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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 w- 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’ ‘suffixed paradigm’); transitive predicates retain the subject suffixes, but add the 3rd person Conjunctive enclitic us, regardless of subject or object person. Each conjunctive enclitic transparently consists of an element w- plus a subject suffix.

*(Thompson fieldwork reported on here has been supported in part by grants from the Phillips Fund of the American Philosophical Society and from the Jacobs Research Funds (Whatcom Museum Foundation, Bellingham, Washington). Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson have provided much intellectual and practical support for fieldwork. Thanks are of course especially due to Kathy York, Mabel Joe, and the late Annie York for enduring my inquiries with patience and good humor. Needless to say, none of the above are responsible for any defects in this paper.

The following grammatical abbreviations are used in morpheme glosses in this paper: 1,2,3 = first, second, third person; Art = article; At = attributive; Cj = conjunctive; Dem = demonstrative; Fut = future; Hyp = hypothetical; Imp = imperative; Intr = intransitivizer; Irr = irrealis; ISu = subject of intransitive; Nom = nominalizer; Ob = oblique; p = plural; Pass = passive; Pl = plural; Po = possessive; Prog = progressive; pc = particle; Quot = quotation; Rdp = reduplication; Rn = relational; s = singular; Sbd = subordinator; Stv = stative; Tr = transitivizer; TSu = subject of transitive.

Abbreviation used in citation of examples: TL = Thompson and Thompson (forthcoming). Thompson examples without reference are from my field notes.

(1) Some Thompson pronominal paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSu</th>
<th>ISu</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Qi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>-n, -n</td>
<td>kn</td>
<td>n-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-t(n)ne</td>
<td>et</td>
<td>e?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-(e)w</td>
<td>kw</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-(e)p</td>
<td>kP</td>
<td>-ep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-(e)s</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>-iyxs</td>
<td>-iyxs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samples of these paradigms are given in (2).

(2) Intransitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Nominalized</th>
<th>Conjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nes kn</td>
<td>[go 1stSu]</td>
<td>'I go'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wile-c-n</td>
<td>[see-2Ob-1stSu]</td>
<td>'what I saw was a bear'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Nominalized</th>
<th>Conjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wile-c-n</td>
<td>[Nom-..]</td>
<td>'(that) I see you'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wile-c-n</td>
<td>[.. Cj]</td>
<td>'(if) I see you'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. pt-kw e q-w? té?
    oozes out Art water there
    'Water oozes out (there)'

b. q'ay'-e-s e s-nuk'-e-s
    shoot-Tr-3TSu Art Nom-friend-3Po
    'He shot his friend' (TL §32.1)

(4) a. sp-e= [np e [s wik-nell]]
    bear Art see-1stSu
    'It's a bear that I saw,' 'what I saw was a bear' (TL §36.14)

1 Number is only optionally distinguished in the third person.
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-ŋak-st-ēs [k n-n-nēs]
Stv-know-Tr-3TSu Art 1sPo-Nom-go
'He knows I went'
b. mūs [e ʔ-s-nīk'-ne]
four Art Nom-cut-1sTSu
'I cut it four times'

(6) a. cūt-x-cm-e [np t se?lis t [s ʔ-s-nīk'-n-xw]]
show-Ditr-1sOb-2sInv Art knife Art Nom-cut-Ts-2sTSu
'Show me the knife that you cut it with'
b. swēt [np e [s ʔ-s-wik-m]]
who Art 2aPo-Nom-sec-Intr
'Who did you see?'
c. wik-ne [np t noqw’uy’m’xw t [s ?ex s-cu-xi-cm-xw]]
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) ntem’ix us
get.in 3Cj
'Let him get in, May he get in!' (TL §21.3)

b. y’e-min-ne [np he se?lis t [s qʷawz-t-ēxw]]
good-Rm-1sTSu Art knife Art use-Tr-2sTSu
'I like the knife that you use(d)'

c. pūp’n kn t [np e w?ex t a [s xwuy’ kn-cēm-s]]
find 1sISu Obli Art someone2 Art Art fut help-1sOb-3TSu
'I found someone to help me'

The conjunctive 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).

(11) a. xw?p-ne [np t cītxʷ n t [fex wn t kiy̱e? us]]
seek-1sTSu Art house at Art exist 1sCj formerly
'I'm looking for the house I used to live in'
b. tatē’ n k [mice’q us e s?ixʷt ta sêytknmx’]3
not.exist at Art sit CJ Art some Art people
'There was no place for some of the people to sit' (TL §35.31)

3 For the use of the negative predicate tatē’ as a negative existential, compare:

(i) tatē’ k qʷ̱w’n e t kém 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
predicative 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)?ex Progressive or xwuy' Future) or adverb
(such as xwuy'ce? 'again') precedes the main predicate, the enclitic immediately follows the auxiliary or
adverb (Thompson and Thompson forthcoming: §31).

(13) a. ?es-kal-kal-xan k'w n'
Snv-Rdp-separate-foot 2sISu Q
'Are you barefoot?,' 'Do you have your shoes off?' (TL §31.3)
b. xwuy' k'w n' nês
Fut 2sISu Q go
'Will you go?' (TL §31.3)
c. (u)?êx kt méwe-me
Prog 1plSu gossip-Intr
'We are gossiping' (TL §31.3)
d. xwuy'ce? k'w xwuy' c'q'w'-ôm
again 2sISu Fut write-Intr
'You're going to write again'

Conjunctive enclitics likewise follow this pattern.

(14) a. ?e ?êx us nke X'ap tékt
maybe Prog 3Cj Evid ptc rain
'I suppose it's raining'
b. pûpn' kn t xep e k'wák'w xe? n e [s xwuy' us n-têm'-ne
find 1sISu Obl Art box at Art Fut Cj in-put.in-1sTSu
e xwê?pit] 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-êne [h us cw-ôm]
help-Tr-1sTSu Det 3Cj work-Intr
'I helped him when he was working'
b. wik-ne tuw e [ws sûtw e k'womat'îy]
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)?ex.

(15') a. kn-t-êne [h ø us cw-ôm]
help-Tr-1sTSu Det Prog 3Cj work-Intr
b. wik-ne tuw e [ø ws sûtw e k'womat'îy]
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. ?e X'u? xe? s-q'mín-ci-me [t yu?-yu?s-xân w'n]
then ptc Dem Nom-throw-1sOb-Pass Art Rdp-trip-foot 1sCj

* The 'main clause' predicate here is nominalized because subordinated to ?e 'then'.
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(17) a. q?áz kn [t w?n cw?m] tired
   b. n hén' k [u?x' s?̂owy't] at where Art 2sCj sleep
   c. u hén' k [us ce-t-éxw e X?x’t] at where Art Cj pu?-Tr-2sTSu Art sweet
   'Where do you sleep?' 'I got tired when I was working'
   'Where are you putting the sugar?' 'I almost fell [lit. "was thrown"] when I tripped'

Although it remains to be seen whether the aspecual meaning of clauses with 'preposed' conjunctive enclitics precisely matches that of the Progressive auxiliary (u)?ëx, 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 clinic' construction to begin to develop its own semantics once the connection with the Progressive auxiliary was no longer obvious.)

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 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), and in Lillooet a special inflectional ending -all(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 morphological use 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 nonpassive constructions in many other languages of the family.)

(18) a. wík-ne [n p? ñm?tec [s p?p-º-st-ºm us c'yê-s]]
   see-1sTSu Art woman lose-Inch-Tr-Pass Cj basket-3Po
   'I saw the woman who lost her basket' (TL p.434f.)
   b. swêt [n p k [s m?º-st-ºm us]]
   who Art break-Tr-Obj Cj
   'Who broke it?'
   c. neewei' [n p e [s c'aq'-º-ºm us ne?e]]
   1stIndep 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 -í (Nater 1984: 38, 54), evidently the Proto-Salish transitive suffix -*t or -*nt; the special ending for the Causative paradigm is -s13W, 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 -*s1aw (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.)

...
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'ixʷ-e-s e k'wən'ī'y
Rdp-gnaw-Tr-3TSu Art mouse
'Mice gnaw (at) it'

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

(20) q'áy'-et-m t a s-núk'weʔ-s
shoo-Tp-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 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'émət '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 reconstructible Bella Coola Ø or Lillooet -al(é.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


