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ABSTRACT. A number of surface constraints on the clause structure of Halkomelem are given in this paper. It is shown that these constraints are not random phenomena but rather part of the systematic organization of Halkomelem according to a person/animacy/nominal type hierarchy. It is seen that the higher ranked nominals prefer to appear as subjects or objects and not as obliques or chomeurs. The overall result of these constraints is that more clausal patterns are avoided than allowed in Halkomelem, thus greatly simplifying clausal organization.

0. INTRODUCTION. In Halkomelem, a Salish language spoken in southwestern British Columbia, as in most natural languages, there are frequently several paraphrases available to express an event. For example, the event of "the woman's having cooked the salmon" can be expressed in an active (1), passive (2), or antipassive (3) clause.

(1) ni q'wəł-ət-əs əə sə̱nəʔ tə̱ sə̱cə̱tə̱n
aux cook -tr-3erg det woman det salmon
'The woman cooked the salmon.'

(2) ni q'wəł-ət-əm əə əə sə̱nəʔ tə̱ sə̱cə̱tə̱n
aux cook -tr-intr obl det woman det salmon
'The salmon was cooked by the woman.'

(3) ni q'wəł-əm əə sə̱nəʔ əə tə̱ sə̱cə̱tə̱n
aux cook -intr det woman obl det salmon
'The woman cooked the salmon.'

In other cases, however, a full range of paraphrases is impossible; for example, the passive clause in (5), corresponding to the active clause in (4), is ungrammatical.

(4) ni con q'wəł-ət tə̱ sə̱cə̱tə̱n
aux lsub cook -tr det salmon
'I cooked the salmon.'
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All of these linguistic techniques are employed in the context of achieving a social goal, i.e., of telling a story which has relevance for all participants. The interplay of linguistic devices, stylistic choices and social interaction together lend meaning to actual language use.
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(5) *ni q'twəl-ət-om ə-ə' ənəə tə səcələn
   aux cook -tr-intr obl-det lemph det salmon
   'The salmon was cooked by me.'

This paper presents a number of constraints in Halkomelem designed to account for missing clauses like (5) above. I claim that each constraint is not an isolated phenomenon but rather part of the systematic organization of Halkomelem syntax. When taken together, the constraints reveal that Halkomelem is organized according to a hierarchy based upon the features of person, animacy, and nominal type (proper vs. common).

1. PERSON/ANIMACY HIERARCHIES. It has been noted in the grammars of several languages that the person or animacy of a nominal can influence its presentation in the surface structure of the clause. For example, Southern Tiwa as discussed in Allen and Frantz (1978) shows an organization in terms of the following hierarchy:

(6) 1st and 2nd persons >
    3rd person animate >
    3rd person inanimate.

This hierarchy is manifested in the grammar according to the hierarchy of grammatical relations: subject > object. Clauses are acceptable in Southern Tiwa only if the subject is equal to or superior to the object according to the hierarchy in (6). Thus, the sentences in (7)-(9) are grammatical because in each case the subject outranks or equals the object.

(7) ti-seuan-mu-ban
   lsg:3lsng-man-see-pst
   'I saw the man.'

(8) men-seuan-mu-ban
   2sg:3lsng-man-see-pst
   'You saw the man.'

(9) seuanide ø-liora-mu-ban man
   3:3lsng-lady-see-pst
   'The man saw the lady.'
However clauses equivalent to 'The man saw me.' and 'The man saw you.' would be unacceptable because in this case the subject nominal (the third person inanimate 'man') would rank lower than the object nominal on the hierarchy in (6). In Southern Tiwa, Allen and Frantz claim, these clauses would be rendered as passives.

(10) seuanide-ba te-mu-che-ban
    man-instr lsg-see-pass-pst
    'I was seen by the man.'

(11) seuanide-ba a-mu-che-ban
    man-instr 2sg-see-pass-pst
    'You were seen by the man.'

Since passive is used as a means to circumvent the hierarchy in (6), it is clear that the hierarchy refers to the final rather than the initial level of structure. This paper shows that a similar hierarchy operates in Halkomelem grammar, specifically the hierarchy in (12):⁴

(12) 2nd person >
    1st person >
    3rd person, animate, common >
    3rd person, animate, proper >
    3rd person, inanimate.

Although a single construction cannot be used to demonstrate the status of this hierarchy (unlike in Southern Tiwa, where the choice of active versus passive clauses demonstrates the relative status of each nominal), consideration of several clausal types leads to the above formulation.

In the following discussion, I am assuming the following hierarchy of grammatical relations:⁵

(13) ergative >
    subject >
    object >
    oblique >
    chomeur.

I show that the hierarchies in (12) and (13) taken together with some constraints on Halkomelem structure account for the non-occurrence of clauses which would otherwise be predicted to be possible.⁶
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The following sections provide evidence for the view that Halkomelem is making use of the hierarchies in (12) and (13) in its clausal organization. Unlike the Southern Tiwa case given above, a single clause type does not suffice to establish the Halkomelem hierarchy. Rather a variety of constructions must be examined to motivate a person/animacy/noun type hierarchy for Halkomelem. Working from bottom to top on the hierarchy in (12), I give evidence in sections 2 and 3 that animate nominals outrank inanimate ones. Section 4 shows that animate common nominals outrank proper and inanimate ones. Section 5 argues that 1st and 2nd persons outrank 3rd persons. Section 6 shows that 2nd person outranks 1st person in Halkomelem. Finally, Section 7 gives the overall picture of Halkomelem clausal organization which results from this discussion.

2. ADVANCEMENTS TO OBJECT. The first evidence that animate nominals outrank inanimate nominals comes from clauses involving advancements to object. In such clauses, a nominal which is semantically the recipient, benefactive, causal, or directional appears as the object, as exemplified in (14)-(17) respectively.\(^7\)

(14) \(ni\ \ ?am-\theta-s-t-\theta\ \ k\wedge\theta\ \ sw\wedge\theta\les\ \ ?\ \ k\wedge\theta\ \ puk\wedge\theta\)
   aux give-adv-tr-3erg det boy obl det book
   'He gave the boy the book.'

(15) \(ni\ \ cen\ \ ?il\wedge\theta-g-e\theta-t\ \ \theta\ \ ne-\theta-m\wedge\theta\ \ \theta\ \ k\wedge\theta\ \ q\wedge\theta-m\wedge\theta-y\wedge\theta-s\wedge\theta\wedge\wedge\theta\wedge\wedge\theta\)
   aux lsub buy-adv-tr det lpos-child obl det shoe
   'I bought my daughter shoes.'

(16) \(ni\ \ \theta\wedge\theta\wedge\theta-ey\wedge\theta-k\wedge\theta-w\wedge\theta-me\wedge\theta^{-}\wedge\theta-t-\theta\wedge\theta\)
   aux startle -adv-tr-3erg det dog
   'He was startled at the dog.'

(17) \(ni\ \ ya\ \ -\wedge\theta-e\wedge\theta-w\wedge\theta-s\wedge\theta^{-}\wedge\theta-s\wedge\theta\ \ \wedge\theta\ \ si\wedge\theta-ne\wedge\theta?\)
   aux ser-come -adv -tr-3erg det woman
   'He's coming toward the woman.'

While in principle it is possible to have a causal (the indirect cause of a state of mind or experience) as either a final oblique or a final object (in an oblique-to-object advancement clause), in practice oblique causals tend to be inanimate while object causals tend to be animate, as seen in (18)-(21).
(18) ni cən siʔsiʔ ʔə kʷθə tintin
aux lsub frighten obl det bell
'I was frightened of the bell.'

(19) ?*ni cən siʔsiʔ-меʔ-ʔ kʷθə tintin
aux lsub frighten-adv-tr det bell
'I was frightened of the bell.'

(20) ??ni cən siʔsiʔ ʔə kʷθə spəpəqʷiʔ'eʔ
aux lsub frighten obl det screech owl
'I was frightened of the screech owl.'

(21) ni cən siʔsiʔ- меʔ-ʔ kʷθə spəpəqʷiʔ'eʔ
aux lsub frighten-adv-tr det screech owl
'I was frightened of the screech owl.'

The same generalization holds for directionals; inanimate directionals are expressed as obliques while animate directionals are expressed as objects in a directional-to-object advancement construction; the latter is signalled by the verbal suffix -n-.

(22) ni nemʔ ʔə kʷθə staʔluʔ
aux go obl det river
'He went to the river.'

(23) *ni nəʔem-n-əs-əs kʷθə staʔluʔ
aux go -adv-tr-3erg det river
'He went to the river.'

(24) ?? ni nemʔ ʔə-ʔ John
aux go obl-det John
'He went up to John.'

(24) ni nəʔem n-əs-əs kʷθə John
aux go -adv-tr-3erg det John
'He went up to John.'

Given the assumption that objects are higher on a hierarchy of grammatical relations than obliques (including causals and directionals), then an explanation for the above distributions can be given. A nominal must be of sufficient rank before it can advance to object; animates, but not inanimates meet this condition, therefore animates must be of a higher rank than inanimates.
This observation provides an explanation for why indirect object-to-object and benefactive-to-object advancement appear to be obligatory in Halkomelem; that is, there are no clauses such as (26) and (27) which do not involve advancement which correspond to the object advancement clauses in (14) and (15) above.

(26) *ni ?am-ǝt-as kʷǝǝ puḵʷ (?ǝ) kʷǝǝ swi̱w̱ɬ̱es
    aux give-tr-3erg det book (obl) det boy
    'He gave the book to the boy.'

(27) *ni ǝn ʔilǝg-ǝt kʷǝǝ ɡʷ̱ṯeʔ̱̱̱n? (?ǝ) ʔǝ ɂǝ-ʔǝnʔǝ
    aux lsbj buy- tr det shoe (obl) det lpos-child
    'I bought shoes for my daughter.'

In (26) and (27), an animate oblique nominal would occupy a lower position than would the inanimate object nominal on the grammatical relation hierarchy in (13). If, however, the clause involves indirect object or benefactive advancement, at the final level of structure the animate object would outrank the inanimate chomeur on the hierarchy in (13). Thus, the nominal hierarchy in (12) and the grammatical relation hierarchy in (13) conspire to prohibit final structures such as (26) and (27).

3. ANTIPASSIVES. Data from antipassives provide a second argument for distinguishing inanimate from animate nominals in Halkomelem. Antipassives are finally intransitive clauses due to the demotion of the notional object to chomeur; hence it appears in the oblique case, as illustrated in (28) and (29).

(28) ni ǝn ɡʷ̱eʔ -ǝm ʔǝ kʷǝǝ sce.ɬtem
    aux lsub cook -intr obl det salmon
    'I cooked the salmon.'

(29) ni ɬǝn-ʔ̱em kʷǝǝ swǝ̱g̱eʔ̱e? ʔǝ kʷǝǝ ǝgweθ̱
    aux plant-intr det man obl det potato
    'The man planted the potatoes.'

In the antipassives above the oblique marked nominal is inanimate. In contrast, antipassives are not possible when an animate nominal is involved, as seen in the antipassives in (31) and (33).
This contrast provides evidence for distinguishing animates from inanimates in Halkomelem. Furthermore, such a condition indicates that animates are ranked higher than inanimates. If only lower ranked - and not higher ranked - nominals are subject to demotion, then inanimates are ranked lower than animates since the latter, but not the former, can be demoted in an antipassive.

By comparing the generalization concerning advancements to object and anti-passive, we see that animates — but not inanimates — allow advancement, while inanimates — but not animates — allow demotion. The higher ranked nominal seems to be preferring the higher grammatical relation and vice versa.

4. AN ERGATIVE CONSTRAINT. In Halkomelem, it is possible to have an inanimate nominal as final subject in an intransitive clause, for example, in (34) and (35):

(34) \( ni \ g'\w^\text{a}l \ k^\text{t}\Theta e \ sc\text{e}.\text{t}an \)
aux bake det salmon
'The salmon baked.'

(35) \( ni \ k^\text{t}\Theta e \ ti \)
aux spill det tea
'The tea spilt.'

However, an inanimate nominal cannot serve as the subject in a transitive clause, as (36) and (37) show.
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(36) *ni q'wagʷ-ot-əs tθə sment tθə le?ləm?  
  aux hit -tr-3erg det rock det house  
  'The rock hit the house.'

(37) *ni əθə-ə-əs kʷəə spəhəls  
  aux push-tr+obj-3erg det wind  
  'The wind pushed me.'

This contrast leads to the following constraint:

(38) Inanimate nominals cannot be ergatives.

The same condition holds for proper nouns; while proper nouns can be subjects of intransitive clauses, e.g. (39) and (40), they do not appear as subjects in transitive clauses, e.g. (41) and (42).⁸

(39) ni t'ɪləm kʷəə Arnold  
  aux sing det Arnold  
  'Arnold sang.'

(40) ni q'ay tə Mary  
  aux die det Mary  
  'Mary died.'

(41) *ni q'wəl-ət-əs tθə Bob tθə sce.ɪtən  
  aux cook -tr-3erg det Bob det salmon  
  'Bob cooked the salmon.'

(42) *ni ləm-əəamʔə-əs tə Mary  
  aux look at-tr+obj-3erg det Mary  
  'Mary looked at me.'

Thus, (38) can be expanded as follows:

(43) Inanimate or animate proper nominals cannot serve as ergatives.

Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that (43) is a surface constraint rather than a semantic condition in Halkomelem as there are several ways to circumvent constraint (43).

First, a notionally transitive clause can be presented as a passive, as in (44)-(45); in this case the inanimate nominal or the animate proper nominal is a final chomouer rather than a final ergative.

(44) ni q'wagʷ-ot-əs tθə le?ləm? ə tθə sment  
  aux hit -tr-intr det house obl det rock  
  'The house was hit by the rock.'
(44) ni q’waqʷ-ət-əs tʰə leʔləm? ?ə tʰə sment
aux hit -tr-intr det house obl det rock
'The house was hit by the rock.'

(45) ni q’wəl-ət-əm ?ə-ʔ kə Bob tʰə sce,šən
aux cook -tr-intr obl-det Bob det salmon
'The salmon was cooked by Bob.'

Secondly, if the clause can be made finally intransitive by means of anti-passive (this is possible only if the object is inanimate; see section 2 above), then animate proper nominals are allowed, as in (46) and (47).

(46) ni q’wəl-əm tʰə Bob ?ə tʰə sce,šən
aux cook -intr det Bob obl det salmon
'Bob cooked the salmon.'

(47) ni panʔ-əm kʷəs Arnold ?ə kʷəs sgewə
aux plant-intr det Arnold obl det potato
'Arnold planted the potatoes.'

Finally, the nominal can be presented as a head of a cleft or pseudo-cleft, as exemplified in (48)-(49).

(48) ni tʰə sment ni q’waqʷ-ət tʰə leʔləm?
3emph det rock aux hit -tr det house
'It's the rock that hit the house.'

(49) ni tʰə Bob ni q’wəl-ət tʰə sce,šən
3emph det Bob aux cook -tr det salmon
'It's Bob who cooked the salmon.'

These data show that constraint (43) is circumvented as long as the last relation of the nominal is not an ergative; in the cleft of psuedo-cleft examples, although the nominal is the final ergative in the embedded clause, the last relation the nominal has in the entire sentence is head of the cleft or the psuedo-cleft. If we consider the surface relation of a nominal to be the very last relation that it holds, the nominal is a final but not a surface ergative. Thus constraint (43) can be restated as follows:

(50) An inanimate nominal or an animate proper nominal cannot serve as a surface ergative.
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What explanation can be offered for the fact that inanimate and animate proper nominals cannot serve as surface ergatives while other nominals, such as the animate common nominals and the 1st and 2nd person nominals can? If we place 3rd person proper nominals lower on the hierarchy in (12) than 3rd person common and 1st and 2nd person nominals, and if we place ergatives higher than absolutive subjects in the hierarchy in (13), then an explanation is possible. Since ergative is the highest position on the grammatical relations hierarchy, only nominals of higher rank serve as ergatives. Inanimates and 3rd person proper nouns, because they are lower ranked nominals, cannot serve as ergatives.

5. A CHOMEUR BAN. Thus far we have seen that inanimate nominals are distinguished from animates and that, furthermore, 3rd person proper nominals are distinguished from 3rd person common nominals, as well as 1st and 2nd person nominals. In this section, it is shown that 1st and 2nd person nominals can be distinguished from all others because they cannot serve as chomeurs in passive clauses.

As seen in (2), (44), and (45) above, 3rd person inanimate, animate common, and animate proper nominals can appear as chomeurs in passives. In contrast, 1st and 2nd person nominals cannot appear as chomeurs, as seen in (51b)-(52b), the passive counterparts of (51a)-(52a).

(51) a. ni con q’wel-et kwòe sce.iten
   aux 1sub cook -tr det salmon
   'I cooked the salmon.'

   b. *ni q’wel-et-am ?e-k’ re.nòe kwòe sce.iten
   aux cook -tr-intr obl-det lemp det salmon
   'The salmon was cooked by me.'

(52) a. ni ñe lem -et îe sïeni?
   aux 2sub look at-tr det woman
   'You looked at the woman.'

   b. *ni lem-et-am îe sïeni? ?e-k’ nêwê
   aux look at -tr-intr det woman obl-det lemp
   'The woman was looked at by you.'
If we assume that 1st and 2nd persons outrank 3rd person nominal, and further, that chomeur is a low ranked position on the hierarchy of grammatical relations, then the ban on 1st and 2nd person chomeurs would follow from the strategy of keeping high ranked nominals in the higher grammatical relations.

In comparing the chomeur ban to the ergative constraint in the preceding section, it is interesting to note that three types of nominals are allowed to be ergatives: 1st persons, 2nd persons, and 3rd person common nominals. Three types of nominals are allowed as chomeurs in passives: 3rd person common nominals, 3rd person proper nominals, and 3rd person inanimates.

Notably, since 3rd person common nominals can appear as either ergatives or chomeurs, active/passive pairs, such as (53)-(54) are possible.

(53) ni lem-ət-əs  is  steni?  kʷəe  swəŋ?qe?
    aux look at -tr-3erg det woman det man
    'The woman looked at the man.'

(54) ni lem-ət-əm  kʷəe  swəŋ?qe?  te  steni?
    aux look at -tr-intr det man obl det woman
    'The man was looked at by the woman.'

6. A TRANSITIVE CONSTRAINT. In the preceding section, 1st and 2nd person nominals were posited to be of a higher rank than 3rd person nominals. In this section, it is argued that of these two types of nominals, 2nd person outranks 1st person.

As mentioned above, only 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person common nominals can serve as subjects in a transitive clause. However, not all subject/object combinations involving these nominals are possible. It is possible to have a 1st person subject with either a 2nd person or 3rd person object, as seen in (55) and (56).

(55) ni  cən  ǵʷaqʷ-əəmə
    aux 1sub  club -tr+2obj
    'I clubbed you.'

(56) ni  cən  ǵʷaqʷ-ət  kʷəe  Bob
    aux 1sub  club -tr det Bob
    'I clubbed Bob.'
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It is also possible to have a 2nd person subject with either a 1st or 3rd person object, as (57) and (58) show.

(57) \( ni \ \z\ q'waq'w-\thetaa\alpha m?\z\)
    aux 2sub club -tr+ obj
    'You clubbed me.'

(58) \( ni \ \z\ q'waq'w-\et k\\w\Theta e \ Bob \)
    aux 2sub club -tr det Bob
    'You clubbed Bob.'

Also, it is possible to have a 3rd person subject with a 1st person object, as shown in (59):

(59) \( ni \ q'waq'w-\thetaa\alpha m?\z-\es \)
    aux club -tr+1obj-3erg
    'He clubbed me.'

However, a transitive clause with a 3rd person subject and a 2nd person object is not permitted:

(60) \( *ni \ lam-\Thetaa m-\es \ to \ sten?i \)
    aux look at-tr+2obj-3erg det woman
    'The woman looked at you.'

(61) \( *ni \ q'waq'w-\Thetaa m-\es \)
    aux club -tr+2obj-3erg
    'He clubbed you.'

(62) \( *ni \ q'waq'w-\et al-\es \)
    aux club -tr+2p1obj-3erg
    'He clubbed you pl.'

As was the case with other disallowed transitive clauses (discussed in section 3), the prohibition of 3rd person subject with 2nd person object can be circumvented by various devices. First, passive can be used, as seen in (63) and (64).

(63) \( ni \ lam-\Thetaa.m \ to \ sten?i \)
    aux look at-tr+2obj+intr obl det woman
    'You were looked at by the woman.'

(64) \( ni \ q'waq'w-\et a\Thetae m \ to \ k\w\Theta e \ swe\gamma qe? \)
    aux club -tr+2p1obj+intr obl det man
    'You pl. were clubbed by the man.'
Second, the third person nominal can serve as the head of a cleft or a pseudo-cleft, as in (65) and (66).

(65)  nii?  ṭə sleni?  ni  ləme-qəqəme
     3emph  det  woman  aux  look  at-tr+2obj
     'It's the woman who looked at you.'

(66)  nii?  kʷəqə swəqəgə?  ni  qʷəqʷə-əqəle
     3emph  det  man  aux  club  -tr+2plobj
     'It's the man who clubbed you pl.'

The latter data show that like the ergative constraint stated in (45) above, the ban on third person subjects with second person objects must be stated as a surface constraint. In (65) and (66), the last grammatical relation that the 3rd person nominal has is head; thus although the nominal is a final subject (in a clause with a 2nd person object) it is not the surface subject. Thus, clauses like (65) and (66) are allowed.

A hierarchy of nominals together with the hierarchy of grammatical relations assumed can account for why transitive clauses with 1st person subject and 2nd person objects or clauses with 3rd person subject and 1st person objects are allowed while clauses with 3rd person subjects and 2nd person objects are prohibited. If we posit that 2nd person outranks 1st person in the nominal hierarchy of Halkomelem, and furthermore, that an object must not outrank its subject by more than one step on the hierarchy, then the correct pattern of transitive clauses is predicted. A transitive clause with a 3rd person subject and a 2nd person object is prohibited because 2nd persons are two steps higher in the nominal hierarchy than 3rd persons, as seen in the graphic summary in (67).

(67)  

```
          object  
          |     \  
          |      \  
          |       \  
          |        \  
          1st person  3rd person
          |     /  
          |    /  
          |   /  
          |  /  
          2nd person
          |     /  
          |   /  
          |  /  
          |/  
          object
```

object  

o.k.  subject

object  

o.k.  subject
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7. CONCLUSION. The sections above offer an explanation for the non-occurrence of many clausal types which, given the morphological and syntactic characteristics of the language, would seem to be possible. A number of restrictions on clause structure, repeated in (68), were given.

(68) a. 1st and 2nd persons cannot be chomeurs in passives.
    b. 3rd persons cannot be ergatives in the presence of a 2nd person object.
    c. 3rd person proper nouns and inanimates cannot be ergatives.
    d. Animates cannot be chomeurs in antipassive.
    e. Animates tend to advance to object but inanimates tend not to.

I have argued that the above restrictions are best formulated as surface constraints; e.g., the ban against proper noun ergatives can be circumvented in a variety of ways - via passive, antipassive, or extraction - depending on other restrictions that may apply.

These surface constraints are not isolated phenomena but reflect the organization of Halkomelem by means of the semantic hierarchy in (69).

(69) 2nd > 1st > 3rd animate common > 3rd proper > inanimate.

It is seen that high ranked nominals prefer to appear as subjects and objects not as obliques and chomeurs, while lower ranked nominals are not allowed to appear as ergatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
<th>ANTIPASSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>chomeur</td>
<td>chomeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>* A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>* A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3p</td>
<td>* A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3i</td>
<td>* A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: 1 = 1st person  c = common
      2 = 2nd person  p = plural
      3 = 3rd person  l = inanimate
      A = acceptable  * = not acceptable

The surface constraints play a major role in the organization of Halkomelem grammar. I have summarized the clausal pattern and the restrictions on them in Table 1. The overall result is that there are more types of clauses that are avoided than are allowed in Halkomelem. A greatly simplified clausal organization is thus achieved.
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NOTES

1. The Halkomelem data are from Arnold Guerin, Musqueam Reserve, Vancouver, B.C. Guerin was a speaker of the Island dialect of Halkomelem. My research was supported by the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund and the National Museum of Man, Ottawa. I thank Arnold Guerin and also Wayne Suttles and M. Dale Kinkade for discussing the claims made in this paper with me, though, of course, errors in data or analysis are my own responsibility.

The paper was presented at the 82nd Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association held in Chicago in 1983.

The following abbreviations are used for glossing the Halkomelem data:

- **adv**: advancement suffix
- **aux**: auxiliary
- **det**: determiner
- **emph**: emphatic pronouns
- **erg**: ergative
- **intr**: intransitive
- **obj**: object
- **obl**: oblique
- **pl**: plural
- **pos**: possessive
- **ser**: serial
- **sub**: subject
- **tr**: transitive
- **1,2,3**: first, second, and third person
2. Given that several possible paraphrases exist for many clauses, why is one and not another chosen? The answer to this question, of course, requires a systemic look at Halkomelem texts and natural discourse to link cognitive factors to grammatical usage.

3. Verbs in passives have several features which distinguish them from transitive clauses. First, while verbs in active clauses have a transitive suffix, verbs in passive clauses have a transitive suffix followed by an intransitive suffix -əm (in main clauses); Gerdts (1981) gives a rule for transitive marking which accounts for its appearance on both finally transitive and passive clauses. Second, while active clauses have agreement with a third-person subject (3erg), passive clauses lack agreement.

In an antipassive, there is no transitive suffix on the verb, rather there is one of several intransitive suffixes: {∅, -əm (intransitive), or -als (activity). The patient in an antipassive is in the oblique case. Furthermore, the agent, although it is a third person subject, does not cue verbal agreement (3erg). These properties of antipassives follow from an analysis that posits that the antipassive is finally intransitive. The patient nominal, although it is an initial object, is demoted to object-chomeur at final level. Thus, the final structure of the clause, since it has a subject not no object, is intransitive.

4. Silverstein (1976) posits the following hierarchy to be universally available: 1st person > 2nd person > 3rd proper > 3rd animate > 3rd inanimate.

The hierarchy which I posit for Halkomelem differs in two respects. First, second person outranks first person, and third animate common outranks third proper.

5. The relational hierarchy generally assumed is: subject > object > indirect object > obliques. The hierarchy I posit here differs in three non-controversial respects. First, ergatives (that is, subjects in transitive clauses) outrank other subjects. Second, I have differentiated obliques and chomeurs; this is seen to be necessary in Halkomelem since pronominals can serve as obliques but not as chomeurs. Finally,
no reference need be made to indirect objects since Halkomelem does not make use of this relation in final structure.

6. The constraints given in sections 5 and 6 have been discussed for Halkomelem and other Coast Salish languages; see Jelinek and Demers (1983) and references therein. However, this work differs from previous discussions in that it posits that the constraints are not random phenomena but are consistent with an overall pattern of clausal organization captured by the hierarchy proposed here.

7. Gerdts (1981) argues for an advancement analysis: the relevant nominals are indirect objects or obliques at the initial level of structure which advance to objects at a later level; if there is an object at initial level (e.g., the patients in (14) and (15)), it is a chômeur and appears with the oblique preposition ?ə.

8. It is clear that there is variation among Halkomelem speakers with respect to the strength of this constraint.

9. That several means of circumventing this constraint are possible gives evidence that a constraint is more appropriate treatment than one which stipulates obligatory passive in these cases. The latter analysis has been given by Jelinek and Demers and others cited therein.