

REMARKS ON PROTO-SALISH SUBJECT INFLECTION

HENRY DAVIS
UBC¹

This paper re-examines the morphosyntactic status and distribution of Proto-Salish subject pronominal markers. As such, it is meant as a contribution to the tradition of work embodied by Hoard (1971), Newman (1979, 1980), and Kroeber (1991). The principle claims to be defended here are the following:

- Proto-Salish had three clitic and one suffixal subject pronominal series, with the latter strictly confined to transitive sentences. This situation closely approximates that of the contemporary Northern Interior language Thompson.²
- In the Proto-Salish system, subject suffixes consistently co-occurred with an impersonal third person clitic taken from one of the three subject clitic series. Thus, transitive clauses invariably contained two inflectionally encoded subject positions. This pattern can be still observed to varying degrees in all Northern Interior and most Central Salish languages.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 1, I review previous comparative work on Salish subject inflection, and revise it in two respects. First, I demonstrate that the Proto-Salish possessive subject series consisted of clitics rather than affixes; and second, I argue that Proto-Salish had a previously unrecognized conjunctive clitic subject series.

In section 2, I turn to the distribution of the Proto-Salish subject pronominal series, and show that once we adopt the two-subject hypothesis for transitive clauses, the apparently skewed system of Proto-Salish subject inflection can be shown to be quite symmetrical, with intransitive subjects consistently represented by subject clitics and transitive subjects by a combination of impersonal subject clitics and subject suffixes.

¹ This study forms part of a larger investigation of subject pronominals across Salish. I would like to thank Beverly Frank, Gertie Ned, Laura Thevarg and Rose Whitley for providing the St'at'imcets data, and the late Dorothy Ursaki for help with nteʔkepməxčín. All unattributed examples were elicited from these speakers. I am also grateful for comments from Paul Kroeber, Lisa Matthewson, and Martina Wiltschko. This work has been partially supported by SSHRCC grant #410-95-1519.

² For ease of comparison with previous work, I will employ the traditional linguistic names for Salish languages here, rather than those employed by contemporary speakers. Thus, Thompson = nteʔkepməxčín, Lillooet = St'at'imcets, Shuswap = Secwepemčtsín, Squamish = Sqwəwú7mesh, and so on. Abbreviations are as follows: app=applicative, aux=auxiliary, caus=causative transitivizer, CnCl=conjunctive clitic, CS=Central (Coast) Salish, deic=deictic, det=determiner, exis=existential, foc=focus, fut=future, InCl=indicative subject clitic, intr=intransitivizer, irr=irrealis, loc=locative mid=middle, neg=negation, NIS=Northern Interior Salish, nom=nominalizer, Obj=object suffix, part=particle, pass=passive, PoAf=possessive affix, PoCl=possessive subject clitic, pl=plural, prog=progressive, prt=particle, Q=question particle, redup=reduplication, rfl=reflexive, sg=singular, SIS=Southern Interior Salish, SuSx=subject suffix, tr=transitivizer. A hyphen (-) indicates an affix boundary and an equals sign (=) indicates a clitic boundary. For the most part, I have retained the morpheme breakdowns of the original sources, except where directly relevant to the analysis at hand.

1.0. Previous work

Both Hoard (1971) and Newman (1979, 1980) reconstruct three series of subject pronominals for Proto-Salish.³ Newman's reconstruction is given below:⁴

	1s	2s	3s	1p	2p	3p
(1) Subject Clitic	*kən	*kəx ^w	*ø	*kət	*kəp	*ø
Possessive Affix	*n-	*ʔn-	*-s	*-it	*-lap	*-s
Subject Suffix	*-an	*-ax ^w	*-as	*-at	*-ap	*-as

As can be seen in (1), Newman and Hoard distinguish between a set of Subject Clitics and two sets of subject affixes, one exclusively suffixal (the Subject Suffix series) and the other, formally identical to the Possessive affix series employed with nominal possessors, consisting of both prefixes and suffixes.

I will suggest two principle modifications to Newman's reconstruction. First, I will argue that the Proto-Salish possessive subject series consisted of clitics, rather than affixes. Second, I will propose a fourth, hitherto unrecognized Proto-Salish subject paradigm, the *conjunctive clitic* (CnCl) series. Together, these modifications entail that Proto-Salish had three clitic and one affixal series, rather than the one clitic and two affixal series reconstructed by Newman.

However, before turning to the details of the analysis, there is one important prerequisite to take care of. Since much of the argumentation for a reevaluation of Proto-Salish subjects hinges on the distinction between clitics and affixes, we need to develop independent and cross-linguistically consistent criteria for the clitic-affix distinction in Salish.

1.1. Clitics versus affixes

There are four potential sources for such criteria. The first is prosodic - Salish affixes always form part of the same prosodic domain as the stem to which they are attached, whereas clitics may form part of a separate prosodic domain.⁵ The second is morphological: clitics will always attach outside of any affixal material, so if a morpheme can be independently identified as an affix, any morphological material inside it will also be affixal, whereas if a morpheme can be independently identified as a clitic, all bound morphemes outside of it will also be clitics. The third criterion is syntactic - affixes always occupy a position which is fixed relative to a particular syntactic head, whereas clitics are mobile - they will attach to the first or last appropriate head in a given phrasal domain. Finally, a semantic criterion can be constructed on the

³ Excluding 'independent' pronouns, which are predicative and thus quite different in syntactic behaviour from pronominal clitics and affixes. See Newman (1977).

⁴ As far as the phonological forms of the pronominals are concerned, most of the details of this reconstruction are uncontroversial. The exceptions are: (i) the reconstruction of schwa instead of [a] for the vowel in the clitic series; (ii) the first and second person plural clitic and possessive forms, which are subject to considerable overlap across the Salish family. Since phonological reconstruction is orthogonal to the major concerns of this paper, I take no hard and fast position on these issues here.

⁵ Or domains. In many Salish languages there are two or more kinds of clitic, with different prosodic and syntactic properties. See Davis (1997) for discussion.

basis of the generalization that clitics are frequently semantically independent from their prosodic hosts, whereas affixes are usually both phonologically and semantically dependent on their hosts.

In practice, within any given Salish language a combination of several of these criteria is necessary to establish the clitic-affix distinction, with the combination varying from language to language.⁶ However, within a comparative Salishan context, we need to find cross-linguistically reliable and consistent criteria, even when these do not necessarily provide the strongest evidence for every individual language. Of the four options outlined above, the third (syntactic mobility) seems the most promising in this respect. Prosodic criteria are useful within a language, but are highly variable across the Salish family, and thus of limited utility cross-linguistically. Morpheme ordering is reliable and consistent, but dependent on the prior identification of at least some morphemes as either clitics or affixes. Semantic in/dependence is at best an approximate indicator of clitic/affix status. Syntactic mobility, on the other hand, gives us a test which is both independent and cross-linguistically consistent. I will therefore adopt the following *clitic mobility criterion*:

Clitic mobility criterion:

- (i) If a bound pronominal occupies a variable position relative to a given predicate, it is a clitic.
- (ii) Otherwise, it is an affix.

The clitic mobility criterion allows us to employ the widespread Salish auxiliary construction as a diagnostic for clitic/affix status, since in languages with auxiliaries, clitic pronouns may attach to the first of a string of pre-predicate auxiliaries, whereas affixal pronouns always remain attached to the main predicate.⁷ This is illustrated in the Lillooet (NIS) examples below: the main clause cases in (2) show the variable position of (indicative) subject (en-)clitics, while the clefted examples in (3) show the fixed position of (subordinate) subject suffixes.⁸

⁶ And from linguist to linguist. For example, van Eijk treats indicative subject clitics in Lillooet as suffixes on primarily phonological grounds, since they contrast with another (prosodically defined) set of enclitics with respect to their ability to attract stress from a weak root (van Eijk 1997: 264, fn 3). According to the criteria adopted here, however, indicative subjects qualify as *bona fide* enclitics on the basis of their syntactic mobility.

⁷ There is disagreement (much of it terminological) as to what constitutes an auxiliary in Salish (see Kinkade 1992 for a careful evaluation). For the present purposes, however, an auxiliary may be defined as any predicative element which is not independently inflected for tense, mood, or agreement, and which forms a monoclausal unit with another (independently inflected) predicate. This definition is broad enough to include, besides typical aspectual and modal auxiliaries, predicates of motion and location and various adverbial elements.

⁸ While the generalization that clitics are mobile while affixes are immobile holds in all languages under discussion, the actual position of the subject clitic relative to a string of auxiliaries varies from language to language and even from dialect to dialect. In many languages, including Halkomelem, Squamish, Thompson, and Lower Lillooet, an indicative clitic may either precede or follow an initial auxiliary, with a concomitant (but cross-linguistically variable) difference in interpretation. In others, the position of the clitic is fixed: for example, in Upper Lillooet, it is always encliticized to the first auxiliary. In still others, a subject clitic may appear variably attached to either an auxiliary or the main predicate, as in Columbian Salish (M.D. Kinkade, p.c.).

(2) *Clitic subject pronoun (Indicative Clitic):*

- a. ?áčx-ən=kan ti=n-šnuḵʷ=a
see-tr=1sgInCl det=1sgPoAf-friend=exis
"I saw my friend." (Lillooet)
- b. čixʷ=kan ?áčx-ən ti=n-šnuḵʷ=a
went(aux)=1sgInCl see-tr det=1sgPoAf-friend=exis
"I went to see my friend." (Lillooet)
- c. plán=kan čixʷ ?áčx-ən ti=n-šnuḵʷ=a
already(aux)=1sgInCl went(aux) see-tr det=1sgPoAf-friend=exis
"I already went to see my friend." (Lillooet)

(3) *Affixal subject pronoun (Subject Suffix):*

- a. níḥ ti=n-šnuḵʷ=a ti=?áčx-ən-an=a
foc det=1sgPoAf-friend=exis det=see-tr-1sgSuSx=exis
"It's my friend I saw." (Lillooet)
- b. níḥ ti=n-šnuḵʷ=a ti=čixʷ=a ?áčx-ən-an
foc det=1sgPoAf-friend=exis det=went(aux)=exis see-tr-1sgSuSx
"It's my friend I went to see." (Lillooet)
- c. níḥ ti=n-šnuḵʷ=a ti=plán=a čixʷ ?áčx-ən-an
foc det=1sgPoAf-friend=exis det=already(aux)=exis went(aux) see-tr-1sgSuSx
"It's my friend I already went to see." (Lillooet)

Similar contrasts exist in all languages with auxiliaries, which include all the Central Salish languages, two out of the three Northern Interior languages, Upper Chehalis, and (more marginally) at least some Southern Interior languages. Examples are given below from Thompson (NIS), Squamish and Halkomelem (CS):

(4)a. *Subject Clitic:*

cúʔ=kʷ=ḥ=ḥəṭ ýe-wíʔx
little(aux)=2sgInCl=Q=now good-become
"Are you a little better now?" (Thompson: Thompson and Thompson 1992: 143)

b. *Subject Suffix:*

ʔuʔex čiw-n-uxʷ ha=smiyč
prog(aux) cut-tr-2sgSuSx det=deer/meat
"You are cutting the deer/the meat." (Thompson)

(5)a. *Subject Clitic:*

wa=čəx^w nsʔi k^wi=ʔəs=wa ničim
 prog(aux)=2sgInCl loud det=2sgPoCl=prog(aux) talk
 "You are loud when you talk." (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 185)

b. *Subject Suffix:*

na wa cún-t-c-as ʔi mʔi-ʔan
 loc(aux) prog(aux) tell-tr-1sgObj-3SuSx aux come-1sgSuSx
 "He was telling me to come here." (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 200)

(6)a. *Subject Clitic:*

me=cəl ɬək^w
 come(aux)=1sgInCl home
 "I'm coming home." (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 360)

b. *Subject Suffix (third person only):*

me k^wʔ:θ-áxʔ-əs
 come(aux) take-tr-1sgObj-3SuSx
 "He came to take me." (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 360)

Obviously, in languages without auxiliaries, the mobility criterion is far less useful. Such languages include Shuswap (NIS: see Davis, Lai and Matthewson 1997), most of the SIS languages, Bella Coola, and Tillamook. In these cases, we must fall back on more indirect evidence involving prosody, semantics, and/or morpheme ordering. For example, indicative subjects in Shuswap follow the question particle, which is generally regarded as an enclitic on prosodic and semantic grounds (Gardiner 1993). It follows via the morpheme ordering criterion that the indicative subject markers must also have enclitic status.

1.2. Possessive Subjects are Clitics

With relatively robust criteria now in place to distinguish affixes from clitics, we are in a position to reassess the status of the Proto-Salish subject series as proposed by Newman. We begin with the possessive subject paradigm, regarded by Newman as consisting of an affixal series.

My first move here is to distinguish two different types of possessive pronominal which have often been conflated in the literature. I will name them *pure possessors* and *possessive subjects*. Pure possessors, which modify nouns in NP, are always optional and may occur affixed to a nominal predicate. Possessive subjects, which occur in various types of nominalized clause, are obligatory and never occur on predicate nominals. These contrasts are illustrated by the (Upper) Lillooet examples below. (7a) and (7b) show that the predicate ʔáma "good" may take a nominal complement (here containing the derived noun š-ʔíʔən "food") either with or without a pure possessor. (8a) shows that the same predicate may also take a nominalized clausal complement (here

containing the verb ʔíʔən "eat"). (8b) shows that under the clausal interpretation a possessive subject is obligatory.

Nominal complement with optional pure possessor

(7)a. ʔáma ta=š-ʔíʔən-š=a
 good det=nom-eat-3PoAf=exis
 "His/her food is good." (Lillooet)

b. ʔáma ta=š-ʔíʔən=a
 good det=nom-eat=exis
 "The food is good." (Lillooet)

Clausal complement with obligatory possessive subject

(8)a. ʔáma ta=š-ʔíʔən-š=a
 good det=nom-eat=3PoCl=exis
 "It is good that he/she ate." (Lillooet)

b.* ʔáma ti=š-ʔíʔən=a
 good det=nom-eat=exis
 no clausal interpretation (Lillooet)

In (9) and (10), I contrast possessors in argument and predicate position. (9) illustrates that possessors are ambiguous when they modify the arguments of predicates which take either a nominal or clausal complement (here ʔáx mīh, "to want"). (10) shows that when these arguments are made into predicate nominals, the ambiguity disappears: only the nominal reading (with a pure possessor) and not the clausal reading (with a possessive subject) survives.

(9)a. *Nominal complement with pure possessor*

ʔáx-mīh=ʔkax^w=ha k^w=n-š-ʔíʔən
 desire-app=2sgInCl=Q det=1sgPoAf-nom-eat
 "Is it my food you want?" (Lillooet)

b. *Clausal complement with possessive subject*

ʔáx-mīh=ʔkax^w=ha k^w=n-š-ʔíʔən
 desire-app=2sgInCl=Q det=1sgPoCl=nom=eat
 "Do you want me to eat?" (Lillooet)

(10)a. *Predicate nominal with pure possessor*

n-š-ʔíʔən=ha k^wu=ʔáx-mīh-əx^w
 1sgPoAf-nom-eat=Q det=desire-app-2sgSuSx
 "Is it my food you want?" (Lillooet)

b. *Predicate nominal with possessive subject*

- * $n=š=ʔf̥tən=ha$ $k^w u=xáʔ-míh-ax^w$
 1sgPoCl=nom=eat=Q det=desire-app-2sgSuSx
 no clausal interpretation⁹ (Lillooet)

As far as I can tell, these contrasts hold throughout Salish. Thus, Hukari (1977: 66) cites Halkomelem cases of nominal predicates with possessive inflection parallel to those in (9) and (10), and Kroeber (1991: 270) gives further examples from Squamish, Halkomelem, Lushootseed and Thompson.

We are now ready to investigate the clitic-affix status of possessive subjects, as opposed to pure possessors. Recall that both are treated by Newman as affixal. However, it turns out that in all Salish languages where evidence is available, the following generalization holds:

- *Possessive pronouns are clitics only if they represent clausal subjects.*

This yields contrasts such as the following, from Lillooet:

(11)a. *Pure possessive affix*

- ...t(i)=wəʔ $n-š-čut$
 ...det=prog(aux) 1sgPoAf-nom-say
 "...what I'm saying" (Lillooet: van Eijk 1997: 154)

b. *Possessive subject clitic:*

- ...t(i)=n=š=wəʔ $čut$
 ...det=1sgPoCl=nom=prog(aux) say
 "...the fact that I'm saying" (Lillooet: van Eijk 1997: 154)

In (11a), the possessive pronominal (and the nominalizer *š-*) are affixed to a noun (the main predicate of the relative clause), and cannot attach to the pre-predicative auxiliary. In (11b), on the other hand, the possessive pronominal is a proclitic clausal subject, and therefore may (and must) attach to the front of the pre-predicative auxiliary. Thus the clitic mobility criterion clearly distinguishes between pure possessors, which are affixes, and possessive subjects, which are clitics.

Again, the data in other Salish languages with auxiliaries parallels the Lillooet cases exactly, as far as I am able to ascertain. Kroeber (1991: 273) makes this point explicitly for Comox, Squamish and Halkomelem. Examples of possessive subject clitics are given below from Thompson, Squamish, and Halkomelem; in all these cases, the clitic is attached to a pre-predicative auxiliary rather than the main predicate, like indicative subject clitics and unlike subject suffixes (compare (4-6) above).

⁹ The reason for this contrast is that predicate phrases are by definition unsaturated, and as such must maintain an open external argument position. Clauses, on the other hand, are by definition saturated, and thus have no open position. Hence a clause cannot be a predicate, and by hypothesis, possessive clitics (which are clausal subjects) cannot occur in predicate positions.

(12) *Possessive subject clitic*

- a. $ʔuʔ$ $ʔe=s=x^w ūy^w=s$ $x^w əsx^w esf̥t$
 prt det=nom=going.to(aux)=3PoCl travel
 "So he was going to travel" (Thompson: Thompson and Thompson 1992: 200)
- b. na $cút-wít$ $k^w=n=s=na$ wa $sáyʔiʔn$
 loc(aux) say-3pl det=1sgPoCl=nom=loc(aux) prog(aux) audible
 "They said that I was audible now and then." (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 187)
- c. $k^w=s=mí=s$ $técəɫ$ $k^w θə$ $mástéyex^w$
 det=nom=come(aux)=3PoCl arrive det person
 "...when that person got here"
 (Halkomelem (Downriver dialect): Suttles n.d; cited in Kroeber 1991: 83)

To summarize: syntactic evidence points to two distinct but homophonous possessive series in Salish. The first, associated with nominalized clauses, consists of clitics; the second, associated with nouns (including nominal predicates in relative clauses) consists of affixes.

1.3. *The Conjunctive Clitic Series*

In this section, I will introduce and motivate a previously unrecognized Proto-Salish subject pronominal paradigm, the conjunctive clitic series. The term 'conjunctive' is a traditional one in Salish linguistics. However, its use is confusing, since it is often used to refer to pronominals in two distinct environments. On the one hand, it refers to a set of subject *suffixes* employed in transitive (often subordinate) clauses of all types; on the other, it refers to a set of subject *clitics* which occur in subjunctive contexts, including negated, hypothetical and optative clauses.¹⁰

The reason for this confusion is quite simple, and closely parallels the confusion over the status of possessive pronominals discussed in the previous section: in many languages (including virtually all CS languages and the NIS language Lillooet) conjunctive clitics and subject suffixes are homophonous.¹¹

However, just as with possessive pronouns, there are good reasons to separate the two series. To start with, in the NIS languages Thompson and Shuswap, conjunctives

¹⁰ In fact, conjunctives are quite frequently referred to as 'subjunctives' in the Salish literature: see van Eijk (1997), Galloway (1993). See also Kroeber (1991: Part I) for an extensive survey of clause types in Salish.

¹¹ Of previous studies, Kroeber (1991) comes closest to recognizing conjunctive clitics as distinct from subject suffixes. However, instead of distinguishing different *paradigms*, Kroeber distinguishes three pronominal *orders* (plain, conjunctive, and nominalized) where an order is used "to label inflectional patterns whose distribution is determined with reference to the status of clauses as subordinate or non-subordinate or as a particular kind of subordinate clause." This notion allows Kroeber to add a further syntactic dimension to the description of Salish subject pronominals, namely that of clause type. However, 'order' is itself problematic, since it neither refers to a purely syntactic configuration nor to a morphological paradigm. In fact, once we characterize the nature of Salish subject inflection correctly, we can eliminate the need for reference to pronominal orders altogether.

and subject suffixes are phonologically distinct: the conjunctive series contains a distinctive initial *w-* (frequently vocalized to *u-* in Thompson, and deleted in Shuswap: see Kuipers 1974, Thompson and Thompson 1992, Kroeber 1992, Gardiner 1993). This *w-* is entirely lacking in the suffixal paradigm, as shown in the examples below from Thompson (13) and Shuswap (14):

(13)a. *Conjunctive Clitic*:¹²

ʔex=xεʔ=ʔuʔ=teʔ ʔé wn kʷxʷ-ám
 prog=prt=still=? good 1sgCnCl basket.make-mid
 "It is still good when I make baskets i.e. I can still make baskets."
 (Thompson: Thompson and Thompson 1992: 143)

b. *Subject Suffix*:

ʔép-ne he=swet=us e=wík-ne
 forget-1sgSuSx det=who=3CnCl det=see-1sgSuSx
 "I forgot who I saw."
 (Thompson: Kroeber 1991: 118)

(14)a. *Conjunctive Clitic*:

wʔεx ʔ=ʔxʔεʔ=wn
 exist det=go(redup)=1sgCnCl
 "I am going."
 (Shuswap: Gardiner 1993: 35)

b. *Subject Suffix*:

m-wíwk-t-n
 past-see(redup)-tr-1sgSuSx
 "I saw it."
 (Shuswap: Gardiner 1993: 35)

There is good reason to suppose that the Thompson/Shuswap pattern is not an innovation, but in fact represents the original Proto-Salish situation. This is because a reflex of the *w-* (*gʷ-*) shows up in the conjunctive paradigm in Tillamook, the southernmost of the CS languages and thus at the extreme opposite periphery of Salish territory from the NIS languages. Tillamook, like Thompson and Shuswap, clearly differentiates subject suffixes from conjunctive clitics, as shown in (15):

(15)a. *Conjunctive Clitic*:

cl gʷəʔ tət-əwí-st gʷən, ...
 if fut leave-app-rfl 1sgCnCl
 "If I go away,..."
 (Tillamook: Egedal and Thompson 1996: 147)

¹² Note that conjunctive clitics in Thompson, like indicative clitics, may precede the main predicate whether or not they are themselves preceded by an auxiliary. See Kroeber (1992).

b. *Subject Suffix*:

gʷəʔ tət-əwí-st-í
 fut leave-app-rfl-1sgSuSx
 "I am going away."
 (Tillamook: Egedal and Thompson 1996: 147)

This strongly suggests a Proto-Salish origin for a *w-* initial conjunctive paradigm.

Further evidence for the conjunctive clitic/subject suffix distinction is provided by their morphosyntactic behaviour. Even where the two series are morphophonologically neutralized, as in Lillooet and all the CS languages except Tillamook, they may still be distinguished by syntactic position. In particular, in languages with auxiliaries, the conjunctive clitic shows up preceding the main predicate, just like indicative and possessive clitics, whereas, as we have already seen, subject suffixes remain fixed to the main predicate. This is shown for Lillooet, Squamish and Halkomelem in (16-18), respectively.

(16) *Conjunctive Clitic*:

a. ...t=wáʔ=an xáʔ-míh
 if=prog(aux)=1sgCnCl desire-app
 "...if I want (it)."
 (Lillooet)

b. ...ʔí=w=an waʔ ʂkʷúkwʷmíʔt
 when=prog(aux)=1sgCnCl prog(aux) child
 "...when I was a child..."
 (Lillooet: van Eijk 1997: 153)

(17) *Conjunctive Clitic*:¹³

a. háw q=w=ʔan námʔ q=ʔas ʔátmʔxʷ kʷáylas
 not irr=prog(aux)=1sgCnCl go irr=3CnCl rain tomorrow
 "I won't go if it is raining tomorrow."
 (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 192)

b. xʷuʔáxʷ q=ʔan ʔíh
 not.yet irr=1sgCnCl eat
 "I haven't eaten yet."
 (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 190)

(18) *Conjunctive Clitic*:

a. ...wə=íʔ=s l-sáí
 if=aux=3CnCl 1sgPoAf-desire
 "...if I want it." (i.e. "...if it is my desire.")
 (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 186)

¹³ Note that the conjunctive clitic in (17b) is attached to the irrealis subordinating conjunction *q=*, which, unlike typical Salish auxiliaries, is clearly non-predicative. I suspect that there is an elided progressive auxiliary *wə* in these examples. Partial support for this speculation is provided by examples where a reduced form of *wə* surfaces next to *q=*, as in (17a).

- b. ʔáwə=cəl ɪf=ɪ sʔíʔəqəʔ
 not=1sgInCl aux=1sgCnCl child
 "I wasn't a child." (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 185)

To summarize: there is strong evidence that we must distinguish a set of conjunctive subject clitics from a set of subject suffixes even in languages where phonological differences between the two sets have been neutralized.

1.4. A Revised Reconstruction of Proto-Salish Subject Inflection

We can now revise Newman's reconstruction of Proto-Salish subject inflection to include three sets of clitic pronouns (the Indicative, the Possessive, and the Conjunctive) and a single set of suffixes. The revised reconstruction is given below:¹⁴

	1s	2s	3s	1p	2p	3p
Indicative Clitic ¹⁵	*=kan	*=kax ^w	*∅	*=kat	*=kap	*∅
Possessive Clitic	*n=	*ʔn=	*=s	*=ɬ=	*=lap	*=s
Conjunctive Clitic	*=wan	*=wax ^w	*=was	*=wat	*=wap	*=was
Subject Suffix	*-an	*-ax ^w	*-as	*-at	*-ap	*-as

Note that the indicative clitic and conjunctive clitic forms appear to be constructed from the subject suffix forms by the addition of an initial consonant (*k-* in the indicative series and *w-* in the conjunctive series). This has been observed previously - see Newman (1979-80), Thompson (1979), Kroeber (1991), Thompson and Thompson (1992) - and has led several investigators to conclude - surely correctly - that the indicative and conjunctive forms are diachronically complex.¹⁶ However, there is to my knowledge no evidence in any Salish language to support a *synchronic* division between the initial consonant and the person-marker.¹⁷ We will therefore treat these forms as simplex in Proto-Salish, though probably complex in Pre-Proto-Salish.

¹⁴ I have replaced the schwa of Newman's reconstruction with a full vowel [a], since it reflects more clearly the relationship between conjunctive and indicative clitics and subject suffixes. See footnote (3) above.

¹⁵ I have renamed the 'Subject Clitic' series *Indicative Clitics*, since given that three of the four subject series consist of clitics, the traditional terminology is uninformative.

¹⁶ Thompson (1979) suggests that *k-* and *w-* may have originally been Pre-Proto-Salish auxiliaries, which over the course of time were reduced to affixal status; this seems as good a speculation as any for the origin of these forms. The original form of *k-* may well have been **k-*, which still surfaces in Lillooet; Kinkade (1995) relates the existence of the 'empty morphemes' *w-* and *ɬ-* in Upper Chehalis to PS **w-* and **k-* respectively.

¹⁷ Pace Kuipers (1967, 1974) who treats the subject clitic (*k-*) series in Squamish and Shuswap as consisting of the root *č-/k-* "to do" (the former palatalized from **k-*) plus a subject suffix. I know of no synchronic evidence in Squamish, Shuswap or anywhere else to support such a contention.

2. Subject doubling and the distribution of subject pronouns in Proto-Salish

I now turn to the syntactic distribution of the various subject series in (19). It is a fairly safe bet to assume that all Proto-Salish intransitive clauses were characterized by one of the subject clitic series (whose distribution is determined by clause-type). This generalization holds exceptionlessly in all contemporary CS languages (with the exception of Tillamook) as well as in Lillooet and Thompson of the NIS subgroup; moreover, it holds partially in Shuswap (NIS), the SIS languages, Upper Chehalis (Tsamosan) and Tillamook. This leaves only Bella Coola as an absolute exception.

Turning to transitive clauses, it is also relatively clear (though partially obscured by historical developments in CS and Tsamosan) that in Proto-Salish all transitives were characterized by subject suffixes. This situation is evidenced in contemporary Salish by all Interior Salish languages save Lillooet, as well as by Bella Coola.¹⁸

This gives us a distribution of pronominal series such as that in (20), which is based on that of Kroeber (1991: 64), but incorporates the modifications introduced above in Section 1:

	intransitive	transitive
Indicative	InCl	SuSx
Nominalized	PoCl	SuSx
Conjunctive	CnCl	SuSx

Note that the introduction of the conjunctive clitic paradigm and the treatment of possessive subjects as clitics enable us to provide a fairly simple and symmetrical picture of Proto-Salish subject inflection. This contrasts with the skewed distribution entailed by the original Newman reconstruction, where subject suffixes appeared in both transitive and intransitive environments, and intransitive possessive subjects were affixes.

However, this is not the end of the story. In this section, I will show that, rather than replacing clitics in transitive clauses, subject suffixes actually cooccurred with them. More specifically, I will claim that all Proto-Salish transitive clauses were expletive constructions - that is, they contained an impersonal subject clitic with the default features of third person singular, doubling a subject suffix which was fully specified for person features.

Strange though this claim may be, it is straightforwardly supported by data from several Salish languages, from both the Interior and Central branches, and is in fact virtually identical to the subject pronominal system of contemporary Thompson. We will examine some of this evidence in the next subsection, which is a much-abbreviated version of the extensive cross-linguistic survey in Davis (1998).

¹⁸ See Davis (1998) for more extensive justification.

2.1. Evidence for Subject Doubling

The clearest evidence for the existence of an expletive subject clitic in transitive clauses shows up in Thompson, where the clitic is overtly realized in both conjunctive and possessive paradigms. As might be expected, in auxiliary constructions with conjunctive and possessive clitics, the clitic attaches to the auxiliary and the suffix to the main verb:

(21) 3 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Conjunctive Clitic:

c/me+us kek-st-és e=nyémítn-s e=séme?
begin(aux)=3CnCl bring-tr-3SuSx det=religion-3PoAf det=white.man
 "When the white men first brought their religion."
 (Thompson and Thompson 1992: 143)

(22) 1/2 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Possessive Clitic:

a. *cut xe? k s=x^wuy=s milt-m-ne*
say deic det nom=fut(aux)=3pPoCl visit-rel(tr)-1sgSuSx
 "She thinks I'm going to visit him/her." (Thompson: Kroeber 1997: 394)

b. *teté? k s=x^wuy=s we?e ce-t-éne*
not det nom=fut(aux)=3pPoCl there put-tr-1sgSuSx
 "I'm not going to put it there." (Thompson: Kroeber 1997: 394)

The coexistence of transitive subject suffixes with third person conjunctive and possessive clitics invites an obvious extension to third person indicative clitics. Of course, in this case the co-occurrence of the clitic with a transitive subject will be phonologically invisible, since the third person indicative clitic form is zero. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that doubling occurs here as well, on grounds of parallelism and conceptual economy. I will therefore assume that an impersonal subject clitic occurs in *all* sentences with a transitive subject in Thompson, and by hypothesis in Proto-Salish.

Though lacking auxiliaries, Thompson's NIS neighbour Shuswap also provides clear evidence for the existence of two subject positions in the transitive conjunctive paradigm, where an impersonal third person clitic follows the subject suffix ending.¹⁹

(23) 1/2 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Conjunctive Clitic:

a. *?ex γ=c-mat-st-ét-n=as*
prog det=loc-feed-caus(tr)-redup-1sgSuSx=3CnCl
 "I am feeding him." (Shuswap: Kuipers 1974: 80)

¹⁹ On the other hand, possessives never double subject suffixes in Shuswap. In fact, possessives may themselves be doubled by conjunctive clitics: see Kuipers(1974: 80) and Davis (1998) for details.

b. *tlayéy me? wík-t-x=was*
deic part see-tr-2sgSuSx=3CnCl
 "You can see him from there."

(Shuswap: Kuipers 1974: 84)

In Lillooet, the third NIS language, there is also clear evidence of subject doubling in both conjunctive and possessive paradigms. Lillooet, however, shows some innovations more typical of its CS neighbours Squamish, Halkomelem and Sechelt. In particular, unlike in Thompson and Shuswap, subject doubling with conjunctives is confined to third person transitive clauses. In first and second person environments, the intransitive subject clitic entirely replaces the NIS expletive clitic plus subject suffix pattern. In possessives, both patterns are available: either a third person expletive possessive clitic doubles a first or second person subject suffix, as in Thompson, or a first or second person possessive clitic replaces the expletive construction, as in CS languages.

Third person doubling cases with conjunctives and possessives are shown in (24) and (25), respectively. Once again, note the positions of the clitic and suffixal subjects with respect to the pre-predicative auxiliary.

(24) 3 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Conjunctive Clitic:

... t=wá? =aš x^way-s-áš ta=šmú+ač=a
... if=prog(aux)=3CnCl love-caus-3SuSx det=woman=exis
 "... if he loved the woman" (Lillooet)

(25)a. 1/2 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Possessive Clitic:

... ni+ t=š=píán=š=a ?áčx-ən(-θ)-ən
foc det=nom=already(aux)=3PoCl=exis see-tr(-3Obj)-1sgSuSx
 "...because I have already seen him" (Lillooet)

b. 3 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Possessive Clitic:

... ni+ t=š=píán=š=a ?áčx-ən-č-aš
foc det=nom=already(aux)=3PoCl=exis see-tr-1sgObj-3SuSx
 "...because he has already seen me" (Lillooet)

The CS languages Squamish and Halkomelem also show subject doubling in a limited range of cases involving third person transitive conjunctive and possessive clauses.²⁰ Conjunctive cases are given in (26) and possessives in (27):

(26) 3 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Conjunctive Clitic:

a. *q=?as pih?-nəx^w-as*
irr=3CnCl get-tr-3SuSx
 "If he gets it." (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 192)

²⁰ Similar evidence is also available in Sechelt; see Beaumont (1985), Davis (1998).

- b. ʔáwə ɪf=s ʔíɫ-sθ-àxʷ-əs
not aux=3CnCl like-caus-1sgObj-3SuSx
"S/he didn't like me." (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 186)

(27) 3 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Possessive Clitic:

- a. na wa ʔáh sqʷáɫwan-s kʷɪs=i=s
ptc prog sore heart-3PoAf det=nom=aux=3PoCl
túy-nt-as kʷəci lamʔ-s
leave-tr-3SuSx det house-3PoAf
"He was sorry to have left his house." (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 186)
- b. xət kʷ s=ʔeʔə=s wət xʷqpeqə-t-əs
say det nom=too(aux)=3PoCl already close-tr-3SuSx
"He said he would close it a little bit."
(Halkomelem (Island (Cowichan) dialect): Hukari et al. 1977, line 322)

In first and second person transitive nominalized clauses, Squamish shows an even more interesting variation. Here, Squamish employs both clitics and suffixes, with the same person specifications, as shown in (28).

(28) 1/2 Subject Suffix doubling with 1/2 Possessive Clitic:

- ...ʔn=s=čáw-at-an
1sgPoCl=nom=help-tr-1sgSuSx
"... (that) I help him..." (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 91)

This 'copy pattern' provides additional important evidence for the hypothesis that there are two distinct subject positions in Salish, the inner represented by a suffix and the outer by a clitic; like the expletive pattern, the copy pattern shows both positions being overtly occupied in the same clause.

To conclude: in a number of languages from both major branches of Salish, there is clear evidence for two simultaneously occupied subject positions in transitive clauses, the outer an impersonal clitic taken from one of the three clitic paradigms, the inner a suffix taken from the transitive suffixal paradigm. If - as argued by Davis (1998) this represents the Proto-Salish system, then we can further revise our reconstruction of the distribution of Proto-Salish subject pronominals, as in (29):

	intransitive	transitive
Plain	InCl	Expletive 3InCl + SuSx
Nominalized	PoCl	Expletive 3PoCl + SuSx
Conjunctive	CnCl	Expletive 3CnCl + SuSx

Under this conception, transitives in Proto-Salish were uniformly characterized by the expletive pattern, in which an impersonal third person clitic taken from one of the three clitic series doubled a subject suffix. Though all contemporary Salish languages except Thompson deviate in varying degrees from this pattern, these deviations are explicable

in terms of well-defined historical changes, and relics of the Proto-Salish pattern are readily detectable in many members of the family.

REFERENCES

- Beaumont, Ronald (1985). *she shashilhalem: The Sechelt Language*. Penticton, BC: Theytus Books.
- Davis, Henry (1997). 'Against the Clitic String'. Paper presented at the Victoria Workshop on Salish Morpho-Syntax.
- Davis, Henry (1998). 'Subject Inflection in Salish'. Ms., UBC.
- Davis, Henry, Sandra Lai and Lisa Matthewson (1997). 'Cedar Roots and singing Detectives: Attributive Modification in Salish and English'. Port Angeles, WA: *Papers for the 32nd International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*.
- Egesdal, Steven M. and M.Terry Thompson (1996). 'A Fresh Look at Tillamook Inflectional Morphology'. Vancouver, BC: *Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages* 143-158.
- Galloway, Brent (1993). *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Publications in Linguistics 96.
- Gardiner, Dwight (1993). *Structural Asymmetries and Preverbal Positions in Shuswap*. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Hoard, James E. (1971). 'Problems in Proto-Salish Pronoun Reconstruction'. *Sacramento Anthropological Society Papers* 11: 70-90.
- Hukari, Thomas E. (1977). 'A Comparison of attributive Constructions in Two Coast Salish Languages'. *Glossa* 11: 48-74.
- Hukari, Thomas E., Ruby Peter and Ellen White (1977). 'Halkomelem'. In *Northwest Coast Texts: Stealing Light*, ed. by Barry Carlson. *International Journal of American Linguistics Native American Text Series* 2, No. 3
- Kinkade, M. Dale (1992). 'Pseudo-auxiliaries in Upper Chehalis'. Kamloops, BC: *Papers for the 27th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages* 22-41.
- Kinkade, M. Dale (1995). 'Speculations on the Origin of an Empty Morpheme in Upper Chehalis'. Victoria, BC: *Papers for the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages* 26-27.
- Kroeber, Paul (1991). *Comparative Syntax of Subordination in Salish*. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Kroeber, Paul (1992). 'Notes on the Position of Conjunctive Enclitics in Thompson Salish'. Kamloops, BC: *Papers for the 27th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages* 44-48.
- Kroeber, Paul (1997). 'Relativization in Thompson Salish'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 39: 376-422.
- Kuipers, Aert (1967). *The Squamish Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kuipers, Aert (1974). *The Shuswap Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Newman, Stanley (1979). 'A History of the Salish Possessive and Subject Forms'. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45: 207-223.
- Newman, Stanley (1980). 'Functional Changes in the Salish Pronominal System'. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46: 155-167.
- Suttlies, Wayne (n.d.). 'Musqueam Grammar'. Ms. Victoria, BC: Royal British Columbia Museum.

- Thompson, Laurence C. (1979). 'Salishan and the Northwest', in *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages*, ed. by Barbara S. Efrat. Victoria, BC: British Columbia Provincial Heritage Record No. 4)
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson (1992). *The Thompson Language*. Missoula, MN: University of Montana Occasional Paper in Linguistics No. 8.
- van Eijk, Jan (1997). *The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.