Configurationality in the Tsimshianic, Wakashan and Na-Dene Languages[1]

Opening Comment:
We've seen that:
(i)   while the languages of the Salishan family display the 'surface level' properties that you'd expect from a P(ronominal) A(rgument) language or a N(on)-C(onfigurational) language…
(ii)   ***Subjects and Objects in Salish languages display a number of syntactic asymmetries, ones that ultimately point instead to a Configurational structure***

The Plan for Today:

Provide a 'whirl-wind tour' of the evidence for configurationality in other language families of the area: Tsimshianic, Wakashan and Na-Dene (Haida).

Most of this is simply evidence that Subjects and Objects have different syntactic properties in the languages…
    … (and so, in some cases, we'll see that it's not truly 'direct' evidence for configurationality…)

---

1.   (Non-)Configurationality of the Tsimshianic Languages

1.1   The *Prima-Facie* Case for a PA or NC Status

Opening Caveat:
This discussion will focus on the languages Nisga'a and Gitksan (mainly Gitksan).   These languages are *very closely related*, and are often considered by linguists to be be sub-dialects of a single language 'Nass-Gitksan'.
…as far as I know, no one has explored the configurationality of Sm'algyax or Sgüüxs.

Tsimshianic languages have an agreement system that might lead one to adopt a PA-analysis.

(1)   **Subject Agreement in Nisga'a**

        Subject agreement is obligatory in Nisga'a (though a morpho-phonological rule sometimes obscures its appearance).

        hlimo-e-**t**-gat-s-t   Kathy-t   John
        help-ERG/TRAN-**3S**-EVID-ERG-DET   Kath-DET   John
        Apparently, Kathy helped John.   (Hunt 1991; p. 206)

---

[1] Because of a lack of phonetic characters on my computer, my transcription of language data throughout this handout will only be an approximation of that provided by the original authors. Please always refer to the original article for the actual data.

(2)   **Object Agreement in Nisga'a**

While object agreement doesn't always appear, there are some contexts where it is obligatory (namely, in verbs of 'dependent form').

needi-t   ga'-**y'**
NEG-3S   see-**1sO**
She didn't see me.   (Hunt 1991; p. 204)

Summary:
In as much as they are 'head marking' languages, Tsimshianic languages might be analyzed as PA-languages (especially if you don't like null pronouns…)
… and in fact on precisely these grounds, Tarpent (1988) promotes a PA-analysis of Niga'a…

1.2   The Evidence for a Configurational Structure

But, of course, merely being a head-marking language (with null anaphora) isn't any very strong reason to adopt a PA-analysis…
*…**and in fact, there are some good reasons for adopting a Configurational Structure…***

1.2.1   Rigid Word Order

Like other languages of their sub-area, Tsimshianic languages have rather rigid VSO order, which is against one of the most basic predictions of the PA-analysis.

(3)   **Rigid Word Order in Gitksan**

    a.   kup-e-t-s-t   Mary-lh   hon
        eat-ERG/TRANS-3S-CASE-DET   Mary-DET   fish
        Mary ate the fish.

    b.   * kup-e-t-lh   hon-s-t   Mary
          eat-ERG/TRANS-2S-DET   fish-CASE-DET   Mary
                                                  (Hunt 1991; p. 208)

1.2.2   Non-Obligatory Marking of Absolutive

Despite the existence of AgrO in sentences like (2), in most cases the absolutive argument in a Tsimshianic language is *not* 'registered' on the verbal predicate

(4)   **No Absolutive Agreement (in 'Independent' Clauses)**

w'itxw-**(*t)**-gat-t   John   ky'ots
come-(*3S)-EVID-DET   John   yesterday
Apparently, John came yesterday.   (Hunt 1991; p. 213)

1.2.3 Argument/Adjunct Asymmetries (CED Effects)

Recall from last class that (J&D94's version of) the PAH predicts that a PAH language will not distinguish between extraction from a CP construed as a propositional argument (e.g. of 'say') and a CP construed as an adjunct (since both are ultimately adjuncts).

(5)   **Argument/Adjunct Asymmetries (CED Effects) in Gitksan**

    a.   n'it t=John=lh   hasaq-y' [tim an=t   kup-t=lh   hon]
        3s   CN=John=CN want-1s FUT AUX-3 eat-3=CONN   fish
        It's John that I want to eat the fish.

    b.   * t=Mary=lh   taaw'l t=John   qu7=l   Hazelton [lhis m'in-ku-T-et]
         CN=Mary=CN leave CN=John LOC=CN Hazelton after up-take-T-3s
        **It was Mary that John went to Hazleton after he picked up.*
                                              (Hunt 1991; p. 209)

1.2.4 The 'T-Deletion Rule' Distinguishes Between Adjacent Subjects and Objects

Gitksan and Nisga'a both require that 3rd subject agreement be deleted when the subject immediately follows the verb.

(6)   **Deletion of 3rd Subject Agreement When Subject Follows Verb**

    a.   hlimoo-e-*(**t**)-t   Peter
        help-TRANS/ERG-**3sS**-DET   Peter
        He helped Peter

    b.   hlimoo-e-(*****t**)-s-t   John-t   Peter
        help-TRANS/ERG-(**3sS**)-ERG-DET   John-DET   Peter
        John helped Peter.   (Hunt 1991; p. 205)

Due to the nature of the morphemes involved, we can state this rule as follows.

(7)   **The 'T-Deletion' Rule**

    /t/ → ∅ / ___ { s, lh }

> <u>Crucial:</u>   The T-Deletion Rule above doesn't apply when the *object* directly follows the V, even though the environment is created.
>
> (8)   **T-Deletion Rule is Not Triggered by Objects**
>
>   m'ats-e-*(**t**)-lh   han'iiquyp'a<u>x</u>   a-lh   lu'p.
>   hit-TRANS/ERG-**3sS**-DET window   P-DET rock
>   *She hit the window with a rock.*   (Hunt 1991; p. 212)

Under either a PA or an NC analysis, Subjects and Objects have an identical structural status in the language. *But, under a configurational analysis, there is an important difference between structures where the S follows the V and ones where the O follows the V…*
   …the O is more embedded!

(9)   **Structural Difference between VS and VO under a Configurational Analysis**

   a.   <u>VS Order</u>
         [V_1 [Subject   [$_{VP}$ t_1 Object   ]

   b.   <u>VO Order</u>
         [V_1 [*pro*   [$_{VP}$ t_1 Object   ]

<u>Hunt's Argument:</u>
A configurational analysis can, by appeal to the structural difference in (9), correctly limit the application of the rule in (7). *A PA or NC analysis, by contrast, has no obvious way of limiting (7) in the appropriate way…*

1.2.5 Classic Principle C Effects

As we noted in the last class, a PA-analysis predicts that the language should appear to allow configurations that violate Principle C.

However, Nisga'a (Gitksan?) does not permit such configurations!

(10)   **Classic Principle C Effects in Nisga'a**

         hlimoo-e-t$_{2/*1}$ no<u>x</u>-s   John$_1$
         help-TRANS/ERG-3S   mother-DET   John
         He$_{2/*1}$ helped John$_1$'s mother.   (Belvin 1990; p. 13)

Sentences like the following show that the impossibility of (10) isn't due just to 'precedence'.[2]

(11)   **Possibility of Cataphora in Nisga'a**

         [lep-no<u>x</u>-t$_1$]$_2$ an-t$_2$ hlimoo-t$_2$-s   John$_1$
         SELF-mother-3S   AUX-3S   help-3-DET   John
         It was [his$_1$ own mother] that helped John$_1$.   (Belvin 1990; p. 14)

---

[2] On the other hand, it should be noted that Hunt 1993 reports that sentences akin to (11) are impossible in Gitksan, which is why she also argues that facts such as those in (10), which also hold for Gitksan, cannot serve there as arguments for configurationality.

1.2.6 VP Ellipsis (VP Pronominalization)

As we noted in last class, either a PA or a NC analysis predicts that there should be no rules of ellipsis (pronominalization) targeting the V and the O to the exclusion of the S.

However, Gitskan seems to have just such a rule.

(12) **VP Ellipsis (VP Pronominalization) in Gitskan**

q'ay k'a   pa$\underline{x}$-en-s   t=John-lh   khaa-txw-y'
PRT PRT drives-TRANS/ERG-ERG   DET-John-DET   car-POSS-1s

a=lh   tii   **wil-s**   t=Bill
P-DET PRT   **do-ERG**   DET-Bill
John drives my car more than Bill does (drives my car).   (Hunt 1993; p. 96)

Rebuttal:
Why can't the structure in (12) simply be analyzed as *V*-ellipsis (with *pro*-drop)?
(Recall that, without the 'sloppy identity' readings, this was a *prima facie* analysis of VP-ellipsis/pronominalization in St'át'imcets…)

Answer:
(Unlike St'át'imcets,) Gitksan does not have free *pro*-drop of objects. Note that the verbal form *pa$\underline{x}$ens* doesn't contain any Object Agreement…
      … so, even if we suppose the elided (pronominalized) VP doesn't contain the full DP *khaatwsy'* 'my car', we still have to suppose that it contains an Object pronoun…)

1.2.7 Weak Cross Over (WCO) Effects

As we noted in last class, either a PA or an NC analysis predicts that WCO Effects of the kind seen in English should not be found.

However, Gitskan seems to exhibit the English-style pattern of WCO Effects!

(13) **WCO Effects in Gitskan**

a.   naa$_1$ an-t   titalq=s   lip-no$\underline{x}$-t$_1$
         who AUX-3   speak.to-DET   SELF-mother-3POSS
         Who$_1$ spoke to their$_1$ own mother?

b.   * naa$_1$=lh   titalq-e=s   lip-no$\underline{x}$-t$_1$
          who-CN   speak.to-TRANS-DET   SELF-mother-3POSS
         Who$_1$ did their$_1$ own mother speak to?   (Hunt 1993; p. 103)

1.2.8 Anaphor Binding

Unlike almost every other North American language, Tsimshianic languages have full, pronominal reflexives. *And, as in English, subjects can bind reflexive objects, but not vice versa.*

(14) **Binding of Reflexives in Gitksan**

     a.   q'uts-e-s   t=Mary$_1$ lipn'it$_1$
             cut-TRANS/ERG-CASE   CN=Mary   herself
             Mary$_1$ cut herself$_1$.

     b.   * q'uts-e-(lh)   lipn'it$_1$ t=Mary$_1$
               cut-TRANS/ERG-CASE   herself   CN=Mary
             *Herself$_1$ cut Mary$_1$.   (Hunt 1993; p. 109)

Summary

Despite their being (somewhat) head-marking and having 'pro-drop', the Tsimshianic languages are most likely configurational.

- They lack many of the surface features you'd expect a PA or NC language to have: (free word-order, radical head-marking…)

- They possess a variety of features that are indicative of a configurational structure, where DPs occupy argument positions and S's asymmetrically c-command Os (Argument/Adjunct asymmetries, Classic Principle C Effects, WCO Effects, VP-ellipsis)

2. (Non-)Configurationality of the Wakashan Languages

2.1 The Structure of Nuu-chah-nulth (NCN)

2.1.1 The *Prima-Facie* Case for a PA or NC Status

There is quite little *prima facie* reason to suspect a PA analysis might be correct for the Southern Wakashan language NCN. Although the language does exhibit subject agreement and subject *pro*-drop (15), **it never exhibits either object agreement or object *pro*-drop (16).**

(15) **Subject Agreement and Subject *Pro*-Drop in NCN**

     a.   n'aatsiicitlit-**7is**   Kyle   k'inlhumc
             see-**3S**   Kyle   sea.anemone
             Kyle saw a sea anemone.

     b.   n'aatsiicitlit-**7is**   k'inlhumc
             He saw a sea anemone   (Davis *et al.* 2007; p. 190)

(16) **No Object Agreement or Object *Pro*-Drop in NCN**

    a.   maakukwit-h   c'upc'upsumlh?
           buy-3S.Q   sweater
           Did he buy a sweater?

    b.   * maakukwit-h
            buy-3S.O   (Davis *et al.* 2007; p. 191)

2.1.2   The Evidence for a Configurational Structure

> *But, besides the initial implausibility of a PA-analysis, are there any phenomena in the language that indicate subjects to occupy A-positions superior to objects (which would also provide evidence against an NC-analysis)?*

2.1.2.1 Incorporation in NCN Applies only to Objects

Only objects in NCN can undergo incorporation into the verb.

(17) **Incorporation in NCN Applies only to Objects**

    a.   **haa7um**-itlas7is   n'uw'iiq.
           food-take   father
           Father went to get food.

    b.   * **n'uw'iiq**-itlas7is   ha7um.
            father-take   food   (Davis *et al.* 2007; p. 192)

<u>Immediate Rejoinder:</u> *Why not adopt a lexical analysis of incorporation in NCN?*

<u>Davis *et al.* (2007):</u>   Because incorporation in NCN does not form a semantic constituent. Structures like (18) suggest that incorporation in NCN takes place in the syntax, after the direct object constituent has been created.

(18) **Incorporation in NCN Doesn't Create a Semantic Constituent**

    c'uc'us-c'iqa7is   Louis   suwis
    new-lose   Louis   shoes
    Louis lost a brand new pair of shoes.   (Davis *et al.* 2007; p. 192)

         *(but, is it really all that obvious that incorporation in (18) **doesn't** form a semantic*
                                                         constituent?...)

2.1.2.2 Possessor Raising in NCN Applies only to Subjects

Only subjects in NCN can undergo 'possessor raising'.

(19)   **Possessor Raising in NCN Restricted to Subjects**

hinkwa7iihuk-**sis**   piispis maamaati
chase-**1sS**   cat   bird
My cat was after a bird.
* A cat was after my bird.   (Davis *et al.* 2007 p. 193)

Rebuttal:
It seems rather unclear how a configurational analysis can handle the facts in (19). *After all, isn't this kinda the opposite of what we would expect* (*cf.* the incorporation data in (17))?
(But, also see Ravinsky (2007) who offers an account of these facts.)

2.1.2.3 WCO Effects in NCN

As we noted earlier, either a PA or an NC analysis predicts that WCO Effects of the kind seen in English should not be found.

However, NCN seems to exhibit the English-style pattern of WCO Effects!

(20)   **WCO Effects in NCN**

a. $7aca_1$-qith   k'wik'wixasitl $7um7iiqsak$-$7i_1$?
     who-AUX   kiss.on.cheek   mother-3POSS
     Who_1 kissed their mother on the cheek?

b.   * $7aca_1$-qith $7um7iiqsak$-$7i_1$ k'wik'wixasitl ?
     who-AUX   mother-3POSS   kiss.on.cheek
     * Who_1 did their_1 mother kiss on the cheek?   (Davis *et al.* 2007; p. 193)

Summary

The Southern Wakashan language Nuu-chah-nulth is not even a *prima facie* plausible PA language (though it might be thought to be NC). There is, moreover, some indication that S occupies an A-position that is structurally higher than O.

- Assuming this has factored into some interesting accounts of incorporation patterns like (17) (e.g. Wojdak 2003) and possessor raising patterns like (19) (Ravinsky 2007).

- A syntactic account of the pattern of WCO Effects in (20) would require this view too.

2.2　The Structure of Kwakwala

2.2.1　The *Prima-Facie* Case for a PA or NC Status

The Northern Wakashan language Kwakwala is also not an obvious candidate for a PA analysis. As in the near-by Tsimshianic languages, most main clauses in Kwakwala don't show any agreement for any arguments at all.

(21)　**No Subject Agreement in Simple Main Clauses**

> **kwix7id**-ida　begwanema-x-a　　q'asa-s-is　　　　t'elwagwayu
> **clubbed**-the　man-ACC-the　　　otter-INST-his　　club
> *The man clubbed the sea-otter with his club*.　　　　(Anderson 1984; p. 24)

However, subject agreement does appear if either:
(i)　　the subject is local person
(ii)　　the subject is not directly adjacent to the predicate (*i.e.*, an AUX is present) (22a)
(iii)　the subject has been *pro*-dropped (22b)

(22)　**Limited Appearance of Subject Agreement**

　　a.　Subject is not Directly Adjacent to Main Predicate

> la-**i**　　　　ax7ed-ida　　ts'edaqa-x-a　　lhu7elqw7i
> AUX-**3S**　　takes-the　　woman-ACC-DET　dishes
> *Then the woman takes the dishes*.　　　　(Anderson 1984; p. 27)

　　b.　Subject is *Pro-Dropped*

> kwix7id-**i**-x-a　　　　　q'asa-s-is　　　　t'elwagwayu
> clubbed-**3S**-ACC-DET　　otter-INST-his　　club
> *He clubbed the sea-otter with his club*.　　　　(Anderson 1984; p. 27)

(...so, Kwakwala might best receive an analysis akin to that given above for Gitksan/Nisga'a, where subject agreement is always present in the clause, but simply gets morpho-phonologically deleted when an overt subject immediately follows the V...)

2.2.2　The Evidence for a Configurational Structure

But, besides the initial implausibility of a PA-analysis, are there any phenomena in the language that indicate subjects to occupy A-positions superior to objects (which would also provide evidence against an NC-analysis)?

2.2.2.1 Reflexive Possessive Pronouns

According to Anderson (1984), reflexive possessive pronouns in Kwakwala can only be bound by subjects.

(23)   **Contrast Between Reflexive and 'Disjoint' Possessive Pronouns in Kwakwala**

      a.   7a<u>x</u>-ida   begwanema$_1$-<u>x</u>-**is**$_1$ yanema
             take-DET   man-ACC-**REFL.POSS**   game
             The man$_1$ took his$_1$ game.

      b.   7a<u>x</u>-ida   begwanema$_1$-<u>x</u>   yanema-**s**$_{2/*1}$
             take-DET   man-ACC   game-**POSS**
             The man$_1$ took his$_{2/*1}$ game.   (Anderson 1984; p. 30)

Sidenote 1:   The data provided by Anderson (1984) don't definitively show that it's *subjects* (rather than, say, clause-mates) that have to bind the reflexive possessors (but we can take him at his word).

Sidenote 2:   What really makes this an argument for configurationality is the implicit generalization that – in contrast to (23a) – one of these 'reflexive possessors' inside of a subject could not be bound by an object.

2.2.2.2 Possessors in Nominalized ('Qa') Clauses

As in many languages, both throughout the world and in the PNW, subordination in Kwakwala is accomplished through nominalization.

Uniformly, it is the 'semantic subject' of the clause that gets mapped to the 'syntactic possessor' of the nominalization.

(24)   **Subordinate Subjects are Possessors of Nominalized Clauses**

      la7eml'a-i n'ik [qa q'aq'al'al-**i7-s**-a   mukwi hay'alha-<u>x</u>-a   tlawayu]
      AUX-3s   say C watch-**NOM-3POSS**-DET four   youths-ACC-DET weir
      Then he said that four young men should watch the (salmon) weir.
                                           (Anderson 1984; p. 31)

In as much as we adopt a syntactic theory of nominalization (for Kwakwala), the differential behavior of 'subjects' suggests that they hold a distinct position in the clause from objects.

2.2.2.3 Extraction of Subjects vs. Objects

As in many languages throughout the world, only *subjects* in Kwakwala can undergo A-bar movement (*cf.* (25a,b)). Extraction of the thematic argument of a transitive verb requires passivization (*cf.* (26a,b)).

(25)   **A-bar Movement of Subject Requires No Special Morphology**

      a.   <u>Relativization</u>

          yum'-u<u>x</u>wda   [begwanem [yelkwamasa-<u>x</u>-a w'ats'i]]
          that-DET   man   hurt-ACC-DET dog
          That's the man that hurt the dog.   (Anderson 1984; p. 33)

      b.   <u>Wh-Question Formation (Based on Relativization)</u>

          7enqw-ida   [hantl'ida-<u>x</u>-u<u>x</u>wda   gala<u>x</u>] ?
          who.is-DET   shoot-ACC-DET   grizzly.bear
          Who shot that grizzly bear?   (Anderson 1984; p. 37)

(26)   **A-bar Movement of 'Object' Requires Passive Morphology**

      a.   <u>Relativization</u>

          yum'-u<u>x</u>wda   [w'ats'i [yelkwamat-**su7**-s-a   bewanama-s-a gwatlu<u>x</u>w
          that-DET   dog   hurt-**PASS**-INST-DET man-INST-DET stick
          That's the dog that the man hurt with a stick.   (Anderson 1984; p. 34)

      b.   <u>Wh-Question Formation (Based on Relativization)</u>

          m'as-i   [lex7id-**su7**-s   John-s-u<u>x</u>da   legayu]
          what.is-DET   hit-**PASS**-INST   John-INST-DET hammr
          What did John hit with that hammer?   (Anderson 1984; p. 38)

<u>Comment:</u>

Although these data do indicate that subjects possess a distinct syntactic 'status' from objects in the language, a configurational analysis of Kwakwala wouldn't obviously have an account of these facts…

*…after all, standard GB theory predicts that subjects are **more**, not less, 'difficult' to extract…*

2.2.2.4 Control Structures

Kwakwala appears to have Control structures based off of non-finite (non-nominalized) clauses. *(note the absence of subject agreement in the subordinate clause of (27), despite the absence of an overt subject)*

(27)   **Control in Kwakwala**

hilhq'al-entla-<u>x</u>-a   bosi   [hamx7ida-<u>x</u>-a   k'utela]
allow-1sS-ACC-DET   cat   eat-ACC-DET   fish
I allowed the cat [to eat the fish].   (Anderson 1984; p. 40)

As we might expect of a Control structure, Kwakwala permits subjects to be 'Controlled' (*i.e.,* to be PRO) (*cf.* (27)).

Moreover, also as we would expect, it does not permit objects to be 'Controlled' (i.e. to be PRO). If one ever wishes to control the theme of a transitive predicate, one must passivize the predicate.

(28)   **No Control of Non-Subjects in Kwakwala**

q'utlel-u<u>x</u>wda begwanaem   ga<u>x</u>en [mex7id-**su7**]
know-DET   man   1sObj   hit-**PASS**
The man knows me to have been hit.   (Anderson 1984; p. 42)

…and we have a standard configurational account of this restriction of PRO…

Summary

Like its Southern Wakashan neighbor Nuu-chah-nulth, the Northern Wakashan language Kwakwala is not even a *prima facie* plausible PA language (though one might attempt an NC analysis). There is, moreover, some indication that S occupies an A-position that is structurally higher than O.

- Reflexive possessors can only be bound by subjects (i.e., they cannot appear inside subjects and be bound by objects).

- Subjects are unique in that they are the only argument mapped to 'possessor' in a nominalizaton (and a syntactic theory of nominalization would account for this via the assumption that subjects occupy the highest A-position)

- Subjects are unique in that only they can undergo A-bar movement in the language (though it's hard to see how, exactly, a configurational theory would account for that).

- Only subjects in Kwakwala can be 'Controlled'.

Interesting Sidenote:

Despite the evidence above, Anderson (1984) pursues an NC-analysis of Kwakwala.

HOW?   He's using the original version of GB where 'Government' plays a crucial role.
        He tweaks the definition of 'Government' so that *subcategorization* rather than
        hierarchical position is what determines Governing relations.
                (and so he can get the facts above without assuming that what
                distinguishes Subjects is that they asymmetrically c-command Objects)

WHY?   Because he can – because he'd rather keep to the 'surface structure' of the
        language if possible (and you can't build a VP from VSO)

---

3.   (Non-)Configurationality of the Na-Dene Languages (Part 1: Haida)

3.1   The *Prima-Facie* Case for a PA or NC Status

Out of all the languages of the Pacific Northwest, Haida is the *last* one you'd ever attempt a PA analysis for.

First, the language has no verbal agreement whatsoever. Though you might at first mistake the clitic pronouns as agreement-markers, they are always in complementary distribution with lexical arguments (as in Romance).

(29)   **Lack of Agreement in Haida**

        a.   dalang dii 'la qing-7aa.aa-hal-gan.
                you   me   3   see-go.to-direct-PAST
                He told me to go see you.

        b.   Bill   dii dalang squdang-hal-gan.
                Bill   me   you   punch-direct-PAST
                You told Bill to punch me.   (Enrico 2003; p. 46)

Another Interesting Thing to Note:

The pronominal clitics do not (always) display Case morphology.
It's generally the *order* rather than the *form* of the clitics that determines what grammatical functions they are mapped to (standard order: OBJ-IO-SUBJ) (*cf.* (29a) vs. (29b)).

Secondly, like all the non-Salishan language's we've examined above, Haida doesn't really have very free word order. In many cases (*i.e., when the subject is of equal or lower 'potency' than the object*), Haida word order is rigidly SOV.

(30) **Rigid SOV Word Order in (Some) Haida Sentences**

7adaahl-.uu   Mary Bill qing-gan.
yesterday-FOC   Mary Bill see-PAST
Yesterday, Mary saw Bill.
* Yesterday, Bill saw Mary.   (Enrico 2003; p. 74)

3.2   The Evidence for a Configurational Structure

But, besides the initial implausibility of a PA-analysis, are there any phenomena in the language that indicate subjects to occupy A-positions superior to objects (which would also provide evidence against an NC-analysis)?

3.2.1   VP-Pronominalization

As noted above, either a PA or a NC analysis predicts that there should be no 'rules of pronominalization' (pronouns) targeting (filling) the V and the O to the exclusion of the S.

However, Haida seems to have just such a rule (31a).

Moreover, as Enrico (2003) points out, the ability for the rule to 'ignore' adjuncts (31a) but *not* arguments (31b) provides evidence against a PA analysis (which would treat both NPs equivalently).

(31) **VP-Pronominalization in Haida**

a.   7adaalh-gu Bill dang squdaa-yaa? 7ee, 7adaalh-.uu   **hak'un hl 7waa-gan**.
     yesterday-Q Bill you punch-EVID yes yesterday-FOC thus   I do-PAST
     Did you punch Bill yesterday? Yes, I did so yesterday.

b.   Bill-gu 7adaalh   dang squdaa-yaa? * 7ee, Bill-.uu **hak'un hl 7waa-gan**.
     Bill-Q yesterday you punch-EVID   yes Bill-FOC thus   I do-PAST
     Was it Bill you punched yesterday? * Yes, I did so Bill.

(Enrico 2003; p. 50)

3.2.2   Extraposition

A PA analysis of Haida would hold that all PPs within a clause are adjuncts of equal syntactic status.

However, as Enrico (2003) points out, *complement PPs* exhibit different syntactic behavior from *true adjunct PPs*. **Only adjunct PPs can be 'extraposed' (i.e., topicalized/dislocated).** [3]

(32)   '**Extraposition' (Topicalization/Dislocation) of Adjuncts vs. Complements in Haida**

    a.   <u>True Adjuncts can be 'Extraposed' in Haida</u>

        ya.aats'-rahl lhaa-.uu   stl-ang   q'iid-an
        knife-with   1s-FOC   hand-own   cut-PAST
        It was me that cut my hand with a knife.   (Enrico 2003; p. 511)

    b.   <u>Complements cannot be 'Extraposed' in Haida</u>

        tsiin-ee-rahl   lhaa-.uu   dang-ga   tla.ayd hlangaa-gang.
        salmon-DEF-with   1s-FOC   you-P   help   could-PRES
        It's me that could help you with the salmon.   (Enrico 2003; p. 512)

(This differential behavior of complement and adjunct PPs might also provide an argument against an NC analysis…)

3.2.3   Anaphoric Potential of Possessive DPs

One feature that distinguishes Subjects in Haida is that *a possessor inside a subject cannot co-refer with any pronoun in the sentence*.

(33)   **Pronouns in Sentence Must be Disjoint from any Possessors Inside the Subject**

    [Bill$_1$ duu.n]   'laa$_{2/*1}$-ga   tla.ayd-an
     Bill younger.brother   3-P   help-PAST
    Bill's younger brother helped him$_{2/*1}$.   (Enrico 2003; p. 86)

Besides providing indication that Subject phrases are distinguished in the grammar from Object phrases, it's worth noting that a configurational analysis could capture these facts via the assumption that possessors in Haida always c-command out of possessed phrases (along with Principle B).

---

[3] The core test for 'extraposition' in Haida is whether the XP can appear before a 'focus-fronted' YP.

3.2.4 Control

Haida shares with Kwakwala (and other configurational languages) the property that only Subjects can be Controlled (can be PRO) in non-finite clauses.

(34)   **Only Subjects Can be Controlled in Haida Infinitives**

     a.   [$\varnothing_1$ hlang.ang-ee-ga]   'la hlrwaaga-ang.
           PRO receive.bad.omen-INF-P   3   fear-PRES
           He is afraid of receiving a bad omen.

     b.   * [x-aay $\varnothing_1$ q'wi.di-ee-ga] Joe hlrwaaga-ang.
           dog-DET PRO bite-INF-P   Joe feat-PRES
           Joe fears being bitten by the dog.   (Enrico 2003; p. 82)

Important Caveat:
There are some apparent counter-examples to the generalization that only Subjects can be Controlled…

If the 'semantic subject' is   *(a)*   *indefinite*
                        (b)   *incorporated*
                        (c)   *'eliminated' via the 'middle voice'*
           then in such cases some apparent 'non-subjects' can be controlled:

(35)   **Control by a Non-Subject in Haida?**

[$\varnothing_1$ **ga**   hlang.ang-ee-ga]   'la hlrwaaga-ang.
  PRO **INDEF** receive.bad.omen-INF-P   3   fear-PRES
He is afraid of something giving him a bad omen. (Enrico 2003; p. 82)

On the other hand, one should also keep in mind that such 'non-subjects' display other properties that might suggest that *they are actually syntactically promoted to Subject position.*

(36)   **Subject-Like Behavior of the 'Putative Object' in (35)**

[Bill$_1$ duu.n]   ['la$_{2/*1}$ k'ut'al-ee]-ran   **ga**   hlang.aan-aa-n.
 Bill younger.brother   3s die-INF-for   **INDEF**   receive.bad.omen-EVID-PA
Bill$_1$'s younger brother received a bad omen that he$_{2/*1}$ would die.
(Lit. *'Something gave Bill$_1$'s younger brother a bad omen that he$_{2/*1}$ would die.'*)
           (Enrico 2003; p. 86)

3.2.5 Internally Headed Relative Clauses

Enrico (2003) mentions another intriguing structural property of subjects in Haida, though he never goes on to illustrate it with data:

"An eighth and even more specialized property of L-subjects is that, while internally headed relative clauses can have their internal heads within clausal complements and adjuncts, such a head cannot have L-subject function within the complement or adjunct clause."
(Enrico 2003; p. 86).
… 'That-Trace Effects' anyone?…

Interesting Sidenote:

Despite the evidence above, Enrico (2003) pursues an NC-analysis of Haida.

HOW?   Unclear. (Presumably, he'd appeal to something like LFG to be able to capture the 'subjecthood' properties listed above, without having to adopt a configurational analysis.)

WHY?   Unclear. (Because he can?)

---

4.   Some Concluding Comments

A.   Tsimshianic (Nisga'a/Gitksan):

Thanks to work by Hunt (1991, 1993), we have a variety of structural arguments that these languages are configurational (more arguments than any of the other languages we've examined here).

B.   Wakashan (Nuu-chah-nulth, Kwakwala):

There is perhaps comparatively little evidence at the moment that either Nuu-chan-nulth or Kwakwala are configurational.

However, neither of these languages are particularly likely candidates for PA or NC analyses, and there is some evidence that a configurational account offers the best approach…

C.   Na-Dene (Haida)

Haida is the last language you'd expect someone to try to analyze as PA. Furthermore, thanks to work by Enrico (2003), there are a few positive pieces of evidence that the language is configurational.