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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>act</td>
<td>activity suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv</td>
<td>advancement suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont</td>
<td>continuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph</td>
<td>emphatic pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erg</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ink</td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl</td>
<td>oblique marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>possessive affix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ser</td>
<td>serial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssub</td>
<td>subordinate clause subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Halkomelem is one of the better explored Coast Salish languages; several M.A. Theses and Ph.D. Dissertations (Galloway 1977, Leslie 1979, Gerds 1981) many articles, and a reference grammar (Suttles (to appear)) have explored various aspects of this language. That so much information is available concerning Halkomelem makes the writing of this report somewhat of a challenge, since my goal is to say something new and interesting about Halkomelem but at the same time something general enough to be understood by the larger linguistic community.

Much of my work on Halkomelem has been cast in the framework of Relational Grammar; many theoretical aspects of Halkomelem syntax were examined in my Ph.D. Dissertation (Gerds, 1981). In this report, however, since I have a more general audience in mind, I back away from the issues and formalisms of Relational Grammar and present some aspects of Halkomelem that I consider to be essential in its clausal organization. These principles of organization, which became clear to me because of the Relational approach I was using, were nevertheless relegated to a minor role in syntactically-oriented discussions. The purpose of this report is to elucidate the principles of Halkomelem structure by pulling together the segments of the grammar that are organized by them.

Most research on Halkomelem has focused on possible constructions. In contrast, this work discusses constructions, which given the general principles morphology and syntax of the language should be a priori possible but which nevertheless do not occur. Taken from this point of view, Halkomelem grammar clearly utilizes transitivity as a major organizational device. I show a number of constructions which have conditions placed upon them which refer to transitivity.

For example, in main clauses, subjects of transitives (i.e., ergatives) but not subjects of intransitives determine 3rd person agreement. Absolutes (i.e., objects of transitives and subjects of intransitives) are accessible to more constructions than are ergatives, e.g. One-Nominal Interpretation, Quantifier Interpretation, and Possessor Extraction. Furthermore, ergative is considered a special position in a clause as demonstrated by restrictions in terms of semantic features as to what kind of nominal can serve as an ergative.

Conditions like the above are shown to operate at the final or surface level of structure. Thus, they can be circumvented by constructions such as Antipassive or Cleaving which realign the final or surface transitivity of the clause.
Intransitivity is also briefly discussed here. In particular a syntactic view of intransitivity—the Unaccusative Hypothesis—ia shown to be inadequate as a means of classification. Lexico-semantic features such as State and Process are shown to play a role in the organization of intransitive verb classes.

Chapter 1 gives a summary of the basic constructions of Halkomelem. The phonology, morphology, and syntax of the Island dialect of Halkomelem is briefly introduced with a particular emphasis on the interaction of morphology and syntax.

Chapter 2 discusses Ergativity. Various phenomena which reference the Ergative/Absolutive distinction are described. Constructions which have the side-effect of realigning Ergativity in the clause are discussed.

Chapter 3 elucidates the role that Person and Animacy play in clausal organization. It is claimed that a hierarchy referencing person, animacy, and nominal type organizes clausal structure and accounts for the unacceptability of some otherwise expected clauses.

Chapter 4 shows the importance of semantics in the organization of derivational morphology. The co-occurrence of intransitive verbs with various affixes depends upon the categories Action, Process, and State.

Chapter 5, the conclusion, summarizes the results of this exploration into the organizational principles of Halkomelem clauses.
CHAPTER ONE
HALKOMELEM BASICS

Halkomelem, a Salish language, is spoken in southwestern British Columbia (from Malahat to NanOOSE on Vancouver Island and from Vancouver 105 miles up the Fraser River to a point north of Yale) and in northern Washington state in the vicinity of Demming. As discussed in Elmendorf and Suttles (1960) and Gerdts (1977), there are three major dialects of Halkomelem—Island, Downriver, and Upriver—which exhibit phonological and lexical differences. The data discussed here are largely from Arnold Guerin, a speaker of Island Dialect (Kuper Island) presently residing at the Musqueam Reserve in Vancouver, British Columbia.

At present only a couple hundred speakers—mostly 60 years of age or older—speak Halkomelem. There are several language projects involved in teaching Halkomelem, but nevertheless children and young adults, in general, do not speak the language.

Halkomelem shares some, but not all, of the properties discussed here with other Central Coast Salish languages—Comox (Sliammon), Sechelt, Pentlatch, Squamish, Nooksack, Straits (Northern Straits: Songish, Sooke, Saanich, Lummi; Clallam), Lushootseed, and Twana. However, this study is not intended to be comparative; thus other dialects of Halkomelem and other Salish languages are not discussed, this topic being left for future research.

1. PHONOLOGY

The consonant and vowel phonemes of Island Halkomelem are given in Table I. The symbols used here are standard for representing northwest languages with a few exceptions: /χ/ rather than /γ/ or /χ/ is used for the uvular fricative and /θ/ rather than /tθ/ for the glottalized dental affricate. Glottalized resonants are represented with /ʔ/ rather than /j/.

As can be seen in Table I, Halkomelem, like other Coast Salish languages, has a distinction between velar and uvular stops and fricatives, between plain and labialized velars and uvulars, and between plain and glottalized stops and affricates. The phonemes /k/ and /k/ are marginal occurring in borrowings and baby talk. The non-glottalized affricate /tθ/ has a very limited occurrence; it is basically found in determiners, such as /tθq/ 'the (masc. visible).'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bilabial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>lateral</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labialized velar</th>
<th>uvular</th>
<th>labialized uvular</th>
<th>laryngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stop</td>
<td>p t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>k' q q' q''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottalized stop</td>
<td>p' t'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(k')</td>
<td>k'q q' q''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless affricate</td>
<td>tʰ c ʰ ʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottalized affricate</td>
<td>ʰ tʰ ʰ ʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless fricative</td>
<td>ʰ s ʰ s ʰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced resonants</td>
<td>m n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l y  w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottalized resonants</td>
<td>m? n?  l? y? w?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSONANTS**

\[i \quad u\]

\[e \quad æ \quad \text{(.) = length}\]

\[a\]

**VOWELS**

**TABLE I. PHONEMIC INVENTORY**
2. BASIC INTRANSITIVE AND TRANSITIVE CLAUSES

The clauses in (1)-(4) are examples of basic intransitive and transitive clauses.

(1) ni con ?imoš
    aux lsub walk
    'I walked.'

(2) ni cam kʰoʰ nikʷʔoʰ kʰoʰ sment
    aux go up det uncle obl det mountain
    'Uncle went up into the mountains.'

(3) ni con tìc'-ot kʰoʰ suplíl
    aux lsub cut-tr det bread
    'I cut the bread.'

(4) ni qʷol-ot-es ʔoʰ steníʔ tʰo sce.ʔten
    aux bake-tr-3erg det woman det salmon
    'The woman baked the salmon.'

As can be seen in these clauses, the word order in Halkomelem is basically VSO (verb subject object others); the verbal complex consisting of auxiliaries, subject clitics (in second position), various particles, the verb (including derivational morphology, objective suffixes, and the 3rd person agreement suffix [3erg1]) precedes the other elements in the clause.

There is a basic difference between verbs in intransitive and transitive clauses; the latter require a suffix which overtly marks transitivity (cf. -t in (3) and (4). The various transitive suffixes, their uses, and their syntactic restrictions are discussed in Chapter 4. The semantics and some of the morphological aspects of intransitive verbs are also discussed in Chapter 4. Intransitive and transitive clauses differ in another respect; while 3rd person subjects determine agreement in transitive clauses, e.g. 3erg in (4) above, they do not determine agreement in intransitive clauses, e.g. in (2) above. This difference can be captured in terms of Ergativity; 3rd person agreement and other phenomena which reference Ergativity are discussed in Chapter 2. There are some constraints on final transitivity in Halkomelem; these are discussed in Chapter 3.

As seen in the examples above, oblique nominals, e.g. the directional in (2), are preceded by the preposition ?o, which
is the general purpose preposition in Halkomelem; in contrast, subject and object nominals are not preceded by prepositions nor do they mark case in any fashion.

3. ADVANCEMENTS TO OBJECT

In the transitive clauses above, the semantic agent is the subject while the semantic patient is the object. In clauses involving Advancements to object, a nominal which is semantically the recipient, benefactive, causal, or directional appears as the object, as exemplified in (5)-(8) respectively.


'He gave the boy the book.'

(6) ni can ?ilaq-éìc-ot 0o no-men?o ?o kwó qwíoy?sen?
aux lsub buy-adv-tr det lpos-child obl det det shoe

'I bought my daughter shoes.'

(7) ni 0'eyk'w-mé?-t-es kwó sqwoméy?
aux startle-adv-tr-3erg det dog

'He was startled at the dog.'

(8) ?i yo-e?wó?-n-os-os 0o sieni?
aux ser-come-adv-tr-3erg det woman

'He's coming toward the woman.'

Gerdtz (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 (5) and (6)) it is a chomeur (French for 'unemployed') at the final level of the Advancement clause--specifically an object-chomeur since its prior relation is object--and appears with the oblique preposition.

Various verbal morphology is associated with indirect object or oblique Advancement to object; this morphology is partially determined by semantics and partially by the initial intransitivity of the clause. Table II gives the Advancement marking suffixes with examples of the sort of verbs they are attached to.
(a)  ?eʔəm  'give'  
    xʷayəm  'sell'  
    ?am-ös-t  'give it to him/her'
    xʷayəm-ös-t  'sell it to him/her'
    ?iw-ös-t  'show it to him/her'
    yəʔ-ös-t  'tell him/her about it'

(b)  q'wəl-ət  'bake it'  
    ʔəy-t  'fix it'
    ʔəy-ət  'fix it for him/her'
    ʔəlʔ-ət  'write it'
    ʔəlʔ-ət  'write it for/to him/her'

(c)  əciws  'tired'  
    q'elʔ  'believe'
    siwəl  'sense'
    siʔsiʔ  'afraid'
    əciws-méʔ-ət  'tired of him/her'
    q'elʔ-méʔ-ət  'believe him/her'
    siwəl-méʔ-ət  'sense him/her'
    siʔsiʔ-méʔ-ət  'afraid of him/her'

(d)  ?əmʔiʔ  'come'
    nemʔ  'go'
    ?əmʔiʔ-n-s  'come to him/her'
    naʔem-nəs  'go to him/her'

---

**TABLE II. ADVANCEMENT SUFFIXES**
In general, indirect object Advancement is marked by the verbal suffix -sənə, benefactive Advancement by -dəcə, causal Advancement by -dəmə, and directional Advancement by -nə; the directional suffix is odd in that, unlike the other suffixes it is not followed by -ə (transitive) but rather what I suppose to be an -ə transitive suffix.

The suffix -mə can also be used in cases of benefactive Advancement, e.g. (10):

(10)   ni kʷukʷ-মeʔ-əmʔəʔsə-əs
       aux cook-adv-tr-lobj-3erg

'He cooked for me.'

Apparently, initial transitivity conditions the choice of -mə vs. -dəcə in benefactive Advancement clauses as seen by contrasting (10) and (11); the former is used in initially intransitive clauses while the latter is used in initially transitive clauses.

(11)   ni qʷəl-eəc-əmʔəʔsə-əs kʷəθə səplíl
       aux bake-adv-tr-lobj-3erg det bread

'He baked the bread for me.'

Conditions on Advancements to object are discussed in Chapter 3.

4. PASSIVES

The Passive, as it appears in main clauses in Halkomelem, is illustrated in (12b)-(13b).

(12) a. ni c'ew-ət-əs əθə səleniʔə əθə swəʔqəʔ
daux help-tr-3erg det woman det man

'The woman helped the man.'

b. ni c'ew-ət-əm əθə swəʔqəʔəʔ əθə səleniʔə
aux help-tr-intr det man obl det woman

'The man was helped by the woman.'
(13) a. ni q'wal-ət-əs ò ọ ścieni? tə sce.ıtən
   aux bake-tr-3erg det woman det salmon

   'The woman baked the salmon.'

b. ni q'wal-ət-om ?ə ò ọ ścieni? tə sce.ıtən
   aux bake-tr-intr obl det woman det salmon

   'The salmon was baked by the woman.'

Verbs in Passives have several features which distinguish them from transitive clauses. First, while the (a) clauses above have a transitive suffix, the (b) 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 the (a) clauses have agreement with the 3rd person subject [3erg], the (b) clauses lack agreement.

Gerdts (1981) presents evidence for an advancement analysis of Halkomelem Passives. At the pre-Passive level of structure, the clause is transitive; the object advances to subject, causing the pre-Passive subject to be a chomeur-- referred to here as a Passive chomeur. In Halkomelem, Passive chomeurs are marked with the oblique preposition òa._. There are limitations on Passive chomeurs, as discussed in Chapter 3.

It is not entirely clear to me what determines word order in Passives; in some cases the final subject precedes the chomeur as in (12) but in other examples the chomeur precedes the subject as in (13). The relative status of the nominals does seem to be a factor. Thus (13) is judged to be more normal than (14) below because ścieni?-- 'woman' has a higher status than sce.ıtən 'salmon'.

(14) ?? ni q'wal-ət-əm tə sce.ıtən ò ọ ọ ścieni?
   aux bake-tr-intr det salmon obl det woman

   'The salmon was baked by the woman.'

5. ANTI-PASSIVES

In the section above, transitive clauses used to express the action of an 'agent' on a 'patient', such as (15a)-(17a) were presented; a second construction used to express these relations is discussed here--the Antipassive, as illustrated in (15b)-(17b).
(15)  a. ni qaʔqaʔ-t-æs tæ stëniʔ kʷʔə qə?
    aux drink-tr-3erg det woman det water

    'The woman drank the water.'

   b. ni qaʔqaʔ tæ stëniʔ o kʷʔə qə?
    aux drink det woman obl det water

    'The woman drank the water.'

(16)  a. ni cən qʷəl-øt tθ ə səpl’il
    aux lsub bake-tr det bread

    'I baked the bread.'

   b. ni cən qʷəl-əm o tθ ə səpl’il
    aux lsub bake-intr obl det bread

    'I baked the bread.'

(17) a. ni kʷtæ-t-æs kʷə qə?
    aux pour-tr-3erg det water

    'He poured the water.'

   b. ni kʷtæ-ls o kʷə qə?
    aux pour-act obl det water

    'He poured the water.'

In an Antipassive, there is no transitive suffix on the verb, rather there is one of several intransitive suffixes: Ø,
-æm (intransitive) or -els (activity). The 'patient' in an Antipassive is in the oblique case. Furthermore, the 'agent',
although it is a 3rd 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 but no
object, is intransitive.

Further evidence for the final intransitivity of Antipassives is given in Chapter 2. A constraint on Antipassives is discussed in Chapter 3.
6. EXTRACTIONS

This section discusses constructions involving Extraction in Halkomelem. In section 6.1., I illustrate four constructions involving Extraction—relative clauses, cleft sentences, pseudo-cleft sentences, and WH-questions. In section 6.2., I give examples of Extraction involving subjects, objects, obliques, and chomeurs.


In relative clauses, a head (underlined) is modified by an embedded clause (in brackets), as illustrated in (18b)-(19b).

(18) a. ni ?imeš te steni?
    aux walk det woman
    'The woman walked.'

    b. stote-stəxʷ con te steni? [ ni ?imeš ]
       know-cs lsub det woman det walk
    'I know the woman who walked.'

(19) a. ni t'iloq tə swayqge?
    aux sing det man
    'The man sang.'

    b. ni con lem-at tə swayqge? [ ni t'iloq ]
       aux lsub see-tr det man det sing
    'I saw the man who sang.'

In the above examples, the head nominal was preceded by a determiner. However, a nominal head is not necessary as seen in (20).

(20) stote-stəxʷ-əs kəqə [ ni t'iloq ]
    know-cs-3erg det aux sing
    'He knows the one who sang.'

In (20) there is simply a determiner which conveys information concerning the gender, number, and proximity of the nominal referred to.

Cleft sentences, illustrated in (21)-(22) consist of the 3rd person emphatic pronoun niʔ followed by a nominal plus relative clause construction.
(21) nii t♂ sò̞niʔ [ni t'ilām]
    3emph det woman aux sing
      'It's the woman who sang.'

(22) nii kʷθə swọ̀ʔqeʔ [ni qʷal]
    3emph det man aux speak
      'It's the man who spoke.'

The structure I posit for cleft sentences involves the emphatic pronoun as predicate and the nominal modified by a clause as the subject.

I posit a similar structure for pseudo-cleft sentences, exemplified in (23) and (24).

(23) sò̞niʔ iə [ni t'ilām]
    woman det aux sing
      'The woman is the one who sang.'

(24) swiwiʔles kʷθə [ni qʷal]
    boy det aux speak
      'The boy is the one who spoke.'

The first nominal, which appears without a determiner, is the predicate, and is followed by a relative clause of the structure illustrated in (20) above.

A common construction, which I assume to be a type of pseudo-cleft, has as its predicate an emphatic pronoun which is not followed by a determiner, as seen in (25) and (26).

(25) ?e.nʔθə [ni t'ilām]
    lemph aux sing
      'I am the one who sang.'

(26) nəʔ [ni kʷon-ʔt]
    2emph aux grab-tr
      'You are the one who grabbed it.'

WH-questions, illustrated in (27)-(28), parallel pseudo-cleft structures.
(27) wet k'wə [ ni ?imeʃ ]
who det aux walk

'Who walked?'

(28) stem k'wə [ ni lək'w ]
what det aux break

'What broke?'

The WH-pronoun is the predicate, appearing in initial position, and is followed by a relative clause usually introduced by the hypothetical determiner k'wə.

6.2. Conditions on Extraction.

In the above examples, the extracted nominal bears the grammatical relation of subject in the embedded clause. Extraction of objects is also allowed, as (29)-(32) show.

(29) statel-storv č iə steni? [ ni ləm-et-ʔé.n? ]
know-cs 2sub det woman aux look at-tr-lssub

'You know the woman that I looked at.'

(30) niʃ k'wə swiən'les [ ni k'wə̃n-et-ʔé.n? ]
3emph det boy aux grab-tr-lssub

'It's the boy that I grabbed.'

(31) sce.itan k'wə [ ni g'wəł-et-ʔé.n? ]
salmon det aux bake-tr-lssub

'Salmon is what I baked.'

(32) stem k'wə [ ni g'wəł-et-əxv ]
what det aux bake-tr-2ssub

'What did you bake?'

However, when the nominal which is extracted bears an oblique relation in the corresponding simple clause, the type of Extractions discussed above are not possible.
(33) a. ni ᶜič'-ṣt-š ʔε kʷθə ſəʔə̂tən
aux cut-tr-3erg obl det knife

'He cut it with the knife.'

b. *ʔə̂tən kʷθə [ ni ᶜič'-ṣt-š ]
knife det aux cut-tr-3ssub
(A knife is what he cut it with.)

(34) a. ni ṭciws ʔε kʷθə sqʷal
aux tired obl det talk

'He's tired of the talk.'

b. *stem kʷ [ ni ṭciws ]
what det aux tired
(What is he tired of?)

Thus, only subjects and objects extract in the fashion discussed above.

However, as Hukari (1977a) has pointed out, obliques can be extracted if the embedded clause is a nominalization. In (33)-(34), I give examples of plain clauses and their corresponding nominalizations.

(35) a. ni ʷcn qʷʷaqʷ-ṣt ʔε kʷθə ʔənʔ-šəpəl
aux lsueb club-tr obl det 2pos-shovel

'I hit him with your shove.'

b. ni ʷnə - ʔ - qʷʷaqʷ-ṣt kʷθə ʔənʔ- šəpəl
aux 1pos-nom-club-tr det 2pos-shovel

'Your shovel was my hitting him with.'

(36) a. yaʔ ʔu ye-ʔʷənʔəm̥ ʔə tənʔə ʔę̂ ə̂lalways lnk ser-run obl det road

'He always ran on that road.'

b. yaʔ ʔu š- ʔʷənʔəm-s tənʔə ʔę̂ ə̂lalways lnk nom-run-3pos det road

'This road was always his running on.'
Nominalizations can stand as complete sentences, as seen above. I assume, following Hukari (1977a), that the above nominalizations are predicate nominal constructions; that is, the nominal which corresponds to the obliques in the (a) sentences is the subject in the nominalization; the subject nominal in the (a) sentences is represented as the possessor in the nominalization. Furthermore, a distinctive feature of nominalizations is the presence of a nominalizing prefix, e.g. _šé_ above, which is used when instruments, locatives, or other obliques are the subject of the nominalization.

Returning to Extractions, obliques may be extracted, but only if the embedded clause is a nominalization, as in (37)-(38):

(37) nít kʷθo ʔən-ʔšapel ni no-šʔqʷəqʷ-oʔ 3emph det 2pos-shovel aux 1pos-nom-club-tr

'It's you shovel that i clubbed it with.'

(38) nít təna? še.ʔ yaθ ʔu š-ʔwančənom-s 3emph det road always 1nk nom-run-3pos

'It's this road that he always runs on.'

Object-chomeurs are also extracted in this manner. The object-chomeurs in the Advancement constructions in (5)-(6) and the Antipassive in (15)-(17) are extracted from nominalizations, evidenced by the expression of the subjects in the (a) sentences as a possessor in the (b) sentences.

(39) a. ni ʔam-əs-t-əs kʷθo swiʔləs ʔo kʷθo pukʷ aux give-adv-tr-3erg det boy obl det book

'He gave the boy the book.'

b. nít kʷθo pukʷ ni s-ʔam-əs-t-s kʷθo swiʔləs 3emph det book aux nom-give-adv-tr-3pos det boy

'It's a book that he gave the boy.'

(40) a. ni qʷol-əm ʔo šeníʔ? ʔo kʷθo əaplíʔ aux bake-intr det woman obl det bread

'The woman baked the bread.'

b. əaplíʔ kʷθo ni s-qʷol-əm-s ʔo šeníʔ? bread det aux nom-bake-intr-3pos det woman

'Bread is what the woman baked.'
In this case the nominalizer prefix s- appears in the embedded clause.

In contrast, passive-chomeurs cannot be extracted at all.

(41)  

a.  ni ləm-st-əm tθ speʔəθ ʔə θə sïeni?  
aux look at-tr-intr det bear obl det woman  
'The bear was looked at by the woman.'

b.  *niθ θə sïeni? ni (s-/š-) ləm-st-əm(-s) tθə speʔəθ  
3emph det woman aux nom look at-tr-intr-3pos det bear  
(It's the woman who the bear was looked at by.)

In summary, subjects and objects are directly extracted, obliques and object-chomeurs are extracted via nominalization, and passive-chomeurs can not be extracted. Extraction of possessors is discussed in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER TWO

ERGATIVE PHENOMENA IN HALKOMELEM

In grammars of Salish languages, the concepts subject and object have normally been considered adequate for discussing basic phenomena. However, I suggest in this chapter that the terms ergative and absolutive are also relevant to the grammar of Halkomelem. Four phenomena—3rd person agreement, one-nominal interpretation, quantifier interpretation, and possessor extraction—which make reference to the ergative/absolutive distinction are discussed here.

The following informal definitions are used in the discussion below:

(a) Transitive: a clause with both a subject and an object.
(b) Intransitive: a clause which is not transitive.
(c) Ergative: the subject of a transitive clause.
(d) Absolutive: the subject of an intransitive clause or the object of a transitive clause.

The relationship among these terms can be summarized in the following diagram:

1.

INTRANSITIVE:  \[\text{subject}\]

\[\text{ergative} \quad \text{subject} \quad \text{object}\]

\[\text{absolutive}\]

TRANSITIVE:  \[\text{subject}\]

In Halkomelem, verbs in transitive clauses are suffixed with one of a set of transitive markers. Throughout this chapter, transitive verbs are suffixed with -\(_t\), the marker of controlled transitivity. Transitive sentences are exemplified in (2)-(4).

(2) \(\text{ergative} \quad \text{absolutive}\)

\[\text{ni q"waq"-et-es} \quad \theta \text{ sway?qe?} \quad \theta \text{ sce.iton}\]

aux club-tr-erg det man det salmon

'The man clubbed the salmon.'
(3) ni kwon-ot-os kwΘe sway?qe? kwΘe swiw?los
aux grab-tr-3erg det man det boy
'The man grabbed the boy.'

(4) ni ?a.-t-os ie steni? kwΘe swiw?los
aux call-tr3erg det woman det boy
'The woman called the boy.'

The subjects of the above transitive sentences are ergatives while the objects are absolutes, as labelled above the nominals in (2).

Sentences (5)-(7) are examples of intransitive sentences:

(5) ni t'ilәm kwΘe sway?qe?
aux sing det man
'The man sang.'

(6) ni ?imoš ie steni?
aux walk det woman
'The woman walked.'

(7) ni q'al kwΘe swiw?los
aux speak det boy
'The boy spoke.'

The subject nominal is the absolutive, as labelled above the nominal in (5).

1. THIRD PERSON AGREEMENT

There is an important contrast between (2)-(4) and (5)-(7) above: while the predicates in (2)-(4) are suffixed with -s, the 3rd person agreement marker, the predicates in (5)-(7) are not. This suffix also occurs when the object is pronominal, as in (8)-(9):

(8) ni kwon-Θe-ám?s-os kwΘe sway?qe?
aux grab-tr-lobj-3erg det man
'The man grabbed me.'

(9) ni ?a.-tál?xw-os ie steni?
aux call-tr-lpobj det woman
'The woman called us.'
Thus, _-_s occurs when the 3rd person is subject of a transitive clause. Furthermore, as seen in (10)-(11), this suffix does not occur in sentences where the only 3rd person is the object.

\[
(10) \quad \text{ni cɛn q'wəl-ət tə səcətən}
\]
\[
\text{aux lsub bake-tr det salmon}
\]

'I baked the salmon.'

\[
(11) \quad \text{ni cɛt kʷən-ət tə səčəni?}
\]
\[
\text{aux lplsub grab-tr det woman}
\]

'We grabbed the woman.'

These data concerning the occurrence of _-_s can be summarized as in (12):

\[
(12) \quad \text{(a) 3rd person subjects of transitive determine agreement (the suffix _-_s).}
\]

\[
(12) \quad \text{(b) 3rd person subjects of intransitives and objects of transitives determine no agreement.}
\]

It is clear from (12) that the relevant distinction is not subject/object but rather ergative/absolutive as in (13):

\[
(13) \quad \text{(a) 3rd person ergatives determine agreement.}
\]

\[
(13) \quad \text{(b) 3rd person absolutes do not.}
\]

1.1. Split Ergativity.

In the linguistic literature, it is common to divide languages into two types: nominative/accusative and ergative. The assignment of a language to one type or the other is based on agreement and/or case marking. In nominative/accusative languages, person and case marking is determined by the distinction subject/object. Subjects of transitives and subjects of intransitives determine the same form while objects of transitives determine another. In contrast, in an ergative language, person or case distinguishes ergative/absolutive.

Some languages, referred to as split ergative, do not fall consistently into one of the two types. In split ergative languages, some agreement or case may be nominative/accusative while others may be ergative/absolutive. There are three common types of split ergative systems--based on person, clause-type, and aspect. Halkomelem, I claim, is a split ergative language: person and clause type but not aspect affect the choice of agreement types.
1.1.1 Person.

As discussed above, 3rd person agreement is determined only by ergatives. However, 1st and 2nd persons do not distinguish ergative/absolutive but rather subject/object, as seen in the following examples by contrasting the intransitive and transitive subjects in (14)-(15) and (16)-(17) respectively with the transitive objects in (8)-(9) above and (17) below:

(14) ni con 'imel
aux lsub walk
'I walked.'

(15) ni č 'otom
aux 2sub eat
'You ate.'

(16) ni con kwen-sθ-amo
aux lsub grab-tr-2obj
'I grabbed you.'

(17) ni č q'waq'-ot tθ speθ-θ
aux 2sub club-tr det bear
'You clubbed the bear.'

The first and second person subjects in (14)-(17) are represented by subject clitics, regardless of the transitivity of the clause.

Thus, while 3rd person distinguishes ergative/absolutive, 1st and 2nd persons distinguish subject/object, and Halkomelem is a split ergative language with respect to pronominal forms.

1.1.2 Clause-Type.

In the data involving person marking above, all the examples were taken from main clauses where 3rd person determine ergative agreement but 1st and 2nd persons determine subject clitics/object suffixes. In subordinate clauses, however, all persons determine subject/object marking. Examples of 1st and 2nd person subordinate subject marking is given in section 1. above.

Observe the following examples: (18)-(19) involve intransitive subordinate clauses, while (20)-(21) involve transitive ones.
The 3rd person marked is _-s in each case. In contrast, 3rd person objects in subordinate clauses are unmarked, as seen in (22) and (23):

(22) le?ləm? ?ə č ce? ?u qʷaqʷ-ət-ʔé.n?
look(cont) int 2sub fut 1nk club-tr-ls

'Will you be watching when/if I club him?'

(23) le?ləm? čən ce? ?u qʷaqʷ-ət-əxʷ
look(cont) 1sub fut 1nk club-tr-2s

'I will be watching when/if you club him.'

It is clear that, in subordinate clauses, 3rd person marking distinguishes subject/object. Thus, Halkomelem exhibits a second type of split ergativity. All subjects of subordinate clauses pattern alike regardless of person or transitivity.

1.1.3 Aspect.

In a third type of split ergativity, the choice of ergative/absolutive versus subject/object is affected by aspect or tense. Halkomelem lacks this type of split. In (24)-(25), the (a) sentences are in the completive aspect while the (b) sentences are in the continuative.

(24) a. ni ḥeq̓-ʔes ility sieni? tʰə səɬɪtən
aux eat-tr-3erg det woman det salmon

'The woman ate the salmon.'
b. ni tey?X-t-as to steni?  e^0  sce.iten
aux eat(cont)-tr-3erg det woman det salmon
'The woman ate the salmon.'

(25) a. ni ?oiten to steni?
aux eat det woman
'The woman ate.'

b. ?i ?i.?iten to steni?
aux eat(cont) det woman
'The woman is eating.'

We can conclude from such examples that aspectual distinctions have no effect on 3rd person marking since transitive clauses in both aspects (e.g. (24)) have -e as while intransitive clauses in both aspects (e.g. (25)) lack it.

1.1.4 Summary.

Halkomelem is thus a split ergative language with respect to person and clause type, but not aspect. Ergatives determine person marking only for 3rd person in main clauses. Subjects of all persons determine marking in subordinate clauses. Halkomelem has a very common type of ergative agreement phenomenon. In main clauses, ergatives are determine agreement while absolutes do not. Furthermore, the same agreement suffix used for the ergative agreement in main clauses is used as the subject agreement suffix in subordinate clauses, while 3rd person objects are unmarked. Third person agreement is summarized in the following chart:

(25) Third Person Marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN CLAUSES:</th>
<th>SUBORDINATE CLAUSES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third Person Marking

- e

∅
2. ONE-NOMINAL INTERPRETATION

Subject and object nominals in Halkomelem are undifferentiated by case marking, as seen in (26):

(26) ni lem-ət-əs tʰə swəw?qe? tʰə swiʔələs
aux look-at-tr-3erg det man det boy

'The man looked at the boy.'

Since Halkomelem is a predicate initial language, the question arises: In clauses where only one nominal is expressed, is that nominal taken to be the subject or the object?

In intransitive clauses, of course, the problem does not arise; the single nominal will be taken as subject, e.g., (27):

(27) ni ?ətən kʷəʔə sqəʔoməʔy?
aux eat det dog

'The dog ate.'

But transitive clauses with a single nominal are potentially ambiguous. However, as seen in (28)-(30), a single nominal is taken to be the object—not the subject—of the transitive clause:

(28) ni qʷəʔən-ət-əs kʷəʔə swəw?qe?
aux club-tr-3erg det man

'He clubbed the man.'

/*'The man clubbed him.'

(29) ni kʷəʔən-ət-əs ɬə sənəʔ?
aux grab-tr-3erg det woman

'He grabbed the woman.'

/*'The woman grabbed him.'

(30) ni qʷəʔən-ət-əs ɬə sənəʔ?
aux bake-tr-3erg det woman

'He baked the woman.'

/*'The woman baked it.'

In conclusion, a condition can be placed on the interpretation of clauses:

(31) One-nominal interpretation: In clauses without person marking other than 3rd person, a single nominal is interpreted as the absolutive—not the ergative.
3. QUANTIFIER INTERPRETATION

One way of expressing quantification in Halkomelem involves the quantifier in initial position followed by a complement clause. In the intransitive clauses in (31)-(32), since there is only a single nominal in the complement clause, the quantifier modifies it.

(31) mək’w niw ḵʷələn’čəməm kwəə səxəl?̓ ʔəqəl
all aux-link run(pl) det children

'All the children ran.'

(32) mək’w niw ?əʔəm tə sənənən’ ʔə
all aux-link eat det women

'All the women ate.'

In the transitive clauses in (33)-(34), however, there are two nominals in the complement clause; as seen by the glosses, the quantifier modifies the object, not the subject.

(33) mək’w niw qʷəl-st-os tə kwəə ʔəpl’̓ qəl
all aux-link bake-tr-3erg det children det bread

'The children baked all the bread.'

/*'All the children baked the bread.'

(34) ni ḵəyəł-t-os tə sənən’ ʔə
aux eat-tr-3erg det women

'The women ate all the salmon.'

/*'All the women ate the salmon.'

Thus, the following generalization can be stated:

(35) Quantifier Interpretation:

A quantifier in initial position modifies the absolutive nominal—not the ergative.

4. POSSESSOR EXTRACTION

A fourth rule in Halkomelem where the ergative/absolutive distinction is relevant is Possessor Extraction. Extractions involving subjects, objects, obliques, and chomeurs were discussed in the preceding chapter. As seen in (36b)-(38b), possessors can also be extracted; Possessor Extraction, like the extraction of subjects and objects is a direct extraction in the sense that it does not require special verbal morphology—such as nominalization; however, the possessor is
represented in the embedded clause by possessive agreement on the head noun.

(36) a. ni ščenəm kʷθə sqaʔeq-ʔaq-s ie siénə?
    aux run det y.brother-3pos det woman
    'The woman's younger brother ran.'

b. ie siénə? ni ščenəm kʷθə sqaʔeq-s
    det woman aux run det y.brother-3pos
    'the woman whose younger brother ran'

(37) a. ni t'ílem kʷθə sqaʔeq-ʔaq-s ie siénə?
    aux sing det y.brother-3pos det woman
    'The woman's younger brother sang.'

b. ie siénə? ni t'ílem kʷθə sqaʔeq-ʔaq-s
    det woman aux sing det y.brother-3pos
    'the woman whose younger brother sang'

(38) a. ni q'ay kʷθə no-ʔsqʷoməʔ?
    aux die det lpos-dog
    'My dog died.'

b. ?e.nʔə ni q'ay kʷθə no-ʔsqʷoməʔ?
    lemph aux die det lpos-dog
    'I'm the one whose dog died.'

*Not all possessors can be extracted, however, as seen in the following examples:

(39) a. ni q'ʷəl-ət-əs kʷθə sqaʔeq-ʔaq-s ie siénə? kʷθə sce.ʔtən
    aux bake-tr-3erg det y.b.-3pos det woman det salmon
    'The woman's younger brother baked the salmon.'

b. *ie siénə? ni q'ʷəl-ət-əs kʷθə sqaʔeq-ʔaq-s kʷθə sce.ʔtən
    det woman aux bake-tr-3erg det y.b.-3pos det salmon
    ('the woman whose younger brother baked the salmon')
(40) a. ni q'a.y-t-əs kʷθə sqeʔəq-s ə steni? kʷθə sqəmeyʔ
    aux kill-tr-3erg det y.b.-3pos det woman det dog
    'The woman's younger brother killed the dog.'

b. *ə steni? ni q'ay-t-əs kʷθə sqə-əq-s kʷθə sqəmeyʔ
    det woman aux kill-tr-3erg det y.b.-3pos det dog
    ('the woman whose younger brother killed the dog')

(41) a. ni ?a.-θ-amʔs-əs əʔən -staʔləs
    aux call-tr-1obj-3erg det 2pos-spouse
    'Your wife called me.'

b. *nəwe ni ?a.-θ-amʔs-əs əʔən-stəʔləs
    2emph aux call-tr-1obj-3erg det 2pos-spouse
    ('You're the one whose wife called me.')

The crucial difference between cases where possessor extraction is possible and where it is not is the transitivity of the embedded clauses; it is intransitive in (36)-(38) but transitive in (39)-(41).

However, Possessor Extraction from transitive clauses is possible, as seen in (42)-(44) if the possessive phrase from which the possessor is extracted is the object of a transitive clause.

(42) a. ni qʷəl-ət-əs kʷθə sce.təʔən-s ə steni?
    aux bake-tr-3erg det salmon-3pos det woman
    'He baked the woman's salmon.'

b. ə steni? ni qʷəl-ət-əs kʷθə sce.təʔən-s
    det woman aux bake-tr-3erg det salmon-3pos
    'the woman whose salmon he baked'

(43) a. ni ə q'a.y-t kʷθə sqəʔəq-s ə steni?
    aux 2sub kill-tr det y.b.-3pos det woman
    'You killed the woman's younger brother.'

b. ə steni? ni q'a.y-t-əxʷ kʷθə sqəʔəq-s
    det woman aux kill-tr-2s.sub det y.b.-3pos
    'the woman whose younger brother you killed'
(44) a. ni can ?a.-t θə ?ən-sta?les
    aux lsub call-tr det 2pos-spouse
    'I called your wife.'

    b. nəwə ni ?a.-t?e.n?  θə ?ən-sta?les
    2emph aux call-tr-lssub det 2pos-spouse
    'You're the one whose wife I called.'

To summarize, Possessor Extraction is possible if the
possessive phrases from which the possessor is extracted is a
subject of an intransitive clause or the object of a transitive
clause; but it is not possible if the possessive phrase is the
subject of a transitive. Clearly, the relevant distinction for
formulating a condition on Possessor Extraction is not subject
vs. object but rather absolutive vs. ergative, as follows:

(45) Possessor Extraction:

A possessor can be extracted only if the possessive
phrase from which it is extracted is an absolutive.

5. THE STATUS OF ERGATIVITY IN THE GRAMMAR

The above sections present four phenomena in Halkomelem
where make use of the ergative/absolutive distinction: in main
clauses, third person agreement is determined by ergatives; the
rules of One-Nominal Interpretation, Quantifier Interpretation,
and Possessor Extraction required conditions on absolutes.

In this section, I briefly show that these rules are
determined by syntactic not semantic ergativity and that,
furthermore, each of the above rules should be stated at the
final level of syntax.

In the previous chapter, the Antipassive construction was
exemplified; in Antipassives, such as (46), the object is
demoted to chomeur; thus the final structure of an Antipassive
is intransitive, hence the lack of transitive morphology.

(46) ni q′wol-am ɨ steni? θə kʷəə sce.ɨtən
    aux bake-intr 'det woman obl det salmon
    'The woman baked the salmon.'

Since an Antipassive clause is finally intransitive, the
subject of an Antipassive is an absolutive—not an ergative—in
the final level of structure. Thus the subject of an
Antipassive does not determine 3rd person agreement (which is
limited to ergatives), as seen in (46) above.
Furthermore, the subject in an Antipassive, as a final absolutive, exhibits the phenomena discussed above. In sentences with initial quantifiers, the quantifier is interpreted as modifying the Antipassive subject, as in (47) and (48).

(47)  ni męk'w ṭu q'wél-óm t'o së'ti'qet ʔə k'wə səplíl
       aux all lnk bake-intr det children obl det bread

    'All the children baked the bread.'
    /*'The children baked all the bread.'

(48)  ni męk'w ṭu ʔətən t'o sənəni? ʔə k'wə sce.ətən
       aux all lnk eat det women obl det salmon

    'All the women baked the salmon.'
    /*'The woman baked all the salmon.'

Also a possessor can extract from a possessive phrase which is the subject of an Antipassive, as seen in (49) and (50).

(49)  a. ni q'wél-óm k'wə səq'əq-s ṭə sənəni? ʔə k'wə sce.ətən
       aux bake-intr det y.b.-3pos det woman obl det salmon

    'The woman's younger brother baked the salmon.'

b. ṭə sənəni? ni q'wél-óm k'wə səq'əq's ṭə k'wə sce.ətən
       det woman aux bake-intr det y.b.-3pos obl det salmon

    'the woman whose younger brother baked the salmon'
(50) a. ni k'wa-le ls k'wa na-saq?aq ?a k'wa ti
    aux pour-act det lpos-y.b. obl det tea

    'My younger brother poured the tea.'

b. ?e.n 0o? ni k'wa-le ls k'wa na-saq?aq ?a k'wa ti
    lemph aux pour-act det lpos-y.b. obl det tea

    'I'm the one whose younger brother poured the tea.'

The above data show that the rules for the above phenomena
make reference to the final level of structure, since the
Antipassive subject is a final--not an initial--absolutive.
The data also provide further evidence for the final
intransivity of Antipassive clause.

By showing the relevance to the grammar of Halkomelem of
the distinction ergative vs. absolutive, I have also provided,
at least in part, a functional explanation of Antipassive
structures. One role of the Antipassive in Halkomelem is to
make the semantic 'agent' into an absolutive in the syntax so
that it may be accessed by rules such as Quantifier
Interpretation and Possessor Extraction.

Other ergative properties (and the role which Antipassive
plays with respect to them) are discussed in the following
chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

A PERSON/ANIMACY HIERARCHY

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

(1) 1st & 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 S. Tiwa only if the subject is equal to or superior to the object according to the hierarchy in (1). Thus, the sentences in (2)-(4) are grammatical because in each case the subject outranks or equals the object.

(2) ti-seuen-mu-ban
    isg:3isg-man-see-pst
    'I saw the man.'

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

(4) seuanide ø-liora-mu-ban man
    3:3isg-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 (1). In S. Tiwa, Allen and Frantz claim, these clauses would be rendered as Passives.

(5) seuanide-ba te-mu-che-ban
    man-instr 1sg-see-pass-pst
    'You were seen by the man.'

(6) 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 (1), it is clear that the hierarchy refers to final (rather than initial) grammatical relations.

In this chapter, I show that a similar hierarchy operates in Halkomelem grammar, specifically the hierarchy in (7):

(7) 2nd person
    ↓
1st person
    ↓
3rd person, animate, common
    ↓
3rd person, animate, proper
    ↓
3rd person, inanimate

Although a single construction can not 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:

(8) ergative
    ↓
subject
    ↓
object
    ↓
oblique
    ↓
chomeur

I show that the hierarchies in (7) and (8) taken together with some constraints on Halkomelem structure account for the non-occurrence of clauses which would otherwise be predicted to be possible.

1. ADVANCEMENTS TO OBJECT

As discussed briefly in Chapter 1, Halkomelem allows several types of Advancements to object: indirect object-to-object, benefactive-to-object, causal-to-object, and directional-to-object Advancements. The latter two types of
Advancement provide evidence for the differentiation of animates from other nominals in Halkomelem.

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 (9)-(12).

(9) ni cen si?si? ?ə kʷθə tintin
    aux lsub frighten obl det bell
'I was frightened of the bell.'

(10) ?*ni cen si?si?-mek-t kʷθə tintin
     aux lsub frighten-adv-tr det bell
     ('I was frightened of the bell.')

(11) ?*ni cen si?si? ?ə kʷθə spəpolqʷiθ'e?
     aux lsub frighten obl det screech owl
     ('I was frightened of the screech owl.')

(12) ni cen si?si?-mek-t kʷθə spəpolqʷiθ'e?
     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 -o-.

(13) ni nem? ?ə kʷθə sta?ly?
    aux go obl det river
    'He went to the river.'

(14) *ni ne?em-n-as-əə kʷθə sta?lu?
    aux go-adv-tr-3erg det river
    ('He went to the river.')
(15) ??ni nem? ʔơ John
aux go obl-det
'He went up to John.'

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

Assuming 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 (17a) and (18a) which do not involve advancement which correspond to the object advancement clauses in (17b) and (18b).

(17) a. *ni ?am-t-əs kʷθə sqʷəmey? ʔə kʷθə sqʷəmey?
   aux give-adv-tr-3erg det bone obl det dog
   ('He gave the bone to the dog.')

   b. ni ?am-əs-t-əs kʷθə sqʷəmey? ʔə kʷθə sqʷəmey?
   aux give-adv-tr-3erg det dog obl det bone
   'He gave the dog the bone.'

(18) a. *ni qʷəl-t-əs kʷθə soplıl ʔə sə stəni?
   aux bake-tr-3erg det bread obl det woman
   ('He baked the bread for the woman.')

   b. ni qʷəl-əc-t-əs ə sə stəni? ʔə kʷθə soplıl
   aux bake-adv-tr-3erg det woman obl det bread
   'He baked the bread for the woman.'

In the forms of (17a) and (18a) an Animate oblique nominal would occupy a lower position than would the Inanimate object nominal on the grammatical relation hierarchy in (8). 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 (8). Thus, the Nominal hierarchy in (7) and the grammatical relation hierarchy in (8) conspire to prohibit final structures such as (17a) and (18a).

2. ANTIPASSIVES

Data from Antipassives provide a second argument for distinguishing Inanimate from Animate nominals in Halkomelem. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, Antipassive clauses involve intransitive verbal morphology; the notional object, if it is present, appears in the oblique case, as illustrated in (19) and (20).

(19)  
| ni   | con | q'wəl-əm | ?ə kʷθə | sce.ʔən |
| aux  | lsub| bake-intr| obl det | salmon  |
'I baked the salmon.'

(20)  
| ni   | pənʔ-əm | kʷθə | swəʔqə | ?ə kʷθə | sqwəθ |
| aux  | plant-intr| det | man      | obl det | potato |
'The man planted the potatoes.'

In the Antipassives above (and those in Chapter 1 and 2 as well) oblique marked nominal is Inanimate. In contrast, Antipassives are not possible when an Animate nominal is involved, as seen in (22) and (24).

(21)  
| ni   | pən-ət-əs | kʷθə | swəʔqə | tə stənʔi? |
| aux  | plant-tr-3erg| det | man      | det woman  |
'The man planted (i.e., buried) the woman.'

(22)  
*ni | pənʔ-əm | kʷθə | swəʔqə | ?ə tə stənʔi? |
| aux | plant-intr| det | man      | obl det woman |
('The man buried the woman.')

(23)  
| ni   | səʔq'ʔ-čəlʔkʷ-əs |
| aux  | seek-tr-lpobj-3erg |
'He looked for us.'

(24)  
*ni | səʔq'ʔ |
| aux | seek |
obl-det lplemph
('He looked for us.')

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 Advancement to object and Antipassive, 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.

3. AN ERGATIVE CONSTRAINT

In Halkomelem, it is possible to have an inanimate nominal as final subject in an intransitive clause, for example, as in (25) and (26):

\[(25)\] ni q'\textsuperscript{w}ol kw\textsuperscript{Ø} s\textsuperscript{étan} aux bake det salmon

'The salmon baked.'

\[(26)\] ni kw\textsuperscript{Ø} ti aux spill det tea

'The tea spilt.'

However, an inanimate nominal cannot serve as the subject in a transitive clause, as *(27) and *(28) show.

\[(27)\] *ni q'\textsuperscript{w}aq\textsuperscript{w}-at-\textsuperscript{Ø}s t\textsuperscript{Ø} sm\textsuperscript{Ø} m\textsuperscript{t} t\textsuperscript{Ø} le?l\textsuperscript{Ø}m?
aux hit-tr-3erg det rock det house

('The rock hit the house.')</n
\[(28)\] *ni θ\textsuperscript{Ø}a-θ-\textsuperscript{Ø}s kw\textsuperscript{Ø} speh\textsuperscript{h}els
aux push-tr+obj-3erg det wind

'The wind pushed me.'

This contrast leads to the following constraint:

\[(29)\] Intransitive nominals cannot be ergatives.

The same condition holds for Proper nouns; while Proper nouns can be subjects of intransitive clauses, e.g. (30) and (31), they do not appear as subjects in transitive clauses, e.g. (32) and (33).
(30) ni t'ilom k'əə Arnold.
aux sing det

'Arnold sang.'

(31) ni q'ay ən Mary
aux die det

'Mary died.'

(32) *ni q'wel-ət-əs əə Bob təə sce.ətən
aux bake-tr-3erg det det salmon

('Bob baked the salmon.')

(33) *ni ləm-əθ-am?ət-əs ən Mary
aux look at-tr-lobj-3erg det

('Mary looked at me.')

Thus, (29) can be expanded as follows:

(34) Inanimate nor Animate Proper nominals cannot serve as Ergatives.

Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that (34) is a surface constraint in Halkomelem. There are several ways to circumvent constraint (34).

First, a notionally transitive clause can be presented as a Passive, as in (35)-(38); in this case the Inanimate nominal or the Animate Proper nominal is a final chomuer rather than a final ergative.

(35) ni q'waq'-ət-əm əə leɬəm? əə əə sənt
aux hit-tr-3erg det house obl det rock

'The house was hit by the rock.'

(36) ni q'wel-ət-əm əəə Bob əə sce.ətən
aux bake-tr-intr obl-det det salmon

'The salmon was baked by Bob.'

(37) ni ləm-əθ-el-əm əəə Mary
aux look at-tr-lobj-intr obl-det

'I was looked at by Mary.'
(38) ni e³θ-ø -el-øm ?e k₉ø spahels
aux push-tr-obj-intr obl det wind
'I was pushed by the wind.'

Secondly, if the clause can be made finally intransitive by means of Antipassive (this is possible only if the object is inanimate (see section 2 above), then animate proper nominals are allowed, as in (39) and (40).

(39) ni q³wæl-øm tø Bob ?e tø sce.îton
aux bake-intr det obl det salmon
'Bob baked the salmon.'

(40) ni pøn?-øm k₉ø Arnold ?e k₉ø øqēwø
aux plant-intr det 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 (41)-(44).

(41) ni tø sment ni q³wæq⁻øt tø le³løm?
3 emph det rock aux hit-tr det house
'It's the rock that hit the house.'

(42) ni tø Bob ni q³wæl-øt tø sce.îton
3 emph det Bob aux bake-tr det salmon
'It's Bob who baked the salmon.'

(43) ni k₉ø øqē Arnold ni pøn-øt k₉ø øqēwø
3 emph det Arnold aux plant-tr det potato
'It's Arnold who planted potatoes.'

(44) ni tø Mary ni lom-øθ-am?ø
3 emph det Mary aux look at-tr-obj
'It's Mary who looked at me.'

These data show that Constraint (34) is circumvented as long the last relation of the nominal is not an ergative; in the Cleft or Pseudo-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 of the pseudo-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 (34) can be
restated as follows:

(45) An inanimate nominal or an animate Proper nominal cannot
serve as a surface ergative.

What explanation can be offered for the reason why
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 in (46)-(48) can?

(46) ni q’ωl-et-as ṯə swoʔqe? ṯə sce.ʔton
aux bake-tr-3erg det man det salmon

'The man baked the salmon.'

(47) ni can q’ωl-et ṯə sce.ʔton
aux 1sub bake-tr det salmon

'I baked the salmon.'

(48) ni ʔ q’ωl-et ṯə sce.ʔton
aux 2sub bake-tr det salmon

'You baked the salmon.'

If we place 3rd person proper nominals lower on the hierarchy
in (7) than 3rd person common and 1st and 2nd person nominals,
and, if we place ergatives higher than absolutive subjects in
the hierarchy in (8), 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.

4. 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 (49)-(50), 3rd person common nominals can
appear as chomeurs in Passives.
(49) ni q’wel-ot-em ?e to sieni? k’Tho sce.iten
aux bake-tr-intr obl det woman det salmon

'The salmon was baked by the woman.'

(50) ni pen-at-em ?e k’Tho sweyqe? k’Tho sgewo
aux plant-tr-intr obl det man det potato

'The potatoes were planted by the man.'

Examples of 3rd person Proper nominals and inanimate nominals serving as chomeurs were given in (37)-(38) above.

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 q’wel-ot k’Tho sce.iten
aux lsub bake-tr det salmon

'I baked the salmon.'

b. *ni q’wel-ot-em ?e? n?e’ k’Tho sce.iten
aux bake-tr-intr obl-det lemph det salmon

('The salmon was baked by me.')

(52) a. ni 2 lem-ot to sieni?
aux 2sub look at-tr det woman

'You looked at the woman.'

b. *ni lom-ot-em ?o? nwe
aux look at-tr det woman obl-det lemph

('The woman was looked at by you.')

If we assume that 1st and 2nd persons outrank 3rd person nominals, 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 lömـst~as ṭo stenī?  kʰoə swayʔqe?
aux look at-tr-3erg det woman det man

'The woman looked at the man.'

(54)  ni lömـst-am kʰoə swayʔqe?  ḏa qe stenī?
aux look at-tr-intr det man obl det woman

'The man was looked at by the woman.'

5. 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 qʷaqʷ-əθ-amə
aux 1sub club-tr-2obj

'I clubbed you.'

(56)  ni cən qʷaqʷ-ət  kʰoə  Bob
aux 1sub club-tr det

'I clubbed Bob.'

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 č qʷaqʷ-əθ-amʔš
aux 2sub club-tr-1obj

'You clubbed me.'

(58)  ni č qʷaqʷ-ət  kʰoə  Bob
aux 2sub club-tr det

'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’-aθ-amʔ-s-øs
       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  ləm-øθ-ama-s  tə-shen?i
       aux  look-at-tr-2obj-3erg  det  woman

 ('The woman looked at you.')

(61)    *ni  q’waq’-øθ-ama-s
       aux  club-tr-2obj-3erg

 ('He clubbed you.')

(62)    *ni  q’waq’-øt-al-øs
       aux  club-tr-2pobj-3erg

 ('He clubbed you pl..')

As was the case with other disallowed transitive clauses (discussed in section 3), the prohibition on 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  q’waq’-øt-al-om  ?ə  kʷoθε  swøyʔqε?
       aux  club-tr-2pobj-intr  obl  det  man

 'You pl. were clubbed by the man.'

(64)    ni  ləm-øθ-a.m  ?ə  tə-shen?i
       aux  look at-tr-2obj-intr  obl  det  woman

 'You were looked at by the woman.'

Second, the third person nominal can serve as the head of a Cleft or a Pseudo-cleft, as in (65) and (66).

(65)    ni i kʷoθε  swøyʔqε?  ni  q’waq’-øt-alə
       3emph  det  man  aux  club-tr-2pobj

 'It's the man who clubbed you pl..'
The latter data shows 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 Haikomelem, 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).

6. SUMMARY

The above sections 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 a priori possible. It is seen that the ergative (subject of a transitive) and accusative (object of a
transitive) positions are deemed favorable to certain nominals but not others. I have shown that the semantic features of Person, Animacy, and Proper/Common play a role in the organization of the Halkomelem clause.

I summarize the restrictions below:

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 Antipassives.

e. Animates tend to advance to object but inanimates tend not to.

I have shown that the above conditions are formulated as surface conditions; e.g. the restriction against Proper noun ergatives can be circumvented in a variety of ways--via Passive, Antipassive, or Extraction--depending on other restrictions that may apply.

The restrictions play a major role in the organization of Halkomelem grammar.
CHAPTER FOUR

INTRANSITIVE VERB CLASSES

Many theories of grammar distinguish two classes of intransitive verbs --agent-oriented and patient-oriented. This distinction has played a central role in the development of Relational Grammar (Perlmutter (1980) and Perlmutter and Postal (1983a, b)) where it is claimed that the two classes of verbs, besides having different semantic structures, also have different syntactic structures. According to the Unaccusative Hypothesis (Perlmutter 1978), Unergative predicates, which denote active, volitional actions, involve only a subject nominal at the initial level of syntax while Unaccusative predicates, denoting non-volitional actions or states, involve only an object nominal at the initial level of syntax.

Furthermore, Perlmutter (1978) makes the claim that the class of verbs which are Unergative vs. Unaccusative can be universally predicted on the basis of semantics. A cross-linguistic study by Rosen (1985) has called this assumption into question, showing that there is some (although not much) disagreement among languages as to which verbs fall into each class. For example, syntactic tests show that audare 'sweat' is initially Unergative in Italian but lakaha 'sweat' is initially Unaccusative in Choctaw. Rosen also shows that, there might be differentiation within a semantic class: for example, some motion verbs in Italian (generally those expressing manner of motion) test to be Unergative while others (generally those expressing directionality or result of motion) test to be Unaccusative. Therefore, while lexical semantics may serve to suggest the class of a verb, syntactic evidence will be ultimately responsible for its class assignment.

This chapter presents evidence that the Unaccusative Hypothesis plays a role in the organization of the grammar of Halkomelem. I briefly show two constructions--Causatives and Desideratives--which are sensitive to the Unergative/Unaccusative distinction. Although many verbs fall into one class with respect to both of these constructions, other verbs are mismatched; that is, they pattern like Unergatives in Causatives but like Unaccusatives in Desideratives or vice versa. However, all of these problematic verbs would be considered to be Unaccusative on semantic grounds. Thus, there are three sub-classes of Unaccusative verbs in Halkomelem, yielding a more complicated intransitive verb system than expected.
1. CAUSATIVES AND DESIDERATIVES

Morphological Causatives are formed by the causative suffix -stoxt as seen by in (1).

(1)  ni can  
    aux lsub  
    eat-cs  
    walk-cs  
    sit down-cs  
  kəwə  swəʔəge

'I made the man eat/walk/sit down.'

As discussed in Gercke (1981), these Causatives, which may be analyzed as Clause Union Causatives, are only possible if the downstairs final subject is also the initial subject; thus while Unergative predicates can form Causatives (as seen in (1)), Unaccusative predicates, since they lack an initial subject, cannot (as seen in *(2)):

(2)  ni can  
    aux lsub  
    fall-cs  
    get lost-cs  
    get cut-cs  
  kəwə  swəʔəge

'I made the man fall/get lost/get cut.'

Desideratives, illustrated in (3), are formed with the suffix -ʔalmen:

(3)  ni can  
    aux lsub  
    go(cnt)-want  
    build canoe(cnt)-want  
    eat(cnt)-want  

'I want to go/build a canoe/eat.'

In general, the person doing the desiring corresponds to the initial subject of the clause; thus in the Passive in (4), the initial subject and not the final subject is the 'desirer'.

(4)  ni c’ec’awʔ-əmʔəʔalmen  
    aux help-tr-intr-want  
    det woman  
  in stenəʔ ʔəʔəx  
  John

'John wants to help the woman.'
(literally: The woman was want helped by John.)
/'"The woman wants to be helped by John.'

Because of this condition, it is possible for Unergatives to form Desideratives, as seen in (3) above. However, Unaccusatives seem to be unable to form Desideratives, as *(5)
shows:
\[ \text{neg sub aux-issub get hit(cnt)-want} \]
\[ \{ \text{get cut(cnt)-want, get lost(cnt)-want} \} \]
\[ \text{I don't want to get hit/get cut/get lost.} \]

In summary, Causatives and Desideratives provide two tests for distinguishing Unergative from Unaccusative verbs in Halkomelem. According to the evidence presented thus far, while Unergatives form both Causative and Desiderative constructions, Unaccusatives form neither.

2. VERB CLASSES IN HALKOMELEM

This section summarizes the results of a random survey of 100 intransitive verbs in Halkomelem with respect to Causatives and Desideratives. The first, noticeable result is that all the verbs which would be predicted on semantic grounds to be Unergative, since they denote willed, volitional actions or involuntary bodily processes, test to be syntactically Unergative (that is, they allow both Causatives and Desideratives); conversely, those which are suspected to be Unaccusative do not. The 42 Unergative verbs that appeared in this sample are listed in Table III; these verbs allow Causatives and Desideratives and the resulting forms usually have the predicted meanings (Causatives = 'make him V'; Desideratives = 'want to V').
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?a:m</td>
<td>'call'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cam</td>
<td>'go up to the house', 'go in land', 'go up into the mountains'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cam?am</td>
<td>'carry (on back or shoulders)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'h'om</td>
<td>'jump'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'e:tem?</td>
<td>'hear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'tem</td>
<td>'crawl'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?e'tem</td>
<td>'eat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?am?at</td>
<td>'sit down', 'rise out of bed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?am?maš</td>
<td>'hunt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?anax?</td>
<td>'stop'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ešel</td>
<td>'paddle'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?et'ón?e</td>
<td>'carry (with arms extended)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesam</td>
<td>'sneeze'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heθ'em</td>
<td>'breathe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hey?</td>
<td>'build a canoe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?imeš</td>
<td>'walk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?itet</td>
<td>'sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?i?waš</td>
<td>'point', 'instruct'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'wi?</td>
<td>'climb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ak'w</td>
<td>'fly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?aw?</td>
<td>'flee'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išiliš</td>
<td>'stand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?'pil</td>
<td>'go down'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nem?</td>
<td>'go'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsgəm</td>
<td>'dive down'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p'ek?</td>
<td>'come to the surface of the water'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'al</td>
<td>'speak'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'ap</td>
<td>'assemble', 'gather'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'wejílaš</td>
<td>'dance'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw'q?</td>
<td>'seek'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six'em</td>
<td>'wade'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaq'wał</td>
<td>'go across to the other side'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taq'wem</td>
<td>'cough'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te'm</td>
<td>'call out', 'yell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t'icam</td>
<td>'swim'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t'ilem</td>
<td>'sing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wawá?as</td>
<td>'bark'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xe?</td>
<td>'ache'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xw'elenom</td>
<td>'run'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yays</td>
<td>'work'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye'at</td>
<td>'vomit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yenam</td>
<td>'laugh'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III. UNERGATIVE VERBS**
In contrast, the 22 verbs in Table IV form neither Causatives nor Desideratives, and thus test to be Unaccusatives; furthermore, they could be considered semantically Unaccusative, since they denote patient-oriented action, results, motion emphasizing the end-point, or description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ik'w</td>
<td>'get lost'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ix</td>
<td>'get scratched on surface'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?iye'tq</td>
<td>'change'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'ân</td>
<td>'be born'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'wes</td>
<td>'get burnt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tic'</td>
<td>'get cut'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mes</td>
<td>'decrease in size'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maya'</td>
<td>'get smaller', 'get cheaper'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pas</td>
<td>'get hit (by a thrown object)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
<td>'get buried'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'mix'</td>
<td>'miss'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'aq'i?</td>
<td>'be ill'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'wap'</td>
<td>'be wrinkled'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scu'et</td>
<td>'be adept, clever'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sliq'wol</td>
<td>'be calm' (weather)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tecâl</td>
<td>'arrive here'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0'as</td>
<td>'be bumped'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wogê?</td>
<td>'arrive after a long crossing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x'wani?</td>
<td>'get there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xe'å'</td>
<td>'be stormy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiq'</td>
<td>'scratch (an itch)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yak'wem</td>
<td>'smash up'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table IV. Unaccusative Verbs**
The remaining 36 verbs, all of which could be considered to be Unaccusative on semantic grounds, divide evenly into two groups: those which allow Desideratives but not Causatives are given in Table V and those which allow Causatives but not Desideratives are given in Table VI. These two groups split semantically: the verbs in Table V denote patient-oriented action and results while the verbs in Table VI denote location and description: I use Process as a cover term for the former and State for the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ak'w</td>
<td>'hang up', 'snag'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'eq'</td>
<td>'be surprised', 'be astonished'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'isi?m</td>
<td>'grow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hil?m</td>
<td>'tumble', 'topple', 'fall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'we?al</td>
<td>'spill'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lak'w</td>
<td>'break'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iæmæc'</td>
<td>'chip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meq'{</td>
<td>'get full of food'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q&quot;aqw</td>
<td>'get clubbed', 'get hit by something suspended'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q&quot;ãl</td>
<td>'cook', 'ripen'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sæq'</td>
<td>'tear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðæwæ</td>
<td>'fade away'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð'el?</td>
<td>'lose everything gambling', 'be broke'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð'øyk'w</td>
<td>'start', 'be startled'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæk'æc'</td>
<td>'fall', 'stumble'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x&quot;iwæl</td>
<td>'go上级' (salmon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeq&quot;w</td>
<td>'catch fire'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeæw'</td>
<td>'come undone'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE V. PROCESS VERBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ayøm</td>
<td>'be slow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?eyaθ</td>
<td>'be sharp'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hol?</td>
<td>'be alive', 'live'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ilæaq</td>
<td>'be alyt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?iyæs</td>
<td>'be happy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'we?las</td>
<td>'be hot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iæqw</td>
<td>'be wet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x'oxw</td>
<td>'be hard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nec'</td>
<td>'be different, strange'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qæ</td>
<td>'be lots'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qi?qe?</td>
<td>'be soft'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q'æn</td>
<td>'be forward'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc'æc'æ'</td>
<td>'be on top of'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si?q</td>
<td>'be underneath a house, or table, etc.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sël?p'</td>
<td>'be floopy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sëk'pal?we?i</td>
<td>'be underneath something whose weight is bearing down'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðnæq?æθ</td>
<td>'across the way'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ði</td>
<td>'be big'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE VI. STATES**
If we leave aside the Unaccusative verbs in Table IV, which include Process, State, and Motion verbs, there are plausible explanations for the patterning of Causatives and Desideratives with respect to the verbs in Tables V and VI. The verbs in Table V all form Desideratives but not with the meaning that the subject 'desires' or 'wants' to do the verb; rather glosses such as 'almost', 'on the verge of', 'beginning to' or 'ready to' are supplied in every case, for example, (6) and (7).

(6) "i can eyáʔ-flat-stax
aux lsub sharp-cs
'I have it sharp.'

(7) \x'alm \can kʰeʔ1as-stax
very lsub warm-cs
'I find it rather hot.'

Thus, the Desiderative in Halkomelem is taking on the meaning of a near or unavoidable future when it is used with a verb lacking an agent capable of 'wanting'. It makes sense that Processes rather than States should allow this meaning; Processes, since the action is spread across time, can be almost or just started, but the point of entering or leaving a State is less relevant than being in or out of it. Thus, 'to be ready to be sharp', 'to be almost different', or 'to be beginning to be ait' are in some respect contradictory-like being 'almost pregnant'.

On the other hand States are more compatible with Causatives than are Processes. The Causative forms for the verbs in Table VI are not glossed as 'make X V' but rather 'have it V', 'keep it V', and find it V', for example, (8) and (9).

(8) ni can tu wəʔ maq'-əlman
aux lsub just already full-want
'I am getting rather full.'

(9) "i qʷeqʷəl'-əlman? tə sʰuʔm?
aux ripe(cnt)-want det berry
'The (last of the) berries are almost ripe.'

The result of the Causative action is being stressed; States and not Processes are logical results of actions. Thus, 'find
it spill', 'keep it fade away', and 'have him astonished' seem anomalous.

3. CONCLUSION

We have seen that applying the tests for Unergative vs. Unaccusative verbs given in Section 2 to a sampling of Halkomelem intransitive verbs yields some interesting results. Unergative verbs faithfully allow both Causatives and Desideratives with the expected meanings but Unaccusative verbs allow either Causatives or Desideratives or neither but never both. Furthermore, Unaccusative Desideratives (limited to Processes) have a future rather than a desiderative meaning and Unaccusative Causatives (limited to States) have a resultative rather than a causative meaning. I have no explanation for why some Processes or States, those in Table IV, block Desideratives and Causatives altogether. I can only surmise that the use of Desiderative as a future and the use of Causative as a resultative has not yet spread to all Unaccusative verbs in Halkomelem.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Halkomelem Salish, like many highly polysynthetic languages, present a unique problem to language description. Given that there are several possible paraphrases for any clause, 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 the extra-linguistic factors to grammatical usage. Furthermore, there is a good possibility that the answers which would arise from such a study would strongly parallel results from research on other languages as their could be a strong cognitive basis for the organization of language at this level. This aspect of the problem has remained unexplored in the current work.

This work has provided a partial answer to the above question, but it has done so by formulating some language specific restrictions on Halkomelem grammatical organization. Of course, other languages exist with similar restrictions. However, there was no a priori means for predicting that the particular set of restrictions discussed here would be found in Halkomelem.

This study shows very clearly that transitivity serves as a basis of organization for Halkomelem grammar. The final transitivity of each clause is essential to its expression. The final transitivity is overtly marked in the morphology by transitive or intransitive suffixes. The ergative position (subject of a transitive) is reserved for a select group of nominals--1st person, 2nd person, 3rd person common animate (in the absence of a 2nd person object)--and the last of these cues a special ergative agreement suffix.

The absolutive (object of a transitive/subject of an intransitive) also plays a special role in Halkomelem grammar. The absolutive--but not the ergative--exhibits the following phenomena: One-Nominal Interpretation, Quantifier Interpretation, and Possessor Extraction.

Given the ban on certain types of ergatives and the special accessibility of absolutes, the function of several alternative clause types becomes clear. Antipassive serves a dual function of letting the subject by-pass ergative restrictions and access absolutive phenomena. The Passive and the Cleft both serve to by-pass ergative restrictions. Advancements to object serve to make a semantically oblique nominal absolutive accessible.
These interactions clearly show that it is the final or surface level of transitivity which is crucial to the organization of Halkomelem grammar.

Person plays a clear role in the organization of the grammar. Not only is verb agreement a split phenomena--only 3rd person ergatives cue agreement, but 1st and 2nd persons are banned a passive chomeurs. Furthermore, 1st and 2nd persons are differentiated since the former but not the latter may be an object in the presence of a 3rd person subject.

Animacy is also critical to clausal organization. Inanimates are banned from ergative position while animates are banned from demotion in an Antipassive. Furthermore, oblique animates advance to object whenever possible while inanimates do not.

Furthermore, third person nominals split into two types--common and proper. Interestingly, the latter cannot serve as ergative. Thus proper nominals in Halkomelem fall between animates and inanimates in terms of accessibility.

I have summarized the above patterns of organization in Table VII. The overall result is that there are more clausal patterns that are avoided than are allowed in Halkomelem greatly simplifying clausal organization.
### Table VII. Clause Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Antipassive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Subject chomeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3 by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 = 1st person
2 = 2nd person
3 = 3rd person
3c = 3rd person, common
3p = 3rd person, proper
3i = 3rd person, inanimate
Finally, I have briefly considered intransitivity in Halkomelem. In many languages it has been found that the Unaccusative Hypothesis plays a major role in organizing clausal structure (see Rosen 1985 and references therein). The Unaccusative Hypothesis posits that intransitive verbs fall into two patterns—those which subcategorize for subjects and those which subcategorize for objects. In Gerdts (1981), I claimed that this difference was crucial for stating a generalization on which intransitive verbs could serve as a basis for Causatives. A second clause type—Desideratives—also appeared to reference this distinction.

However, upon closer examination of the verbs which formed Causatives and Desideratives, it was seen that more semantic based notions like Action, State, and Process affected the derivational potential of an intransitive stem.

In conclusion, the grammatical distinction of transitive/intransitive (and the ergative/absolutive distinction derived from this) serves as a major factor in clausal organization. Further differentiation of types of intransitivity did not serve to organize Halkomelem clauses, though the semantic classes of intransitive verbs were seen to influence the morphological organization of the language.
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