This young woman, this young man's
      spouse, went to shore.') (MTS 45)

     The use of possessors, since they are arguments of a noun, not a verb, allows
overt noun phrases without increasing the number of verb arguments. Common
noun possessors follow the head, which bears cross-referencing possessive agree-
ment. Overt possessors are fairly common and are used for a variety of functions,
including noun phrases that would be considered benefactives (or malefactives)
in other languages.[14]

(7) neṁ   ct   ?aləx̌-ət   k̓ʷ   s?əttən-s   tᶿəṅ   s?əĺeləx̌ʷ.
    go   1.PL.SUB   select-TR   DT   food-3.POS   DT.2.POS   elder(PL)

    'We will get some food for our elders.' (lit., 'We will hunt your elders' food.') (MTS 8)

     We can see the effectiveness of using possession to decrease the number of
overt noun phrase arguments in clauses like (8), which involve backward pro-
nominalization into subject position.

(8) nəc̓a?   sk̓ʷəyəl   səẃ–qʷəl–mə–t–s   [θə   staləs-θ   tᶿəẃniɬ   swiẃləs]...
    one   day   N.CN-say-REL-TR-3.POS   DT   spouse-3.POS   this.one   young.man

    'One day, this young man said to his wife . . .' (lit., 'One day, he$_i$ said to this young
      man's$_i$ wife . . .') (MTS 7)

The agent is expressed as an overt possessor noun phrase embedded within the
object noun phrase.[15]

     So we see that the lack of verb-subject-object clauses in Halkomelem is not
due to an aversion to noun phrases per se. The use of alternative devices
increases the number of noun phrases while avoiding two direct postverbal noun
phrase arguments.

2.2.2. Verb chaining.   Verb chaining constructions provide another means of
reducing the number of overt noun phrases.[16] Having several verbs in one
sentence is extremely common, especially in the action-adventure genre. A verb
chain arises when a series of verbs share a single subject, as in (9).[17]

(9) ṁi   ct   ce?   k̓ʷə?eɬ   ?əẃ–q̓ʷaɬ–ət   ce?   lem–ət.
    come   1.PL.SUB   FUT   indeed   CN-wait-TR   FUT   look-TR

    'We will come and look again.' (MTS 75)

The first person plural subject clitic *ct,* which appears in second position in the
clause, serves as subject for all three verbs. An example with an overt noun
phrase subject *tᶿəẃniɬ ?esx̌ʷ* is given in (10).

(10) həye?   t^θəẃniɬ   ?esx^w   nem̓   q^wsə–θət   ?ə   t^θə   qa?.
     depart   this.one   seal   go   submerge-REFL   OB   DT   water

   'And the seal left, going into the water.' (MTS 21)

Any combination of verbs is allowed in a chain—intransitive, active, or passive.[18]
In (11), the noun phrase *θəẃniɬ q̓em̓i?* is the subject of both the preceding intran-
sitive verb and the following transitive verb; the object noun phrase follows the
transitive verb.

(11) stə?e–e–e   heẃq̓^w   θəẃniɬ   q̓em̓i?   ?aĺməc-t–əs
     be.like(RL)   drift(ST)   this.one   young.woman   wait(IMPF)-TR-3.SUB

   k^wə   staĺəs–θ
   DT   spouse-3.POS

   'Then she drifted around waiting for her husband.' (lit., 'Then the young woman
    drifted around waiting for her husband.') (MTS 43)

The following is an example of the subject sandwiched between two transitive
verbs.

(12) he–e–e?   ċiməĺ-nəx^w–əs   t^θəẃniɬ   swiẃləs   ləm-nəx^w–əs
     yes(RL)   get.close-LCTR-3.SUB   this.one   young.man   see-LCTR-3.SUB

   t^θə   hay   ?əĺ   θi   ?esx^w.
   DT   most   just   big   seal

   'As the young man approached (the seals) he saw the biggest one.' (MTS 18)

In some examples, the chained verbs are synonymous, as in (13), or even iden-
tical, as in (14).

(13) səẃ–q^wal–s   t^θəẃniɬ   sa?səq^wt   yəθ–əs–t–əs
     N.CN-speak-3.POS   this.one   younger.sibling   tell-DAT-TR-3.SUB

   t^θə   šx^w?aĺəq̓^wa?–s
   DT   sibling(PL)-3.POS

   'The younger brother then told his cousins.' (MTS116)

(14) səẃ–k^wən–nəx^w–əs   t^θəẃniɬ   k^wən–nəx^w–əs   t^θə   ƛeləẃ–s
     N.CN-take-LCTR-3.SUB   this.one   take-LCTR-3.SUB   DT   arm-3.POS

   t^θey̓   šx^w?aq̓^wa?–s.
   DEM   sibling-3.POS

   'He managed to get hold of his cousin's arm.' (MTS 158)

We see then that verb chaining is an effective means of distributing noun phrases
through a sentence, so that each verb has at most one postverbal noun phrase.
Verb chaining is a very frequent construction in Halkomelem texts and, because
the noun phrase arguments are shared across the verbs, the use of verb chains

lowers the referential density. However, since many chains involve sequences of verb plus noun phrase plus verb plus noun phrase, verb chains promote an overall ratio of one verb to one noun phrase.

2.2.3. Preverbal noun phrases. An obvious means for avoiding two postverbal noun phrases would be to place one of the noun phrases before the verb in sentence-initial position.[19] Elsewhere we have discussed the syntax of various extraction phenomena, including clefts, pseudoclefts, topicalization, WH-questions, and relative clauses (Hukari 1977; Gerdts 1988b). We do not elaborate on them here.

In the two texts under study, we see many examples of these constructions. And in the case of transitive clauses with third person subjects and objects, noun phrases appear in preverbal positions 18 percent of the time in MTS (eleven out of sixty-two examples) and 12 percent of the time in SSS (four out of thirty-three examples). We find that focus constructions are used early and late in texts during the descriptive setup and the denouement.[20] For example, take the first line of the story in MTS shown in (15); the fronted noun phrase is in boldface.

(15) **kʷə   naṅəċaʔ   swiẁləs**   [ʔaɫəx̌–ət   tᶿə sčəłtən–s].
     DT   one.person young.man   select(IMPF)-TR DT food-3.POS

     'There was a young man who hunted for food.' (MTS 4)

The embedded clause in (15) is transitive. The agent is in sentence-initial focus position. This is an extraction, as seen by the antiagreement: there is no third person ergative agreement suffix on the transitive verb ʔaɫəx̌ət.

Such focus constructions are fairly rare in the action portion of the text. However, they may arise when participants are being contrasted. For example, in (16), sentence 1 discusses 'the young men' as a whole; sentence 2 sets up the subgroup of the fastest runners among them; and sentence 3 contrastively focuses on the subgroup by the use of a cleft with a predicative pronoun niɫ in sentence-initial position.

(16) 1 səẁ–na–a–anəm   tᶿəẁneʔəlɫ   swaẁləs.
        N.CN-discuss(RL) this.one(PL) young.man(PL)

        'The young men discussed the problem.'

     2 θəy–θət —   x̌əɫə–st–əṁ   k̓ʷay–θət   θəy–θət kʷθə hay
        fix-REFL   say(IMPF)-CS-PAS bathe-REFL fix-REFL DT   most

        ceʔ ʔəɫ́ x̌ʷəm kʷs   xʷčenəm–s.
        FUT just fast   DT.N   run-3.POS

        'Then the fastest runners had the preparation baths.'

     3 niɫ   ceʔ   neṁ kʷən–ət ceʔ kʷθə šʷʔaq̓ʷaʔ–s.
        3.PRO FUT   go   take-TR FUT DT   sibling-3.POS

        'They were the ones that were going to catch their brother.' (MTS 138–40)

There is also a strong tendency for noun phrases quantified by *məkʷ* 'all' to appear in sentence-initial position. We found several examples like (17) in each story.

(17) **məkʷ   stem   ʔesxʷ**   *[ʔəẃ–s–ƛ̓eʔɬənəm̓–s].*
   all   what   seal   CN-N-hunt.in.water(IMPF)-3POS

   'They got all kinds of food from the sea, even the seal.' (MTS 6)

Preverbal noun phrase constructions deserve further attention, but suffice it to say that these constructions always carry special discourse functions that motivate their use. They are not used with neutral meaning simply as a means of avoiding postverbal noun phrases.

2.2.4. Passive.   In Halkomelem passives, the agent appears as an oblique noun phrase and thus there is no confusion between agent and patient, even though they both appear postverbally.[21]

(18) *niʔ   kʷən–ət–əm   ʔə   kʷθə   swəÿ́qeʔ   kʷθə   θəqiʔ.*
   AUX   take-TR-PAS   OB   DT   man   DT   sockeye

   'The man took the sockeye.'

Furthermore, passive seems to be much more frequent in Halkomelem than in English, as can be ascertained from the fact that Halkomelem passive clauses are frequently translated into English as active.[22] Both of the stories examined here contain many passives—ninety in MTS and sixty-one in SSS; the number of active transitive versus passive clauses is given in table 2.[23]

Table 2. Actives vs. Passives

	ACTIVE		PASSIVE		TOTAL
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	
MTS	124	58%	90	42%	213
SSS	88	59%	61	41%	149

The number of active clauses in these stories is rather high compared to what we have found in other texts. However, both stories contain a considerable amount of dialogue involving first and second person subjects in both stories, and these are always expressed as agents in the active voice. Halkomelem disallows first and second person agents in passive clauses (Gerdts 1988a, 1988b). If we compute the totals again, using only clauses with third person agents and patients, we arrive at the numbers in table 3.[24] So passives are relatively frequent in Halkomelem, and, in the case of third person agents, more frequent than actives.

Table 3. Actives vs. Passives: Third Person Agents and Patients Only

	ACTIVE		PASSIVE		TOTAL
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	
MTS	77	46%	90	54%	167
SSS	33	35%	61	65%	94

Given its popularity, passive would be a likely strategy for avoiding two post-verbal direct noun phrases.[25] Recall that the agent of a passive clause appears with an oblique preposition. However, it is, in fact, very rare to have a passive with both agent and patient overtly expressed. In MTS, there were no examples, and in SSS, there were 3 examples, or 5 percent of the total (see table 4).

Table 4. Expression of Noun Phrases in Passive Clauses

	MTS		SSS	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Both agent and patient are overt postverbal noun phrases	0	0%	3	5%
Only overt postverbal noun phrase is agent	7	8%	7	11%
Only overt postverbal noun phrase is patient	26	29%	32	52%
Both agent and patient are zero	57	63%	19	31%
Total passives with third person patients	90	100%	61	100%

In clauses with an overt agent and patient, passives are no more common than actives, as seen by comparing the results for SSS for actives (see table 1) and passives (see table 4).[26] In clauses with an overt agent and patient, passives are no more common than actives, as seen in table 5.

Table 5. Expression of Noun Phrases in Active and Passive Clauses in SSS

	ACTIVE		PASSIVE	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Agent and patient are overt postverbal noun phrases	3	10%	3	5%
Only overt noun phrase is agent	1	3%	7	11%
Only overt noun phrase is patient	15	52%	32	52%
Both agent and patient are zero	10	35%	19	31%
Total number of clauses in which both agent and patient are third person	29	100%	61	100%

Judging from the few examples we have, passives with overtly expressed agents and patients seem to occur in the same circumstances as their active counterparts. Namely, we see them when two already established elements of the story come together, as in (19).

(19) ʔəwə ċə   kʷs   xʷ–təlq-ət-əm–s   tᶿəẃniɬ ʔə tᶿə si:yeẏə–s
      not   CONF   DT.N   PRFX-answer-TR-PAS-3.POS   this.one OB DT friend(PL)-3.POS
      'His friends never answered him (Seagull) anymore . . .' (SSS 44–45)

In a second example of this type (20), 'Seagull' is treated as a proper noun, as seen by the form of the oblique determiner, and thus the active transitive counterpart of this sentence is not possible, since proper nouns cannot be ergatives (Gerdts 1988a, 1988b).[27]

(20) ẋeʔ   ċə   wəɬ   nəʔəm–nəs-əm ʔə-ẋ̇   qʷəni   tᶿə   x̌θəm.
      again CONF   then go-TR-PAS   OB-DT seagull   DT   box
      'And Seagull went to the box again.' (SSS 199)

The next example illustrates another use of passive in texts. Sometimes passive clauses express two overt participants that have not been previously mentioned. This occurs at the beginning of the text or at the beginning of a new segment of the text.[28] We speculate that the passive is used here because the patient, and not the agent, is the topic of the subsequent discourse.[29] This is illustrated by (21).

(21) cəs–ət–əm̓   ċə   tᶿəẃneʔəɬ məstiməxʷ ʔə tᶿə x̌e:ĺs,
      tell(IMPF)-TR-PAS CONF   this.one(PL) person   OB DT changer

      "ƙʷukʷəẏək̓ʷ ce:p,   yaθ   ce:p   ʔəẃ–ƙʷuk̓ʷəẏək̓ʷ
      fish(IMPF)   2.PL.SUB always   2.PL.SUB   CN-fish(IMPF)

      ʔən–səẃ–qəẋəm̓–š–ələp   tᶿə   ċəĺċ–s   tᶿə   sce:ɬtən.
      2.POS-N.CN-come.off-TR-2.PL.POS   DT   scale-3.POS   DT   salmon
      'The Creator told the people, "You please fish, always fish and take the salmon scales off."' (SSS 5–7)

This is in fact the only mention of the Creator in the story.[30] But the people are referred to periodically.

Overall, the passives, like their active counterparts, are not used for introducing two new overt postverbal noun phrases in Halkomelem.[31] Passives are used in examples in which two already established participants come together (like actives) or, less frequently attested, where a new topic is being introduced.

2.3. Summary.   Clauses in either active or passive voice with an overtly expressed agent and patient are not common in Halkomelem texts. Other constructions, including noun phrase fronting (which is reserved for special discourse functions) and especially verb chains commonly occur instead. Also, there

are many ways of including noun phrases in the sentence without making them arguments of a verb, for example, as an appositive element or a possessor. So speakers have many alternatives for expressing agent and patient without using a clause with two postverbal noun phrases.

We have very few instances of clauses with two overt postverbal noun phrases in the two texts. However, our impression is that active transitive clauses with two postverbal noun phrases are used when both noun phrases are already established in the text. Sometimes the two noun phrases are being contrasted or related in some way. Other times the subject is being reintroduced and the object is somehow significant in its own right. If a syntactically transitive clause is used as the first utterance in the text or in a segment of the text, the subject is likely to appear in sentence-initial focus position, as seen in the first line of the MTS story shown in (15).

Passive clauses with overt agents and patients also arise under these circumstances. In addition, they can be used when the agent and patient are introduced for the first time. In this case, the patient is topical.

3. One postverbal noun phrase.   Halkomelem is a verb-initial language, and subject and object noun phrases are not marked for case. Thus, a clause such as (22) is potentially ambiguous.

(22) * niʔ   lem–ət–əs $k^w\theta ə$ swəy̓qeʔ*.
     AUX look-TR-SUB DT   man

     'He/she/it looked at the man.'
     *'The man looked at him/her/it.'

However, as Gerdts (1988b:57–59) notes, speakers judge such sentences to have only one meaning. This led her to propose the generalization in (23).

(23) In the absence of marking for other persons, a single third person nominal is
      interpreted as the absolute.

As she shows in (24), this condition, which has become known as the One Noun Phrase Interpretation (ONI) condition, holds even when the result is pragmatically odd (as marked by *!!*).

(24) *!!niʔ   q̓ʷəl–ət–əs   łə   sɫeniʔ*.
      AUX bake-TR-3.SUB DT   woman

     !! 'He baked the woman.'
     *'The woman baked it.'

So the ONI condition is part of the formal grammar of Halkomelem and not just a random result of the pragmatics of transitivity.

Looking back at table 1, we see that data from texts show ONI effects: postverbal noun phrases in transitive clauses are overwhelmingly the object, not

the subject, of the clause. In both texts, the most frequent type of transitive clause is one in which the subject is zero and the object is an overt noun phrase. However, there are also some examples—two in MTS and one in SSS—where the subject is an overt noun phrase while the object is zero.[32]

Below, we look at clauses with one overt noun phrase in some detail. First, we discuss exceptions to the ONI condition, and discuss strategies for circumventing the condition (see section 3.1). Then we pose the question: why should Halkomelem have such a condition on the expression of noun phrases, rather than the opposite—that a single noun phrase should be the subject? This leads us to consider the discourse function of subjects as topics (see section 3.2).

3.1. Working around the ONI condition.   First, we should note that there are systematic violations to the ONI condition. They occur both in texts and elicited data. Hukari (1979) has noted that an noun phrase that contains a third person demonstrative must be interpreted as a transitive subject, even if it is the sole postverbal noun phrase.[33]

(25) *niʔ   lem–ət–əs   tᶿəẃniɫ   swəẏqeʔ.*
      AUX   look-TR-SUB   this.one   man

      'This man looked at him/her/them.'
      * 'He/she/they looked at this man.'

In our texts, we see the following three examples of solo noun phrases interpreted as subjects:

(26) *kʷən–nəxʷ–əs   tᶿəẃniɫ   swiẇləs.*
      take-LCTR-3.SUB   this.one   young.man

      'The young man caught what he was after.' (MTS 287)

(27) *səẇ–x̌ɫas–t–s   tᶿəẃniɫ   spa:ĺ*
      N.CN-dine-TR-3.POS   this.one   raven

      'And the raven fed them.' (SSS164)

(28) *ɫək̓ʷ–stxʷ–əs   tᶿəẃneʔəɫt   tən̓niʔ   ʔə   tnanəɫ   xʷəlməxʷ   sɫiyemən.*
      go.home-CS-3.SUB   this.one(PL)   be.from   OB   DT   Indian.person   Sliammon

      'It was the Indian people from Sliammon that took him home.' (MTS 293)

In (26) and (27), the object is obvious from the preceding discussion. The subject is being reintroduced as the topic. In (28), the subject noun phrase is a heavy noun phrase, so it sounds best in sentence-final position.

The most popular way of expressing an overt subject when the object is zero is as the first noun phrase in a verb chain, as in (29)–(31).

(29) *ne–e–em̓–s   ʔəẇ–c̓tem   tᶿəẃniɫ   swiẇləs   nem̓   lem–ət–əs.*
      go(RL)-3.POS   CN-crawl   this.one   young.man   go   look-TR-3.SUB

      'And so the young man crawled toward them to see.' (MTS 90)

(30) *həye–e–e?–s   tᶿəẃniɬ   swiẃləs   nem̓ x̣̓ic̓–ət–əs.*
depart(RL)-3.POS this.one young.man go   sneak-TR-3.SUB

'So the young man went on to sneak up to them.' (MTS 94)

(31) *x̌ʷc̓enəm   tᶿəẃniɬ   səẃ–x̌̓əy̓q̓əs–t–əs.*
run   this.one N.CN-pin.down-TR-3.SUB

'He (the young man) ran to him and held him down with his foot.' (MTS 284)

In these verb chain examples, the subject appears after an intransitive verb and also before, not after, the transitive verb.[34]

We also see some instances of passive clauses in which the agent and not the patient is expressed. As noted in table 4, MTS and SSS each have seven examples. If we compare this to their occurrence in active clauses (see table 1), we see that MTS has only two examples while SSS has only one. Thus, the passive construction might be used as a strategy for avoiding the ONI condition.[35] For example, consider (32).

(32) *ni-i-i? ?əẃ–x̌i?x̌ɬem̓–ət–əm̓   ?ə tᶿə c̓əm̓c̓əyi.*
AUX   CN-watch(IMPF)-TR-PAS OB DT ant

'The ants were watching him.' (SSS198)

The unexpressed object 'him', referring to Seagull, is the overtly expressed agent in the preceding and following sentences. Moreover, we see some examples in which the agent is further elaborated with a relative clause.

(33) *ni? p̓e?   kʷən–ət–əm ?ə tᶿey̓ ni? yaθ–ət*
AUX EMPH take-TR-PAS OB DT AUX always-PST

?əẃ–x̌̓e?ɬənəm̓–t–əs.
CN-hunt.on.water(IMPF)-TR-3.SUB

'He must have been captured by the ones he always kills for food.' (MTS 74)

(34) *ləm–n–əm   ?ə tᶿə swaẃləs   x̌̓əẃ he?kʷəÌ̓əš–t   tᶿey̓ ?esxʷ.*
see-TR-PAS OB DT young.man(PL) also shoot(IMPF)-TR DT seal

'It was some young seal hunters that saw him.' (MTS 183)

Such sentences would not be good candidates for verb chaining or a sentence-initial focus construction since the noun phrases are so heavy.

To summarize, we see that one direct postverbal noun phrase in an active transitive clause is overwhelmingly interpreted as the object. However, systematic exceptions to this generalization occur if the agent noun phrase contains a third person demonstrative. This brings up the question of why the ONI condition holds most of the time. We turn to this in the next section.

3.2. The zero topic effect.   How do we account for ONI effects? Why is the sole noun phrase preferentially the object? To answer this, we must flip the question

around and ask: When are subjects zero? The preliminary answer to this question is: when they are topics (Davis 1994; Kroeber 1995; Beck 2000). We explore the relationship between topics and zero in this section.[36]

The key concept in our discussion will be the term "continue," which we borrow from Centering Theory (Walker, Joshi, and Prince 1998). Centering Theory focuses on pairs of utterances and examines them for their local coherence. Although there is debate about what morphosyntactic unit should be equated with the concept "utterance" (Taboada and Hadic Zabala 2008), for our Halkomelem research we take this to be a sentence—i.e., a main clause and any clauses embedded beneath it, bearing in mind that main clauses in Salish languages can be finite or nominalized. (See the appendices for examples of portions of a text divided into sentences.) The flow of one sentence to the next is called a transition. A continue is a transition type that arises when the topic of the previous sentence is the same as the topic in the current sentence. For example, if one sentence in a discourse is *John is sick* and the next sentence is *He should eat some chicken soup*, then the transition type is continue, because noun phrases with the same referent are topics in both.

Continues are the universally preferred transition type within a discourse segment, since they lead to much greater coherence than other sorts of cross-sentential transitions, such as topic shifts. Topics following the continue transition (we call such noun phrases continues, for short) are universally expressed in the weakest form available in a language, a weak pronoun (*he* in our English example above), or, if possible, a zero noun phrase (Brennan, Friedman, and Pollard 1987; Gundel 1998).

It is easy to see how this concept will play out in Salish discourse. Texts tend to have long discourse segments. Continues are the preferred transition within a segment. Continues are zero universally. Topics are subjects in Salish. Therefore, the majority of subjects in a Salish text will be zero continues.

Our aim in this section is to try to bring some clarity to the concept of topic and to the status of zero noun phrase. We depart from our discussion of transitive clauses to engage in an exploration of the fit between continues and zero. In section 3.2.1, we illustrate continues that are zero. In section 3.2.2, we look at zeros and note that they sometimes are not continues, at least as formally defined. In section 3.3.3, we discuss continues that are not zero, suggesting some strategies that would result in the topics being overt noun phrases. In section 3.2.4, we explore the relationship between nontopics and zero. Since nontopics are not continues, we do not expect them to occur as zero very readily. If they were zero, this could obscure the role of zero as a signal for a continue, thus reducing coherence.

3.2.1. Continues are zero.   In examining Halkomelem texts, we find that continues expressed as a zero subject are extremely frequent. For example, in (35) (MTS 105–8), the man who turns into a seal is set up as the topic in

sentence 1, and then is a zero continue in sentence 2, where he is the subject of three chained verbs and the verb in the relative clause. Sentence 3 shifts the topic to the younger brother, and then in sentence 4 we see a zero continue: the younger brother is zero subject of the main verb and also of the subsequent chain of three verbs.[37]

(35) 1 *səẃ–łx̌iləš   celqəm   t̓əẃnił   swiẃləs   ni?   x̌ʷə–s–q̓əq̓a?*
       N.CN-stand follow this.one young.man AUX INC-ST-gather(RES)

    ?ə   t̓eẏ́   ?esx̌ʷ.
    OB DEM seal

    'The young man who was with the seals stood up to follow.'

  2 *səẃ–x̌ʷčenəm   qʷsə–θət   yə–s–q̓əq̓a?   ?ə   t̓ə   ?esx̌ʷ*
       N.CN-run   go.in.water-REFL SER-ST-gather(RES) OB DT seal

    ni?   kʷən–n–əm   ?ə   t̓ə   ?esx̌ʷ.
    AUX take-LCTR-PAS OB DT seal

    'He ran into the water along with the seals he was captured by.'

  3 *x̌i?x̌tem̓   t̓əẃnił   sqe?eq–s.*
       watch(IMPF) this.one younger.sibling-3.POS

    'The younger brother just watched.'

  4 *səẃ–x̌ʷə?aləm̓   ?ə   t̓ə   snəx̌ʷəł–s   səs   ?əẃ–?əšəl   ṫak̓ʷ*
       N.CN-return(IMPF) OB DT canoe-3.POS N.AUX.3.POS CN-paddle go.home

    nem̓   ?ə   t̓ə   si꞉yeẏə–s.
    go   OB DT relative(PL)-3.POS

    'He returned to his canoe and paddled home to his relatives.' (MTS 105–8)

Often in texts, there is a whole discourse segment where the same protagonist is the subject in a series of sentences.[38] This leads to a chain of continues, and, in Halkomelem, this most often results in zero subjects. For example, examine SSS lines 18–38 (reproduced as appendix 1). The referent 'Sun' (*səm̓šaθət*) is established as the protagonist in the first sentence of this passage and more or less remains the ongoing backward center through the next thirteen sentences, with a couple of brief asides, until Seagull is introduced in the last sentence of the passage. We summarize SSS lines 18–38 in table 6. Numbers in the first column identify sentences in the passage, as in appendix 1.[39] The second column displays the presentation of the referent 'Sun'; "SUN" in capital letters stands for overt occurrences of *səm̓šaθət*. The same column also specifies the number of times 'Sun' is subject of a verb (or if not subject, possessor) in each sentence ("1x" for "once," "2x" for "twice," and so on). The third column gives the noun phrase that is the subject of the main clause (i.e., the topic) of the current sentence. The fourth column gives the type of transition that exists between the current sentence and the previous one. We have adopted a hybrid set of terms here, defined

as follows: "start" is used at the beginning of a discourse segment; "continue" is when the topic of the previous sentence is the same as the current one; "shift" is where the topic of the previous sentence is not the same as the current one; and "resume" is where we go back to the overall topic of the segment, *səmšaθət*.

Table 6. Lines 18–38 in SSS

SENTENCE	SUN =	TOPIC	TRANSITION
1	SUN (1x); Ø (2x)	Sun	start
2	Ø (4x)	Sun	continue
3	Ø (3x)	Sun	continue
4	Ø (3x)	Sun	continue
5	possessor (1x)	fish scales	shift
6	Ø (2x) †	house	shift
7	Ø (1x)	Sun	resume
8	SUN (1x)	Sun	continue
9	possessor (1x)	his eyes	continue
10	Ø (2x) ††	you	shift
11	none	things that burn	shift
12	none	you	shift
13	THAT SUN (1x), Ø (1x)	Sun	resume
14	Ø (1x)	Sun	continue
15	none	Seagull	start

† While 'house' is the subject of the main clause of sentence 6, and thus is considered the topic, 'Sun' continues as the zero subject of a subordinate clause. Obviously, a more careful study would have to address the issue of clauses within clauses and how they affect the flow of discourse. Hedberg and Dueck (1999) also bring up this issue.
†† 'Sun' is the covert agent of a passive with a second person patient in the first main conjoined clause of the sentence (and also the zero subject of two subordinate clauses). The subject of the second conjunct is second person.

We can see in sentences 2, 3, 4, and 14, that zero is used when 'Sun' is the topic in a continue. Furthermore, we see that a shift away from 'Sun' as topic, results in an overt mention of *səmšaθət* in the sentence when 'Sun' resumes as topic (see sentence 13) or shortly thereafter (see sentence 8).

3.2.2. Zeros that are not continues. So we see, as expected, an association of zero subjects with the continue transition type. However, some zero subjects arise even when the transition is not a continue.

First, it is possible to interrupt a chain of continues with a brief aside and then switch back to the protagonist without using an overt noun phrase, as in (36).

(36) 1 *m̓i* *yə-saq̓-θət* *t^θə skʷeyəl ʔiʔ niʔ wəł niʔ*
     come SER-break(IMPF)-REFL DT day CONJ AUX PERF AUX

    kʷsəs *s–ƛ̓iƛ̓əc̓-stxʷ–əs.*
    DT.N.AUX.3.POS ST-sneak-CS-3.SUB

    'At the break of dawn he sneaked up and camouflaged himself.'

2 *nem̓   cak^w   t^θə   qaʔ   nem̓   x^wcək^wcək^w.*
  go   far   DT water go   low.tide

'The tide was going out and was at its lowest point.'

3 *niʔ   wət   ċeɫəm-ət-əs   k̓^wi   qəx̌^w   ʔesx^w   ʔəw̓-q^walq^wəl̓   ʔəw̓-ʔən̓an̓x̌^wəm̓.*
  AUX then hear-TR-3.SUB DT many seal CN-talk(IMPF.PL) CN-bark(IMPF.PL)

'He then heard many seals barking and making noises.' (MTS 87–89)

Another example of this type is shown in (37), where Sun is expressed as a zero subject, even though the previous two sentences contain an excursus on the box that Sun is being kept in.

(37) *səs   ʔəw̓-əmət ʔəl̓.*
     N.AUX.3.POS CN-sit   just

'So he [Sun] just sat down.' (SSS 99)

Most of these brief diversions contain references to the natural setting or involve the elaboration of the object.

    Second, sometimes the referent of a noun phrase is set up as protagonist over a whole segment (or even a whole text) and it is expected that the listener will be able to figure out the referent without overt mention.[40] A dramatic example of this sort appears in MTS. The title character, the young man who turns into a seal, is often expressed as zero, even when other noun phrases have been more recent topics. For example, he is overtly mentioned in sentence 128 as 'older brother' and is expressed by zero in sentence 130. Then he is not mentioned again until sentences 134 and 135 (sentences 1 and 2 of (38)), where he is expressed as a zero object and zero subject, respectively.

(38) 1 *x^weləq   cən   ʔiʔ   nəw̓   k^wən-nəx^w   ʔiʔ   niʔ   q^wsə-θət.*
      almost 1.SG.SUB CONJ AUX.CN take-LCTR CONJ AUX go.in.water-REFL

'I almost caught him before he went into the water.'

  2 *niʔ   x̌^wčenəm   celqəm   ʔə   k^wθə   niʔ   š-s-q̓əq̓aʔ-s.*
    AUX run   follow   OB   DT   AUX INS-ST-gather-3.POS

'He ran along following the ones he was with.' (MTS 134–35)

    We see in the above data that zeros can be used for an ongoing topic or overall main character, even if there is a brief excursus. Perhaps data of this type show that the Centering Theory practice of defining transitions using pairs of sentences is too restrictive.[41]

3.2.3. Continues that are not zero.   We see then that there are some zero subjects that are not actually continues, at least by a narrow definition. The opposite is also true: there are continues where the subject is not zero.

    First, let us clarify that a continue is not a pragmatic function, but must be defined on the basis of formal identity in person or number. Evidence for this

comes from examples involving dialogue. Third person noun phrases, even if they are continued as first or second person noun phrases within dialogue, are always reestablished afterwards, as in sentence 4 of (39).

(39) 1 *səʔw̓-xʷ-θt-iwən-s*   *tᶿəw̓nił*   *swiw̓ləs*   "*ʔəy̓*   *kʷənəs*
     N.CN-PRFX-say-inside-3.POS   this.one   young.man   good   DT.1.SG.POS.N

     ɬəw̓-t̓ᶿeʔ-əm.
     shed-clothes-MID

     'So the young man thought, "I had better undress."'

    2 "*ɬəw̓-t̓ᶿeʔ-əm*   *cən.*"
      shed-clothes-MID   1.SG.SUB

      '"I'll undress."'

    3 "*nem̓*   *cən*   *t̓icəm*   *kʷən-ət*   *tᶿə-nə*   *šən̓cə.*"
      go   1.SG.SUB   swim   take-TR   DT-1.SG.POS   catch

      '"I'll swim and get my catch."'

    4 *səw̓-ɬəw̓-t̓ᶿeʔ-əm-s*   *tᶿəw̓nił*   *swiw̓ləs*   *səs*
      N.CN-shed-clothes-MID-3.POS   this.one   young.man   N.AUX.3.POS

      ʔəw̓-qʷsə-θət.
      CN-go.in.water-REFL

      'So the young man undressed and went into the water.' (MTS 28–31)

There are many examples of this type in SSS. For example, Sun is reestablished by the demonstrative pronoun *tᶿəw̓nił* in sentence 4 of (40) after the dialogue in sentences 2 and 3.

(40) 1 *səw̓*   *xʷə-sən̓iw̓-s*   *ʔəw̓-nem̓*   *ʔəw̓-yə-nəʔ-as*   *ʔə*   *tᶿə*   *šeł*
     N.CN   INC-inside-3.POS   CN-go   CN-SER-there-face   OB   DT   door

     kʷəs   *nem̓*   *yə-həy̓ə-θət.*
     DT.AUX.3.POS   go   SER-leave(IMPF)-REFL

     'When he entered, he kept his face to the door, as he entered backward.'

    2 "*ʔewə*   *č*   *ʔə*   *təʔi,*   *ʔewə*   *č*   *ʔə*   *təʔi.*
      come.here   2.SG.SUB   OB   here   come.here   2.SG.SUB   OB   here

      '"Come over here,   come over here.'

    3 *ʔeʔət*   *tᶿə*   *q̓əlštən,*   *ʔən̓-š-ɬeʔx̌nəctən.*"
      AUX.DT   DT   mat   2.POS-N.OB-sit

      'Here is a mat for you to sit on."'

    4 *səw̓*   *xʷ-ɬeʔx̌nəcəm-s*   *tᶿəw̓nił.*
      N.CN   PRFX-sit-3.POS   this.one

      'And he sat down.' (SSS 64–67)

In fact, we find no examples where a third person is not reestablished after dialogue by either a full noun phrase or a third person demonstrative pronoun such as *tᶿəẃniɫ*.[42]

Above, we noted that it is possible to use many zero subjects in a row when there is a chain of continues. However, there does seem to be a tendency to occasionally reestablish the referent. There may be an upper limit to how long a speaker will go without mentioning the noun phrase.[43] A typical example of this is in SSS lines 175–91 (reproduced in appendix 2), which we have summarized in in table 7. (The notation used in table 7 is similar to that used in table 6; see the discussion in section 3.2.1 above.)

Table 7. Lines 175–91 in SSS

SENTENCE	ANTS =	TOPIC		TRANSITION
1	ANTS	ants	subject	start
2–5	'we'	ants	subject	continue
6	ANTS	ants	subject	continue
7	THOSE ONES, ∅ (3x)	ants	subject	continue
8	THOSE ONES	ants	subject	continue
9	∅ (3x)	ants	subject	continue
10[†]	∅ (4x)	ants	agent of passive	continue
11	THOSE LITTLE ONES, ∅ (1x)	ants	subject	continue
12	∅ (1x)	ants	subject	continue
13	∅ (3x)	ants	subject	continue
14	∅ (3x)	ants	subject	continue
15	∅ (3x)	ants	subject	continue
16[†]	∅ (2x)	ants	agent of passive	continue
17	THOSE ONES	ants	subject	continue
18	∅ (1x)	ants	subject	continue
19	THOSE ONES ANTS	ants	subject	continue
20	none	seagull	subject	shift

[†] In lines 10 and 16, the agent of the motion verb is linked to the agent in the passive. (See Gerdts and Hukari [2001a, 2001b] for a discussion of this type of chaining.)

The central character throughout this passage is the 'ants', which are mentioned overtly at the start in sentence 1 and reestablished in sentence 6 after the dialogue in sentence 2–5. It apparently takes a couple more mentions to get them established as the central character—see the deictic pronouns in sentences 7 and 8. Then the continues mostly result in zero subjects, or some cases zero agents of passives, except for the deictic pronouns in 11 and 17, which immediately follow the passives in 10 and 16. We take these to be examples of "refreshing" the referent, borrowing the term from Hedberg (2000):[44] referring to the referent pronominally serves to remind the hearer of the referent—that is, "refresh" it—without fully reestablishing it by means of a noun phrase. Finally, the full noun phrase is overtly mentioned in line 19, the last line of the segment. We often see this phenomenon—the repeating of the overt noun phrase in the last line of

the segment.[45] So there is a wrapping effect, with the first and last sentence of a section having the same overt noun phrase.[46]

3.2.4. Nontopics and zero. Using zeros for topic is only effective if zero arguments are not otherwise popular in Halkomelem. In fact, what we find is that often noun phrases are repeated in Halkomelem in situations where they would appear as pronouns in English, that is, when they are nontopics that are closely associated with a previous expression of an noun phrase.

For example, the subject Raven is the topic in SSS 160–62 and appears as an overt noun phrase, a zero subject, and a pronoun. But the object 'friends' is a nontopic and appears as an overt noun phrase both sentences 1 and 2 of (41).

(41) 1 *səw̓–həye?–s   ɫak̓ʷ   tᶿə spa:l̓   səw̓–?a:–t–s   tᶿə si:yéyə–s.*
      N.CN-depart-3.POS go.home DT raven N.CN-call-TR-3.POS DT friend(PL)-3.POS

     'And so the raven went home. And he called his friends.'

   2 *ni?   yaθ   ?əw̓–x̌ətəs–t–əs   tᶿəẃnił tᶿey̓ təw̓ si:yéyə–s.*
     AUX always CN-dine(IMPF)-TR-3.SUB this.one DEM DL friend(PL)-3.POS

    'He always fed his friends.' (SSS 160–62)

We even see this effect clause-internally. In (42), 'seal' is the object and then the subject in conjoined clauses, but it is overtly mentioned each time.

(42) *səw̓–x̌ət̓ə–s   θəẃnił   "ni? p̓e? kʷələš–t–əs   kʷθə ?esxʷ*
     N.CN-say(IMPF)-3.POS this.one AUX EMPH shoot-TR-3.SUB DT seal

    səs   ?əw̓–p̓əkʷ kʷθə ?esxʷ ni? ?ə kʷθə cəw̓cəw̓."
    N.AUX.3.POS CN-surface DT seal AUX OB DT middle

   'And she said, "He killed/shot the seal, and it floated up above the water far away."'
   (MTS 55)

The ongoing topic of this segment is the title character. In another example of this type shown in (43), 'seal' appears both as an oblique phrase in the first clause and as the overt agent of the following chained passive clause.

(43) *səw̓–x̌ʷčenəm qʷsə–θət   yə–s–q̓əq̓a?   ?ə tᶿə ?esxʷ ni?*
     N.CN-run   go.in.water-REFL SER-ST-gather(RES) OB DT seal AUX

    kʷən–n–əm   ?ə tᶿə ?esxʷ.
    take-LCTR-PAS OB DT seal

   'He ran into the water along with the seals he was captured by.' (MTS 106)

The repetition of the overt noun phrase 'seal' solves a quandary for the speaker. The title character, as the ongoing topic, should be the pivot of the embedded passive. But, unlike the English translation, agents of passive clauses in Halkomelem cannot be extracted in relative clauses. The speaker resorts to stringing together two clauses with two overt noun phrases.

Repetition of subject noun phrases is also possible. 'Smoke' is mentioned twice in a row in sentences 1 and 2 of (44). But this is just a brief excursus on smoke, not enough to establish it as a topic. Sentence 3 returns to the topic 'people', which is expressed as a zero subject.

(44) 1 *yaθ ʔəẃ–niʔ tᶿeý sṗaƛ̓əm.*
  always CN-there DT smoke
  'The smoke was always there.'

 2 *yaθ ʔəẃ–yəẃeṅ tᶿə sṗaƛ̓əm kʷs yə–ʔiṁəš–s   kʷəs*
  always CN-ahead DT smoke DT.N SER-walk(IMPF)-3.POS DT.AUX.3.POS

  yə–kʷəṅe–t–əs tᶿeý həýqʷ syał.
  SER-hold-TR-3.SUB DT burn(IMPF) wood
  'The smoke was always in front of them as they walked because they held the burning wood.'

 3 *yaθ ʔəẃ–seẃq̓–t–əs   tᶿəẃneʔałt tᶿeý ƙʷiʔxʷ syał.*
  always CN-seek(IMPF)-TR-3.SUB this.one(PL) DT pitch wood
  'They always looked for the pitch wood.' (SSS 135–37)

Another example of this sort is (45), where the noun phrase 'box' is repeated in close succession, even though it is subject in the two adjacent sentences.[47]

(45) 1 *ni–i–iʔ ƛ̓liṁ ʔəẃ–š–θəl̓–wit–st–əṁ   tᶿə x̌θəm ʔə tᶿə ċəl̓ċ–s*
  AUX(RL) really CN-N.OB-line-vessel-CS-PAS DT box OB DT scale-3.POS

  tᶿə sce:ttən.
  DT salmon
  'The box was completely lined with the salmon scales.'

 2 *st̓e ʔəẃ–ni:s ƛ̓liṁ ʔəẃ–xʷə–s–xʷəl̓aƙʷ   tᶿə x̌θəm.*
  be.like CN-AUX.3.SUB really CN-INC-ST-envelope(RES) DT box
  'It was as though the box was completely enveloped.' (SSS 97–99)

Sometimes the exact noun phrase is not repeated, but rather a synonymous noun phrase or slightly varied noun phrase is used. We see this in (44) above with the two object noun phrases 'burning wood' (sentence 2) and 'pitch wood' (sentence 3). Another example of this is seen in (46), where *st̓ᶿaqʷiʔ* 'spring salmon' is repeated as *sce:ttən* 'salmon'.[48]

(46) 1 *niʔ ʔəẃ–wəł kʷeʔ–t–əm ʔəl̓ tᶿə st̓ᶿaqʷiʔ.*
  AUX CN-PERF drop-TR-PAS just DT spring.salmon
  'Now they just let the spring salmon go.'

 2 *txʷay tᶿeý ʔəẃ–təẃ həl̓iq ʔəl̓ kʷs kʷən–nəxʷ–s tᶿəẃneʔałt*
  only DEM CN-DL easy just DT.N take-LCTR-3.POS this.one(PL)

> *sce:ɬtən ni? ʔəẃ–s–tətes   ʔə   tᶿə smənment . . .*
> salmon AUX CN-ST-approach-RES OB DT rock(PL)

'Only the salmon that were easy to get right close to the rocks did they get.' (SSS 124–26)

This use of a synonym allows the overt mention of the noun phrase without the redundancy involved in a full repetition of it.[49]

3.3. Summary.   This section has presented a study of clauses involving just one postverbal noun phrase. Overwhelmingly, this is the object, not the subject, and thus examples from Halkomelem texts by and large obey the ONI condition. Two factors are simultaneously at work.[50] First, that the subject noun phrase is frequently zero is no surprise, especially from the point of view of Centering Theory. The subject is often the topic in a continue. The continue transition cross-linguistically results in the least marked form of the noun phrase—i.e., pronouns or, in languages like Halkomelem, zero noun phrases. Moreover, the subject can be zero even after brief interruptions in the story. However, when there is a long string of continues, the subject is occasionally refreshed with an overt noun phrase. The other force at work is that nontopics, including objects, tend not to be zero.[51] We see cases of the overt expression of an noun phrase in adjacent sentences, or even within the same sentence, contrasting markedly with the English translations, where such repetition is impermissible. We return to the interaction of these two factors in section 4.

We nevertheless do find examples of sentences in which the sole postverbal noun phrase is the subject. Since there are only three examples in total from both texts, it is hard to say anything conclusive here.[52] It seems likely, though, that a sole subject noun phrase often contains a third person demonstrative. Hukari (1979) has shown that noun phrases of this type systematically violate the ONI constraint, in elicitations as well as texts. This brings up the question of when an object can be zero, which seems to contradict the claim that we have made that nontopics cannot be zero. This is discussed further in the following section.

4. No postverbal noun phrases.   We have seen above that a zero object in the presence of an overt subject is extremely rare. But we see by the statistics in table 1 that the frequency of zero objects increases dramatically when the subject is also zero. As one would surmise based on the general principle that the speaker does not want to confuse the listener, verbs with no overt subject or object frequently occur in close association with other clauses or sentences. The reference is parasitic on nearby overt noun phrases. This happens occasionally sentence-internally, as in (47).[53]

(47) *səẃ–nem̓–s   tᶿə səm̓šaθət, tsə–θət   ʔə   tᶿeỷ x̌θəm, səẃ–lem–ət–s.*
      N.CN-go-3.POS DT sun   get.close-REFL OB DT box   N.CN-look-TR-3.POS

'So the sun went to the box and looked.' (SSS 83–84)

In examples of this sort, there is always a parallelism effect: subject matches subject and nonobject matches nonobject.[54]

More often, there is a string of sentences that set up the referents. For example, in (48), the agent 'seagull' and the patient 'salmon scales' are overtly expressed in the first two sentences and then they are expressed as the zero subject and zero object, respectively, of the third sentence.

(48) 1 *nem̓ c̓ə   t̓θə⍵̓niɬ qʷəni, səⱳ̓–kʷən̓–əm–s   ʔə t̓ʰey̓ sce:ɬtən.*
       go   CONF   this.one seagull N.CN-take-MID-3.POS OB   DT   salmon

    'The seagull went and took some of the salmon.'

     2 *k̓eʔ səⱳ̓–kʷən̓–əm   ʔə t̓ʰey̓ c̓əl̓c̓.*
       also N.CN-take-MID   OB   DT   scale

    'He also took some of the scales.'

     3 *nem–əstxʷ–əs ʔə t̓θə šeɬ–s.*
       go-CS-3.SUB   OB   DT   door-3.POS

    'He put them by his door.' (SSS 51–53)

Again, we see a parallelism effect. Another example of this sort can be seen in (49).

(49) *səⱳ̓ heʔk̓ʷ–s   t̓θəⱳ̓niɬ qʷəni yaθ   ʔəⱳ̓–c̓ec̓əⱳ̓–ət–əm̓*
     N.CN   remember(IMPF)-3.POS this.one seagull always CN-help(IMPF)-TR-PAS

    ʔə–ƛ̓   spa:l̓ ʔə t̓θə təⱳ̓ mək̓ʷ ʔəl̓ stem. ʔəy̓ kʷs c̓ew–ət–s.
    OB-DT raven   OB   DT   DL   all   just what   good DT.N help-TR(IMPF)-3.POS

    'And the seagull remembered that the raven helped him with all kinds of things. He (Seagull) should help him (Raven).' (SSS 277–79)

Example (50) shows that the two references can be established several clauses before.

(50) 1 *št̓ewən̓ t̓θəⱳ̓niɬ spa:l̓, "haʔ cən   q̓ay ʔiʔ ʔəⱳ̓–q̓ay cən,*
       think   this.one   raven   if   1.SG.SUB die   CONJ CN-die   1.SG.SUB

     ʔəⱳ̓–ni:n̓   yəqʷ."
     CN-AUX:1.SG.SUB burn

    'The raven thought, "If I die then I die, if I burn."'

     2 *kʷən–ət–əs   t̓θə səm̓šaθət səs   nem̓ ʔəⱳ̓–ɬak̓ʷ nem̓ cɬaqʷ–θət*
       take-TR-3.SUB   DT   sun   N.AUX.3.POS go   CN-fly   go   go.through-REFL

     ʔə tənanət šqʷəqʷe š–xʷə–nəm̓–s   t̓θə sƛ̓eyəq̓əm.
     OB   DEM   hole   N.OB-INC-go-POS   DT   smoke

    'He took the sun and he flew through the hole way up where the smoke goes.'

3 *niɬ*   *s–nem̓–s*   *ʔəw̓–hən̓–ʔəƛ̓q–nəxʷ–əs*   *səw̓*   *cse–t–s,*
   3.PRO   N-go-3.POS   CN-MOT-go.out(IMPF)-LCTR-3.SUB   N.CN   tell-TR-3.POS

"*nem̓*   *č*   *həyeʔ,*   *nem̓*   *č*   *ƛ̓lim̓*   *ʔəw̓–k̓ʷi.*"
   go   2.SG.SUB   depart   go   2.SG.SUB   really   CN-climb.

'When he got through he told him, "You go away, you go way up there."' (SSS 328–32)

One spectacular example of a passage with several instances of transitives with both zero subject and object occurs in SSS lines 300–302 (reproduced in (51) below), where four of the ten such clauses in SSS occur. This passage describes Raven's ruse of pretending not to be able to see the splinters in Seagull's foot so that he can trick Seagull into letting him open the box where Sun is being kept. The passage contains four vision verbs without overt subjects and objects— *tik̓ʷətəs* 'he squints at it' (twice), *ləmnəxʷəs* 'he sees it' (once), and *lemətəs* 'he looks at it' (once). Prior to this, Raven has been overtly mentioned in line 295, and the entity that is being looked at, 'that which pierced his foot', is overtly mentioned in line 298.

(51) 1 *ƛ̓eʔ*   *wəɬ*   *nem̓*   *tik̓ʷ–ət–əs.*
    too   then   go   squint-TR-3.SUB

    'He went to squint at it.'

   2 *tik̓ʷ–ət–əs.*   *lem–ət–əs.*
     squint-TR-3.SUB   look-TR-3.SUB

     'He squinted at it. He looked at it.'

   3 *sk̓ʷey*   *kʷs*   *ləm–nəxʷ–s.*
     cannot   DT.N   look-LCTR-3.POS

     'He could not see it.'

   4 *x̌ət̓ə*   *kʷs*   *sk̓ʷey–s*   *kʷs*   *ləm–nəxʷ–s*   *k̓ʷə*   *niʔ*
     say(IMPF)   DT.N   cannot-3.POS   DT.N   look-LCTR-3.POS   DT   AUX

     s–c̓əq̓ʷ–šen̓–s
     ST-pierce-foot(RES)-3.POS

     'He said that he could not see the slivers.' (SSS 300–302)

Data such as these bring up a further point that should be studied. Certain classes of verbs, such as perception verbs, may preferentially take zero objects. We see that 'look' and 'speak' expressed as transitive verbs with zero objects occur frequently in MTS. An example is seen in (52).

(52) *ʔe–e–eʔ*   *ʔəw̓–niʔ–əs*   *ceʔ*   *ləm–nəxʷ–əs.*
    AUX(RL)   CN-AUX-3.SUB   FUT   look-LCTR-3.SUB

    'Then he saw them.' (MTS 93)

The last mention of the object 'seals' was in MTS 89, but nonetheless they are not referred to by an overt noun phrase in MTS 93. Another set of 'look' verbs appears shortly thereafter in MTS 96.

(53) *səs*　　　　*nem̓*　*ʔəẁ–c̓iməl̓*　*tᶿəẁnił*　*swiẁləs*　*səẁ–lem–ət–əs*
　　　N.AUX.3.POS　go　　CN-approach　this.one　young.man　N.CN-look-TR-3.SUB

　　　ləm–nəxʷ–əs.
　　　look-LCTR-3.SUB

　　　'When the young man got close he looked and saw them.' (MTS 96)

We would need a larger corpus of data to explore this more thoroughly. However, it does appear that certain verbs allow or maybe even prefer zero objects, even when the distance to the last occurrence of overt mention is great.[55]

5. Conclusion.　　　In this article, we have discussed the expression of noun phrases in Halkomelem based on data from two texts. The picture that emerges from the above discussion is that overt noun phrases appear as often as necessary to allow the listener to track the various noun phrases in a text. For example, noun phrase topics, though usually zero, are periodically refreshed in a long segment, or reestablished after dialogue. Also, segments tend to end with an overt expression of the topic. However, we see that overt postverbal ergative noun phrases are not used to introduce new topics. Intransitive clauses, clefts, or passives get used for this function instead. Nontopic noun phrases, including object noun phrases, tend to be overt, even when they closely follow an overt expression of the same or similar noun phrase.[56] They express information relating to the topic.

Countering the need for the clarity provided by overtly expressed noun phrases is the need for parsimony.[57] Constant repetition of the same noun phrases detracts from the action of the story related by the verbs. So there is pressure to reduce the number of noun phrases. The obvious candidate to be a zero noun phrase is the subject when it is continued as the center of attention through a segment of text. Also, the title character can act as a default topic and appear as zero even if it has not been mentioned recently. In addition, it is possible to have a zero object. In our sample of transitive clauses where both subject and object are third person, zero objects most commonly appear when the subject—i.e., the topic—is also zero.[58] Most often this is within a chain of events with a continuing topic. Parallelism effects govern the interpretation of the zero noun phrases. Since at least one zero noun phrase in the clause will be the topic, and this is predictable on the basis of parallelism effects, zero noun phrases can be used to good effect for discourse cohesion.

Based on the above discussion, we can form two idealized principles concerning the expression of subjects and objects in transitive clauses.

(54a) Subjects should be zero.

(54b) Objects should be overt.

We can see how these principles relate to the data discussed in this article, cited in table 1. We have reformatted the results in table 8.

Table 8. Overt vs. Zero Noun Phrases

	ZERO SUBJECT	OVERT SUBJECT	TOTAL
ZERO OBJECT	35%	4%	38%
OVERT OBJECT	53%	9%	62%
TOTAL	88%	12%	100%

The principle (54a) is stronger, while (54b) is weaker: transitive clauses have zero subjects in 88 percent of our data, while overt objects appear in only 62 percent of our data. Putting it another way, as in table 9, we can see how the two principles relate to each clause type.

Table 9. Two Principles

	ONE NP = OBJECT	NO OVERT NPs	TWO NPS	ONE NP = SUBJECT
	53%	35%	9%	4%
ZERO SUBJECT	yes	yes	no	no
OVERT OBJECT	yes	no	yes	no

The preferred construction will be the one that satisfies both principles. This would be a clause in which the sole noun phrase is the object, and over half of the data is of this clause type. Among the clause types that satisfy one of the principles, the clause type that satisfies (54a), the stronger principle, is preferred over clause types that violate it. Clauses with no overt noun phrases appear in 35 percent of the data. In contrast, the clauses that violate (54a) but satisfy (54b), that is, clauses with two overt noun phrases, appear in only 9 percent of the data. Finally, clauses that violate both of the principles are rare, and we find them in only 4 percent of the data.

Furthermore, we see how the two principles together derive ONI effects.[59] Clauses in which the sole noun phrase is the object are the most preferred construction while clauses in which the sole noun phrase is the subject are the least preferred of the clause types. Why should we find overt subjects at all? Because, as we mentioned above, there is pressure to refresh or reestablish the topic, and this is strong enough to override principle (54a). Proof that the topicality of the noun phrase is relevant comes from the fact that our examples frequently involve a third person demonstrative. We discuss this in detail elsewhere (Gerdts and Hukari 2004).

Other data that show overt subject noun phrases contra principle (54a) are clauses with two overt noun phrases. However, we see in our data that such clauses, because they satisfy principle (54b), are slightly more frequent than clauses in which the sole noun phrase is the subject, since the latter violate both principles. Again, we can see the effect of topicality at work. As mentioned above, clauses with two overt noun phrases do not arise in out-of-the-blue contexts, but rather when the subject is being reestablished or reinforced as the topic, sometimes with an element of contrast to the object.

At this point, it should be obvious to anyone who has read Davis (1994) that we have arrived at the same conclusion as this seminal work on the discourse role of topical objects in St'át'imcets. Our count of clause types fits perfectly with the theory of topic mapping that he develops (Davis 1994:120–25). This is not surprising, given the general patterns of Salish structure that are shared by both languages and the similarity in our underlying assumptions.

There is one small (or maybe not so small) difference between his methodology and ours that leads to different empirical predictions. In our research, we have tried to establish what the topic of the sentence is first, and then see whether it is expressed by an overt or zero noun phrase. Since continues are universally the most preferred transition type, and since topics in continues are associated with the weakest forms, i.e., a zero pronoun in Salish languages, topics are preferentially zero. However, we have suggested above that topics can be overt noun phrases, for example, when the topic is being refreshed or reestablished. Overt ergative noun phrases do not arise in out-of-the-blue contexts.

In contrast, Davis (1994) starts from the point of view of zero pronouns and how they are to be interpreted. He uses the term discourse topic (d-topic), which corresponds to the protagonist(s) of a given discourse. This discourse topic will have the ability to be the antecedent of a zero pronoun. So far, this is parallel to our approach, and his use of d-topic is similar to our use of topic.[60] However, his connection between d-topics and zero pronouns is bidirectional. He says that "a d-topic is represented in the syntax as the index binding an empty pronominal" (1994:123). Consequently, overt noun phrases by definition are not d-topics. But this does not correspond with what we found in our data: topics can be overt noun phrases, for example, when they are being refreshed or contrasted.

To conclude, the differences in our methodologies, especially in how we define and use the notion topic, raise some interesting questions about the discourse functions of clauses with overt ergative noun phrases. We clearly cannot answer them on the basis of the few examples that we found in our two texts. As more texts become available, especially in searchable electronic form, and as we develop better discourse theories, we can address these questions in a more sophisticated way. In the meantime, we hope that our exploration of the expression of noun phrases in Halkomelem contributes to an understanding of the intricacies of discourse structure in Salish languages.

Appendix 1

The text below corresponds to lines 18–38 of Hukari, Peter, and White (1977). (See table 6.)

1. səẃ ƛ̓eʔə-šə-t-əm̓-s t̓ᶿə səm̓šaθət ʔəẃ-mi:s ƛ̓pil.
   N.CN invite-foot-TR-PAS-3.POS DT sun CN-come.3.SUB go.down
   'And the sun was invited to come down.'

2. ʔəwə kʷs nem̓-s ʔəẃ-yə-nəʔ-as ʔə t̓ᶿə šeɬ ʔə kʷs
   not DT.N go-3.POS CN-SER-be.there-face OB DT door OB DT.N

   nem̓-s ləẃiləm.
   go-3.POS go.in
   'He never faced the door as he went in.'

3. niʔ ċə ƛ̓eʔ x̌əl̓ċ-θət səs nem̓ ʔəẃ-yə-həy̓ə-θət.
   AUX CONF also turn-REFL N.AUX.3.POS go CN-SER-leave(IMPF)-REFL
   'He would turn around and go in backward.'

4. niɬ kʷəʔeɬ kʷs x̌ʷəẃe-s nem̓-əs ləẃiləm ʔiʔ niʔ wəɬ
   3.PRO indeed DT.N INC.not.3.SUB go-3.SUB go.in CONJ AUX PERF

   pənəs-θət ʔə t̓ᶿey̓ ċəl̓ċ-s t̓ᶿə sce:ɬtən.
   sprinkle-REFL OB DEM scale-3.POS DT salmon
   'Before he went inside he would sprinkle himself with salmon scales.'

5. niʔ xʷə-s-t̓əl̓iʔt̓iyəm̓ t̓ᶿey̓, sl̓e ʔəẃ-ni:s xʷə-sʔit̓ᶿəm-s.
   AUX INC-ST-stick.on(RES.DIM.PL) DEM be.like CN-AUX.3.SUB INC-garment-3.POS
   'The little things would stick on, just like a garment.'

6. səẃ ʔəwəs yəqʷ-əs t̓ᶿə leləm̓ nem̓ šxʷ-ən̓nəẃ-s.
   N.CN not.3.SUB burn-3.SUB DT house go N.OB-go.in(RES)-3.POS
   'So the house he went into would not burn.'

7. ʔəwə ċə ƛ̓eʔ kʷs n̓an-s ʔəẃ-yə-x̌ən̓eq̓t.
   not CONF also DT.N very-3.POS CN-SER-open.eyes(RES)
   'He never kept his eyes all the way open.'

8. niʔ ʔəẃ-sl̓e ʔəẃ-ni:s təẃ yə-t̓ᶿit̓ᶿəp̓nəxʷ t̓ᶿə səm̓šaθət.
   AUX CN-be.like CN-AUX.3.SUB DL SER-shut.eyes(IMPF) DT sun
   'The sun went along with his eyes half shut.'

9. *hay* *ʔəĺ* *qəl, qəl* *c̓ə* *t̓ə qələm̓–s.*
   only just bad bad CONF DT eye-3.POS

   'His eyes were very bad.'

10. *haʔ* *niʔ* *x̓lim̓* *ʔəw̓–lemə–θa:m* *ʔə* *kʷs* *ʔəwə-s* *ni:s*
    if AUX really CN-looked.at-2.SG.PAS OB DT.N not-3.POS AUX.3.SUB

    x̓lim̓ *ʔəw̓–s–θəθiʔ,* *kʷs* *niʔ–s* *təw̓* *t̓et̓iyəq̓,* *ʔiʔ*
    really CN-ST-right(RES) DT.N AUX-3.POS DL angry(IMPF) CONJ

    x̌ʷəm *č* *yəqʷ.*
    can 2.SG.SUB burn

    'If he really looked at you when he was not very well, when he was angry, then you
    would burn up.'

11. *ni–i–iʔ* *yəqʷ* *t̓ə* *niʔ* *niʔ, ʔiʔ* *x̓lim̓* *niʔ* *ʔəw̓–txʷ–ʔəxʷin̓* *ʔəĺ.*
    AUX(RL) burn DT AUX be CONJ really be CN-only-little just

    'When things did burn, there was hardly anything left.'

12. *niʔ* *xʷə–cq̓iʔq̓x̌* *k̓ʷən̓* *s–łełəq̓* *ʔə* *t̓ə* *təməxʷ, k̓ʷən̓*
    AUX INC-black(DIM) DT.2.POS ST-lie(RES) OB DT ground DT.2.POS

    s–x̓lim̓ *ʔəw̓–yəqʷ.*
    N-really CN-burn

    'You would be just black little ashes lying on the ground, very burnt.'

13. *səw̓* *laĺəm̓–əθət–s* *t̓əw̓nił* *səm̓šaθət* *ʔəwə* *scekʷəĺ–əs*
    N.CN look.at(IMPF)-REFL-3.POS this.one sun not how-3.SUB

    ʔiʔ *x̓lim̓* *ʔəw̓–lem–ət–əs* *t̓ə* *si:yey̓ə–s.*
    CONJ really CN-look-TR-3.SUB DT friend(PL)-3.POS

    'So the sun took care that he never really looked at his friends.'

14. *ni–i–ič* *st̓e* *ʔə* *t̓ey̓* *ʔiʔ* *ʔəwə* *kʷs* *ʔa:t–əm–s* *ʔə–x̓* *qʷəni.*
    AUX(RL) be.like OB DEM CONJ not DT.N call-TR-PAS-3.POS OB-DT seagull

    'This was how things were, and he was never called by Seagull.'

15. *x̌ət̓ə* *t̓ə* *qʷəni,* "*sx̓ax̓əm̓* *ʔəw̓–ʔənθe:s* *š–st̓θet̓θək̓ʷ–s*
    say(IMPF) DT seagull ST-right(RES) CN-1.SG.PRO.3.POS N.OB-light-3.POS

    t̓ə *skʷeyəl.*"
    DT day

    'The seagull would say, "I should be the light of the world."'

Appendix 2

The text below corresponds to lines 175–91 of Hukari, Peter, and White (1977). (See table 7.)

1. *"ʔa–a–a, waɫə   ʔəy̓–əs,   niʔ   ct   ʔəw̓–x̌ec–t,"   θət t^θə ċəm̓ċəyi.*
   ah(RL)   maybe good-3.SUB AUX 1.PL.SUB CN-ponder(IMPF)-TR say DT ant

   '"Oh, all right, we are pondering on it," said the ant.'

2. *"niʔ   ct   ʔəw̓–x̌ec–t.*
   AUX 1.PL.SUB CN-ponder(IMPF)-TR

   '"We are pondering on it.'

3. *niʔ   ct   št̓ewən̓ niʔ   ct   ʔəw̓–staɫ–stəx^w.*
   AUX 1.PL.SUB think   AUX 1.PL.SUB CN-know-CS

   'We think we know.'

4. *niʔ   ct   x^wiyən̓em–ət k^wθən̓   sye ʔyəʔ–ələp,   sye ʔyə–ct.*
   AUX 1.PL.SUB hear-TR   DT.2.POS friend-2.PL.POS friend-1.PL.POS

   'We heard your friend, our friend.'

5. *nem̓   ct   həyeʔ,   m̓i   ct   ceʔ   x̌̓eʔ ʔəw̓–x^wə–ʔi."*
   go   1.PL.SUB depart come 1.PL.SUB FUT   too   CN-INC-here

   'We will go now, but we will be back."'

6. *səw̓   həyeʔ–s   t^θə ċəm̓ċəyi.*
   N.CN leave-3.POS DT ant

   'So the ants left.'

7. *ne–e–em̓–s   ċtem   t^θəw̓neʔəɫ   ləw̓iləm ʔə   t^θey̓ leləm̓   ʔə–x̌̓   q^wəni.*
   go(RL)-3.POS crawl this.one(PL) go.in   OB   DEM house OB-DT seagull

   'And they crawled into Seagull's house.'

8. *niʔ   yə–x̌əliʔx̌ak̓^w–θət   t^θəw̓ne–e–eʔəɫ.*
   AUX SER-squeeze(DIM.PL)-REFL   those.ones(RL)

   'They squeezed themselves through little cracks.'

9. *niʔ   ċə   niʔ   t^θə niʔ   x̌̓lim̓   niʔ   ʔəw̓–sk̓^wey k^ws*
   AUX CONF be.there DT AUX really AUX CN-cannot DT.N

   hən̓–nəw̓–namət–s.
   MOT-go.in-manage-3.POS

   'Some of them could not manage to get in.'

10. *səẁ   wəł   m̀–i–i–i–i   q̓ik̓ʷ–ət–əm,   q̓ik̓ʷ–ət–əm,   c̓əƛ́c̓əƛ́q̓ʷ–t–əm   tᶿə*
    and   PERF   come(RL)   chew-TR-PAS   chew-TR-PAS   gnaw-TR-PAS   DT

    liƚəm̀   ʔə–ƛ̓   qʷəni.
    house(DIM)   OB-DT   seagull.

    'So they chewed and chewed and gnawed at Seagull's house.'

11. *x̌ətə́   ʔiʔ   niʔ   ʔəẁ–wəł   nem̀   yə–cəliʔcətəqʷ–θət   tᶿəẃnəǹəł.*
    do(IMPF)   CONJ   AUX   CN-PERF   go   SER.go.through(DIM.PL)-REFL   this.one(DIM)

    'Pretty soon the ants were getting through.'

12. *ni–i–i–iʔ   c̓ə   niʔ   tᶿə   ƛ̓lim̀   niʔ   ʔəẁ–xʷə–sʔaʔt̓.*
    AUX(RL)   CONF   AUX   DT   really   AUX   CN-INC-ST-stretch(RES)

    'Some of them were really stretched.'

13. *cəlel   ʔiʔ   xʷ–ƚq̓ʷ–iwən   kʷəs   nem̀   ʔaʔt̓ə–θət.*
    almost   CONJ   PRFX-pop.in.two-body   DT.AUX.3.POS   go   stretch(IMPF)-REFL

    'They were almost popped in two from stretching.'

14. *niʔ   tᶿey̓   ƛ̓lim̀   niʔ   ʔəẁ–xʷə–sk̓ʷey   kʷs   nem̀–s   ʔiməš.*
    AUX   DEM   really   AUX   CN-INC-cannot   DT.N   go-3.POS   walk

    'Some of them could not even walk anymore.'

15. *ƛ̓lim̀   niʔ   ʔəẁ–xʷə–st̓e   ʔəẁ–ni:s   xʷə–š–ƚq̓ʷ–iẁəǹ.*
    really   AUX   CN-INC.like   CN-AUX.3.SUB   INC-ST.PRFX-pop.in.two-body(RES)

    'They were almost cut in half.'

16. *həǹ–nəẁ   səs   ʔəẁ–ƛ̓i–i–i–c̓ə–tə–m.*
    MOT-go.in   N.AUX.3.POS   CN-sneak-TR-PAS(RL)

    'They sneaked in.'

17. *s–t̓əƚi–i–i–in̓   tᶿəẃneʔəłt.*
    ST-line.up(RES)(RL)   this.one(PL)

    'They lined up.'

18. *ʔəwə   kʷs   ləm–n–əm–s   ʔə–ƛ̓   qʷəni.*
    not   DT.N   look-LCTR-PAS-3.POS   OB-DT   seagull

    'The seagull could not see the ants.'

19. *nił   kʷəs   ƛ̓lim̀   ʔəẁ–cq̓əliʔq́x̌   tᶿəẃneʔəłt   c̓əm̀c̓əyi.*
    3.PRO   DT.AUX.3.POS   really   CN-black(DIM.PL)   this.one(PL)   ant

    'This was because they were such black little things.'

20. *ʔe–e–et*　　*qʷiɬqʷəl̓-θət*　　　*t^θə*　*qʷəni*, . . .

　　　AUX.DT(RL)　talk(IMPF.PL)-REFL　DT　seagull

　　　'The seagull was talking to himself, . . .'

Notes

Transcription. The transcription of Halkomelem mostly uses standard Americanist symbols; less familiar symbols include *x̌* (voiceless uvular fricative) and *ƛ̓* (glottalized lateral affricate). Rhetorical lengthening (glossed as RL) is marked as *–V–V–*.

Abbreviations. 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; AUX = auxiliary; CN = connective; CONF = confirmative ('it is said'); CONJ = conjunction; CS = causative; DAT = dative applicative; DEM = demonstrative; DIM = diminutive; DL = delimiter; DT = determiner; EMPH = emphatic; FUT = future; IMPF = imperfective; INC = inchoative; INS = instrumental; LCTR = limited control transitive; MID = middle; MOT = translational motion; N = nominalizer; OBJ = object; OB = oblique; PAS = passive; PERF = perfect; PL = plural; POS = possessive; PRFX = locative prefix; PRO = pronoun; PST = past; REFL = reflexive; RES = resultative; REL = relational applicative; RL = rhetorical lengthening; SER = serial; SG = singular; ST = stative, SUB = subject, TR = transitive. Parentheses are used to set off the glosses of infixes, reduplication, and other nonsegmental processes such as glottalization of resonants.

1. We use the terms "hard" and "soft" constraints in the sense of Bresnan, Dingare, and Manning(2001).

2. Among the other languages of the world that have been noted to have this effect are Chamorro (Chung 1984), Navajo (Platero 1982), and Tz'utujil (Aissen 2003).

3. The topic is the entity that the speaker intends to give further knowledge about. The topic is a protagonist who continues as the center of attention over stretches of discourse (Reinhart 1981; Gundel 1988; Lambrecht 1994; etc.). The correlation of topics with zero or weak pronouns is well established. See Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (1993) and references therein.

4. Cross-linguistically, the topic in unmarked cases tends to be the subject (Givón 1979; Lambrecht 1994:132).

5. This article is part of an ongoing attempt to analyze and understand the structure of texts. Gerdts had presented two earlier papers in this vein (2001, 2002).

6. We have updated the transcription and interlinear glosses.

7. We exclude examples where a subject or object noun phrase appears in the sentence-initial focus position. See section 2.2.3.

8. See tables 2 and 3 below for the frequencies of active versus passive clauses.

9. In one example, the agent is the third person plural pronoun *ʔe:ɬtən*. Two examples involve constructions of the type 'X calls Y Z'.

10. In examining sentences with two overt postverbal noun phrases in St'át'imcets, Davis (2001:302) says they are triggered by the presence of more than one potential antecedent for the subject.

11. Strong pronouns such as *t^θəẃniɬ* are complex demonstratives consisting of a determiner, a connective, and a third person predicative pronoun. See Wiltschko (2002)

for a formal analysis of the structure of the equivalent form in the Upriver dialect of Halkomelem, and Gerdts and Hukari (2004) for a discussion of its discourse function.

12. A more detailed study would need to examine verb-subject-object clauses in a large set of texts, since so few show up in one text. Factors such as the semantics of the verbs and noun phrases involved should be studied. For example, we think it is no accident that two of the three examples of verb-subject-object clauses in SSS involve the noun phrase *məstiməxʷ* 'people'. This is often used as a kind of "light," generic noun.

13. Actually, the situation in Halkomelem is probably a less extreme version of what Watkins says about Kiowa: "In some cases there is no noun phrase in a sequence of as many as twenty clauses, whereas in others nouns naming participants are repeated in clause after clause" (1990:410).

14. Croft (1985), citing examples from several languages, calls this indirect object "lowering."

15. One reviewer asks if this sentence could be analyzed as a verb-object-subject construction and thus be an example of a clause with two overt noun phrases. However, verb-object-subject clauses are extremely rare in Halkomelem, mostly limited to cases where the object is inanimate and where there is no potential for ambiguity between the agent and the patient. Thus, we take this clause to be an example of backwards pro-nominalization with the overtly expressed possessor anteceding the unexpressed subject, a frequently encountered structure in Halkomelem. This analysis results in an apparent violation of Chomsky's (1981) Binding Condition C, which states that an R-expression (i.e., the overt noun phrase) must be free (i.e., cannot be preceded by a coreferring pronoun in an argument position. Binding Condition C violations are well attested in Halkomelem (Hukari 1997; Wiltschko 2002) and other Salish languages (Gardiner 1993; Matthewson, Davis, and Gardiner 1993).

16. Davis (2001) has noted the St'át'imcets equivalent, pointing out its usefulness for avoiding two postverbal nouns. See his example (36).

17. The shared argument is not always a subject throughout. Chains in which the first verb is a motion verb often have a passive as the second verb, and link agent to agent (Gerdts and Hukari 2001a, 2001b).

18. Davis (2001) says the first verb is intransitive in the equivalent construction in St'át'imcets.

19. Island Halkomelem does not allow subject-verb-object clauses without extraction effects.

20. This point is also made in Gerdts (2002).

21. Either order of the agent and patient noun phrases is permissible in passive constructions. The conditions under which one order or the other is preferred remain to be studied.

22. See Dingare (2001) and Thompson (1987) for the frequency and use of the passive in English discourse. See Darnell (1997), Forrest (1994), and Jacobs (1994) for text counts of passive (also called "inverse") in Salish languages. Gerdts (2002) shows that passives outnumber active transitives in a Halkomelem text. See Bresnan, Dingare, and Manning (2001) for a comparison of passive in English and Salish languages.

23. We do not give a full discussion of the interaction of voice and noun phrases here. As Gerdts (2002) notes, factors concerning noun phrase type (such as person, common vs. proper noun, etc.) always override discourse considerations. The interaction of these two systems yields a complex of rules governing the occurrence of actives and passives in texts. Thomason and Thomason (2002) have also made this point. See Aissen (1999) for an Optimality Theory analysis of Salish person hierarchy effects.

24. These numbers include sentences with a noun phrase in sentence-initial focus position.

25. For example, Lushootseed uses passives rather than actives in this context (Hess 1973).

26. We have excluded from the count in table 5 examples with an noun phrase in sentence-initial focus position. Although either the subject or the object can be extracted in active sentences, only the patient, and not the agent, can be extracted in passives.

27. The proper noun oblique determiner is $\dot{\lambda}$. With common nouns, the same determiners that are used for direct arguments are used after the oblique preposition ʔə, as in (18).

28. The term "segment" or "discourse segment" is used here (as is common in the pragmatics literature, following Grosz and Sidner [1986]) to refer to an aggregate of utterances that convey a common theme, thread, or event in the story. We can impressionistically divide the story into a series of episodes that are further divided into discourse segments using an analysis based on plot coherence as well as more formal clues such as intonation. In the written version of the texts, a segment roughly corresponds to a paragraph or to a set of short closely related paragraphs.

29. Since the noun phrase is appearing for the first time, this is probably not technically topic maintenance. Gerdts (2002) points out other examples of this.

30. 'Creator' is not expressed as a proper noun here, as indicated by the use of the article tᶿə after the oblique preposition ʔə. As noted earlier, the proper noun oblique determiner is $\dot{\lambda}$.

31. We disregard antipassives in this article. Gerdts (1988a) suggests antipassive as a means for circumventing surface constraints. However, as shown by Gerdts and Hukari (2000), antipassives evoke special verb semantics.

32. Gerdts and Hukari (2004) discuss this clause type on the basis of a larger sample of data.

33. This is discussed in more detail by Gerdts and Hukari (2004).

34. We know the noun phrase is in a verb chain and not in some preverbal extraction site because of the presence of the ergative agreement suffix. Extracted ergatives in Halkomelem have antiagreement; the ergative agreement suffix does not appear when an ergative is extracted, as exemplified in (15) above.

35. In (32), c̓əm̓c̓əyi 'ant' is a common noun, as seen by the presence of the plain determiner, not the proper noun oblique determiner after the oblique preposition. So this sentence theoretically could have been expressed in the active. But given the overall popularity of passives, some clauses could be passives for other reasons, such as topic maintenance (Gerdts 2002).

36. See n. 3 for our understanding of what topics are.

37. There is much evidence for topic maintenance in Salish languages; see especially Beck (1996b, 1998b, 2000) and Kinkade (1989).

38. See n. 28 for our definition of "discourse segment."

39. These differ from the line divisions in the published version of SSS, which do not correspond to sentences.

40. Perhaps this accounts for the zero subjects of subordinate clauses in sentences 6 and 10 in table 6, where the topic shifts away from 'Sun', and also in sentence 7, where 'Sun' resumes as topic, although overt mention is not made until line 8.

41. Hedberg and Dueck (1999) also make this point.

42. As Paul Kroeber has pointed out to us, it may be the case that the switch in and out of dialogue might be sufficient to require the noun phrase to be reestablished, even if the referent in question is referred to in the dialogue by third person forms, rather than first or second person forms. Further research is needed to establish whether this is so.

43. Darnell (1997) measures referential persistence in Squamish.

44. Hedberg points out that "demonstrative pronouns are most typically used to introduce a focus shift, to refresh a discourse topic, to draw attention to a discourse segment boundary or to point out something in the external context" (2000:898). As can be seen from the use of THOSE ONES in table 7, demonstratives are used for these purposes in Halkomelem. See Gerdts and Hukari (2004) for more discussion of this phenomenon.

45. The tendency to wrap up a segment by putting a full noun phrase in the last line has also been noted by Hedberg and Dueck (1999).

Placing the overt noun phrase in the last clause of the last sentence in a segment sometimes yields a case of backward pronominalization—the noun phrase in the last clause corefers to the unexpressed main clause subject—resulting in a Condition C violation. See n. 15.

46. Gerdts (2001) notes that often the first and last lines of a segment show a striking parallelism.

47. Sentences 14 and 15 in appendix 1 also illustrate this. There are two occurrences of 'Seagull' in close proximity.

48. Usually the noun phrase expressed first is more specific and the subsequent noun phrase is more general.

49. Gerdts (2001) also points out that sentences at the end of segments often finish with increments, where an appositive noun phrase doubles the last noun phrase of the sentence, e.g. $t^\theta \partial$ snəxʷəɫ, θi snəxʷəɫ 'the canoe, big canoe' or $t^\theta \partial$ snəxʷəɫ, $t^\theta \partial$ q̓x̌əw̓ɫ 'the canoe, the war canoe'. In this case, the second noun phrase is usually more specific.

50. Roberts, in his study of St'át'imcets subject and topic (1994), arrives at the same viewpoint, and states it in a much more elegant fashion.

51. Agents in passive clauses and patients in antipassive clauses, which are frequently omitted, are, of course, an exception to this.

52. Gerdts and Hukari (2004) compile a larger sample of data and discuss this issue in more detail.

53. The verb *lemət* 'look at it' is transitive in Halkomelem, even though this is not reflected in the English translation.

54. Parallelism effects within or across clauses have been noted in Bella Coola (Davis and Saunders 1984) and Northern Interior Salish languages (Matthewson, Davis, and Gardiner 1993; Davis 1994; Roberts 1999).

55. Darnell (1997) measures referential distance in Squamish texts.

56. The first part of Grice's (1975) maxim of quantity—"be as informative as required"—may account for the appearance of many overt noun phrases.

57. Gundel (1998) notes that the first part of the quantity maxim predicts that for referents that are in focus, an unstressed personal pronoun or zero will be preferred over a demonstrative or stressed pronoun.

58. Within Centering Theory, the Pronoun Rule (Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein 1986) says that, if anything is referred to with a pronoun, the backward center (i.e., topic) will be. A consequence of this is that other noun phrases can be pronominal (or zero) if the topic is as well.

59. This point was previously made by Roberts (1994).

60. Though, since a clause can have more than one zero pronoun, there can be more than one discourse antecedent (in Davis's terms, more than one d-topic). We have been using the Centering Theory approach and limiting the sentence to one topic. This means, of course, that there are zero noun phrases that are not topics, as discussed in section 4 above. Clearly, further research on secondary protagonists is in order.

References

Aissen, Judith L.

1999   Markedness and Subject Choice in Optimality Theory. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 17:673–711.

2003   Interpretive References and Optimality in Morphosyntax. Paper presented at the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley. Calif., 14–17 February.

Beck, David

1996a   Is There a Syntactic Subject in Lushootseed? Paper presented at the Thirty-first International Conference on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages, Vancouver, B.C., 15–17 August.

1996b   Subjecthood, Agency, and Topicality in Lushootseed. Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics 15:1–29. Toronto: Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.

1998a   Eliding the Obvious: Zero Subjects in Lushootseed. *In* Proceedings from the First Workshop on American Indigenous Languages, 15–29. Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 8. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara.

1998b   On the Syntactic Expression of Topic and Rheme in Two Salishan Languages. *In* Proceedings of Workshop on Focus, edited by Elena M. Benedicto, Maribel Romero, and Satoshi Tomioka, 13–36. Amherst, Mass.: Graduate Linguistics Student Association, University of Massachusetts.

2000   Semantic Agents, Syntactic Subjects, and Discourse Topics: How to Locate Lushootseed Sentences in Space and Time. Studies in Linguistics 24:277–317.

Bickel, Balthasar

2002   Referential Density in Discourse and Syntactic Typology. Language 79: 709–36.

Boelscher, Marianne

1990   Passive and Agency in Shuswap Narrative Discourse. Paper presented at the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages, Vancouver, B.C., 16–18 August.

Brennan, Susan E., Marilyn Walker Friedman, and Carl J. Pollard

1987   A Centering Approach to Pronouns. *In* Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Association of Computational Linguistics, 6–9 July, 155–62. Morristown, N.J.: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Bresnan, Joan, Shipra Dingare, and Christopher D. Manning

2001   Soft Constraints Mirror Hard Constraints: Voice and Person in English and Lummi. *In* Proceedings of the 2001 Lexical Functional Grammar Conference, edited by Miriam Butt and Tracy Halloway King, 13–32. Stanford, Calif.: CLSI Publications.

Burton, Strang, Henry Davis, Peter Jacobs, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Martina Wiltschko

2001   A Boy, a Dog, and a Frog. *In* ICSNL 36: The Thirty-Sixth International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, edited by Leora Bar-el, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Ian Wilson, 37–54. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 6. Vancouver, B.C.: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.

Chomsky, Noam

1981   Lectures on Government and Binding. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chung, Sandra

1984   Indentifiability and Null Objects in Chamorro. Proceedings of the Tenth

Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 116–30. Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Croft, William
    1985   Indirect Object Lowering. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 39–51. Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa, and M. Dale Kinkade
    1998   Salish Languages and Linguistics. *In* Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives, edited by Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, 1–68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Darnell, Michael
    1997   Functional Analysis of Voice in Squamish. Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee.

Davis, Henry
    1994   Tali-Ho! Paper presented at the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages, Salish Kootenay College, Pablo, Mont., 11–13 August.
    2001   Kayám: An Early St'át'imcets Text. Anthropological Linguistics 43:288–347.

Davis, Philip, and Ross Saunders
    1984   An Expression of Coreference in Bella Coola. *In* The Syntax of Native American Languages. Vol. 16: Syntax and Semantics, edited by Eung-Do Cook and Donna B. Gerdts, 149–67. New York: Academic Press.

Dingare, Shipra
    2001   The Effect of Feature Hierarchies on Freqencies of Passivization in English. M.A. thesis, Stanford University.

Doak, Ivy G.
    1991   Coeur d'Alene Rhetorical Structure. Texas Linguistic Forum: Discourse 33: 43–70.
    1997   Coeur d'Alene Grammatical Relations. Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Forrest, Linda B.
    1994   The De-Transitive Clauses in Bella Coola: Passive vs. Inverse. *In* Voice and Inversion, edited by Talmy Givón, 147–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gardiner, Dwight
    1993   Structural Asymmetries and Preverbal Positions in Shuswap. Ph.D. diss., Simon Fraser University.

Gerdts, Donna B.
    1988a   A Nominal Hierarchy in Halkomelem Clausal Organization. Anthropological Linguistics 30:20–36.
    1988b   Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish. New York: Garland.
    2001   Narrative Devices in a Halkomelem Story. Paper presented at the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas, Workshop on American Indigenous Languages, University of California, Santa Barbara, 6–8 July.
    2002   Transitivity and the Expression of NPs in a Halkomelem Text. Paper presented at the Workshop on American Indigenous Languages, University of California, Santa Barbara, 26–28 April.

Gerdts, Donna B., and Thomas E. Hukari
    2000   Stacked Antipassives in Halkomelem Salish. *In* ICSNL XXXV: The Thirty-Fifth International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, edited by Suzanne Gessner and Sunyoung Oh, 95–106. University of British

Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 3. Vancouver, B.C.: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.

2001a   A-Subjects and Control in Halkomelem. Proceedings from the Seventh International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, 100–23. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

2001b   Argument Linking and Passives in Halkomelem. *In* ICSNL 36: The Thirty-Sixth International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, edited by Leora Bar-el, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Ian Wilson, 113–44. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 6. Vancouver, B.C.: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.

2004   Determiners and Transitivity in Halkomelem Texts. *In* Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honor of M. Dale Kinkade, edited by Donna B. Gerdts and Lisa Matthewson, 151–71. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

Givón, Talmy
1979   On Understanding Grammar. New York: Academic Press.

Grice, H. P.
1975   Logic and Conversation. *In* Speech Acts, edited by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Grosz, Barbara, Aravind K. Joshi, and Scott Weinstein
1986   Centering: A Framework for Modeling the Local Coherence of Discourse. Computational Linguistics 21:203–25.

Grosz, Barbara, and Candace L. Sidner.
1986   Attention, Intentions, and the Sturcture of Discourse. Computational Linguistics 12:175–204.

Gundel, Jeanette K.
1998   Centering Theory and the Givenness Hierarchy: Towards a Synthesis. *In* Centering Theory in Discourse, edited by Marilyn A. Walker, Aravind K. Joshi, and Ellen F. Prince, 183–98. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski
1993   Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse. Language 69:274–307.

Hedberg, Nancy
2000   The Referential Status of Clefts. Language 76:891–920.

Hedberg, Nancy, and Sandra Dueck
1999   Cakchiquel Reference and Centering Theory. Proceedings of WSCLA 4: The Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the Languages of the Americas, 59–74. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 2. Vancouver, B.C.: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.

Hess, Thom
1973   Agent in a Coast Salish Language. International Journal of American Linguistics 39:89–94.

Hukari, Thomas E.
1976   Transitivity in Halkomelem. Paper presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Salish Languages. Ellensburg, Wash., 14–16 August.

1977   A Comparison of Attributive Clause Constructions in Two Coast Salish Languages. Glossa 11:1.

1979   Diathesis and Discourse Reference in Halkomelem. Paper presented at the Western Conference on Linguistics, University of British Columbia, 19–21 October.

1997   Anaphora in Hul'qumi'num'. Paper presented at the Salish Syntax Workshop, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, 27 January.

Hukari, Thomas E., Ruby Peter, and Ellen White
    1977   Seagull Steals the Sun. *In* Northwest Coast Texts: Stealing Light, edited by
                 Barry F. Carlson, 33–68. International Journal of American Linguistics,
                 Native American Text Series, Vol. 2, No. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago
                 Press.

Jacobs, Peter
    1994   The Inverse in Squamish. *In* Voice and Inversion, edited by Talmy Givón,
                 121–45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kinkade, M. Dale
    1987   Passives and the Mapping of Thematic Roles in Upper Chehalis Sentences.
                 Paper presented at the Twenty-Second International Conference on
                 Salishan and Neighbouring Languages, Victoria, B.C., 13–15 August.
    1989   When Patients are Topics: Topic Maintenance in North American Indian
                 Languages. Paper presented at the Twenty-Fourth International Confer-
                 ence on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages, Steilacoom, Wash., 17–19
                 August.
    1990   Sorting Out Third Persons in Salishan Discourse. International Journal of
                 American Linguistics 56:341–60.

Kroeber, Paul D.
    1995   Rhetorical Structure of a Kalispel Narrative. Anthropological Linguistics
                 37:119–40.
    1999   The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax. Lincoln: University of
                 Nebraska Press.

Kuipers, Aert H.
    1967   The Squamish Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary. The Hague: Mouton.

Lambrecht, Knud
    1994   Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental
                 Representations of Discourse Referents. Cambridge: Cambridge University
                 Press.

Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Dwight Gardiner
    1993   Coreference in Northern Interior Salish. Paper presented at the Twenty-
                 Eighth International Conference on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages,
                 University of Washington, Seattle, 19–23 August.

Mattina, Anthony
    2001   Okanagan Sentence Types: A Preliminary Working Paper. *In* ICSNL 36: The
                 Thirty-Sixth International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Lan-
                 guages, edited by Leora Bar-el, Linda Tamburri Watt, and Ian Wilson,
                 215–36. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 6.
                 Vancouver, B.C.: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.

Platero, Paul
    1982   Missing Noun Phrases and Grammatical Relations in Navajo. International
                 Journal of American Linguistics 48:286–305.

Reinhart, Tanya
    1981   Pragmatics and Lingistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. Philosophica
                 27:53–93.

Roberts, Taylor
    1994   Subject and Topic in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). M.A. thesis, University of
                 British Columbia.
    1999   Grammatical Relations and Ergativity in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish).
                 International Journal of American Linguistics 65:275–302.

Taboada, Maite, and Loreley Hadic Zabala.
    2002   Deciding on Units of Analysis within Centering Theory. Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory 4:63–108.
Thomason, Sarah, and Lucy Thomason
    2002   Prominence Marking in Verbal Arguments in Salish and Algonquian. Paper presented at the Seventh Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the Languages of the Americas, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 22–24 March.
Thompson, Sandra A.
    1987   The Passive in English: A Discourse Perspective. *In* In Honor of Ilse Lehiste, edited by Robert Channon and Linda Shockey, 497–511. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
Van Eijk, Jan
    1997   The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax. Vancouver: UBC Press.
Van Eijk, Jan P., and Lorna Williams, eds.
    1981   Cuystwí Malh Ucwalmícwts: Lillooet Legends and Stories. Mount Currie, B.C.: Ts'zil Publishers.
Walker, Marilyn A., Aravind K. Joshi, and Ellen F. Prince
    1998   Centering in Naturally Occurring Discourse: An Overview. *In* Centering Theory in Discourse, edited by Marilyn A. Walker, Aravind K. Joshi, and Ellen F. Prince, 1–28. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Watkins, Laurel J.
    1990   Noun Phrase versus Zero in Kiowa Discourse. International Journal of American Linguistics 56:410–26.
Wiltschko, Martina
    2002   The Syntax of Pronouns: Evidence from Halkomelem. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 20:157–95.