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1. Causals in Halkomelm.*

In Halkomelm, a Salish language spoken in southwestern British Columbia, there are several ways of expressing psychological events. In cases involving a causal—an indirect cause of a psychological state, the nominal playing the role of causal can be expressed in two ways. First, it can be an oblique in an intransitive clause, as exemplified in 1-3):

1) ?i cə̱n sicíw'sə̱ ni ?ə̱l ne syay'sə̱ asp l-sub asp-tired obl det asp pst l-pos work
   'I am tired from working.'
2) ni cə̱n q'ə̱l?ə̱ k'ə̱Θə̱ smə̱θə̱qə̱'ə̱nə̱ms asp l-sub believe obl det lies-3-pos
   'I believed his lies.'
3) ni cə̱n c'ə̱q'ə̱ k'ə̱Θə̱ smə̱Χə̱'ə̱ms asp l-sub astonished obl det jump-3-pos
   'I was astonished at his jump.'

Second, the causal can be the object of a verb suffixed with me?, as exemplified in 4-6):

4) ni cə̱n wə̱l lćiwsə̱mət te John asp l-sub already tired-adv-tr det
   'I am already tired of John.'
5) ni cə̱n q'ə̱l'me'?ə̱t k'ə̱Θə̱ ləplə̱t asp l-sub believe-adv-tr det priest
   'I believed the priest.'
6) ni θ'ə̱y?k'ə̱mə̱təs k'ə̱Θə̱ smə̱'ə̱mə̱y?
   asp stare-tr-adv-tr-erg det dog
   'The dog was startled at him.'

In 7), I have listed other verbs which can occur with the suffix me?. In all, there are about 30 verbs occurring with this suffix. They are of a consistent semantic class—psychological predicates.

7)  
   Xi?xə̱?
   'ashamed'
   hilə̱k' 
   'be happy'
   siwə̱l
   'sense'
   siʔsiʔ?
   'frightened'
   wistə̱nə̱q
   'be jealous'
   c'ə̱wə̱l?
   'be annoyed' (Musqueam only)
   ?ə̱lyə̱?
   'dream' (Musqueam only)
   həʔk'ə̱?
   'remember' (Musqueam only)
In Halkomelem, causals as in 1-6) contrast syntactically and semantically with agents. In the transitive constructions given in 8) and 9), the agent is the direct, purposeful inducer of the psychological state and appears as subject.3

8) ni cən ʔyʔk' ut kʷəo sqʷaméyʔ ʔə kʷəo t̠ín tin
   asp 1-sub startle-tr det dog obi det bell
   'I startled the dog with the bell.' (on purpose)

9) ni cən c'q̱'t̠
   asp 1-sub astonish-tr
   'I astonished him.' (with my skill, etc.)

The purpose of this paper is to give an analysis for sentences like those in 4-6), where the causal is the object of a verb suffixed with meʔ. Making use of the concepts available in Relational Grammar,4 I argue that these sentences involve the advancement of an Oblique (the causal) to object (2), as represented in the sub-network in 10):

As this advancement is marked by the verbal suffix meʔ, I refer to these sentences as meʔ constructions.

To motivate an analysis involving Obl-2 advancement for meʔ constructions, I first give evidence for the 2-hood of the causal on the basis of Case Marking and Passive. Second, I propose an animacy constraint on causal-2 advancement in Halkomelem. Third, I argue on the basis of Nominalizations that all nominals that are semantically causals are initial Obliques.

In the second section of this paper, I discuss meʔ constructions in light of the Unaccusative Hypothesis, as proposed by Perlmutter (1978) and Perlmutter and Postal (to appear b). I give evidence from Causatives for initial unaccusative strata. After demonstrating that meʔ constructions are initially unaccusative, I show that their Passive counterparts constitute a counterexample to a law proposed as a universal by Perlmutter and Postal—the 1 Advancement Exclusiveness Law.

1.1 Arguments for the 2-hood of the Causal.

As was discussed above, the analysis I propose here for meʔ constructions involves the advancement of the causal to 2, as represented in the sub-network in 10) above. I give arguments for the 2-hood of the causal based on Case Marking and Passive.

1.1.1 Case Marking.

The first argument for Obl-2 advancement is based on Case Marking in Halkomelem. For nominals, two cases are distinguished: the straight case, in which the nominal is preceded only by a determiner, and the oblique case, in which the nominal is preceded by an
oblique marker and a determiner, as exemplified in 11): 5

11) Straight Case Oblique Case

ʔə siłėni?
DET LADY

ʔə ʔə siłėni?
OBL DET LADY

Observe the active transitive sentence in 12).

12) ni pənətəs ʔə siłėni? kʷʔə sqəwə
ASP PLANT-TR-ERG DET LADY DET POTATO
'The woman planted the potatoes.'

In this sentence, both the final 1 and the final 2 are in the straight case. Final 1s in intransitive clauses are also in the straight case, as seen in 13).

13) ni ?ʔiməs ʔə siłėni?
ASP WALK DET LADY
'The woman walked.'

In contrast, nominals bearing final Oblique relations, such as the locative in 14) and the instrument in 8) are in the oblique case:

14) ni cəám kʷʔə niłkʷ ʔə tʰə smə̱ent
ASP GO UP DET UNCLE OBL DET MOUNTAINS
'Uncle went up into the mountains.'

On the basis of this data, Case Marking in Halkomelem can be formulated informally as in 16): 6

16) a. Final 1s and final 2s are in the straight case.
b. Final Obliques are in the oblique case.

Returning to the meʔ constructions in 4-6), the causal is in the straight case. This follows from Case Marking as formulated in 16) and the analysis proposed here—OBL-2 advancement.

Additional evidence for this analysis comes from the pronominal system, which distinguishes four cases—subjective, objective, oblique, and possessive. For expediency, I will limit the discussion to 1st and 2nd person singular pronouns; the forms of the pronouns for each case are given in 17).

17) subjective objective oblique possessive
1st sg cən -ʔəmʔə̱ ?əxʔə̱ enʔə̱ no-
2nd sg č -ʔə̱m ?əxʔə newə̱ ?ə̱-
The subjective set of pronouns are clitics and follow the first element of the clause. The objective set is suffixed to the predicate. The oblique pronouns consist of independent pronouns preceded by the oblique marker and a determiner. The possessive set are affixes.

Observe the active transitive sentence in 18):

18)  ni č kʷoŋəmʔ?š
     asp 2-sub grab-1-obj
     'You grabbed me.'

The final 1 is expressed by a subjective clitic and the final 2 by an objective suffix. In intransitive sentences, such as 19), the subject clitic set is used for the final 1.

19)  ni cən ?'imoʔ
     asp 1-sub walk
     'I walked.'

In meʔ constructions, where the causal is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, as in 20-21), the causal is expressed by an objective suffix.

20)  ni hləkʷmèʔəmʔ?šəs le sliʔni?
     asp be happy-adv-1-obj-erg det lady
     'The lady was happy on account of me.'

21)  ni cən lciwsəməmə
     asp 1-sub tired-adv-2-obj
     'I am tired of you.'

That the objective case is used for causals in meʔ constructions can be accounted for automatically in the analysis proposed here; the causal is a final 2 via Obl-2 Advancement.

1.1.2 Passive.

Another argument for the 2-hood of the causal comes from Passive. In Halkomelem, there are Passive constructions like that given in 22b) which involve the advancement of a 2 to 1; the 2 in advancing to 1 places the initial 1 en chomage, as represented in the network in 22c). I have argued for Passive elsewhere and I am assuming it here.(

Contrast the active transitive clause in 22a) and the Passive clause in 22b):

22)  a. ni pənətəs le sliʔni? kʷəʔ sqəʔ
     asp plant-tr-erg det lady det potato
     'The lady planted the potatoes.'

  b. ni pənətəm kʷəʔ sqəʔʔ ?ə le sliʔni?
     asp plant-tr-intr det potato obl det lady
     'The potatoes were planted by the lady.'
In 22a), the 1 precedes the 2 and both are marked in the straight case. The verb is suffixed with the transitive marker -t. In 22b), the final 1 (semantically the patient) precedes the 1 chomeur (semantically the agent). The final 1 is in the straight case while the chomeur is in the oblique case. The verb is suffixed with both the transitive marker -t and an intransitive marker, -m.

Passive, as universally characterized by Perlmutter and Postal (1977), advances the 2 of a transitive stratum to 1. Passive in Halkomelem follows this characterization; only 2s advance to 1 in Passive; Obliques cannot advance directly to 1 via Passive as seen in 23) and 24).

23) * ni caməm tə è smént ?ə kʷəθə ńikʷ asp go up-intr det mountains obl det uncle 'The mountains were gone up into by Uncle.'

24) * ni pənətəm kʷəθə șapəl kʷəθə sqəwəθ asp plant-tr-intr det shovel det potato 'The shovel was planted potatoes with.'

In me? constructions, we find that the causal can be final 1 in a Passive construction, as exemplified in 25-27). The a) sentences are active transitive—the causal is a 2. In the b) sentences, the causal is advanced to 2 and from 2 to 1 via Passive, as represented in the sub-network given in 27c).

25) a. ni ləciwəmətes kʷəθə swəw?ləs kʷəθə sqəməey? asp tired-adv-tr-erg det boy det dog 'The boy is tired of the dog,' b. ni ləciwəmətes kʷəθə sqəməey? ?ə kʷəθə swəw?ləs asp tired-adv-tr-intr det dog obl det boy literally: 'The dog was gotten tired of by the boy.'

26) a. ni xiʔxəmətes tə swəyʔqe? ʔə sən?iʔ asp ashamed-adv-tr-erg det man det lady 'The man as ashamed in front of the lady.' b. ni xiʔxəmətes kʷəθə Bob ?ə X' John asp ashamed-adv-tr-intr det obl det literally: 'Bob was gotten ashamed in front of by John.'
27) a. ni si?si?mé?tës k'?Θë spé?Θ
asp frightened-adv-tr-erg det bear
'He was frightened of the bear.'
b. ni si?si?me?tëm k'?Θë spé?Θ
asp frightened-adv-tr-intr det bear
literally: 'The bear was frightened of.'

c. causal

That 25-27b) are Passives can be seen by Word Order, Case Marking, and verbal morphology. The causal, immediately following the verb, is in the straight case, while the 1 chomeur, following the causal, is in the oblique case. The verbs in 25-27b) are suffixed with both the transitive marker and the intransitive marker, as was the verb in the Passive in 22b).

I have argued above that only 2s can advance to 1 in Passives. That the causal is final 1 in the Passive of a me? construction follows from the analysis of causal to 2 advancement posited here.

1.2 An Animacy Constraint on Causal-2 Advancement.

I have shown in 1-6) two ways of expressing a causal in Halkomelem. First, in 1-3) it is an oblique in an intransitive clause. Second, in 4-6), the causal advances to 2 and the verb is suffixed with me?. I maintain here that the distribution of these two patterns is regular and predictable.

Observe the sentences in 28) and 29).

28) a. ni cen c'?eq' ?ë k'?Θë sëx'ek'ës
asp l-sub astonished obl det carving-3-pos
'I was astonished at his carving.'
b. ?ë ni cen c'?eq'mí?t k'?Θë sëx'ek'ës
asp l-sub astonished-adv-tr det carving-3-pos
'I was astonished at his carving.'

29) a. ?? ni cen c'?eq' ?ë k'?Θë sq'awëy?
asp l-sub astonished obl det dog
'I was astonished at the dog.'
b. ni cen c'?eq'mí?t k'?Θë sq'awëy?
asp l-sub astonished-adv-tr det dog
'I was astonished at the dog.'

In 28a) the causal is an oblique and the sentence is grammatical. However, in 28b) the causal is a 2 in a me? construction and the sentence is ungrammatical. The opposite pattern holds for 29a) and b). In 29a), the causal is an oblique; in 29b) it is a 2 in a me? construction. The latter is much preferred. This pattern is paralleled in 30) and 31):
35) a. ni cən póŋət kʷəə sqəwə
asp 1-sub plant-tr det potato
'I planted the potatoes,'

b. *ni nə špənət kʷəə sqəwə
asp 1-pos nom-plant-tr det potato
literally: 'My planting was the potatoes.'

As can be seen in 36-39), all causals regardless of animacy
can head Nominalizations.

36) a. ni cən q'əl? ʔə kʷəə šmoθ'əŋqɨnəms
asp 1-sub believe obl det lies-3-pos
'I believed his lies.'

b. ni nə šq'əl?  kʷəə šmoθ'əŋqɨnəms
asp 1-pos nom-believe det lies-3-pos
literally: 'My believing was his lies.'

37) a. ??ni cən q'əl? ʔə kʷəə lepliɪ
asp 1-sub believe obl det priest
'I believed the priest.'

b. ni nə šq'əl?  kʷəə lepliɪ
asp 1-pos nom-believe det priest
literally: 'My believing was the priest.'

38) a. ni cən əciws ʔə kʷəə q'əλəmən
asp 1-sub tired obl det talk
'I am tired of the talk.'

b. ni nə šəciws kʷəə q'əλəmən
asp 1-pos nom-tired det talk
literally: 'My tiring was the talk.'

39) a. ??ni cən əciws ʔə ʃə John
asp 1-sub tired obl det
'I was tired of John.'

b. ni nə šəciws to John
asp 1-pos nom-tired det
literally: 'My tiring was John.'

Since the relevant generalization is that only an initial
Oblique can be the head of a Nominalization in which the predi-
cate is prefixed with ə-, the fact that causals can be the
heads of such Nominalizations provides evidence that they are
initial Obliques.

2. əme? Constructions and the Unaccusative Hypothesis.
In the second portion of this paper, I discuss əme? constructions
in light of the Unaccusative Hypothesis, proposed by Perlmutter (1978)
and Perlmutter and Postal (to appear b). According to this hypothesis,
initially intransitive clauses are of two types: those whose initial
stratum is unergative, which contain a 1-arc but no 2-arc, and those
whose initial stratum is unaccusative, which contain a 2-arc but no
1-arc. These are represented in 40) and 41) respectively.
40) Unergative  

41) Unaccusative

Perlmutter and Postal assert that initial unergativity vs. unaccusativity is largely predictable from the semantics of the clause. Verbs in unergative clauses are active, often willed and volitional actions, e.g. 'speak', 'walk', 'dance', and 'knock'. In contrast, verbs in unaccusative clauses are verbs of existing, happening, or undergoing, e.g. 'melt', 'fall', 'drown', and 'die'. This semantic contrast can be seen clearly in an intransitive verb such as 'fall' which appears in either initially unergative clauses, as in 42a), or in initially unaccusative clauses, as in 42b).  

42) a. John fell right on cue in the third act.  
   b. John fell from the second-story window.  

While 'fell' is a volitional act in 42a), it is not in 42b). The unaccusative stratum in 41) is not a well-formed final stratum, as it violates the Final 1 Law (Perlmutter and Postal to appear a). Informally stated, the Final 1 Law requires every basic clause to have a final 1. Thus, in unaccusative clauses, some nominal must advance to 1. It is possible for the initial 2 to advance to final 1, as represented in 43); this is called Unaccusative Advancement by Perlmutter and Postal.  

43)

Notice that there is a crucial difference between Unaccusative Advancement and Passive, given in 44).  

44)

Although they both involve advancements of a 2 to 1, in the case of Passive, the 2 is in a transitive stratum, while in the case of Unaccusative Advancement, the 2 is in an intransitive stratum. Perlmutter (1978) provides syntactic evidence for unergativity versus unaccusativity from Impersonal Passives in Dutch. In an Impersonal Passive, a dummy inserted as a 2 advances to 1. Impersonal Passives of initial unergatives are possible in Dutch. Perlmutter gives examples like 45) and 46), as represented in 47).
45) Er wordt hier veel geskied.  
'It is skied here a lot.'

46) Er wordt hier door de jonge lui veel gedanst.  
'It is danced here a lot by the young people.'

However, Perlmutter claims that Impersonal Passives of initial unaccusatives are not possible. The ungrammatical sentences in 48) and 49) are represented by the network in 50).

48) *Er werd door de bloemen binnen een paar dagen verflensst.  
'The flowers had wilted in a few days.'

49) *Er werd door het water uit de rots degrippeld.  
'The water dripped out of the rock.'

50)

Perlmutter attributes the impossibility of Impersonal Passives in the case of initial unaccusatives to the fact that they would violate the 1 Advancement Exclusiveness Law. (Perlmutter and Postal, to appear a). The 1 AEX is stated informally in 51).

51) (Perlmutter 1978, p. 166) No clause can involve more than one advancement to 1.

As can be seen in the relational network in 50), Impersonal Passives of initial unaccusatives involve both Unaccusative Advancement and Passive. Hence the violation of the 1 AEX.

Thus, Perlmutter has motivated the distinction between two types of initially intransitive clauses on semantic and syntactic grounds.

In the analysis of me constructions proposed above, the causal is an initial Oblique; me constructions are intransitive at initial level, as seen in 52) where X represents an unknown grammatical relation.

52)
The question arises—Are me? constructions initially unergative or initially unaccusative? Here, I give two arguments, one semantic and one syntactic, for the initial unaccusativity of me? constructions.

2.1 Unaccusatives and 2s of Transitives.

It has been claimed that the assignment of initial grammatical relations is determined by the semantic role of the nominals. In 53) I have quoted Perlmutter and Postal on this subject.

53) (Perlmutter and Postal, 1977, p. 402): '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 1s . . . patients 2s, etc.'

One of the facets of the Unaccusative Hypothesis is that it would allow the butter in 54) and 55) to have the same initial grammatical relation.

54) The butter melted.

55) John melted the butter.

In each case the butter is semantically the patient, undergoing the act of melting. The Unaccusative Hypothesis allows the butter in 54) to be initial 2, bearing the same initial grammatical relation as the butter in 55), the 2 of a transitive.

By positing initial unaccusativity for me? constructions, a similar parallelism in semantic roles can be captured. Contrast the me? construction in 6) with the transitive sentence in 8). In the latter, the experiencer is the initial 2 in a transitive. By positing 6) as an initially unaccusative stratum, the experiencer in me? constructions is also a 2. Thus, nominals having the same semantic role with respect to the same verb would be assigned the same initial grammatical relations.

2.2 Causative Clause Union and Unaccusativity in Halkomelem.

Syntactic evidence for the initial unaccusativity of me? constructions comes from Causatives in Halkomelem. One way of forming Causatives is through Causative Clause Union. In these cases, the predicate is suffixed with the causative suffix -st. I have argued elsewhere that two constraints are placed on CCU in Halkomelem.14 First, notice the Causative in 56).

56) * ni q’q’alatostexwes 1ə siśni? (ʔə) k’q’ə səmplil
    asp bake-tr-cs-erg det lady obl det bread
    'He had the lady bake the bread.'
The complement is a transitive clause as is seen by the transitive suffix -t following the verb root. CCU is impossible in 56), regardless of word order or case marking of the nominals. In contrast, CCU is possible if the complement clause is detransitivized by Antipassive. In 57), note that the verb root is immediately followed by -m, an intransitive suffix, which in this case marks downstairs Antipassive.

57) ni q'Welomstax'os ìs sléni? ð'ë k'ë sëplîl
asp bake-intr-cs-erg det lady obl det bread
'He made the lady bake the bread.'

On the basis of the impossibility of CCU in 62), where the complement is a final transitive, and the possibility of CCU in 63), where the complement is a final intransitive, I formulate a constraint on CCU given in 58).

58) CCU in Halkomelem is possible only if the complement is intransitive in the final stratum.

However, such a constraint could not account for the ungrammaticality of 64). Here, the complement is a Passive construction. Following the verb root is the transitive suffix -t and the intransitive suffix -m, which mark Passive in Halkomelem. Although the complement in 59) is intransitive via Passive, CCU is not possible.

59) *ni q'Welotomstax'os k'ë sëplîl
asp bake-tr-intr-cs-erg det bread
'He had the bread baked.'

On the basis of the impossibility of CCU in 59) and the possibility of CCU in 57), I formulate a constraint on CCU given in 60).

60) CCU in Halkomelem is possible only if the final 1 of the complement is the initial 1 of the complement.

Thus, a sentence like 59), where the initial downstairs 2 is advanced to 1 via Passive), CCU is not possible.

This constraint on CCU in Halkomelem taken together with the Unaccusative Hypothesis accounts for the contrast between 61-63), in which CCU is possible, and 64-66), in which CCU is not possible.

61) ni cân ?qWelotomstax' k'ë sq'omey?
asp 1-sub eat-cs det dog
'I let the dog eat.' / 'I fed the dog.'

62) ni cân ?qWelomstax' te John
asp 1-sub walk-cs det
'I made John walk.'

63) ni cân ?qWelomstax'
asp 1-sub sit-cs-2-obj
'I had you sit down.'
In 61-63), the predicates would be classed on semantic grounds as unergative. In the complement, the final 1 is initial 1 and CCU is possible.

However, if the predicate would be classed on semantic grounds as unaccusative, CCU is not possible, as exemplified in 64-66).

64) *ni cân wəc'əvəstəxʷ kəθə səc'əst
asp 1-sub fall - cs det stick
'I made the stick fall.'

65) *ni cân kəwələstəxʷ kəθə ti
asp 1-sub spill - cs det tea
'I made the tea spill.'

66) *ni cân qəwələstəxʷ kəθə səpləl
asp 1-sub bake - cs det bread
'I made the bread bake.'

By positing initially unaccusative strata for the complements in 64-66), the impossibility of CCU is accounted for by constraint 60). The complement is unaccusative; thus the nominal participating in CCU is the initial 2.

Thus, CCU in Halkomelem provides a test for distinguishing initially unaccusative from initially unergative clauses. Applying this test to the psychological predicates that appear in me? constructions, we find that CCU is not possible, as exemplified in 67-70).

67) *ni cân c'eqəstəxʷ tə John
asp 1-sub astonish - cs det
'I caused John to be astonished.'

68) *ni cân hilək'əstəxʷ tə John
asp 1-sub happy - cs det
'I made John happy.'

69) *ni cân c'iwələstəxʷ tə John
asp 1-sub annoy - cs det
'I caused John to be annoyed.'

70) *ni cân ə'yəq'əstəxʷ tə John
asp 1-sub startle - cs det
'I caused John to be startled.'

This follows automatically from constraint 60) if the initial intransitive strata in 67-70) are unaccusative.

2.3 2 - 1 Advancement.
I argued above that the experiencer in me? constructions is an initial 2 in an unaccusative stratum. Here, I will briefly give evidence that the initial 2 in these constructions advances to 1 via Unaccusative Advancement as represented in 71).
71)

experimenter

First, note that in the me? construction in 72a), the experimenter is a pronoun from the subjective set, used for final is. If the experimenter were a final 2, we would expect it to be in the objective set of pronouns, as given in 72b).

72) a. ni cēn siʔsiʔmekʔt kʰʔə spəʔəlqʷičəʔə?
   asp l-sub frighten-adv-tr det screech owl
   'I was frightened at the screech owl.'

b. ni siʔsiʔmekʔʔamʔəs kʰʔə spəʔəlqʷičəʔə?
   asp frighten-adv-l-obj-erg det screech owl
   'The screech owl was frightened at me.'

That the experimenter is in the subjective set follows from an analysis involving 2-1 advancement.

Second, it can be shown that the experimenter in me? constructions is not a final chomeur. I have argued above that the initial Oblique advances to 2 in me? constructions. If the experimenter, an initial 2, is not advanced to 1, then Obl-2 advancement would place it en chomage, resulting in the clause represented in 73).16

73)

exp   causal

In Halkomelem 2 chomeurs are in the oblique case, e.g. the 2 chomeur in a clause involving Ben-2 advancement as in 74), represented in the relational network in 75).17

74) ni cēn θeyəlcət ɫə siʔniʔ? ʔə kʰʔə snəʔəl
    asp l-sub fix-ben-tr det lady θəl det canoe
    'I fixed the canoe for the lady.'

75)

θəy  cēn snəʔəl siʔniʔ?
   'fix'   'I' 'canoe' 'lady'

However, the experimenter is in the straight case as in 26a). Thus it is not a 2 chomeur. Since the experimenter is not a final chomeur and the causal is the final 2, the experimenter must be the final 1.

Thus, the pronominal and nominal case marking of the experimenter give evidence for the advancement of the initial 2 to 1 in me? constructions.
2.4 Summary of the Analysis of me? Constructions. The relational network for me? constructions can now be given in 76).

At initial level, the experiencer is a 2 and the causal is an Oblique; me? constructions involve both the advancement of the initial 2 to 1 and the advancement of the Oblique to 2. At this point, I would like to summarize the evidence for this analysis.

That the causal is an initial Oblique is evidenced by:
1) the appearance of causals, when they are inanimate, as Obliques;
2) the behavior of all causals regardless of animacy as Obliques in Nominalizations.
That the causal advances to 2 in me? constructions is evidenced by:
1) pronominal marking from the objective set of pronouns;
2) the ability of the causal to advance to 1 via Passive.
That the experiencer is initial 2 is evidenced by:
1) the parallelism of semantic role with experiencers that are 2s in transitive strata;
2) the inability of experiencers to participate in CCU.
That the experiencer is final 1 is evidenced by:
1) pronominal marking from the subjective set of pronouns;
2) case marking as a term, not as a 2 chomeur.

2.5 Passives of me? Constructions and the 1 AEX. The final point of this paper concerns the Passive of me? constructions, exemplified in 25-27b) above. In these constructions, the 2, which is the initial causal, advances to 1 via Passive, placing the 1, the experiencer, en chomage. The relational network for this construction is given in 77).
Notice that in this construction there are two advancements to 1. First, the initial 2 advances to 1 via Unaccusative Advancement. Second, the 2, the initial Oblique, advances to 1 via Passive. Thus, such constructions constitute a counterexample to the 1 Advancement Exclusiveness Law, given in 51).18

Contrasting the representation of the Passives of me? constructions in 77) with the analysis of Impersonal Passives of unaccusatives proposed for Dutch by Perlmutter in 50) above, it is clear that the Halkomelem example is exactly the kind of structure that the 1 AEX is supposed to rule out. Furthermore, if the 1 AEX as a universal constraint is invalid, as the Halkomelem data suggest, then the syntactic arguments from Dutch for the Unaccusative Hypothesis must be re-examined.

3. Conclusion.

From the discussion of me? constructions, several interesting conclusions can be drawn concerning the grammar of Halkomelem. First, the nominal having the semantic role of causal is an initial Oblique. Second, the initial causal can advance to object. In this case, the verb is suffixed with the advancement marker me?. Third, causal to 2 advancement in Halkomelem is subject to an animacy constraint. Whereas inanimate causals are preferably Oblique, animate causals are preferably advanced to 2. Fourth, initially intransitive strata with psychological predicates behave as unaccusatives.

In addition, the discussion of me? constructions has led to several conclusions for universal grammar. First, there exist languages, e.g. Halkomelem, in which agent and causal differ semantically and syntactically. While agents are initial 1s, causals are initial Obliques. Second, I have argued here that the behavior of me? constructions is best analyzed as involving an initial unaccusative stratum and causal to 2 advancement. Because Passives of me? constructions are possible, they constitute a counterexample to a law proposed as a universal—the 1 Advancement Exclusiveness Law.
Footnotes.

*These data on Halkomelem are from Mr. Arnold Guerin, Musqueam Reserve, Vancouver, B.C. I thank him for his patience in working with me on this construction. I would also like to thank Wayne Suttles for discussing this data with me and Margaret Langdon and David Perlmutter for commenting on the present analysis.

Any errors in data or analysis are my own responsibility.

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation through grant No. BNS78-17498 to the University of California-San Diego.

These abbreviations are used in the glosses of the Halkomelem:

adv    marker of causal-2 advancement
asp    aspect (locative and temporal)
cs     causative
det    determiner
erg    ergative
intr   intransitive
nom    nominalizer
obj    objective pronominal suffixes
obl    oblique marker
pos    possessive pronominal affixes
sub    subjective pronominal clitics
tr     transitive
1      1st person
2      2nd person
3      3rd person

1. The term 'causal' as used here originates with the work of Eduardo Raposo on Portuguese Causatives.

2. Data from two dialects of Halkomelem are given here:
in the Cowichan dialect, the causal to object advancement marker is me?, in the Musqueam dialect, this marker is mi?, and in either dialect, the stressed form alternates with an unstressed variant me.

3. In the examples in 8) and 9), the agent is the purposeful inducer of the psychological state. This does not imply that all agents are performing purposeful actions. Observe the following sentences:

1) ni con siwəłnə̱xʷ
   asp 1-sub sense-tr
   'I happened to make him sense me.'

ii) ni con siwəlt
    asp 1-sub sense-tr
    'I got his attention.'

I would claim that in both sentences, 'I' is the agent semantically and the initial 1 syntactically. In the former sentence, the action is accidental as marked by the transitive -n; in the latter sentence, the action is purposeful as marked by the transitive -t. In both, the action is directed by the agent toward the experiencer.
4. For precise definitions of the terms and for explanation of the networks used in Relational Grammar, cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1977 and Perlmutter to appear. Briefly, 1 is subject, 2 is direct object, 3 is indirect object, 1 is 1 chomeur, and 2 is 2 chomeur. Oblique relations are locative, instrumental, benefactive, etc. In an advancement, a nominal assumes a grammatical relation that is higher on the relational hierarchy: 1 2 3 Obl.

5. The determiners used in these data are:

\[ t^* \quad \text{plain visible definite} \]
\[ k^* \theta \quad \text{plain invisible definite} \]
\[ \theta \theta \quad \text{feminine visible definite} \]
\[ l^* \quad \text{feminine invisible definite} \]

In the oblique case, the determiner \( \underline{3} \) is always used before pronouns and proper nouns.

6. Halkomelem is a split ergative language. For 1st and 2nd persons, subject and object are marked. For 3rd persons, ergatives are marked but absolutes are generally unmarked.


8. The suffix \(-m\) can only appear in clauses that have a transitive stratum.

The suffix \(-m\), sometimes referred to as the marker of middle voice, can only appear in final intransitive clauses.

9. Thus, in passives in Halkomelem, both the initial transitive stratum and the final intransitive stratum are marked.

10. Transitive marking, which occurs only on clauses with a transitive stratum, gives evidence against an analysis in which the oblique advances directly to 1. In such an analysis, there would be no transitive stratum.

11. Other advancements in Halkomelem are governed by animacy constraints, e.g. 3s and benefactives are always animate in Halkomelem and they obligatorily advance to 2. Cf. Gerds 1979a.

12. Nominalizations of this type are used in Relativization, Focus, and Clefting of Obliques. They can also be independent sentences, as in the examples in 33-39b). I do not argue for the structure of sentences like 33b) here. They appear to be predicate nominative constructions with the possessed nominalized predicate as complement and the oblique nominal as subject. In the absence of evidence for this analysis at present, I am idiosyncratically using the term 'head' to refer to the oblique nominals.


18. Notice that Passives of me? constructions also violate various alternative formulations of the 1 AEX, e.g. the 1-Advancee Preservation Law (Wachtel 1979).
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