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0.1 In this paper we outline the syntax of Bella Coola, a Salishan language spoken in Bella Coola(nu̱x̱al̓k), British Columbia.¹ In earlier times the language was spoken as far west as Kwatna, approximately fifty miles west of Bella Coola on Kwatna Inlet, and as far east as Stuie(stuíx), approximately forty miles east on the Bella Coola River. To the north, Bella Coola was spoken in Kimsquit(nu̱x̱íl) at the mouth of the Dean River; and to the south it was spoken at Tallio, on the South Bentinck arm of the Dean Channel. Voegelin and Voegelin(1964) cite 200-400 as an estimate of the present number of native speakers. The total number of registered Bella Coolas in 1966 was 578, and of these only the middle aged and older speak the language. This number is closer to 200.²

The framework we adopt for the presentation of the syntax is generally that of Chomsky 1965. The main portions of that theory which we use are the distinction of deep and surface structure and the concomitant base and transformational rules. Our suggested base structures are more semantic than those in Chomsky 1965, and in this our framework is closer to that of Chafe 1970a and 1970b. We adopt a provisional base component that seems best suited to the exposition of Bella Coola grammar.
0.2 Bella Coola is a VSO language. Compare the following sentences:

(1) k'xis ti?imlktx cixnascx 'The man sees the woman'
(see-he/her Prox-man-Art Prox-woman-Art)

(2) sp'tis ti?immTkltx wawac'uksc 'The boy is hitting the dogs'
(hit-he/them Prox-boy-Art Prox-dog-Plural-Art)

The verbs here k'x 'see' and sp' 'hit', exhibit a set of affixes that incorporate the subject and object of (1) and (2). The affixes appear to mark not only a subject and direct object but also the subject and indirect object as in

(3) naptis cixnascx wa?imlkuksc xtism+ktx 'The woman is giving the men the fish'
(give-she/them Prox-woman-Art Prox-man-Plural-Art Prox-fish-Art)

(The peripheral term, tism+ktx, is marked by the preposition x-.)

The subject-object affixes then copy onto the verb the information of person and number from the first two adjacent nouns. The agreement of (3) is (employing the usual terms) between the subject and indirect object. But in

(4) sp'tis cixnascx ti?imlktx xtistntx 'The woman is hitting the man with the stick'
(hit-she/them Prox-woman-Art Prox-man-Art Prox-stick-Art)

the middle noun is the direct object, and the peripheral term, tistntx again marked by x-, is the instrument. The second nouns in (1)-(4) are treated identically in Bella Coola as are the third nouns in (3) and (4). We assume this same formal treatment to indicate a semantic identity. The notions of subject, direct object, indirect object, and instrument as usually (and informally)
understood do not coincide with the distinctions made within Bella Coola. We will call the first term (e.g., cǐxnascx in (4)) the Agent; the second term (e.g., ti?imlktx in (4)), the Patient; and the third term (e.g., xṭistntx in (4)), the Adjunct. The designation of Bella Coola as VSO is then correct with the equation of S with Agent and of O with Patient.

0.3 Utterances in Bella Coola are basically predicative consisting of two principal terms we label Comment and Topic. Sentences (1)-(4) involve at least two terms (Agent and Patient) within the Topic, but they are otherwise structurally identical to sentences with only an Agent within the Topic:

(5) ḋapaw waX'mstac 'The people are going' (go-they Prox-person-Art)
(6) staltmx ti?imlktx 'The man is chief' (chief Prox-man-Art)
(7) waks tiX'aptx 'Who is going' (who Prox-go-Art)

where ḋap 'go', staltmx 'chief', and waks 'who?' are predicated of their respective Topics. The principal syntactic difference between sentences (1)-(4) and (5)-(7) lies only in the presence of two (or more) terms within the Topic versus the presence of one term and the respective application of Agent-Patient Agreement versus the Agent Agreement rule. The Comment associated with a one-term Topic—that is always the Agent—announces a property predicated of that Agent. In a two-termed Topic, the Comment predicates a relationship between the Agent and Patient. All
sentences in Bella Coola seem to be of this structure or to be derivable from combinations of it by embedding. The elemental base structure within Bella Coola is assumed to be

(8) \[ S \rightarrow \text{Comment} \rightarrow \text{Topic} \rightarrow \text{Agent} \rightarrow \text{Patient} \rightarrow \text{Adjunct} \]

1.0 In the remainder of this paper we consider three sentence-types involving complex structures that we label "adjectival clauses" (1.1 and 2.1), "relative clauses" (1.2 and 2.2), and "complex sentences" (1.3 and 2.3). These sentence-types exhibit many of the principal syntactic phenomena of Bella Coola.

1.1 Consider the following:

(9) (i) \( k'xic \ tiJa \ ti?im\ktx \ 'I see the good man' \)
    \( \text{(see-I/him Prox-good Prox-man-Art)} \)

(ii) \( k'xic \ ti?im\k\ tij\atx \ 'I see the good man' \)
    \( \text{(see-I/him Prox-man Prox-good-Art)} \)

The two are paraphrases. Formally, the -tx is restricted to one occurrence, while the ti- occurs as many times as there are modifying Comments; thus

(10) \( k'xic \ tija \ tic\äcti \ ti?im\ktx \ 'I see the good, young man' \)
    \( \text{(see-I/him Prox-good Prox-young Prox-man-Art)} \)

but

(11) *\( k'xic \ tij\atx \ ti?im\ktx \)

The adjectival clause also occurs where the modified term is Agent of an intransitive verb (12), Agent of a transitive verb (13), Patient of a transitive verb (14), and Adjunct (15):
The paraphrases of (9) are absent in (12)-(15). Only one sequence of modifier and modified occurs. In (12) only modifier-modified is acceptable; in (13)-(15), it is the reverse. If a formal distinction is made between Adjective and Nonadjective, it is possible to predict where paraphrases may occur and where they may not. To predict which of the fixed sequences occurs in (12)-(15), a further distinction must be made between the Intransitive Comment of (12) and the Transitive Comments of (13)-(15). Sentences containing nouns as modifying terms parallel (12):

(16) (i) k'xic tisnaltx txisnaltx 'I see the man who is chief'
(see-I/him Prox-chief Prox-man-Art)
Adjective/Nonadjective and Transitive/Intransitive are considered to be properties of each lexical item. Syntactically, the distinction between Transitive and Intransitive Comments can be derived from the occurrence of an Agent and Patient or of an Agent alone.

1.2 Relative clause constructions are illustrated by the following:

(17) (i) ?a+kJuki+ swas tija ti?imlktx 'We know the man who is good'
          (know-we/him who Prox-good Prox-man-Art)

          (ii) ?a+kJuki+ swas ti?imlk tijatx 'We know the man who is good'

(18) (i) ?a+kJuki+ swas tiXap ti?imlktx 'We know the man who is going'
          (know-we/him who Prox-go Prox-man-Art)

          (ii) *?a+kJuki+ swas ti?imlk tiXaptx

(19) (i) *?a+kJuki+ swas tiqWup+t t i?imlktx9

          (ii) ?a+kJuki+ swas ti?imlk tiqWup+ttx 'We know the man who punched him'
               (know-we/him who Prox-man Prox-punch-Past-he/him-Art)

(20) (i) *?a+kJuki+ swas tiqWup+t it ti?imlktx

          (ii) ?a+kJuki+ swas ti?imlk tiqWup+ttx 'We know the man who they punched'
               (know-we/him who Prox-man Prox-punch-Past-they/him-Art)

(21) (i) *?a+kJuki+ swas tisnapixw tisnäxtx10

          (ii) ?a+kJuki+ swas tisnäx tisnapixwtx 'We know the slave who you are giving him'
               (know-we/him who Prox-slave Prox-Prep-give-you/him-Art)
As in sentences (9) and (12)-(15), paraphrases exist where the Comment is an Adjective, and they are absent where the Comment is a Nonadjective. The extant forms for the latter group of sentences share with adjectival clauses the same orders of modifier-modified or modified-modifier in parallel syntactic structures. Compare (12) and (18) and (13)-(15) and (19)-(21).

Sentences (17)-(21) are paralleled by a set where the relative was 'who' is replaced by kas 'which':

(22) (i) ʔaˡk'jukì skas ti'ja tiʔimlk  'We know which man is good'
         (know-we/him which Prox-good Prox-man)
(ii) ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiʔimlk ti'ja

(23) (i) ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiʔapsu+ tiʔimlk ?at'axʷ  
         'We know which man lives there'
         (know-we/him which Prox-live Prox-man there)
(ii) *ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiʔimlk tiʔapsu+ ?at'axʷ

(24) (i) *ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiqʷup'ít tiʔimlk
(ii) ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiʔimlk tiqʷup'ít  'We know which man punches him'
         (know-we/him which Prox-man Prox-punch-he/him)

(25) (i) *ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiqʷup'ít tiʔimlk
(ii) ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tiʔimlk tiqʷup'ít  'We know which man they punch'
         (know-we/him which Prox-man Prox-punch-they/him)

(26) (i) *ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tisnapíxʷ tisnåx
(ii) ʔaˡk'juki+ skas tisnåx tisnapíxʷ  'We know which slave you are giving him'
         (know-we/him which Prox-slave Prox-Prep-give-you/him)
These sentences with kas work syntactically as those with was do with two differences. The first is their behavior with respect to the occurrence of Demonstrative/Article. Neither may occur with kas. The relative element kas refers to an indefinite object and as such is incompatible with the definiteness of the grammatical categories of Demonstrative/Article. (Cf. fn. 3 with respect to indefiniteness imparted by the absence of Demonstrative/Article.) The relative element was identifies a specific object and must occur with a member of this grammatical opposition. The second difference between kas and was lies in the modified items with which they may occur. The relative kas occurs with inanimate, animate, nonhuman, and human nouns, but was is restricted to modifying human nouns.

1.3 The following complex sentences occur:

(27) ?a+napi+ s\'aps ti\'iml\ktx 'We know the man is going'
     (know—we/him go—he Prox-man-Art)

(28) ?a+napiz\w s\jas ti\iml\ktx 'You know the man is good'
     (know—you/him good—he Prox-man-Art)

(29) ?a+napi+ was\xaps ti\iml\ktx 'We know the man is going'
     (know—we/him go—he Prox-man-Art)

(30) ?a+napiz\w was\jas ti\iml\ktx 'You know the man is good'
     (know—you/him good—he Prox-man-Art)

In (29) and (30) wa is sometimes translated by native informants as "actually," "really," or "already." This con-
2.0 We now turn to a formal description of the sentences in 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; and that description must be taken as tentative. The underlying structures are based on our feeling for the language—about "how things work"—and native informant reactions. The transformational rules are for the most part "motivated"; that is, they have application to two or more distinct structures. But it is always possible for a series of incorrect solutions to support each other mutually and appear correct overall. The following comments are then to be taken as one systematicization of certain syntactic phenomena in Bella Coola without claim of ultimate correctness.

2.1 Although sentences (9, 12-15) and (17-21) constitute close paraphrases, we forego drawing from this the conclusion that they are exact paraphrases and must derive from identical base structures. Our reasons are in part the formal syntactic differences between the two groups and in part the observations of Bolinger (1967 and 1968).

Sentences (9) and (12-15) are assumed to have an underlying structure analogous to the following one for (9):
The structure of $S_2$ is based on earlier discussion of the predicative character of Bella Coola utterances. In the adjectival clause, the given Topic(Agent) of $S_2$ is "?imlk 'man', and it is predicated of this term that it is good. Similarly for the remaining sentences of this class.

To derive a surface structure from the above, underlying one, an Equi-Constituent Deletion rule applies as in English and elsewhere in Bella Coola (cf. Davis and Saunders 1972) deleting "?imlk in $S_3$. This yields (with tree-pruning. Cf. Ross 1969) a derived structure

(32)
Agent-Patient Agreement now produces \( k'x\)-is. Any pronoun dominated by Agent or Patient is deleted; this Pronoun Deletion rule removes 'I' from the Agent of \( S_1 \).

Notice that the Agent Agreement rule does not apply to the derived \( S_2 \) in (32), although we might expect it to and to affix an -s according to our observation in fn. 5 that -s is the normal third person singular marker of an Agent in embedded sentences. The Agent affixes are absent for the other persons and numbers in this structure:

\[
(33) \ k'xtic \ waja \ wa?ilm\kuksc \ 'I \ see \ the \ good \ men' \\
\text{(see-I/them Prox-good Prox-man-Plural-Art)}
\]

One account of this is the following. We may have recourse to the notion of global rules (Lakoff 1970) such that Agreement holds between Comments and Topics only if the two are immediately dominated by the same S in the base structure; if a syntactic configuration of Comment and Topic dominated by an S is derived by some transformational rule, then Agreement does not apply. Since the Comment-Topic structure of \( S_2 \) in (32) is derived the Agreement rules are inapplicable. Looking at (31), this means that Equi-Constituent Deletion must apply before Agent Agreement because the structural condition for the application of the latter is met there, but it does not apply. Examination of sentences (59)-(62) below provide support for this description.

A difficulty remains with the occurrence of the deictic particles. We assume that Demonstrative/Article and Distal/Proximal are properties introduced within the base structure. In
terms of classical transformational generative grammar, these properties may be introduced via a set of context-free rules for Agent and so forth, so that a Complex Symbol is produced. A morphophonemic rule then gives phonological shape to the features of the Complex Symbol. Given this, the single, rightmost occurrence of -tx may be achieved by a rule spelling out Demonstrative/Article to the right of the Agent of (32). In (32) ?imlk of S₃ has been deleted before this rule applies. The result of ordering Equi-Constituent Deletion before Demonstrative/Article spelling is a single Demonstrative/Article element in S₂. The multiple occurrence of ti- may be derived by a feature spreading rule adding [+ Proximal -Female](in this case) to all Comments within the embedded S₃. Notice that disagreement of deixis within an adjectival or relative clause is not possible:

(34) *k'xis taju ti?imlktx

(35) *k'xis swas taju ti?imlktx

Feature spreading accounts for this restriction. Distal/Proximal is not spread to Comments of all embedded sentences. See, for example, (27)-(30). Only those structures comparable to (31), where some item is deleted, are so affected. This correctly characterizes the sentences of 1.1 and 1.2, but not those of 1.3. The spreading of Distal/Proximal may then be included in the operation of Equi-Constituent Deletion, and the subsequent operation of Deixis Spelling on both the Agent of S₂ and its Comment adds the prefixes where appropriate.
Sentence (13) has the following underlying structure:

As before we employ Equi-Constituent Deletion with respect to the two occurrences of X'msta, but notice that the affix of q'up' is -t, not the normal 'he/him' -is. Where a third person singular or plural Agent (co-occurring with a third person singular Patient) of a transitive verb is to be deleted, the affix is -t. Where the Patient is singular, no other affix occurs; where it is plural, the additional increment -an appears:

(37) ?a+k'kjuk+ tiX'msta tiq'up+tantx13 'We know the person who punched them'
    (know-we/him Prox-person Prox-punch-Past-he/them-Art)

Where third person Agents occur with Patients of the first or second person in S3 of (36), we again find the normal Agent-Patient affixes (cf. fn. 5):

(38) (i) k'xit ti?iml k tiq'up'cstx 'They see the man who is punching me'
    (see-they/him Prox-man Prox-punch-he/me-Art)
Sentence (14) has the structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S_1 \\
\text{Comment} \\
\text{Topic} \\
\text{Agent} \\ S_2 \\
\text{Comment} \\
\text{Topic} \\
\text{Agent} \\
\text{Comment} \\
\text{Topic} \\
\text{Agent} \\
\end{array}
\]

and the normal Agent-Patient affix for third person plural Agent and third person singular Patient(-it) occurs.

The syntactic structure attributed to sentences (13) and (14) seems to occur only where the modified term---the Topic of \( S_2 \) in (36) and (39)---is third person. That is, Bella Coola seems to lack the equivalent of English "They see us who are good," "They see us who hit the man," "We see you who the man hit," etc. Here Bella Coola has sentences on the model of (27)-(30). For example,
(40) (i) k'x'tu't wasja' 'They see that we are good'
(ii) k'x'tu't ssp'iu' ti?imlktx 'They see that we hit the man'
(iii) k'x'tu'tnu ssp'ct xti?imlktx 'We see that the man hit you'

and so forth.

To account for the affixes of (13) and (14), we must assume Agent-Patient Agreement to apply before Equi-Constituent Deletion. The reverse order results in making Agent-Patient Agreement inapplicable, since one of the constituents required for its application (either Agent or Patient) would be deleted. The -t and -tan of (13) and (37) are neutralizations of -is/-it and -tis/-tit, respectively. Factors affecting Agreement in embedded sentences with Transitive Comments are then:

(41) Person of the Agent
    (i) Third
    (ii) Nonthird

(42) Person of the Patient
    (i) Third
    (ii) Ninthird

(43) Identity
    (i) The Agent is to be deleted
    (ii) The Patient is to be deleted

(41i), (42i), and (43i) produce -t and -tan. (41i), (42i), and (43ii) or (41i), (42ii), and (43i) produce the more usual affixes (cf. fn. 5). (41ii) and 43i) or (42ii) and (43ii) produce sentences on the model of (40).
Sentence (15) has the structure:

\[ (44) \]

\[ S_1 \]

\[ \text{Comment} \]

\[ \text{Topic} \]

\[ \text{Agent} \]

\[ \text{Patient} \]

\[ S_2 \]

\[ \text{Comment} \]

\[ \text{Topic} \]

\[ S_3 \]

A rule is now required to raise the Agent Topic of \( S_2 \) in (44)---and also in (31), (36), and (39)---obligatorily or optionally under the conditions noted above. For (44) this produces (with tree-pruning) the derived structure:

\[ (45) \]

\[ S_1 \]

\[ \text{Comment} \]

\[ \text{Topic} \]

\[ \text{Agent} \]

\[ \text{Patient} \]

\[ S_3 \]

Analogous derived structures are produced from (31), (36), and (39). Topic-Raising must follow Equi-Constituent Deletion.

The other transformational rules apply as before, but two additional comments are required. The first concerns the -s-
of \( \text{tisnapixw} \) in (15). This appears whenever a portion of an Adjunct co-occurring with the preposition \( x- \) has been deleted. It is assumed to be a permutation-copy (and allomorph) of \( x- \). We return to its discussion below.

The second comment concerns the transitive structure of \( S_3 \) in (36), (39), and (44). The following sentences occur where an overt Agent, Patient, or Adjunct is present, e.g., "I know the man who punched the woman" in place of "I know the man who punched her/him":

(46) \( \text{a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tig'up+t cixnascx} \) 'We know the man who punched the woman'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-punch-Past-he/her Prox-woman-Art)

(47) \( \text{a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tig'up+tis cixnascx} \) 'We know the man the woman punched'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-punch-Past-she/him Prox-woman-Art)

(48) \( \text{a+k'juki+ tisn\text{"a}x tisnapixw cixnascx} \) 'We know the slave you are giving the woman'
    (know-we/him Prox-slave Prox-Prep-give-you/her Prox-woman-Art)

(49) \( \text{a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tina~x cixnascx xtisn\text{"a}xtx} \) 'We know the man you are giving the slave to'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-give-you/him Prep-Prox-slave-Art)

(50) \( \text{a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tina\text{"a}t cixnascx xtisn\text{"a}xtx} \) 'We know the man who is giving the woman the slave'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-give-he/her Prox-woman-Art Prep-Prox-slave-Art)

Expressions of (46)-(50) such as
and so forth are incorrect. The Demonstrative/Article elements may occur within only one Topic of an adjectival (or relative) clause, i.e., the \( S_2 \) structures of (36), (39), and (44). This intersects with the obligatory-optional raising of the \( S_2 \) (modified) Topics of these sentences. In adjectival clauses where the structure of the \( S_3 \) Comment is transitive and such permutation is obligatory as in (46)-(50), the Demonstrative/Article elements are always those of the \( S_3 \) Topic. The permuted Topic never has these deictic elements (cf. (51i)),\(^\text{15}\) while the \( S_3 \) Topic does (cf. \( xnas \) in (46)-(48)). In adjectival clauses where the structure of the \( S_2 \) Comment is intransitive, permutation does not occur, and it is always the \( S_2 \) Topic that has the Demonstrative/Article elements. In (9), which has an Adjective Comment, it is the \( S_2 \) Topic again that has these elements. But notice that where permutation occurs (optionally in (9ii) or obligatorily in (13ii), (14ii) and (15ii)) this element is left behind.

\[
\begin{align*}
(51) & \quad (i) \quad *?a+k'juki+ ti?im1ktx tiq\text{wup}'t \text{ cixnascx} \\
& \quad (ii) \quad *?a+k'juki+ ti?im1k tiq\text{wup}'t \text{ cixnascxtx} \\
& \quad (iii) \quad *?a+k'juki+ ti?im1k tiq\text{wup}'t \text{ cixnastx} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(52) *?a+k'juki+ ti?im1ktx ti\text{j}\a
(53) *?a+k'juki+ ti?im1ktx tiq\text{wup}'t

and so forth are incorrect. A pattern can be seen in this, viz., Deixis Spelling of Demonstrative/Article applies to lexical categories within a Topic if the Comment of that Topic
contains no S. (Note that where pronouns alone occur in $S_3$
or where a single lexical item occurs in $S_3$ and is lost by
Equi-Constituent Deletion, the Topic of $S_3$ dominates no lexi-
cal items. It is dropped, and Ross's (1969) tree-pruning
further drops the $S_3$ node producing a derived structure of $S_2$
comparable to that of (32). Deixis Spelling may then correctly
apply to the $S_2$ Topic of such derived structures.) Where
raising of the $S_2$ Topic is obligatory as in (46)-(50), the
$S_3$ node has not been deleted, and Deixis Spelling is prevented
from applying to the $S_2$ Topic. This accounts for the final
-tx in (13ii)-(15ii) and the absence of two final Articles
(or Demonstratives) in (46)-(50).

Let us now consider the following additional sentences:

(54) \[ ?a+k'juki+ tijatx 'We know the good one' \]
\[ (\text{know-we/him Prox-good-Art}) \]

(55) (i) \[ ?a+k'juki+ tiq'up'htx 'We know the one who punched him/her/it' \]
\[ (\text{know-we/him Prox-punch-Past-he/him-Art}) \]

(ii) \[ ?a+k'juki+ tiq'up'ht cixnascx 'We know the one who punched the woman' \]
\[ (\text{know-we/him Prox-punch-Past-he/her Prox-woman-Art}) \]

(56) (i) \[ ?a+k'juki+ tiq'up'hstx 'We know the one he/ she punched' \]
\[ (\text{know-we/him Prox-punch-Past-he/him-Art}) \]

(ii) \[ ?a+k'juki+ tiq'up'tis cixnascx 'We know the one the woman punched' \]
\[ (\text{know-we/him Prox-punch-Past-she/him Prox-woman-Art}) \]
(57) (i) ?a+k'juki+ tisnap\#x\#tx  'We know the one you gave him/her'
(know-we/him Prox-Prep-give-Past-you/him-Art)

(ii) ?a+k'juki+ tisnap+lx cixnascx 'We know the one you gave the woman'
(know-we/him Prox-Prep-give-Past-you/her Prox-woman-Art)

The structure of these sentences is that of those previously considered. The difference lies in the choice of lexical item as modified $S_2$ Topic. In place of choosing a noun—-?im\#k or \#msta as before—as Topic, a third person pronoun 'he' occurs in (54)-(57); in (54) for example

---

The Agent pronoun 'he' of $S_3$ is deleted by Equi-Constituent Deletion, and the Agent pronoun of $S_2$ is deleted after Agent-Patient Agreement as elsewhere yielding (54).

Let us now add these sentences:
(59) (i) ja cixnas cxn + ti?imlktx 'The woman is good to the man'
    (good Prox-woman-Art Prep-Prox-man-Art)
(ii) *?a+k'juki+ tisijas cixnas ti?imlktx
(iii) ?a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tisijas cixnas cxn 'We know the man the woman is good to'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-Prep-good-she Prox-woman-Art)
(iv) ?a+k'juki+ tisijas cixnas cxn 'We know the one the woman is good to'
    (know-we/him Prox-Prog-good-she Prox-woman-Art)

(60) (i) xa+ap cixnas cxn + ti?imlktx 'The woman is going to the man'
    (go Prox-woman-Art Prep-Prox-man-Art)
(ii) *?a+k'juki+ tisixaps cixnas ti?imlktx
(iii) ?a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tisixaps cixnas cxn 'We know the man the woman is going to'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-Prog-go-she Prox-woman-Art)
(iv) ?a+k'juki+ tisixaps cixnas cxn 'We know the one the woman is going to'
    (know-we/him Prox-Prog-go-she Prox-woman-Art)

(61) (i) ja cixnas cxn + ti?imlktx 'The woman is good for the man'
    (good Prox-woman-Art Prep-Prox-man-Art)
(ii) *?a+k'juki+ tisijas cixnas ti?imlk
(iii) ?a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tisijas cixnas cxn 'We know the man the woman is good for'
    (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-Prog-good-she Prox-woman-Art)
(iv) ?a+k'juki+ tisijas cixnas cxn 'We know the one the woman is good for'
    (know-we/him Prox-Prog-good-she Prox-woman-Art)
(62) (i)  ?ap cixnas cx ?a+n ti+?imlktx 'The woman is going with the man'
            (go Prox-woman-Art Prep-Prox-man-Art)

(ii) *?a+k'juki+ tisi?aps cixnas ti?imlktx

(iii) ?a+k'juki+ ti?imlk tisi?aps cixnas cx
            'We know the man the woman is going with'
            (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-Prep-go-she
            Prox-woman-Art)

(iv) ?a+k'juki+ tisi?aps cixnas cx 'We know the one the woman is going with'
            (know-we/him Prox-Prep-go-she Prox-woman-Art)

(63)  ?ixq'm cixnas cx wix++ti?imlktx 'The woman is walking from the man'
            (walk Prox-woman-Art Prep-Prox-man-Art)

The (i)-sentences of (59)-(63) require the modification of the elemental underlying structure of Bella Coola to allow for ?u+-, wix++, and ?a+-.

The first---?u+---means "directed towards the object" as in (59) where some property is directed away from some point(xnas) to another(?imlk), and in (60) where the motion is from one point to another(?imlk). The second---wix++---means "directed from the object." The deictic orientation is derived from the initial position with respect to the object. Hence, for ?u+ the deixis is distal, and for wix++ it is proximal. Both are nonstative involving direction or motion. ?a+-is to be compared with x-:

(64)  sp'is tiwac'tx xtistntx 'He hits the dog with the stick'
            (hit-he/it Prox-dog-Art Prep-Prox-stick-Art)

(65)  sp'is tiwac'tx ?a+tistntx 'He hits the dog with the stick'
            (hit-he/it Prox-dog-Art Prep-Prox-stick-Art)
In (64) \( x \) implies the ready presence of the stick; \( ?a \) in (65) implies the \( \text{agent} \) had to go and get the stick. The prepositions \( ?a \) and \( x \) are opposed, as \( ?u \) and \( \text{proximal} \) are, by distal versus proximal, respectively; their point of orientation is defined with respect to the \( \text{Agent} \) of the sentence. Both \( ?a \) and \( x \) are stative. In (62) and (65) \( ?a \) denotes a fixed orientation of the \( \text{Agent} \) and the object of the preposition as does \( x \) in (64). In earlier examples \( x \) marked a term that was passed from one point to another. See (3). There it may appear to indicate motion, but that results from equating Bella Coola \text{nap} with English "give," where a better equation would be English "gift." A closer translation of (3) would be 'The woman gifted the man with a fish'; the staticness of \( x \) is now more apparent as is the essential sameness of the Adjuncts in (3) and (4).

The distal \( ?a \) and \( ?u \) are opposed by static versus non-static as are the proximal \( x \) and \( \text{proximal} \). In (59) and (61) the translation of \( ?u \) as 'to' implies some action upon the man such as giving presents. The translation of \( ?a \) as 'for' implies no action upon the man, but that the man benefits indirectly by what the woman does or by her influence.

The four prepositions may then be described by the two oppositions distal:proximal and stative:nonstative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Nonstative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>( ?a )</td>
<td>( ?u )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td>( x )</td>
<td>( \text{proximal} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To incorporate these additional data into our description of the syntax, the Adjunct of (8)—now repositioned as a constituent of $S$ along with Comment and Topic (cf. fn. 15)—may be specified to have further structure:

\[ (66) \]

\[ S \]

\[ \text{Comment} \]

\[ \text{Topic} \]

\[ \text{Adjunct} \]

\[ \text{Agent} \quad \text{Patient} \quad \text{Preposition} \quad \text{Object} \]

Where Equi-Constituent Deletion has removed the Object of an Adjunct, Preposition Copying replicates the preposition immediately before the Comment. The copying form of $x-$ is $-s-$; that of the Distal $?a+$ and $?u+$ is $-si-$. But $wix++$ has no copying form. Given (67)

\[ (67) \]

\[ ?ixq'm cixnas cx wix++ti?im ktx \]

'The woman is walking from the man'

we would expect to find it embedded as a Comment in an adjectival clause analogous to (60iii) and (62iii):

\[ (68) \]

\[ ?a+k'juki+ ti?im k ti_?ixq'ms cixnas cx \]

where the ___ would be filled by some copy of $wix++$. Since 

$-si-$ copies Distal prepositions, we might expect $-s-$ to copy both Proximal ones. But this is not the case. Sentences such as (68) are absent from the language, and the semantic slot is filled by constructions employing a verb; for example,

\[ (69) \]

\[ ?a+k'juki+ ti?im k tiwal is cixnas cx \]

'We know the man the woman is leaving'

(know-we/him Prox-man Prox-leave-she/him Prox-woman-Art)
Notice that in (59)-(62) the Comment of the embedded $S_3$ has an -s marking the third person singular Agent. The other Agent-Patient affixes occur where appropriate. This is because there is no deletion of Agent or Patient of the embedded $S_3$ as there was in previous examples of adjectival clauses; it is the Object of the Adjunct that is deleted, and the agreement rules apply unaffected. Compare

\[(70)\] ?a+k'x:i+ tisten tisisp'+i+is tiwac'tx 'We are looking at the stick he hit the dog with' (look-we/it Prox-stick Prox-Prep-hit-Past-he/it Prox-dog-Art)

that has the underlying structure

\[(71)\] $S_1$

```
Comment
  |
  v
Agent  Topic
  |
  v
Agent  Patient
  |
  v
Comment  Topic
  |
  v
S_2
  |
  v
S_3
  |
  v
Comment  Topic  Adjunct
  |
  v
Agent  Patient  Prep Object Agent
  |
  v
?a+k'x 'we' sp' 'he' wac' ?a+ stn stn
```

and the derived structure (72) after Equi-Constituent Deletion and Agent-Patient Agreement have applied to $S_3$: ...
It is to this structure of $S_3$ in (72) and comparable ones that Preposition Copying applies.

2.2 The structure of the relative clauses in sentences (17)-(21) and (22)-(26) is similar to that assumed for the adjectival ones of (9) and (12)-(15). The difference lies in the presence of was and kas and their syntactic structure. They function as a Comment, the Topic of which is the structure $S_2$ in (31). Sentence (17), for example, has the structure:
The following sentences show more clearly that wa functions as a Comment:

(74) (i) ?a+kJ'jukcant swac 'They know who I am'
      (know-they/me who-I)

(ii) ?a+kJ'jukct swanu 'They know who you are'

(iii) ?a+kJ'jukit swas 'They know who he is'

(iv) ?a+kJ'juktu+f swa+ 'They know who we are'

(v) ?a+kJ'juktap swanap 'They know who you all are'

(vi) ?a+kJ'juktit swanaw 'They know who they are'

In (74) wa is a Comment to a pronoun Topic; the structure of (74i) is
In (17)-(21) an obligatory -s occurs suffixed to wa--- and similarly for ka in (22)-(26). This is the marker of a third person singular Agent within the Topic that must be present in embedded sentences but absent in nonembedded ones. Compare (74iii) and (74vi) and the following relative construction:

(76) ?a+k'jukti+ swanaw wa?imlkuksc wajac 'We know the men who are good'
     (know-we/them who-they Prox-man-Plural Prox-good-Art)

The affix -naw marks the third person plural Agent. This coincidence of Agent suffixes is taken as support for the description of wa and ka as Comments.

The Comments wa and ka occur in two forms. Compare the following:

(77) (i) ?a+k'juki+ swas ti?[aptx 'We know who is going'
     (know-we/him who Prox-go-Art)

(ii) ?a+k'juki+ swas ti?[aptx 'We know who is going'
(78) (i) ?a+k’juktu^nu swanu 'We know who your are'
    (know-we/you who-you)

(ii) ?a+k’juktu^nu swanu 'We know who you are'

(79) (i) ?a+k’juki+ swas tipu’tx 'We know who is coming'
    (know-we/him who-he Prox-come-Art)

(ii) ?a+k’juki+ swas tipu’tx 'We know who is coming'

(80) (i) ?a+k’juki+ skas 'We know which he is'
    (know-we/him which-he)

(ii) ?a+k’juki+ skas 'We know which he is'

The (i)-forms of (77)-(80) imply closeness to the speaker;
the (ii)-forms imply distance. One shouts when he says "?a+k'

k’juktu^nu swanu." In the following:16

(81) (i) was tika?imlk tika^ap'tx 'I wonder who will
    be the man who will go'
    (who Prox-Unrealized-man Prox-Unrealized-go-
     -Art)

(ii) wâs tika?imlk tika^ap'tx 'I wonder who will
    be the man who will go'

(82) (i) was ti?imlk tîk^ap'tx 'I wonder who the man
    is who went'
    (who Prox-man Prox-go-Past-Art)

(ii) wâs ti?imlk tîk^ap'tx 'I wonder who the man
    is who went'

(83) (i) kas tika?imlk tika^ap 'I wonder which
    will be the man to go'
    (which Prox-Unrealized-man Prox-Unrealized-
     -go)

(ii) kâs tika?imlk tika^ap 'I wonder which
    will be the man to go'

the first sentences of (81) and (83) imply a closely approaching
departure, and the second imply a more distant one. In parallel
fashion, the first sentence of (82) implies a recent departure and the second, one more distant in the past. The deixis is again distal-proximal but in terms of both time and space.

Returning to (73), the structure is affected by the same transformational rules that operate on the adjectival structures of 2.1. One additional rule is required to account for the s- before wa- and ka-. Notice that this s- also occurs in sentences (27)-(30). The conditioning of its occurrence seems to be the following: wherever an embedded sentence occurs such that Equi-Constituent Deletion does not apply spreading the deictic Distal/Proximal, an s- is prefixed to that sentence. In (73) deictic elements are attached to ja of $S_3$ by Equi-Constituent Deletion; but within $S_2$ Equi-Constituent Deletion does not apply, and an s- is prefixed. 17

There is one apparent difference between adjectival and relational clauses, viz., where an overt Agent is present within an embedded S. The relative clause comparable to (47) is

(84) (i) *?a+$^+$'juki+ swas ti?im|k tiq'up+'is cixnascx
(ii) ?a+$^+$juki+ swas ti?im|k tiq'up+'im xcixnascx

'We know the man who was punched by the woman'

(know-we/him who-he Prox-man Prox-punch-
Past-Passive/he Prep-Prox-woman-Art)

(84i) is incorrect; it is necessarily further affected by the passive transformation. The Agent in such constructions is shifted to Adjunct position and normally marked by x-(although
?a\+ can also occur), and the Patient moves to Agent position. A set of Passive Agent suffixes are then added to the Comment marking the person and number of the derived Agent:

(85) \[-t\text{inic} \quad 'I' \quad -t\text{ini}^+ \quad 'we'\]
     \[-ct \quad 'you' \quad -t\text{ap} \quad 'you'\]
     \[-i\text{m} \quad 'he/she/it' \quad -t\text{im} \quad 'they'\]

The unacceptability of (84i) seems to be solely a function of an overt Agent, e.g., cixnascx. The passive construction occurs elsewhere independently of the syntactic circumstances of (84):

(86) \[k'x\text{tinic} \quad x\text{ti}^?i\text{ml}k\text{tx} \quad 'I am seen by the man'\]
     \[(\text{see-Passive/I Prep-Prox-man-Art})\]

The remaining relative clause structures parallel those of (73) and the adjectival clauses. 18

2.3 The complex sentences of (27)-(30) have an underlying structure analogous to that of (75) for (74):

(87)

Because Equi-Constituent Deletion does not apply to $S_2'$, Agent Agreement affixes the expected -s to $\chi'\text{ap}$, and because no deictic element is spread to the Comment of $S_2$ by Equi-Constituent
Deletion, an s- is prefixed to $S_2$. The complex sentences do not undergo Topic Raising as the adjectival and relative clauses do:

(88) $^{*}?a+napit$ sti?i$m1k $\lambda'aps^{19}$

The presence of $wa$- in (29) and (30) may be treated as part of s- prefixation. We leave its precise description unsettled.\textsuperscript{20}
NOTES

1 We wish to express here our gratitude to the National Museum of Canada, Simon Fraser University, Rice University, and the Canada Council for financial support of our fieldwork on Bella Coola since 1966.

2 The number chosen also depends on what is meant by the term "Bella Coola." Those of early middle age, say, 35-50/55, speak a language that older speakers call "broken." It is the language of the older speakers that is represented in this paper. The figure of 200+ includes both these groups, but we will use "Bella Coola" to designate only the language of the latter group.

Within the older speakers we find additional variation in data across individuals, but because of the small number of speakers it is not possible to determine whether this is idiolectal or a reflex of dialectal differences. It is typical of one of our informants to label as "Kimsquit" or "Tallio" some sentence construction with which she does not agree. The amalgamation of the villages into Bella Coola was virtually complete by 1920. The number moving from the settlements of Kimsquit and Tallio was small relative to those in Bella Coola. There are few who were reared in either of these villages still alive. It seems more likely this variation is idiolectal and perhaps further increased by the degree of influence English has had on each speaker. Cf. now also Dorian 1973.
The forms ti---tx and ci---cx bracketing ?imlk and xnas, respectively, represent a set of deictic elements. The grammatical categories involved are here Distal-Proximal, Demonstrative-Article, and Invisible-Visible. The distinction of Invisible-Visible is made only in combination with Distal. Deixis intersects the grammatical categories of Singular-Plural and, within the singular number, Female-Nonfemale (The distinction is one of sex, not gender. Morphemes occurring with deixis are divided into those that refer to female animals and an unmarked group including male animals.) This intersection produces the following forms:

(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deixis</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>IIIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>ci-cx</td>
<td>ci-c'ajx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfemale</td>
<td>ti-tx</td>
<td>ti-t'ajx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>wa-c</td>
<td>wa-t'ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The referents of morphemes in construction with the deictic affixes of I are said to be near or in a know location, or seen frequently, but not necessarily visible. In construction with III the referents are either extant in the past, but not the present(IIIa) or they are not visible(IIIb). The "past" reference of IIIa implies invisibility, and the forms of III are opposed to those of IV as Invisible-Visible.
It can be seen from the display of (i) that the prefix marks the Distal-Proximal distinction, while suffixation distinguishes between Demonstrative-Article and further in III between Temporal and Spatial Distance. The Demonstrative suffixes are practically identified as only those that may accompany a gesture of pointing. Neither those of I nor III may do so. A further distinction is made within Proximal between a Near Proximal and a Middle Proximal. This is marked by -al occurring immediately before the deictic suffix of I and II. It is identical for all forms of Proximal deixis except the Plural Demonstrative where it is -a+ai-.

The Nonfemale Proximal prefix is also used to form gerunds:

(ii) tix'ap 'going'
Gerunds may not occur with the Demonstrative/Article suffixes. Nouns, however, occur without those suffixes; without them they have indefinite reference. This makes (ii) ambiguous meaning either 'going' or 'a one[male] who is going'. The Plural Proximal prefix wa- also occurs without an accompanying suffix to mark an inanimate collective:

(iii) wa?anajkmixw 'what [thing(s)] you want'
It is syntactically singular. Compare (iv) and (v):

(iv) a+naptic wa?anajkmixw 'I know what you want'
(v) a+naptic wa?anajkmixw 'I know who[all] you want'
Compare also

(vi)  ?a+napi+ wa?amatnu  'We know where you live'

The Nonfemale Singular suffix of IIIa—tx—occurs with other prefixes than ta-. Where this happens, it is translated as past tense consistent with its deictic reference:

(vii)  k'xis ti?imlktx swōs ti?anajkmix'tx  'The man sees who you wanted'
(see-he/him Prox-man-Art who Prox-want-you/him-Art)

The Plural Distal prefix and suffix of IIIa together may mark past time:

(viii)  ?a+napi+ taX'apnutx'w  'We know what time you went'

Bella Coola makes no thoroughgoing distinction between nouns, verbs, and adjectives (But see the discussion of sentences (9) and (12)-(15) below.). We will use "verb" and so forth loosely without giving them precise meaning within Bella Coola.

The affixes are partially fused, making clear distinction of a subject and object difficult. The set of noncausative, nonpassive affixes are (cf. also Newman ca. 1935 and 1969):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--- cinu ic</td>
<td>--- tu+ap tic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>cxw --- ixw</td>
<td>tu+xw --- tixw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>cs ct is</td>
<td>tu+s tap tis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--- tu+nui i+</td>
<td>--- tu+ap ti+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>cap --- ip</td>
<td>tu+p --- tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>cant ct it</td>
<td>tu+t tap tit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Verbs without additional tense, modal, or aspectual modification are undetermined within time; in our examples we gloss such verbs as simple or progressive present depending solely upon what is appropriate to the English.) Certain combinations of subject and object require further comment. Where a third person subject (singular or plural) and a second person object (singular or plural) occur with an overt subject, i.e., not a pronoun, that subject is marked by the preposition `x- (cf. (3) and (4)):

(ii) (a) *k'xct ti?imlktx
(b) k'xct xti?imlktx 'The man sees you'

(iii) (a) *k'xtap ti?imlktx
(b) k'xtap xti?imlktx 'The man sees you all'

(iv) (a) *k'xtap wa?imlkuksc
(b) k'xtap xa?imlkuksc 'The men see you all'

(In (ivb) the segment sequence /xw/ yields /x/ before /a/.)

This phenomenon occurs only within this combination of persons. The (b)-constructions are incorrect with other person-number combinations.

The dashes marking some subject-object intersections in (i) occur where the referent of both subject and object is identical. In this circumstance a reflexive morpheme `-cut-' is affixed to the stem and the subject affixes added. They are
They occur elsewhere with nouns (vi), intransitive verbs (vii), and adjectives (viii):

(vi)  sitalmcx 'I am chief'
(vii)  X'apc 'I am going'
(viii)  sx$ 'I am bad'

They also mark possession; (vi), for example, can mean 'my chief'. The variant forms within the plural of (v) are determined by the final segment of the stem. The vowel initial variants occur after consonants, and the consonant initial ones after vowels (The formulation is actually more complex than given here.) The -s of the third person singular is more troublesome. In embedded sentences it always occurs with third person singular subjects. In nonembedded ones the -s at one time appeared to be stylistically determined (Newman ca. 1935:28):

One of my informants said that the -s suffix characterizes "the way stories are told," that the zero suffix is more commonly used in conversation. Although it is true that the zero suffix is relatively rare in texts as compared with my field notes, it is not consistently avoided in telling stories....Apparently a stylistic difference is felt between the -s and the zero suffix, the latter perhaps expressing a more informal abbreviated version of the pronominal reference.
Our informants most frequently do not use -s in nonembedded sentences. Where it does occur in that position it is affixed only to verbs, not adjectives nor nouns—a first indication of a distinction between verb and nonverb in the language. Nonembedded sentences containing it elicit the comment that they are "a little bit different" from the ones without it. When pressed to explain that difference informants respond to sentences with -s with "I'm just talking about it." This fits with Newman's observation that the -s characterizes stories. Given that it is explained as "just talking" and that it can be used outside its appropriate stylistic matrix, it may be that a stylistic difference is in progress of being reinterpreted as a grammatical one.

Both sets of affixes in (i) and (v) will be absent from underlying structures and assumed to be added by transformational rules that we (looking forward to the introduction of the terms Agent and Patient below) call Agent-Patient Agreement for (i) and Agent Agreement for (v).

6 (12ii) is usually considered incorrect, although there is some vacillation on the part of informants.

7 (13i) is correct if glossed as 'I see him who punched the person' in place of 'I see the person who punched him'. The latter is intended here.

8 (15i) is correct if glossed as 'I see what/him you are giving the slave' in place of 'I see the slave you are giving
him/her'. The latter is intended here.

9(19i) is correct with the gloss 'We know who punched the man' but not with the gloss 'We know the man who punched him'. The latter is meant here.

10(21i) is correct with the gloss 'We know who you are giving to the slave' but not with the gloss 'We know the slave you are giving him/her'. The latter is intended here.

11(24i) is correct with the gloss 'We know which one punches the man' but not with the gloss 'We know which man punches him/her'. The latter is meant here.

12(26i) is correct with the gloss 'We know which one you are giving the slave' but not with the gloss 'We know which slave you are giving him/her'. The latter is intended here.

13The form q'ūxp' is a reduplication from the root q'ūp'. For a statement of reduplication and verbal categories in Bella Coola, see Saunders and Davis 1972.

Transitivity then forces the following extrinsic ordering:

(i) Agent-Patient Agreement
(ii) Equi-Constituent Deletion
(iii) Agent Agreement

15 An apparent exception to this is

(i) ?a+k'juki+tii?im'l? tina[pix'xxtx xtism+ktx 'We know the man you are giving the fish' (know-we/him Prox-man Prox-give-you/him-Art Prop-Prox-fish-Art)
(i) is a paraphrase of (49). There are no paraphrases of (46)-(48) or (50) on the model of (i). For example, (46) does not have the paraphrase

   (ii) *?a+k'jukit_ti?ilmk tiq-qup+tx cixnascx

What this indicates is (1) the statements concerning the occurrence of Demonstrative/Article with respect to Topic are correct but that (2) the Adjunct is not a constituent of Topic; it is a constituent of S:

(iii)  

In the remainder of the paper we shall substitute the nuclear base structure of (iii) for that given in (8).

16 Sentences (81)-(83) are "mild" questions glossed as 'I wonder'. They contrast with "true" questions formed on the same roots but with the affix -ks: waks 'who?' and kaks 'which?'. These also occur in lengthened distal forms; for example,

   (i) waks tiX'ap+ 'Who went'
   (ii) wāks tiX'ap+ 'Who went'

This lengthening as deictic-marker can also be seen in the past tense itself:

   (iii) X'ap+ 'He went'
   (iv) X'ap++ 'He went'

(iii) implies a recent departure, and (iv) a more remote one.
ka- is an aspectual prefix that marks the Comment as incomplete or unrealized. It is usually translated as an English future tense. It also occurs with nouns as in tika?imlk in (81) implying an unknown, hence unrealized, person. It also occurs in such sentences as

(v) ?a+napi+ tikasi ka- 'We know who it will be with whom you will go'

(vi) ?a+napi+ ska?imlk 'We know it will be a boy [said of a pregnant woman]

where the ka- before si- in (v) is copied from the Adjunct along with the preposition when the pronoun is deleted:

(vii)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Adjunct} \\
\text{Prep} & \text{Object} \\
?a+ & \text{ka-'he'}
\end{array}
\]

In (vi) the structure is

(viii)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{Comment} & \text{Topic} \\
\text{Agent} & \text{Patient} \\
\text{Comment} & \text{Topic} \\
\text{Agent}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
?a+nap & \text{'we'} \\
\text{ka-?'imlk} & \text{'he'}
\end{array}
\]

ka- "Unrealized" contrasts semantically with the wa- of (29)-(30): their syntactic behavior is, however, not parallel. ka- "Unrealized" and wa- "Realized" differ from the relative (and interrogative) ka and wa. The latter exhibit deictic
behavior while the former do not.

This s- may be identified with the s- of deverbal noun derivation that occurs in Bella Coola and other Salish languages. Compare

(i) (a) na-χc-αχ 'lie down'
(b) s-χic-ta 'bed'
(ii) (a) c'χn-m-αχ' 'think'
(b) s-c'ūχin 'brain'

If such identification is made, then embedded S's may be interpreted as being required to convert to nouns either by incorporation within a noun (i.e., via the deictic spreading of Distal/Proximal) or where that does not apply, by s-derivation.

Other morphemes that occur as Comments similar to the relatives are xsuc 'all' and q'wala 'all gone, no more':

(i) ?a+k'jukti? sxsucaw wαχ'msta wαχ'ap 'We know all the people who are going'
(ii) ?a+k'jukti? sq'walanaw wαχ'msta waja 'We know there are no more people who are good'

Sentences (i) and (ii) have underlying structures analogous to (73). Sentence

(iii) ?a+napi? spαχw sαχ'apnu 'We know when you are going'

has the following structure:
The s's before and after paχw are predictable by the same rule that introduces s- in (73) and (87).

19Sentences similar to this—which we have not considered in this paper—do occur:

(i) ʔa+naptixw waʔi m1 kuskc waʔi apaw

(i) means something like 'You know the men[plus the fact that] they are going'. (i) cannot be said of strangers, but (ii) can:

(ii) ʔa+naptixw waʔi apaw waʔi m1 kuskc

In (ii) what is known is that the men are going, not specifically who they are.

(i) appears to manifest nonrestrictive modification in contrast with the restrictive modification of 1.1 and 1.2. It may possibly be described by a paratactic structure opposed to the hypotactic structure of 2.1 and 2.2:
Phonologically, this is supported by a pause that usually occurs between ti?im1ktx and was'aps.

20 wa- "Realized" cannot easily be treated as a Comment, for it, unlike wa- 'who' and so forth, cannot again occur following the s- sentence prefix:

(i) *?a+napcinu swas'apnu

Nor can it be identified with the wa- "Collective" use of the deictic particle; they seem too semantically disparate.

It may also occur before relative clauses:

(ii) ?a+k’juktH waswanaw wak’xt cixnas cx 'We know the ones who see the woman'
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