

everyone to share the meat, reminding them of their prior insults.

(20) ?əʃaʔti, čəlopa kʷədalikʷ ?ə
tiʔəʔ biac. biac ?ə tiʔəʔ
tudʒilid čələp. ?əʃaʔti, qəbuʔ
ʃutiqʷilabacləp.

(20) Come take meat. This meat from
the one you folks maligned. Come
on you folks, even though you
might get contaminated by his sores.

So much of this humor is obvious to those familiar with our language and culture that they can truly repeat after Coyote when he says so often:

(21) haʔkʷ čəd ?əxʷscutəb.

(21) For a long time I thought that.

I KNEW IT ALL ALONG!!!!!!

Halkomelem and Configuration¹

Thomas E. Hukari

University of Victoria

0. Introduction

Languages may differ on a parameter of configurationality, according to Chomsky (1981). Although this property is not clearly defined, let us assume that the grammatical relations of subject and object either cannot or, for some reason, should not be defined by tree configuration in nonconfigurational languages, as opposed to configurational languages such as English, where the subject is [NP, S] and the object, [NP, VP] (Chomsky, 1965). We might very well ask the extent to which a language may be nonconfigurational: are there languages with an absolutely flat syntax? Further, are there correlates to configurationality or nonconfigurationality?

I will argue below that Halkomelem is nonconfigurational at least to the extent that the relationships of argument phrases (i.e., putative NPs) to the predicate is not configurationally defined. Possibly argument phrases are, in turn, minimally structured, consisting of an article head plus optional clauses, although the facts may be open to a more conventional analysis.

Given a certain degree of nonconfigurationality, we might then ask whether there are correlates. Chomsky (1981) speculates

that nonconfigurational languages may be nontransformational (in the narrower sense of transformation, cf, Chomsky, 1973). I suggest below that Halkomelem may be nontransformational. Or, more precisely, that it may not possess wh-movement (movement to COMP) or move-NP.

1. Configuration at the clause level

Halkomelem seems to be nonconfigurational to the extent that the relations of phrasal arguments (putative NP) to the predicate are not configurationally defined. While word order is not absolutely fixed, a phrasal subject tends to precede all other phrasal arguments (ARG) and follow the predicate complex, yielding a V+Subj+ARG* order.

- (1) ni? k'w'icət--əs t^ə swəy?qe? t^ə sceeitən ?ə t^ə ʒəptən.
 AUX butcher-3Su ART man ART salmon CASE ART knife

The man butchered the salmon with the knife.

The relatively high frequency of V+Subj+ARG* order militates against treating Halkomelem as a configurational language as far as arguments and the predicate are concerned. If we assume this order is basic, the verb and any arguments it subcategorizes (e.g., object, oblique object) will not be adjacent and hence they cannot form a syntactic constituent (VP) in phrase structure grammar. In effect, both subjects and objects are [NP, S].

2. Degrees of configurationality

While some languages such as Walbiri (Hale 1978) may have a flat syntax, it seems likely that Halkomelem exhibits some degree of configurationality. Possibly the predicate and argument phrases are "bounding" nodes, containing their constituents (except for the lack of phrasal arguments in the predicate complex). So far as I know, the constituents of a phrasal argument are always adjacent (excluding floating quantifiers) and, in fact, their order is partly fixed (see below). Similarly, the elements of a predicate complex, excluding phrasal arguments, are adjacent and their order is fixed.

2.1. Predicates.

The discussion of predicates will be confined to verb-headed ones for the moment. Generally, a verb-headed predicate has a temporal-spacial auxiliary (proximal versus nonproximal), an auxiliary verb or both, followed by the head.

- (2) ni? x'xpəlqst--əm t^əənə mən?ə ?ə t^ə pus.
 AUX scratch-nose- ART-my son CASE ART cat
 PASS

My son was scratched on the nose by the cat.

- (3) nem? ʒə x'ɬast--əs t^ə t^əəpsi?aʒən?
 go reportedly feed-3Su ART squirrel

(He) is going to feed the squirrel.

- (4) ni? nem? x'w'ət^əəlqsənəm k'ʒən? mən?ə.
 AUX go wipe-nose ART-your son

Your child went to wipe his nose.

In addition, there may be adverbs, which precede the head and follow any auxiliaries.

- (5) ni? cən ʔlim? ʔo? ɟayt t^θə spe?əθ.
 AUX I really kill ART bear

I really killed the bear.

There is slight evidence of constituent structure, setting the auxiliaries off from the verb and its adverb modifiers. Certain clauses, usually involving temporal sequencing, show nominal trappings plus a particle /ʔo?/. In simple cases, the particle precedes the first word of the clause.

- (6) s--(?)o?--c^ʔəm--s t^θey? swiw?ləs.
 NOM-O --jump--3POSS ART young-man

Then this young man jumped.

But if the first word is an auxiliary, the particle skips to the first word of the predicate complex.

- (7) ... s --nem?--s ʔo? k^ʔi? ...
 NOM-go-3POSS O climb

... (then) he climbed ...

- (8) ... nə--s--ni? ʔo? taant.
 my-NOM-AUX O leave

... (and) I walked away.

Possibly then the verb and any adverb modifiers form a constituent.

If so, it is not clear whether they combine in turn with auxiliaries to form a larger predicate phrase or not. I will assume they do not. Using more or less traditional phrase structure categories, the following rules approximate the major

constituent structures of a Halkomelem verb-headed clause.

S → (AUX) VP NP*

AUX → (Tem/Spac) (V_{aux})

VP → ADV* V

These rules will be revised in various ways below. However, I will continue to assume that all phrasal arguments are essentially the same category in that /ʔo?, a particle preceding all non-subject/nonobject arguments is a case marker (not a preposition heading PP). Possibly one might wish to say that noncase-marked arguments must be bound to an agreement system involving subject and object inflection (cf, Hukari, 1981). I will not comment here on the relationship of phrasal arguments to the predicate, but I will assume some interpretive procedure involving properties of the predicate head are involved (cf, Bresnan, 1982, or Chomsky, 1981).

2.2. Argument phrases.

Certain elements within a phrasal argument occur in fixed order. The case marker, if present, is initial and followed by an obligatory article. At least in surface form, only an article is obligatory (cf, #9).

- (9) sitən t^θey?
 basket that

This is a basket.

An argument phrase may contain a head noun.

- (10) ni? ləmnəx^w--əs k^wθə ʃaca?
 AUX see--3Su ART lake

He saw the lake.

Any adjective modifiers precede the head noun, and I suggest in

section (4) below that Adj+N forms a constituent.

- (11) ni? ləmnəx^w--əs k^wθə ʃeʃəm? ʃaca?
 AUX see--3Su ART shallow lake

He saw the shallow lake.

The categories adjective and noun can be distinguished.

For one, only nouns take possessor affixes + N.

- (12) ʔəy?stəx^w cən θə cqiʃ ən? swetə.
 like I ART black your sweater

I like your black sweater.

Also, nouns occur freely as argument heads, while adjectives occur as heads only in elliptical constructions, where the head is interpretable in context (a fact which creates problems for any analysis, as noted below).

- (13) ʔəy?stəx^w cən θə cqiʃ ən? swetə ʔi? qəlstəx^w
 like I ART black your sweater CONJ hate
 cən θə (*ən?) ʔəq (ən? swetə).
 I ART your white your sweater

I like your black sweater but I don't like the white.

I doubt that we can preclude the possibility of multiple class membership, but seemingly there are lexical items which occur only as prenominal modifiers (and, as discussed below, as predicate heads), excepting elliptical contexts.

Relative clauses may precede or follow the head noun. They

may also occur without a head noun.

- (14) ni? cən ʔo? statəl?stəx^w ʔə
 AUX I know ART

{ steni? ni? q^wələt k^wθə sceeitən }
 { ni? q^wələt k^wθə sceeitən steni? }
 { AUX barbecue ART salmon woman }

I know the woman who barbecued the salmon.

- (15) ʔwet k^wθə ni? ləmnəx^w--əx^w ni? k^wik^wəčət.
 who ART AUX see--YOU AUX butchering

Who did you see that was butchering. (Lit.: The (one) that you saw that was butchering was who.)

Unlike the adjective constructions above, such arguments without noun heads are not elliptical. That is, they do not require discourse contexts in which a head noun is recoverable.

Let us assume for the moment that Halkomelem arguments are NPs and that they may be described essentially by the following rules.

NP → ART (S) (N') (S)

N' → ADJ* N

I will present a competing analysis in section (4) below, where I suggest that it may be possible to analyze phrasal arguments as ART+S* constructions. If this analysis turns out to be viable, then argument phrases are relatively unstructured.

2.3. Summary

This very brief discussion of Halkomelem predicates and arguments has deliberately avoided certain fundamental problems, such as the fact that any major lexical item may occur as a predicate (see below). We have seen, however, a dichotomy in clauses between the predicate complex (which may have some internal structure) and arguments (putative NP), the latter having some elements in fixed order and possibly some internal structure.

3. The projection problem

Chomsky (1981) makes the conjecture that generative categorical rules (i.e., x-bar phrase structure rules) can be eliminated from the grammar and that constituent structure is a projection from the lexicon. Assuming for the sake of discussion that Jackendoff (1977) is essentially correct in his analysis of constituent structure, then every major lexical category will project three phrasal levels (indicated by bars or, here, by apostrophes).

X^{'''} → ...X'' ... (where "...''" may contain specifiers and possibly nonrestrictive modifiers)

X'' → ...X' ... (where "...'" may contain restrictive modifiers)

X' → ...X ... (where "...'" may contain elements sub-categorized by X, the lexical category)

Assuming, for example, that a language has the major lexical categories noun, verb and adjective, these would project to N', N'', N''' and so on. If, as proposed by Jackendoff, S is V''', then the lexical head of a clause is the verb.

A problem not resolved by Chomsky is the order of elements within a phrase, which may require language-specific rules. Also the implementation of this system within a nonconfigurational language is left open. (Presumably an interpretive procedure would associate a string with the lexical head, X, to compose a X' and so on.)

A major problem in the analysis of Halkomelem is the fact that any major lexical item may function as a predicate head.

(16) sk^utey? tə?i.
 littleneck clam this

 This is a littleneck clam.

(17) ʔi t^ə swəy?qe?
 big ART man

 The man is big.

If, as I suggest above, N and A are distinct lexical categories (leaving at least V as an additional major lexical category), it seems to follow that S equals V''', N''' or A''', assuming the lexical head of a predicate heads a clause. In effect, there is no one category equivalent to S (V''' in English). Furthermore, if N''' constitutes a clause when N is the predicate head, how do we account for the formal distinction between noun-headed

clauses, which do not take a case marker or articles, and N-headed arguments, which do? For that matter, what of ART+S arguments, where the predicate head of the clause is V — are these actually V'''?

A partial solution to the projection problem is to assume that clauses may be headed by any major category item, that the classes V, N and A are not differentiated in this respect — call them all +C, major category. Possibly S equates with C''', although I will use S here.

S → (AUX) C''' ARG*

AUX → (Tem/Spac) (V_{aux})

C'' → [mod, C]* C' (mod, C = ADV for N, V, A or A for N)

C' → C

In short, wherever else categorical distinctions may exist between major lexical categories, they are undifferentiated as heads of clauses. These rules could be viewed as a generative system or possibly as a projection from the lexicon, where all major-category lexical items are +C.

The categorical status of ARG is left open here and this is discussed below. Possibly it is a projection above S (i.e., C''') or, if the article is taken as the head, as a projection of ART (ART'). In any case, a partial characterization of arguments is as follows.

ARG → (CASE) ART (X)

It is the status of X that I turn to below, considering the hypothesis that X is clausal or, more precisely, a concatenation of one or more clauses.

4. Arguments as clauses²

It was noted above that argument phrases are preceded by articles while clauses are not and, as such, some formal distinction should be maintained. This does not preclude the possibility that arguments contain clauses as their major constituent. In fact, we have seen that an argument may be simply ART+S and that such arguments occur freely (unlike the elliptical ART+ADJ construction).

What if we say all arguments contain clauses? Since nouns may function as predicate heads (cf, #16), ultimate heads of clauses, it is not obvious how we could prevent analysis A as opposed to simply analysis B below, if any argument may consist of ART+S.

(18) A. [t^θ [[[[swəy?qe?]]]]]
 ARG SC " C' C C C' C'' SARG

B. [t^θ [swəy?qe?]]
 ARG N N ARG

If the ARG rule is simply as follows, this prevents the double generation of ART+N surface strings, all being instances of ART+S.

ARG → (CASE) ART S*

The fact that S must be a relative clause should be no more of

a problem than in a more traditional analysis where relative clauses are modifiers. In either case, we must explain the fact that a relative clause is "open" and must be bound somehow. (Possibly the article functions as an operator, binding into clauses.)

The hypothesis that Halkomelem arguments are essentially clausal (ART+S) may seem controversial — the category NP being a likely candidate for a linguistic universal — but perhaps it is no less plausible than the claim that they are noun phrases, given that noun phrases are N", a projection from the lexical category N, since Halkomelem arguments of the form ART+S and I turn to this in section (5) below.

5. Arguments as clauses: evidence and counterevidence

The discussion below is essentially programmatic, pointing to areas of the grammar which may test the clausal-argument hypothesis. The facts are often complex and the results are mixed, although I do not believe they disconfirm the hypothesis. While the data are in many cases specific to Halkomelem, it is my hope that this discussion will generalize in some cases to other Salishan languages.

5.1. Adjectives.

The distribution of adjectives is a problem: they do not occur freely as argument heads (see above), yet they function as

predicate heads and, hence, as heads of clauses. It should follow that they head arguments. I see no remedy short of treating this lacuna as an extragrammatical fact or positing an (ad hoc) surface filter. But this problem may be independent of the clausal argument hypothesis. The fact remains in any analysis that arguments may consist of ART+S and predicate adjectives should be able to head such clauses.

The existence of ART+ADJ+N constructions follows nicely enough from the clausal analysis even if adjective-headed clauses must be excluded, since a predicate nominal may have adjective modifiers.

(19) Θi swəyʔqeʔ.
big man

He is a big man.

This is, of course, also compatible with a non-clausal analysis of noun-headed arguments.

5.2. Multiple nouns.

Since an argument may contain multiple relative clauses (cf, #15) multiple nouns should also be possible in the clausal analysis. While the construction is comparatively infrequent, it does occur.

(20) $\text{ʔeʔx}^w\text{e}ʔ\Theta$ $\text{ʔ}\Theta$ $t^{\theta}\Theta(n?)$ $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{l}\text{ə}\text{m}\text{ə}\text{t}\text{u}\text{l}^{\text{ʔ}}\text{q}\text{ə}\text{n} \quad (\text{ə}\text{n}^{\text{ʔ}}) \quad \text{s}\text{e}\text{y}^{\text{ʔ}} \\ \text{s}\text{e}\text{y}^{\text{ʔ}} \quad (\text{ə}\text{n}^{\text{ʔ}}) \quad \text{l}\text{ə}\text{m}\text{ə}\text{t}\text{u}\text{l}^{\text{ʔ}}\text{q}\text{ə}\text{n} \\ \text{w}\text{o}\text{o}\text{l} \quad \text{y}\text{o}\text{u}\text{r} \quad \text{s}\text{h}\text{e}\text{e}\text{p}\text{-w}\text{o}\text{o}\text{l} \end{array} \right\}$.

Give me your sheep-wool.

- (21) nem? kʷənət kʷə } qʷəyi?ləʒəip nə ʔqet
 go take ART }
 } ʔqet nə qʷəyi?ləʒəip }
 } tree my jackpine }

Go get my jackpine tree(s).

Further, it seems quite unlikely that these are compounds as either member may take an adjective modifier and a possessive affix in some cases.

- (22) ʔexʷeʔ ʔə tʰə } cxʷikʷ sey? ən? ləmətulʔqən }
 give-me CASE ART }
 } ʔən sey? cxʷikʷ ʔən ləmətulʔqən }
 } your wool grey your sheep-wool }

Give me your grey sheep-wool.

Perhaps further work on such constructions will reveal that in some cases one member is a modifier, since it is not always possible for both to occur with a possessive affix.

- (23) nem? cən ce? ʔaat ʔə } sʔeni? nə taktə }
 go I FUT call ART }
 } nə taktə sʔeni? }
 } *taktə nə sʔeni? }
 } doctor my woman }

I am going to call my woman doctor.

Examples such as (22) strongly suggest though that multiple nouns are possible, a fact which certainly does not follow from a non-clausal treatment of such arguments. If arguments are noun phrases and projections from a lexical category following along the lines of Jackendoff (1977) we would expect to identify one unique lexical head.

5.3. Modality.

If ART+N sequences are clausal the noun should co-occur with the same range of elements as predicate nominals do (save any distributional constraints which may hold in general on relative clauses). For example, Halkomelem clauses may contain a range of clitics involving modality or discourse reference.

- (24) nem? yaxʷ ʔ ce? ʔʒxʷimelə.
 go suppose you FUT go-to-store

I guess you will be going to the store.

Since these modal clitics occur with noun-headed clauses, we would predict that they also occur in noun-headed arguments.

In fact, such clitics do occur in noun-headed arguments. Their occurrence seems to be situationally constrained, although I have no reason to think they are grammatically constrained.

- (25) ʔi cən ʔəʔənəm? ʔə tʰən? ʔəlʔʒətən ce?.
 AUX I weaving CASE ART-your mat FUT

I am weaving your mat.

- (26) ni? qaytəm ʔə kʷə ʔələqəm xʷkʷeyʔqʷəmʔnəc ʔe?.
 AUX kill-PASS CASE ART dangerous rattlesnake too

He was killed by the dangerous rattlesnake (which was killed by another rattlesnake).

It should be noted that elicitation in this domain is difficult (perhaps due in no small part to my difficulties with the semantics of modal clitics). A systematic attempt to elicit all possible clitics in N-headed arguments has not been carried out and perhaps should be.

While the occurrence of modal clitics in N-headed arguments follows from the clausal hypothesis and this would have been a serious gap if they did not occur, this is at least compatible with the contrary hypothesis. That is, one could claim they occur both in predicates and in noun phrases.

5.4. Relative clause accessibility.

Relative clause binding is absolutely clause bounded in most cases (cf, Hukari, 1981). That is, it is not possible to bind into a subordinate clause of a relative clause, unlike English.

(27) k^wθə swəyʔqeʔ niʔ k^wičət--e e k^wθə sməyəθ
 AUX man AUX butcher-Ø Ø ART deer

the man who butchered the deer

(28) k^wθə sməyəθ niʔ k^wičət--əs k^wθə swəyʔqeʔ e
 AUX deer AUX butcher-3SUBJ ART man Ø

the deer which the man butchered

(29) *t^θə sceeɪtən [niʔ cəsəθeʔəlt [ʔoʔ k^wičət--ənʔ e]]
 ART salmon AUX telling-me butcher-I Ø

the salmon that she was telling me to butcher

But if arguments are clausal, there will be one exception to boundedness: possessor binding. As noted by Donna Gerds (1981) the possessor of an absolutive (intransitive subject or transitive object) may be bounded.

(30) ɬə sieniʔ niʔ q^wələm k^wθə sqeʔəq-s ʔə k^wθə sceeɪtən
 ART woman AUX barbecue ART y.sibling-POSS CASE ART salmon
 the woman whose younger brother barbecued the salmon

(31) ɬwet k^wθə swəyʔqeʔ niʔ ɬeɬəwʔət-əs t^θənʔ men t^θə sqeʔəq-s
 who ART man AUX helping-3SU ART-your father ART y.sibling-POSS
 Who is the man whose younger brother your father is helping?

If the possessed nouns in these examples are predicates in clauses, then we must say that it is possible to bind into a subordinate clause in just this case. Given the highly special nature of the rule, perhaps this is not a serious formal objection to the hypothesis however.

5.5. Clauses and arguments

Subordinate clauses (excluding relative clause type arguments) never function as syntactic objects in Halkomelem. (It is, in fact, moot whether they function as subjects.) The two major subordinate clause types are kw-clauses, which are introduced by a /k^w-k^w/ component and have s-nominal trappings, and o-clauses, which are introduced by the particle /ʔoʔ/ and contain dependent clause subject clitics.

(32) niʔ cən ʔoʔ ɬeɬəmʔ [k^w-ənʔ--s--ʔi wəɬ hənʔnəwʔ].
 AUX I hear your-NOM-AUX then get-in

I heard you come in.

(33) ʔi cən ɬecθaʔmə [ʔoʔ niʔ--əx^w ceʔ ʔoʔ ɬewəθamʔs].
 AUX I pondering-you AUX-you FUT help-me

I am trying to figure out if you are going to help me.

Neither type occurs as objects of transitive verbs. Suppose arguments are truly clauses (i.e. ARG=S' or C '''), as in the following rules.

S → (AUX) C'' S'*

S → ART S*

It is not obvious what would differentiate such arguments from, in particular, kw-clauses. It is quite conceivable that the kw component is historically related to the articles (remote and hypothetical articles having a kw component). If kw-clauses are expanded by the same rules it is not clear why only argument clauses may function as verb objects.

I am not saying that this formal distinction between arguments and subordinate clauses cannot be resolved in the clausal argument analysis. One possibility is that arguments are not clauses (not S') but simply contain clauses. For example, perhaps they are projections of articles (ART'), given the fact that articles are the only obligatory category in arguments.

ART' → ART S*

5.6. Summary

Possible areas of imperical differences between the two hypothesis for N-headed arguments --N as a simple lexical head of N''' and N as a predicate heading a clause--have been briefly touched on here. The results are hardly conclusive, but it is by no means

clear that a clausal analysis should be rejected out of hand. Most certainly the possibility of multiple nouns and the presence of modal clitics in arguments tend to support the clausal hypothesis. In any case, the free occurrence of ART+S arguments suggests that either arguments in Halkomelem are not noun phrases or that, if they are, then phrasal categories are not projections from the lexicon.

6. Halkomelem as a nontransformational language.

Chomsky (1981) makes the conjecture that nonconfigurational languages may be nontransformational. Bear in mind that the notion of transformation is to be construed rather narrowly in his current work (cf, Chomsky, 1982) and may reduce essentially to two cases: wh-movement and move-NP. It is not obvious that either rule is operative in Halkomelem.

6.1. Wh-movement.

I have argued elsewhere (Hukari, 1981) that Halkomelem probably does not have wh-movement. Possibly the only construction in Halkomelem where one might consider the application of wh-movement is relative clauses. The examples in preceding sections clearly illustrate the absence of relative pronouns in Halkomelem. This, in itself, is not sufficient to argue against movement to COMP, where a phonologically null element is moved (cf, Chomsky, 1981). Chomsky (1977) suggests that any construction showing gaps with certain properties may be derived via some

version of wh-movement or movement to COMP. For example, clear cases of wh-movement in English show the following properties: a gap, an antecedent wh-pronoun which may be several clauses above the gap, but with certain island constraints holding between the antecedent wh-pronoun and the gap.

(34) [[who_i] [does John believe [[t_i that] [Marsha saw t_i]]]]
 S' C S S' C S S

(35)*[[who_i] [does John believe [the claim [[t_i that] [Marsha saw t_i]]]]]
 S' C S NP S' C S S

Chomsky assumes that wh-movement is cyclic, that under the appropriate circumstances a constituent containing a wh-word not only moves into the COMP (the slot occupied by that in (34)), but it may move cyclically to a higher COMP node, creating a long-distance gap. However the constituent cannot move out of two cyclic nodes (possibly NP and S) in one application of the rule. In (35) movement from the lower to the higher COMP requires passing out of both NP and S, a violation of subadjacency.

To state the case against wh-movement in Halkomelem briefly, it seems to me that in a language without overt relative pronouns we need very compelling evidence before claiming that a movement to COMP rule is operative. As noted above, relative clause binding is clause-bounded in Halkomelem. Subjects and direct objects of the highest clause of the relative clause may be bound (cf (27) and

(28) above).

The one possible counterexample is, of course, binding to a possessor (cf, (30)). But even here relative clause binding in Halkomelem does not resemble a long-distance rule. As such, the case for a transformation is hardly compelling.

Other constructions where one might expect movement to COMP phenomena are subsumed under relative clauses. A putative focus construction is clearly a case of base generation, where a predicate nominal is followed by a ART+S subject.

(36) swoy^oqe^o t^o ni^o k'wicat t^o sceełton.
 man ART AUX butcher ART salmon

It was a man that butchered the salmon.

Putative wh-questions follow exactly the same pattern, where interrogative pronouns are predicates.

(37) hwet t^o ni^o k'wicat t^o sceełton.
 who ART AUX butcher ART salmon

Who butchered the salmon? (The one that butchered the salmon was who?)

In short, the facts seem consistent with saying that Halkomelem does not have movement to COMP.

6.2. Move-NP

Move-NP (possible extendable to Move-Xⁿ, a maximal phrasal category) is structure preserving, moving a NP to an independently motivated NP slot, as in English passives (cf, Chomsky, 1981 and for the structure-preserving constraint, Emonds, 1976).

- (38) a. [e] TNS be surrounded [the army]
 b. [the army_i] TNS be surrounded [t_i]

In Chomsky's Binding and Government model, it turns out that the NP is always moved from a non-case assigning position to one where if appropriate, it may receive case. The object of a passive participle does not receive case and must be moved (if lexically filled). Movement from a case-assigning position to a case-assigning position is ruled out by a filter, since the NP would not only receive case directly but it would inherit the case of its trace.

If move-NP is operative in Halkomelem we would expect to see arguments moved to independently motivated argument positions. Further, this should happen under circumstances where the argument could not remain in its deep structure position (i.e., a position which does not assign case). I am not aware of this set of conditions in Halkomelem, but let us consider briefly one case of a putative raising rule. (Chomsky analyses subject-to-subject raising in English as move-NP.) In (39 a) the main predicate is intransitive and followed by a kw-clause. With apparently the same meaning, the corresponding transitive verb can be used in (b), where its object is the subject of the subordinate clause. (k^wəs = k^w--- s--ni?--s: kw-NOM-AUX-3POSS.)

- (39) a. Xi?Xiem? k^wəs wəi q^wsəθət t^θə sta?ləs-θ
 watching then go-in-water ART husband-3POSS
 She watched her husband go into the water.
 b. Xi?Xie?m-ət-əs t^θə sta?ləs-θ k^wəs wəi q^wsəθət.
 watching-TR-3Su ART husband-3POSS then go-in-water
 She watched her husband go into the water.

While this could be taken as a case of raising to object, there are a number of reasons why I do not think this can be move-NP. For one, the NP can remain in the lower clause.

- c. Xi?Xie?m-ət-əs k^wəs wəi q^wsəθət t^θə sta?ləs-θ
 watching-TR-3Su then go-in-water ART husband-3POSS
 She watched her husband go into the water.

The transitive marker in the higher clause indicates that it is marked for putative raising (since a clausal "object" would not trigger transitivity). It is unclear how this construction could result from move-NP. For one, this would require a highly unlikely rule which then lowers the argument back into the subordinate clause. Also, one would think there would be case conflict here. In fact, even (b) may be a counterexample, given case assignment and I turn to this below.

While it is not obvious how the notion of case would be incorporated into a nonconfigurational language such as Halkomelem, the following seems plausible. Assume that arguments are generated freely with or without the case particle. Any argument which has no case marker (and only these) must receive case by binding to the person system (AGR): to the subject inflection (represented

by clitics or the transitive verb subject suffix), to the object inflection or to a third person possessor suffix, these being the three situations in which a noncase-marked argument is permissible.

I leave open whether Halkomelem has nonlexical or phonologically null PRO arguments (although I see no reason to suppose it does, particularly given the absence of subjectless infinitives). In any case, a phonologically filled argument must have case, either by the presence of a base-generated case marker or by binding to the "agreement" system.

Note that in examples (b) and (c) above the subordinate clause contains all the usual trappings (as in (a)), including the subject inflection, signalled by the possessor suffix. If subject inflection is present in the lower clause it is not clear why the deep structure subject (or its trace) would not receive case in the lower clause and, if so, when it is raised it would presumably receive case twice: once as the object of the higher clause and once, via its trace, as subject of the lower clause. This objection is, of course, contingent on the analysis of case sketched out above, plus the assumption that the double-case constraint is universal. I see no reason, however, to think either is implausible (in the context of the Government and Binding model).

It appears then that, while anaphoric-like relationships may hold between clauses in Halkomelem, they may very well not constitute cases of move-NP. Any firm conclusions would be premature

given the complexity of the facts, but at this point it seems unlikely that Halkomelem is a transformational language, a fact which may well be consistent with its nonconfigurationality.³

¹I wish to thank Ms. Ruby Peter of Duncan, B.C., who was the primary language consultant. The data are from the Cowichan micro-dialect of Vancouver Island Halkomelem (həl'qəmi'nəm?).

²The hypothesis that arguments are clausal most certainly does not originate with me. While I am not sure who is the originator, I should give credit to a number of Salishanists, including Laurence Thompson and Dale Kinkade.

³It should perhaps be emphasized that the existence or nonexistence of transformations in a given language is not a major theoretical issue.

REFERENCES

- Bresnan, Joan (ed.). 1982. *The mental representation of grammatical relations*. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- 1973. *Conditions on transformations*. S. Anderson and P. Kiparsky (eds.). *A festschrift for Morris Halle*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- 1977. *On wh-movement*. P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian (eds.). *Formal syntax*. Academic Press.
- 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Foris.
- 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding*. MIT Press.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1976. *A transformational approach to English syntax*. Academic Press.
- Gerds, Donna. 1981. *Objective and absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, U.C. San Diego.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1978. *On the position of Walbiri in a typology of the base*. Unpublished memo, MIT.
- Hukari, Thomas. 1977. *A comparison of attributive clause constructions in two Coast Salish languages*. Glossa 11.
- 1981. *Cowichan relative clauses*. Working papers in linguistics. vol. 1, University of Victoria.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X Syntax: a study of phrase structure*. MIT Press.