A close look at the distribution in constructions of the closed class of complex predicate forming stems in Klallam traditionally called 'auxiliaries' reveals that in addition to auxiliaries there are at least three categories of lexical items that can be labeled 'adverb'. The distribution of the set of true, non-adverbal, auxiliaries provides a syntactic test for membership in a category 'verb'. The syntactic and morphological characteristics of another class of complex predicate constructions provide evidence for identifying categories 'adjective' and 'noun'.

1 Introduction

Thompson and Thompson 1971:263 briefly mention a class of lexical items in Klallam they call 'auxiliaries', which appear in complex predicate constructions. They give four examples with this comment (quoted in its entirety):

One kind of independent particle affects predicates in an important way: auxiliaries appear first in their predicates, followed by a full word as predicate center. Such predicates are complex. In such cases predicative proclitics remain bound to the predicate center, but enclitics follow rather the auxiliary.

The four examples have been reelicited from native speakers and are repeated here in (1) with transcription adjusted to the current understanding of Klallam morphophonemics.1 The auxiliary and its gloss are italicized.2

(1a) man' \_cn \ ?u\_qá\'k\"i.
    very\_SUBJ \ ?u\_tired
    ‘I’m awfully tired.’

(1b) tú\_ya? \ ?u\_wás\'ys.
    exactly\_PAST \ ?u\_bark
    ‘It [the dog] was just beginning to bark.’

---

1 Only relevant morphology is indicated. An underline attaches clitics to their hosts.
2 For a description of Klallam subject and object markers see Montler 1996.
Even I was angry.

'Are you eating, too?'

Thompson 1979 looks at the auxiliaries from a historical perspective in an attempt to find an explanation for the varying position of subject enclitics across the Salishan languages. What are of particular interest here are the Klallam examples he gives. One elicited example is repeated here in (2).

(2) hiyá? ya? cn ták'í.
go_PAST_1SUBJ cross
'I went across.'

The auxiliary in (2) seems quite different from those in (1) in at least two respects. First, they differ semantically. In (1) it is the auxiliary that adverbially modifies the main predicate. In (2), however, it is the main predicate ták'í that provides manner adverbial modification to the auxiliary, hiyá?. The second way they differ is syntactically. The proclitic ?u? is required in the sentences in (1) while it is not in (2). The differences between (1) and (2) suggest that we have two different constructions and two different lexical categories.

Poggi 1981 looks at some of the items in this class of words and analyzes the constructions as complex sentences with the auxiliary as the main predicate and the second predicate as subordinate. Jelinek 1990 discusses the Lummi cognates of these constructions in more detail. Jelinek assumes, as does Poggi, that the auxiliaries are predicates but that those in (1) are adverbial 'second order predicates', not main predicates followed by subordinate clauses.

This paper explores these possibilities describing and exemplifying these constructions in detail. It is shown how the two constructions in (1) and (2) are fundamentally different and how they provide evidence for the grammatical categories verb and adverb as distinct from each other and as distinct from other contentive categories. It is also shown that aside from the two constructions in (1) and (2) there are at least two other similar constructions.

---

3 This ?u? undoubtedly has the underlying form w', and it is probably a prefix rather than a clitic. These points are not relevant to this paper, therefore I present the morpheme here as traditionally done to allow for easier comparison across languages and dialects.

4 The details of constructions under discussion in Klallam are essentially the same in the closely related Northern Straits dialects Saanich and Lummi. The major differences are phonological with an occasional non-cognate lexical item such as Klallam xam and Northern Straits mák'k 'all'.
We begin by describing simple predicate constructions in section 2. In section 3 the scope of what we are calling ‘complex predicates’ is given a working definition. Section 4 describes each of the four ‘auxiliary’ constructions found in Klallam. The grammar of the auxiliary constructions with transitive and intransitive main verbs is briefly described in section 5. The categories noun and adjective are discussed in section 6. The conclusion in section 7 summarizes the findings.

2 Simple predicates

Simple predicates in Klallam are basically the same as those in most other Central Salishan languages: the predicate comes first, immediately followed by zero or more speech-act enclitics. All but the first of the auxiliaries in (1) and (2) can also be simple predicates as in (3).

(3a)  hiyəʔyaʔ_cn.
      go_PAST_1SUBJ
      ‘I went.’

(3b)  tūʔxʷ_yaʔ
      middle_PAST
      ‘It was the middle.’

(3c)  čəwín_cn.
      even_1SUBJ
      ‘Even I am.’

(3d)  ḵ'áy_u_cxʷ
      alsoQUEST_2SUBJ
      ‘Are you, too?’

The second predicates in (1) and (2) can also be simple predicates as shown in (4).

(4a)  qáḵʷčn.
      tired_1SUBJ
      ‘I’m tired.’

(4b)  wəsəys_yaʔ.
      bark_PAST
      ‘It [the dog] barked.’

These enclitics situate the speech act and include first and second person subjects, past and future tense, and various evidentials and question markers. The Klallam version of these is very similar to what were called ‘post-predicate particles’ in Saanich (Montler 1986).
Four types of constituents can immediately follow this simple predicate/enclitic bundle: a determiner phrase (example 5), a prepositional phrase (example 6), a subordinate clause (example 7), or a conjoined DP (example 8).

Up to two determiner phrases\(^7\) are possible:

\(^6\) Tense marking is not obligatory in Klallam. Sentences unmarked for tense may be translated with any tense depending on context.

\(^7\) These determiner phrases may be seen as arguments or as adjuncts indexed to pronominal arguments. If there is one, it is always coreferential with the intransitive subject and usually with the transitive object, but if the context is clear it may be coreferential with a transitive subject. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ččàt-s} & \quad \text{ca_sūf.} \\
\text{build-3SUBJ} & \quad \text{DET_road} \\
\text{He built the road.}
\end{align*}
\]

but

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ččàt-s} & \quad \text{ca_ncst.} \\
\text{build-3SUBJ} & \quad \text{DET_my father} \\
\text{My father built it.}
\end{align*}
\]

In the former the determiner phrase is the object while in the latter it is the subject.

If there are two DPs, a relatively rare but certainly natural occurrence, the first, if they are of equal animacy, is indexed to the subject and the second the object. In both Klallam and Saanich, unlike Jelinek and Demers (1994) report for Lummi, the order of subject and object DPs in such cases is fixed. Order between the two is free when one is clearly of higher animacy than the other:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ččàt-s} & \quad \text{ca_ncst} \quad \text{ca_sūf} \\
\text{build-3SUBJ} & \quad \text{DET_my father} \quad \text{DET_road} \\
\text{My father built the road.}
\end{align*}
\]

or

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ččàt-s} & \quad \text{ca_sūf} \quad \text{ca_ncst.} \\
\text{build-3SUBJ} & \quad \text{DET_road} \quad \text{DET_my father} \\
\text{My father built the road.}
\end{align*}
\]

Also the order is free when one is marked as the possessor of the other. In this case the only interpretation allowed is where the possessor is subject and the one marked for possession is the object. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kʷnts} & \quad \text{ca_swéw-as} \quad \text{ca_cat-s} \\
\text{look at} & \quad \text{DET_boy} \quad \text{DET_father-his}
\end{align*}
\]

or
(5a)  hiyáʔˀ_yaʔ  ca_swáʔyʔaʔ.
go_PAST  DET_man
‘The man went.’

(5b) kʷwáʔnts  ca_swáʔyʔaʔ  ca_stáni.
look at  DET_man  DET_woman
‘The man looked at the woman.’

A prepositional phrase is marked by the one general-purpose oblique case marker, ?aʔ:

(6a)  hiyáʔˀ_cn  ?aʔ_cá_súł
go_1SUBJ  PREP_DET_door
‘I went to the door.’

(6b) kʷwáʔmnáʔ_cn  ?aʔ_cá_swáʔyʔaʔ.
be seen_1SUBJ  PREP_DET_man
‘I was seen by the man.’

(6c) sáʔt_u_cxʷ  ?aʔ_cá_sáʔyaʔ?
hit_QUEST_2SUBJ  PREP_DET_stick
‘Did you hit it with a stick?’

There are three types of non-DP subordinate clauses: ‘if/when’ clauses marked by the subjunctive clause indicating proclitic kʷaʔ (example 7a), ‘while’ clauses marked by the proclitic ?aʔ (example 7b), and subjective genitive clauses (see Montler 1996 for examples of this latter type clause).

(7a)  hiyáʔˀ_cn  kʷaʔ_hiyáʔ-xʷ.
go_1SUBJ  SUBORD_go-2SUBORDSUBJ
‘I’ll go if/when you go.’

(7b)  hiyáʔˀ_cn  ?aʔ_hiyáʔ-xʷ
go_1SUBJ  WHILE_go-2SUBORDSUBJ
‘I’ll go when/while you go.’

The conjoined DP is preceded by the comitative conjunction ?iʔ:

kʷwáʔnts  ca_cáʔ-s  ca_swéʔwás
look at  DET_father-his  DET_boy
both are interpreted as ‘The boy saw his father.’ It seems that the interpretation that violates binding condition C is blocked. There may be some other explanation for this pattern, but in any case it is indicative that there is syntax involved beyond that expected of mere adjuncts.
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(8)  hiyaʔ_ cn  ?iłʔ_eə_ncaʔt.
go_1SUBJ  COM_DET_my father
    ‘My father and I went’ or ‘I went with my father.’

These exhaust the types of constituents that can immediately follow a simple, sentence-initial predicate-enclitic.

3 Complex predicates and second-position clitics

The complex predicate constructions will be assumed to be any that do not correspond to the patterns presented in section 2. That is, we assume that we have a complex predicate construction whenever the sentence-initial full word-enclitic bundle is followed by something other than a determiner phrase, prepositional phrase, subordinate clause, or conjoined determiner phrase. What all such constructions have in common is that they have two or more predicative words with one subject and neither is subordinate to the other. Such is the case in both examples (1) and (2). In order to show that there are in fact complex predicates in Klallam it is first necessary to describe the placement of the speech-act enclitics.

It has been established, at least since Demers (1980), that the speech act enclitics in Straits Salishan languages are strictly second-position clitics. The enclitic bundle forms a constituent itself⁸ that attaches to the first major word of the sentence. The sentences in example (9) and in particular the complex predicate construction in (9c), a Klallam version of the Lummi example given by Demers (1980:13), show that the enclitic is the subject of the whole passive predicate complex and not just of the first predicate. (9c) is not merely a combination of (9a) and (9b) and the second predicate of (9c) is certainly not subordinate.

(9a)  hiyaʔ_yaʔ_ cxw.
go_2SUBJ
    ‘You went.’

(9b)  kʷʔₕₚₜ-ʔn-ʔ_yaʔ_ cxw.
see-PASSIVE_PAST_ 2SUBJ
    ‘You were seen.’

(9c)  hiyaʔ_yaʔ_ cxw  kʷʔₕₚₜ-ʔn-ʔ.
go_2SUBJ  see-PASSIVE
    ‘Someone went to see you.’

⁸ Demers 1980 refers to the enclitic bundle constituent as AUX.
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A characteristic typical of second position clitics is that they may be inserted to break up what one would expect to be an unbreakable constituent. Compare (10a) and (10b):

(10a) ?úpn ?iʔ_či_tac cs
ten COM_DET_eight
'eighteen'

(10b) ?úpn_yaʔ_cn ?iʔ_či_tac cs sčiʔánnəŋ.
ten_PAST_1SUBJ COM_DET_eight year
'I was eighteen years old.'

Example (10a) shows the normal method of forming numbers eleven through nineteen. ‘Eighteen’ is literally ‘ten and an eight’. When ‘eighteen’ is the predicate, the subject and tense markers attach to the first word even though it breaks into the constituent ‘eighteen’.

It can thus be seen that at least constructions such as (2) and (9c) with hiyáʔ are indeed complex predicates. Each is composed of two major constituents that may occur as independent predicates, but in these they each have one subject, which must, as in all other sentences, appear after the first word.

4 Categories of ‘auxiliaries’

There is a limited class of lexical items that act as first elements in what we are assuming to be complex predicate constructions. These are presumably what the Thompsons were referring to as ‘auxiliaries’. The major feature--other than syntactic position--that these auxiliaries have in common is their lack of morphology. While generally in Klallam there seem to be few limits on what morphology can appear on which words in a sentence, the auxiliaries are almost always bare roots. They are always underived intransitives. While each is formed of a root that may appear transitivized in other constructions (for example hiyáʔ ‘go’ becomes hiyáʔtxʷ ‘take’), they are neither transitivized nor detransitivized when appearing as auxiliaries. While plural or diminutive morphology may appear on the main predicate or on any other full word in a sentence, neither may occur on the auxiliary. The same is true of aspect morphology including the very common ‘actual’ imperfective aspect.

---

9 This lack of morphology was also correctly noted by Poggi 1981.

10 There are two apparent exceptions to the bare-root nature of the auxiliaries. The auxiliary sʔáŋ ‘constantly’ appears to be composed of a root sʔá and the -ʔáŋ ‘middle’ suffix. This root has, however, never been recorded without the ending, so sʔáŋ may be a unit morpheme. The other exception is clearly a derived form. The auxiliary ?šáxʷ ‘definitely’ has a root šxʷ ‘straight’ with the common morpheme combination š- ‘stative’ prefix, -x ‘durative’ suffix, and -a- ‘resultative’ infix. When not used as an auxiliary this word has the meaning ‘be straight’ and the root appears in such words as šxʷšt ‘steer’ and šxʷšst ‘give a talking to, lit. straight-face someone’.
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Although the auxiliaries have morphological and syntactic similarities, it will be shown here that these items can be divided into at least four distinct categories based on their semantics and the morphological and syntactic details of the constructions in which they appear. The four categories will be described in order: zero-class (section 4.1), ?u?-class (section 4.2), ?i?-class (section 4.3), and c-class (section 4.4). There is one apparent auxiliary (discussed in section 4.5) that does not fall into any of these categories.

4.1 Zero-class auxiliaries and verbs

The zero-class auxiliaries are those that are immediately followed by the second predicate. Examples (2) and (9c) represent this class. In each of these the predicate following the initial auxiliary-enclitic bundle has no proclitic; there is a zero connection between the two predicates. Four lexical items form this class: hiyá?, qen?á, X¿y, and huy.

4.1.1 hiyá? and qen?á

The two straightforward cases of zero-class auxiliaries are hiyá? ‘go’ and qen?á ‘come’. These are common and occur with a wide variety of predicates as shown in (11) and (12).

(11a) hiyá?_cæ?n  Xácu.
go_1SUBJFUT  fishing
‘I’ll go fishing.’

(11b) hiyá?_cœ  ?uxw  qa?_cœ_súf.
go_1SUBJ  go there OBL_DET_door
‘I went over to the door.’

(11c) hiyá?_ya?_cœ  ?uy?  qa?_cœ_snáxw?.
go_PAST_1SUBJ  go aboard OBL_DET_canoe
‘I went aboard the canoe.’

(11d) hiyá?_u cxw  qan?
go_QUEST_2SUBJ  eat
‘Are you going to eat?’

(11e) hiyá?_cœ  ?át.
go_1SUBJ  sleep
‘I’ll go to sleep.’
For the examples in (11), the *hiyáʔ* could be removed, the enclitic bundle put after the next word, and the translation would not be much different. What the auxiliary adds is a focus on the motion and its direction with respect to the speech act.

Although the range of lexical items that may occur as second predicates in these zero-class constructions is large, it is not unlimited. In fact, words that may appear here also form a distinct class. Words that can function as stative predicates, i.e. qualities and nominals, may not occur as the second predicate. Sentences such as those in (13) are consistently rejected, though not beyond interpretation.  

(13a) *hiyáʔ_c?n *š?šúʔt.
go_1SUBJ happy

---

11 Native speakers will interpret these items in (13) as two sentences each. For example, ‘I went. He's happy.’ For meanings such as ‘I went happy’, ‘I went well’, or ‘I went to my house’ entirely different constructions are used.
This gives us a straightforward syntactic test for membership in a lexical category **Verb** in Klallam: any lexical item that may appear as the second predicate in a zero-class complex predicate construction is a verb.

### 4.1.2 *híyá? and húy*

It might be argued that, since they are motion predicates, *híyá?* and *ʔan?á* require only lexical items subject to motion as second predicates, and so the class is not entirely syntactically defined. Even leaving aside such non-motion second predicates as *ʔitá* ‘sleep’ (11e) and *kʷñoʔnaʔ* ‘be seen’ (12a), the other two zero-class auxiliaries show that this is not the case.

While *híyá?* and *ʔan?á* function in two ways—either as independent predicates or as zero-class auxiliaries—*k'áy* and *húy* each have three possible functions: independent predicates, zero-class auxiliaries, and *ʔu*-class auxiliaries. Their meaning and function as *ʔu*-class auxiliaries is described in section 4.2. In the function as independent predicate or zero-class auxiliary *k'áy* means ‘again’ and *húy* means ‘finish’.

(14a) *k'áy* _cn _again_1SUBJ _I did/will again._

(14b) *k'áy* _cn _fiym._ _again_1SUBJ _sing _I’l’ sing again._

(14c) *k'áy* _u cxw_ _čáʔi._ _again_QUEST_2SUBJ _working _Are you working again?_

(14d) *k'áy* _cn _ʔfn._ _again_1SUBJ _eat _I ate again._
(15a) húy_cn
    finish_1SUBJ
    'I finished.'

(15b) húy_cn tfym.
    finish_1SUBJ sing
    'I finished singing.'

(15c) húy_caʔ_st čáʔi.
    finish_FUT_1PLSUBJ working
    'We’ll finish working.'

Examples (14a) and (15a) show húy and húy as independent predicates. Neither húy nor húy are motion predicates, but the class of lexical items that can appear as second predicates with them is the same as the class that can appear as second predicates with auxiliaries hiyaʔ and ?enʔá. The second predicate may not be adjectival or nominal:

(16a) *húy_cn šaʔšúʔi.
    again_1SUBJ happy

(16b) *húy_cn ?áy.
    again_1SUBJ good

(16c) *húy_cn nʔáʔiŋ.
    finish_1SUBJ my house

In order to convey ideas like ‘I’m happy again’ or ‘I’m good again’ the adjectival must be made a verb with derivational morphology such as the verbal txʷaʔ- ‘mutative’ prefix, which is frequently translated ‘become’ or ‘get’. Compare (17) with (16a).

(17) húy_cn txʷaʔ-šaʔšúʔi.
    again_1SUBJ MUT-happy
    'I got happy again.'

There are at least two ways of fixing (16c) so that it makes grammatical sense. These fixes involve putting a determiner in front of the second lexical item so that we have an entirely non-auxiliary construction. Example (18a) is a simple transitive and (18b) is a simple intransitive.
(18a) húy-tx”_cn  cə_n?á?iŋ.
    finish-CAUSE_1SUBJ DET_my house
    ‘I finished my house.’

(18b) húy  cə_n?á?iŋ.
    finish DET_my house
    ‘My house is finished.’

4.2 ʔuʔ-class auxiliaries: ʔuʔ adverbs

All of the auxiliaries listed by Thompson and Thompson 1971 and exemplified in (1) are in the ʔuʔ-class. The defining feature of this class is the required presence of the ʔuʔ proclitic on the second element. With eleven lexical items identified as belonging to this group, it is the largest class of auxiliaries. Each is illustrated in (19).

(19a) ʃ’áy_cn  ʔuʔ_šaʔšuʔi.
    also_1SUBJ ʔuʔ_happy
    ‘I’m also happy.’

(19b) húy_cn  ʔuʔ_hiyáʔ.
    only_1SUBJ ʔuʔ_go
    ‘I’m only going.’

(19c) ʔéʔ_cn  ʔuʔ_kʷán.
    just like_1SUBJ ʔuʔ_lost
    ‘I’m just lost.’

(19d) ʃšaʔη_cn  ʔuʔ_qʷáqʷi.
    continuously_1SUBJ ʔuʔ_talking
    ‘I’m talking continuously.’

(19e) ʔéʔat_cn  ʔuʔ_ʔíʔn.
    truly_1SUBJ ʔuʔ_eat
    ‘I truly ate.’

(19f) ʔsláx’ʃ_ćx”  ʔuʔ_ʔíʔom.
    definitely_2SUBJ ʔuʔ_strong
    ‘You’re definitely strong.’
With the exception of one, all of the lexical items in this group may function as independent predicates. The exception is máñ ‘very’ (illustrated in (1a) and (19k)), which requires a following ?u?-marked predicate.\(^{12}\) máñ cannot stand as an independent predicate itself, and it cannot occur with any of the morphology associated with predicative words. These facts indicate that máñ is, indeed, not a predicate but a member of a separate lexical category. If máñ is not a predicate, then this ?u? construction is not a complex predicate construction. The most appropriate name for the lexical category that máñ represents is Adverb. The ?u? clitic can be seen as a formative of an adverbial construction.

Since each of the other possible first elements in this construction has a similar function, they can be seen as derived adverbs. They are not morphologically derived, but derived by their position in the construction. Three characteristics of these constructions support this analysis. First, the semantics of each as represented in the translations in (19) are clearly adverbial. Each modifies the verbal or adjectival second element. Second, where possible, scope ambiguities arise just as one would expect from adverbs. For example, (19b) could also be translated ‘only I am going’, given the right context. Similarly, (19g) also means ‘I’m even talking’. The third characteristic is the most striking: there is an unpredictable but consistent semantic shift, typical of derivation, between the adverbial and predicative functions of most of the words appearing as first elements in (19). This semantic shift can be

\(^{12}\) As any of the other auxiliaries, the root máñ may be transitivized with the causative suffix \(-tx\)\(^{\*}\). The resulting form máñ\(-tx\)\(^{\*}\) means something like ‘intensify’ and is not an auxiliary. This is the only morphology recorded occurring with this very common root.
seen by comparing (19a-b) with the forms in (14) and (15). As an adverb *A'ay* means ‘also’ while in other constructions it means ‘again’.13 The adverb *huy* means ‘only’ while in other constructions it means ‘finish’. Minimal pairs are shown in (20) and (21).

(20a)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A'ay}_{-cn} & \text{ ffym.} \\
\text{again}_{-1\text{SUBJ}} & \text{ sing} \\
\text{‘I’ll sing again.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(20b)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A'ay}_{-cn} & \text{ ?u?_ffym.} \\
\text{also}_{-1\text{SUBJ}} & \text{ ?u?_sing} \\
\text{‘I’ll sing, too.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(21a)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{huy}_{-cn} & \text{ ffym.} \\
\text{finish}_{-1\text{SUBJ}} & \text{ sing} \\
\text{‘I finished singing.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(21b)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{huy}_{-cn} & \text{ ?u?_ffym.} \\
\text{only}_{-1\text{SUBJ}} & \text{ ?u?_sing} \\
\text{‘Only I sang.’}
\end{align*}
\]

A summary of the semantic shifts is shown in the table in (22).

(22)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In ?u? construction</th>
<th>In other constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>A'ay</em></td>
<td>also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>huy</em></td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>təŋ</em></td>
<td>just like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>səloŋ</em></td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cəʔət</em></td>
<td>truly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔsƛ̓xʷ</em></td>
<td>definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>čwʔí</em></td>
<td>even (so)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>túʔxʷ</em></td>
<td>exactly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These meaning differences are consistent among different speakers and are essentially the same in Saanich and Klallam. For some of the items, the semantic connection is obvious (*cəʔət* for example), while for others it is vague (*túʔxʷ*) but

---

13 The Saanich cognate *Xeʔ* patterns the same way: when followed by *ʔəw* it means only ‘also’; in other constructions it means only ‘again’. Just as in Klallam there are no exceptions to this in the corpus, and native speakers are consistent in elicitation. Perhaps Lummi or Samish is different in this respect. Jelinek 1990:182 shows the Lummi/Samish cognate in a sentence with *ʔəw* and glosses it as ambiguous between ‘again’ and ‘also’.
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recoverable. For τού the connection is obscure. The adverbial meaning of τού is difficult to translate with a simple gloss. The examples in (23a-g) show its range as an adverb and (23h) shows its use as a predicate.

(23a) τόν cn ʔuʔ.xcft.
just like_1SUBJ ʔuʔ.know it
‘I really know it.’

(23b) τόν cn ʔuʔ.kwÁnnoʔ.
just like_1SUBJ ʔuʔ.saw it
‘I just saw it.’

(23c) τόν cn ʔuʔ.swÁyqaʔ.
just like_1SUBJ ʔuʔ.man
‘I’m a real man/I’m just a man.’

(23d) τόν u.cxw ʔuʔ.hiyáʔ.
just like_QUEST_2SUBJ ʔuʔ.go
‘Are you really going?’

(23e) τόν ʔuʔ.páʔ.
just like ʔuʔ.white
‘It’s really white/It’s almost white.’

(23f) τόν cn ʔuʔ.siʔámi.
just like_1SUBJ ʔuʔ.rich
‘I’m just like I’m rich. [context: getting a ride in a limousine]’

(23g) τόν cxw ʔuʔ.sq’wmo’y.
just like_2SUBJ ʔuʔ.dog
‘You’re just like a dog. [an insult]’

(23h) τόν cn.
detach_1SUBJ
‘I’m off (what I was stuck on).’

For ṣwín’ the difference is surprising. Unlike the other meaning differences where the meaning in the first column occurs only in the ʔuʔ construction while the meaning in the second column occurs in all other constructions, the ‘not even’ reading of ṣwín’ occurs only when it has a third person subject and is followed by a determiner phrase marked for possession. It is not clear how this construction contributes to the meaning ‘not even’ since there is no negative element and when ṣwín’ occurs alone it means ‘even’. Examples of ṣwín’ are shown in (24).
(24a) čwín cn ʔuʔ.čpaypsénts.
even_1SUBJ ʔuʔ. have five cents
'Even I have five cents.'

(24b) čwín či nsuʔčpaypsénts.
not even DET_my having five cents
'I don't even have five cents.'

(24c) čwín cn ʔuʔ.kʷənnúŋa.
even_1SUBJ ʔuʔ. see you
'I even saw you.'

(24d) čwín či nskʷənnúŋa.
not even DET_my seeing you
'I didn't even see you.'

(24e) čwín cn.
even_1SUBJ
'Even I (do).' 

The table in (22) lists only eight of the eleven. As mentioned above, mán' occurs only in the adverbial construction, so is not listed. Of the other two ʔən' ‘all’ is very common and, though it usually does appear with the following ʔu?, it can appear without it and without a change in meaning. Unlike all of the other ʔu?-class adverbs, it seems that ʔən' can occur as an adverb, a predicate, or as an adjective.

The final adverb, ʔuʔiʔ?, exemplified in (19j) is rare in the corpus. There are not enough data to determine if it has some other function. It has no cognate in Saanich.

Note that when the stem shifts semantics in the adverbial construction it usually becomes an intensifier. It seems likely that the one purely lexical adverb, mán', is the syntactic and semantic prototype for these derived adverbs.

Perhaps these are not adverbs derived from predicates but separate lexical items distinct from the homophonous predicates. If so, these lexical items never appear in any other syntactic context and are thus of the distinct category adverb.

4.3 ʔiʔ-class auxiliaries: ʔiʔ adverbs

A group of lexical items similar to the ʔuʔ adverbs have the clitic ʔiʔ rather than ʔuʔ preceding the main predicate. This is a much smaller set having only three basic members: čayáy ‘almost’, hic ‘long since’, and xʷiy ‘possibly’. A fourth member is derived from the first just mentioned, kʷčayáy ‘soon’, with the ‘realized’ prefix kʷ. These are illustrated in (25).
(25a) čayáy cn ?i?_tanén.
    almost_1SUBJ ?i?_miss
    ‘I almost missed (the target).’

(25b) híc cn ?i?_hán.
    long since_1SUBJ ?i?_eat
    ‘It’s a long time since I ate.’

(25c) xʷýŋ cn ?i?_hiyaʔ.
    possibly_1SUBJ ?i?_go
    ‘I might go/I can go/It’s possible for me to go.’

(25d) kʷčayáy cn ?i?_hiyaʔ.
    soon_1SUBJ ?i?_go
    ‘I go soon.’

Just as most of the ?u? adverbs, all four of these may be independent predicates and, just as most of the ?u? adverbs, each of the three basic forms has an unpredictable semantic shift. The table in (26) shows the semantic shifts.14

(26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In ?i? construction</th>
<th>In other constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čayáy</td>
<td>almost</td>
<td>barely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>híc</td>
<td>long since</td>
<td>long duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xʷýŋ</td>
<td>possibly, might, can</td>
<td>quick, fast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of each of these in other constructions are shown in (27).

(27a) čayáy cə_nsuʔtánən.
    barely DET_my missing
    ‘I barely missed (the target).’

---

14 Jelinek 1990:181 incidentally mentions xʷýŋ as a ‘modal predicate’. This is better analyzed as an adverbal since 1) there is otherwise no identifiable class of modal predicates in Klallam or Saanich (and presumably in Lummi), 2) when used as a predicate it is not modal at all, and 3) it has all the same syntactic and morphological characteristics as the other adverbs. Jelinek 1990:182 also mentions čoléʔ, the Northern Straits cognate for čayáy, and lists it as one of the ?u? adverbs (‘second order predicate’) but gives no examples. This is a fairly frequently occurring word in both Klallam and Saanich and it has never been recorded with a following ?u?.
The relationship between the two functions of čayáy is very similar to the relationship between the two functions of the ?u? adverb čwín ‘even; not even’ illustrated in (24). In each the meaning in its non-adverbial function is negative with respect to its meaning as an adverb. The sentence in (25a) implies that the target was hit by a narrow margin, while (27a) implies that the target was not hit by a narrow margin. Also the morphological and syntactic requirements are the same: the non-adverb use for each requires a third person subject and a determiner phrase marked for possession.

What these ?u? adverbs have in common in contrast with the ?u? adverbs is reference to time. Though čayáy can be use for both time and space, when it has the ‘realized’ prefix in k'čayáy it refers only to time. This may be historically related to the semantics of the ?i? proclitic.

4.4  ?i? and ?u?

There are at least two separate morphemes, proclitic or prefix, with the form ?i?. One, probably cognate with the yc- ‘continuative’ prefix found in Coeur d’Alene (Doak 1997), indicates continuing motion. The other is the comitative conjunction mentioned in section 2. Both are illustrated in one compound sentence in (28) showing that they are two different morphemes.

(28) xàł cn ?i?_?i?-štóŋ cn.
sick_1SUBJ COM_CONTIN-walking_1SUBJ
‘I’m sick and I’m walking.’

The sentence in (28) has an equivalent with conjunction reduction shown in (29).

(29) xàł cn ?i?_?i?-štóŋ.
sick_1SUBJ COM_CONTIN-walking
‘I’m sick and walking.’

Note that the form of (29) is superficially the same as the ?i? adverb constructions in (25). They are not the same constructions, however, since, when a main clause subject for the second predicate is added, the meaning is changed becoming two
separate clauses as in (30), which native speakers find of marginal acceptability. Compare (30) with (25a).

(30) ċəyáy_cn ?i?_fáŋen_cn.  
barely_1SUBJ COM_miss_1SUBJ  
‘I barely did it and I missed.’

The conjunction ?i? has inherent temporal semantics; it conjoins only simultaneous events. It differs both from a logician’s ‘and’ that conjoins predicates regardless of temporal relationship and from a sequential ‘and’ that implies the event of the first conjunct precedes the second in time. This was recognized by Thompson and Thompson 1971 with their ‘accompanying’ label and by Efrat’s 1969 gloss ‘simultaneity’ for the Sooke cognate and by Raffo’s 1972 gloss ‘simultaneous’ for Songish. The fact that the ?i? adverbs each have time-related semantics while none of the ?u? adverbs do indicates that the ?i? of the adverbial construction must be historically related to the conjunction ?i?.

Thompson and Thompson 1971 and Montler 1986 call the ?u? ‘contemporaneous’, Poggi 1981 labels it ‘aspect’, and Jelinek 1990 labels it ‘link’. While only Jelinek identifies it as crucial to the adverbial construction, all identify this ?u? with an ?i? proclitic that appears in clause initial position and indicates discourse or extralinguistic contrast. Though they are perhaps historically related, these are synchronically distinct. The contrast marker appears in sentences such as ?u?_šástǝŋ cn ‘I’m walking.’ The sentence without the ?u? is also translated ‘I’m walking’, but native speakers consistently use contrastive intonation in the English translation of the form with the ?u?. Generally this initial ?u? means something like ‘contrary to what one might think’ or ‘in contrast to the previous context’. Out of context this ?u? is optional. The ?u? in the ‘auxiliary’ construction is not optional and never carries semantic or pragmatic function. It is strictly a construction formative.

When the ?i? conjunction and ?u? contrast marker both appear before a second predicate the translation usually includes ‘but’ as in (31).

(31) ʃáŋ_cn ?i?_?u?_?i?-šástǝŋ.  
sick_1SUBJ COM_CONTRAST_CONTIN-walking  
‘I’m sick but I’m walking.’

4.5 c-class auxiliaries: negative adverbs

The c-class auxiliaries are a class of only two lexical items: ?áwa ‘not’ and ?u?á? ‘not yet’. These both require that the following main predicate be preceded by the c proclitic or prefix. This c is probably cognate with the Thompson ka ‘unrealized’

---

15 When ?i? and ?u? appear together the phonetic result is usually yu?.
(Thompson and Thompson 1992:150) particle and the Moses-Columbia ‘unrealized’ prefix \textit{kas}- described by Mattina 1997:331. The Thompson and Moses-Columbia negative constructions look very similar to the Klallam pattern. Unlike the cognates, however, the distribution of the Klallam \textit{c} is extremely limited—it occurs only before predicates following the \textit{?dwa} and \textit{?u?a}?.\footnote{The situation in Klallam is clearer than in Northern Straits. The Northern Straits cognate is \textit{s} (Montler 1986:191), merging phonologically with other \textit{s} prefixes. Once all the \textit{s}’s are properly sorted out, the pattern in Northern Straits seems to be the same as Klallam.} Examples of \textit{?dwa}, a very common word, are shown in (32) and \textit{?u?a?}, much less common in the corpus, in (33).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(32a)] \textit{?dwa} c\textunderscore h\textasciicircum{w}fy\textgamma. \\
not \hspace{1cm} C\_return \\
‘She didn’t return.’
\item[(32b)] \textit{?dwa}_cn c\textasciicircum{x}\textasciitilde{on\textasciitilde{f}\textasciitilde{am}}. \\
not\_1\text{SUBJ} \hspace{.5cm} c\_white \text{person} \\
‘I’m not a white man.’
\item[(32c)] \textit{?dwa}_cx\w{c\_c\textasciitilde{\text{a}}\text{\textit{?s}}\text{\textit{o}}}. \\
not\_2\text{SUBJ} \hspace{.5cm} c\_two \text{people} \\
‘There aren’t two of you.’
\item[(32d)] \textit{?dwa} c\textunderscore n\textasciicircum{k}\w{w}. \\
not \hspace{1cm} C\_you \\
‘It’s not you.’
\item[(32e)] \textit{?dwa}_cn c\textasciitilde{K\textasciitilde{\text{w}}\textasciitilde{\text{m}}\textasciitilde{n}\textasciitilde{\text{\textacute{\textomega}}}}. \\
not\_1\text{SUBJ} \hspace{.5cm} c\_see\textasciitilde{-PASSIV} \\
‘I wasn’t seen.’
\item[(32f)] \textit{?dwa}_cn c\_\textasciitilde{\text{p}}\textasciitilde{y}. \\
not\_1\text{SUBJ} \hspace{.5cm} c\_good \\
‘I’m not well.’
\item[(32g)] \textit{?dwa}_ya\w{_st} c\textasciitilde{s\textasciitilde{k\textasciitilde{\text{\textacute{\textomega}}}\text{\textacute{\textomega}}}}. \\
not\_\text{PAST\_IPL\text{SUBJ}} \hspace{.5cm} c\_go \text{to school} \\
‘We didn’t go to school.’
\item[(33a)] \textit{?u?a}_cn c\_\textasciitilde{\text{f\textasciitilde{n}}}. \\
not\_\text{yet\_1\text{SUBJ}} \hspace{.5cm} c\_\text{eat} \\
‘I didn’t eat yet.’
\end{enumerate}
(33b) ʔúʔaʔ c_Xúmʔ.
    not yet C_enough
    'It's not yet enough.'

(33c) ʔúʔaʔ c_táʔi.
    not yet C_arrive here.
    'He didn’t get here yet.'

(33d) ʔúʔaʔ c_hiyáʔ.
    not yet C_go
    'I’m not going yet.'

ʔáwa can stand alone as a negative answer to a yes/no question. Aside from that and from the adverbial function shown in (32) and (33), both of these negative words can be predicative. Either word may occur with a subject and no following predicate as illustrated in (34).

(34a) ʔáwa cn.
    not_1SUBJ
    'I’m not/I didn’t/I won’t.'

(34b) ʔáwa c_aʔkʷáʔwén.
    not DET_rat
    'Rat won’t.'

(34c) ʔúʔaʔ cn.
    not yet_1SUBJ
    'I didn’t yet.'

4.6 húʔ? conjoined conditional

húʔ may fit the definition of ‘auxiliary’ or ‘adverb’, but it has a unique distribution that distinguishes it from the other ‘auxiliaries’ and, indeed, from all other roots. This root never takes any morphology and occurs in only one construction. It is used in a construction that is the most common way of expressing a conditional statement. A conjoined conditional construction uses a sentence initial root húʔ as illustrated in (35).

(35) húʔ caʔ cxʔw hiyáʔ ?iʔ_hiyáʔ caʔn.
    if/when FUT_2SUBJ go COM_go_1FUTSUBJ
    'I’ll go if/when you go.'
The *hui?* root in (35) seems to pattern with the zero-class auxiliaries discussed in section 4.1--*hui?* and its enclitics are immediately followed by a main predicate. It differs from them in two respects. First, *hui?* is never predicative itself; it must always be followed by a predicate. So forms like *hui?_caʔ_cxʷ* are unacceptable alone. The second difference is that it must be the first word of the first of a pair of conjuncts; it never occurs in a simple, non-compound, sentence. So forms like *hui?_caʔ_cxʷ hiyáʔ* are unacceptable alone. The two conjuncts must appear with the *hui?* clause first so that *hiyáʔ_çaʔ_n ?iʔ huiʔ_caʔ_cxʷ* is unacceptable. This is unique in that, with its main-clause subject, it has the form of an independent clause but cannot occur independently.

5 Transitive main verbs with auxiliaries and adverbs

Another interesting difference between the true auxiliaries (zero-class) and the adverbs is in the interpretation of an immediately following determiner phrase. As established in section 4.1, the identifying feature of the true auxiliaries is the immediately following verb. In all of the examples in that section the main verb is intransitive. While intransitive verbs are most usual with the auxiliaries, it is also possible to get a transitive verb. Examples are shown in (36). Compare especially (12a) with (36a).

(36a) ʔenʔá_yaʔ_cn  kʷənnaxʷ.\(^{17}\)
      come_PAST_1SUBJ  see:3OBJ
      ‘I came to see him.’

(36b) ʔenʔá_yaʔ_cn  kʷən-
      come_PAST_1SUBJ  see-2OBJ
      ‘I came to see you.’

(36c) ʔenʔá_yaʔ  kʷənt-s.
      come_PAST  look-at:3OBJ-3SUBJ
      ‘He came to look at him.’

The third person transitive subject is not an enclitic as are the first and second persons but a suffix that remains on the main verb and does not move to second position. An explicit third person object determiner phrase must follow the main verb as illustrated in (37).\(^{18}\)

\(^{17}\) The third person object is zero. This word has the -naxʷ ‘non-control’ transitivizer.

\(^{18}\) It is not actually possible to structurally distinguish between the interpretation given in (36) and an interpretation where (36) is two sentences: ‘He came. He looked at the canoe.’ The same is true of (37) which could be ‘He came. The canoe was looked at by the man.’
An important feature of auxiliaries is that mention of an explicit agent in a
determiner phrase requires the use of the passive as in (38).

(38) ?on?á_ya? ká özel-s ce snáxá?l.
come_PAST look at:3OBJ-3SUBJ DET_canoe
The man came to look at the canoe.'

Up to a point, the adverbs pattern similarly. Compare the examples in (39)
with those in (36), (37), and (38).

(39a) čwín cn ?u?_césát.
even 1SUBJ ?u?_hit:3OBJ
'I even hit him.'

(39b) čwín cn ?u?_césác.
even 1SUBJ ?u?_see:2OBJ
'I even hit you.'

(39c) čwín ?u?_césát-s.
even ?u?_hit:3OBJ-3SUBJ
'He even hit him.'

(39d) čwín ?u?_césát-s ce ncést.
even ?u?_hit:3OBJ-3SUBJ DET_my father
'He even hit my father.'

(39e) čwín ?u?_césát-əŋ ce ncést ?a?_ce_swáy'ga?.
even ?u?_hit-PASSIV DET_my father OBL_DET_man
'The man even hit my father.' or 'My father was even hit by the man.'

As described in section 4.2, the adverb differs from the auxiliary in that the
construction defining characteristic is not an immediately following verb but a
following ?u?-marked predicate. The adverb also differs from the auxiliary in that
the passive is not required when a transitive agent is explicitly mentioned in a
determiner phrase. The subject determiner phrase comes before the ?u?-marked
predicate. Compare (39d) with (40).
even DET_my father ?u?_hit:3OBJ
'My father even hit him.'

The only possible interpretation is as a simple predicate with a relative clause construction as subject. Relative clauses in Klallam are essentially the same as in Saanich (Montler 1993). In (41) swayqaJ is the head and k"?nnaxw is the restricting clause while ?en?á is the main verb.

6 Adjectives and nouns

Though no one has referred to any of the components of constructions like (42) as ‘auxiliaries’, this has been called a complex predicate.

(42) čq̓ cxw̓ swayˈqa?.
big_2SUBJ man
'You are a big man.'

Jelinek 1990:188 identifies constructions such as that illustrated in (42) with what we have been calling the zero-class or true auxiliaries discussed in section 4.1. They do indeed look similar to those complex predicates. As shown in (43), both of the words in (42) can be predicative and there is nothing else between the two.

(43a) čq̓ cxw̓.
big_2SUBJ
'You are big.'

(43b) swayˈqaʔ cxw.
man_2SUBJ
'You are a man.'
The construction in (42) does differ, however, from the auxiliary constructions both semantically and distributionally. Semantically, in this construction the first word is always a quality and the second is always a nominal, never verbal. In contrast, the four auxiliaries of section 4.1 are always followed by a verb, never by an adjectival or nominal word. This alone suggests that we have at least a separate category of auxiliary whose defining characteristic is that it must be followed by a nominal predicate. And corollary to that we must have a category of nominal predicates that may follow these adjectival auxiliaries.

A more definitive difference between these adjectivals and the auxiliaries is that these can take regular morphology. As noted in section 4, one of the defining characteristics of the auxiliaries (and the adverbs) is that they participate in no regular morphological processes—they are typically bare stems. The adjectivals, in contrast, may be, and in some cases, must be marked with the collective plural morphology.

It is necessary, first of all, to point out that plural marking is not obligatory in Klallam. Both examples in (44) are acceptable and are synonymous. (44a) show the singular form for ‘man’ and (44b) shows the reduplicated plural.

(44a) čá?sa? swág'yaq?.
  two  man
  ‘two men’

(44b) čá?sa? swáwý'yaq?.
  two  men
  ‘two men’

The adjectival in (42) may be pluralized with a singular nominal following as in (45).

(45) čáyq cxw' hay swág'yaq?.
    bigPL_2SUBJ_2PL  man
    ‘You are big men.’

And, just as in (44b), the nominal may also be plural as in (46).

(46) čáyq cxw' hay swáwý'yaq?.
    bigPL_2SUBJ_2PL  men
    ‘You are big men.’

But when the nominal is plural the adjectival is also required to be plural. So (47) is unacceptable.

(47) *čáq cxw' hay swáwý'yaq?.
    big_2SUBJ_2PL  men
This agreement is required not only in predicates but also in determiner phrases. (48) shows the same pattern as (42), (45)-(47).

(48a) `kʷánəxʷ cn əčəq swəʔyaʔ.
see:3OBL_ISUBJ DET_big man
'I see the big man.'

(48b) `kʷánəxʷ cn əčəyq swəʔyaʔ.
see:3OBL_ISUBJ DET_bigPL man
'I see the big men.'

(48c) `kʷánəxʷ cn əčəyq swəʔyəʔaʔ.
see:3OBL_ISUBJ DET_bigPL men
'I see the big men.'

(48d) *`kʷánəxʷ cn əčəq swəʔyəʔaʔ.
see:3OBL_ISUBJ DET_big men

There is one further restriction on these forms: the order of the words in (42) cannot be reversed as shown in (49).

(49) *swəʔyaʔaʔ _cxʷ əčəq.

The adjectival əčəq must be in a separate category from the nominal swəʔyaʔaʔ.

The special semantic, morphological, and syntactic restrictions on the categories of words such as shown in (42) lead us to the conclusion that they are distinct categories from each other and neither is in the same category as the auxiliaries. They are neither adverbs nor do they pass the test for the category verb discussed in 4.1.1 and 4.1.2. The most appropriate category names for words like əčəq and swəʔyaʔaʔ are adjective and noun, respectively.

7 Conclusion

By considering their surface syntactic and morphological distribution, the ‘auxiliaries’ of Thompson and Thompson 1971 are shown to be a different grammatical category from those of Thompson 1979. There is a small class of complex predicate forming lexical items in Klallam that can be called ‘auxiliaries’. Only four have been identified thus far. The auxiliaries are shown to be distinct from adverbs. Once the category ‘auxiliary’ is established we are able to find a simple, superficial distributional test for membership in a grammatical category ‘verb’.

We can identify three categories of ‘adverb’ depending on what proclitic the adverb requires on the main predicate: ʔuʔ-class, ʔiʔ-class, and c-class. The distinct
semantic shift of adverbs that function in other constructions as predicates shows that they form a category distinct from verbs and other predicative categories. The adverbs are also shown to be distinct from the auxiliaries in the syntax of determiner phrase agent placement when the main verb is third-person transitive.

Finally, grammatical categories 'adjective' and 'noun' are established by their distribution in contrast to auxiliaries in complex predicates. While auxiliaries are never morphologically marked, an adjective must be marked for plural if its accompanying noun is plural.

The grammatical patterns described here for Klallam are essentially the same in Northern Straits. These categories were arrived at by looking at the surface distribution of lexical items in construction. No reference was made to particular morphology allowed on particular lexical items independent of the constructions they appear in. Klallam and other Salishan languages are unlike most languages, for example the Muskogean languages like Alabama, where, although there is no 'be' verb, a number of simple morphological tests for membership in categories 'noun' and 'verb' can be found in the first few fieldwork sessions. For example, Alabama nouns take diminutive morphology but verbs do not, and the negative of predicate nouns in Alabama has a form distinct from the negative morphology of verbs. In contrast, almost any lexical item in Klallam can be predicative, plural, diminutive, imperfective, transitivized, and so on with uniform morphology. What is surprising is that in a language with as much morphology as Klallam and other Salishan languages there seems to be a scarcity of general, simple, morphological tests for membership in syntactic categories. Although it now seems certain that in constructions we can identify distinct grammatical categories, the language is no less rare and amazing.
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