

The Syntax of Pronouns: Evidence from Halkomelem Salish

Author(s): Martina Wiltschko

Source: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Feb., 2002), pp. 157-195

Published by: Springer

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4048052>

Accessed: 19-04-2016 13:44 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Springer is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*

THE SYNTAX OF PRONOUNS: EVIDENCE FROM HALKOMELEM
SALISH*

ABSTRACT. This paper investigates the syntax of independent pronouns in Halkomelem Salish and argues that these pronouns are morphosyntactically complex. In particular, the paper shows that independent pronouns contain a syntactically active determiner, and concludes that they are full DPs with an elliptical NP. Licensing of elliptical NPs is subject to cross-linguistic variation, and thus not all languages allow for determiners to be used pronominally. The analysis of independent pronouns as full DPs is supported by their external syntax as well as their binding properties. It is shown that independent pronouns behave like R-expressions in that they are subject to Condition C. On the basis of this observation, it is concluded that binding theory must be sensitive to syntactic categories and, crucially, that regular 'condition B' pronouns cannot be analyzed as (intransitive) DPs, contrary to standard assumptions.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates in detail the syntax of a particular set of pronouns in Halkomelem Salish called 'independent pronouns'.¹ Unlike other pronominal forms in the language, which attach to the main predicate as clitics and affixes, independent pronouns pattern with full nominal phrases; they

* I am grateful to my consultants Rosaleen George, Elisabeth Herrling, and Tilly Gutierrez for sharing their knowledge of Halkomelem. Furthermore, Shirley Norris was of great help in eliciting the data. Original data belongs to the Stó:lō Nation. I would also like to thank the following people for their helpful comments: Strang Burton, Henry Davis, Rose-Marie Déchaine, Hamida Demirdache, Naomi Sawai, and the two anonymous reviewers, as well as the audience at the 33rd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages where an earlier version of this paper was presented. Errors remain my responsibility. Research on this paper was sponsored by the Academy of Science, Vienna (APART 435).

¹ Halkomelem is a Central Coast Salish language spoken in British Columbia. Data presented are from the Upriver dialect (Stó:lō Halq'eméylem).



are syntactically and phonologically independent of the main predicate.² Table I shows the set of independent pronouns:

TABLE I
Halkomelem independent pronouns (Galloway 1993: 171f.)

	SG	PL
1.	te' élthe/te à'elthe	telhlímelh
2.	teléwe	telhwélep
3.	tú'ò/thúí'ò	tutl'ó:lem/thutl'ó:lem/yutl'ó:lem

I will argue for the following two claims: i) Halkomelem independent pronouns are full DPs with an elliptical NP, and ii) Halkomelem independent pronouns behave like R-expressions.

Ultimately, I will show that the latter claim can be derived from the former. That is, if we assume that R-expressions are defined as DPs, as proposed in Wiltschko (1998a, 1999), it will follow that independent pronouns are subject to Condition C.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 1, the internal syntax of independent pronouns is discussed and evidence is provided that they contain a syntactically visible determiner. It will further be argued that independent pronouns are best analyzed as full DPs with an empty NP. Cross-linguistic differences in licensing empty NPs will also be discussed. In section 2, it is shown that independent pronouns behave like R-expressions. This conclusion has important theoretical consequences in that it forces us to abandon the standard assumption that regular Condition B pronouns are to be analyzed as (intransitive) DPs. In section 3, it is shown that analyzing independent pronouns as full DPs makes the right predictions for their external syntax, i.e., independent pronouns have exactly the same syntactic distribution as full DPs. Finally, in section 4 it is argued that the full DP pronouns do not correspond to strong pronouns in Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) sense, but rather seem to establish a fourth kind of pronominal form (besides clitics, weak pronouns, and strong pronouns).

² Halkomelem is a head marking language: arguments are obligatorily realized as agreement endings or clitics, while full DP arguments are optional. Independent pronouns pattern with full DPs in that they are optional. They do not provide any information that is not already supplied by the obligatory pronominal marker on the main predicate. Rather, their use induces a certain kind of emphasis on the denoted individual. For this reason, independent pronouns are also labeled 'emphatic' pronouns. The specific (discourse) restrictions on independent pronouns will not be addressed in this paper, as they are not crucial to the analysis presented here.

2. THE INTERNAL SYNTAX OF HALKOMELEM INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS

In this section I will argue that independent pronouns in Halkomelem are best analyzed as in (1):

- (1) [DP [D *te* [AgrDP [AgrD {*elthe, lewe, tl'ó, . . .*} [NP \emptyset]]]]

According to the structure in (1) Halkomelem independent pronouns contain a syntactically active determiner that heads its own projection. Accordingly, the entire pronoun is of category DP. Furthermore, (1) implies that independent pronouns are morphosyntactically complex in that the element following the determiner (*elthe, lewe, tl'ó*, etc.) heads its own projection (Agr). And finally, according to (1) independent pronouns contain an empty NP. All of these assumptions will be motivated in turn. We begin by providing evidence for the claim that independent pronouns contain a syntactically active determiner.

2.1. Independent Pronouns Contain a Syntactically Active Determiner (D^0)

Consider again the Halkomelem independent pronoun paradigm given in Table I repeated below for convenience:

TABLE I

Halkomelem independent pronouns (Galloway 1993: 171f.)

SG	PL
1. te 'élthe/te à'elthe	telhlímelh
2. teléwe	telhwélep
3. tú 'ð/ thúl 'ð	tutl'ó:lem/ thutl 'ó:lem/ yutl 'ó:lem

The boldface letters in the above table highlight the determiner-like element that appears prefixed on all the independent pronouns throughout the paradigm.³ That Halkomelem independent pronouns are prefixed by a determiner is a straightforward observation (cf. Galloway 1993; Newman

³ Note that the determiner-like element for third person pronouns appears as *tu-* rather than *te-*. This vowel change might derive from the following construction '*te u tl'ó*' whereby '*u*' is a focus particle (Strang Burton, p.c.). Note, however, that this construction is not attested synchronically. I therefore assume that *tu* in third person independent pronouns is an allomorph of *te* which is restricted to third person.

1977⁴). There is, however, a non-trivial question arising in this context: Is the determiner-‘prefix’ lexicalized or is it syntactically active? In other words, which of the following analyses do we choose for independent pronouns?

- (2)a. [DP [D⁰ *te* [XP [X⁰ *lewe* ...
 b. [X⁰ [[D^{0/-1} *te*] [X *lewe*]]

In (2a) the determiner heads its own projection, namely a determiner phrase (DP). This structure obviously implies that the determiner is syntactically visible. In (2b) the determiner is prefixed at a level below X⁰. This structure implies that the determiner *te* is not visible in the syntactic component because syntax does not ‘see’ below the X⁰ level. Consequently, morphologically complex words like (2b), which are not derived syntactically, are syntactic atoms. In what follows I will show that the evidence crucially favors the structure in (2a).

2.1.1. *All the Determiners are Productively Used on Independent Pronouns*

A first argument for a syntactic analysis of independent pronouns in Halkomelem stems from the fact that all the possible determiners are attested with independent pronouns. Determiners in Halkomelem encode number, gender, and remoteness. A list of the possible Halkomelem determiners is given in Table II.

TABLE II
 Halkomelem determiners (adopted from Galloway 1993: 387)

	MALE/UNMARKED	FEMALE
PRESENT + VISIBLE	<i>te</i>	<i>the</i>
NEAR + NOT VISIBLE	<i>kwthe</i>	<i>se, kwse</i>
DISTANT	<i>kw’e</i>	<i>kw’the, kwse</i>
PLURAL	<i>ye, (any of the above)</i>	<i>ye, (any of the above)</i>

It is striking that the ‘prefixed’ determiner on independent pronouns exhibits the same kind of form and meaning correspondence as the determiners in Table I. We find that the prefixed determiner varies according

⁴ According to Newman (1977), Halkomelem is the only Salish language where the determiner is found on independent pronouns.

to number, gender, and remoteness in exactly the same way as the regular determiner. This is shown in Table III.

TABLE III

Independent 3rd pronouns with different determiners (Galloway 1993: 403)

	Male	Female
Singular	tú(:)tl'ò	thú(:)tl'ò
Plural	tutl'ólem yutl'ólem	thutl'ólem
Absent	kwthú:tl'ò	kwsú:tl'ò

If the prefixed determiner were lexicalized, i.e., if independent pronouns were stored in the lexicon, this parallelism between the regular determiner and independent pronouns would be a mere coincidence. However, the productive use of the different determiners follows straightforwardly from the syntactic analysis. The prefixed determiner is simply an instantiation of the regular determiner. Thus, we expect to find all the possible forms.

Note that this fact would also be compatible with the assumption that independent pronouns are productively derived in the morphological component. Thus, we do not yet have an argument for the syntactic visibility of the determiner. In order to show that the determiner is really syntactically visible, we have to provide evidence that it is sensitive to the syntactic environment in which the independent pronoun occurs. Following is a series of arguments that point in this direction.

2.1.2. *The Determiner Varies with a Syntactically Defined Position*

In Halkomelem, the form of the determiner varies according to syntactically definable criteria. For example, in the complement position of a preposition, a proper name is preceded by an oblique determiner:⁵

⁵ With this classification, I differ from Galloway (1993) who essentially classifies *tl'* as a determiner for not visible or distant humans. As far as I have been able to determine, *tl'* is more likely to be classified as an oblique determiner restricted to names, much like its Cowichan counterpart discussed in Gerdtz (1988).

- (3) lemél-stexw-es tɬ' Bill te sq'émél xwelám
throw-CAUS(3O)-3S DET.OBL Bill DET paddle over.to
 tɬ' Bob⁶
DET.OBL Bob
 Bill threw the paddle over to Bob. (Galloway 1993, p. 342)

Crucially, the same is true for independent pronouns. Table IV and the examples in (4–5) makes this clear:

TABLE IV

Independent pronouns as objects
 of prepositions⁷ (Galloway 1993:
 190)

	sg	pl
1.	tɬ'á'elthe	tɬ'(e)hlímelh
2.	tɬ'eléwe	tɬ'alhwélep

- (4) le wá:lx-es te sqémél stetís tɬ'á'elthe
AUX throw-3S DET paddle near DET.OBL-1SG.INDEP
 He threw a paddle beside (near) me. (Galloway 1993, p. 242)
- (5)a. kwú-t-es telí tɬ'á'elthe
take-TR-3S from DET.OBL-1SG.INDEP
 Hel took it from me. (Galloway 1993, p. 341)
- b. kwú-t-es telí tɬ'-eléwe
take-TR-3S from DET.OBL.2SG.INDEP
 He took it from you. (Galloway 1993, p. 341)

⁶ Abbreviations used are as follows: AUX = auxiliary; DET = determiner; FEM = feminine; FUT = future tense; INDEP = independent pronoun; INTR = intransitivizer; MASC = masculine; NEUT = neuter; NOM = nominalizer; O = object; OBL = oblique; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; REDUP = reduplicated; S = subject; SG = singular; TR = transitivizer. A short key to the orthography of Upriver Halkomelem (see Galloway 1993) is: a = æ or ε; ch = tʃ, ch' = tʃ', e (between palatals) = ɪ, e (between labials) = u, e (elsewhere) = ə, lh = ɬ, o = a, ô = o, xw = x^w, x̄ = x̄, y = j, sh = ʃ, th = θ, th' = tθ', tɬ' = tɬ', ts = c, ts' = c', x = x or x^j, x̄w = x̄^w, ' = ʔ, ' = high stress, ` = mid stress.

⁷ tɬ' is not used on 3rd person pronouns (*tɬ'tl'ə).

These data conclusively show that the determiner must be syntactically visible. If it were not, then it would not be expected that it can vary according to the syntactic environment.

Another crucial argument for the syntactic nature of the determiner stems from its sensitivity to the predicate – argument distinction. I will start by looking at predicative environments.

2.1.3. *The Determiner on Independent Pronouns is Dropped in Predicate Position*

If the determiner heads its own projection (DP), i.e., if it is syntactically active, we expect that it can be dropped in environments where determiners are generally dropped. This is indeed the case. It is a well-known fact about Salish languages that nouns in predicate position are not preceded by a determiner:

- (6) swíyeqe te í:mex
man DET walking
 That's the man that's walking.

Independent pronouns behave exactly as expected under the syntactic analysis. The determiner 'prefix' is dropped just in case the independent pronoun occurs in predicate position:⁸

- (7)a. [élthe]_{pred} te í:mex
1SG.INDEP DET walking
 That's me that's walking.
- b. *[te-élthe]_{pred} te í:mex
DET-1SG.INDEP DET walking
- (8)a. [lhwélep]_{pred}-cha lám
2PL.INDEP-FUT go
 It will be you folks that go. (Galloway 1993, p. 172)
- b. *[te-lhwélep]_{pred}-cha lám
DET-2PL.INDEP-FUT go

⁸ Salish languages are strictly predicate-initial. Thus the position of the pronoun in (7–9) must be the predicate position. Also in these languages, arguments are necessarily preceded by a determiner. Therefore, elements following the predicate in these examples must be functioning as arguments, as they are introduced by a determiner.

- (9)a. [tɬ'o]_{pred} te ma:l-s tú-tɬ'ò
 3INDEP DET father-3POSS DET-3INDEP
 That's his father.
- b. *[tɬ-tɬ'o]_{pred} te ma:l-s tú-tɬ'ò
 DET-3INDEP DET father-3POSS DET-3INDEP
 That's his father.

This pattern would be completely unexpected if the determiner were not syntactically active. In that case we would not expect it to be sensitive to the predicate – argument distinction. However, under the assumption that the determiner-‘prefix’ is simply the regular syntactic determiner, the pattern above is fully expected.

2.1.4. *DPs in Argument Position Need a (Syntactically Active) Determiner*

The counterpart of the previous argument concerns the behavior of independent pronouns in argument position. Again we are led to the conclusion that the determiner of an independent pronoun has to be syntactically visible.

It is a well-known fact about Salish that NPs in argument position are obligatorily preceded by a determiner (see Matthewson 1998 among others):

- (10)a. h́kw *(te) sẃyeqe
 big DET man
 The man is big.
- b. kw'éts-lexw-es *(te) sẃyeqe *(the) slhá:lí
 see-TR(3O)-3S DET man DET.FEM woman
 The man sees the woman.
- c. t'í:t'elém *(ye) mestíyexw
 singing DET.PL people
 The people are singing.

Independent pronouns have essentially the same distribution as full DPs. It is therefore remarkable that they do not show a (second) determiner even if they occur in the same position as their full DP counterparts:

- (11)a. í:mex-tsel **te-'á'elthe**
walk-1SG.S DET-1SG.INDEP
 I am walking.
- b. yóyes-chexw **te-léwe**
working-2SG.S DET-2SG.INDEP
 You are working.
- c. lá:yem-tset **te-lhímelh**
laughing-1PL.S DET-1PL.INDEP
 We are laughing.
- d. ewó:lem-chap **te-lhwélep**
playing-2PL.S DET-2PL.INDEP
 You folks are playing.

- (12)a. q'óq'ey **tú-tl'ò**
sick DET-3INDEP
 He is sick.

- b. kw'éts-lexw-es **tú-tl'ò** **thú-tlò**
see-TR(-3O)-3S DET-3INDEP DET.FEM-3INDEP
 He sees her.

The same holds true in the possessive construction. As shown in (13), a possessor argument is obligatorily preceded by a determiner (see Matthewson 1998):⁹

- (13)a. híkw te kopú-s ***(tl')** John
big DET coat-3POSS DET.OBL John
 John's coat is big.

⁹ If the possessor is a name, the oblique determiner is used.

- b. híkw te lálém-s *(tl') Mali
big DET house-3POSS DET.OBL Mary
 Mary's house is big.
- c. kwé-lexw-es te John te pékw-s *(te)
find-TR(30)-3S DET John DET book-3POSS.3POSS DET
 swíyeqe
man
 John found the man's book.

Crucially, if an independent pronoun is used as the possessor it is not preceded by a (second) determiner:

- (14)a. t'í:t'elém te má:l-s **thú-tl'ò**
singing DET father-3POSS DET-3INDEP
 Her father is singing.
- b. tl'o te má:l-s **tú-tl'ò**
3INDEP DET father-3POSS DET-3INDEP
 That's his father.

The data discussed in this section indicate that the determiner on the independent pronoun must be syntactically visible. On the one hand, we know that an NP in argument position is obligatorily preceded by a determiner. On the other hand, we observe that there is no extra (second) determiner preceding an independent pronoun in argument position. Therefore we can conclude that the 'prefixed' determiner on independent pronouns is syntactically active. It must count as the necessary determiner of the argument.

Under the assumption that the determiner is prefixed presyntactically (i.e., in the lexicon), this pattern would be quite surprising. Given the assumption that morphologically complex words behave like syntactic atoms, the determiner would not be visible in the syntax. It would then be a peculiar property of pronouns that they do not have to be preceded by a determiner even though they behave like full (argument) DPs in other respects.

2.1.5. *Summary*

At this point let us briefly summarize the result of this section. We have seen evidence that independent pronouns in Halkomelem contain a syntactically active determiner. Therefore, the structure in (2a), repeated as (15a), is clearly preferable over the one in (15b): the determiner is inserted in the head position of a DP.

(15)a. [DP [D⁰ *te* [XP [X⁰ *lewe* ...

b. [X⁰ [D^{0/-1} *te*] [X *lewe*]]

2.2. *The Structure of Independent Pronouns*

So far we have seen that independent pronouns in Halkomelem contain a syntactically active DP projection. The question is, what does D⁰ take as its complement? Which of the following structures do we choose?

(16)a. [DP [D⁰ *te* [XP [X⁰ *lewe* [NP ∅]]]]]

b. [DP [D⁰ *te* [NP *lewe*]]]

According to the structure in (16a), there is an intermediate projection between DP and NP. This amounts to saying that *elthe*, *lewe*, *tl'o* ... are not of category NP. According to the structure in (16b), D⁰ takes an NP-complement and *elthe*, *lewe*, *tl'o* would be of category NP. In what follows I will provide evidence for the former assumption, i.e., for the structure in (16a).

2.2.1. *Independent Pronouns as Determiners*

A crucial piece of evidence that helps to decide between the two possibilities discussed above stems from the fact that independent pronouns in Halkomelem can license an overt noun. This means that independent pronouns can not only be used as pronouns but also as determiners. This phenomenon has been observed by Galloway: "Sometimes a nominal can be added parenthetically after another nominal phrase as long as they refer to the same person or thing" (Galloway 1980, p. 39) and "in such slightly more demonstrative examples these pronouns are probably best translated as 'that'" (Galloway 1993, p. 174).

The following examples illustrate this fully productive phenomenon:

- (17)a. *su me ts'tl'ém thu-tl'ò só:seqwt*
so come jump DET.FEM-3INDEP youngest.sister
 So the youngest sister came to jump.

- b. la t'ék'w'-stexw-es yú-tl'ò:lèm q'á:lemi te
 go home-CAUS(3O)-3S DET.PL-3PL.INDEP girl.PL DET
 swíweles

boy

They, the girls, took the young man home. (Galloway 1980, p. 39)

- (18) tl'ó-cha-l-su qwemcíwe-t thú-tl'ò q'ami.
 then-FUT-1SG.S-so hug-TR DET.FEM-3INDEP girl
 Then I'm going to hug that girl (Galloway 1993, p. 174)

This pattern provides clear evidence against the structure in (16b). If *tl'o* were an NP complement of D^0 we would not expect the possibility for another NP.¹⁰ Thus the complement of D^0 cannot be NP. This leaves us with the structure in (16a), repeated here as (19):

- (19) [DP [D⁰ te [XP [X⁰ {elthe_{1sg}, lewe_{2sg}, tlo_{3sg} ... }] [NP ∅]]]]

2.2.2. The Category of the Intermediate Projection

So far we have established that independent pronouns consist of at least three layers of projections: a DP headed by the determiner (*te*), an intermediate projection (XP in (19)) headed by the second morpheme of an independent pronoun (*elthe*, *lewe*, *tl'o*, etc.) and an NP which can be empty or filled. In this subsection we will determine the nature of the intermediate category XP.

First, note that it has to be assumed that these elements *elthe*, *lewe*, *tl'o*, etc. constitute their own syntactic categories, rather than, for example, being attached to D below the D^0 level as in (20):

- (20) [DP [D [*te*] [*elthe*]] [NP]]]

¹⁰ An anonymous reviewer points out an alternative analysis. One could make use of Giusti's (1992, 1993) assumption that demonstratives are XPs in SpecDP. With this assumption one could analyze *tl'o* as the NP complement of a demonstrative and there would still be another NP position available:

- (i) [[DP thu [NP *tl'o*]] D⁰ [NP q'ámi]]

There are two immediate problems with this analysis for Halkomelem. First, one might expect that the determiner head of D could be filled by another determiner (as in 'double definiteness languages'; see Giusti 1994). This is, however, not the case in Halkomelem: **thutl'o the q'ámi*. Second, if *tl'o* really were an instance of N, then it is not clear why this NP position is restricted to these elements (i.e., why can we not get two nouns as in **the q'ámi só:seqwt?*).

Evidence that *elthe* heads its own syntactic category comes from the fact that in predicate position, it can be used on its own (see 1.1.6):

- (21) **élthe** te í:mex
 1SG.INDEP DET walking
 I am the one who is walking.

From (21), we can also conclude that the category XP must be one that can appear in predicate position which immediately excludes DP as a possible candidate, because according to standard assumptions, D turns a predicate into an argument (see, for example, Higginbotham 1985; Stowell 1989; Longobardi 1994, among many others).

In accordance with a number of analyses concerning the internal structure of DPs, I will assume that this intermediate category is an AgrP, that is, a projection hosting phi-features.¹¹ Crucially, Déchaine and Wiltschko (2001, to appear) argue that AgrPs (their φ Ps) can be used as arguments or predicates. If their analysis is on the right track, AgrP is of the right kind to appear in predicate position. Note also that the assumption that *elthe*, *lewe*, *tl'o* etc. is of category AgrP is consistent with the fact that independent pronouns encode phi-features (namely person and number).

Another piece of evidence for analyzing these elements as Agr has to do with the interaction of independent pronouns with possessive affixes. Possessive affixes cliticize onto the determiner,¹² as shown below:

- | | | |
|------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| (22) | REGULAR DP | 1ST SG POSSESSIVE DP |
| | te má:l – the father | te-l má:l – my father |
| | te kapú – the coat | te-l kapú – my coat |
| | te pú:s – the cat | te-l pú:s – my cat |
- (Galloway 1993, p. 179)

We have seen that it is a property of independent pronouns that they can be used as determiners, and it is a property of possessive affixes that they can be attached to all the different determiners. However, the possessive affixes cannot be attached to independent pronouns used as determiners:

¹¹ Note that different authors use different labels for essentially the same projection: Ritter (1995) uses Num(ber)P, Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) use I(nfl)_{NP}, Wiltschko (1998a) uses AgrP, and Déchaine and Wiltschko (to appear) use φ P.

¹² This is an oversimplification: only some possessive affixes cliticize onto the determiner, whereas others cliticize onto the noun. For a detailed discussion see Galloway (1993).

- (23)a. *í:mex **tú-tlò-l** **mál**
walking DET-3INDEP-1SG.POSS father
 My father is walking. (Wiltschko 1998b, p. 469 ex. 53)
- b. í:mex **tú-tlò** **má:l**
walking DET-3INDEP father
 The father is walking.
- c. í:mex **te-l** **má:l**
walking DET-1SG.POSS father
 My father is walking.

The question now obviously is why (23a) is ungrammatical. The answer lies in the fact that *tló* is of category AgrP as proposed above. This assumption derives the ungrammaticality of (23) in the following way.

Possessive affixes can be analyzed as instances of AgrP (see Wiltschko 1998c for evidence).¹³ Consequently, it is expected that *tl'o* (which instantiates AgrP) and the possessive affixes (which instantiate AgrP) are in complementary distribution. This is indeed the case as the ungrammaticality of (23) shows.

Based on this assumption we can now replace XP in (19) with AgrP and thus end up with the following structure for independent pronouns:

- (24) [DP [D *te* [AgrDP [AgrD {*elthe, lewe, tl'ó, ...*} [NP \emptyset]]]]]

In this context I would like to briefly address another question, one having to do with the licensing of empty NPs.

2.2.3. *When Can Determiners Be Used Pronominally?*

The structure in (24) basically says that independent pronouns are determiners that are used without an overt NP (in essence, a pronominally used determiner). Halkomelem independent pronouns are thus reminiscent of a set of German pronouns standardly called d-pronouns. Wiltschko (1998a) has argued that these d-pronouns are also pronominally used determiners (i.e., instantiating a full DP with an empty NP).¹⁴ Thus, they have the same

¹³ To be precise, Wiltschko (1998c) argues that possessive affixes are to be analyzed as Pers(on)P and Num(ber)P, respectively. I take these projections to be instances of AgrP, that is, much like IP is split into TP and AgrP (cf. Pollock 1989), it can be assumed that the nominal AgrP can be split into PersP and NumP (cf. Shlonsky 1989, among others).

¹⁴ It is crucial that homophony between articles and pronominal elements does not automatically mean that the pronouns are of category D. The opposite conclusion is also

structure as Halkomelem independent pronouns (compare (25) and (26) with (24)):

- (25) Maria hat **den** (Mann) gesehen.
Mary has D-PRON (man) seen
 Mary has seen him/the man.

- (26) [DP [D *d-* [AgrDP [AgrD *er* [NP {*Mann*, \emptyset }]]]]]

Given this analysis of German d-pronouns and Halkomelem independent pronouns, we have to ask why it is not always possible to use a determiner pronominally. Consider, for example, the English sentences below:

- (27)a. *Mary saw the.
 b. Mary saw the man.

As seen in (27), English determiners cannot be used pronominally. We thus have to address the question as to what determines whether or not a determiner can be used pronominally or, in other words, when can an NP be empty?

It is a well-known fact that the presence or licensing of empty elements is related to agreement. In purely descriptive terms, the presence of sufficient agreement allows for empty elements (see, for example, Borer 1983, 1986, 1989; Huang 1984; Rizzi 1986 for the phenomenon of pro drop and Olsen 1991; Kester 1995 for licensing within the DP). In Wiltschko (1998a) the difference between German and English is captured with the following assumption:

- (28) IDENTIFICATIONAL LICENSING FOR EMPTY NPs
 Strong AgrD licenses an empty NP

In this section I will briefly sketch a minimal reanalysis of (28) and show how it can account for the cross-linguistic difference between German, English, and Halkomelem. Wiltschko's (1998a) version to capture the intuitive relation between agreement and empty NPs relies on the notion of government, which is not available in the minimalist program. However, we can still maintain a relation between Agr⁰ and the empty NP without

possible: articles might well be of category Agr rather than D. Déchaine and Wiltschko (2001) argue that this is the case for Romance clitics and articles, which they analyze as pro- φ Ps.

government. Consider the minimalist (i.e., bare phrase structure) version of (24):

- (29) [D [D *d-*] [_{AgrD} [_{AgrD} *er* [_N \emptyset]]]]

Under the theory of bare phrase structure it is no longer necessary to indicate whether a given node is a head or a phrase as these concepts are contextually defined. Thus, the (contextually defined) head Agr is in a local relation with the empty N (which is at the same time a head and a phrase). The relation is still definable in minimalist terms: it is the relation of sisterhood. We can thus redefine (28) as follows:

- (30) An empty N recovers its phi-features from the phi-features of its sister.

With this in mind we can now turn to the cross-linguistic differences between German, English, and Halkomelem.

First, consider German d-pronouns:

- (31) [D [D *d-*] [_{AgrD} [_{AgrD} *er* [_N \emptyset]]]]

In German, N's sister is a personal pronoun heading Agr. According to (30) this is the right configuration for an empty N to recover its phi-features. Consequently, empty Ns in German are licensed and determiners can be used pronominally.

Consider now English determiners:

- (32)a. *[D [D *the*] [_{AgrD} [_{AgrD} [_N \emptyset]]]]

- b. *[D [D *the*] [_N \emptyset]]

Whether we assume that English has an Agr projection which is not filled (32a) or no Agr projection (32b), an empty N cannot recover its phi features: its sister does not contain appropriate phi-features. Therefore English determiners cannot be used pronominally. Note, however, that there is a way to save the structure in (32). This is to use an overt dummy NP (*one*), which makes the need for licensing obsolete:

- (33) Mary saw **the one**

- (34)a. [D [D *the*] [_{AgrD} [_{AgrD} [_N *one*]]]]

- b. [D [D *the*] [_N *one*]]

Finally, let us turn to Halkomelem independent pronouns:

- (35) [D [D *te*] [AgrD [AgrD {*elthe*_{1sg}, *lewe*_{2sg}, *tl'o*_{3sg} ... } [N ∅]]]]

As in German, N is sister to Agr, and Agr is occupied by a head containing the appropriate phi-features to license the empty N.

Observe, however, that the Halkomelem morpheme instantiating D (*te*) differs from its German counterpart (*d-*) in that the former is a free morpheme whereas the latter is a bound morpheme. In other words, in Halkomelem the determiner can be used without the agreement morphemes, whereas in German this is not the case:

- (36) kw'éts-lexw-es **te** swíyeqe **the** shhálí
see-TR(3O)-3S DET man DET.FEM woman
 The man saw the woman.

- (37)a. D-er Mann sah d-ie Frau
D-3SG.MASC man saw D-3SG.FEM woman
 The man saw the woman

- b. *D Mann sah d Frau
D man saw D woman
 The man saw the woman.

Since the Halkomelem determiner is a free morpheme the question arises as to whether it can be used pronominally by itself, that is, without the agreement morphemes. As the following sentences show, this is not the case ((38a)/(39a)). The determiner needs the agreement endings to be used pronominally ((38b)/(39b)):

- (38)a. *kw'éts-lexw-es **te the**
see-TR(3O)-3S DET DET.FEM
 He saw her.

- b. kw'éts-lexw-es tú-tl'ò thú-tl'ò
see-TR(3O)-3S DET-3INDEP DET.FEM-3INDEP
 He saw her.

- (39)a. *kw'éts-lexw-es **ye the**
see-TR(3O)-3S DET.PL DET.FEM
 They saw her.

- b. kw'éts-lexw-es yu-tl'ólem thú-tl'o
see-TR(30)-3s DET.PL-3INDEP.PL DET.FEM-3INDEP
 They saw her.

In light of the present proposal, this is a surprising result. Since the Halkomelem determiners in (38) and (39) encode gender and number, they appear to be equipped with phi-features and thus we would expect them to be able to license an empty N under sisterhood:

- (40) * $[_D [_D \{te, the, ye \dots\}] [_N \emptyset]]$

In what follows I will argue that the number and gender features on the determiner correspond to natural, not grammatical, categories and thus are not actually phi-features. They cannot enter into syntactic relations and therefore the empty N in the configuration in (40) cannot be licensed.¹⁵

Evidence for the claim that number and gender in Halkomelem are not grammatical categories comes from two considerations. First, there are no mismatches between natural number/gender and grammatical number/gender. For example, a noun in Halkomelem can only be used with a feminine determiner if it denotes a female individual. In languages where gender is a grammatical category this is not the case. Secondly, and this is most striking, number and gender agreement in Halkomelem is generally **optional**. For example, if plurality is expressed on the noun, then the determiner can, but need not, encode plural.

- (41)a. ílhtel ye slhelháli
eat DET.PL woman.PL
 The women are eating.
- b. íhtel the slhelháli
eat DET.FEM WOMAN.PL
 The woman are eating.

¹⁵ That natural gender cannot trigger agreement in NPs is supported by the following example:

- (i) das Mädchen (ii) * die Mädchen
the_{neut} girl_{neut} the_{fem} girl_{neut}

The German noun *Mädchen* denotes a female individual (girl) but its grammatical gender is *neuter*. The data above establish that only grammatical gender, but not natural gender, can trigger agreement with the determiner.

The same is also true for gender. If the noun unambiguously encodes whether the individual under consideration is male or female, the determiner does not have to agree. For example, the noun *sháli* ‘woman’ can co-occur with the unmarked determiner *te*:

(42)a. *ilhtel the sháli*
eat DET.FEM woman
 The woman is eating.

b. *ilhtel te sháli*
eat DET woman
 The woman is eating.

The marked feminine determiner *the* is only obligatory for reasons of disambiguation. For example the noun *álex* ‘sibling’ can be disambiguated by means of the determiner to mean either ‘brother’ or ‘sister’:

(43)a. *íhtel tel á:lex*
eat DET-1SG.POSS sibling
 My brother is eating.

b. *íhtel thel á:lex*
eat DET.FEM-1SG.POSS sibling
 My sister is eating.

This property of the Halkomelem number and gender features is quite striking in light of the present problem. For example, German number and gender agreement is strictly obligatory.

(44)a. *der Mann *der Frau*
DET.MASC man.MASC DET.MASC woman.FEM
**der Kind*
DET.MASC child.NEUT

b. *die Männer *der Männer*
DET.PL men.PL DET.SG men.PL

The fact that number and gender agreement in Halkomelem NPs is optional is consistent with the assumption that they do not instantiate grammatical categories and as such cannot trigger obligatory agreement.

2.3. Summary

In this section we have discussed the internal syntax of Halkomelem independent pronouns. First, we saw evidence that they contain a syntactically visible determiner which heads its own projection DP. Secondly, I argued that they also contain an empty NP that can be filled (i.e., independent pronouns can be used as determiners). And finally, we saw evidence that the category associated with the second morpheme of independent pronouns is Agr. In this context we discussed cross-linguistic differences in the possibility of licensing empty NPs: determiners can only be used pronominally (that is, with an empty NP) if phi-features are available.

The crucial result of this section is that Halkomelem independent pronouns are exactly parallel to full DPs. In the remainder of this paper I will show that this is a desired result given the binding properties and the external distribution of this set of pronouns.

3. INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS AND BINDING THEORY

In this section, I will discuss the binding properties of independent pronouns. We will see that they behave like R-expressions in that they are subject to Condition C. First, I will justify this claim empirically and then I will discuss its theoretical implications.

3.1. *Halkomelem Independent Pronouns Behave Like R-Expressions*

Before we can look at the binding behavior of independent pronouns, we must briefly discuss one important issue about Condition C in Halkomelem, which is that it does not hold across clauses (see, among others, Davis 1993; Matthewson 1993; Matthewson et al. 1993; Demirdache 1997, for a discussion on Condition C in other Salish languages). Consider the following paradigm:

- (45)a. st'ówel te Strang_i [_{CP} kw'-s-es schechewót *pro*_i
think DET Strang DET-NOM-3S smart
 Strang thinks he is smart.
- b. st'ówel *pro*_i [_{CP} kw'-s-es schechewót te Strang_i
think DET-NOM-3S smart DET Strang
 He thinks Strang is smart. (= Strang thinks he is smart)

Note that independent pronouns behave exactly like full DPs in this respect:

- (46) st'ówel te Strang_i [CP kw'-s-es schechewót
think DET Strang DET-NOM-3S smart
 tú-tl'ò_i
DET-3INDEP
 Strang thinks he is smart.

This lack of Condition C effects across clauses in Salish will not be of any concern in this paper (see the above references for a detailed discussion). However, within a clause, Condition C effects can be observed. Consider first the following set of sentences:

- (47) kw'áts-et-es te tá:l-s te John
see-TR-3S DET mother-3POSS DET John
 (i) John_i saw his_i mother.
 (ii) *He_i saw John's_i mother

As indicated, (47) can only mean *John saw his mother*. In other words, John can only be construed as the subject, therefore forcing a VOS word order (which is possible in general). The possessor in *te tá:ls* is only expressed as the agreement ending (-s). Crucially *te John* cannot be interpreted as the possessor of *te tá:ls* as shown by the ungrammaticality of the translation in (ii). Note that without coreference this construction would be perfectly grammatical, that is, an overt DP can occur as a postnominal possessor as in (48) below:

- (48) tl'ó [te tá:l-s te John]
3INDEP DET mother-3POSS DET John
 This is John's mother.

Consider now the following sentences:

- (49)a. súq'-t-es [te swíyeqe]_S [te kopú-s]_O
look.for-TR-3S DET an DET coat-3POSS
 The man_i was looking for his_i coat.

- b. súqʻ-t-es [te swíyeqe_i]_S [te kopú-s
look.for-TR-3S DET man DET coat-3POSS

tú-tlʻò_i]_O

DET-3INDEP

The man_i was looking for his_{*i/j} coat.

- (50)a. xwmékwath-et-es [te Strang]_S [te stóles-s]_O
kiss-TR-3S DET Strang DET wife-3POSS

Strang was kissing his wife.

- b. *xwmékwath-et-es [te Strang_i]_S [te stóles-s
kiss-TR-3S DET Strang DET wife-3POSS

tú-tlʻò_i]_O

DET-3INDEP

Strang was kissing his wife.

- (51)a. hélépex-es [te Strang]_S [te sthóqʻi-s]_O
eat-3S DET Strang DET fish-3POSS

Strang is eating his fish.

- b. *hélépex-es [te Strang]_S [te sthóqʻi-s tú-tlʻò]_O
eat-3S DET Strang DET fish-3POSS DET-3INDEP

Strang is eating his fish.

In the (a) examples above the non-overt possessor of the object DP can be coreferent with the subject DP. However, once the possessor is realized as an independent pronoun as in the (b) examples, coreference is no longer possible. In order to show that independent pronouns are indeed subject to Condition C of the binding theory we must demonstrate that the violations in (49)–(51) are structurally determined.

First, note that the impossibility for coreference is independent of linear precedence. We have already seen that sentences with VOS order are possible. Another example is given in (52a) below. Crucially, if the offending independent pronoun is in the object position preceding the subject the result is still ungrammatical (52b):

- (52)a. hélépex-es [te sthóqʻi-s]_O [te Strang]_S
eat-3S DET fish-3POSS DET Strang

Strang is eating his fish.

b. *hélpex-es [te sthóq'i-s tú-tl'ò_i]O [te Strang_i]s
eat-3S DET fish-3POSS DET-3INDEP DET Strang
 Strang is eating his fish.

(53)a. súq'-t-es [te kapú-s]O [the Martina]s
look.for-TR-3S DET coat-3POSS DET.FEM Martina
 Martina is looking for her coat.

b. *súq'-t-es [te kapú-s thú-tl'ò_i]O
look.for-TR-3S DET coat-3POSS DET.FEM-3INDEP
 [the Martina_i]s
DET.FEM Martina
 Martina is looking for her coat.

The sentences above indicate that the object in a VOS sentence is interpreted in its base position (VSO) for the purposes of binding theory. This shows that independent pronouns can precede their antecedent and still induce ungrammaticality. Thus, the coreference restriction of independent pronouns is independent of linear precedence.

Secondly, we can show that coreference of the independent pronoun is governed by a c-command restriction. That is, if the coreferent element does not c-command the independent pronoun the structure is ruled in:

(54) [te tál-s tl' Strang_i]s
DET mother-3POSS DET.OBL Strang
 mamáy-t-em [tú-tl'ò_i]O
help.REDUP-TR-INTR DET-3INDEP
 Strang's mother is helping him.

In (54), the coreferent DP (*tl' Strang*) is embedded as the possessor in the subject DP. From this position it does not c-command the independent pronoun, making coreference possible.

We can therefore conclude that the restriction on coreference of independent pronouns is indeed a matter of binding: it is governed by structural c-command.

3.2. *Theoretical Implications*

3.2.1. *The Problem*

Above we have seen that independent pronouns in Halkomelem behave like R-expressions in that they are subject to Condition C. Given the present analysis of these elements, this is not really surprising. After all, we have argued that they are full DPs with an empty NP. However, while it may appear straightforward to claim that full DPs should be subject to Condition C, it actually is not. The problem we are facing is as follows.

Pronouns are standardly analyzed as intransitive determiners (see Postal 1966; Abney 1987). Under this analysis a regular condition B pronoun would differ from Halkomelem independent pronouns (which, for the time being, we can label condition C pronouns) in the following way:

(55)a. intransitive pronouns (Condition B)

[_{DP} [_{D⁰}]]

b. independent pronouns (Condition C)

[_{DP} [_{D⁰}] [_{AgrP} [_{Agr⁰} [_{NP} ∅]]]]

However, it is not immediately clear how binding theory should distinguish between the two pronominal elements as both are DPs in their outer layer (which is presumably the one relevant for binding theory). Crucially, the problem does not disappear under proposals that claim that pronouns differ in their internal syntax (for example, in how many or which functional projections are present). Under most of these proposals, all pronouns are still of category DP (cf. Cardinaletti 1994; Ritter 1995; Noguchi 1997). The problem mentioned above equally applies to these kinds of proposals: it is not clear as to how binding theory can be sensitive to the internal structure of a given category when the upper layer is a DP.

Another source of this problem is the fact that under current versions of binding theory, the notion of ‘pronoun’ is not defined at all.

3.2.2. *The Categorical Determination of Binding Properties*

One way out of this problem is suggested in Wiltschko (1998a, 1999) where it is argued that the standard assumption that pronouns are universally of the same syntactic category, namely DP, should be abandoned. It is proposed that different pronominal forms can be of different syntactic categories, namely (nominal) AgrP and DP. Then the problem as

to how binding theory distinguishes between different types of pronouns can easily be solved by redefining binding theory in the following way:

- (56) Condition B: (Nominal) AgrPs cannot be bound within their binding domain.

Condition C: DPs have to be free. (Wiltschko 1999)

Thus, what at first sight looks like a pronoun may in fact be an R-expression and, as a consequence, be subject to condition C. The result of this proposal is summarized in Table V.

TABLE V

Pronoun-types and their binding properties (see Wiltschko 1999)

TYPE OF PRONOUN	CATEGORY	BINDING PRINCIPLE
Agr-Pronoun	AgrP = Pronoun	Condition B
D-Pronoun	DP = R-expression	Condition C

Note that this proposal has the advantage of formally defining pronouns and R-expressions. It was exactly the lack of such a definition that created the problems discussed earlier.

As discussed in Wiltschko (1998a, 1999) this distinction also accounts for the different binding behavior of two sets of pronouns in German (briefly discussed in section 1.2). D-pronouns are ‘pronominally’ used determiners (i.e., DPs with an empty NP) which cannot be bound (57a), whereas ‘regular’ pronouns are AgrPs and consequently can be bound outside their binding domain (57b):

- (57)a. **Arnold_i** glaubt daß **der_{*i/j}** stark ist.

Arnold believes that he strong is

Arnold believes that he is strong.

- b. **Arnold_i** glaubt daß **er_{i/j}** stark ist

Arnold believes that he strong is

Arnold believes that he is strong. (Wiltschko 1999, ex. 7)

Obviously, Wiltschko’s proposal can also straightforwardly handle the Halkomelem data. In section 1 we saw that independent pronouns are pronominally used determiners (i.e., DPs with an empty NP) just like

German d-pronouns. Consequently, it is expected that they behave like R-expressions. Note that this analysis crucially implies that standard Condition B pronouns cannot be analyzed as DPs, contrary to standard assumptions.

4. THE EXTERNAL SYNTAX OF HALKOMELEM INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS

The present analysis of Halkomelem independent pronouns as full DPs predicts that they have exactly the same distribution as other full DPs. As we will see, this prediction is borne out: independent pronouns appear in the same position as full DPs, they can be modified like full DPs, and they can be coordinated like full DPs. In sum, there is no syntactic difference whatsoever between full DPs and independent pronouns.

4.1. *Word Order*

4.1.1. *VSO vs. SVO*

Halkomelem is a VSO language. Thus, full DPs appear in postverbal position:

- (58)a. *xwmékwàth-et-es tl'* Strang the Martina
kiss-TR-3S DET.OBL Strang DET.FEM Martina
 Strang kissed Martina.
- b. *kwé-lexw-es te John te pékw-s*
see-TR(3O)-3S DET John DET book-3POSS
 John found his book.
- c. *kw'éts-lexw-es te swíyeqe the shhá:lí*
see-TR(3O)-3S DET man DET.FEM woman
 The man sees the woman.

As shown below, independent pronouns can appear in the same position as full DPs, i.e., they appear postverbally:

- (59)a. *xwmékwàth-et-es tú-tl'o* the Martina
kiss-TR-3S DET-3INDEP DET.FEM Martina
 He kissed Martina.

- b. kw'éts-lexw-es tú-tl'ò thú-tl'ò
see-TR(30)-3S DET-3INDEP DET.FEM-3INDEP
 He saw her.
- c. lí xwmékwàth-et-es tú-tl'ò thú-tl'ò
AUX kiss-TR-3S DET-3INDEP DET.FEM-3INDEP
 Did he kiss her?
- d. tsel sísele te-é' elthe
1SG.S grandmother DET-1SG.INDEP
 I'm a grandmother.
- e. tsel xlhém te-'é'lthe
1SG.S tired DET-1SG.INDEP
 I'm tired.

In addition to VSO order, Halkomelem also allows for SVO order:

- (60)a. tl' Strang xwmékwàth-et the Martina
DET.OBL Strang kiss-TR DET.FEM Martina
 Strang kissed Martina.
- b. te John kwé-lexw te pékw-s
DET John see-TR(30) DET book-3POSS
 John found his book.
- c. te swíyeqe kw'éts-lexw the slhá:lí
DET man see-TR(30) DET.FEM woman
 The man sees the woman.

Again, independent pronouns also allow for the SVO order:

- (61)a. tú-tl'ò kw'éts-lexw-es thú-tl'ò
DET-3INDEP see-TR(30)-3S DET.FEM-3INDEP
 He saw her.
- b. tú-tl'ò xwmékwàth-et the Martina
DET-3INDEP kiss-TR DET.FEM Martina
 He kissed Martina.

- c. te'-é'elthe kw'éts-lexw te Strang
DET-1SG.INDEP see-TR(30) DET Strang
 I saw Strang.

4.1.2. Possessives

In possessive DPs the possessor appears in postnominal position:

- (62)a. axwí:l te pú:s-s tɬ' Strang
small DET cat-3POSS DET.OBL Strang
 Strang's cat is small.
- b. híkw te kopú:-s tɬ' John
big DET coat-3POSS DET.OBL John
 John's coat is big. (Wiltschko 1998c, pp. 416f., ex. 36)

The same is true for independent pronouns:

- (63)a. tɬ'ó te má:l-s thú-tl'ò
3INDEP DET father-3POSS DET.FEM-3INDEP
 That's her father.
- b. tɬ'ò te sqwemá:y-s tú-tɬ'ò
3INDEP DET dog-3POSS DET-3INDEP
 That's his dog.
- c. t'í:t'elem the tá:l-s thú-tɬ'ò
sing.REDUP DET.FEM mother-3POSS DET.FEM-3INDEP
 His mother is singing.

Another pattern is found in the presence of *swa* 'own'. Here the possessor precedes the possessed noun as shown in the examples below:

- (64)a. axwí:l te swá-s tɬ' Strang pú:s
small DET own-3POSS DET.OBL Strang cat
 Strang's own cat is small.
- b. híkw te swá-s tɬ' John kopú
big DET own-3POSS DET.OBL John coat
 John's own coat is big. (Wiltschko 1998c, p. 462 ex. 38)

Again, independent pronouns follow this pattern. In the presence of *swa* the independent pronoun possessor precedes the possessed noun:

- (65) *tló te swá-s tú-tl'ò sqwemá:y*
3INDEP DET own-3POSS DET-3INDEP dog
 That's his own dog.

In sum, independent pronouns have the same distribution as full DPs, as expected by the present proposal: they are full DPs.

4.2. Modification

In this subsection we will see that independent pronouns, like full DPs, can be modified. We will first look at modification with *only* and then modification by means of a relative clause.

4.2.1. Only

Consider the following sentences where full DPs are modified by *loyò* 'only':

- (66)a. *loyò te mímeqw í-l kw'éts-lexw*
only DET bird AUX-1SG.S see-TR(3O)
 I only saw a bird.
- b. *wa loyò te Strang í-l kw'éts-lexw*
AUX only DET Strang AUX-1SG.S see-TR(3O)
 I saw only Strang.

Again, we observe that independent pronouns pattern exactly with full DPs:

- (67)a. *loyò tú-tl'ò í-l kw'éts-lexw*
only DET-3INDEP AUX-1SG.S see-TR(3O)
 I only saw him.
- b. *loyò thú-tl'ò í-l kw'éts-lexw*
only DET.FEM-3INDEP AUX-1SG.S see-TR(3O)
 I only saw her.
- c. *loyò te-é'elthe kw'éts-lexw-es tl' Strang*
only DET-1SG.INDEP see-TR(3O)-3S DET.OBL Strang
 It was only me that Strang saw.

- d. wa loyò te'-é'elthe kw'éts-lexw te Strang
 AUX only DET-1SG.INDEP see-TR(30) DET Strang
 Only I saw Strang.

Note that English pronouns can also be modified with *only*; however, the Halkomelem independent pronouns nevertheless differ from English pronouns in that Halkomelem pronouns also allow for modification with relative clauses as shown in the next subsection.

4.2.2. Modification by Relative Clause

The following sentence contains a relative clause modifying a full DP (*te swíyeqe*):

- (68) tsel kw'éts-lexw te swíyeqe la xwmékwàth-et the
 1SG.S see-TR(30) DET man AUX kiss-TR DET
 Martina
 Martina
 I saw the man that kissed Martina.

Unlike English, Halkomelem allows relative clauses to modify independent pronouns:

- (69)a. tsel kw'éts-lexw tú-tl'ò la xwmékwàth-et the
 1SG.S see-TR(30) DET-3INDEP AUX kiss-TR DET
 Martina
 Martina
 I saw him who kissed Martina.
- b. tl'ó te'-é'elthe la í:mex
 3INDEP DET-1SG.INDEP AUX walking
 I'm the one who is walking.

Of course, this is expected if Halkomelem independent pronouns are in fact full DPs.

4.3. *Coordination*

Finally, let us consider coordination. In (70) we find coordinated full DPs:

- (70) kw'éts-lexw-es tl' Strang te swíyeqe qas the
see-TR(30)-3S DET.OBL Strang DET man and DET.FEM
 slháli
woman
 Strang saw a man and a woman.

Note that the same pattern is found in cases with independent pronouns:

- (71)a. kw'éts-lexw-es tl' Strang tú-tl'ò qas
see-TR(30)-3S DET.OBL Strang DET-3INDEP and
 thú-tl'ò
DET.FEM-3INDEP
 Strang saw him and her.
- b. tsel kw'éts-l-òme tú-tl'ò qas te-léwe
1SG.S see-TR-2SG.O DET-3INDEP and DET-2SG.INDEP
 I saw you and him.
- c. te-é'elthe qas te-léwe kw'éts-lexw-es
DET-1SG.INDEP and DET-2SG.INDEP see-TR(30)-3S
 tl' Strang
DET.OBL Strang
 It was me and you that Strang saw.

And finally, independent pronouns can also be coordinated with full DPs as expected by the present analysis:

- (72)a. te swíyeqe qas te-é'elthe yóyes
DET man and DET-1SG.INDEP working
 The man and I are working.
- b. í:mex te-é'elthe qas te John
walking DET-1SG.INDEP and DET John
 I and John are walking.

- c. tú-tl'ò qas te swíweles lá:yem
DET-3INDEP and DET boy laughing
 He and the boy are laughing.

To sum up, independent pronouns have exactly the same external syntax as full DPs. They show the same distribution within both sentences and possessive DPs, they can be modified, and they can be coordinated. The present analysis that independent pronouns are full DPs predicts exactly this pattern.

5. ARE INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS STRONG PRONOUNS?

Let me briefly recapitulate the essence of the present proposal. It is argued that Halkomelem independent pronouns are full DPs. As such they have rather different properties than regular ‘personal pronouns’: they are subject to Condition C and have the same distribution as full DPs. To capture the binding properties it was proposed that binding theory is category sensitive in that all DPs are subject to Condition C. If true, the present analysis implies that standard ‘Condition B’ pronouns cannot be of category D as standardly assumed (Postal 1966; Abney 1987; Cardinaletti 1994; Ritter 1995; Noguchi 1997, among many others).

For completeness, I will now turn to an existing proposal that categorically distinguishes among different types of pronouns. This is Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1999) (henceforth C&S) account for the difference between ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ pronouns. The question that I will address is whether we could treat Halkomelem independent pronouns as ‘strong pronouns’ and derive their properties from this assumption.

5.1. *Cardinaletti and Starke 1999*

C&S assign the following structure to strong and weak pronouns, respectively:

- (73)a. Strong pronouns:
 $[_{CLP} [_{CL^0} [_{\Sigma LP} [_{\Sigma L^0} [_{ILP} [_{I_L^0} [_{LP}]]]]]]]]]$
- b. Weak pronouns:
 $[_{ILP} [_{\Sigma L^0} [_{ILP} [_{I_L^0} [_{LP}]]]]]$

They argue that the structural difference between the two sets of pronouns is responsible for the properties summarized in Table VI.

TABLE VI
Properties of strong and weak pronouns

	STRONG PRONOUNS	WEAK PRONOUNS
(i) Are morphologically reduced?	no	yes
(ii) Modification possible?	yes	no
(iii) Coordination possible?	yes	no
(iv) Can occur in base-position?	yes	no
(v) Are associated with range?	yes	no

In the next subsection I will investigate the properties of independent pronouns with respect to the strong/weak distinction.

5.2. *Halkomelem Independent Pronouns as Strong Pronouns*

Recall from section 1 that Halkomelem independent pronouns are morpho-syntactically complex. If we take morphological complexity as a diagnostic for the strong/weak distinction, it is tempting to assume that Halkomelem independent pronouns are strong (along with the German d-pronouns). Accordingly, we could assign the following structure:

(74)a. Halkomelem Independent pronouns:

$[_{CLP} [_{CL^0} tu] [_{\Sigma LP} [_{\Sigma L^0} [_{ILP} [_{IL^0} t'l'o] [LP]]]]]$

b. German d-pronouns:

$[_{CLP} [_{CL^0} d-] [_{\Sigma LP} [_{\Sigma L^0} [_{ILP} [_{IL^0} er] [LP]]]]]$

Many of the properties of Halkomelem independent pronouns discussed in this paper would support this analysis. In particular, as shown in section 3, independent pronouns can be modified, coordinated, and can occur in their base-position. C&S take the impossibility to be used as an expletive pronoun to be related to the presence of a range. Crucially, Halkomelem independent pronouns (and German d-pronouns) cannot be used as expletives, suggesting that they are associated with a range:

(75)a. lhémexw

raining

It is raining.

- b. Es regnet.
it rains.
 It is raining.

- (76)a. *lhémexw tú-tl'ò
raining DET-2INDEP
 It is raining.

- b. *Das regnet.
D-PRON rains
 It is raining.

(Wiltschko 1998a, p. 164, ex. 35)

In summary, all the properties of Halkomelem independent pronouns (and German d-pronouns) seem to support their status as strong pronouns in C&S's sense, as shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII
 Halkomelem independent pronouns

	STRONG PRON.	HALKOMELEM INDEP.PRON.
(i) Are morphologically reduced?	no	no (see 1)
(ii) Modification possible?	yes	yes (see 3.2)
(iii) Coordination possible?	yes	yes (see 3.3)
(iv) Can occur in base-position?	yes	yes (see 3.1.)
(v) Are associated with range?	yes	yes (see (75/76))

5.3. *Problems with the 'Strong-Pronoun' Analysis of Independent Pronouns*

Although there appears to be some initial support for this analysis, there are at least two serious problems with it. The first problem has to do with the properties of independent pronouns that occur without the determiner (our AgrPs), and the second has to do with their binding properties.

5.3.1. *Independent Pronouns Used Without Determiners*

As mentioned above, the morphological complexity of independent pronouns might lead to the conclusion that they are strong. By the same reasoning, we might be led to conclude that independent pronouns that

occur without the determiner are weak pronouns, since presumably they lack the element that occupies C_{L^0} (i.e., *tu*). We would thus end up with the following categorial distinction between the two kinds of Halkomelem independent pronouns:

- (77)a. Independent pronoun with determiner = strong pronoun
 $[_{CLP} [_{CL^0} tu] [_{\Sigma LP} [_{\Sigma L^0}] [_{ILP} [_{IL^0} tl'o] [LP]]]]]$
- b. Independent pronoun without determiner = weak pronoun
 $[_{\Sigma LP} [_{\Sigma L^0}] [_{ILP} [_{IL^0} tl'o] [LP]]]$

Note that a categorial difference between the two sets of pronouns is desirable given their sensitivity to the predicate/argument distinction (i.e., only pronouns without the determiner element can be used as predicates).

However, this analysis faces a serious problem. It predicts that pronouns that occur without determiners, that is, pronouns that are used as predicates, cannot be modified or coordinated. This prediction is, however, not borne out. They can be modified (78) and they can be coordinated (79):

(78) Modification

- a. *loyò lewe kw'êts-lexw-es tl' Strang*
only 2SG.INDEP see-TR(3O)-3S DET.OBL Strang
 It was only you that Strang saw.
- b. *loyò é'elthe kw'êts-lexw-es tl' Strang*
only 1SG.INDEP see-TR(3O)-3S DET.OBL Strang
 It was only me that Strang saw.

(79) Coordination

- é'elthe qas léwe kw'êts-l-exw-es tl'*
1SG.INDEP and 2SG.INDEP see-TR(3O)-3S DET.OBL
 Strang
 Strang
 It was me and you that Strang saw.

Given this pattern, we would have to conclude that independent pronouns without the determiner element are strong pronouns in C&S's sense as well, but then the fact that the two sets of pronouns have different morphological properties, which go hand in hand with different syntactic properties, remains unexplained.

On the other hand, the analysis proposed in this paper can explain all the properties of independent pronouns summarized in Table VII by claiming that they are full DPs. Crucially, this analysis does not run into the problems that the ‘strong pronoun’ analysis has to face. There is a strict correlation between the morphological and the syntactic properties (see Déchaine and Wiltschko 2001 for further discussion).

5.3.2. *The Binding Properties of Independent Pronouns*

C&S do not discuss the binding properties of strong and weak pronouns. However, given the spirit of their analysis a natural assumption suggests itself which could account for the fact that Halkomelem independent pronouns (along with German d-pronouns) behave like R-expressions.

Suppose we say that being associated with a range makes it impossible for a nominal element to be bound. That is, the crucial property of an R-expression is its being associated with a range. This would lead to the simple generalization that strong pronouns cannot be bound. Would this assumption provide us with an alternative analysis to Wiltschko’s (1998a, 1999)? If so, binding theory would not have to be altered in any way. The answer, however, is, no. There are various problems such an analysis would have to face.

The first problem has to do with the fact that not all strong pronouns in C&S’s sense are subject to Condition C, and thus the simple generalization that “strong pronouns cannot be bound” is not possible.

The facts are as follows. C&S observe that “the vast majority of known (weak; strong) pairs are homophonous: This is the case in English (*him*; *him*), German (*sie*; *sie*) [. . .]” (C&S, p. 180). Recall now that coordination of pronouns is restricted to strong pronouns. Thus, one way to disambiguate personal pronouns in English and German is to coordinate them. Consequently, if we say that strong pronouns cannot be bound, we predict that coordinated personal pronouns cannot be bound. This prediction is, however, not borne out:

- (80)a. Peter_i said that [he_i and Mary] will get married.
 b. Peter_i hat gesagt, daß [Maria und er_i] heiraten werden.
 Peter has said that Mary and he marry will
 Peter said that Mary and he will get married.

(80) establishes that the simple generalization that strong pronouns cannot be bound cannot be maintained. Consequently, C&S’s proposal does not provide a principled solution to the problem as to why Halkomelem independent pronouns and German d-pronouns cannot be bound. In ad-

dition, the fact that Condition C pronouns are morphologically complex remains a coincidence. Again, the analysis presented in this paper provides a straightforward solution and is thus empirically more adequate.

Having discussed and rejected the possibility of analyzing Halkomelem independent pronouns as strong pronouns in C&S's sense we have to conclude that the pronouns, which we analyze as full DPs, are a fourth kind of pronoun (in addition to C&S's three types: clitics, weak pronouns, and strong pronouns). Most likely, C&S's division is one that holds among different kinds of AgrPs (see Déchaine and Wiltschko 2001 for discussion).

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper I have discussed in some detail the internal and external syntax of Halkomelem pronouns. We saw evidence that they are best analyzed as full DPs with a syntactically active determiner and an empty NP position, much like German d-pronouns in Wiltschko's (1998a) analysis. Consequently, independent pronouns are expected to behave like full DPs. This prediction was borne out in that they share exactly the same syntax as full DPs. Finally, it was shown that independent pronouns (like German d-pronouns) are subject to Condition C of the binding theory (i.e., they behave like R-expressions). This was shown to create some non-trivial problems for standard assumptions concerning binding theory on the one hand and the treatment of pronouns on the other. It was shown that these problems can be overcome with Wiltschko's (1998a) assumption that R-expressions should be defined as DPs, whereas standard Condition B pronouns should be analyzed as AgrPs. Consequently, the standard assumption that pronouns are (intransitive) DPs cannot be maintained.

REFERENCES

- Abney, Steve. 1987. *The English Noun Phrase in Its Sentential Aspect*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Borer, Hagit. 1983. *Parametric Syntax*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Borer, Hagit. 1986. 'I-subjects', *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 375–416.
- Borer, Hagit. 1989. 'Anaphoric Agr', in O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 69–109.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 1994. 'On the Internal Structure of Pronominal DPs', *The Linguistic Review* 11, 191–219.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke. 1999. 'The Typology of Structural Deficiency: A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns', in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Mouton, Berlin, pp. 145–233.

- Davis, Henry. 1993. 'A Configurational Pronominal Argument Language', *Proceedings of WECOL 1993*, University of Seattle, Washington.
- Déchine, Rose-Marie and Martina Wiltschko. 2001. 'Decomposing Pronouns', unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia (to appear in *Linguistic Inquiry*).
- Déchine, Rose-Marie and Martina Wiltschko. To appear. 'On Pro-nouns and Other "Pronouns"', *Proceedings of the Antwerp Conference: From NP to DP*.
- Demirdache, Hamida. 1997. 'Condition C', in H. Bennis, P. Pica and J. Rooryck (eds.), *Atomism and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 51–88.
- Galloway, Brent. 1980. *The Structure of Upriver Halkomelem, A Grammatical Sketch and Classified Word List for Upriver Halkomelem*, Coqualeetza Education Training Center, Sards, B.C.
- Galloway, Brent. 1993. *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Gerds, Donna. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*, Garland, New York.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 1992. *La sintassi dei sintagmi nominali quantificati* [The syntax of quantificational noun phrases], unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Padua.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 1993. *La sintassi dei determinanti* [The syntax of determiners], Unipress, Padua.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 1994. 'Enclitic Articles and Double Definiteness: A Comparative Analysis of Nominal Structure in Romance and Germanic', *The Linguistic Review* 11, 241–255.
- Higginbotham, James. 1985. 'On Semantics', *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 547–593.
- Huang, James. 1984. 'On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns', *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 531–574.
- Kester, Ellen-Petra. 1995. 'Adjectival Inflection and the Licensing of Empty Categories in DP', *OTS Working Papers*.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. 'Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-movement in Syntax and Logical Form', *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609–665.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 1993. 'Binding and Configurationality in St'át'imcets', unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 1998. *Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from Salish*, Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Dwight Gardiner. 1993. 'Coreference in Northern Interior Salish', *Papers for the 28th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*, University of Washington, pp. 217–232.
- Newman, Stanley. 1977. 'The Salish Independent Pronoun System', *International Journal of American Linguistics* 43, 302–314.
- Noguchi, Tohru. 1997. 'Two Types of Pronouns and Variable Binding', *Language* 73, 770–797.
- Olsen, Susan. 1991. 'AGR(eement) und Flexion in der deutschen Nominalphrase', in C. Bhatt, E. Löbel and C. Schmidt (eds.), *Syntactic Phrase Structure Phenomena in Noun Phrases and Sentences*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 51–69.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. 'Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP', *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365–424.
- Postal, Paul. 1966. 'On So-called Pronouns in English', in D. Reibel and S. Schane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, pp. 201–223.
- Ritter, Elizabeth. 1995. 'On the Syntactic Category of Pronouns and Agreement', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 405–443.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. 'Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of pro', *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501–558.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 1989. 'The Hierarchical Representation of Subject and Verb Agreement', unpublished manuscript, Haifa University.
- Stowell, Tim. 1989. 'Subjects, Specifiers and X'-theory', in M. Baltin and A. Kroch (eds.), *Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 232–262.
- Wiltschko, Martina. 1998a. 'On the Syntax and Semantics of (Relative) Pronouns and Determiners', *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2, 143–181.
- Wiltschko, Martina. 1998b. 'On the Internal and External Syntax of Independent Pronouns in Halq'eméylem', *Papers for the 33rd International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*, Seattle, pp. 428–447.

Received 17 February 2000

Revised 18 May 2001

University of British Columbia
Department of Linguistics, UBC
E 270-1866 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
Canada
<wmartina@interchange.ubc.ca>