O. Introduction

Morpho-syntactic transitivity in the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem and its interaction with person inflection and phrasal adjuncts are discussed here in a relatively superficial framework. While the goal of linguistic description is an economical, descriptively adequate account of the relationship between meaning and surface form, it is not clear that linguistic theory is any closer to attaining this goal now than it was ten years ago. The multiplicity of alternate, perhaps equivalent, syntactic analyses of English in the literature does not augur well for a descriptively 'new' language such as Halkomelem, as again any number of syntactic analyses would probably be compatible with the facts as we know them. An account of the more obvious, and superficial, syntactic relationships in Halkomelem constitutes a reasonable interim goal, serving as a basis for further research in both Halkomelem and in related languages.

Previous scholarship in related Salishan languages has made occasional use of the case-related terms agent and patient. Applying these to Halkomelem, we could label the phrasal adjuncts in the following examples as agent and patient.

\[
\text{(1) } \text{ni? q\'el\'em t}^\Theta \text{ sway?qe?}. \quad \text{The man barbecued.}
\]

\[
\text{ni? q\'el\'em t}^\Theta \text{ sway?qe?}
\]

\[
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5
\]
While case terms undoubtedly reflect something about the semantic interpretation of these sentences, there is no more motivation for distinguishing between (1) and (2) in surface syntax than between the following English examples.

(3) Mary cooked.
(4) The roast cooked.

Despite the rather strikingly close correlation between transitive subject and semantic agent, as discussed below, the morphosyntactic categories subject and object, based on the person inflection system, are more immediately relevant to syntactic description in Halkomelem and the phrasal adjuncts of sentences such as (1) and (2) are interpreted as subjects.

Although there are obvious correspondences between syntax and semantic case in Halkomelem, the case relation obtaining between a phrasal adjunct or person marker and a predicate is in part a strictly semantic function not reflecting surface syntax.
For example, the roots q'waq' get hit and səwʔə seek take, respectively, patient and agent subjects, where the morpho-syntactic category of subject is constant despite the difference in case relations.

(5) niʔ con q'waq'. I got hit.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
\text{SUBJECT/PATIENT} & \text{nonproximal} & \text{get-hit}
\end{array}
\]

(6) niʔ con səwʔə. I sought (someone).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
\text{SUBJECT/AGENT} & \text{nonproximal} & \text{seek}
\end{array}
\]

Holding the case relations constant, the corresponding transitive constructions, marked by a /-t/ predicate suffix, differ.

(5a) niʔ q'waq'əsamʔəs. He/she hit me.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\text{OBJECT/PATIENT} & \text{proximal} & \text{hit} & \text{me (object)} & \text{third person trans. subj.}
\end{array}
\]

(6a) niʔ con səwʔət. I sought (him/her).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{SUBJECT/AGENT} & \text{proximal} & \text{I (subject)} & \text{transitive}
\end{array}
\]
Whatever the semantic relations, it is clear that subject and object, rather than the case terms agent and patient are relevant to the description of the Halkomelem person system and that /con/I in (5) and (6) are surface subjects. Further, there is no evidence that agent and patient are relevant to the syntactic description of phrasal adjuncts. Sentences (7) and (8) are parallel to (5) and (6), where the phrasal adjunct /θə sənə?/ the woman is interpreted analogously to the subject marker /con/I.

(7) niʔ qʷaqʷ θə sənə? The woman got hit.
(8) niʔ səʔəʔ θə sənə? The woman sought (someone).

This suggests that, despite semantic differences, at some point in the grammar the phrasal adjuncts of (7) and (8) are syntactically equivalent.

The syntactic and, in part, semantic status of a phrasal adjunct correlates with the morphology of the predicate. Consider the following sentences, all based on the root /ləkʷ(ə)/ break in two.

Root (Intransitive):

(9) niʔ ləkʷ tə sənəʔ st. The stick broke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 nonproximal
2 break in two
3 article
4 stick
/-els/ activity suffix (Intransitive)

(10) ni? 1əkʷələs təH swəʔqeʔ. The man broke (things) in two.

ni? 1əkʷ-els təH swəʔqeʔ

1 nonproximal 4 article
2 break in two 5 man
3 activity

/-t/ (Transitive):

(11) ni? 1əkʷətəs təH səcəst. He/she broke the stick in two.

ni? 1əkʷ-a-təs təH səcəst

1 nonproximal 4 third person trans. subj.
2 break in two 5 article
3 transitive 6 stick

Benefactive /-ic/ plus /-t/ (Transitive):

(12) ni? 1əkʷətəcətəs təH swəʔqeʔ. He/she broke (it) in two

ni? 1əkʷ-ic-təs təH swəʔqeʔ

1 nonproximal 5 third person trans. subj.
2 break in two 6 article
3 benefactive 7 man
4 transitive

As discussed below, the interpretation of a phrasal adjunct as subject or object correlates with the person inflection system, where only transitive predicates take objects. The case interpretation of an adjunct is a function of both its syntactic status as subject or object and the predicate morphology. For example, while the root /1əkʷ/ break in two (9) takes patient subjects, the
activity suffix /-els/ (10) takes agent subjects. Similarly, the simple transitive /ləkʷat/ break it in two (11) takes a patient object while the benefactive transitive /ləkʷətʃət/ (12) takes a benefactive object.

We consider below Halkomelem transitive and intransitive predicate morphology and its interaction with person and phrasal adjuncts, showing that a considerable range of syntactic phenomena may be accounted for by taking transitivity and the person inflection categories of subject and object as significant linguistic constructs.

1. Predicates

1.0 A root in Halkomelem is morpho-syntactically intransitive in contrast to languages such as English (compare die and kill). A transitive predicate in Halkomelem may inflect for both person categories, subject and object, while an intransitive predicate may inflect for subject only. The sole means of introducing object inflection is through the presence of a transitive suffix, the productive transitive suffixes being /-t/ transitive, /-nexʷ/ lack-of-control and /-stəxʷ/ causative.

While the relationship between semantic function (case) and syntactic category is not one-to-one in Halkomelem, the subject of a transitive predicate is in some sense the agent (or perceiver in the case of /ləməxʷ/ see). For those roots which do not take agent subjects, the presence of a transitive suffix switches the
case relation of a subject marker from patient (or some other non-agentive relation) to agent, as in the following examples where the subject marker is /con/ I.

(13) ni? con pas.  
PATIENT  
ni? con pas  
1 2 3  
1 nonproximal  
2 I  
3 get-hit  

(14) ni? con pasat.  
AGENT  
ni? con pas-t  
1 2 3 4  
1 nonproximal  
2 I  
3 hit  
4 transitive  

However, the ability to take agent subjects is not a function unique to the transitive suffixes. In this section we consider predicate suffixes which take agent subjects.

1.1 Transitive Suffixes

As mentioned above, the productive transitive suffixes are /-t/ transitive, /-nexw/ lack-of-control and /-staxw/ causative. In addition, there are the apparently nonproductive forms /-§/ and /-nas/. Such transitive suffixes constitute the sole means of introducing object inflection, which is discussed below in section two.

The suffixes /-t/ transitive and /-nexw/ lack-of-control contrast semantically, marking the degree of control the subject has over the event. The /-nexw/ suffix implies that the subject is not
in full control: the subject did it accidentally, he managed to do it under adverse circumstances, or he simply was not really in control (as in the case of /ləmənəxʷ/ see, where the subject is more an experiencer than an agent). The /-t/ suffix is seemingly more neutral, but implies a greater degree of control over the event. Although this distinction does not translate readily in English, the following examples may give some idea of the contrast.

| ?ikʷət       | throw (it) away |
| ?əkʷnəxʷ     | lose (it)      |
| kʷlet        | pour (it)      |
| kʷənəxʷ      | spill (it)     |
| kʷənət       | take (it)      |
| kʷə(n)nəxʷ   | find/get/receive (it) |
| taʔəlt       | study/learn (it) |
| təlʔnəxʷ     | find (it) out  |
| ləkʷət       | break (it) in two |
| ləkʷnəxʷ     | accidentally break (it) in two, manage to |

The causative suffix /-stəxʷ/, while also a transitive suffix, is distributionally distinct, combining with stems which do not necessarily take /-t/ or /-nexʷ/. For example, it combines with stems ending in the activity suffix /-els/ (discussed
below), while /-t/ and /-nexu/ do not.

- qwil to club
- qwilstoxu have/take (him/her) to club
- xels fry
- xelstoxu have/take (him/her) to fry

It also occurs with resultatives, consisting of consonant-vowel reduplication of the root plus the static /s/- prefix, while /-t/ and /-nexu/ do not.

- tenat stack (them) side-by-side (transitive)
- statin stacked side-by-side (resultative)
- statinstox get (them) stacked side-by-side
- tenat weave (it)
- stelin woven
- stelinstox get (it) woven

The remaining transitive suffixes are marginal. The /-x/ suffix, as in /new x/ put (it) in (root, /new/ in) may be viewed as a suppletive allomorph of /-t/. In fact, speakers are somewhat reluctant to accept /-x/ when the predicate is inflected for object and usually switch to the /-t/ inflection. Another transitive form, /-nəx/, occurs with hem? go as in /nəmnəx/ go toward (him/her), and /nəwə/ come here, as in /nəwnəx/ come toward (him/her),
Intransitive Agent Suffixes

While transitive suffixes are unique in permitting object inflection, they are not the only suffixes which take agent subjects. The /-els/ activity suffix takes agent subjects as may (although not necessarily) the so-called middle voice /-m/.

The Activity Suffix

The activity suffix /-els/ is intransitive, not inflecting for object but taking agent subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḷeʔxʷt</td>
<td>ḷeʔxʷels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭeʔt</td>
<td>ṭeʔels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭeʔt</td>
<td>ṭeʔels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḷeʔt</td>
<td>ḷeʔels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suffix provides a means of introducing an agent subject without mentioning the thing undergoing the action, not unlike optionally transitive verbs in English, such as pick or sew, except that such intransitives are overtly marked in Halkomelem. As third person object is unmarked in Halkomelem (see section two), the distinction between transitive and activity predicates may seem subtle in the following examples.
(15) ni? cəŋ cəy?xʷ-t.  
I dried (it).
ni? cəŋ cəy?xʷ-t  
nonproximal I dry-transitive
1  2  3  4

I dried (something).
ni? cəŋ cəy?xʷ-els  
nonproximal I dry-activity
1  2  3  4

(17) ni? cəŋ kʷlet.  
I poured (it).
ni? cəŋ kʷlet  
nonproximal I pour-transitive
1  2  3  4

(18) ni? cəŋ kʷels.  
I poured.
ni? cəŋ kʷels  
nonproximal I pour-activity
1  2  3  4

However the significance of an intransitive predicate taking agent subjects will become apparent in section three.

The /-els/ activity suffix is apparently highly productive, however it sometimes denotes a culturally significant activity with specialization of meaning.

Transitive  
| Activity |
|---|---|
| wenš | throw (it) |
| nəwʔəš | put (it) in |
| ?ələq | take (it) out |
| leqət | lay (it) down |
| həqət | put (it) under; bake (it) |

Activity  
| Activity |
|---|---|
| wenels | throw out money or blankets in the longhouse |
| nəwʔels | bring in a picture of a person for ceremonial purposes in the longhouse |
| ?ələqels | withdraw money from the bank |
| leqels | make a down payment; donate blankets |
| həqels | bake |
The use of /-els/ in culturally significant activities may be due to the fact that it permits the expression of an agent subject without an object and this, as we will see below, is impossible under certain circumstances with transitive suffixes. That is, in culturally well defined contexts the thing acted upon will be understood and the activity suffix then permits the speaker to focus on the actor.

1.2.2 Middle Voice

The so-called middle voice suffix /-m/ also may (though not necessarily) take agent subjects and does not inflect for object. This suffix is apparently not as productive as /-els/, however there is a sizeable number of roots which normally occur with /-m/, such as /ʔiləm/ sing and /qʷələm/ barbecue. Often the transitive/intransitive opposition parallels that of /-els/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Middle Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pənʔet</td>
<td>plant, bury it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qʷələt</td>
<td>barbecue it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʷət</td>
<td>count it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even in these cases /-els/ forms are frequently possible, although not as common: /pənʔels/ plant, /qʷəlels/ barbecue, /kʷəels/ count.

It is conceivable, perhaps likely, that Halkomelem has more than one suffix involving /m/. I have found upon experimentation that several stems which do not occur spontaneously with /-m/
permit a /-e?om/ suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Middle Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k'weet</td>
<td>k'weels</td>
<td>k'we?om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiqet</td>
<td>hœqels</td>
<td>hœqe?om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḋay?x'wt</td>
<td>ḋay?x'wels</td>
<td>ḋay?x'v?om</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms are apparently synonymous with the activity forms but far less common. I have no explanation for this phonological shape if this is the same morpheme as /-m/. Compare, for example, /'kwset/ count it, /'kwsels/ count, and /'kwsem/ count to /'kweet/ pour it, /'kweels/ pour and /'kwe?om/ pour.

Further, in none of the examples above is it clear that the term middle voice is an accurate description. That is, it is not obvious that the actor is viewed as performing the action for his own benefit. However, these are stems with which /-m/ appears to convey the notion of middle voice, acting upon oneself or for one's own benefit.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tši?q'om</td>
<td>comb one's hair</td>
<td>tši?q'ot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x'vtx'asom</td>
<td>wash one's face</td>
<td>x'vtx'ast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šak'om</td>
<td>bathe oneself</td>
<td>šak'ot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these are activities typically performed on people, it is understandable that the /-m/ forms are interpreted as actions upon oneself, however, this would not a priori be the only possible interpretation, yet I am aware of no ambiguity in these forms.
Predicates with /-m/ do not necessarily take agent subjects. For example, /haq'əm/ smell, /yak'əm/ break, and /qewəm/ get paid take patient subjects. This suggests that case interpretation of predicates with /-m/ is a function of the predicate root, some roots taking subjects and others taking patients; however, it is also possible that this reflects distinct but homophonous /-m/ suffixes.

1.3 Summary

Halkomelem exhibits overt marking for transitivity, transitive predicates being marked by the presence of a transitive suffix. We can distinguish between the morpho-syntactic property of transitivity (taking both subject and object markers) and semantic agentivity. While transitive predicates take agent subjects, so do intransitive predicates with the activity suffix /-els/ and sometimes with the middle voice suffix /-m/.

The interaction of transitivity person and phrasal adjuncts will be discussed in section three below. First, however, we turn to a brief discussion of the Halkomelem person system.

2. Person

2.0 Halkomelem inflects for two person categories: subject and object, intransitive predicates taking subject markers only and transitives permitting both.
2.1 Subject

The Halkomelem subject markers are clitics, appearing in second position in a clause. As is typical of Central Coast Salish, there are two subject series, the independent clause series preceded by a /c- ~ č/ formative and a subordinate series without it.

Independent Clause Subject Clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>cen</td>
<td>ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>ceep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Clause Subject Clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>-(e)nʔ</td>
<td>-ət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>-əxʷ</td>
<td>-ələp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td></td>
<td>-əs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third person is unmarked in the independent clause series. However there is a transitive third person subject suffix /-əs/, homophonous with the dependent clause clitic, but distributionally distinct. While the clitic forms, including the dependent clause /-əs/, maintain second position in a clause, the transitive third person suffix always remains fixed to a transitive predicate.

The position of subject clitics is illustrated in the following sentences, where the subject clitic /cen/ I maintains second position, after the main predicate in (19), a temporal-spacial auxiliary in (20) and after an adverb in (21).
Like English tense or verb suffixes in Chomsky's (1956) treatment, the underlying position of Halkomelem subject clitics is somewhat arbitrary, although I am inclined to suggest that (19) represents the basic position as Halkomelem exhibits VSO properties (see section three).

The third person transitive subject suffix /-ős/ is unique in the system. It is a predicate suffix, not a clitic and co-occurs with the subordinate clause third person subject clitic.

In (22) the subordinate clause clitic /-ős/ occurs after the first
word of the clause /ni?/ nonproximal but the transitive third person suffix /-as/ occurs as well, on the transitive predicate /k'icot/ butcher (it). In contrast to this, the first or second person subject is not doubly marked in subordinate clauses.

(23) \[ \text{whether I butchered the deer} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hypothesetical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>nonproximal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I, subordinate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>deer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Object

Object markers are predicate suffixes occurring only with transitive stems (stems containing a transitive suffix).

Object Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>-(s)am?§</td>
<td>-al?x'w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>-(s)amö</td>
<td>-alö</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third person is unmarked in the object system of Halkomelem. The singular object suffixes have allomorphs with /s/ when they occur with the transitive suffix /-t/, combining to form /θ/. This /s/ may represent an old first person singular object which has lost its status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/-t/</th>
<th>/-nexw/</th>
<th>/-staxw/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>Lack-of-Control</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lemət</td>
<td>look at (it)</td>
<td>lemənxʷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- first sing. leməθ(əm?ʃ)  lemənam?ʃ  lemståm?ʃ
- second sing. leməθame  leməname  lemståme
- first plur. lemətal?xʷ  lemənal?xʷ  lemståtal?xʷ
- second plur. leməṭale  lemənale  lemståle

Subject and object markers combine freely, except for a constraint paralleling that of Squamish (Kuipers: 1967) that second person object and third person subject do not co-occur. Instead, the medio-passive paradigm is employed (see section 2.3).

/-s/ occurs as a short form of first or second person singular objects in combination with transitive /-t/ (realized as /θ/). When the subject is first person, /-s/ occurs as an optional second person form.

(24) čewəθ can ceʔ.  I will help you.

čew-t-s can ceʔ
1 2 3 4 5

1 help 4 I
2 transitive 5 future
3 you

Apparently, this form is acceptable only if the subject clitic follows the inflected predicate. If it precedes, the full form is required.

(25) niʔ can ceʔ  čewəθame.  I will help you.
Otherwise, /-s/ is a short form for the first person singular object.

(26) čewθ.  
    Help me.

(27) ni? čewθes.  
    He/she helped me.

The longer forms are stylistically preferable (except perhaps for the command form), suggesting that the short form may be a truncation rather than a continuation of an etymological first person singular.

2.3 Passives

Cowichan passives represent a mixed category in surface form. They are based on transitive stems and permit inflection for object but not for subject. Two passive constructions exist: the medio-passive ending in /-m/ and the dependent passive ending in /-t/.
2.3.1 The Medio-Passive

Medio-passive predicates are based on transitive stems, which may be inflected for object, plus the suffix /-m/. The object forms are not morphologically transparent, although the inflectional categories of the transitive object system are maintained except that the first and second person plural forms are homophones.

### Medio-Passive Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>-(s)eləm</td>
<td>-aləm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>-(s)am</td>
<td>-aləm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td></td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third person is again unmarked, save the medio-passive /-m/. Note again the /s/ in the singular forms, which occurs with transitive /-t/, combining to form /θ/.

### /-t/ Transitive  /-nex/ Lack-of-Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/-t/ Transitive</th>
<th>/-nex/ Lack-of-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lemətəm</td>
<td><em>it is looked at</em></td>
<td>lemənəm <em>it is seen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first singular</td>
<td>leməθeləm</td>
<td>lemneləm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second sing.</td>
<td>leməθam</td>
<td>lemnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first plural</td>
<td>lemətaləm</td>
<td>lemnaləm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second plur.</td>
<td>lemətaləm</td>
<td>lemnaləm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The medio-passive represents an intermediate series, between transitives and intransitives: like intransitives, medio-passives inflect for one person category only, like transitives, they inflect
for object, but unlike either category, medio-passives do not take subject clitics. Further they do not take the third person transitive subject marker /-əs/, a characteristic of transitive predicates.

2.3.2 The Dependent Passive

Dependent passive predicates are virtually identical to medio-passives, except for the presence of a /-t/ suffix instead of /-m/.

### Dependent Passive Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>-(s)elt</td>
<td>-alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second pers.</td>
<td>-(s)amat</td>
<td>-alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td></td>
<td>-əwət</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feasibly dependent passives are based on medio-passives with the addition of a final /-t/ suffix triggering the loss of the medio-passive /-m/ (and no epenthetic /ə/). This might account for the relationship between the three second person singular suffixes.

transitive       -(s)amə
medio-passive   -(s)am
dependent passive -(s)amat

The medio-passive form may derive from */-(s)amə-m/* with loss of intervocalic /m/, while this is preserved in the dependent passive.
with loss of the second /m/, from *-/s)amə-m-t/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Transitive/ Lack-of-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/-t/</td>
<td>/-nexw/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lemətewət</td>
<td>lemnewət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first sing.</td>
<td>it is looked at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lemədelt</td>
<td>lemnelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second sing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lemədəmət</td>
<td>lemnamət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first plur.</td>
<td>lemətalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lemətlalt</td>
<td>lemnlalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second plur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third person dependent passive /-ewət/ has a partial /-ew/ for which I have no explanation. Possibly this represents an empty connective.

The /-t/ suffix is tentatively assigned here to a non-productive stative morpheme, occurring in such forms as /təyt/ upstream, as opposed to /təyəl/ go upstream (with inchoative /-il/) and the triply marked resultative /swəʔwəlʔt/ hidden (/s/ static, /wəl/ hide, reduplicated, /-t/ stative).

2.3.3 The Status of Passives

Cowichan passives appear to be subjectless transitive predicates, in that they inflect for object but do not permit subjects. They differ markedly in surface form from such languages as Lushootseed, Squamish (Kuipers: 1967) and Straits (Thompson: 1971) in which subject inflection but not object is employed. In Lushootseed, for example, the medio-passive suffix /-b/ (cognate with Cw. /-m/) is affixed to the transitive stem and a subject
clitic signals the patient (corresponding to the object of a transitive).

(28) ?ukwaxwatb čəd. I was helped. (Passive)

    ?u-kwaxw(a)-t-b čəd
    1 2 3 4 5

1 completive
2 help
3 transitive
4 medio-passive
5 I

Even in languages where subject clitics appear in the medio-passive it is conceivable that this construction represents a subjectless transitive in deep structure, with a rule moving an object marker into subject clitic position. In any case, medio-passives are closely related to transitive predicates. For example, the case relations of a transitive predicate are not undone by the medio-passive. For example, a root such as /səwʔə/ seek, taking an agent subject in Cowichan, maintains patient as its object in both the transitive and the medio-passive forms.

(30) ni? səwʔəmʔəs. (He) looked for me.

(31) ni? səwʔəmeləm. I was looked for.

That is, the one person category associated with the medio-passive
predicate maintains the same case relation as the object of the corresponding transitive, despite whatever case relations hold for the intransitive root. I suspect similar examples exist in Salishan languages where subject inflection appears in the medio-passive. That is, there are intransitive roots which take agent subjects but the surface subject of a medio-passive is nevertheless a patient, reflecting a closer association with the object of the corresponding transitive.

2.4 Summary

Halkomelem has two person inflection categories: subject and object. In addition, the transitive subject suffix /-os/ appears to represent a category of its own. The person systems of Halkomelem are distributionally distinct from phrasal adjuncts, which are discussed below. Subject and object markers are closely associated with the predicate, object suffixes appearing on transitive predicates and subject clitics maintaining second position in the clause. As phrasal adjuncts follow the predicate, strictly speaking the person markers are not pronominal in that they do not substitute for phrasal adjuncts. This fact has no a priori implications for linguistic description, except for the obvious point that Halkomelem person markers clearly do not belong to the same surface category as phrasal adjuncts. It does not follow, for example, that Halkomelem person markers represent deep structure categories distinct from phrasal adjuncts. On the other hand, the obvious functio-
nal parallel between person and phrasal adjuncts discussed below does not necessarily imply the opposite, that person markers and phrasal adjuncts should be derived from the same deep structure category.

3. Predicates and Adjuncts

3.0 A phrasal adjunct may be direct or oblique in Halkomelem. Direct adjuncts are interpreted as subject or object. Oblique adjuncts are preceded by the general preposition /ʔa/ and represent the means of introducing adjuncts in addition to those which are interpreted as subject or object.

\[
\text{(32) } \text{ni? ʔaməstəs} t^Oə \text{ swiwsəs} ?e t^Oə ʔəptən.}
\]

\begin{tabular}{cccc}
DIRECT & (OBJECT) & OBLIQUE \\
1 ni? & 2 ?aməstəs & 3 t^Oə & 4 swiwsəs & 5 ?e & 6 t^Oə & 7 ʔəptən \\
\end{tabular}

He/she gave the boy a knife.

\[
\text{ni? ʔaməs-t-əs} t^Oə \text{ swiwsəs} ?e t^Oə ʔəptən}
\]

1 nonproximal 4 third trans. subj. 7 oblique
2 give 5 article 8 article
3 transitive 6 man 9 knife

3.1 Direct Adjuncts

3.1.1 Intransitive Constructions

The direct adjunct of an intransitive predicate is interpreted as the subject. An intransitive construction may have a subject clitic, a direct adjunct or neither (the unmarked third person). Although subject clitics are syntactically distinct from direct adjuncts, maintaining second position in a clause, the
two are functionally equivalent in intransitive constructions. For example, if a subject clitic is interpreted as the semantic agent, then a direct adjunct is also the agent.

(33) ni? con k'wem. 
    SUBJECT/AGENT
ni? con k'w'em
1 2 3 4
nonproximal I count-middle
1 2 3 4

I counted.

(34) ni? k'w'em tθ s.wəy?qe?. 
    SUBJECT/AGENT
ni? k'w'em tθ s.wəy?qe?
1 2 3 4 5
1 nonproximal
2 count
3 middle voice
4 article
5 man

The man counted.

Similarly, if a subject clitic is interpreted as patient, then so is a direct adjunct.

(35) ni? con pas. 
    SUBJECT/PATIENT
ni? con pas
1 2 3
1 nonproximal
2 I
3 get-hit

I got hit.

(36) ni? pas tθ s.wił?las. 
    SUBJECT/PATIENT
ni? pas tθ s.wił?las
1 2 3 4
1 nonproximal
2 get-hit
3 article
4 boy

The boy got hit.
While the relation between subject clitics and direct adjuncts must be accounted for in any descriptively adequate grammar, it does not necessarily follow that they are transformationally related. In any case, subject clitics and direct adjuncts in intransitive constructions are interpreted analogously.

3.1.2 Transitive Constructions

3.1.2.1 The interpretation of a direct phrasal adjunct with a transitive predicate is a function of the person system. The direct adjunct is interpreted as object if the predicate is not inflected for first or second person subject or object.

(37) ni? lemətəs ʔθ e speʔeθ.  
      ni? lemə-t-əs ʔθ e speʔeθ  
      1 2 3 4 5 6

1 nonproximal 4 third pers. trans. subj.
2 see 5 article
3 transitive 6 bear

This contrasts with intransitives, where a direct adjunct is interpreted as subject. That is, /ʔθ e speʔeθ/the bear (37) is interpreted analogously to /-samʔs/me(object) in (38) rather than /cən/I (subject) in (39).

(38) ni? leməθamʔsəs.  
      OBJECT  
      ni? lem-t-samʔs-əs  
      1 2 3 4 5

1 nonproximal 4 me (object)
2 see 5 third pers. trans. subj.
It is not obvious why a direct adjunct of a transitive predicate should be interpreted as object rather than subject under these circumstances. One might argue that the /-əs/ third person transitive subject suffix fills the role of subject. However this argument loses its force in face of the fact that a subject adjunct and the /-əs/ suffix may co-occur, as shown below.

Further in Lushootseed (Puget Salish), a direct adjunct under similar conditions is interpreted as object, yet the third person suffix is not used.

(40) tušuuc ti spaʔc.  (he/she) saw the bear.

tu-šu-c ti spaʔc
1 2 3 4 5
1 remote
2 see
3 transitive

4 article
5 bear

The object interpretation of direct adjuncts of transitive predicates represents an almost ergative characteristic. One may compare intransitive roots and their corresponding transitives, where the case relation holds constant.

(41) niʔ ʔaʔ̌m ʔə xʷiʔlem.  The rope broke.

niʔ ʔaʔ̌m ʔə xʷiʔlem
1 2 3 4 5
1 remote
2 see
3 transitive

4 article
5 bear
However too much may be made of this. As we have noted above, the case relation of an adjunct to a root need not be patient, as in the case of /saw/ seek, where the parallel does not hold (see sentences (6) and (6a)). Further, the person system is, if anything, accusative, where the object of a transitive predicate does not correspond formally to the subject of an intransitive.

3.1.2.2 When two direct adjuncts occur with a transitive predicate the first is interpreted as subject and the second as object.

(43) ni? q'waq'etalas t^o sway?qe? t^o spe?e\theta.

The man clubbed the bear.

1 nonproximal 5 article
2 club 6 man
3 transitive 7 article
4 third pers. trans. subj. 8 bear
Such examples suggest that Halkomelem is a VSO language. It seems significant to note, however, that this is not a common construction. An example of its infrequency is the fact that in one twenty-five minute text (a traditional story) I found no examples of a transitive predicate with two direct adjuncts. Nevertheless, the construction does occur spontaneously, if infrequently.

3.1.2.3 Elsewhere the interpretation of a direct adjunct is a function of the person system. If a transitive predicate is inflected for first or second person subject, a direct adjunct is interpreted as object.

(44) ni? con čewat ŋə stəni?.
     SUBJECT OBJECT

I helped the woman.

ni? con čew-t ŋə stəni?

1 2 3 4 5 6

1 nonproximal 4 transitive
2 I (subject) 5 article
3 help 6 woman

Similarly, if a transitive predicate is inflected for first person object, a direct adjunct is interpreted as subject.

(45) ni? čewəsamʔəs ŋə stəni?.
     OBJECT SUBJECT

The woman helped me.

ni? čew-t-samʔəs-əs ŋə stəni?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1 nonproximal 5 third pers. trans. subj.
2 help 6 article
3 transitive 7 woman
4 me (object)
3.1.2.4 To summarize, a direct adjunct of a transitive predicate is preferentially interpreted as goal unless the goal role is filled. That is, if the predicate is inflected for goal than a direct adjunct is interpreted as subject. Similarly, when there are two direct adjuncts then one (the first) is interpreted as subject. In the remaining cases a direct adjunct is interpreted as goal.

3.1.3 The facts as discussed above indicate a functional trade-off between person inflection and direct adjuncts in Halkomelem. This does not lead to any obvious unique syntactic analysis. One can conceive of a number of descriptions compatible with the data, including the following:

I. Adjuncts arise within the predicate complex, in the positions maintained by the person system, and are transformationally moved to the end of the clause. That is, the position of person markers is basic (VOS).

II. Person markers arise from pronominal adjuncts, being derived through agreement rules (as in English subject-verb agreement) or through movement rules. That is, the position of direct phrasal adjuncts is basic (VSO).
III. Person markers and direct adjuncts are distinct categories in deep structure.

While it is not clear that these alternatives are empirically distinguishable in Halkomelem, I tend to prefer III, if on no other grounds than the fact that this most closely reflects the surface syntax of Halkomelem and hence represents in some sense the neutral hypothesis.

I give the following phrase markers as tentative deep structures. The categorical symbols are merely for the purpose of exposition and conceivably could be replaced by other conventions such as feature matrices in the x-bar convention (Chomsky, 1970). Further, several alternatives are possible for the representation of person. While I give syntactic status to person, this could be a function of the lexicon. The essential point in the following examples is that the role of a direct adjunct can be viewed as a function of the person system, where the interpretation as subject or object is determined by the semantic component.

3.1.3.1 First and Second Person

Let us call the predicate complex, including auxiliaries, the predicate and person markers, the proposition. Sentence (46) is in itself a proposition.

(46) ni? can lemaθame. I looked at you.
As mentioned above, it is conceivable that person is a function of the lexicon and that object and subject do not represent deep structure categorical symbols. For the purpose of discussion, however, let us assign person to syntactic nodes and, as suggested in section 2.1, I take the postverbal position as basic for clitics.

3.1.3.2 Adjuncts

It is not clear that subject and object adjuncts are structurally distinct. I suggest that they are not and that one or two direct phrasal adjuncts (labeled NP here) may appear as sisters to the proposition.

(47) ní? lemôtes te spēpēθ. (He/she) saw the bear.
The interpretation of a direct adjunct is a function of semantic interpretation rules binding the adjuncts to third person within the person system. Such rules would reflect the facts discussed above in this section. For example, a single direct adjunct will be interpreted as co-referential with third person object and if the object is not third person the adjunct will be bound to the subject. Similarly, the first of two direct adjuncts will be co-referential with third person subject and the second with third.
person object.

3.2 Oblique Adjuncts

Oblique adjuncts, introduced by the preposition /?a/, do not correspond functionally to the person categories of subject or object, providing a syntactic means of introducing an additional adjunct. In some cases an oblique adjunct corresponds semantically to a direct adjunct of a lexically related predicate. Three cases of this are discussed here.

3.2.1 Activity Predicates

Activity predicates with the /-els/ suffix are intransitive although, like transitives, they take agent subjects.

(49) ni? cən čəkʷxels.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
1 \text{ nonproximal} \\
2 \text{ I} \\
3 \text{ fry} \\
4 \text{ activity}
\end{array}
\]

I fried.

(50) ni? čəkʷxels ʔə stəniʔ.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{SUBJECT} \\
1 \text{ nonproximal} \\
2 \text{ I}
\end{array}
\]

The woman fried.

However an additional adjunct, not corresponding to subject or object, is possible if introduced by the preposition /?a/.

(51) ni? cən čəkʷxels ʔə tə sceʔtən.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\text{OBIQUE}
\end{array}
\]

I fried the salmon.
ni? can čak‘x-els ta t^0 sceeítən

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 nonproximal 5 oblique
2 I 6 article
3 fry 7 salmon
4 activity

(52) ni? čak‘xels ta steni? t^0 sceeítən.
   SUBJECT OBIQUE
   The woman fried the salmon.

Note the parallel between this construction and the corresponding transitive with čak‘xt fry it, where the object acted upon (sceeítən salmon) is expressed as a object direct adjunct.

(53) ni? can čak‘xt t^0 sceeítən.
   SUBJECT OBJECT
   I fried the salmon.

(54) ni? čak‘xtas ta steni? t^0 sceeítən.
   SUBJECT OBJECT
   The woman fried the salmon.

There is an obvious semantic correspondence between the object of a transitive and the oblique adjunct of an activity predicate. Nevertheless, activity predicates are syntactically intransitive, not inflecting for object, permitting only one direct adjunct and not taking the third person transitive subject suffix /-as/.

It is interesting to note that this construction provides a means of introducing the agent as an adjunct without mentioning the thing acted upon. As we have mentioned above, normally transitive predicates occur with only one adjunct, which is interpreted as object (unless there is a first pers. object). But the direct ad-
junct of an activity predicate is the subject (and the agent), yielding the following contrast.

(55) ni? 1əkʷatəs tə sɛeʃt. He/she broke the stick.
    ni? 1əkʷa-t-əs tə sɛeʃt
    1 nonproximal
    2 break
    3 transitive
    4 third pers. trans. subj.
    5 article
    6 stick

(56) ni? 1əkʷels ə səniʔə. The woman broke (something).
    ni? 1əkʷ-els ə səniʔə
    1 nonproximal
    2 break
    3 activity
    4 article
    5 woman

The fact that activity predicates take agent subjects and do not inflect for goal provides a means of expressing the agent alone, which may account for its frequent use in culturally well-defined activities (see section 1.2), when the object acted upon would be known.

3.2.2 Middle Voice

Middle voice predicates are syntactically parallel to activity predicates. They are intransitive and may take agent subjects.

(57) ni? can əχələm. I barbecued.

SUBJECT
ni? cən Ɂəɬ-m  I barbecued.
1 2 3 4

1 nonproximal 3 barbecue
2 I 4 middle voice

(58) ni? Ɂəɬəm ɬə sənɨʔ.  The woman barbecued.

As in the case of activity predicates, the thing acted upon may be introduced obliquely.

(59) ni? cən Ɂəɬəm ᵃ tə qə səɬətən.  I barbecued the salmon.

(60) ni? Ɂəɬəm ɬə sənɨʔ ᵃ tə qə səɬətən.

The woman barbecued the salmon.

The correspondence between transitive object and intran- sitive oblique adjunct holds for middle voice forms as well, as in the following three sentences, using the root /kʷəi/ spill/pour.

Transitive

(61) ni? cən kʷəet ᵃ tə kəfə.  I poured the coffee (out).

Activity

(62) ni? cən kʷəels ᵃ tə kəfə.  I poured the coffee.

Middle voice

(63) ni? cən kʷəʔəm ᵃ tə kəfə.  I poured the coffee.
3.2.3 Benefactives

Unlike the examples above, benefactive predicates are transitive, however the object of a benefactive is the beneficiary, not the thing or individual acted upon. Benefactive stems are formed with the benefactive suffix /-ic/ plus the transitive marker /-t/. The fact that benefactives are transitive is illustrated in the following examples.

(64) \( ?i \, \text{can ce? lækʷ-ic-\text{same}} \)  
\( \text{I will break it for you.} \)

\( ?i \, \text{can ce? lækʷ-ic-t-same} \)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 proximal 5 benefactive
2 I 6 transitive
3 future 7 you
4 break in two

(65) \( ni? \, \text{dækʷ-ic-\text{tas tʰ swiwʔles}} \)  
\( \text{He/she broke (it) for the boy.} \)

\( ni? \, dækʷ-ic-t-\text{es tʰ swiwʔles} \)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 nonproximal 5 third pers. trans. subj.
2 break in two 6 article
3 benefactive 7 boy

That is, benefactives inflect for object as well as subject and take the third person transitive suffix /-\text{es}/.

A benefactive predicate may take an adjunct in addition to those corresponding to subject and object. This is an oblique adjunct semantically corresponding to the object of a simple transitive.
3.2.4 Oblique Adjuncts in Deep Structure

The oblique adjuncts discussed in previous sections are often interpreted, as we have seen, parallel to objects of transitive predicates. It does not necessarily follow that they are syntactically related. On the other hand, it is not clear that oblique adjuncts represent a distinct syntactic category in deep structure. Other adjuncts with distinct interpretations are also preceded by the general preposition /ʔa/, including passive agents, instrumentals and various locatives. In fact, any adjunct-type construction which does not stand in a subject or ob-
ject relation to a predicate is formally identical to the oblique adjuncts discussed above, being preceded by /ʔa/. The position taken here is that oblique adjuncts represent a distinct deep structure category. Evidence for this analysis (which is not altogether compelling) is presented in section 4. Sentence (66), then, may be assigned the following deep structure.

(66) niʔ con lakwəcət t⁰ə na syeʔyaʔə t⁰ə s̩ešt.

*I broke the stick for my friend.*

A similar analysis would hold for other oblique adjuncts discussed above. For example, the deep structure of (51) would be the following.

(51) niʔ con čəkʷxels t⁰ə sceeʔtən.

*I fried the salmon.*
3.3 Summary

The intent here has been to illustrate that transitivity and the morpho-syntactic categories of subject and object are central to Cowichan syntax, even at the expense of semantic relations. While certain semantic regularities obtain between constructions, this is not necessarily an area for syntactic description. For example, the relationship between objects of transitive predicates, such as /q"ələt/ barbecue (it) and oblique objects of intransitives such as /q"ələm/ barbecue may be a function of the lexicon and lexical rules of semantic interpretation along the lines suggested by Jackendoff (1975). Further, it has been suggested that adjuncts do not represent the fundamental relationships in Cowichan, but rather that the person categories of subject and object are central and that direct adjuncts are interpreted analogously. It is not clear at this time, however, whether this is a claim with empirical substance.

4. Attributive Clauses

Attributive clauses offer evidence for the central nature of the subject and object categories in Halkomelem, as I have discussed elsewhere (Hukari: 1975, 1976). When the understood relationship between a head and its attributive clause is subject or object the clause contains no special markings (other than the use of subordinate clause subject clitics). When any other relationship is understood to hold between a head and its attributive clause...
a nominalizer appears.

4.1 Understood Subject or Object

When the understood relationship between a head and its attributive clause is subject, the attributive lacks a subject clitic.

men ?e kʷθə sceeʔən.

Do you know the woman who gave my father the salmon?


(He/she/it) gave my father the salmon.

The lack of a third person transitive subject suffix /-əs/ in (68a) is significant in that it overtly marks the understood subject relationship.

When the understood relation is object, no overt marking is present in the attributive clause, although the presence of a subordinate subject clitic is, by default, an indication of the understood object relation.
Subject and object in Halkomelem may be thought of as syntactically referential positions, permitting anaphoric relationships to obtain between heads and attributive clauses.

4.2 Understood Oblique Adjuncts

When the understood relationship between an attributive clause and a head is that of oblique adjunct, the predicate head of the attributive clause takes the /s-/ nominalizer.

We dried the salmon which you gave us.

ni? ct čeyʔxʷt kʷʔə smēʔən ni? ?əŋʔ-s-ʔeʔtalʔxʷ
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
This overt marking of understood oblique relationships sets oblique adjuncts off from the syntactically more central categories of subject and object. Further, other relations introduced by the preposition /æ/, such as locatives and instrumentals, are formally differentiated from oblique adjuncts in attributive clauses.

4.3 Understood Instrumentals and Locatives

Understood instrumental and locative relations between heads and attributive clauses are signalled by the instrumental nominalizer /§(x'w)\-/.
(71b) ni? cæn pas ʔe kʷθə səmt.

I was hit by the rock.

ni? cæn pas ʔe kʷθə səmt
1 2 3 4 5 6

1 nonproximal 4 oblique
2 I 5 article
3 hit 6 rock

(72a) mʔi ʔaməsəʔəmʔə ʔə tʔə xəm niʔ sʔ(ə)nʔiwʔ s kʷθə səyʔ.

Come give me the box the wool is in.

(hə)mʔi ʔaməst-səʔəmʔə ʔə tʔə xəm niʔ sxʷʔ-s-ʔənʔiwʔ-ʔ s kʷθə səyʔ
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

1 come 7 nonproximal
2 give 8 instrumental
3 me 9 static
4 oblique 10 be-in
5 article 11 third possessive
6 box 12 article

13 wool

(72b) niʔ ʔə sənʔiwʔ kʷθə səyʔ ʔə kʷθə xəm.

Is the wool in the box?

niʔ ʔə sʔ-hənʔiwʔ kʷθə səyʔ ʔə kʷθə xəm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1 nonproximal 6 wool
2 question 7 oblique
3 static 8 article
4 be-in 9 box
5 article

The use of /s(əxʷ)-/ rather than /s-/ to mark understood instrumental and locative relations suggests these categories are grammatically distinct from the oblique adjuncts discussed in section 3.2. However, this may not be compelling evidence for treating oblique adjuncts as distinct from locatives and instrumentals in syntax. It is conceivable that nominalized attributives should be treated as
deep structure nominals and, if so, the grammar would not contain
nominalization transformations which differentiate between oblique
adjuncts on one hand and locatives and instrumentals on the other.

4.4 Summary

The specifics of attributive clause formation (if trans­
formations are necessary) are not pertinent to the present study.
However it is significant to note that subject and object relations
do not require special markings, which offers independent evidence
of the central nature of these two categories in Halkomelem syntax.

5. Conclusions

Subject and object, as represented in the person systems
of Halkomelem, have been presented here as central grammatical ca­
tegories. This implies that certain semantic regularities in the
language are not a function of syntax. For example, the following
relationships have been noted above:

i. subjects of many (not all) roots correspond semantically
to objects of transitives;

ii. subjects of transitive predicates are agents (or at least
thematically higher than instrument or patient);

iii. oblique adjuncts of benefactives correspond to objects of
simple transitives;
iv. oblique adjuncts of middle voice /-m/ and activity /-els/ predicates correspond to objects of transitives.

Obviously these facts must be accounted for in the grammar, however this need not be a function of syntactic description. It seems equally, if not more, plausible to account for such case or thematic relations in the lexicon by lexical redundancy rules along the lines of Jackendoff (1975).
Footnotes

1 This work was supported in part by the Canada Council, Humanities and Social Sciences Division, grant no. S73-0828.

I am indebted to the Halkomelem-speaking students of the University of Victoria Native Indian Language Diploma Program for their many insights into the language. In particular, Mrs. Ruby Peter has served as a primary consultant through much of the research leading to this paper.

2 I do not object to the terms agent and patient per se, but if they are intended to reflect syntactic categories rather than semantic ones, the usage is misleading.

3 The term lack-of-control is awkward, however, I have not found a more appropriate label in the literature. /-nexʷ/ is listed here as the underlying form, however it is conceivable that the /e/ represents a phonological strengthening of /ə/. The /e/ form occurs optionally with weak stems (having no inherent vowel).

4 The resultative of stems in CːC is formed by CV-reduplication plus infixation of /i/, replacing the stem /ə/.

5 Conceivably /-nəs/ is a morphologically complex form, however, the examples given exhaust the data collected to date, which are insufficient for further analysis.
The person system of Halkomelem has been discussed extensively by Dr. Wayne Suttles in unpublished materials prepared for his classes.

The form /ę/ in Cowichan represents a loss of /-x^w/, compare Musqueam /čx^w/ or Saanich /sx^w/. Apparently the /c-/ formative is palatalized before /x^w/.

The dependent passive construction apparently occurs only in subordinate clauses.
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