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10.1 Introduction

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

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

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

(1) a. naʔat qʷəs-təs təʔəl̓əm sec̓ctən.  
   AUX go.in.water-TR-3ERG DT salted salmon  
   'He/she put the salted fish in water.'
As Gjers (1988) points out, the object in a transitive clause appears as a simple DP as in (1a), not as an oblique-marked DP (with the oblique preposition ‘k’ as in (1b). Furthermore, Halkomelem verb morphology transparently represents the difference between transitive and intransitive clauses: (i) the third-person ergative in (1a) determines agreement (-m), but the third-person absolutive in (1b) is zero-marked; and (ii) the transitive verb in (1a) is overtly marked by a transitive suffix (-t), while the intransitive verb in (1b) is marked instead with the antipassive suffix (-k). The seemingly unmotivated chomérgation of an object is not limited to antipassive constructions. In this chapter, I discuss three additional constructions in which the notional object appears as an oblique-marked DP rather than as the syntactic object. These are constructions with lexical suffixes (2), denominal verbs (3), and cognate objects (4).

(2) nən̓ ʔə cən̓ nəsəłəpu ʔə kʷəmətəmələlu
   go 2MS: bring-in—firewood OBL DT firewood
   “Go bring in the firewood!”

(3) nən̓ ʔə cə kʷə sənələpu ʔə kʷəmə kʷəmənələpu
   go 1SUB VBL-get.roots OBL DT cedar root
   “I’m going to get cedar roots.”

(4) ləlam ə cə kʷə sələmə.
   sing 1SUB PUT OBL DT sing
   “I will sing a song.”

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

Before turning to these constructions, I first review in section 10.2 some examples of what would be considered in RG terms to be the motivated chomérgation of an object NP. I briefly illustrate the properties of the final object versus the chomérged object, which appears as an oblique-marked DP, in several constructions. A key piece of evidence is extraction: chomérged objects are extracted differently from both direct objects and oblique nominals. In section 10.3, I turn to a discussion of the syntax and semantics of doubling constructions, showing that the oblique-marked DPs in these constructions align with the chomérged objects discussed in section 10.2. Examination of these constructions leads to the conclusion that objects may be chomérged not only if another NP takes on the object role, but also if there is some predicate-internal reference to the nominal. I briefly explore the limits of the
phenomena that fall under this umbrella in section 10.4, where I return to the issue of antipassive constructions. I conclude with some brief remarks on the syntax and semantics of doubling constructions and their implications for the morphology-syntax interface in section 10.5.

10.2 Extra Objects

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

(5) niʔ qaʔw-at-ʔas tʔa speʔqəʔ.  
   AUX club-TR-3ERG DT man DT bear 
   'The man clubbed the bear.'

(6) niʔ can qaʔw-at tʔa speʔqəʔ.  
   AUX 1SUB club-TR DT bear 
   'I clubbed the bear.'

(7) niʔ qaʔw-at-amʔas tʔa speʔqəʔ.  
   AUX club-TR:OBJ-3ERG DT man 
   'The man clubbed me.'

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

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

(8) nem can saʔ-ʔas-t la sleniʔ ʔaʔə ʔənə snaxʷəl.  
   AUX 1SUB sell-DAT-TR DT woman OBL DT POS canoe 
   'I’m going to sell my canoe to the woman.'

(9) niʔ qaʔw-ʔət-ʔas la no ten la sleniʔ ʔaʔə kʷəʔələpəl.  
   AUX bake-BEN-TR-3ERG DT 1POS mother DT woman OBL DT bread 
   'My mother baked the bread for the woman.'

(10) nem can maʔw-staxʷ tʔa skiiʔəqəl ʔə ʔənə dqayʔəmən, nem ʔə tʔa kʷaʔkwə  
    go 1SUB pick.up-CON DT child OBL DT shell go OBL DT salt.wat  
    seashore 
    'I’m going to get the boy to pick up seashells by the seashore.'
Halkomelem is what Dryer (1986) calls a primary/secondary object language. In cases of competition, the patient always loses the object slot to some other nominal. Thus, in examples like those above, the dative (6), benefactive (9), or cause (10) is a direct argument, which appears as a DP, as in the above examples, or a pronoun object, as in the following:

(11) niʔ ʔam-zi-peq̓sə-as ʷə kʷaʔ pəkʷ*
    'He gave me the book.'

(12) niʔ qʷəl̓əl̓-suʔ-θə-as ʷə kʷaʔ sełk̓əł̓.
    AUX bake-GEN-TR:1/0M-3/4ERG OBL DT salmon
    'He baked the salmon for me.'

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

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

(13) a. niʔ े lem-ət
    AUX 2/3PL look-AT-TR DT man
    'You looked at the man.'

b. nil kʷaʔ sełk̓əł̓jəʔ [niʔ lem-ət-axʷ*]
    3PL DT kʷaʔ sełk̓əł̓jəʔ AUX look-AT-TR-2SUB
    'It's the man that you looked at.'

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

(14) ʔtuʔəl kʷəl̓ə niʔ ʔam-zi-1-as ʷə kʷaʔ pəkʷ*
    boy DT AUX give-DAT-TR-3SUB OBL DT book
    'It's a boy that he gave the book to.'

(15) həʔ kʷəl̓ə niʔ qʷəl̓əl̓-suʔ-θə-as ʷə kʷaʔ sełk̓əł̓jəʔ.
    who DT kʷaʔ sełk̓əł̓jəʔ AUX bake-GEN-TR:1/0M-3/4ERG OBL DT bread
    'Who did you bake the bread for?'

(16) həʔ caʔ kʷəl̓ə nən̓ niʔ maʔkʷəl̓əl̓-suʔ-θə-as ʷə təʔ əʔəxəʔ.
    who DT pick up-CAUS-TR-3SUB OBL DT shell
    'Who are you going to pick up the shells?'

In contrast, the extra object can only be extracted via nominalization; the verb has a nominalizing prefix s̓ and the subject is expressed as a possessor:
(17) nil kʷθə pukʷ niʔ sʔam-os-t-s kʷθə swiwiwəs.
    3PRO DT book AUX N-give-DAT-TR-3POS DT boy
    'It's the book that he gave the boy.'

(18) snaxʷʷəl kʷθə niʔ sʔə-gəc-t-s kʷθə swəʔqeq.
    canoe DT AUX N-fix-BEN-TR-3POS DT man
    'A canoe is what he fixed for the man.'

    What INQUI DT AUX 2POS N-pick.up-CS DT child
    'What did you have the child pick up?'

Direct extraction of the oblique-marked DP is ungrammatical:

(20) *nil kʷθə pukʷ niʔ sʔam-os-t-s kʷθə swiwiwəs.
    3PRO DT book AUX give-DAT-TR-3SUB DT boy
    'It's the book that he gave the boy.'

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

(21) niʔ sən qʷaqʷ-at ?ə kʷθən ʔapəl-at.
    AUX 1SUB club-TR OBL DT:2POS shovel-PST
    'I hit him with your shovel.'

(22) yaʔ ?əw yaʔ-xʷʔaʔcanəm ?ə taʔə sə:l.
    Always LNK SER-run(IMPF) OBL DM road
    'He always ran on that road.'

They are also extracted via nominalization:

(23) nil kʷθə ʔəʔ-ʔapəl-at niʔ no sʔqʷaqʷ-at.
    3PRO DT 2POS-shovel-PST AUX 1POS N.O-club-TR
    'It's your shovel that I clubbed it with.'

(24) nil taʔə sə:l yaʔ ?əw sʔ-xʷʔaʔcanəm-s.
    3PRO DM road always LNK N.O-run-3POS
    'This is the road that he always runs on.'

However, the nominalizing prefix used in oblique extraction is the prefix š(xʷ)- and not s-.

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

(25) a. Objects are directly extracted.
    b. Oblique-marked DPs are extracted via nominalization.
i. Nominalization with $\pi$ is used to extract extra objects (themes of ditransitives, patients of causatives, etc.).

ii. Nominalization with $\mathcal{i}(x^\pi)$ is used to extract obliques (location, direction, instrument, manner, stimulus).

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

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

10.3 Doubling Constructions

The constructions that I have discussed so far (ditransitives, applicatives, and causatives) are fairly typical of those found in many of the world’s languages, especially in what Gerds (1992) refers to as 2-MAP languages. But now the plot thickens. Halkomelem has many polysynthetic properties, including robust verbal affixation. Besides verbal affixes for transitives, applicatives, causatives, reflexives, reciprocals, middles, and desideratives, Halkomelem also has lexical suffixes (Gerds 2003), which are suffixes that function like incorporated nouns, and verbalizing prefixes used to create denominal verbs (Gerds and Hakari 2000).  

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

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

10.3.1 Lexical Suffixes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case marking</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Oblique objects</th>
<th>Obliques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td>via nominalization with $\pi$</td>
<td>via nominalization with $\mathcal{i}(x^\pi)$</td>
<td>preposition $\pi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preposition $\pi$</td>
<td>via nominalization with $\pi$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(26) qələm ‘eye’ =ələs ‘eye’
əsqəm ‘foot’ =əsən ‘foot, leg’
əlebə ‘arm, wing’ =əxən ‘arm, wing’
əlebəm ‘house’ =əwtxə ‘building, room’
əqeq ‘baby’ =əyəl ‘baby, child’
əcələs ‘hand’ =əsəs ‘hand, finger’

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

(27) əθələn ‘mouth’ =ə(a)θən ‘mouth, edge’
əmqəsn ‘nose’ =əqəsən ‘nose, point’
ətəpsəm ‘neck’ =əpsəm ‘neck’
ətəmaxə ‘land’ =əmaxə ‘land, group of people’

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

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

(28) əsəkə=əyəl bathe=boy ‘bathe a baby’
əsq=əncəp split=firewood ‘split firewood’
əqəs=əxən dip.into.water=net ‘set a net’
əsəwə=ənsəm seek=body ‘search for a lost person’
ələ=əlsən cut=hair ‘shear wool’

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

(29) a. ni? əsəkə=əyəl to sənə?.
AUX bathe=boy DT woman
‘The woman bathed the baby.’
b. ni? əsəkə-ət-os to sənə? to qeq.
AUX bathe-3ERG DT woman DT baby
‘The woman bathed the baby.’

(30) a. əi: əsq=əncəp kəθənə maðə?
AUX:Q split(IMPF)=firewood DT:2POS offspring
‘Is your son chopping wood?’
b. əi: əsq-t-os kəθənə maðə təŋə səyə?
AUX:Q split(IMPF)-3ERG DT:2POS offspring DT firewood
‘Is your son splitting the firewood?’
The (b) clauses are transitive and thus their predicates have the -t transitive suffix and third-person ergative agreement, while the (a) clauses lack these. Furthermore, NPs in argument positions are always preceded by a determiner in Halkomelem. 

In this respect, lexical suffixation parallels the type of noun incorporation that has become known in the literature as compounding noun incorporation (S. Rosen 1989; Geroth 1998a). We see this for example in Chukchee (Muravyova 1998, 524–525):

(31) a. gam-25̂ ta-wa-a-mas-25̂ g-ʔak.
    1-ABS 1SG.S-knife-sharpen-AOR-1SG.S
    'I sharpened the knife.' (Lit. 'I knife-sharpened.'

b. gam-ma-n wall-25̂ ta-noe-25̂ g-ʔen.
    1-ERG knife-ABS 1SG.S-knife-sharpen-AOR-3SG.O
    'I sharpened the knife.'

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

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

(32) nen-č 677-č ʔa 27a li-ʔa-hat!
    go 2SG.fix—intric orb.OT bed
    'Go make your bed!'

(33) nen-č na 27a 27a eq=ʔeq=ʔeq.
    go 1SG cut.off—intric orb.OT bulrush
    'I'm going to cut down the bulrushes.'

(34) nen-č na 27a 27a eq=ʔeq=ʔeq=ʔeq.
    go 1SG soak—intric orb.OT wool
    'I'm going to dye the wool.'

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

(35) Tolka niyohpe:ke 7s i nahe' sha'čeqču niki:ší: 7s ni bahbeit several SOIT.year.numbers so it goes eight of.them bullhead wahne-tsy-onac̱mi ki 7s i nahe' he-ful=bought this my.father
    'Several years ago, my father bought eight bullheads.'

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

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

(39) ?ewe:č l-tih-ox?w?
NEG:Q:2SUB VBL-tea-2SUB
‘Won’t you take tea?’

(40) ?i ?a yaś w c-tiqiw kwotən sandbox?
AUX Q SUP LNK VBL-horse DT:2POS grandparent(PL)
‘Do you suppose your grandparents still have horses?’

(41) ni? txw*-lelah kwa: na stiwan.
AUX VBL-house DT 1POS nephew
‘My nephew bought a house.’

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

(42) ni? ?iq-ntas kwotə na stiwan kwotə lelahs.
AUX buy-TR-3ERG DT 1POS nephew DT house-3POS
‘My nephew bought his house.’

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

Nevertheless, denominal verbs can be doubled with an oblique-marked DP.
(43) ni? can k-*əpənil? ʔa k*pəkan? əpənil?
  AUX 1SUB VRL-bread 3PL DT swelling-up bread
   'I ate some yeast bread.'

(44) nehi can k-*əqələn ʔa k*əthol s-əqələn.
  go 1SUB VRL-smoke 3PL DT menthol-h smoke
   'I'm going to smoke a menthol cigarette.'

(45) nehi can k-*ək*əmlax? ʔa k*əθo k*əpəd k*əmlax?.
  go 1SUB VRL-get.roots 3PL DT cedar root
   'I'm going to get cedar roots.'

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

(46) nil k*əθo əqələn səpənil ni? ʔa s-əqənil.
  3PRO DT swelling-up bread AUX 1POS N-VRL-bread
   'It's yeast bread that I ate.'

(47) nil k*əθo menthol s-əqələn ni? ʔa s-əqələn.
  3PRO DT menthol-h smoke AUX 1POS N-VRL-smoke
   'It's a menthol cigarette that I smoked.'

(48) nil k*əθo k*əpəd k*əmlax? ni? ʔa s-ək*əmlax?.
  3PRO DT cedar root AUX 1POS N-VRL-get.roots
   'It's cedar roots that I got.'

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

(49) c-saθo k*pənil ʔiβələʔ ʔa ʔa siθəla-s.
  VRL-grandparent(DOM) DTLink:3PRO wren 3PL DT grandparent(DOM)-3POS
   'Wren had a grandmother.'

Also, we see that in (50) the DP includes an N modifier s*əθəlax?* 'blackberry' of
  the head pay 'pie'.

(50) nehi k-*əθo ʔa k*əθəlax? əθəlax? ni? ʔa k*əθəlax.
  go 1SUB VRL-pie 3PL DT blackberry pie AUX 3PL DT table
   'Go and have the blackberry pie that's on the table.'

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

Nouns formed from verbs by means of the addition of the prefix s- are quite common in Halkomelem. One major pattern is nouns formed from unergative verbs (verbs that are intransitive and whose sole argument is an agent). The meaning of the noun is the concrete or abstract thing that is associated with the event denoted by the verb.¹

(51) qʷal 'speak' sqʷal 'speech, words'
filam 'sing' stilam 'song'
išwuʔal 'pray' stiwʔal 'prayer'
jaːm 'order (v.)' syaːm 'order (n.)'
yays 'work (v.)' syays 'work (n.)'
sʔaltan 'eat'¹² sʔaltan 'food'

None of the verbs in (51) allow the addition of the transitive suffix -t (*qʷalt, *filamit, *išwuʔalt, *jaːmit, *yayst, *sʔaltanit), and they cannot appear in transitive clauses with a DP object. Nevertheless, Halkomelem allows such intransitive verbs to appear in semantically transitive clauses in which the patient is expressed as an oblique-marked DP, which can be cognate with the verb itself:

(52) filam can ceʔ sʔ- filam.
   sing 1SUB FUT OBL DT N-sing
   'I will sing a song.'

(53) niʔ can yays ?ə θə na s-yays.
   AUX 1SUB work OBL DT 1POS N-work
   'I worked on my work.'

(54) išwuʔal can ceʔ kʷθə s-išwuʔal ?ə taňa sľeʔ ?ə təey.
   pray 1SUB FUT OBL DT N-pray OBL this now OBL that
   'I will say the prayer now.'

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

(55) nil ə na s-nilam [na s-nilam ceʔ].
   3PRO DT 1POS N-sing 1POS N-sing FUT
   'It is my song that I will sing.'

(56) nil ə na s-qʷal [na s-qʷal ceʔ].
   3PRO DT 1POS N-speak 1POS N-speak FUT
   'It’s my speech that I will speak.'
In these extraction examples, the predicate is a doppeglinger of the noun: the verb is nominalized with the a- prefix and so it exactly matches the noun that is derived from the verb with the same a- nominalizer.

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

(58) q*al can CE? 3b *x*?i a s-q*al.
    speak SUB Fut Obl DT little n-speak
    'I will give a little speech.'

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

(59) n? qatam 3b šen? 3b *k*?saqal.
    AUX eat DT woman Obl DT bread
    'The woman ate the bread.'

(60) nerf can yam 3b *k*?lešjan nerf 3b+s k*lešjan-čiwa*.
    go SUB order-MID Obl DT shoe go Obl DT shoe-building
    'I am going to order shoes from the shoe store.'

(61) n? lāšen 3b la na syawan.
    AUX lāšen sing Obl DT lposespirit.song
    'I sang my spirit song.'

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

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

10.4 Antipassive as a Case of Doubling?

Antipassives in Halkomelem (Gerdtz and Hukari 2000b, 2005), as mentioned in the introduction, show this same pattern: they are semantically transitive since they in-
volve an agent and a patient but are syntactically intransitive, as seen by comparing
the transitive clauses in the (a) examples in (62)–(63) with their antipassive counter-
parts in the (b) examples in (62)–(63):

(62) a. niʔ tən̪-otɔs  tə sləwy.  
AUX pound-TR-3ERG DT cedar.inner.bark
'He/she pounded on the inner bark of the cedar.'

b. niʔ tən̪-els ʔə  tə sləwy.  
AUX pound-ACT OBL DT cedar.inner.bark
'He/she pounded on the inner bark of the cedar.'

(63) a. xəl-ot ć tən̪ sne.  
write-TR 2SUB DT:2POS name.
'Write your name.'

b. niʔ ʔə ć wəl xəl-els ʔə kʷθə nu pipə?  
AUX Q 2SUB already write-ACT OBL DT 1POS paper?
'Did you write my letter/form already?'

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

(64) stem kʷə niʔ ʔən̪-xəl-els?  
what DT AUX 2POS-N-write-ACT
'What did you write?'

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

(65) ʔpəls  ‘collect’ [when going around collecting money]
wanels  ‘throw’ [when throwing out money or blankets in the bighouse]
ləełs  ‘lay (it) down’ [when making a down payment or donating
blankets]
yəqʷels  ‘burn’ [ritual burning of the clothes of the deceased]
pepəqʷełs  ‘smoking’ [when smoking salmon for storing]
ləq̓yəełs  ‘push down’ [when kneading bread]
yəkʷełs  ‘break’ [when breaking old plates in ceremony for black faces]
ləełs  ‘(shaman) working a cure’, ‘escape being guessed right on’ [in the
bone game]
Examples like these show that perhaps the best way to conceive of the antipassive morphology is that it functions like nonspecific object marking: it sketches the presence of a patient without giving it a role in the argument structure.

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

(66) % k'èk'k'ola 0x'OoNs 0m 0a k' k' saw?
   aux k'y.fy(mpp)-act dt:2pos child obl dt:toy.bread
   'Is your daughter frying bread?'

(67) nek 0yo'ee-eks 0a k' k' pane'xun!
   go snip-act obl dt:ribbon
   'Go and snip a piece of ribbon!'

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

(68) mi 0a yak'x-eks 0a t'0 0? 0x.
   aux conf break-act obl dt:1pos door
   'He broke down my door.'

(69) nek can 0hlaq-eks 0b no tel'xub t'ahini 0b la telewu*x.
   go 1sub-out-act obl:dt:1pos money from obl dt:back
   'I am going to take my money out of the bank.'

(70) % can lesh-eks 0a p'ah 5$t'0em.
   aux 1sub hem(mpp)-act obl dt:2pos dress
   'I am hemming your dress.'

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

10.6 Conclusion: The Syntax and Semantics of Doubling

A defining characteristic of polysynthesis is that reference to a nominal can be made within the predicate complex. Not only can grammatical features such as the person, number, and gender of the nominal be referenced by verb agreement in a head-
marking language, but sometimes the nominal semantics itself can be referenced, either vaguely, as in the case of classificatory constructions, or more precisely, as in the case of denominal verbs. Nevertheless, what does not seem to appear within the predicate complex is reference to a nominal’s deixis—its location in time and space. This is accomplished by means of the determiner element within a DP.\textsuperscript{14}

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

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

(71) niʔ can kw̓en-ət.  
AUX 1SUB take-TR  
'I took him/her/it/them/*something.'

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

How do the Halkomelem constructions discussed relate to the starting point of the chapter—the legacy of Relational Grammar with respect to the Stratal Uniqueness Law and the Motivated Chômege Law? The Stratal Uniqueness Law, since it refers only to nominal arguments per se, is only relevant to doubling constructions if there is some presumption that the element within the predicate originates as an argument NP, as, for example, in the head movement analysis of noun incorporation in Baker 1988. If, on the other hand, the predicate-internal reference to the nominal is considered to originate as part of the predicate, then Stratal Uniqueness is irrelevant to doubling constructions.
The more serious challenge is to the Motivated Chômeurje Law. One approach is to assume that if the internal argument nominal is referred to by predicate-internal morphology, then the language may consider the object position to have been filled (or in Case-theoretic terms, Accusative case is absorbed), resulting in a surface intransitive clause. We see this in the case of morphological reciprocals and reciprocals cross-linguistically, which differ in this respect from object agreement morphology, as first pointed out by Perlmutter (1969). But as Chang and Ladusaw (2004) point out, predicate-internal reference to the nominal serves to restrict it but not necessarily to saturate it. Additional semantic facts relating to the nominal may be expressed in a freestanding DP. Since languages vary as to whether the presence of predicate-internal morphology results in intransitive syntax, they vary as to whether this DP is framed as a direct object or an adjunct.

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

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

Notes

1. Data are given with symbols often used for Native American languages. Glottalization is marked with an apostrophe over the consonant, and labialization with a superscript α. The alveolar fricative is represented as ʃ, the uvular fricative as ʢ, and the lateral fricative as l. The affricates are represented as ɾ (retroflex), ɬ (alveolar), ɭ (palatal), and ʎ (lateral).


2. Halkomelem does not allow bare NPs in argument positions, though bare NPs appear as predicate nominals, appositives, and vocatives.
3. Gerds 1988, 59ff discusses the structure of extractions and the nominalizations on which oblique extractions are based.

4. More precisely, there is an oblique prefix \( x^e \)- preceded by the nominalizing prefix \( s^- \). The \( s^- \) changes to \( s^- \) before \( x^e \), and the \( x^e \) is lost (in Island Halkomelem dialects), except before glottal stop.

5. See Gerds 1998a for a comparison of noun incorporation, lexical suffixation, and denominal verbs.

6. Lexical suffix constructions can also be transitive. For discussion, see Gerds 2003 and Gerds and Hinkson 1996, 2004a, 2004b.

7. See note 2.

8. Lexical suffix constructions of the classificatory type are also possible (Gerds and Hinkson 1996, 2004a, 2004b). These constructions are surface transitives and the patient is the direct object.

(i) \( ?\omega^s \) hay \( k^w^s \) \( x^e \)-\( t^6 \)\( 8^w \)-\( wil^t \) \( ct \) \( t^6 \)\( lap^t \) \( ?i \) \( t^6 \)\( la^6 \)\( an \).

\[ \text{LWP only DT VPX-wash=vessel-TR 1PL.SUB DT pot and DT dishes} \]

'We only wash pots and plates.'

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

9. The nominal prefix \( s^- \) is omitted after \( c^- \) and \( l^- \) but not after \( t^x^e \) and \( \hat{s}^- \). Thus I conclude that a phonological rule of cluster simplification is at work in the former cases rather than a morphological restriction that requires the base to be a root.

10. Gerds and Hukari (2008) argue that the base is an NP rather than an N.


12. The verb \( ?\omega^t \)\( on \) is used strictly as an intransitive verb. The patient, if there is one, is always an oblique object. Halkomelem also has a transitive verb for 'eat', \( l\omega^t \).

13. The root in this verb also occurs with the transitive suffix to form a semantically ditransitive verb \( yar^t \) 'order someone to do something'.

14. Several scholars have observed that incorporated nouns lack deictic properties. Farkas and de Swart (2003) note the semantic similarity between incorporated nouns and bare NPs.

15. Various accounts within Relational Grammar have been offered to explain the surface intransitivity of noun incorporation constructions and their ilk. Gerds (1979), following a suggestion of Postal (1977), claims that noun incorporation constructions involve antipassive and thus incorporation is simply a way of packaging an object-chômeur. This analysis proved unsatisfactory for cases of classifying noun incorporation, since they show no evidence of detransitivization.

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