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1. Introduction
This paper is an exploration of antipassive constructions in Halkomelem, a Central Coast Salish language of British Columbia. Data are from original fieldwork on Hałq̓emil̓ęm, the Island dialect of Halkomelem, currently spoken by around one hundred people. In Halkomelem, a polysynthetic language, words usually contain several morphemes. We have been investigating the morphosyntactic properties of the over one hundred affixes in Halkomelem. This paper reports on two of these affixes, the middle suffix and the activity suffix, and their use in antipassive constructions.

Halkomelem has two different morphological means of marking antipassives. This paper explores the similarities and differences between the two antipassive constructions. Other languages of the world have been shown to have two or more antipassives. Halkomelem antipassives conform to previous generalizations about the form and function of antipassives (e.g. Foley and Van Valin 1984). However, Halkomelem shows one phenomenon that to our knowledge has never been discussed: Halkomelem allows the two antipassives to stack. We give an analysis of stacked antipassives and discuss its implications for the architecture of morphosyntactic theory.

2. The Two Halkomelem Antipassives
We give a transitive clause in (1a) and its antipassive counterpart in (1b).\(^1\)

---

\(^1\)The following abbreviations are used in glossing the Halkomelem examples: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, ACT = activity, APPL = applicative, AUX = auxiliary, BEN = benefactive, COMP = complementizer, CONT = continuative, CS = causative, DET = determiner, EMPH = emphatic, ERG = ergative, FUT = future, MID = middle, NOM = nominalizer, OBJ = object, OBL = oblique, POS = possessive, PL = plural, SUB = subject, SSUB = subordinate subject, TR = transitive.
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(1) a. niʔ ӰʔaɁ-Ɂt-Ɂs t⁶ə sce:Ɂtən.
   AUX bake-TR-3ERG DET salmon
   ‘He cooked/barbecued the salmon.’

   b. niʔ ӰʔaɁ-Ɂm ?ə t⁶ə sce:Ɂtən.
   AUX bake-MID OBL DET salmon
   ‘He cooked/barbecued the salmon.’

The verb in the transitive clause in (1a) contains a transitive suffix -t, which marks controlled transitive action (Hukari 1976) and the 3rd person ergative agreement suffix. Third person absolutes are Ø-marked in main clauses. Core arguments of the verb are unmarked for case, though they are preceded by determiners signaling degree of distance from the speaker. In contrast, there is no transitive suffix on the verb in (1b); instead the middle suffix -m (~eʔm, ~əm) appears, and the patient appears in the oblique case. The suffix -m is used for a range of constructions, including logophoric reflexives, personal reflexives, main-clause passives, and various monadic intransitive constructions, including verbs of motion and body care. Gerdts and Hukari (1998) gives an analysis of the middle, arguing for personal reflexive as the source of this construction. Krooiber (1999) discusses the pan-Salish use of the suffix -m in antipassives.

The second antipassive uses the activity suffix -els (~əl$'$s). Example (2a) gives a transitive clause and (2b) gives the corresponding antipassive.

(2) a. naʔət qʷəs-t-əs t⁶ə ɁəɁəm sce:Ɂtən.
   AUX go.in.water-TR-3ERG DET salted salmon
   ‘She put the salted fish in water.’

   b. naʔət qʷəs-els ?ə t⁶ə ɁəɁəm sce:Ɂtən.
   AUX go.in.water-ACT OBL DET salted salmon
   ‘She soaked the salted fish.’

Again, the antipassive lacks transitive marking and 3rd person ergative agreement, and the patient in the antipassive appears in the oblique case.

There seems to be very little difference in meaning between the transitive clauses and the antipassive clauses. Various person/animacy restrictions come into play, as discussed in Gerdts (1988a, 1988b). As with antipassives in many other languages, the oblique-marked object in Halkomelem antipassives is usually third person and inanimate. It can be definite or indefinite, though often it has a non-individualized or non-specific meaning.

---

We use the term ‘patient’, without prejudice as to animacy, roughly in the sense of Dowty’s (1991) proto-patient. The reader may substitute ‘undergoer’ or ‘notional object’. Gerdts has used the terms ‘initial object’ and ‘theme’ in previous work, but we reserve the term ‘theme’ for locatum or entity in motion, following Jackendoff (1991) and others.
2.1 Antipassive Syntax

The two antipassives are syntactically identical. Gerdts (1998b) presents evidence that antipassives are syntactically intransitive. Causatives provide one argument for this. Causatives can be formed on intransitive bases (3), but not on transitive bases (4).

(3) niʔ cən ʔìməs-stəxʷ tə swìw-ləs.
   AUX 1SUB walk-CS+TR+3OBJ DET boy
   ‘I made the boy walk.’

(4) *niʔ cən ʔ*əl-ət-stəxʷ ɬə sələniʔ (ʔə) kətə səpləl.  
   AUX 1SUB bake-TR-CS+TR+3OBJ DET woman OBL DET bread
   ‘I had the woman bake the bread.’

Antipassives can form causatives as we see in (5) and (6); the agent of the antipassive is the object of the causative.

(5) niʔ cən ʔ*əl-əm-stəxʷ ɬə sələniʔ ʔə tə səpləl.  
   AUX 1SUB bake-MID-CS DET woman OBL DET bread
   ‘I had the woman bake the bread.’

(6) niʔ cən ʔ*ə-s-əls-stəxʷ ɬə sələniʔ ʔə tə ʃələm sce:lən.  
   AUX 1SUB go.in.water-ACT-CS DET woman OBL DET salted salmon
   ‘I had the woman soak the salted salmon.’

As Gerdts (1988b) argues, the semantic agent of an antipassive is a surface absolutive. In terms of person agreement, Halkomelem is a split ergative language. Only 3rd person shows ergative/absolutive agreement, and only in main clauses. But there are several syntactic constructions that select absolutes, and antipassives feed these constructions. For example, Halkomelem has a constraint that a sole NP argument in a clause with only third person agreement is interpreted as an absolutive. So in the transitive clause in (7), the sole NP argument is the object.

(7) niʔ ʔ*əl-ət-sə ɬə sələniʔ.  
   AUX bake-TR-3ERG DET woman
   !!‘He cooked/barbecued the woman.’
   not: ‘The woman cooked (something).’

In contrast, the sole NP in the antipassive in (8) is the subject.

(8) niʔ ʔ*əl-əm ɬə sələniʔ.  
   AUX bake-MID DET woman
   ‘The woman cooked (something).’
   not: !!‘He cooked/barbecued the woman.’
Also, as Gerdts (1988b) notes, only absolutes link to preverbal quantifiers, and only absolutes allow their possessors to extract. Evidence that the semantic patient is a surface “oblique object” comes from data involving extraction (Gerdts 1988b, Hukari 1976, 1977, 1979, 1980). We give a summary of extraction facts in (9).

(9) Extraction (wh-questions, relative clauses, clefts, pseudo-clefts)
   a. No special morphology is used to extract
      • ergatives (ergative agreement is deleted)
      • absolutes
   b. Nominalization with s- is used to extract
      • patients of antipasses
      • themes of applicatives
   c. Nominalization with ʃ(xœ) is used to extract
      • obliques (location, direction, instrumental, manner, stimuli)

Core nominals (9a) extract with no special morphology. But oblique nominals extract via nominalization. Oblique objects (9b) extract with s- while true obliques (9c) extract with the prefix ʃ(xœ)-. Examples (10) and (11) show the extraction of the patient of both types of antipasses.

(10) stem ʃø ni? s-q"s-e?œm-s ʃø sœni??
    what DET AUX NOM-go.in.water-MID-3POS DET woman
    ‘What did the woman put in the water/soak?’

(11) stem ʃø ni? œhon-ʃœø-els?
    what AUX AUX 2POS-NOM-write-ACT
    ‘What did you write?’

The predicate is nominalized with the prefix s-. The subject of the nominalization appears as a possessor.

2.2 Antipassive Morphology
There are three ways to mark antipasses: -els (12a), -m (12b), or Ø (12c).
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(12) a. ʔⱡʷqⱡʔels ‘club, bat’, ḟⱢⱢeⱢels ‘pick (fruit)’, ḟⱫⱢeⱢels ‘hit with hammer’, yⱡⱢⱢeⱢels ‘open’, ḟⱡⱢels ‘tie’, ḟⱡⱢⱢeⱢels ‘hook’, ḟⱨⱢels ‘shuck (shellfish)’, ḟⱨⱢⱢeⱢels ‘pierce’, ḟⱨⱢⱢeⱢels ‘cut’, ḟⱨⱨⱢeⱢels ‘boil’, ḟⱨⱢeⱢels ‘pok into ground’


c. ḟⱨⱨ ‘eat’, qⱡʔqⱡⱢ ‘drink’, ḟⱨⱨ ‘fall in the water’

The choice between these is basically a lexical one. -els, the activity suffix, is the most popular: approximately 90% of the verbs in our sample take -els. Only about 15% of verbs take the middle -m. There are around a dozen very common verbs that can form antipassives with Ø morphology. We set aside this last class for the purposes of this paper. Some verbs allow two or three different forms. For example, we see the verb qⱡʷ ‘fall in the water’ can take either the activity (13) or middle suffix (14).

(13) na?at qⱡʷ-s-els ḟⱨ eⱢⱢeⱢ eⱢ sten.  
AUX go.in.water-ACT OBL DET salted salmon  
‘She soaked the salted fish.’

(14) ni? qⱡʷ-eⱨm ḟⱨ eⱢⱢeⱢ eⱢ sten.  
AUX go.in.water-MID OBL DET salted salmon  
‘She soaked the salted fish.’

Some more examples are given in (15). The first column shows the verb root: the root is unaccusative with a patient-oriented meaning. The next two columns show the middle and the activity suffixes. The last column shows the corresponding transitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>root</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>activity</th>
<th>transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qⱡʷ ‘fall in water’</td>
<td>qⱡʷ-s-eⱨm</td>
<td>qⱡʷ-sels</td>
<td>qⱡʷ-sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḟⱨ ‘pierced’</td>
<td>ḟⱨ-s-eⱨm</td>
<td>ḟⱨ-sels</td>
<td>ḟⱨ-sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḟⱨ ‘collected’</td>
<td>ḟⱨ-s-eⱨm</td>
<td>ḟⱨ-sels</td>
<td>ḟⱨ-sat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In fact, we see from an examination of a full-range of data that antipassive and transitive suffixes are closely linked. In our database of over 500 verb bases tested in combination with various suffixes and also in additional sporadic data from the Hul’qumi’num’ Dictionary (Hukari and Peter 1995), all verbs that can take the transitive suffix -t can form an antipassive. Many stative and unergative verbs do not take -t, and these also do not form antipassives. Furthermore, every verb in our sample that takes antipassive -m takes transitive -t. And verbs that take antipassive -els usually take transitive -t. There is one small class of exceptions to the last generalization. A dozen motion verbs that form transitives with the causative suffix -staxʷ also form antipassives in -els:³

(16) ³ɔši:ls ‘paddle with something, tow’, ca:mel’s ‘bring them up’,  
šqʷi:ls ‘take across to the other side’, ³ənəxʷels ‘bringing to a stop’,  
nəwεl’s ‘bring in’

These motion verbs are exceptional in other ways (Gerdts and Hukari 2000). Based on these distributional facts, we conclude that, although antipassives are syntactically intransitive, they are semantically transitive. A notional object, whether stated or implied, is always part of the argument structure.

2.3 Antipassive Semantics
So far we have talked about ways in which the two antipassives are similar. We turn now to a way in which the two antipassives are different: they seem to have slightly different meanings. Both antipassive suffixes can be used to make the agent an absolutive. The agent is then accessible to constructions that target absolutives, as discussed in section 2.2 above. Also, both antipassives are used to express non-specific, de-individualized patients, or to avoid expressing a patient.

However, the -els activity suffix often brings an additional meaning. It is used to emphasize the action. The event is often a job-like activity that will take time and effort. Sometimes the agent is playing a role in a social situation. He/she is the delegated doer of the event. For many forms with the activity subject, certain patients are evoked even when they are not expressed. The patient is fully understood from the cultural context of the activity (see also Galloway 1993:252–255, Hukari 1979, Suttles in prep.):

³Van Eijk (1997:116) has noted the same sort of small exceptional class of antipassives in Lillooet, a nearby Interior Salish language.
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(17) őpes 'collect' [when going around collecting money]
wænels 'throw' [when throwing out money or blankets in the bighouse]
næw els 'bring in' [when showing a picture for ceremonial purposes in the bighouse]
lqels 'lay (it) down' [when making a down payment or donating blankets]
θæq’els 'dig' [when digging a grave for the funeral]
yæq’els 'burn' [ritual burning of the clothes of the deceased]
pepæk’els 'smoking' [when smoking salmon for storing]
λæq’els ‘push down’ [when kneading bread]
æk’els ‘break’ [when breaking old plates in ceremony for black faces]
læwels ‘(shaman) working a cure’, ‘escape being guessed right on’ [in the bone game]

In various languages, antipassive is correlated with progressive or continuative aspect. For example, Blake (1987) notes that antipassive in Australian languages is often associated with imperfect, desiderative, or habitual aspect. Adams and Marlett (n.d.) note that the Madija antipassive is more likely to be used when the continuative aspect of the action is emphasized. This is not exactly what is going on in Halkomelem, since antipassives cross-cut the aspect paradigm. Perfective or progressive antipassives are allowed. Nevertheless, the job-like semantics often evoked by the suffix -els seems to be a similar phenomenon.

We can see the difference in semantics in the way the two antipassives are nominalized. Using an antipassive base to form a noun is quite common in Halkomelem. In (18), nouns formed with the s- prefix express a nominal that corresponds to the patient of the antipassive.

(18)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sæcel s</td>
<td>ćæels 'make a design or pattern'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqæpels</td>
<td>őpels 'gather something'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spæhæm</td>
<td>pañæm 'plant, bury'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stæm</td>
<td>țiæm 'sing'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activity suffix is also frequently used in instrumental nouns formed with the oblique prefix ı̊(x̌)-. Since the suffix -els puts a job-like cast on an event, it makes sense that it would be used to create words for tools.


We have found no examples of the middle suffix being used in this fashion. So we find, then, that the -els suffix often adds a special job-like meaning to an event, while the middle suffix does not.
3. Stacked Antipassives

The following examples show that in some cases Halkomelem allows antipassives in which both the middle suffix and the activity suffix appear.

(20) ƣʷ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ ɢ ɬ-ɬ kʷ sce:ɭɭ ɬ ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ.
bake-MID-ACT 1SUB FUT OBL DET salmon COMP day-3SSUB
‘I am going to barbeque fish tomorrow.’

AUX 1PL.SUB plant+CONT-MID-ACT OBL DET potato
‘We are doing the planting of the potatoes.’

(22) ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ ɬ-ɬ ɬ-ɬ ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ.
burn-MID-ACT OBL DET water fowl
‘Do the job of singeing the water fowl!’

Other examples are given in (23).

mitɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ ‘mashing’, ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ ‘pour’

The opposite order of stacking—the activity suffix inside the middle suffix—is not allowed, as the data in (24) show.


When viewed from a semantic perspective, double antipassives are not unexpected, since the two suffixes have slightly different lexical restrictions and different semantic functions. Adding -els to a form that already has -m adds the additional meaning of a job-like activity, as we see by contrasting the translation of the simple antipassive in (25) to the stacked antipassive in (26).

AUX pour-MID-ACT OBL DET tea DET John
‘John poured some tea.’

AUX pour-MID-ACT OBL DET tea DET John
‘John served some tea.’

In cases like (20), the verb root takes -em (ƣʷ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ) but not -els (*ƣʷ-ɬ-ɬ-ɬ). The presence of the -m makes the -els possible.
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Double antipassives have exactly the same surface syntax as single antipassives. They are intransitive, as the causatives in (27) and (28) show.

(27) \( nõ\; cõn\; q^\text{-s-}\text{e-\text{am-els-stx}}^* \; lõ \; s\text{løni}. \)
\( \text{AUX} \; 1\text{SUB} \; \text{go.in.water-MID-ACT-CS} \; \text{DET} \; \text{woman} \)
‘I had the woman do the soaking.’

(28) \( nõ\; cõn\; \text{ka\text{-l-\text{om-els-stx}}^*} \; ðø\; \text{nas} \; \text{øø} \; \text{ðø-nø} \; \text{piøø}. \)
\( \text{ACT} \; 1\text{SUB} \; \text{write-MID-ACT-CS} \; \text{DET} \; \text{nurse} \; \text{OBL} \; \text{DET-1POS} \; \text{paper} \)
‘I had the nurse fill out my form.’

Recall that only intransitives form causatives in Halkomelem. Also the data in (29) and (30) show that the patient in the double antipassive is an oblique object that extracts via \( s \)-nominalization.

(29) \( \text{stem} \; a\text{\text{-lø-a-k\text{-ø-ni}}}\; s-q^\text{-s-}\text{e-\text{am-els-s} \; lõ \; s\text{løni}?} \)
\( \text{what} \; \text{EMPH} \; \text{DET} \; \text{AUX NOM-go.in.water-MID-ACT-3POS DET woman} \)
‘Whatever did the woman soak?’

(30) \( \text{stem} \; a\text{\text{-lø-a-k\text{-ø-ni}}}\; s-k^\text{-l\text{-e-\text{am-els-s} \; lõø \; John}}? \)
\( \text{what} \; \text{EMPH} \; \text{DET} \; \text{AUX NOM-pour-MID-ACT-3POS DET John} \)
‘Whatever did John serve?’

Thus, adding a second antipassive morpheme has no syntactic consequences.

Stacked -\( \text{els} \) presents a problem for the generalization we gave earlier. We said that -\( \text{els} \) and -\( m \) work like detransitivizers. They attach to transitives. But in forms like \( q^\text{-al-\text{om-els}} \) in (20), the activity suffix is attached to an intransitive base. So we seem to have a violation of our previous generalization. Actually the generalization that we need to accommodate the additional facts is quite straightforward. What -\( \text{els} \) is looking for is not a transitive base to attach to, but a verb root with a transitive argument structure. This claim is supported by evidence from lexical suffixes, the Salish equivalent to noun incorporation:

(31) \( y\text{-k\text{-øn-as-øls}} \; \text{‘steer horses, drive car’ [hold face]} \)
\( \text{šašøm-a\text{-q\text{-els}} \; \text{‘smoking fish heads’ [smoke-dry head]} \)
\( k^\text{-k\text{-as-els}} \; \text{‘count money’ [count round objects]} \)
\( x^\text{-l\text{-òq\text{-s-els}} \; \text{‘punch in face’ [punch face]} \)
\( ðø-x^\text{-\text{-iws-els}} \; \text{‘scrape ducks’ [scrape body]} \)
\( k^\text{-ax\text{-\text{-øtx\text{-øls}} \; ‘knock on houses’ [knock building]} \)
\( l^\text{-øx\text{-ø\text{-øls}} \; ‘washing clothes’ [wash garment]} \)

In (31) the lexical suffix is the patient. This type of lexical suffixation can result in detransitivization in Halkomelem (Gerds 1998, Gerds and Hinkson 1996). So, in fact, the verb base is already detransitivized when the activity suffix -\( \text{els} \) is attached. The suffix -\( \text{els} \) adds the job-like semantics. So we see that the crucial condition on -\( \text{els} \) is that it be attached to a form
with a verb root with a transitive argument structure. The middle suffix -m is different. Verb bases with lexical suffixes do not form antipassives with -m. Another use of the middle, the personal reflexive, is allowed (Gerds to appear, Gerds and Hukari 1998), but an antipassive use of the middle suffix following lexical suffixes is not. This, together with the fact that -m cannot appear outside of -els (*24), shows that, unlike -els, -m places restrictions on the base to which it attaches. We summarize the difference between -els and -m in (32).

(32) Transitivity conditions on Antipassive morphology:
   a. -m requires the base to which it attaches to be a 2-place predicate.
   b. -els requires the underlying predicate to be 2-place.

Both antipassive morphemes require transitivity. But -m requires the base to which it attaches to be transitive while -els requires the underlying predicate to be transitive.

The requirement in (32b) might seem a little strange if you are used to thinking in terms of ordered, bracketed derivation with Mirror Principle effects (Baker 1988). But having a condition on morphology that requires looking back into the argument structure of the verb root is not unprecedented for Halkomelem. Gerds (to appear) gives the following restrictions on the two benefactive applicatives:

(33) a. Use -əlc- when the underlying predicate is 2-place.
    b. Use -meʔ- when the underlying predicate is 1-place.

Like the activity suffix, the benefactive -əlc- is attached to transitives per (32a), as exemplified in (34), but the benefactive -meʔ- is used in intransitive contexts, as exemplified in (35).

(34) niʔ əɛl-əlc-t-oš ḏə kʷθə sceu:ltən.
   AUX bake-BEN-TR-3ERG OBL DET salmon
   ‘He baked the salmon for her.’

(35) kʷukʷ- meʔ-t!
   cook-APPL-TR
   ‘Cook for him/her!’

But also like the activity suffix, the benefactive can appear after lexical suffixes, as in (36) and (37). So its transitivity requirement is met by the transitivity of the root at the underlying level, not according to the base to which it attaches.

(36) ḏxʷ-əlwat-əlc-ət!
   wash-clothes-BEN-TR
   ‘Wash clothes for him/her!’
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We see then that the transitivity of the root can satisfy the transitivity requirement for both the Halkomelem benefactive suffix -\textit{alc} and the activity suffix -\textit{els}, despite the fact that there are intervening detransitivizing suffixes.

4. The Structure of Antipassives
What do stacked antipassives tell us about the architecture of morphosyntactic theory? To account for antipassives, we need an analysis involving a transitive argument structure but an intransitive surface syntax. Many different analyses for antipassive constructions have been proposed in the literature. Although the terminology and devices vary across theories, they nevertheless can be grouped into two general approaches.

First, some theories take the “demotion” approach to antipassive. In these theories, antipassive morphology is associated with detransitivization. The first formal treatments of antipassive were given in Relational Grammar (Postal 1977). The clause is assigned an initial transitive structure, but the initial object is “chomeurized” either via the retreat and advancement of the subject (see especially Davies (1986) or via spontaneous demotion, as Gerdt (1988b) posits for Halkomelem. Another analysis that treats antipassive as a syntactic rule is the Government/Binding Incorporation approach (Baker 1988). Antipassive morphology is base-generated as the object of the verb; the NP object is an adjunct. The morpheme head-moves to the V and absorbs accusative case. Other linguists have proposed non-syntactic demotion. Lexicalist approaches (e.g. Grimshaw & Mester 1985) associate antipassive with a lexical rule affecting the argument structure of the clause, turning the object/theme into an oblique nominal. The antipassive morpheme is added to the base as a concomitant to the lexical rule. Farrell (1992) gives a lexical account of Halkomelem antipassive based on arguments supplied by Gerdt.

Any of the demotion analyses can handle the simple antipassive examples. However, none of them can handle multiple antipassives. When the second antipassive is added, it should correlate with detransitivization. However, the second antipassive cannot detransitivize a structure that has already been detransitivized by the attachment of the first antipassive suffix. So, under demotion approaches, multiple antipassives are totally unexpected and unexplained.

A second type of approach to antipassive has been proposed, however. Antipassive can be associated with the “maintenance” of an agent by mapping the agent, but not the patient, onto subsequent layers of morphosyntactic structure. Many functional accounts of antipassive imply this process. See, for example, “foregrounding” antipassives (Foley and Van Valin 1984) and the “agent focus” construction in Mayan (Aissen 1999 and references therein). In Mapping Theory, an off-shoot of Relational Grammar, Gerdt (1993, 1995) proposes the following mapping rule for the Halkomelem antipassive:

(38) Do not link the 2 (patient) and cancel the B (object) inflectional position
    (if there is one).
Such a rule allows for multiple antipassive, since NOT linking the 2 twice has no more effect on the clause than NOT linking the 2 once.

In addition, a mapping analysis is possible within HPSG. Following Manning and Sag (1998) and Wechsler (1998), we propose that antipassive has a complex argument structure. The a-subject of the antipassive corresponds to the a-subject of the inner argument structure, where, by ‘a-subject’, we mean the leftmost argument on the (local) list.

(39) antipassive ARG-ST <a, <a, b>>

The outer a-subject maps to the syntactic role of subject and, for Halkomelem, we assume that a (distinct) inner argument maps to oblique object. Compare this to passive (Manning and Sag 1998), roughly represented as follows:

(40) passive ARG-ST <b, <a, b>>

That is, the outer a-subject links to the inner a-object and this role would generally map to subject, while the inner a-subject would link to an oblique role (if at all). If the -m antipassive creates the complex argument structure in (39), then the question arises as to the structure of a double antipassive. Is it as follows?

(41) double antipassive ARG-ST <a, <a, <a, b>>>

It is not obvious that the complex structure in (41) satisfies the condition on antipassives, as discussed above, namely that the base predicate’s argument structure is transitive. It seems we need access to the inner argument structure, which is transitive.

(42) An outer antipassive [e.g. Halkomelem -els] is only possible if the AP morpheme can satisfy a condition on transitivity somewhere within its (innermost) argument structure (cf. (32b)).

Thus we see that, double antipassive with no syntactic effect will be possible in an HPSG analysis, provided that the outer antipassive morpheme can satisfy its transitivity requirement from the innermost predicate.

5. Conclusion
In conclusion, antipassives in Halkomelem show many properties that have been attested in antipassives of other languages. One property though, stacking, is something previously unattested. Stacked antipassives are problematic for demotion analyses of antipassives. However, mapping approaches that allow for the crucial feature of an antipassive structure to be the maintenance of the agent into subsequent layers of morphosyntactic structure can

\[\text{4The Halkomelem passive is beyond the scope of this paper. The status of the Halkomelem passive patient is moot, as discussed in Gerdt (1988b).}\]
accommodate multiple antipassives. We have proposed a mapping analysis within HPSG for the Halkomelem antipassive.

Thus, the Halkomelem facts support a model of argument structure where fully formed words, at least up to the level of inflection, stand in relationship to other fully formed words without internal bracketing, following Anderson (1992). Argument structure mapping approaches do not “derive” antipassives from transitive bases or double antipassives from single antipassives, but rather allow verb valences to stand in a lexical relation to each other.

We might ask, why are stacked antipassives so rare? The answer, we think, lies in (32b)—the fact that the suffix -els can satisfy its requirement for transitivity from the root rather than from the base it attaches to. Such “look back” licensing runs counter to the usual procedures of ordered, bracketed derivation. We expect “look back” licensing to be rare, so likewise multiple antipassives will also be rare.
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