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Hukari (1976 fn. 8) says, "The dependent passive construction apparently occurs only in subordinate clauses." Certainly the most obvious difference between the 'medio-passive' and the 'dependent passive' is their occurrence in co-ordinate and subordinate clauses, as (the forms cited are in the Musqueam dialect)

\[ k'\text{w}\text{c}n\text{\text{é}l} \text{\text{e}m} \quad \text{I am seen} \\
\text{wak'w}\text{c}n\text{\text{é}l} \text{t} \quad \text{if I am seen} \]

But there is another common use-- in nominalizations.

A number of constructions require that predicates be nominalized and their subjects indicated by possessives. Compare

\[ k'\text{w}\text{c}n\text{\text{e}x} \text{w} \text{c}n \text{e} c? . \quad \text{I will see him.} \]
\[ \text{see-him I future} \]
\[ \text{sk'\text{w}\text{e}y} \quad k'\text{w} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{sk'w}\text{c}n\text{\text{e}x} \text{w} . \quad \text{I can't see him.} \]
\[ \text{impossible the my seeing-him} \]

When the predicate to be nominalized is a passive, the resulting form is a nominalized dependent passive, e.g.

\[ \text{sk'\text{w}\text{e}y} \quad \text{q} \text{o} \quad k'\text{w} \quad \text{s}k'\text{w}\text{c}n\text{\text{e}l} \text{t} . \quad \text{I can't be seen!} \]

\[ \text{impossible ! the my-being-seen/some one's seeing me} \]

There is also a sentence type occurring frequently in narratives that consists of a nominalized predicate, possibly (though often not) introduced by \( \text{s}a \) 'be it, it is the one that, he is the one who, etc.' and possibly followed by adjuncts. Typically, if the subject is 3rd person, the nominalization begins with \( \text{sew} \), which consists of the nominalizer s-
and the clitic wə-/əw 'then (?)', 'now(.)', followed by the first

word of the predicate with the 3rd person possessive -s, as

\[(\text{1a}) \text{səw nəh}s. \quad \text{'Then he went.'} \]

\[\text{səw kʷəcənoxʷs.} \quad \text{'Then he saw it.'} \]

Hukari (1976 fn. 8) says, "The dependent passive construction
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The dependent passive also occurs in negative constructions, but its occurrence there may be seen as a special sort of subordinate clause. In Halkomelem, when the negative (auxiliary) verb ʷəws is followed by a word it negates, the latter (unless it is a passive) must take one of the subordinate subject suffixes, as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I do not go.} &\quad ʷəws \con nəmən. \\
\text{I am not a child.} &\quad ʷəws \con səƛəqənən. \\
\text{I do not see him.} &\quad ʷəws \con kəcənəxən. \\
\end{align*}
\]

But when the word negated is passive, it is one of the subordinate (dependent) set, as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I will not be seen.} &\quad ʷəws \ce nəcənət \ \text{future obs.} \\
\text{They will not be seen.} &\quad ʷəws \ce nəcni t \text{ 3rd person.plural} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The absence of a co-ordinate subject particle following ʷəws implies that it has a 3rd person subject. Compare

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I did not see him.} &\quad ʷəws \con ni nəcənəx. \\
\text{I am not (was not) seen.} &\quad ʷəws nəs nəcənəxəm. \\
\end{align*}
\]

This 3rd person indicated (by zero) for the negative verb and (by -əs) for the auxiliary seems to support Hukari's identification of the "medio-passive" affixes as objects.

1 The materials used were dictated by Mrs. Christine Charles and Mr. James Point. Mrs. Charles was quite consistent in usage.