Attributive Constructions in Saanich

Timothy R. Montler
University of North Texas

0. Introduction. A number of researchers in Salishan languages have discussed relative clause constructions. In the Coast branch of the family Hukari (1977) and Gerdts (1982) give detailed descriptions of Halkomelem constructions that translate into English as relative clauses. Hukari (1977) also discusses relative clauses in Lushootseed and compares them to similar structures in Halkomelem. But Hess and Hilbert (1980b) claim that there are no relative clauses in Lushootseed. Jelinek (1987) discusses "headless" relatives in the Lummi dialect of North Straits. In that analysis every word that is preceded by a determiner is a relative clause. In the Interior branch, Thompson and Thompson (to appear) state that "it seems impossible to identify a particular Thompson [River Salish] structure that would meaningfully be designated a relative clause." In the Bella Coola branch of Salishan Davis and Saunders (1987) explicitly argue that relative clauses do not exist in that language. All of these studies look at very similar, probably cognate structures. Some see relative clauses and some do not. My purpose in this paper is to give a descriptive sketch of the various structures the Saanich dialect of North Straits Salish has to express attribution and to look at structures similar to those designated relative clauses in other Salishan languages from a cross-linguistic and pan-Salishan point of view. I show that there are relative clauses in Saanich but that the evidence I give for Saanich is not to be found in some other Salishan languages.

1. Relative clauses cross-linguistically. Part of the problem in finding relative clauses in Salishan languages is finding a language-independent definition of the construction. For the purposes of this paper I take Keenan and Comrie's (1977) and Keenan's (1985) cross-linguistic characterization of relative clauses as definitive.[1] Thus this paper will not absolutely determine whether or not Saanich has relative clauses but determine only whether or not Saanich has a structure that fits Keenan and Comrie's characterization.

A (restrictive) relative clause minimally has a head and a restricting clause. The restricting clause is a subject-predicate structure having a form more or less like that of a main clause and functions to restrict the reference of the domain specified by the head. So for example, in *the man that I saw* the head *man* is a domain whose reference is restricted by the more or less sentence-like *I saw*.

Cross-linguistically a determiner and a relative connector are two elements other than a head and restricting clause that may be present. In the example given *the* is the determiner and *that* is the connector. Many languages do not have the determiner, and the connector may take the form of an invariant particle (*that* in the example), a relative pronoun (*who* in place of *that* in the example), or it may be entirely absent (*the man I saw*).

Languages differ with respect to the order of the determiner, head, and restricting clause. There are a very few languages where the head is internal to the restricting clause. Keenan (1985) does not distinguish between "internal headed" and "headless" relative clauses.

Languages with external heads must have some way of indicating the grammatical function of the head within the restricting clause. Languages may have case-marked relative pronouns to do this though they are not common outside of European languages, and some languages have "resumptive

[1]I realize that this characterization is problematic particularly in that it largely ignores the discourse function of structures that have been called relative clauses. Davis (ms.) in particular dissects Keenan's definition and concludes that there is "no coherent syntactic characterization of relative clauses" but that several semantic and pragmatic factors such as topic are basic to the notion of relative clauses.

pronouns", anaphors of the head, internal to the restricting clause. A cross-linguistically common way of indicating the function of the head in the restricting clause is by means of what has been called "gapping", "extraction", or "incomplete valence". In *the man that I saw*, for example, we know that the head is the direct object of the restricting clause because the valence of the transitive verb *saw* is incomplete; there is a gap in the direct object position of the restricting clause.

Apparently all languages have some way of producing clausal attribution.[2] But not all languages can be said to have relative clauses. A key diagnostic feature of a true relative clause is that it be a unique construction. That is, if we are to say that a language has a relative clause construction, that construction must be used exclusively for that function. Keenan (1985:166) notes that a number of Australian languages do not have true relative clauses[3] but have the functional equivalent in a general subordinate clause construction. It is this feature of relative clauses, their status as a unique structure in the language, that will be of particular interest in this paper. It is this feature that Hess and Hilbert (1980), Davis and Saunders (1987), and Thompson and Thompson (to appear) find lacking in the attributive constructions they have found in their languages.

2. Attribution in Saanich. There are at least four ways attribution can be expressed in Saanich: in simple predicates, complex predicates, genitive constructions, and clausal attributives. It is the latter that stands as the major candidate for the designation "relative clause", but before I describe these it will be useful to demonstrate basic Saanich clause structure by describing the other three constructions first.

2.1. Simple predicates. To assert a simple attribute the simple predicate construction is used:[4]

(1) čəq tsə swəy'qə?.
big DEM male
'The man is big.'

Saanich is always predicate initial, so this is a simple intransitive sentence identical in structure to 2.

(2) ye? tsə swəy'qə?.
go DEM male
'The man went.'

Any word (excluding some determiners, prepositions, and a few other particles) may be predicative and apparently any word may be preceded by a determiner to function as a coreferential adjunct to a predicate. Thus *swəy'qə?* in 3 is the verb.

(3) swəy'qə? tsə čəq.
male DEM big
'The big one is a man.'

[2]Jelinek (1987) notes that there are some languages (Seneca) that have no subordination at all and therefore cannot be said to have any kind of clausal attribution.

[3]Though Hale 1976 refers to these as "adjoined relative clauses."

[4]Many of the examples given here come from natural continuous text and native speaker conversation, but many, obviously, are artificially elicited. I have found all of the structures discussed here to occur in natural text, and I have double checked native speakers' judgements of unacceptability. I use elicited examples rather than examples from texts only as an aid to illustration and comparison.

Adjuncts coreferential with the pronominal arguments to a predicate are preceded by a demonstrative determiner here labeled DEM[5]. Third person has overt marking only in posessives, in the subject of certain subordinate clauses, and in the subject of main clause transitives. So *čəq*, *ye?*, and *swəy'qə?* in 1, 2, and 3, respectively, are zero marked for third person subjet.

First and second person subjects are indicated by second position clitics:

(4) čəq‿sən
big‿1SUBJ
'I'm big.'

(5) čəq‿sx^{w}
big‿2SUBJ
'You're big.'

(6) swəy'qə?‿sən
male‿1SUBJ
'I'm a man.'

2.2. Complex predicates. A second way attribution is expressed in Saanich is in complex predicate constructions. Complex predicates are composed of two or more words juxtaposed to form a construction that functions as a simple predicate:

(7) čəq swəy'qə?.
big male
'He's a big man.'

The first and second person subjects always follow the first of these; they are invariably second position clitics:

(8) čəq‿sən swəy'qə?.
big‿1SUBJ male
'I'm a big man.'

(9) čəq‿sx^{w} swəy'qə?.
big‿2SUBJ male
'You're a big man.'

Otherwise a complex predicate functions as a unit. An adjunct coreferential with the zero marked third person subject can be placed after the complex predicate just as in the simple predicate constructions 1-3:

(10) čəq swəy'qə? tsə si?ém'.
big male DEM boss
'The boss is a big man.'

And if preceded by a determiner, it can function as an adjunct coreferential with a third person argument:

[5]See Montler 1986 for a description of these determiners.

(11) si?ém' tsə čəq swəy'qə?.
boss DEM big male
'The big man is boss.'

This construction is identical to what Thompson 1979 has called the auxilliary constructions which occur in several Salishan languages. 12-14 are examples of non-attributive complex predicates in Saanich.

(12) ?ən?e hiw'əl.
come join in
'He came to join in. / He came and joined in.'

(13) ?ən?e‿sən hiw'əl.
come‿1SUBJ join in
'I came to join in. / I came and joined in.'

(14) ye?‿sən k^{w}əwyək^{w}.
go‿1SUBJ fishing
'I went/am going fishing.'

There is a small subclass of predicates denoting qualities that may not occur as the second of a pair in some complex predicates.[6]

(15) *swəy'qə? čəq.

(16) *si?ém' tsə swəy'qə? čəq.

There is no obvious semantic or pragmatic reason why 15 and 16 would not be acceptable with 15 having a reading like 'male big one' (cf. example 3). The word *swəy'qə?* may be occur first in this construction:

(17) swəy'qə? səməyəθ.
male deer
'It's a buck.'

(18) ye? tsə swəy'qə? səməyəθ.
go DEM male deer
'The buck went.'

(19) swəy'qə? sɬeni?.
male female
'She's a mannish woman.'

(20) sɬeni? swəy'qə?.
'He's a womanish man.'

[6]There are some words that *čəq* may follow in complex peredicates. These include the person predicates *?əsə* 'I am', *nək^{w}ə* 'you are', and *nił* 'he/she/it is'.

Jelinek 1988 details the syntax and semantics of another subclass of predicates in the Samish dialect of North Straits. Much more needs to be done in discovering and describing various subcategories of predicates in Salishan languages. For example, *?əy' tsə čəq* 'the big one is good' and *ye? tsə ?əy'* 'the good one went' are acceptable but not **čəq tsə ?əy'*.

(21) si?ém' tsə swəy'qə? sɬeni?.
boss DEM male female
'The mannish woman is the boss.'

In all of examples of complex predicates thus far (7-21) it is the attributing word that comes first. Some words (such as *čəq*) are inherently attributive and must come first, but others, when they are paired with a word that is equally likely to be attributive, have an attributive or non-attributive interpretation depending on whether or not they are in initial or non-initial position. There is yet another class of words, and these are always attributive in complex predicates whether or not they come first:

(22) ha?əqʷ tsə sqʷaqʷi? sməyəθ.
stink DEM dead deer
'The dead deer stinks.'

(23) ha?əqʷ tsə sməyəθ sqʷaqʷi?.
'The dead deer stinks.'

The predicate *sqʷaqʷi?* is attributive whether it precedes or follows *sməyəθ*. I have not been able to find any difference in meaning between 22 and 23. It is constructions such as that in 23 that are potentially relative clauses. I will return to these in section 2.4.

2.3. Genitive constructions. There are three types of genitive attributives. One of these types occurs only in adjuncts; a second has the form of a simple predicate with an oblique adjunct; and a third has the form of a complex predicate.

The possessive person markers are affixes on the possessed term which forms the head of the construction. First person singular and second person are prefixes; first plural and third person are suffixes. These are summarized in 24 and illustrated in 25.

(24)

	Sg.	Pl.
1	nə-	-ɬtə
2	?ən'-	
3	-s	

(25) nə-ten 'It's my mother'
ten-ɬtə 'It's our mother'
?ən'-ten 'It's your mother'
ten-s 'It's his/her/its mother'

2.3.1. In the first, most common type of genitive attributive the posessed term is the head of a special genitive construction within an adjunct:

(26) təɬsət tsə men-s tsə swiw'ləs.
dancing DEM father-3POS DEM young man
'The young man's father was dancing.'

The adjunct *tsə mens tsə swiw'ləs* must form a constituent in itself with *mens* as the head and *swiw'ləs* as its adjunct since this sentence is intransitive and reversing the order of these two adjuncts is unacceptable:

(27) *təɬsət tsə swiw'ləs tsə men-s.

The embedded head-adjunct construction looks like a simple predicate construction, but as an independent predicate it would have quite a different meaning (which is slightly bizarre since *swiw'ləs* is often translated 'boy' and actually means 'unmarried young man'):

(28) men-s tsə swiw'ləs.
father-3POS DEM young man
'The young man is his father.'

Without the possessive suffix, the two adjuncts in 26 could only be interpreted as independent, but two independent adjuncts occur only in transitive sentences. The main verb of 26 is intransitive, therefore 29, which differs from 26 only in lacking the possessive suffix, is unacceptabe:

(29) *təɬsət tsə men tsə swiw'ləs.

The adjunct in 26 has a structure that is used only in forming genitive attributives. Therefore the adjunct in 26 represents a unique genitive construction.

This genitive occurs only in intransitive sentences coreferential with the subject (example 26) and in transitive sentences with a first or second person subject where it is coreferential with the object (example 30):

(30) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən tsə men-s tsə swiw'ləs.
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM father-3POS DEM young man
'I saw the young man's father.'

If the main verb is transitive with a third peson subject, the two adjuncts are interpreted as separate with one coreferential with the subject and the other with the object:

(31) kʷən-ət-əs tsə men-s tsə ŋənə?
see-TRANS-3SUBJ DEM father-3POS DEM offspring
'The son looked at his father.'

(32) kʷən-ət-əs tsə ŋənə?-s tsə men
see-TRANS-3SUBJ DEM offspring-3POS DEM father
'The father looked at his son.'

When one of the adjuncts has a possessive affix and the other does not, the possessed form is always interpreted as object regardless of word order. 33 has the same meaning as 31:

(33) kʷən-ət-əs tsə ŋənə? tsə men-s.
see-TRANS-3SUBJ DEM offspring-3POS DEM father-3POS
'The son looked at his father.'

When both are possessive, the sentence is ambiguous:

(34) kʷən-ət-əs tsə ŋənə?-s tsə men-s.
see-TRANS-3SUBJ DEM offspring-3POS DEM father-3POS
'His son looked at his father. / His father looked at his son.'

2.3.2. The second type of genitive construction can usually replace the form described in 2.3.1, but it is not a structure used uniquely as a genitive attributive. This construction has the form of a simple predicate with an oblique adjunct. Example 26 has the same meaning as 35:

(35) təl̓səṯ tsə men ʔə ƛ̓ swiw̓ləs.
dancing DEM father OBL DEM young man
'The young man's father was dancing.'

The simple predicate sentence in 36 has the same semantics as the adjunct in 35:

(36) men ʔə ƛ̓ swiw̓ləs.
father OBL DEM young man
'It's the young man's father (It's the father of the young man).'

This construction may not be corefential with the object in a transitive sentence with a first or second person subject:

(37) *kʷənnəxʷ‿sən tsə men ʔə ƛ̓ swiw̓ləs.

The head of this construction may occur with or without the possessive affix with no apparent change in meaning. Example 38 is equivalent to 35:

(38) təl̓səṯ tsə men-s ʔə ƛ̓ swiw̓ləs.
dancing DEM father-1POS OBL DEM young man
'The young man's father was dancing.'

2.3.3. I digress a bit in discussing the third way of expressing genitive attribution. I include it for the sake of completeness and because it's interesting in its own right.

In this construction it is the possessor, not the possessed, that is morphologically marked. A special prefix, *txʷ-* 'belonging to'[7], is affixed to the possessor:

(39) txʷ-tipət swel̓ət.
belonging to-David reefnet
'It's David's reefnet.'

I have little data on this construction. It has been recorded only in main predicate constructions like this and never as an adjunct. I have found it only recently in natural texts of the oldest speakers; it has never been offered in direct elicitation. If the meaning of 39 were directly elicited, the response would be:

(40) swel̓ət ʔə ƛ̓ tipət.
reefnet OBL DEM David
'It's David's reefnet.'

This construction is one of a number of incorporating forms that I have found only in natural texts. One of the functions (perhaps the only function) of incorporation in Saanich is to provide contrasting focus, which can only be found in context. The incorporated form, 39, allows the possessor to be put

[7]This prefix is both distributionally and semantically distinct from two other prefixes having a similar form: *txʷə-* 'mutative' and *txʷ-* 'buy'.

into initial, focusing position. The periphrastic form, 40, is neutral or tending to focus on the possessed. The contrast between 39 and 40 can be brought out in English by putting heavy stress on *David's* in 39. This focusing function can best be seen in exchanges such as the following, which occurred between two native speakers:

(41) txʷsen swel̓ət? 'Whose reefnet was it?'
txʷ-helisχeleyəʔ tsə leʔə. 'The one there was Harry Sχeleyəʔ's.'
belong to-Harry S. DEM there

2.4. Clausal attributives. The construction that most looks like and most often translates as a relative clause in Saanich has a determiner followed by the head followed by the attributing clause; there is no relative pronoun or other connecting particle. The construction (shown bracketed in 42 and 43) fits all of Keenan's (1985) functional criteria:

(42) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən [tsə swəy̓qəʔ ƛ̓iƛ̓əw̓].
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male escaping
'I saw the man who was getting away.'

(43) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən [tsə swəy̓qəʔ q̓əp-əŋ ʔə tsə sčaɬ].
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male chop-MDL OBL DEM firewood
'I saw the man who was chopping firewood.'

Unlike the Australian languages mentioned by Keenan, this is not a general subordinating construction. These two sentences contrast with 44 and 45:

(44) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən tsə swəy̓qəʔ kʷə s-ƛ̓iƛ̓əw̓-s.
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male SUB s-escaping-3POS
'I saw the man (when he was) getting away.'

(45) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən tsə swəy̓qəʔ kʷə s-q̓əp-əŋ-s ʔə tsə sčaɬ.
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male SUB s-chop-MDL-3POS OBL DEM firewood
'I saw the man (while he was) chopping firewood.'

The particle *kʷə* introduces certain subordinate clauses. When the subject of the subordinate *kʷə* clause is indicated with the possessive affixes (some words also require the *s-* prefix), the interpretation is indicative. When the subject of the *kʷə* clause is indicated with one of the special subordinate clause subject suffixes, the interpretation is hypothetical as in 46:

(46) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən tsə swəy̓qəʔ kʷə ƛ̓iƛ̓əw̓-əs.
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male SUB escaping-3SUBJ
'I'll see the man if he's getting away.'

The problem with attributives like those in 42 and 43 is not that they are like other subordinate clauses but that they are identical to main clauses. There is no structural difference between 42-43 and 47-48:

(47) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən tsə swəy̓qəʔ. ƛ̓iƛ̓əw̓.
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male escaping
'I saw the man. He's getting away.'

(48) k^{w}ən-nəx^{w}_sən tsə swəy̓qə?. q̓əp-əŋ ?ə tsə sčaɬ.
see-TRANS_1SUBJ DEM male chop-MDL OBL DEM firewood
'I saw the man. He's chopping firewood.'

It is on this basis that Hess and Hilbert (1980:124) demonstrate with examples like these that there is no independent relative clause construction in Lushootseed. There is never any difference (other than intonational) between head-initial attributive constructions and juxtaposed independent sentences.

There is an important difference between Lushootseed and Saanich. In Lushootseed a third person subject is overtly marked only in subordinate clauses (with the *-s* possessive suffix) and in dependent clauses (with the *-əs* third person hypothetical). In main clauses third person subject as well as the object is always zero (Hess and Hilbert 1980:38). In Saanich, however, there is an overt marker of third person subject in transitive forms (as well as the subordinate *-s* possessive and *-əs* hypothetical illustrated in 44 and 46).[8] In 49 the third person transitive subject (ergative) is marked with the *-əs* suffix; the third person object is always zero.

(49) t̓əm̓-ət-əs.
hit-TRANS-3SUBJ
'He hit it.'

The attributive constructions in 42 and 43 are intransitve and have no overt marking. It is only transitive constructions that show the restricting clauses in Saanich to be truly dependent:

(50) ?əw̓χči-t_sən [k^{w}sə swəy̓qə? t̓əm̓-ət].
ASP know-TRANS_1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS
'I know the man who hit it.'

The attributing predicate in the bracketed construction in 50 cannot be interpreted as independent because its valence is incomplete. If it were an independent sentence with a third person subject it would have to have the ergative *-əs* suffix. *t̓əm̓-ət* can indeed stand on its own as a sentence but only with an imperative interpretation: 'hit it!'

The dependence of the attributing predicate is even more evident when the object of the restricting clause is first or second person. In order to show this it will be necessary to describe briefly Saanich object marking. 51 summarizes the object suffixes for the *-ət* transitivizer[9] and 52 illustrates them.

(51)

	Sg.	Pl.
1	-s	-aɬx^{w}
2	-sə	
3	ø	

(52a) k^{w}ən-ə-sə_sən 'I looked at you.'
see-TRANS-2OBJ_1SUBJ

[8]In main clauses predicates in Saanich the third person object and third person intransitive subject are zero marked. A single adjunct following an intransitive predicate is coreferential with the subject and following a transitive predicate is coreferential with the object. Saanich thus displays an ergative-absolutive pattern in the third person of main clauses. Elsewhere, in first and second person and in subordinate clauses, the pattern is nominative-accusative.

[9]There are several transitivizing suffixes in Saanich including *-ət ~ -t ~ -ə ~ ø* 'control transitive' and *-nax^{w} ~ -nax^{w} ~ -n* 'non-control transitive'. The form of the 'control transitive' object paradigm given in 50 is slightly different from the others. See Montler 1986 for details.

(52b) k^{w}ən-ə-s_sx^{w} 'You looked at me.'
see-TRANS-1OBJ_2SUBJ

(52c) k^{w}ən-ət-aɬx^{w}_sx^{w} 'You looked at us.'
see-trans-1PLOBJ_2SUBJ

(52d) k^{w}ən-ət_sx^{w} 'You looked at him.'
see-trans-_2SUBJ

A regular phonological process deletes the /t/ of the transitivizer before the /s/ of the first or second person object. Another general process reduces a pair of contiguous schwas to one. This latter process produces a potentially ambiguous surface form with a high functional load when the third person subject suffix is attached to a stem with a first person singular or second person object:

(53a) //k^{w}ən-ət-s-əs// → k^{w}ənəsəs
see-TRANS-1OBJ-3SUBJ

(53b) //k^{w}ən-ət-sə-əs// → k^{w}ənəsəs
see-TANS-2OBJ-3SUBJ

This ambiguity is invariably resolved in favor of the more highly salient first person. That is, *k^{w}ənəsəs* has only the reading 'he looked at me'.[10] In order to say 'he looked at you' one must resort to the passive:

(54) k^{w}ən-ət-əŋ_sx^{w}
see-TRANS-PASV_2SUBJ
'He looked at you (you were looked at).'

Returning to the attributive clauses, it was seen in 50 that when the head of the construction is coreferential with the (third person) subject, the restricting clause has incomplete valence. That is the third person subject marker is absent; there is a gap where we would expect the subject marker to be. In 55 the object of the restricting clause is first person, and in 56 it is second person. The third person subject is gapped, therefore no ambiguity can arise. There is no need here to switch to the passive when the subject is third and the object second person.

(55) ?əw̓ χči-t_sən [k^{w}sə swəy̓qə? t̓əm̓-ə-s].
ASP know-TRANS_1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS-1OBJ
'I know the man who hit me.'

(56) ?əw̓ χči-t_sən [k^{w}sə swəy̓qə? t̓ám̓-ə-sə].
ASP know-TRANS_1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS-2OBJ
'I know the man who hit you.'

(57) ?əw̓ χči-t_sən k^{w}sə swəy̓qə? k^{w}ə s-t̓əm̓-ə-sə-s
ASP know-TRANS_1SUBJ DEM male SUB s-hit-TRANS-2OBJ-3POS
'I know the man hit you.'

[10]I have recorded such a form once in context with a second person object reading but I have not been able to reelicit it. Note that *k^{w}ənətaɬx^{w}əs*, where there is no possibility of ambiguity, is perfectly acceptable.

(58) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ k^{w}ə s-t'əm'-ə-s-s
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male SUB s-hit-TRANS-1OBJ-3POS
'I know the man hit me.'

The restricting clause forms a constituent with a following oblique (59) or a non-oblique (60) adunct:

(59) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ t'ə́m'-ə-sə ʔə k^{w}sə sŋenət.
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS-2OBJ OBL DEM rock
'I know the man who hit you with a rock.'

(60) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ t'ə́m'-ət k^{w}sə pus.
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS DEM cat
'I know the man who hit the cat.'

Oblique adjunts may come before or after a non-oblique. 61 and 62 are equally acceptable:

(61) t'əm'-ət‿sən k^{w}sə pus ʔə k^{w}sə sŋenət.
hit-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM cat OBL DEM rock
'I hit the cat with a rock.'

(62) t'əm'-ət‿sən ʔə k^{w}sə sŋenət k^{w}sə pus.
'I hit the cat with a rock.'

But 63, based on 59 with the oblique object of the restricting clause moved out, is unacceptable:

(63) *ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən ʔə k^{w}sə sŋenət k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ t'ə́m'-ə-sə.

The construction illustrated in 42, 43, 50, 55, and 56 is uniquely used for clausal attribution. It contrasts with other subordinate clause constructions like 44, 45, 57, and 58. It has the word order determiner-head-restricting clause which is head initial as are main clauses and forms a constituent with oblique and non-oblique adjuncts as do main clauses. The syntactic function of the head in the restricting clause is indicated by a gap. These are clearly relative clauses.

Given that there are relative clauses in Saanich, the question arises as to what syntactic functions in the restricting clause can be relativized. I have thus far given only examples where the head is coreferential with the subject of the restricting clause. This is only because it is the absence of the third person subject that demonstrates the dependence of the restricting clause. Object headed relative clauses like subject headed intransitive relative clauses do not reveal a gap because both objects and intransitive subjects are zero. Object headed relative clauses do show dependence in the use of special subordinate subject suffixes, which are summarized in 64.

(64)

	Sg.	Pl.
1	-ən	-ɬtə
2	-əx^{w}	
3	-əs	

Examples 65 and 66 are parallel to 55 and 56 but in these the head is the direct object of the restricting clause. 67 shows the third person transitive subject.

(65) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən [k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ t'əm'-ət-ən].
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS-1SUBJ
'I know the man who I hit.'

(66) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən [k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ t'ə́m'-ət-əx^{w}].
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS-2SUBJ
'I know the man who you hit.'

(67) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən [k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ t'ə́m'-ət-əs].
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male hit-TRANS-3SUBJ
'I know the man who he hit.'

I have not yet determined what other grammatical relations may be relativized. But all examples given here were easily elicited, and I have not been able to elicit, nor have I found in texts, any comparable examples of relativized genitives or obliques. The only functionally equivalent structures I have found use other general subordinating patterns.

Two variations on this construction must be mentioned though they perhaps cloud the picture. First, a determiner may optionally, and apparently freely intervene between the head and the restricting clause. Thus example 68 has the same meaning as 67:

(68) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən k^{w}sə swəy̓qəʔ k^{w}sə t'ə́m'-ət-əs.
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM male DEM hit-TRANS-2SUBJ
'I know the man who he hit.'

The second variation is that a transitive restricting clause without adjuncts may precede the head. Example 69, thus, has the same meaning as 56, but 70, with an oblique adjunct followng the resticting clause is unacceptable. Example 71 is the same as 42 but the order of the intransitive restricting clause and the head is reversed:

(69) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən k^{w}sə t'ə́m'-ə-sə (k^{w}sə) swəy̓qəʔ.
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM hit-TRANS-2OBJ DEM male
'I know the man who hit you.'

(70) *ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən k^{w}sə t'ə́m'-ə-sə ʔə k^{w}sə sŋenət swəy̓qəʔ.
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM hit-TRANS-2OBJ OBL DEM rock male

(71) *k^{w}ən-nəx^{w}‿sən k^{w}sə k'iḵ'əw̓ (k^{w}sə) swəy̓qəʔ.
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM escaping DEM male

This variation looks like the complex predicate attributive construction, but in all non-attributive instances of complex predicates it is the second of the pair that takes the transitive and object inflection.

2.5. Headless relatives. Headless relative clauses have been reported for the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem by Hukari (1980) and for the Lummi dialect of North Straits by Jelinek (1987). In Hukari's analysis the headless relative clauses occur as predicative adjuncts similar to the adjuncts in the Saanich examples 72 and 73:

(72) k^{w}ən-nəx^{w}‿sən [k^{w}sə k'iḵ'əw̓].
see-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM escaping
'I saw the one who was getting away.'

(73) ʔəw̓ χči-t‿sən [k^{w}sə t'ə́m'-ə-sə].
ASP know-TRANS‿1SUBJ DEM hit-TRANS-2OBJ
'I know the one who hit you.'

In English relative clauses usually have an overt head, and thus English uses the semantically empty pronoun 'one' in such constructions. Headless translations of 72 and 73 are also possible (though not semantically identical to the headed English translations): *I saw who was getting away* and *I know who hit you*. Gerdts' (1982:61) dispute of Hukari's claim is primarily terminological. Gerdts (and others including Keenan (1985)) identifies 'headless' relative clauses with 'internal head' relative clauses. It is useful to distinguish two types of 'headless' relatives: those with an overt head internal to the restricting clause and those with no overt head at all. Mallinson and Blake (1981) refer to these as 'internal head relatives' and 'free relatives', respectively. The headless relative clauses in Cowichan, Lummi, and Saanich are free relatives. Internal head relatives are apparently not possible (71 would be an example).

Jelinek (1987), noting that all nonparticles are predicative in Lummi, makes the connection between forms such as the Saanich 74 and 75.

(74) swəy̓qəʔ 'It's a man.'

(75) kʷən-nəxʷ‿sən kʷsə swəy̓qəʔ. 'I know the man.'

There is no reason to analyze *swəy̓qəʔ* in 75 any differently than *x̓iẋ̓əw̓* in 72. Therefore 75 contains a free relative: *I know the one who is a man*. The head, according to Jelinek, is incorporated in the determiner. I can confirm this analysis for Saanich with the following example from a monolingual Saanich speaker born in the 1880's and tape recorded by a speaker of Saanich (a native Cowichan speaker) in 1971.

(76) ʔəw̓ naʔtˤəʔ č̓ə [θə qʷaqʷəʔ-t-əs kʷsə nə-men
ASP be only one person EVID DEM including-TRANS-3SUBJ DEM 1POS-father

ləʔ ʔiʔ tsə s-qʷaləʔ-s].
PAST CONJ DEM S-include (pl.)-3POS
'My father and his companions included only one woman.'[11]

This is an intransitive sentence with the bracketed free relative functioning as subject. A more literal translation might be 'the woman who my father and his companions included was the only one.' Note that the word *sləniʔ* 'woman' appears nowhere in the Saanich sentence. This direct object head is entirely missing. The only indication of its existence is in the contrastive feminine form of the initial demonstrative *θə*. Here the head is clearly incorporated in the determiner.

3. Conclusion: Saanich compared with other Salishan languages. Among Salishan attributive constructions described thus far, Saanich is most similar to the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem as described by Hukari (1977). The Cowichan structure is virtually identical, but for lexical differences, to Saanich. It has a third person transitive subject marker that is gapped in transitive, subject-headed relative clauses, and it has a set of special subordinate subject suffixes which are used in object-headed relative clauses. Hukari does not give examples of other attributing constructions or of other subordinating constructions as evidence of the uniqueness of the Cowichan attributive clauses. Saanich may differ from Cowichan in allowing a determiner to occur between the head and the restricting clause and in allowing a transitive restricting clause to precede the head.

[11]This is the translation given by a native speaker of Saanich. The context of this sentence makes it clear that what it means is 'the newdancer initiation ritual was so rigorous in my father's generation that only one woman was strong enough to be admitted.'

Lushootseed differs from Saanich in two important ways. One way, discussed above, is that Lushootseed lacks a third person transitive subject marker; non-possessive and non-hypothetical third person subjects and objects are all zero. Therefore there can be no evidence from gapping for the dependence of the attributing clause in Lushootseed.

The other difference between Lushootseed and Saanich is that the cognate set of special subordinate subject suffixes (64) are used exclusively in hypotheticals (subjunctives) in Lushootseed (Hess and Hilbert 1980:38). In Saanich these are hypothetical only when preceded by the subordinator *kʷəʔ*[12] (see example 46). Lushootseed has no structures like 65-67 that would show the dependence of the attributive clause when the head is the direct object. In functionally equivalent constructions the attributing clause has a full main clause subject (Hukari 1977:52). With no evidence to the contrary we must conclude, as Hess and Hilbert (1980) claim, Lushootseed has no relative clause construction *per se*.

The situation is similar in Thompson River Salish; it has no unique relative clause construction. Thompson and Thompson (to appear) list several structures that can be functionally equivalent to relative clauses, but these "subordinating devices are also used for various other purposes." And Davis and Saunders (1987) also demonstrate, based on the non-uniqueness of attributing constructions, that Bella Coola has no relative clause.

The diversity of the three Salishan languages lacking relative clauses (Lushootseed is Central Coast, Thompson is Northern Interior, and Bella Coola forms a branch on its own) suggests that the relative clauses in Cowichan and Saanich are a recent development. These two languages have been in intimate contact for many generations. In fact today there are more Cowichan speakers on the Saanich reserves than there are Saanich speakers. Intermarriage is common, and all Saanich speakers can at least understand some Cowichan. There is a great deal of phonological and lexical diffusion between the two especially from Cowichan to Saanich. It is reasonable to conclude that the development of relative clauses in both Saanich and Cowichan is due to diffusion. It would be interesting to find out whether relative clauses exist in Klallam. Klallam is very closely related to Saanich, forming with it and the other dialects of North Straits the Straits subgroup of Central Coast Salish. Although it is genetically close to Saanich, Klallam has had very little contact with Cowichan; there is no known lexical or phonological diffusion between the two. If Klallam also has relative clauses, we can conclude that the direction of diffusion is from Saanich to Cowichan.

References

Davis, Philip W. Ms. The nature of relative clauses. Houston: Rice University.

Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders. 1987. Bella Coola relative clauses. American Anthropological Association meeting. Chicago.

Gerdts, Donna. 1982. Object and absolutive in Halkomelem. UCSD PhD dissertation.

Hess, Thom and Vi Hilbert, Taqʷšəblu. 1980. Lushootseed 2. Seattle: Daybreak Star Press.

Hukari, Thomas E. 1977. A comparison of attributive clause constructions in two Coast Salish languages. Glossa 11:1.48-73.

Hukari, Thomas E. 1980. Subjects and objects in Cowichan. In Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Salish Languages pp. 286-314.

[12]This subordinator is apparently reconstructable to Proto-Salish **wə* 'subjunctive' as the introducer of a hypothetical clause (Thompson 1979:744).

Jelinek, Eloise. 1987. 'Headless' relatives and pronominal arguments: a typological perspective. In P. D. Kroeber and R. E. Moore, eds. Native American Languages and Grammatical Typology. IULC.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1988. Quantification without nouns in Salish. Presented at the December LSA meeting in New Orleans.

Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Relative clauses. In T. Shopen, ed. Language typology and syntactic description, volume II pp. 141-170. Cambridge University Press.

Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. 1977. NP accessibility and universal grammar. Linguistic Inquiry 8:63-100.

Mallinson, Graham and Barry J. Blake. 1981. Language typology: cross linguistic studies in syntax. North Holland Publishing Company.

Montler, Timothy R. 1986. An outline of the morphology and phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 4.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. Salishan and the northwest. In L. Campbell and M. Mithun, eds. The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment pp. 693-765. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. To appear. The Thompson Language. University of Montana Occasionional Papers in Linguistics.

Pronominal Arguments and the Syntax of Lushootseed Transitives*

Robert Hagiwara
University of California, Los Angeles

1. Introduction

Languages of the New World present an important testing ground for generative theories of syntax--in particular the theory of government and binding (recently recast in Chomsky (1986) as the "barriers" framework and which I will refer to as the theory of "parameterized universal grammar"), which was created mostly under the influence of the study of western European languages. My work on Lushootseed has been driven not only by my interest in the language and culture native to the Pacific Northwest, but by my belief that the study of American languages has much to contribute to the generative theory of language, just as this theory has much to contribute to our understanding of the languages of the New World.

In this paper, I want to describe the morphology and syntax of the Lushootseed transitive sentence (S), invoking Jelinek's (1985) Pronominal Argument Parameter to account for the complementarity between the morphological person marking paradigms (subject clitics and object suffixes) and full noun phrases (NP) representing verbal arguments. In addition, I will analyze the -d and -eb suffixes (suffixes with a somewhat controversial analytical history) as pronominal in the sense of the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH), and suggest that many of the properties of the Lushootseed transitive S follow from interactions of the PAH and the case assigning properties I assume for the Lushootseed S.

2. The Lushootseed person marking morphology

Lushootseed is an argument-dropping (pro-drop) language; that is, arguments of a predicate may be named by an independent noun phrase (NP, or nominal) or it may be omitted, the referent being inferred from context.

(1) ?es-?itut ti?iɬ sqʷebayʔ ?es-?itut
STV-sleep DEM dog STV-sleep
"that dog is sleeping" "he/she/it/they is/are sleeping"

If an argument of a verb is first or second person, it is realized as a second position (2P) clitic (in the case of subject) or a verbal suffix (in the case of object). Consider the following sets of clauses.[3]

(2) tes 'hit (with fist)'

?u-tes(e)t-s čexʷ ?u-tes(e)t-sid čed
PNT-hit(TR)-1sO =2sS PNT-hit(TR)-2sO =1sS
"you(sg) hit me" "I hit you(sg)"

?u-tes(e)t-ubuɬ čelep ?u-tes(e)t-ubuɬed čeɬ
PNT-hit(TR)-1pO =2pS PNT-hit(TR)-2pO =1pS
"you(pl) hit us" "we hit you(pl)"