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I. Antipassives.

In Halkolim, a Salish language spoken in southwestern British Columbia, many sentences with an action of an 'agent' on a 'patient' can be expressed in two ways: a) as an active transitive clause; b) as an antipassive clause: 1

1. a. ni g'qatam oo akul? qa sapili
   aasp bake-tr-erg det lady det bread
   'The lady baked the bread.'

   b. ni g'qiqom oo g'qil?
   aasp bake-mid det lady det bread
   'The man baked the bread.'

   a. ni pūnem k'qo qa swq'qam k'qo qa wqul
   aasp plant-tr-erg det man det potatoes
   'The man planted potatoes.'

   b. ni pūnem k'qo qa swq'qam k'qo qa wqul
   aasp plant-mid det man det potatoes
   'The man planted potatoes.'

   a. ni q'on k'qo qa qa
   aasp 1-shi pour-tr det water
   'I poured the water.'

   b. ni q'on k'qo qa qa
   aasp 1-shi pour-attr det water
   'I poured the water.'

The morphological differences between these two types of sentences is apparent. In the transitive constructions in a), the predicate is suffixed with -i, a transitive marker; the b) sentences lack this suffix. Second, in 1a) and 2a) the final subject is a third person nominal or pronoun. Thus, the predicate is suffixed with -u, the second person ergative marker. This marker is present when a 3rd person is subject of a transitive clause. However, the predicate in the b) sentences lack this suffix, suggesting that these clauses are intransitive. Finally, the predicates in the b) sentences are suffixed with -am, the middle voice marker, or -wqul, an intransitive suffix. 2 The verbal morphology suggests that the a) sentences are transitive while the b) sentences are intransitive.

A second apparent difference between the a) and b) sentences is the case marking of the 'patient'. In the a) sentences the 'patient' is in the genitive case; i.e., the nominal is preceded only by a determiner. 3 However, in the b) sentences, the 'patient' is in the oblique case; i.e., the nominal is preceded by an oblique marker as well as a determiner. Assuming that the 'patient' is an object of a transitive in the a) sentence, it appears that the 'patient' is not an object in the b) sentences, suggesting again that the b) sentences are intransitive.

Arguing within the theory of Relational Grammar, I analyze the above sentences as follows: the a) sentences are assumed to be active transitive and can be represented by relational networks as the network for (a) in 4).

4. Transitive:

Although they share the same initial stratum, the a) and b) sentences differ in a crucial respect: the a) sentences are transitive at the final level [i.e., the final stratum contains both a 1 and a 2]; the b) sentences are intransitive at the final level [i.e., the final stratum contains a 1 but no 2].

In 4, I give evidence from Quantifiers and Focus Constructions for an analysis involving antipassive for the b) sentences above. I discuss two restrictions on the rule of Antipassive.

In 5, I discuss Causatives, showing that while Causative Clause Union is possible in the case of a transitive Antipassive, it is not possible in the case of a transitive Transitive.

Also, I discuss Causatives in constructions where Antipassive is not possible.

1.1 Quantifiers.

As discussed above, the crucial difference between the a) and b) sentences is final transitivity; while the former are transitive the latter are intransitive at the final level. Thus, the final 1 in the a) sentences differs from the final 1 in the b) sentences; while the former is an ergative [the 1 in a transitive stratum] the latter is an absolutive [the 1 in an intransitive stratum or the 2 in a transitive stratum].

Thus, rules distinguishing ergatives from absolutives, as, for example, the rule of 3rd person ergative marking discussed above, provide evidence that the b) sentences are determinativized.
by Antipassive. In this section, I discuss another such rule in Halkomelem—Quantifiers.

Observe the following sentences in which the Quantifier *na?*—
'all' is a higher predicate. Note that the clause following the Quantifier is introduced by the complementizer *na*.

6. a. *na?* n?w' *q'alem's'om* k?o4 sn'ul'q'eq
   all asp-cmp run-pl det children
   'All the children ran.'

b. *na?* n?w' wa'kw?oo k?o4 sq'ow?m'aw?y?
   all asp-cmp barked det dogs
   'All the dogs barked.'

7. a. *na?* n?w' *q'i'l?ttes* t?o sn's?i'q'eq k?o4 sq'mi?i
   all asp-cmp bake-tr-pl-tr-erg det men det bread
   'The men baked all the bread.'

   all asp-cmp drink-pl-tr-erg det men det water
   'The men drank all the water.'

In the sentences in (6), the clause following the complementizer is intransitive; the Quantifier is interpreted as modifying the 1 of this intransitive clause. Of more interest are the sentences in (7), in which the clause following the complementizer is transitive. In these sentences, the Quantifier is unambiguously interpreted as modifying the 2 of the transitive clause.

Thus the rule for interpretation of Quantifiers must be stated in terms of *gaphasitive*.

Observe the sentences in (8); here the clause following the complementizer is an Antipassive.

   all asp-cmp bake-sid det children obi det bread
   'All the children baked the bread.'

   all asp-cmp plant-sid det men det potatoes
   'All the men planted potatoes.'

In these sentences the Quantifier is unambiguously interpreted as modifying the 1 of the Antipassive, suggesting that it is an absolute. Thus, Quantifiers support the analysis of Antipassive given in (5).

1.2 Focus Constructions.

A second crucial difference between the a) and b) sentences in 1-3) is in the final grammatical relation of the Initial 2. As you can clearly see in (4) and (5), the Initial 2 in the a) sentences is a Final 2 while the Initial 2 in the b) sentences is a Final 2 Chomsky. Thus, rules distinguishing 2s from 2 chomsky's, such as case marking discussed above, provide evidence for an Antipassive analysis of the b) sentences.

Thus, a second argument for Antipassive is based on deletion rules, which operate in at least three sentence types in Halkomelem—Relative Clauses, Clefts, and Focus Constructions. I discuss only the latter here; the rules are parallel in all three constructions.

As you can see in 1-3) above, the basic word order in Halkomelem is:

9. Predicate Final Subject Final Object Non-terms.

If a nominal is especially emphasized, flagged, or contrasted, it is placed before the predicate; the predicate is marked for the grammatical relation of the nominal being focussed.11 (Observe the sentences in (10), which are Focus Constructions based on final ls.)

    lady det asp bake-sid obi det bread
    'A Lady baked the bread.'

b. *st?n*? o? ni *q'i?lot t?o sq'mi?i
    lady det asp bake-tr det bread
    'A Lady baked the bread.'

In these cases, the predicate is unaffected. Notice in (10b) that when a final 3rd person ergative is being focussed, the ergative marker is deleted. To clearly see the disambiguating function of this deletion, contrast (10b) with (11):

11. sq'mi?i t?o ni *q'i?lotas* o? *st?n*?
    bread det asp bake-tr-erg det lady
    'Bread is what the lady baked.'

In (11) the final 2 of a transitive is focussed. The predicate is unaffected and the ergative marker is suffixed to the predicate. It is clear that the 3 and not the 1 is focussed in (11).

In (12), the 'patient' of an Antipassive is focussed.

    bread det asp non-bake-sid-loc det lady
    'Bread is what the lady baked.'

The predicate must be prefixed with the nominalizer *qa*.

Therefore, the 'patients' of the b) sentences in 1-3 do not behave like final 2s of the a) sentences; the former require that the nominalizer *qa* be prefixed to the predicate, while the latter cannot have this prefix. This can be accounted for in an analysis positing Antipassive for the b) sentences.
It is important to note that Focus Constructions based on the 'patients' in Antipassive are like those based on 2 chomseus of sentences involving 3-2 [13]) or Sen-2 [14] Advancement. 12

13. a. ni ʔamətus ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp give-tr-erg det boy det knife 'He gave the boy the knife.'

b. ʔamətən ʔə ni ʔamətus ʔə ʔaməsən knife det asp non-give-tr-erg det boy 'A knife is what he gave the boy.'

14. a. ni ʔamətus ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp break-ben-tr-erg det boy det stick 'He broke the stick for the boy.'

b. ʔaməsətən ʔə ni ʔaməsətən ʔə ʔaməsən stick det asp non-break-ben-tr-erg det boy 'A stick is what he broke for the boy.'

Notice in the unfocussed examples (13-14 a) that the 2 chomseus is in the oblique case. In the Focus Constructions in 13-14b), the predicate is prefixed with the nominalizer ʔə.

Furthermore, other nominals in the oblique case (15a) which are initial and final Oblique (e.g. Instrument, Locative) can also be focussed, in which case the predicate is prefixed with the nominalizer ʔə, as in 15 b). 13

15. a. ni ʔamətən ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp stab-tr-erg det boy det knife 'He stabbed John with the knife.'

b. ʔaməsətən ʔə ni ʔaməsətən ʔə ʔaməsən knife det asp non-stab-tr-3pos det 'A knife is what he stabbed John with.'

Thus the data from Focus Constructions argue for an analysis involving Antipassive for the b) sentences in 1-3). The 'patients' in these sentences do not behave like 2b) of transitive sentences. Neither do they behave like the 2 chomseus of constructions involving 3-2 or Sen-2 Advancement. This supports the Antipassive analysis given in 5) where the initial ʔə is a final 2 chomseus.

1.3 Restrictions on Antipassive.

In the above sections, I have argued for a rule of Antipassive for sentences like those in 1-3b). Here, I discuss two restrictions on the rule of Antipassive in Halkomelem. 14 First, we have seen in 1-3b) that 3rd person nominals can be placed on chomage by a rule of Antipassive. In Halkomelem there is a general constraint against placing 1st and 2nd persons (Speech Act Participants) on chomage. Thus, Antipassive counterparts for the following sentences do not exist:

16. a. ni ʔamətən ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp labj plant-2-obj 'I buried you.'

b. * ni ʔamətən ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp non-plant-1-obj-erg 'He buried me.'

17. a. ni ʔamətən ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp non-recover-1-obj-erg 'He recovered me.'

b. * ni ʔamətən ʔə ʔaməsən ʔə ʔaməsətən ʔə ʔaməsətən asp non-recover-1-obj-erg-3pos det boy 'The boy went.'
Thus the relational network representing the initial level for causatives like 21a) would be:

In CUC, the upstairs and downstairs clauses are merged; the downstairs nominals are assigned grammatical relations in the upstairs clause. The universal prediction concerning grammatical relations in CUC made by Relational Grammar is: 25

23. a) downstairs absolutive is upstairs 2.
   b) downstairs ergative is upstairs 3.
   If the causatives in 21) met this prediction, they could be represented in relational networks like the following one for 21a).

The 1 of the downstairs intrasitive clause is an absolutive; thus that nominal is an upstairs 2 in CUC. I briefly give two arguments that the downstairs absolutive is upstairs 2 in Causatives like those in 21).

2.0.1 Pronominal Case. In Halkomelem, there are three cases of pronouns: subject clitics (used for final 1s), object suffixes (used for final 2s) and independent pronouns (used for emphatic and oblique). In CUC, if a downstairs pronominal absolutive is upstairs 2, we would expect a pronominal object suffix. As can be seen in 25), this prediction is borne out.

25. a. ni ʔeʔstuməməsən
   ap ʔeat-sp-mid det bread obl det lady
   'The bread was baked by the lady.'
   b. ni ᵇəʔetumən ʔəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det dog
   'The dog was fed by the boy.'
   c. ni ʔəʔetuməmən ʔəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det boy
   'The boy was fed by the boy.'

2.0.2 Passive. In Halkomelem, there is a rule of Passive, which advances 2 to 1 placing the initial 1 in comings. In 26), I have given examples of Passives of simple transitive sentences.

26. a. ni ʔəʔetumən ᵇəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det bread obl det lady
   'The bread was baked by the lady.'
   b. ni ᵇəʔetumən ʔəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det dog
   'The dog was fed by the boy.'
   c. ni ᵇəʔetumən ʔəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det boy
   'The boy was fed by the boy.'

The predicate is suffixed with -ŋ, the middle voice marker. The Initial 1, which is the final 1, occurs in the position immediately following the predicate. The Initial 1, which is final 1 coming, occurs at the end of the sentence preceded by the oblique marker.

In CUC, if the downstairs absolutive is upstairs 2, we would predict that this 2 could advance to 1 via Passive. In 27), we see that this is the case.

27. a. ni ʔetumən ʔəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det dog obl det boy
   'The dog was fed by the boy.'
   b. ni ʔetumən ʔəʔ eat-sbg-3obl det bread obl det boy
   'The bread was baked by the boy.'
c. ni $\phi$âšas $\gamma$âšas qâ
asp cone-ca-xiâ det water
'the water was brought.'

Thus, Prominental Case and Passive provide evidence that Causatives like those in 21) are single clauses at final level.

2.1 Downstairs Initial Transitives.

Finding evidence for the initial bi-clausal structure of Halkomelem Causatives is more difficult; for this, I turn to cases of Causatives with downstairs initial transitive clauses.

According to the prediction concerning CGI, if the downstairs clause of a Causative is transitive, e.g. 20), the downstairs absolutive (\'qâ$\phi$âšas 'the bread') is upstairs 2 and the downstairs ergative (\'mâ$\phi$âšas 'the lady') is upstairs 3.

28. ni qâ$\phi$âšas $\gamma$âšas stênî $\gamma$â$\phi$âšas
asp bake-tr-erg det lady det bread
'the lady baked the bread.'

In 29), I have tried various possibilities in Halkomelem of forming a Causative on a downstairs transitive. In 29a), I have tried CGI and 3-2 advancement; I have argued elsewhere that 3-2 advancement is obligatory in Halkomelem. But just in case, I have tried CGI without 3-2 advancement in 29b). Neither of these constructions are grammatical, regardless of case marking and word order.

29 a. * ni qâ'mâšasâšas $\gamma$âšas stênî (\'mâ$\phi$âšas)
asp bake-tr-ca-39aî-erg det lady obl det bread
'he had the lady bake the bread.'

b. * ni qâ'mâšasâšas $\gamma$â$\phi$âšas (\'mâ$\phi$âšas) stênî
asp bake-tr-ca-39aî-erg det bread obl det lady
'he had the bread baked by the lady.'

However, if the downstairs initial transitive is an Anti-passive construction, CGI is possible, as can be seen in the examples in 30).

30. a. ni qâ'mâšasâšas $\gamma$âšas stênî (\'mâ$\phi$âšas)
asp bake-ca-39aî-erg det lady obl det bread
'he made/had the lady bake the bread.'

b. ni kâ$\phi$âšasâšas
asp fry-intr-ca-39aî-erg obl det water
'he made him fry the salmon.'

In these constructions, the downstairs final absolutive is upstairs 2. Again, evidence for the upstairs 2-ood of the downstairs absolutive can be given from the Passive counterparts of the sentences in 30:

32. a. ni qâ$\phi$âšas $\gamma$âšas stênî (\'mâ$\phi$âšas)
asp bake-ca-39aî-erg det woman obl det bread
'the woman made to bake the bread.'

b. ni kâ$\phi$âšas $\gamma$â$\phi$âšas
asp pour-intr-ca-39aî obl det water
'he was made to pour the water.'

3 c. ni o$\phi$âšasâšas $\gamma$â$\phi$âšas
asp fry-intr-ca-39aî obl det salmon
'he was made to fry the salmon.'

To account for the impossibility of CGI in the case of downstairs final transitives and to account for the possibility of CGI in the case of downstairs Antipassive, I propose the following restriction on CGI in Halkomelem:

33. CGI is possible only if the downstairs clause is finally transitive. 16

On the basis of the Causatives in 30), I can now form arguments that at initial level Causatives in Halkomelem are bi-clausal. In formulating an analysis of Antipassives, I crucially maintained the assumption that the semantic role of nominal is encoded at the initial level of syntax. [cf. fn. 6 ] I claimed that Antipassives and transitives share the same initial stratum; in both cases there is an 'agent' and a 'patient'. Under this assumption, Antipassive is a syntactic role.
If this assumption is to be maintained in the case of Causatives, then I am forced to posit 30’ stafa’il ‘the lady’ in 30(a) as a I and 31’s stafa’il ‘the bread’ as a 2 at some initial level with the predicate q3’tas ‘bake’ since these nominals have the semantic roles of ‘agent’ and ‘patient’ respectively. This assumption can be maintained only in a bi-clausal analysis of Causatives.

Furthermore, in the Causatives in 30, Antipassive, as marked by 3 or 31’s, determinatizes the downstairs clause. Thus the I is absolute in the final level downstairs and behaves as such in CCU. [cf. 31] If the claim that Antipassive is a syntactic rule is maintained, CCU (which is possible in the case of downstairs Antipassive) must also be a syntactic rule.

2.2 Periphrastic Causatives.

I argued in the previous section that only downstairs final causative clauses could participate in CCU. In the case of downstairs initial transitives, determinatization is accomplished via Antipassive. This raises the question as to how Causatives are formed in cases where Antipassive is not possible. [cf. 34.1]

Besides Causatives formed with the suffix 33t, as exemplified above, there is a construction with causative force based on the predicate caaf ‘tell someone to do something’ followed by a complement clause. This construction I call a Periphrastic Causative. We get examples like the following:

34. a. ni caaf ‘la k3ni aq3 bəcəŋəbəj
   i lə-bəj tell-tr cmp bathe-33bəj
   ‘I told him to bathe.’

b. ni caaf ‘la k3ni aq3 bəcəŋəbəj
   kəu cəfəŋəbəj
   lə-bəj tell-33bəj cmp eat-tr-33bəj det senən
   ‘I told you to eat the salmon.’

c. ni caaf ‘la k3ni aq3 bəcəŋəbəj
   lə-bəj tell-tr cmp hit-lo3-qəbəj
   ‘I told him to hit me.’

d. caafəq3bənəq3μəyən
   kəu k3ni təjəfən
   tell-33bəj lə-bəj cmp cmp ben-33bəj-lə-bəj ob det tea
   ‘I will tell you to pour the tea for me.’

e. caafəq3bənəq3μəyən
   kəu k3ni aq3 bəcəŋəbəj
   tell-33bəj lə-bəj cmp cmp ben-33bəj-lə-bəj ob det bread
   ‘I will tell you to bake the bread for him.’

Note that in the case of 34–e), only Periphrastic Causatives are possible, because it is impossible due to the restrictions noted in 3.1 to have Antipassive in the complement clause.

3. Conclusion.

I have argued here for a role of Antipassive in Halkomelem. I gave evidence from verbal morphology, case marking, Quantifiers, and Focus Constructions that Antipassives (1–3b) are finally intransitive, the initial I being placed on chomage. I discussed two restrictions on the role of Antipassive in Halkomelem. First, Antipassive could not place 1st or 2nd persons on chomage. Second, Antipassive could only place initial 1s on chomage. Thus, sentences with 3–1 or 3–2 Advancement have no Antipassive counterparts.

Second, I gave examples of Causatives formed with the suffix 33t. I proposed that such Causatives are initially bi-clausal.

In such Causatives, in accordance with universal predictions concerning Causative Clause Union, the downstairs absolute is the upstairs 2, as is evidenced by pronominal morphology and Passive.

I gave examples of Causatives with downstairs initial intransitive clauses and with downstairs initial transitive clauses which are determinatized via Antipassive. Pointing out that downstairs final transitive clauses could not participate in CCU, I suggested a restriction on CCU in Halkomelem: CCU is possible only if the downstairs clause is finally intransitive.

Finally, I discussed Periphrastic Causatives, formed with the predicate caaf, ‘tell someone to do something.’ I pointed out that in cases where it was impossible to form Causatives with CCU, it was possible to form Periphrastic Causatives.

Footnotes:

*This data on Halkomelem is from Arnold Guerin, Musqueam Reserve, Vancouver, B.C. Mr. Guerin, who is a teacher and researcher of the Halkomelem language, speaks a dialect from Upper Island, B.C. I sincerely thank him for his patience and understanding as well as his critical comments concerning the present analysis.

Any errors in data or analysis are my own responsibility.

My research on Halkomelem was supported by research grants from Flaga Xi and from the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund. My trip to HLS 6 was made possible by a travel grant from the Faculty of Social Science, University of Calgary.

A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 14th International Conference on Salishan Languages, Bellingham, Washington, August, 1979. Portions of this paper are in an earlier unpublished ms. "Oblique Objects in Halkomelem Salish." Dr. Thomas B. Huard of the University of Victoria has also come to the same conclusions concerning Antipassive. In Huard (1979), he points out the similarities of 2-choomres in Antipassive and 3–2 Advancement constructions using data from relativization.

Several scholars [Davies, Kuper, Mattice, Thompson] working on other Salish languages have discussed Antipassive, calling this construction by various names including pseudo-transitive and pseudo-intransitive.

Fronts has pointed out similar data concerning Antipassives.
and Causatives in Blackfoot. Abbreviations used in glossing the Halkomelem sentences are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>act</td>
<td>aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben</td>
<td>benefactive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erg</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>middle voice marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj</td>
<td>object suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron</td>
<td>pronominal object suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tran</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmp</td>
<td>complemenizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl</td>
<td>oblique marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss</td>
<td>pronominal possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subcl</td>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>pronominal forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am using 'agent' and 'patient' as an expedient means for introducing the data. I make no claims as to the usefulness or defensibility of such notions.
2. The choice of suffixes is lexically governed.
3. The determiners used in the data herein are:
   - **e** plain visible definite
   - **k'** plain invisible definite
   - **s** feminine visible definite
   - **q** feminine invisible definite
   - **w** indefinite

4. In Gerdes 1979a, I give a more precise analysis of case marking; final nuclear terms are in the straight case; non-nuclear terms are in the oblique case.
5. For precise definitions of the terms and for explanation of the networks used in Relational Grammar, cf. Farkas and Postal (1977). Briefly, 1 is subject, 2 is direct object, and 3 is indirect object. 
6. On semantic roles in BC, Farkas and Postal (1977, p. 402) say: 'Our ultimate claim is that the justification for the assignment of grammatical relations at initial level is universally determined by principles referring to the semantic role of the nominal. Thus... agent nominals are initially 1... patients 2, etc.'
7. I use here the formulation of Antipassive as proposed in Postal 1977.
8. I cannot argue at this time if such constructions arise through movement, deletion, or neither. What is essential to the argument, however, is the nominative in the complement clause which the Quantifier modifies.

9. Notice that the Quantifier refers to the 2 of a transitive even though the 1 is more proximate.
10. For evidence that Word Order is stated on final level, observe the Passive constructions in 26-7) and the 3 and 2 and Ben-2 Advancement constructions in 13-14).
11. I will not argue for a deletion analysis of Focus constructions here, but note that these constructions are in the form of a predicate nominative construction, i.e., NP Det BP. In this case the second NP is a clause, marked for aspect.
12. I have argued for these rules in Gerdes 1979a.
13. The difference between the two nominalizers ę and ę is not due to a phonological rule. Observe 13 and 14 below:

   a. ę'qų'sa 'to work'
   b. ę'yų'sa 'work, job'
   c. ę'yų'sa 'tool'
   d. ę'yų'sa 'to be ashamed'
   e. ę'yų'sa 'his shame'
   f. ę'yų'sa 'that which he is ashamed of'
14. The constraint against 1st and 2nd person nominals is a general one. Thus, Passive counterparts of sentences with 1st and 2nd person initial do not exist.

15. Universal predictions concerning CCI are from Farkas, Class Lectures, UCSB.
16. It is notable that CCI is not possible in the case of downstream Passive. Thus, the restriction on CCI would have to be refined:
17. CCI is possible only when downstream initial 1 is downstream final absolutive.
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