REMARKS ON PROTO-SALISH SUBJECT INFLECTION

HENRY DAVIS

This paper re-examines the morphosyntactic status and distribution of Proto-Salish subject pronoun 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 pronoun 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 pronoun series, and show that once we adopt the two-subject hypothesis for transitive clauses, the subject pronominal markers 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 pronouns across Salish. I would like to thank Beverly Frank, Certe Neid, Laura Thevage and Rose Whitley for providing the St'at'imcets data, and the late Dorothy Ursaki for help with n'x?k?wma?c?n. All unattributed examples were elicited from these speakers. I am also grateful for comments from Paul Kroeker, Lisa Matthewson, and Martina Willensch. This work has been partially supported by SSHRCC grant R410-95-1519.

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 = n't?k?k?wma?c?n, Lillooet = St'at'imcets, Stswawi = Secwepemctsin, Squamish = S?kwxw?m?n, and so on. Abbreviations are as follows: app=applicative, aux=auxiliary, cas=causative transitive, naff=conjunctive clitic, CS=Central (Coast) Salish, det=deictic, det= determiner, exis=existential, foc=focal, fut=future, Inter=Intransitive, intrans=Intransizer, inv=inverse, loc=locative mid=middle, neg=negation, NIS=Northern Interior Salish, nom=nominalizer, Obj=object suffix, part=particle, pas=passive, PoA=possessive affix, PoC=possessive subject clitic, pl=plural, prog=progressive, pro=particle, Q=question particle, redup=reduplication, refl=reflexive, sing=singular, SIS=Southern Interior Salish, subj=subject suffix, =transitive. A hyphen (-) indicates a clitic 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. Previous work

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Clitic</th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>2s</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Affix</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Suffix</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.⁴ 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 behavior from possessive clitics and affixes. See Newman (1977).

⁴ As far as the phonological forms of the pronouns 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. 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 pronoun 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-predicative auxiliaries, whereas affixal pronouns always remain attached to the main predicate. 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.

---

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 monoclusal 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.).
(5a). Subject Clitic:

wa="Cax"  
prog(aux)=2sgInCI loud  det=2sgPoCl=prog(aux) talk
"You are loud when you talk."  (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 185)

b. Subject Suffix:

na wa  
cūn-t-c-as  
lοc(aux) prog(aux) tell-tr-lsg0bj-3SuSx
"He was telling me to come here."  (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 200)

(6a). Subject Clitic:

me=cat  
tak*  
home
"I'm coming home."  (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 360)

b. Subject Suffix (third person only):

me  
k"0.8-"sx-"as  
come(aux)  
"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 ?ama "good" may take a nominal complement (here containing the derived noun §-?f+an "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 ?f+an "eat"). (8b) shows that under the clausal interpretation a possessive subject is obligatory.

Nominal complement with optional pure possessor

(7a). ?ama ta=?f+an=?a  
good  det=nom-eat=3PoAf=exis  
"His/her food is good."  (Lillooet)

b. ?ama ta=?f+an=a  
good  det=nom-eat=exis  
"The food is good."  (Lillooet)

Clausal complement with obligatitary possessive subject

(8a). ?ama ta=?f+an=?a  
good  det=nom-eat=3PoCl=exis  
"It is good that he/she ate."  (Lillooet)

b. *?ama ta=?f+an=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 xsk-miłh, "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.

(9a). Nominal complement with pure possessor

xsk-miłh=ka"x"=ha  
k"=n=?f+an  
desire-app=2sgInCl=Q  det=IsgPoAf-nom-eat  
"Is it my food you want?"

b. Clausal complement with possessive subject

xsk-miłh=ka"x"=ha  
k"=n=?f+an  
desire-app=2sgInCl=Q  det=IsgPoAf-nom-eat  
"Do you want me to eat?"

(10a). Predicate nominal with pure possessor

n=§-?f+an=ha  
k"=xsk-miłh=aw  
IsgPoAf-nom-eat=Q  det=IsgPoAf-nom-eat  
"Is it my food you want?"  (Lillooet)
b. Predicate nominal with possessive subject

\[ n=\text{the person} \quad k^{\text{w}}=\text{say} \quad \text{aux} \]

1sgPoCl=nom=eat=Q det=desire-app-3sgSuS

no clausal interpretation\(^9\) (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:

\[ ...t(1)=\text{say} \quad n=\text{the person} \quad \text{aux} \]

...det=prog(aux) 1sgPoAf-nom-say

"...what I'm saying" (Lillooet: van Eijk 1997: 154)

b. Possessive subject clitic:

\[ ...t(1)=\text{say} \quad n=\text{the person} \quad \text{aux} \]

...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 \(=\)) 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 subject clitic, 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).

10 In fact, conjunctives are quite frequently referred to as 'subjectives' 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 pronouns, 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:**

\[ ?ex=xse?=ku?=te? \]

prog=prt=still=?

\[ \begin{align*}
  & \text{good} \\
  & \text{basket.make-mid}
\end{align*} \]

"It is still good when I make baskets i.e. I can still make baskets." 

(Thompson: Thompson and Thompson 1992: 143)

b. **Subject Suffix:**

\[ i6p-ne \]

\[ he=5wet=U5 \]

\[ e=wfk-ne \]

\[ \text{det=see-lsgSuSx forget-lsgSuSx det=who=3CnCI} \]

"I forgot who I saw." 

(14)a. **Conjunctive Clitic:**

\[ w?ex \]

\[ 'Y"~?e?=wn \]

\[ \text{exist det=go(redup)=lsgCnCI} \]

"I am going." 

(Shuswap: Gardiner 1993: 35)

b. **Subject Suffix:**

\[ m-wiww-t-n \]

\[ \text{past-see(redup)-tr-lsgSuSx} \]

"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:**

\[ cl \]

\[ g"a? \]

\[ ta+wfi+st \]

\[ g"a? \]

\[ \text{fut leave-app-rfl} \]

\[ 1sgCnCl \]

"If I go away..." 

(Tillamook: Egesdal and Thompson 1996: 147)

b. **Subject Suffix:**

\[ g"a? \]

\[ ta+wfi+st-i \]

\[ \text{fut leave-app-rfl} \]

\[ 1sgSuSx \]

"I am going away." 

(Tillamook: Egesdal 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. 

\[ ...w?ex=an \]

\[ \text{if=prog(aux)=lsgCnCI} \]

"...if I want (it)." 

(Lillooet)

b. 

\[ ...?1+w?=an \]

\[ \text{when=prog(aux)=lsgCnCI} \]

"...when I was a child..." 

(Lillooet: van Eijk 1997: 153)

(17) **Conjunctive Clitic:**

a. 

\[ haw \]

\[ q=w-?an \]

\[ nam? \]

\[ q=?as \]

\[ t6+m\x75 w k W ay1as \]

\[ \text{not irr=prog(aux)=lsgCnCI} \]

\[ \text{go irr=3CnO} \]

\[ \text{rain tomorrow} \]

"I won't go if it is raining tomorrow." 

(Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 192)

b. 

\[ x?u?q=axw \]

\[ q=?an \]

\[ ?1+n \]

\[ \text{not.yet} \]

\[ \text{eat} \]

"I haven't eaten yet." 

(Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 190)

(18) **Conjunctive Clitic:**

a. 

\[ ...w=if=a \]

\[ 1=s\x75 \]

\[ \text{if=ax=3CnCl} \]

\[ 1sgPoAf-desire \]

"...if I want it." (i.e. "...if it is my desire.") 

(Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 186)

---

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).

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 in these examples. Partial support for this speculation is provided by examples where a reduced form of \( w \) surfaces next to \( q \), as in (17a).
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

(19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>2s</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative Clitic</td>
<td>*kan</td>
<td>*=kan</td>
<td>*g</td>
<td>*kat</td>
<td>*kap</td>
<td>*g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Clitic</td>
<td>*n=</td>
<td>*=n=</td>
<td>*=s</td>
<td>*=t</td>
<td>*=g</td>
<td>*=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Clitic</td>
<td>*=wan</td>
<td>*=wan</td>
<td>*=as</td>
<td>*=at</td>
<td>*=ap</td>
<td>*=as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Suffix</td>
<td>*=an</td>
<td>*=an</td>
<td>*=as</td>
<td>*=at</td>
<td>*=ap</td>
<td>*=as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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). This has been observed previously - see Newman (1979-80), Thompson (1979), Kroeber (1991), Thompson 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.

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 affixed 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 f- in Upper Chehalis to Ps *w- and *f- respectively.

17 Pace Kuipers (1967, 1974) who treats the subject clitic (k-) series in Squamish and Shuswap as consisting of the root f-k- “to do” (the former palatalized from *[f-] 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 transitive clauses 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.  

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:

(20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Possessive Clitic</th>
<th>Conjunctive Clitic</th>
<th>Subject Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominalized</td>
<td>InCl</td>
<td>PoCl</td>
<td>CrCl</td>
<td>Suxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflected</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>Conjugative</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 cocccurred 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:
    cfn+us  kek-st-∂s  enỹetn-∂s  esém?  
    begin(aux)=3CnCl  bring-tr-3SuSx  det=religion-3PoAf  det=white.man  
    “When the white men first brought their religion.”  
    (Thompson: Thompson and Thompson 1992: 143)

(22) 1/2 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Possessive Clitic:
    a. cut xe? k  s=xu0-y=g  m1t-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. tet? k  s=xu0-y=g  we? ce-t-∂ne  
    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  q=c-mat-st-∂l-∂n=g  
    prog  det=loc-feed-caus(tr)-redup-1sgSuSx=3CnCl  
    “I am feeding him.”  
    (Shuswap: Kuipers 1974: 80)

b. tiuγy  me?  w/k-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.

Though 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:
    ... 4+w=S=as  
    ... 4w=3=as  
    ... 4w=S=as  
    ... 4w=S=as  
    ... 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:
    ... n=  
    ... n=  
    ... n=  
    ... n=  
    ... s=prog(aux)=3CnCl  love-caus-3SuSx  det=woman=exis  
    “... because I have already seen him”  
    (Lillooet)

b. 3 Subject Suffix doubling with 3 Possessive Clitic:
    ... n=  
    ... n=  
    ... n=  
    ... n=  
    ... s=prog(aux)=3CnCl  love-caus-3SuSx  det=woman=exis  
    “... 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=2ge  3p1h^-naxw=as  
    irr=3CnCl  get-tr-3SuSx  
    “If he gets it.”  
    (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 192)

---

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.

20 Similar evidence is also available in Sechelt; see Beaumont (1985), Davis (1998).
b. ?6wa if-s k1i=s-3x-y-as
not aux=3Cl like-caus-1sg-obj-3su

"S/he didn’t like me.” (Halkomelem (Upriver dialect): Galloway 1993: 186)

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

a. na wa ?6n sq\\w{\textquoteleft}i\textquoteleft{\textquoteleft}wan-s k'\textquoteleft{\textquoteleft}i=s=s=1s
ptc prog sore heart-3PoAf det=nom=aux=3Po CI
 leave-tr-3SuSx det house=3Po AF

“He was sorry to have left his house.” (Squamish: Kuipers 1967: 186)

b. x\textquoteleft{\textquoteleft} say det 3= aux=3Po Cl
subject S suffix
wa= nom=too(aux)=3Po Cl

“He said he would close it a little bit.” (Halkomelem (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:

... 3= aux=3Po CI

"... (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 pronouns, as in (29):

(29) intransitive transitive
Plain
InCl Expletive 3PoCl + 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.
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