Notes on the position of conjunctive enclitics in Thompson Salish*

Paul Kroeber

Reed College

Thompson Salish, like its neighbors Shuswap and Lillooet and like the Coast Salish languages, has three distinct paradigms which combine expression of the subject relation with an indication of the status of the clause with regard to modal notions and subordination. The morphological form of the Thompson paradigms is described in Thompson and Thompson (forthcoming), and closely resembles the Shuswap paradigms described by Kuipers (1974). What I will label here the indicative paradigm is marked for transitive predicates by means of a series of subject suffixes (TSu in (1)), and for intransitive predicates by means of a series of subject enclitics, transparently reconstructible as consisting of an element k- followed by the appropriate subject suffix, except that the third person form of the enclitic series is represented by Ø (ISu in (1)). The nominalized paradigm is marked by the nominalizer prefix s- and—for intransitive predicates only—replacement of the subject clitics by affixes of the Possessive series (Po in (1)); transitive verbs retain their usual subject suffixes. Finally, the conjunctive paradigm is marked for intransitive predicates by replacement of the indicative subject enclitic by the appropriate Conjunctive enclitic (Cj in (1); Kuipers' 'suffixal paradigm'); transitive predicates retain the subject suffixes, but add the 3rd person Conjunctive enclitic us, regardless of subject or object person. Each conjunctive clitic transparently consists of an element w- plus a subject suffix.

(1) Some Thompson pronominal paradigms

	TSu	ISu	Po	Cj
1s	-n, -(é)n̓e	kn	n-	wn, un
1p	-(é)t/-(é)m(e)	kt	e?-	ut
2s	-(é)xʷ	kʷ	-s	uxʷ
2p	-(é)p	kp	-ep	up
3	-(é)s	Ø	-s	us
3p[1]	-íyxs			-íyxs

Samples of these paradigms are given in (2).

(2) Intransitive
	Indicative	nés kn	[go 1sISu]	'I go'
	Nominalized	n-s-nés	[1sPo-Nom-go]	'(that) I go'
	Conjunctive	nés wn	[go 1sCj]	'(if) I go'

Transitive
Indicative	wík-c-n	[see-2sOb-1sTSu]	'I see you'
Nominalized	s-wík-c-n	[Nom-...]	'(that) I see you'
Conjunctive	wík-c-n us	[... Cj]	'(if) I see you'

1. Functions of the paradigms

The indicative paradigm is characteristic of main clauses (3) and of most relative clauses in which the target of relativization is the subject or the object of the relative clause (4).

(3)   a.   ptákʷ e qʷú? té?

            ooze.out Art water there

            'Water oozes out (there)'

   b.   q̓áy̓-e-s   e s-núk̓ʷe?-s

            shoot-Tr-3TSu Art Nom-friend-3Po

            'He shot his friend' (TL §32.1)

(4)   a.   spé?ec [NP e [S wík-ne]]

            bear   Art see-1sTSu

            'It's a bear that I saw', 'what I saw was a bear' (TL §36.14)

b.   y'e-mín-ne [NP he se?lís tə [S qʷəz-t-éɪʷ]]

    good-Rln-1sTSu Art knife Att use-Tr-2sTSu

    'I like the knife that you use(d)'

c.   púpn' kn   t [NP e w?éɪ   t ə [S xʷuy' kn-cém-s]]

    find   1sISu Obl Art someone² Att Art Fut   help-1sOb-3TSu

    'I found someone to help me'

The nominalized paradigm is found in many sorts of complement clauses (5) and in relative clauses whose target is a non-locative oblique (e.g., an instrument, or the patient of an active-intransitive verb or of a ditransitive) (6).

(5) a.   ?es-ɪək-st-és [k n-s-nés]

    Stv-know-Tr-3TSu Art 1sPo-Nom-go

    'He knows I went'

  b.   mús [e s-ník'-ne]

    four Art Nom-cut-1sTSu

    'I cut it four times'

(6) a.   cúɫ-x-cm-e   [NP ɫ se?lís t ɫ [S s-ník'-n-xʷ]]

    show-Ditr-1sOb-2sImv Art knife Att Art Nom-cut-Ts-2sTSu

    'Show me the knife that you cut it with'

  b.   swét [NP e [S ?-s-wík-m]]

    who   Art 2sPo-Nom-see-Intr

    'Who did you see?'

  c.   wík-ne [NP ɫ noɪʷúym'ɪʷ ɫ [S ?ex s-cu-ɪí-cm-ɪʷ]

    see-1sTSu Art car   Art Prog Nom-fix-Ditr-1sOb-2sTSu

    'I saw the car you were fixing for me'

The conjunctive paradigm has various uses: the principal ones are as a sort of (usually non-3rd-person) imperative or optative in main clauses (7) (Thompson and Thompson forthcoming: §21.3), in at least some conditional clauses (8), in time clauses (9), in embedded questions (10), and in relative clauses in which the target of relativization is locative (11).

(7) nɫém'ix us

    get.in   3Cj

    'Let him get in!, May he get in!' (TL §21.3)

---

² Literally '(one who) exist(s)'.

(8)   ?e n-c'?éɫ e cítxʷ e ?s-n-kəɫ-cín-st-xʷ   us

    Hyp in-get.cold Art house Hyp Stv-in-separate-door-Tr-2sTSu Cj

      e ntəqcíntn

      Art door

    'The house will get cold if you keep the door open'

(9)   ?úpi-t-m   ɫ swéw'ɫ [ɫ q'ʷíyt us]

    eat-Tr-1pTSu Art fish   Art cooked 3Cj

    'We ate the fish when it was cooked'

(10) təté? k s-ɪək-st-éne   [he qʷcíyx us]

    not Art Nom-know-Tr-1sTSu Art leave 3Cj

    'I don't know whether (s)he left' [he here perhaps a variant of Hypothetical (?)e]

(11) a.   xʷí?-ne [NP ɫ cítxʷ n ɫ [?ex wn ɫ kíye? us]]

    seek-1sTSu   Art house at Art exist 1sCj formerly

    'I'm looking for the house I used to live in'

  b.   təté? n k [míce?q us e s?íxʷɫ tə séytknmɪ]³

    not.exist at Art sit   Cj Art some Att people

    'There was no place for some of the people to sit' (TL §35.31)

(Note that the locative preposition n that governs the target of the relative clauses in (11) is apparently fronted out of the relative clause: cf. Kroeber 1992b.) Another, somewhat puzzling, function of the conjunctive is in constructions involving certain quantifiers—notably tékm 'all'—which appear to involve subordination (Kroeber 1992a).

(12) a.   qʷəz-t-és tékm us e s-zəl-zéɫt

    use-Tr-3TSu all   Cj Art Nom-Pl-dish

    '(S)he used all the dishes'

  b.   tékm e ntəqcíntn e cu-t-és   us

    all   Art door   Art fix-Tr-3TSu Cj

    '(S)he fixed all the doors'

  c.   tékm xe? e ɪək-st-és   us e sptékʷɫ

    all   ptc Art know-Tr-3TSu Cj Art story

    '(S)he knows all the stories'

---

³ For the use of the negative predicate təté? as a negative existential, compare:

(i) təté?   k qʷú? n e ɫkép

    not.exist Art water at Art pail

    'There's no water in the pail'

I will not try to come up with a unified account of the semantics of the Thompson conjunctive here; my concern is rather with the linear position of the conjunctive enclitic.

2. Position of the conjunctive enclitics

In general the pronominal and other enclitics of Thompson attach to the first element of the predicate part of the clause: if the predicate consists of a single word (the main predicate), the enclitic immediately follows that word; if an auxiliary (such as (u)ʔex Progressive or xʷuy' Future) or adverb (such as xʷúy'ceʔ 'again') precedes the main predicate, the enclitic immediately follows the auxiliary or adverb (Thompson and Thompson forthcoming: §31).

(13) a. ʔes-kəɬ-kəɬ-xán kʷ   n'
          Stv-Rdp-separate-foot 2sISu Q
          'Are you barefoot?', 'Do you have your shoes off?' (TL §31.3)

      b. xʷuy' kʷ n' nés
          Fut   2sISu Q go
          'Will you go?' (TL §31.3)

      c. (u)ʔéx kt   méwe-me
          Prog   1pISu gossip-Intr
          'We are gossiping' (TL §31.3)

      d. xʷúy'ceʔ kʷ   xʷuy' c'q'ʷ-ə́m
          again   2sISu Fut   write-Intr
          'You're going to write again'

Conjunctive enclitics likewise follow this pattern.

(14) a. ʔe   ʔéx us   nke X'əp tékɬ
          maybe Prog 3Cj Evid ptc rain
          'I suppose it's raining'

      b. púpn' kn   t [NP e k'ʷák'ʷxʷeʔ n e [S xʷuy' us n-ɬém'-ne
          find 1sISu Obl Art box   at Art Fut   Cj in-put.in-1sTSu
               e   xʷeʔpít]]
               Art clothes
          'I found a box to put the clothes in (that I would put the clothes in)'

In some subordinate-clauses, however, conjunctive enclitics precede the main predicate even though there is apparently no pre-predicate auxiliary or adverb.

(15) a. kn-t-éne [h   us cw-ə́m]
          help-Tr-1sTSu Det 3Cj work-Intr
          'I helped him when he was working'

      b. wík-ne tuw e [ws ʔúɬxʷ e k'ʷətn'íy]
          see-1sTSu from Det 3Cj enter Art mouse
          'I see (the place) where the mice are getting in'

One might suppose that the conjunctive enclitic is here attaching to the clause-initial or pre-clausal article; if so, such attachment would have to be optional, since examples of conjunctive clauses were cited earlier (8-11) wherein the conjunctive enclitic attaches to the main predicate rather than to an initial article or other introductory particle. In fact, a different analysis seems preferable: the apparently preposed conjunctive enclitics in sentences like (15) should be understood as encliticized to an optional zero allomorph of the Progressive auxiliary (u)ʔex.

(15') a. kn-t-éne [h   Ø   us cw-ə́m]
          help-Tr-1sTSu Det Prog 3Cj work-Intr

      b. wík-ne tuw e [Ø   ws ʔúɬxʷ e k'ʷətn'íy]
          see-1sTSu from Det Prog 3Cj enter Art mouse

There are two sorts of evidence for the analysis represented in (15'). First, 'preposed' conjunctive enclitics seem not to cooccur with an overt auxiliary (or pre-predicate adverb). It is a general rule of Thompson that there is never more than one auxiliary per predicate complex (Thompson and Thompson forthcoming: §31.3): thus, the complementary distribution between auxiliaries and 'preposed' conjunctive enclitics means that the 'preposed' clitics are acting as if they contained an implicit auxiliary.

Second, clauses with 'preposed' conjunctive enclitics typically have some sort of imperfective semantics that suggests the progressive. Note, for example, the contrast between the subordinate clauses of (16), which have postposed conjunctive enclitics and perfective (more exactly, momentaneous) semantics, and those of (17), with 'preposed' conjunctive enclitics and imperfective (sometimes durative, sometimes habitual) semantics.

(16) a. ʔe   X'uʔ xe s-q'mín-ci-me   [ɬ   yuʔ-yuʔs-xán' wn][4]
          then ptc Dem Nom-throw-1sOb-Pass Art Rdp-trip-foot 1sCj

---

[4] The 'main clause' predicate here is nominalized because subordinated to ʔe 'then'.

5

6

46

'I almost fell [lit. "was thrown"] when I tripped'

b.　n hén' k [q'mín-c-ɬ　　us]

at where Art throw-2sOb-Pass Cj

'Where did you fall?'

c.　u hén' k [ce-t-éxʷ us ɬ X'áxt]

at where Art put-Tr-2sTSu Cj Art sweet

'Where did you put the sugar?'

(17) a.　q?áz kn　[ɬ wn cwém]

tired 1sISu Art 1sCj work

'I got tired when I was working'

b.　n hén' k [uxʷ ʕʷóy't]

at where Art 2sCj sleep

'Where do you sleep?'

c.　u hén' k [us ce-t-éxʷ　e X'áxt]

at where Art Cj put-Tr-2sTSu Art sweet

'Where are youn putting the sugar?'

Although it remains to be seen whether the aspectual meaning of clauses with 'preposed' conjunctive enclitics precisely matches that of the Progressive auxiliary (u)?ex, there is certainly a good enough fit to make it plausible that subordinate clauses like those of (15, 17) contain a zero allomorph of that auxiliary to which the conjunctive enclitics attach (as in (15')), or at the very least that this is the diachronic source of the construction. (It would of course not be too surprising for the 'preposed clitic' construction to begin to develop its own semantics once the connection with the Progressive auxiliary was no longer obvious.)[5]

3. Subject-centered transitive relative clauses

Another place where conjunctive enclitics appear in an anomalous position is a construction that has not yet been discussed: certain transitive relative clauses. Although transitive relative clauses with object as target, and those with subject as target provided that the object is 1st or 2nd person, take indicative inflection as shown in (4) above, transitive relative clauses that have a 3rd person object but

---

[5] One should note too the rare morph x, appparently at least originally an allomorph of the Progressive auxiliary, which is occasionally found in non-conjunctive subordinate clauses and typically has some such meaning as 'habitual' (Thompson and Thompson forthcoming: §33.13).

(i)　taté? xe?e [kə x　　　s-?uqʷe?-t-íyxs　　e tíy]

not Dem Art Prog(?) Nom-drink-Tr-3pTSu Art tea

'They never drink tea' (TL §33.13)

7

whose subject is the target of relativization ('the man who saw him') take a special form, in Thompson as in Shuswap, Lillooet, and Bella Coola. (In Coast Salish languages, subject pronominals are simply omitted from all relative clauses with subject target, while in the Southern Interior Salish languages relative clauses seem to have exactly the same inflection as main clauses.) Such relative clauses in Bella Coola have a special inflectional ending that can be diachronically reconstructed as absence of a subject suffix (Kroeber 1991: 253-56),[6] and in Lillooet a special inflectional ending -ali(h) of obscure historical status is used (van Eijk 1985: 185ff.)—could it possibly have some connection with the 'topical object' suffixes discussed by Kinkade (1990)? In Thompson as in Shuswap, however (for which see Kuipers 1974: 83, Gardiner and Saunders 1990), the inflectional form of such relative clause predicates is constructed out of morphology used elsewhere in the language: instead of a subject suffix, the transitive predicate is given the Passive (or Impersonal, if you prefer) suffix -(é)m followed by the 3rd person conjunctive enclitic us.

(For typological comparability to the rest of Salish, I will continue to speak of these as 'subject-centered' relative clauses, even though their passive morphology suggests that the target is an oblique agent rather than a subject—the Thompson construction under discussion being functionally comparable to clearly non-passive constructions in many other languages of the family.)

(18) a.　wík-ne [NP ɬ　smúɬec [S pi?-p-st-ém　us c'y'é-s]]

see-1sTSu Art woman　　　lose-Inch-Tr-Pass Cj basket-3Po

'I saw the woman who lost her basket' (TL p.434f.)

b.　swét [NP k [S máʕ'-st-m us]]

who　Art break-Tr-Obl Cj

'Who broke it?'

c.　ncéwe? [NP e [S c'əq'ʷ-t-ém us ne?eɬ]

1sIndep　Art write-Tr-Pass Cj Dem

'It's me that wrote that'

This is a distinctive construction in at least two respects. First, it involves an unusual use of the passive. Cross-linguistically it seems well established that less oblique syntactic roles, such as subject and object, are more readily made the target of relativization than are more oblique syntactic roles, and

---

[6] In Bella Coola transitive relative clauses with subject target and 3rd person object, verbs inflected with the Plain Transitive paradigm replace normal object-plus-subject personal endings by a special ending -t (Nater 1984: 38, 54), evidently the Proto-Salish transitive suffix *-t or *-nt; the special ending for the Causative paradigm is -txʷ, clearly the word-final allomorph of the Causative transitive suffix -tu- that can be segmented out of the other forms of this paradigm (Nater 1984: 39, 54) and a reflex of the Proto-Salish Causative transitive suffix *-staw (cf. Newman 1980). Note that no subject pronominal elements follow the reconstructed transitive suffix in these relative clause forms, contrary to the normal main-clause inflection of transitive predicates in these languages. (The absence of an overt object pronominal suffix is expected, since 3rd person object is reconstructibly zero throughout Salish.)

8

moreover it is common for voice constructions such as passive to promote NPs from more oblique to less oblique syntactic positions so that they can be relativized (Keenan and Comrie 1977). But in the Thompson (and Shuswap) construction, the relativized NP appears to be demoted from the non-oblique role of transitive subject to the oblique role of agent in a passive construction. Note that subjects of transitive verbs are simple NPs—

(19) k'ixʷ-k'íxʷ-e-s e k'ʷətn'íy
      Rdp-gnaw-Tr-3TSu Art mouse
      'Mice gnaw (at) it'

—whereas agents of passive constructions are marked as oblique by the generic preposition t(ə).

(20) q'áy'-et-m t ə s-núk'ʷe?-s
      shoot-Tr-Pass Obl Art Nom-friend-3Po
      'He was shot by (his) friend' (TL §32.2)

Second, the conjunctive is used in a way not parallel to its other uses. Semantically, this use of the conjunctive has little specific in common with other uses of the conjunctive; though this is not a very significant fact given the heterogeneity of those other uses. More significantly, the enclitic us in transitive relative clauses with subject as target of relativization, unlike other instances of the conjunctive, is not mobile in position: it always attaches to the main predicate of the relative clause, even if auxiliaries precede that predicate.

(21) a. su-swét xe? [NP Ø [S xʷuy' kʷén-t-m us xe?é]]
          Pl-who ptc Art Fut take-Tr-Pass Cj ptc
          'Who will take it?'
      b. pzé-ne [NP ɬe [S ?ex cu-t-ém us (ə) noxʷúym'xʷ]]
          meet-1sTSu Art Prog make/fix-Tr-Pass Cj Art car
          'I met the man who was fixing the car'
      c. cu-t-és [NP ɬ [S xʷuy' xʷesít-st-m us]]
          make/fix-Tr-3TSu Art Fut travel-Tr-Pass Cj
          'He built what was going to convey him' (TL §36.12)

As (11a) and (14b) show, conjunctive enclitics do attach to pre-predicate auxiliaries in relative clauses with locative target: thus, non-mobility of the conjunctive enclitic is a property, not of conjunctives in relative

clauses, but specifically of the sequence -(é)m us used to mark transitive relative clauses with subject (agent) as target.

In the equivalent Shuswap construction, the conjunctive enclitic or suffix (w)əs is likewise not mobile in position, always attaching to the main predicate of the clause, but it is not exceptional in this respect since Shuswap appears to lack enclitics of mobile position (pronominal enclitics, at any rate)—a trait it shares with Southern Interior Salish languages. Shuswap, to be sure, lacks auxiliaries like those of Thompson, but does have some pre-predicate adverbs to which one might expect enclitics to attach (e.g. k'éməɬ 'but', also found in Thompson). The mobility of pronominal and other enclitics in Thompson— more exactly, the fact that they regularly occupy second position in the predicate complex—aligns Thompson with Lillooet and the Coast Salish languages. The special Thompson transitive relative clause construction thus does not match very well the usual ordering properties of the language, which makes one wonder if it might possibly have been borrowed from Shuswap, perhaps as a replacement for some other special morphology (such as reconstructable Bella Coola Ø or Lillooet -ali(h)) that earlier marked the predicates of such relative clauses. In any case, it would certainly be a mistake to seek some common ground between the 'conjunctive' in these relative clauses and the conjunctive in its other uses in Thompson: the morphosyntactic divergence between the two shows that synchronically they are not the same thing.

REFERENCES

Gardiner, Dwight, and Ross Saunders. 1990 (ms). 'On the grammatical status of Shuswap /-əs/.' Paper presented at the 25th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, 16-19 August, Vancouver, B.C.

Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. 'Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, pp. 63-99.

Kroeber, Paul. 1991. *Comparative syntax of subordination in Salish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

Kroeber, Paul. 1992a (ms). 'Preliminary remarks on the syntax of quantification in Thompson Salish.' Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia, 10 January.

Kroeber, Paul. 1992b (ms). 'Prehistory of Thompson Salish locative relative clauses.' Paper presented at the 28th annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 25 April.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. *The Shuswap language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Nater, H. F. 1984. *The Bella Coola language*. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper 92. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

Newman, Stanley S. 1980. 'Functional changes in the Salish pronominal system.' *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46, pp. 155-67.

Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson. .Forthcoming. *The Thompson language*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics.

van Eijk, Jan. 1985. *The Lillooet language*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

9

10