Subjects and Objects in Cowichan[1]

Thomas E. Hukari
University of Victoria

0. Introduction

The Cowichan (Cw) dialect of Halkomelem shows a contrast between subjects and objects, on one hand, and all other NP relations on the other, as evidenced by fairly straightforward syntactic criteria discussed in sections (1) through (3) below. In marked contrast, the language does not abound with syntactic constructions which differentiate between subjects and objects, as seen in sections (2) and (3). I suggest that a dichotomy between direct (subject or object) and oblique (other) noun phrases is fundemental to Cw, with direct NP being appositional to the person system, where the subject and object roles are primary to the person system and are assigned to direct NP derivatively.

1. Direct and oblique noun phrases

Cw subjects (S) and objects (O) are pivotal in the sense of Dixon (1979), being the two grammatical categories which are accessible when conditions of coreferentiality are imposed on syntactic constructions (cf, section 3). The pivotal/nonpivotal dichotomy is reflected both in the person system, where only S and O are marked, and in the NP system, where S and O NP are <u>direct</u>, having no introductory preposition, and all other NP are <u>oblique</u>, being introduced by the preposition //ʔɔ//.[2]

1.	niʔ	ʔámɔsθàmʔšɔs	ɬɔ	qə́ʔmiʔ	ʔɔ	kʷθɔ	čɔ́mɔx̌.
	AUX	give-TRANS-me-3SUBJ	ART	young-woman	PREP	ART	gum
			SUBJECT		OBLIQUE		

The young woman gave me the gum.

2. ni? cən ?ámɔst łɔ q̓é?mi? ?ɔ kʷθɔ čémɔx̌.
   AUX I give-TRANS ART young-woman PREP ART gum
   OBJECT OBLIQUE

I gave the young woman the gum.

In (1), for example, the NP indicated as an oblique is introduced by a preposition, while the subject NP is not. The grammatical object is a verb suffix in (1), while the subject is a person marker (clitic) in (2) and the object is a direct NP. This functional trade-off between direct NP and person markers will be discussed further in section 2, where I suggest that the S/O distinction in the NP system is derivable from the person system by interpretive binding rules rather than being a structural distinction inherent to noun phrases.

2. Subjects and objects

Subject and object noun phrases are not differentiated by clear syntactic criteria in Cw, despite the fact that S and O are distinct in the person system. As one can surmise from the examples in the previous section, there are no S/O case markers. Further, either VSO or VOS word order is possible, although generally only one direct NP occurs per clause, as discussed below. Nevertheless, the role of a NP normally can be derived from the syntactic context, as illustrated by the following sentences which exemplify the functional trade-off between person markers (subject clitics and object verb suffixes) on one hand and direct NP on the other.

3. ?i cən ce? c̓éwɔt θɔ słéni?.
   AUX I FUT help-TRANS ART woman

I will help the woman.

4. ʔi ce? c̓ewəθàmʔšəs θə sɬéniʔ.
AUX FUT help-TRANS-me-3SUBJ ART woman
The woman will help me.

Clearly the role of a direct NP in a transitive construction containing one first or second person marker is derivable from the context. By default, the direct NP in (3) must be the object and it must be the subject in (4). In each case one S/O role is already filled by a first or second person marker, hence only the remaining role is available for assignment to the direct NP.

The role of a direct NP is usually derivable even if a transitive construction contains no first or second person markers. If there is only one direct NP (as is generally the case), it is taken to be the object, not the subject.

5. ʔi ce? c̓ewətəs θə sɬéniʔ.
AUX FUT help-TRANS-3SUBJ ART woman
He/she will help the woman.

For transitive constructions containing only one direct NP, then, this NP is interpreted as the object unless the verb has a first or second person object marker, whereupon the NP is (by default) the subject.

The remaining case, where a sentence contains two direct NP, is at best marginal in Cw (despite the examples sprinkled throughout this paper). The preferred interpretation may be VSO, although VOS is apparently possible, as indicated by the English glosses for the following sentences.

6. ni? ʔámətəs θə sɬéniʔ t^{θ}ə sk^{w}áθšənʔ ʔə t^{θ}ə čə́məx̌.
AUX give-TRANS-3SUBJ ART woman ART (name) PREP ART gum

The woman gave S. the gum. /S. gave the woman the gum.

7.	ni?	ʔámɔstɔs	$t^{\theta}ɔ$	$sk^{w}áθšən$ʔ	θə	słéni?	ʔə	$t^{\theta}ɔ$	čómɔx̌.
	AUX	give-TRANS-3SUBJ	ART	(name)	ART	woman	PREP	ART	gum

Ditto.

Not even word order then clearly differentiates subject and object NP in Cw. Further, a sentence generally contains only one direct NP, whose role is derivable from the syntactic setting: the person elements present in the sentence.

I suggest that noun phrases in Cw may be paratactic or appositive to a clause which contains person elements: object verb suffixes, which are products of the lexicon, and syntactic subject clitics. Subject/object functional (semantic) relations could be defined over these person elements. The roles of noun phrases would then be determined by anaphoric rules which bind NP to person markers. These binding rules would constitute a formal description of the facts discussed above.[3] While this approach seems plausible for Cw, given the somewhat marginal role of NP, it is of course possible that a highly desirable universal syntactic theory might require that NP be fundamental in defining syntactic roles. Base generated syntax along the lines of Brame (1978) offers a model which, on the contrary, may be incompatible with any claim that the S/O roles of noun phrases are basic in Cw rather than derived. In base generated syntax, operations such as deletion and adjunction do not exist, hence Cw surface structures containing person markers but no noun phrases would be essentially the same at the base level and could not receive functional (semantic) interpretations if S/O roles were primary to NP,

as no NP would be present in the base structures.

In summary, I suggest that Cw direct NP are appositional, receiving interpretations as a result of being bound to person elements. If this is so, we should not expect to find a syntactic contrast between subject and object NP per se, since these functional roles are primary to the person system, not to noun phrases. Beyond this, it is not clear at present what empirical consequences this conjecture might yield in a formal syntactic description.

3. Syntactic frames

The salience of the direct/oblique dichotomy in Cw is supported by an examination of additional syntactic constructions. In section 3.1 the interplay between S/O interpretations of direct roles in three simple clause constructions is reminiscent of NP interpretations discussed in section 2 above. Three complex constructions are discussed in section 3.2, which again point to the centrality of the direct/oblique dichotomy. On the other hand, an examination of predicate pronoun constructions in 3.4 suggests that a distinct relative clause forming strategy exists for bound objects as opposed to subjects. Even here, though, the facts are compatible with a theory of appositional noun phrases.

3.1 Simple clauses

The third person (human) plural verb postclitic //ʔéétən// refers to the subject if possible.

8. ni? t̓íləm ʔéétən (*t$^{\theta}$ə sx̓əlʔíqɔt).[4] *They sang.*
   AUX sing PL ART children

9. ni? kʷɔ́ləstɔs ʔéétən. *They all shot him at once.*
   AUX shoot-TRANS-3SUBJ

10. ni? q̓áytəs ʔéé4tən k̓ʷ c̓əwx̌íləm. *They all killed*
AUX kill-TRANS-3SUBJ PL ART Tzuhalem *Tzuhalem.*

It will also refer to the passive patient, since this is the only direct role in a passive.

11. ni? q̓áytəm ʔéé4tən. *They were all killed at once.*
AUX kill-TRANS-PASS

But it receives an object interpretation if this is the only uncommitted role.

12. ni? cən lómnəxʷ ʔéé4tən. *I saw them (all together).*
AUX I see-TRANS PL

13. ni? cən x̌4ast ʔéé4tən. *I fed them.*
AUX I feed-TRANS PL

Subjects, then, receive priority, but the pluralizer may refer to the object if the subject is unavailable.

The quantifier //mək̓ʷ// *all* generally precedes the verb, although it may precede the element it modifies (e.g., NP or subject clitic). It seems preferentially to modify objects, all things being equal.

14. ni? mək̓ʷ ʔuʔ-c̓éwətalʔxʷəs. *He/she helped us all.*
AUX all help-TRANS-us-3SUBJ

15. nemʔ ct ceʔ mək̓ʷ ʔuʔ-c̓éwətàlə.
AUX we FUT all help-TRANS-you-PL
We are going to help all of you.

But apparently it can modify either the subject or the object, given a plural subject clitic.

16. ni? ct mək̓ʷ ʔuʔ-4əyxt tᶿə sʔáx̌ʷaʔ.
AUX we all eat-TRANS ART clam
We ate all the clams. / We all ate the clams.

The construction may be more complex than the examples above would lead one to believe. When the quantifier modifies a transitive

third person subject the subject suffix is deleted.

17. ni? ʔə mɔkʷ ɬɔyx̌t tθɔ sʔáx̌ʷaʔ.
AUX Q all eat-TRANS ART clam
Did they all eat clams?

This is a property of subject-bound relative clauses, as discussed below. It need not follow that (17) contains a relative clause however, since this may be a general property of subject binding which is applicable both to relative clauses and to quantifiers. [5] For the present //mɔkʷ// yields no conclusions about the subject/object distinction, but the ambiguity of (16) seems typical of the interplay between subject and object interpretations in Cw.

For one last simple syntactic context, let us consider the role of deictic articles in overriding the object interpretation of noun phrases. While this is not a test frame, it is again indicative of the interplay between subject and object interpretations which one might expect if NP are appositional and derive their interpretations from the context.

While a single direct NP normally has an object interpretation unless the object role is taken, an NP with an article containing the predicative deictic //niɬ// *be he/she/it* receives a subject interpretation. Compare the following sentence pairs.

18a. ni? q̓áytɔs kʷθə swɔ́yʔqeʔ. *He/she killed the man.*
AUX kill-TRANS ART man
3SUBJ

b. ni? q̓áytɔs tθuʔniɬ swɔ́yʔqeʔ. *The man killed him/her.*
AUX kill-TRANS that-one man
3SUBJ

19a. ni? q'ʷə́ləcəs kʷθə scéél̓tən.
AUX barbecue-TRANS ART salmon
3SUBJ

He/she barbecued the salmon.

b. ni? q'ʷə́ləcəs θu?ni̓l̓ sl̓éni?.
AUX barbecue-TRANS that-one woman
3SUBJ

The woman barbecued it.

These articles have primarily a discourse function of signalling (perhaps highlighting) old information. That is, the participant has been introduced earlier in the discourse context. That they should also function to signal a subject interpretation fits well with an appositional, referential approach to S/O NP roles, particularly if subjects are referentially more prominent in discourse, as I suggest elsewhere (Hukari, 1979), since then the subject interpretation can be viewed as a by-product of the discourse prominence assigned to these articles.

The three constructions discussed above are, I think, indicative of the interplay between subject and objects interpretations in Cw. As these are the two pivotal roles, modifiers (such as //?éél̓tən//) and NP may be bound to either, but under most conditions the context will dictate the appropriate interpretation.

3.2 Relative clauses

Keenan and Comrie (1977 and 1979) have noted that languages may employ distinct relative clause forming strategies for different grammatical relations, the basic strategy being used for relative clause subjects but perhaps extending to objects, indirect objects and so on down a hierarchy of grammatical relations.[6] As I have noted

elsewhere (Hukari, 1977), Cw possesses more than one relative clause forming strategy: direct relations are unmarked in relative clauses, while other relations (i.e., obliques) require nominalization. This again points to the pivotal status of Cw subjects and objects, but offers no criteria for distinguishing between subject and object noun phrases.

Let us say a grammatical role in a relative clause is *bound* when that role is understood to be the referent of the noun phrase containing the relative clause.[7] For example, the subject of the relative clause in (20) is bound, as is the object in (21).

20. Felix saw the person who took Alice's crayons.

21. Felix saw the crayons (which) Frederick took.

In Cw, both subject and object binding are unmarked in relative clauses, however the omission of the transitive third person verb suffix signals transitive subject binding, removing potential ambiguity.[8]

22a. ni? ʔə č ʔuʔ-státəlʔstəxʷ łə słéni? ni? ʔéxʷeʔt
AUX Q you know-TRANS ART woman AUX give-TRANS

kʷθə nə men ʔə kʷθə scéélłtən.
ART my father PREP ART salmon

Do you know the woman who gave my father the salmon? [SUBJECT]

b. ni? ʔéxʷeʔtəs kʷθə nə men ʔə kʷθə scéélłtən.
AUX give-TRANS ART my father PREP ART salmon
3SUBJ

23a. ni? ct łəyx̌t kʷθə sməyəθ ni? kʼʷíc̓ət-əxʷ.
AUX we eat-TRANS ART deer AUX butcher-TRANS-you

We ate the deer which you butchered. [OBJECT]

b. ni? ʔə č kʼʷíc̓ət kʷθə smə́yəθ.
AUX Q you butcher-TRANS ART deer

Did you butcher the deer?

Transitive subject and object bound relative clauses actually do differ formally, but since third person objects are never marked in Cw, the absence of a subject marker in subject binding leads to no particular conclusions. Barring evidence to the contrary, we could claim, for example, that the bound person marker is deleted, vacuously if it is an object. In section 3.3 below a construction which may contain a relative clause suggests that first and second person object suffixes are not deleted when they are bound. If so, then distinct strategies are used for subjects and objects. I return to this below.

Bound oblique relations require nominalization of the relative clause verb. When the oblique object relation is bound, the verb of the relative clause is preceded by an //s-// nominalizing prefix (and the subject is a possessive).

24a. ni? ct c̓əy?xʷt kʷθə scéél̓tən ni? ən?-s-?éxʷ-ø-?tàl?xʷ.
AUX we dry-TRANS ART salmon AUX your-NOM-give-TRANS-us
We dried the salmon which you gave us. [OBLIQUE OBJECT]

b. ni? ?ə č ?éxʷe?tàl?xʷ ?ə kʷθə scéél̓tən.
AUX Q you give-TRANS-us PREP ART salmon
Did you give us the salmon?

I have suggested elsewhere (Hukari, 1977) that nominalizing the predicate allows a semantic oblique object to stand in a subject relation and that the function of nominalization in relative clauses is to create relativizable roles, that is, subjects. While this observation seemed essentially correct at the time, I had reservations due to the difficulty in eliciting such nominalizations in independent clauses. Subsequent field work supports this analysis. As it turns

out, such sentences are limited in their discourse functions but they are grammatical, as illustrated by the following examples.[9]

25a. ni? nə-s-q̓ʷə́ləm tə?i scéé4tən.
AUX my-NOM-barbecue this salmon
INTR

This salmon is what I barbecued.

b. ni? cən q̓ʷə́ləm ?ə tᶿə scéé4tən.
AUX I barbecue PREP ART salmon
INTR

I barbecued the salmon.

26a. ni? ce? nə-s-x̌4ásθàmə tə?i scéé4tən.
AUX FUT my-NOM-feed- this salmon
TRANS-you

This salmon is what I will feed you.

b. ni? cən ce? x̌4ásθàmə ?ə tə?i scéé4tən.
AUX I FUT feed-TRANS PREP this salmon
you

I will feed you this salmon.

The first sentence in each pair contains a nominalized predicate while the second has a corresponding simple predicate. Note the systematic relationship between the subjects of nominalized predicates and the oblique objects of the corresponding simple predicates, bearing out the hypothesis that nominalization 'promotes' oblique objects to subjects, which are available for binding in relative clauses. Similar observations can be made about other oblique relations, such as the instrumental in the following example, where the instrumental nominal prefix /ˊšxʷ-// is analogous to //s-// above.

27a. ni? nə-š-pásà?qʷ tən?a šləmélə.
AUX my-INSTR-hit this bottle
head

This bottle is what I got hit on the head with.

27b. ni? cən pásà?q^{w} ?ə tən?a šləmélə.
AUX I hit-head PREP this bottle
I got hit on the head with this bottle.

It seems reasonable to conclude that only direct roles are available for binding in relative clauses. This again underscores the pivotal status of direct roles.

3.3 Interrogatives and cleft constructions

Variant word order, as in interrogatives, is a potential area of syntactic differentiation among grammatical roles. In Cw however, predication rather than simple permutation is the primary device in forming questions (and cleft sentences), where the questioned or emphasized NP is expressed as a predicate and the remainder of the sentence is a relative clause. Despite superficial appearances, no movement rules are involved and the constructions simply reconfirm the facts discussed above in section 3.2.

The interrogative pronouns //ɬwet// *who* and //stem// *what* function as predicates and may therefore take subjects. The subject of an interrogative predicate may be as elementary as the deictic articles //tə?i// *this* or //t$^{\theta}$ey?// *that*.

28. stem tə?i. *What is this?*
what this

29. ɬwet t$^{\theta}$ey?. *Who is that?*
who that

A participant in a clause is questioned by predicating on a appropriately bound relative clause, the distribution of relative clause types following the patterns discussed in section 3.2.

30a. ɬwet t$^{\theta}$ə ni? k^{w}íc̓ət t$^{\theta}$ə sməyəθ. *Who butchered the deer?*
who ART AUX butcher- ART deer

b. ni? k'ʷíc'ətəs tθə swáy?qe? tθə sməyəθ.
AUX butcher-TRANS ART man ART deer
3SUBJ

The man butchered the deer.

31a. ɬwet k'ʷə ni? ?áməstəs ?ə ɬə télə.
who ART AUX give-TRANS- PREP ART money
3SUBJ

Who did he/she give the money to? [OBJECT]

b. ni? ?áməstəs ɬə sɬéni? ?ə ɬə télə.
AUX give-TRANS- ART woman PREP ART money
3SUBJ

He/she gave the woman the money.

10

32a. stem kʷθə ni? ən?-s-?éxʷe?θàmət.
what ART AUX your-NOM-give-TRANS-you-SUB.PASS

What did he give you?/What were you given? [OBLIQUE OBJECT]

b. ni? ?éxʷə?θààm ?ə tθə scéélɬtən.
AUX give-TRANS- PREP ART salmon
you-PASS

He gave you a salmon. /You were given a salmon.

The formal identity of the subordinate clauses in these examples with relative clauses is of course immediately apparent. Note however that an article precedes the relative clauses here. A more accurate description of the construction is that the subject of the interrogative predicate is a NP consisting of an article and a relative clause, as in the following diagram.

[Interrogative] [ART Relative Clause]
PRED NP

Such headless relative clauses are common in Cw and freely occur as noun phrases, as evidenced in the following example.

33. ni? cən lómnəxʷ kʷθə ni? k'ʷíc'ət tθə sməyəθ.
AUX I see-TRANS ART AUX butcher ART deer
TRANS

I saw the one who butchered the deer.

Clearly both the interrogative predicate and the subject NP in the diagram above are elements which occur independently of each other and should follow from any descriptively adequate grammar without further elaborations. That is, there is no apparent necessity for a fronting rule.

Similarly, a cleft-like construction in Cw is formed by predicating the emphasized participant on the remainder of the sentence, the latter being again a headless relative clause.

34a. ni? kʷíc̓ətəs tᶿə swóy?qe? tᶿə scéél̓tən ?ə tᶿə šəptən.
AUX butcher- ART man ART salmon PREP ART knife
The man butchered the salmon with a knife.

b. swóy?qe? tᶿə ni? kʷíc̓ət tᶿə scéél̓tən ?ə tᶿə šə́ptən.
It was a man that butchered the salmon with a knife. [SUBJECT]

c. scéél̓tən tᶿə ni? kʷíc̓ətəs tᶿə swóy?qe? ?ə tᶿə šə́ptən.
It was a salmon that the man butchered with the knife. [OBJECT]

d. šə́ptən tᶿə ni? š-kʷíc̓əts tᶿə swóy?qe? tᶿə scéél̓tən.
It was a knife that the man butchered the salmon with.
[INSTRUMENT]

Due to the greater possibilities in discourse situations, a wider range of articles is likely to appear in such cleft sentences than in interrogatives, drawing from the following set of articles.

	unmarked	marked (feminine, diminutive)
basic	tᶿə	θə
remote	kʷθə	ɬə
hypothetical/ deceased	kʷ	kʷs

That these construcions employ articles, not some homophonous forms, is shown by the following sentences where the sex of the referent

determines the appropriate article.

35. swə́y?qe? t$^{\theta}$ə ni? k'^{w}íc'ət t$^{\theta}$ə scéél̓tən ?ə t$^{\theta}$ə šə́ptən.
man ART AUX butcher-TRANS ART salmon PREP ART knife

It was a man that butchered the salmon with the knife.

36. q̓é?mi? θə ni? k'^{w}íc'ət t$^{\theta}$ə scéél̓tən ?ə t$^{\theta}$ə šə́ptən.
young-woman ART

It was a young woman that butchered the salmon with a knife.

Similarly the following interrogatives contrast in their presuppositions as to the sex of the referent.

37. ɬwet t$^{\theta}$ə ni? k'^{w}íc'ət t$^{\theta}$ə smə́yəθ.
who ART AUX butcher-TRANS ART deer

Who butchered the deer?

38. ɬwet θə ni? k'^{w}íc'ət t$^{\theta}$ə smə́yəθ.
ART

Who butchered the deer? [FEMININE REFERENT]

That is, in uttering the second question, the speaker is taking on the presuppostion that the referent is female, while no such presuppositon holds for the use of the unmarked article in (37).

It appears then that interrogatives and cleft sentences are essentially the same syntactic construction, composed of a predicate interrogative pronoun or a noun, followed by a NP which is composed of an article and a headless relative clause. Since it is the internal structure of the relative clause that signals the understood grammatical role of the questioned or emphasized element (the predicate), these constructions shed no further light on the subject/object distinction in Cw.

3.4 Predicate pronouns

Predicate pronoun constructions, like interrogatives and clefts, appear on first examination to involve permutation, with special clause-initial pronouns instead of the usual first or second person markers.

39. nə́wə ʔe ce? x^wt^{θ}ə́x^wwíls.
be-you Q FUT wash-dishes
Is it you that is going to wash dishes?

40. ʔénʔθə ce? k^wə́ləšt k^wθə smə́yəθ.
be-I FUT shoot-TRANS ART deer
It is me that will shoot the deer.

Unlike clefts and interrogatives, no article appears after the clause-initial pronoun, making it less obvious this construction is composed of a predicate and a subordinate clause.

Placing the whole construction in a subordinate context reveals that the pronouns must be predicates rather than subject markers in the examples above, since the third person subordinate subject clitic //-əs// (3SUB) then appears on the pronouns--which is compatible with the hypothesis that the pronouns are predicates, but not subjects.

41. ʔə́wə ʔe nə́wə-es ʔi x^wt^{θ}ə́x^wwíls.
not Q be-you-3SUB AUX wash-dishes
Isn't it you that washed dishes?

42. ʔə́wə ʔénʔθə-es ʔi k^wə́ləšt k^wθə smə́yəθ.
NOT be-I-3SUB AUX shoot-TRANS ART deer
It wasn't me that shot the deer.

Negation, as in (41) and (42), is a subordinate context. If the subject is first or second person, it is marked both by a main clause clitic and a subordinate clause clitic, as in (43).

43. ʔə́wɔ cɔn ʔi-ɔn? kʷə́šəqɔt tᶿə lísek.
not I AUX-I be-counting container ART sack

I am not counting the sacks.

If the subject is third person, the subordinate clause third person clitic appears on the first word after the negative.

44. ʔə́wə ʔi-əs kʷə́šəqɔtəs tᶿə lísek.
not AUX-3SUB be-counting container ART sack

He/she isn't counting the sacks.

Clearly (41) and (42) pattern as if the pronouns are predicates, not subjects, which accounts for the third person marking.

Evidence for the subordinate clause status of the remainder of the construction emerges when the pronominal predicate is interpreted as the object and the subject is first or second person, since the subordinate subject forms then appear.

45. ʔén ʔəθə ʔe ʔi cə́səθə̀mʔš-əxʷ ʔuʔ-xʷtᶿəx̌ʷwíls-ɔnʔ.
be-I Q AUX be-telling-TRANS-me-you wash-dishes-I

Is it me that you are asking to wash the dishes?

Not only is this a subordinate clause subject marker, but its appearance on the verb rather than the clause-initial auxiliary //ʔi// identifies the construction as a relative clause, since in all other subordinate contexts these clitics follow the first word of the clause (as do main clause subject clitics).

Sentence (45) brings evidence to bear on relative clause forming strategies (assuming the subordinate clause is, in fact, a relative clause). In section 3.2 I noted that when the relative clause (transitive) subject is bound it is deleted and I speculated that deletion

(or some formal equivalent) might be the general strategy, applying vacuously except for the one case when an overt marker would otherwise appear, the transitive subject marker. In sentence (45) the first person object form has not been deleted, although it is interpreted as being bound to the predicative pronoun. It appears then that Cw has a distinct relative clause forming strategy for objects--that the object form remains.

The retention of the bound object marker holds for both active and passive verbs, which can be taken as evidence that passive patients are objects.[11]

46. ʔénʔθə ʔi ʔáməsθàmʔšəs ʔə łə télə.
be-I AUX give-TRANS PREP ART money
me-3SUBJ

It was me that he gave the money to.

47. ʔénʔθə ʔi ʔáməsθèləm ʔə łə télə.
be-I AUX give-TRANS PREP ART money
me-PASS

It was me that was given the money.

When the subject is bound, as in (39) and(40) above, no marker appears in the relative clause, so clearly passive patients follow the object strategy, a point to which I return in section 4.

The predicat pronoun construction seems to offer the best evidence of a subject/object distinction. But this evidence does not constitute counterevidence to an appositional NP analysis, since the construction in question involves anaphoric binding rather than a movement rule. That is, it was not necessary to postulate a movement rule which appeals to a formal distinction between subject and object noun phrases. Even here, then, the facts are compatible with

the claim that noun phrases are appositional in Cw and receive their S/O interpretation through binding to person markers.

4. Passives

As the prototypical major movement rule in transformational grammar, the passive would seemingly offer fruitful ground for differentiating among NP roles. The Cw passive however points to the indeterminancy of the subject/object distinction (or, at least, the difficulty in finding suitable test frames in Cw). While a compelling argument either for or against object-to-subject advancement in Cw does not follow from the facts available, the evidence below leads me to suggest that object-to-subject advancement generally does not occur in Cw passives.

At issue here is more than the search for syntactic test frames which differentiate subjects and objects. If, as I suggest, passive patients are objects in Cw this may bear on a universal definition of the passive. A number of relational grammarians, including Perlmutter and Postal (1978), have claimed that object-to-subject advancement is an essential property of passives and triggers the removal of the transitive subject (to chomeur status). This position is by no means universal (cf, Comrie, 1977) and apparently Perlmutter and Postal no longer rule out the spontaneous removal of elements to chomeur status (cf, Perlmutter, 1979). If Cw passive patients are syntactic objects then object-to-subject advancement is not a part of a universal characterization of the passive--or the Cw construction is not a passive.

We might of course wish to exclude the Cw construction from a

universal characterization of the passive a priori on the grounds that passive patients must be subjects (assuming they are not in Cw). It is not clear to me that this is an assailable position, since it is definitional, but a comparison with other Central Coast Salishan passives which do exhibit object-to-subject advancement may reveal family resemblences. Two points will (or may) then emerge from the following discussion: that the Cw passive may not involve object-to-subject advancement and that, despite this, the Cw construction shares a sufficient number of characteristics with its neighbors (and presumably with passives in general) to seriously consider it a passive construction.

Cw passives are marked by an //-m// suffix (//-t// in certain subordinate constructions) which appears on the transitive verb stem after any object suffix (see the appendix). The agent, if expressed, is a prepositional phrase while the patient is a verb object suffix (first or second person) or a direct NP, as exemplified below, leaving first and second person forms aside for the moment.

48a. ni? q̓ʷələtəs kʷθə scéél̓tən.
AUX barbecue- TRANS-3SUBJ ART salmon

He/she barbecued the salmon. [ACTIVE]

b. ni? q̓ʷələtəm ʔə ɬə sɬéni? kʷθə scéél̓tən.
AUX barbecue- PREP ART woman ART salmon

The salmon was barbecued by the woman. [PASSIVE]

The passive agent may either precede or follow the patient NP.

In using the //-m// suffix to signal the passive, Cw shares a trait with its Central Coast Salishan neighbors. That is, in Cw and

in neighboring languages //-m// on an overtly transitive stem signals the passive, a construction in which the agent (when it is expressed) is a chomeur rather than a subject (see below). Further, Cw shares wil Squamish the constraint that the passive is obligatory given a second person patient and a third person agent (Kuipers, 1969)--and Squamish is a language in which passive patients are subjects. These facts go beyond fortuitous coincidence, suggesting that there is a general passive construction shared among a set of fairly closely related languages, but perhaps with individual differences among the language (such as the status of the patient).

Cw differs from many of its neighbors in maintaining an object inflection on passive verbs. Consider the following set of sentences.

49. ni? q̓ʷáqʷəθèləm. *I was clubbed.*
AUX club-TRANS-me-PASS

50. ni? č q̓ʷáqʷəθàm?š. *You clubbed me.*
AUX you club-TRANS-me-PASS

51. ?ímoš cən. *I walk.*
walk I

Unlike the English passive, Cw passives do not pattern quite like intransitive verbs. That is, a first or second person passive patient is not signalled by the element which signals intransitive (or active transitive) subjects. Rather, the patient is a verb suffix which closely resembles active objects (see the appendix).

This object inflection is a characteristic shared by Sliammon (Davis, 1980) and Sechelt (Beaumont, 1977). Consider the following Sliammon examples (Davis).

52. sə́p̓-t-si-əm. *You are clubbed.*
club-TRANS-you-PASS

53. sə́p̓-t-si č. *I club you.*
club-TRANS-you I

54. ʔímə́š čxʷ. *You walk.*
walk you

As in Cw (and more transparently so), the object inflection is maintained in the passive, making passives appear less like intransitive constructions than in English or in the majority of Central Coast Salishan languages.

In Lushootseed, Squamish (Kuipers, 1969), Clellam (Thompson and Thompson, 1971) and probably in Twana (Drachman , 1969) passive patients are subjects and hence passive verbs appear to be intransitives. Compare the following Lushootseed sentences to the Cw and Sliammon examples above.[12]

55. čə́xʷa-t-əb čəxʷ. *You are clubbed.*
club-TRANS-PASS you

56. čə́xʷa-t-sid čəd. *I club you.*
club-TRANS-you I

57. ʔíbəš čəxʷ *You walk.*
walk

The passive (55) more closely resembles an intransitive (57) than it does a corresponding active such as (56), since the patient is the subject and the verb contains no person marker.

Given that Cw passive patients are marked by object morphology, it need not follow that they necessarily pattern as syntactic objects. Davis, in fact, concludes that Sliammon passive patients are syntactic subjects despite the object morphology. His conclusions are

based on certain syntactic conditions on anaphora which will be discussed below. Since this logical possibility appears to be realized in a closely related language, it seems reasonable to consider a range of syntactic constructions in Cw which exhibit anaphoric conditions in order to determine whether passive patients behave as syntactic subjects or objects.

The syntactic status of passive patients in Cw is not as easily determined as that of agents. The preposition preceding the passive agent (e.g., sentence (48b) above) indicates it is not a direct NP let alone a syntactic subject. This is born out by relative clauses, since passive agents are not available for relative binding. Patients on the other hand are available for relative binding, as shown in the following example.

58. lémɔt $t^{\theta}ɔ$ scéélɬtɔn ʔi kʷíkʷəc̓ɔtɔm?.
look- TRANS ART salmon AUX be-butchering-TRANS-PASS
Look at the salmon that is being butchered.

While this is compatible with object-to-subject advancement, it also fits the contrary hypothesis that passive patients are syntactic objects. Since passives do not have the transitive third person subject marker, the relative clause shows no evidence of subject deletion, which is compatible with the assumption that the patient is a subject. By the same token, if the patient is an object we would also expect to see no special marking or deletion, as in the corresponding active relative clause.

59. lémɔt $t^{\theta}ɔ$ scéélɬtɔn ni? kʷíkʷəc̓ɔtɔs.
look TRANS ART salmon AUX be-butchering-TRANS-3SUBJ

Look at the salmon he is butchering.

All we can conclude from this is that passive NP patients are direct noun phrases and pivotal.

The predicative pronominal constructions discussed in section 3.4 above may offer evidence against object-to-subject promotion. Consider again sentences (39), (46) and (47).

39. nə́wɔ ʔe ce? xʷtᵊəx̌ʷwíls. *Is it you that is going to wash*
be-you Q FUT wash-dishes *dishes?*

46. ʔén?Θə ʔi ʔáməsΘàm?šəs ʔə ɬə téłə.
be-I AUX give-TRANS- PREP ART money
me-3SUBJ

It is me that he gave the money to.

47. ʔén?Θɔ ʔi ʔáməsΘèləm ʔə ɬə téłə.
be-I AUX give-TRANS PREP ART money
me-PASS

It is me that was given the money.

Both active and passive patients show a verb person suffix agreeing with the predicative pronoun, as opposed to a bound subject in (39), which is missing from the relative clause. This parallelism is even more significant, as I noted above, if we take the clause following the predicative pronoun to be a relative, since this shows that bound objects of relative clauses follow a different strategy from bound subjects--one common to both active and passive objects.

A construction in Sliammon taken by John Davis (1980) to be ascension copying (an agreement phenomenon analogous to object-to-subject raising) occurs also in Cw. There is agreement between the object of the matrix verb and an element of the subordinate clause. In Sliammon, Davis reports that the subordinate clause element must

be either a subject or a passive patient, not an object, which suggests that Sliammon passive patients are syntactic ~~objects~~ subjects. In Cw, however, the situation differs, as illustrated by the following examples.

48. ʔi cən x̌écθàʔmə ʔuʔ-niʔ-əxʷ ce? ʔuʔ-c̓éwəθàmʔš.
AUX I be-figuring TRANS-you AUX-you FUT help-TRANS-me

I am wondering if you are going to help me.

50. *NOT:* *ʔi cən x̌écθàʔmə ʔuʔ-niʔ-əs ce? ʔuʔ-c̓éwəθààm.
AUX I be-figuring TRANS-you AUX-3SUB FUT help-TRANS you-PASS

FOR: I am wondering if they will help you./You will be helped.

51. ʔi cən x̌ect ʔuʔ-niʔ-əs ce? ʔuʔ-c̓éwəθààm.
AUX I be-figuring TRANS AUX-3SUB FUT help-TRANS-you-PASS

I am trying to figure out if they will help you.

It would appear that identity must hold between the matrix object and only the subject of the subordinate clause; the passive patient in (50) will not do. However it is not clear that the S/O distinction is relevant here, since in (51) it could be the understood passive agent that is coreferential with the matrix object. This is supported by the following example, where the plural marker must refer to a human entity, the matrix object in this case (since the subject is singular), indicating that the matrix verb has a referring human object which is seemingly coreferential with the passive agent of the subordinate clause.

52. ʔi cən x̌ect ʔéélton ʔuʔ-niʔ-əs ce? ʔuʔ-c̓éwəθààm.
AUX I be- PL AUX-3SUB FUT help-TRANS-
figuring- you-PASS
TRANS

I am trying to figure out if they will help you.

This is somewhat perplexing since generally passive agents are not

available for anaphora (Hukari, 1979). As it turns out, anaphora need not hold with the subject of the subordinate clause so long as the bound participant is identifiable as the agent of the event. Given our discussion of interrogatives in section 3.3 above, it seems clear that the first person element is not the subject of the clause immediately subordinate to the matrix sentence in the following examples, despite the fact that it refers to the agent of the event.

53. ʔi xə̂cθèʔləmʔ ʔuʔ-ɬwet-əs kʷ c̓ə́wət-ənʔ.
AUX be-figuring-TRANS-me-PASS who-3SUB ART help-TRANS-I

They are trying to figure out who I am going to help.

54. ʔi xə̂cθèʔləmʔ ʔuʔ-stem-əs kʷθə ni? q̓ayt-ənʔ
AUX be-figuring-TRANS-me-PASS what-3SUB ART AUX kill-TRANS-I

They are trying to figure out what I killed.

For the verb in question, then, agency rather than subjecthood seems to be the operating parameter. While this condition is probably lexical, I have found no verbs which exclude coreferentiality with a subordinate object while accepting coreferentiality with a subordinate subject or passive patient.

It does not appear that passive patients advance to subjects in Cw, given the data examined here. The evidence is hardly overwhelming, so we cannot disallow the possibility that crucial support for advancement will be forthcoming. However the fact that passive patients follow the object strategy in relative clauses is positive evidence that they are syntactic objects.

Despite my conclusion that Cw passive patients are syntactic objects, it appears that something akin to raising may occur in

special contexts. A passive main clause may be doubly marked for the patient, having both a verb suffix and a subject clitic, although such sentences are rare and apparently only marginally acceptable.

55. nem? (cən) c̓ə ləmstéləm- ʔə kʷθə stəqíw.
go I QUOT see-CAUS- PREP ART horse
I am going to be shown the horse.

The quotative enclitic //c̓ə// increases the acceptability of the subject clitic, for reasons which are not altogether clear.

The subordinate passive //-t// will optionally cooccur with a possessive corresponding to the patient in nominalizations.

56a. ʔə́wə kʷs (s-)ləmnéélt.[13]
not ART NOM-see-TRANS-me-SUB.PASS
They never get to see me.

b. ʔə́wə k̓ʷə nə-s-ləmnéélt.
not ART my-NOM-see-TRANS-me-SUB.PASS
Ditto.

The possessive, of course, would normally signal a subject of a nominalized clause. Note that with //-t// passives there is no third person subject (or possessive) marking, so the subject/possessive role is available. This double marking never occurs with subordinate //-m// passives

57a. ni? cən ʔu?-yəlé?ləm?əθà?mə k̓ʷ ən?-s-?i wəɬ q̓ʷáqʷəθàmət.
AUX I be-looking-TRANS ART your-NOM then club-TRANS
you AUX you-SUB.PASS
I saw you get clubbed.

b. ni? cən ʔu?-yəlé?ləm?əθà?mə kʷ(s)əs wəɬ q̓ʷáqʷəθààm.
AUX I be-looking-TRANS ART-NOM-AUX then club-TRANS-
3POSS you-PASS
Ditto.

c. *NOT:* *ni? cən ʔuʔ-yəlé?ləm?əθà?mə k̓ʷ ən?-s-?i wəɬ q̓ʷáqʷəθèɬəm.
your-NOM AUX then club-TRANS-you-PASS

FOR: I saw you get hit.

Possibly the third person possessive, corresponding to the subject, in nominalized //-m// passive clauses blocks advancement.

These two cases of subject (or possessive) marking for passive patient involve double marking, since the object inflection remains on the verb. If this were the general pattern in Cw, one might make a case for object-to-subject advancement, where the 'history' of the patient remains in the form of an object suffix. Possibly that is the direction Cw would have taken, left to its own devices. The fact is, however, these doubly marked constructions are rare and can hardly be taken as evidence when considering the predominant pattern.

5. Conclusions

I have noted a major distinction in Cw between direct and oblique NP and proposed that direct NP are appositional to subject and object markers, whence they derive their subject/object interpretation. It follows that there is no hierarchical or other formal distinction between subject and object NP. It remains to be seen whether this hypothesis is empirically testable.

Despite the pausity of syntactic test frames for the subject/object distinction, facts such as the relative clause formation stategy (section 3.4) evidenced in predicate pronoun constructions suggest that passive patients generally are objects, not subjects, in Cw.

Appendix

Active Object Inflections

	//-t// *transitive*		//-nexʷ// *limited control*		//-stəxʷ// *causative*	
1s	lémə0àm?š	*look at me*	ləmnám?š	*see me*	ləmstám?š	*show me*
2s	lémə0àmə		ləmnámə		ləmstámə	
1pl	lémətàl?xʷ		ləmnál?xʷ		ləmstál?xʷ	
2pl	lémətàlə		ləmnálə		ləmstálə	
3	lémət		lə́mnəxʷ		lə́mstəxʷ	

Passives

1s	lémə0èləm	ləmnéləm	ləmstéləm
2s	lémə0ààm	ləmnáám	ləmstáám
1pl	lémətàləm	ləmnáləm	ləmstáləm
2pl	lémətàləm	ləmnáləm	ləmstáləm
3	lémətəm	lə́mnəm	lə́mstəm

Subordinate Passives

1s	lémə0èlt	ləmnélt	ləmstélt
2s	lémə0àmət	ləmnámət	ləmstámət
1pl	lémətàlt	ləmnált	ləmstált
2pl	lémətàlt	ləmnált	ləmstált
3	lémətèwət	ləmnéwət	ləmstéwət

Footnotes

1 My sincere thanks go to Mrs. Ruby Peter of Duncan, B.C., who is a fluent speaker of Cowichan and has been my primary consultant for this paper. All forms cited here are Cowichan unless otherwise specified, although most examples would be acceptable throughout Vancouver Island Halkomelem.

This work was supported in part by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

2 For a discussion of oblique objects see Hukari (1979a). I use the term oblique rather loosely here. In addition to oblique objects, various adverb-like phrases are oblique in that they are introduced by a preposition.

3 While a formal treatment of binding is beyond the scope of this paper, a highly informal consideration of a few examples may lend substance to the proposal. Suppose direct NP must be bound to third person elements (and assume further that unmarked transitive objects are third person, Ø).

a. *ni? cən c̓ə́wəθàmə θə sɬéni?.

b. ni? cən c̓ə́wət-Ø θə sɬéni?.

c. ni? c̓ə́wəθàm?šəs θə sɬéni?.

In (a) both person elements are filled by non-third person forms, hence the direct NP cannot be bound and the sentence is ill-formed. In (b), the subject is filled by a non-third person form, but the object is open, therefore the direct NP must be bound to it, which I indicate by cross-indexing.

b'. ni? cən c̓ə́wət-Ø$_i$ θə sɬéni?$_i$.

In (c) the object is filled but the subject is open, therefore the direct NP must be bound to the subject.

c'. ni? c̓ə́wəθàm?šəs$_i$ θə sɬeni?$_i$.

For a treatment of binding in English relative clauses and other constructions see Brame (1978)

4 //?éé̓ɬtən//, like the subject clitics, operates instead of a NP, not in conjunction with one.

5 Clearly quantifiers merit further investigation.

6 This is the NP accessibility hierarchy. Keenan and Comrie claim that a given relative clause strategy operates over a continuous range of this hierarchy:

SUbject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > OBLique object > GENitive > Object of COMParison

7 I anticipate that relative clause binding will be congruent with a general approach to binding, including the binding of NP and quantifiers to person markers. See also footnote 3.

8 Compare the following, which are disambiguated by the subject suffix.

t$^{\theta}$ə swə́y?qe? ni? q̓ə́ytəs *the man who he killed*

t$^{\theta}$ə swə́y?qe? ni? q̓ayt *the man who killed him*

Example (22b) translates as "He/she gave my father the salmon."

9 These sentences seem to require an immediate context and deixis, as suggested by the translations. That is, the speaker is identifying something in the context of which the predicate is true.

10 Note the possessive prefix //ən?-//, agreeing with the passive patient here. See section 4 for comments on this phenomenon.

11 Donna Gerdts' consultant rejects active object binding but accepts passive patients (Gerdts, 1979). My primary consultant, Mrs. Peter, has varying intuitions, but finds passive patients no better or worse than active objects. A fluent Cw speaker in his eighties accepts both.

12 A text in Drachman's dissertation (Drachman, 1969) contains one passive, where a second person patient is a subject clitic.

13 This is a different negative pattern from the one discussed earlier.

References

Beaumont, Ronald C. (1977). Causatives and control in Sechelt. XII International Conference on Salishan Languages.

Brame, M.K. (1978). Base Generated Syntax. Linguistics Research Monograph Series, Volume 1. Noit Amrofer, Seattle, Wn.

Comrie, Bernard (1977). In defense of spontaneous demotion: the impersonal passive. In P. Cole and J.M. Sadock (eds.), Syntax and semantics: grammatical relations, volume 8. Academic Press.

Comrie, Bernard and Edward L. Keenan (1979). Noun phrase accessibility revisited. Language, volume 55, number 3, pp 649-664.

Davis, John (1980). The passive in Sliammon. Berkeley Linguistic Society.

Drachman, Gaberell (1969). Twana phonology. University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation.

Dixon, R.M.W. (1979). Ergativity. Language, volume 55, number 1, pp 59-138.

Gerdts, Donna (1979). Passives and transitive marking in Halkomelem Salish. Western conference on Linguistics.

Hukari, Thomas E. (1977). A comparison of attributive clause constructions in two Coast Salish languages. Glossa, volume 11, number 1, pp 48-73.

..... (1979). Diathesis and discourse reference in Halkomelem. Western Conference on Linguistics.

..... (1979a). Oblique objects in Halkomelem. XIV Conference on Salishan Languages.

Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie (1977). Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. Linguistic Inquiry, volume 8, pp63-99.

Kuipers, Aert (1967). The Squamish language. Mouton.

Perlmutter, David M. (1979). Relational grammar. To appear in Edith Moravcsik and Jessica Wirth (eds), Syntax and Semantics: Current approaches to syntax. Academic Press, New York.

Perlmutter, David M. and Paul M. Postal (1978). Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. To appear in David M. Perlmutter (ed.), Studies in relational grammar 1.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson (1971). Clellam: a preview. In Jesse Sawyer (ed.), Studies in American Indian languages. UCPL 65, pp. 251-94.