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In Thompson, expressions that translate as English subordinate clauses and expressions that translate as English noun phrases are closely similar in form: both kinds of expression are likely to contain a head that is morphologically marked as nominal (by Nominalizer g- and by Possessive affixes) and are even more likely to be introduced by a member of the determiner system. Nevertheless, the two kinds of expression differ in fine details of morphosyntax.

I consider here especially expressions that appear to function as subcategorized arguments of predicates, and adverbial expressions of time and reason. Conditional protases and some other expressions will not be discussed, since they are never introduced by determiners; nor will I treat relative-clause-like constructions.

The determiner and core case-marking systems of Thompson are quite similar to those of Shuswap (Kuipers 1974: 56f.), though with differences of detail. There are three determiners, all phrase-initial: e Actual (he or she after vowels and occasionally elsewhere), k Past (sometimes he), and k Unrealized. The last is used especially in reference to entities that the speaker is presenting as not existent or identifiable—a category familiar in other Salish languages. Demonstratives (xh?e "this", x?g?e "that", etc.) do not belong to the determiner system and are not considered here.

There are two core cases: Direct, without overt mark, used for subject and for surface direct object (1); and Oblique, marked by preposition ka, used for agents of passive clauses, for instruments (2), and for patients that are not surface direct objects—this includes patients of active intransitive predicates (3) and of ditransitive predicates (1). Determiner and case marker interact morphophonologically: the Actual determiner e is almost always reduced-to Ø after Oblique k, while on the other hand Oblique e is omitted before the Past determiner k (4, 5).

(1) nê-x-c e x?g?axw e sk?e?e-t-s ñ sk?y  (G 32.4)
give-Ditr-Tr+3TSu Act man Act son-3Po Obl bow/arrow "The man gave his son a bow and arrow"

(2) niit-ne tâ kâ̈kâ̈mâ̈ Acting-3Po Obl scissors "I cut it with the scissors"
(3) xâ∫â?âns a m-k-e?e tê sqâ?y  (G 32.4)
est Act la70-younger.sister Obl berries "My younger sister ate some berries"
(4) po't-t-sa ek'â n tê sqâ?axw x? tâkâ?ist-s  (G 33.11)
pound-Tr-3TSu Hearsay on Past inside Obl Past hammer-3Po "He pounded it on the inside with his hammer"
(5) n-cu-xi-t-t-s ñ sqâ?kâye-s  (GT 217f.)
then Nom-make-Ditr-Tr-Pass Obl Past lunch-3Po "Then they made his lunch for him"

NPs that are neither surface subjects nor surface direct objects are always given Oblique marking (or else are in other sorts of prepositional phrases). In particular, note that NPs with the Unrealized determiner k receive Oblique case marking when they are not surface subjects or direct objects.

(6) xâ∫â?âns km ek'â tê sqâ?y  (G 33.2)
est la70 Hearsay Obl Unr berries "They tell me I ate some kind of berries (I do not remember)"
(7) n-kâµ-sai-t-e-c-m-e ñ k sqâ?ym  (G 33.2)
in-putîš-wood-Tr-1s0b-Imv Obl Unr wood "Bring me in some wood"

(The sequence tâ k, or sometimes just tâ, has also become a fixed mark of attribution within the NP and apparently of certain kinds of adverbial expressions.

(8a) yê tak x?usqâ?xw  (G 34.1)
good Att man "a good person"
(8b) cu-t-t-ê-t-uke xe? nê-xe tak yê  (D 7a)
make-Tr-Imv-ImvPl Dem there Att good "Do it well now, you people"

I will have little to say of these uses here.

Subordinate clauses in Thompson are of various types. The predicate of temporal ("when") clauses is inflected with the Conjunctive subject clitics: w-n 1st sing., u-s 3rd, etc. (Transitive predicates simply add invariable u-s to their ordinary personal inflection.) Nearly all semantic types of complement clause are nominalized: the predicate is marked with the Nominalizer prefix g-, and intransitive subject clitics are replaced by Possessive affixes. In addition, all these clause types are introduced by
predicates of manner (11) and quantification (12) and of the aspectual Unrealized determiner. Temporal clauses are introduced by Actual as well as various other complements whose time reference is future or potential with respect to the matrix clause, are all introduced by the Unrealized determiner.

Complement clauses can be divided into two types. (i) Complements of predicates of manner (11) and quantification (12) and of the aspectual predicate "stop" (13) are introduced by the Actual determiner. (ii) On the other hand, complements of the negative (15), of "desire" (16), of command (17), and of propositional attitude (18), as well as various other complements whose time reference is future or potential with respect to the matrix clause, are all introduced by the Unrealized determiner.

It appears that g can be replaced by Unrealized k if the time reference is future.

The choice of determiner to introduce subordinate clauses thus matches fairly reasonably the semantics of determiners in NPs: the Actual determiner, used in reference to known or presupposed entities, introduces clauses that are presupposed true; while the Unrealized determiner, used in reference to hypothetical entities, introduces clauses whose truth is not presupposed. The match is not complete, however: the Past determiner never introduces complement clauses, regardless of their time reference; and predicates meaning "know" take complement clauses introduced by k, even though the truth of the complement clause is presupposed. (Cross-linguistically it is the case that "know" patterns with propositional-attitude predicates rather than with factive--presupposing--predicates (Noonan 1985: 119).) Thus, complement clauses at least probably already need to be distinguished from canonical NPs in order to account fully for the distribution of determiners. The same conclusion emerges when one considers the case marking of subordinate clauses. Complements of predicates of manner and quantification, of "stop", of the negative, and of "desire" can reasonably be interpreted as subjects of these predicates: in these constructions, the matrix predicate has invariable 3rd person subject inflection (zero, as is normal for intransitives in Thompson) and never allows an overt NP that could be a subject. Thus it is quite in order that these complement clauses are not marked as Oblique by k. However, temporal clauses (9, 10) cannot be interpreted as subjects or objects of the matrix clause, nor can many instances of k complements of predicates of command or propositional attitude --namely those instances (17, 18, 20-23) in which the subject and object slots of the matrix clause are filled by overt NPs or by pronominal affixes, or in which no object slot is available since the matrix predicate is intransitive.
Oblique order to account for the surface morphosyntactic facts of case marking and, kind of distinction must be drawn between subordinate clauses and marking. At present I perhaps, determiner choice. 6

But whichever one picks, some (and other conceivable) alternatives. 5 But whichever one picks, some 

reason clauses (nominalized) do receive Oblique marking.

Finally, one should note that reason clauses (nominalized) do receive Oblique marking.

This seems consistent with the case marking pattern of NPs, since in (26, 27) the reason clause cannot be subject or object of the matrix predicate (w'rex and q'nog respectively). To be sure, a couple of instances have turned up of reason clauses that one might wish to interpret as subjects or the matrix predicate and yet are marked Oblique.

Temporal clauses are distinct in their case-marking behavior from these expressions too.

It has been noted for other Salish languages that subordinate clauses display only partial similarity to NPs. Kuipers (1967: 185f.) notes that Squamish normalized clauses introduced by the determiner k't fail to receive Oblique marking, for instance. The Thompson facts are more complex than those of Squamish, since Thompson subordinate clauses display a more flexible choice of initial determiner, whose selection is governed by principles closely resembling those that apply in NPs. Nevertheless even in Thompson one cannot simply conflate the class of subordinate clauses with that of NPs; distinctions must be drawn among argument types.

Notes

My field research on Thompson in summer 1989 was partly supported by a small grant from the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society; I am grateful for that and for extensive logistical and other support that I received from Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson, from Mabel Joe of Shulus, M.C., and from my parents. Examples cited here without indication of source are from my fieldnotes. Sources of other examples are indicated as follows: 6

D = Thompson and Thompson 1985ms (followed by headword under which example occurs)

G = Thompson and Thompson forthcoming (followed by section number)
I have sometimes altered the segmentation, glossing, or free translation of examples for expository purposes; I am responsible for any errors thus introduced. Abbreviations used in the glosses are as follows: 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person; s, p = singular, plural; Act = Actual, Asp = Aspect, Att = Attributive, Conj = Conjunctive, Dem = Demonstrative, Ditr = Ditransitive, Fut = Future, Imv = Imperative, ImvPl = Imperative Plural, Inch = Inchoative, Intr = Intransitive, Isu = Intransitive Subject, NC = Noncontrol, Nom = Nominalizer, Ob = Object, Obl = Oblique, Po = Possessive, Prog = Progressive, Rdp = Reduplication, Refl = Reflexive, Stv = Stative, Tr = Transitive, Tsu = Transitive Subject, Unr = Unrealized.

1 The preposition to also has a local sense "around, by way of"; in this use it is retained before k.—The analysis here of determiners and case marking is different from, but largely interconvertible with, that of Thompson and Thompson (forthcoming). Nothing of what I have to say below crucially depends on this difference of analysis.

2 Actually, temporal clauses are not yet as well attested in Thompson as they might be; but the facts of closely-related Shuswap seem similar (cf. Kuipers 1974: 85).

3 The Conjunctive here is used as a sort of optative (Thompson and Thompson forthcoming, section 21.3).

4 This difference in the case marking of k expressions according to whether they are NPs or complement clauses helps clarify a point noted by Thompson and Thompson (forthcoming, section 33). They find that to Oblique is often, but not always, omitted before k. Inspection of their data indicates that to is retained before k NPs, omitted before complement clauses with k. (An occasional instance of a k NP unexpectedly lacking to does turn up, but the statistical trend is quite clear.)

5 It is hard to determine whether complement clauses fill the same slots in the subcategorization frames of predicates as NPs do, since it is hard to find nouns that would be semantically suited to head NPs in the same syntactic positions as complement clauses. (Hence the interest of the time expressions discussed in the preceding paragraph.) Nor is it easy to come up with other tests for the grammatical functions of subordinate clauses—such as whether they are subject to relation-changing rules.

6 I have said nothing here about headless relative clauses, which occur in Thompson as in other Salish languages. I would expect headless relative clauses to receive case marking as NPs do, although there is little evidence bearing on the point to date.
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