Auxiliaries and other grammatical categories in Klallam

Timothy Montler
University of North Texas

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-adverbial, 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) *mán'*_cn   ʔuʔ_qák*ʷɬ.
      *very*_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_tired
      'I'm awfully tired.'

(1b) *túʔxʷ*_yaʔ   ʔuʔ_wəsə́ys.
      *exactly*_PAST   ʔuʔ_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.

(1c) *čəw̓ín̓*_cn   ʔuʔ_qiʔnúʔŋət.
      *even*_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_angry
      'Even I was angry.'

(1d) *X̌áy*_u_cxʷ   ʔuʔ_ʔéʔłn̓.
      *also*_QUEST_2SUBJ ʔuʔ_eating
      '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 reelicited example is repeated here in (2).

(2)   *hiyáʔ*_yaʔ_cn   t̓ákʷi.
      *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 *t̓ákʷi* that provides manner adverbial modification to the auxiliary, *hiyáʔ*. The second way they differ is syntactically. The proclitic *ʔuʔ*[3] 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[4] 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 *ʔuʔ* undoubtedly has the underlying form *w̓*, 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 *x̌ə́n̓* and Northern Straits *mə́kʷʷ* '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[5]. All but the first of the auxiliaries in (1) and (2) can also be simple predicates as in (3).

(3a) hiyá?_ya?_cn.
      go_PAST_1SUBJ
      'I went.'

(3b) tú?x^w_ya?
      middle_PAST
      'It was the middle.'

(3c) čəw̓ín̓_cn.
      even_1SUBJ
      'Even I am.'

(3d) x̣̌áy_u_cx^w.
      also_QUEST_2SUBJ
      'Are you, too?'

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

(4a) qák^{w}ɫ_cn.
      tired_1SUBJ
      'I'm tired.'

(4b) wəsə́ys_ya?.
      bark_PAST
      'It [the dog] barked.'

---

[5] 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).

(4c) qiʔnúʔŋət_cn.
angry_1SUBJ
'I was angry.'[6]

(4d) ʔéʔłn̓_u_cxʷ.
eating_QUEST_2SUBJ
'Are you eating?'

(4e) t̓ákʷi_yaʔ_cn.
cross_PAST_1SUBJ
'I crossed.'

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 (example7), 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:

ččát-s   cə_súł.
build-3SUBJ DET_road
'He built the road.'

but

ččát-s   cə_ncə́t.
build-3SUBJ DET_my father
'My father built it.'

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:

ččát-s   cə_ncə́t   cə_súł
build-3SUBJ DET_my father DET_road
'My father built the road.'

or

ččát-s   cə_súł   cə_ncə́t.
build-3SUBJ DET_road   DET_my father
'My father built the road.'

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,

ƛ̓ʷə́nts cə_swéw̓əs cə_cət-s
look at DET_boy   DET father-his

or

240

(5a) hiyáʔ_yaʔ cə_swə́yʹqaʔ.
      go_PAST   DET_man
      'The man went.'

(5b) kʷə́nts cə_swə́yʹqaʔ· cə_słáni.
      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, *ʔaʔ*:

(6a) hiyáʔ_cn ʔaʔ_cə_súł
      go_1SUBJ PREP_DET_door
      'I went to the door.'

(6b) kʷə́nnəŋ_cn ʔaʔ_cə_swə́yʹqaʔ.
      be seen_1SUBJ PREP_DET_man
      'I was seen by the man.'

(6c) šč̓ə́t_u_cxʷ   ʔaʔ_cə_šč̓ə́yaʔ
      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 *ʔəł* (example 7b), and subjective genitive clauses (see Montler 1996 for examples of this latter type clause).

(7a) hiyáʔ_cn kʷaʔ_hiyáʔ-xʷ.
      go_1SUBJ SUBORD_go-2SUBORDSUBJ
      'I'll go if/when you go.'

(7b) hiyáʔ_cn ʔəł_hiyáʔ-xʷ
      go_1SUBJ WHILE_go-2SUBORDSUBJ
      'I'll go when/while you go.'

The conjoined DP is preceded by the comitative conjunction *ʔiʔ*:

---

kʷə́nts cə_cət-s   cə_swéwʹəs
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.

(8) hiyáʔ_cn ʔiʔ_cə_ncə́t.
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 itself[8] 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) hiyáʔ_yaʔ_cxʷ.
go_2SUBJ
'You went.'

(9b) ḱʷə́nn-əŋ_yaʔ_cxʷ.
see-PASSIVE_PAST_2SUBJ
'You were seen.'

(9c) hiyáʔ_yaʔ_cxʷ ḱʷə́nn-əŋ.
go_2SUBJ   see-PASSIVE
'Someone went to see you.'

---

[8] Demers 1980 refers to the enclitic bundle constituent as AUX.

242

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):

(10*a*) ʔúpn   ʔiʔ_či_táʔcs
    ten   COM_DET_eight
    'eighteen'

(10*b*) ʔúpn_yaʔ_cn   ʔiʔ_či_táʔcs   sčiʔánəŋ.
    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.[9] 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[10] 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 *sáɬəŋ* 'constantly' appears to be composed of a root *saɬ* and the *-əŋ* 'middle' suffix. This root has, however, never been recorded without the ending, so *sáɬəŋ* may be a unit morpheme. The other exception is clearly a derived form. The auxiliary *ʔsɬáxʷɬ* 'definitely' has a root *ɬxʷ* 'straight' with the common morpheme combination *ʔs-* 'stative' prefix, *-ɬ* '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 *ɬxʷə́t* 'steer' and *ɬxʷúst* 'give a talking to, lit. straight-face someone'.

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), *ʔuʔ*-class (section 4.2), *ʔiʔ*-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: *hiyáʔ, ʔənʔá, X̣'áy,* and *huy*.

4.1.1 hiyáʔ and ʔənʔá

The two straightforward cases of zero-class auxiliaries are *hiyáʔ* 'go' and *ʔənʔá* 'come'. These are common and occur with a wide variety of predicates as shown in (11) and (12).

(11*a*) hiyáʔ_caʔn   X̣'ácu.
     go_1SUBJFUT   fishing
     'I'll go fishing.'

(11*b*) hiyáʔ_cn   ʔúx̣ʷ   ʔaʔ_cə_súɫ.
     go_1SUBJ   go there   OBL_DET_door
     'I went over to the door.'

(11*c*) hiyáʔ_yaʔ_cn   ʔúyɫ   ʔaʔ_cə_snə́xʷɫ.
     go_PAST_1SUBJ   go aboard   OBL_DET_canoe
     'I went aboard the canoe.'

(11*d*) hiyáʔ_u_cx̣ʷ   ʔíɫn?
     go_QUEST_2SUBJ   eat
     'Are you going to eat?'

(11*e*) hiyáʔ_cn   ʔítt.
     go_1SUBJ   sleep
     'I'll go to sleep.'

(11*f*) hiyáʔ_u_cxʷ   šə́təŋ?
      go_QUEST_2SUBJ walking
      'Are you going walking?'

(12*a*) ʔənʔá_yaʔ_cn   kʷʔnnəŋ.
       come_past_1Subj be seen
       'Someone came to see me.'

(12*b*) ʔənʔá_cn   ʔúx̣ʷ   ʔaʔ_čx̣ʷícn.
       come_1SUBJ go there OBL_Port Angeles
       'I came over to Port Angeles.'

(12*c*) ʔənʔá_yaʔ_cn   haʔwí-st-əŋ
       come_PAST_1SUBJ go forward-CAUS-PASSV
       'They brought me up front.'

(12*d*) ʔənʔá_cn   tákʷi.
       come_1SUBJ cross
       'I came across.'

(12*e*) ʔənʔá_u_caʔ_cxʷ   ʔíɬn.
       come_QUEST_FUT_2SUBJ eat
       'Will you come eat?'

(12*f*) ʔənʔá_st   x̣ʼqíct.
       come_1PLSUBJ come up out of water
       'We came up out of the water.'

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.[11]

(13*a*) *hiyáʔ_cn   šaʔšúʔɬ.
        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.

245

(13*b*) *hiyá?_cn ?áy.
  go_1SUBJ good

(13*c*) *hiyá?_cn nə?á?iŋ.
  go_1SUBJ my house

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 ƛ̓áy and húy

It might be argued that, since they are motion predicates, *hiyá?* and *?ən?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 *?ít* 'sleep' (11*e*) and *k̓ʷə́nnəŋ* 'be seen' (12*a*), the other two zero-class auxiliaries show that this is not the case.

While *hiyá?* and *?ən?á* function in two ways--either as independent predicates or as zero-class auxiliaries--ƛ̓áy and húy each have three possible functions: independent predicates, zero-class auxiliaries, and *?u?*-class auxiliaries. Their meaning and function as *?u?*-class auxiliaries is described in section 4.2. In the function as independent predicate or zero-class auxiliary ƛ̓áy means 'again' and húy means 'finish'.

(14*a*) ƛ̓áy_cn
  again_1SUBJ
  'I did/will again.'

(14*b*) ƛ̓áy_cn t̓iym.
  again_1SUBJ sing
  'I'll sing again.'

(14*c*) ƛ̓áy_u_cxʷ čá?i.
  again_QUEST_2SUBJ working
  'Are you working again?'

(14*d*) ƛ̓áy_cn ?íɬn.
  again_1SUBJ eat
  'I ate again.'

246

(15a) húy_cn
       finish_1SUBJ
       'I finished.'

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

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

Examples (14a) and (15a) show X̣'áy and húy as independent predicates. Neither X̣'áy 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 hiyáʔ and ʔənʔá. The second predicate may not be adjectival or nominal:

(16a) *X̣'ay_cn   šaʔšúʔɬ.
        again_1SUBJ   happy

(16b) *X̣'ay_cn   ʔəy̓.
        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) X̣'ay_cn   txʷaʔ-šaʔšúʔɬ.
       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-txʷ_cn   cə_nʔáʔiŋ.
       finish-CAUSE_1SUBJ   DET_my house
       'I finished my house.'

(18b) húy   cə_nʔáʔiŋ.
       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) *ƛ̓áy_cn*   ʔuʔ_šaʔšúʔɬ.
       also_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_happy
       'I'm also happy.'

(19b) *húy_cn*   ʔuʔ_hiyáʔ.
       only_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_go
       'I'm only going.'

(19c) *ɬə́ŋ_cn*   ʔuʔ_kʷán.
       just like_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_lost
       'I'm just lost.'

(19d) *sə́ɬəŋ_cn*   ʔuʔ_qʷáqʷi.
       continuously_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_talking
       'I'm talking continuously.'

(19e) *céʔət_cn*   ʔuʔ_ʔíɬn.
       truly_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_eat
       'I truly ate.'

(19f) *ʔsɬáx̌ʷɬ_cxʷ*   ʔuʔ_ʔíyəm.
       definitely_2SUBJ   ʔuʔ_strong
       'You're definitely strong.'

(19g) čwín_cn ʔuʔ_qʷáqʷi.
  *even_*1SUBJ ʔuʔ_talking
  'Even I am talking.'

(19h) túʔxʷ_cxʷ ʔuʔ_ʔsƛ̓úʔƛ̓m.
  *exactly_*2SUBJ ʔuʔ_correct
  'You're exactly right.'

(19i) xən_st ʔuʔ_tíym.
  *all_*1PLSUBJ ʔuʔ_sing
  'We all sing.'

(19j) ʔuʔúʔ_yaʔ_cn ʔuʔ_čáy.
  *beginning_*PAST_1SUBJ ʔuʔ_work
  'I was at the beginning of work.'

(19k) mán_cn ʔuʔ_šaʔšúʔɬ.
  *very_*1SUBJ ʔuʔ_happy
  'I'm very happy.'

With the exception of one, all of the lexical items in this group may function as independent predicates. The exception is *mán* 'very' (illustrated in (1a) and (19k)), which requires a following *ʔuʔ*-marked predicate.[12] *mán* cannot stand as an independent predicate itself, and it cannot occur with any of the morphology associated with predicative words. These facts indicate that *mán* is, indeed, not a predicate but a member of a separate lexical category. If *mán* is not a predicate, then this *ʔuʔ* construction is not a complex predicate construction. The most appropriate name for the lexical category that *mán* represents is **Adverb**. The *ʔuʔ* 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 *mán* may be transitivized with the causative suffix *-txʷ*. The resulting form *mántxʷ* 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 λ̓áy means 'also' while in other constructions it means 'again'.[13] The adverb húy means 'only' while in other constructions it means 'finish'. Minimal pairs are shown in (20) and (21).

(20a) λ̓áy_cn   t̓íym.
      again_1SUBJ   sing
      'I'll sing again.'

(20b) λ̓áy_cn   ʔuʔ_t̓íym.
      also_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_sing
      'I'll sing, too.'

(21a) húy_cn   t̓íym.
      finish_1SUBJ   sing
      'I finished singing.'

(21b) húy_cn   ʔuʔ_t̓íym.
      only_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_sing
      'Only I sang.'

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

(22)

	In ʔuʔ construction	In other constructions
λ̓áy	also	again
húy	only	finish
ɬə́ŋ	just like	detach
sə́ɬəŋ	continuously	continue
céʔət	truly	tell the truth
ʔsɬáx̣ʷɬ	definitely	be straight
čw̓ín̓	even (so)	not even (so)
túʔx̣ʷ	exactly	be in the middle

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 (céʔət for example), while for others it is vague (túʔx̣ʷ) but

---

[13] The Saanich cognate λ̓eʔ patterns the same way: when followed by ʔəw̓ 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 ʔəw̓ and glosses it as ambiguous between 'again' and 'also'.

recoverable. For *ɬə́ŋ* the connection is obscure. The adverbial meaning of *ɬə́ŋ* is difficult to translate with a simple gloss. The examples in (23*a-g*) show its range as an adverb and (23*h*) shows its use as a predicate.

(23*a*) ɬə́ŋ_cn   ʔuʔ_x̌čít.
just like_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_know it
'I really know it.'

(23*b*) ɬə́ŋ_cn   ʔuʔ_k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ.
just like_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_saw it
'I just saw it.'

(23*c*) ɬə́ŋ_cn   ʔuʔ_swə́y̓qaʔ.
just like_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_man
'I'm a real man/I'm just a man.'

(23*d*) ɬə́ŋ_u_cxʷ   ʔuʔ_hiyáʔ.
just like_QUEST_2SUBJ   ʔuʔ_go
'Are you really going?'

(23*e*) ɬə́ŋ   ʔuʔ_pə́q̓.
just like   ʔuʔ_white
'It's really white/It's almost white.'

(23*f*) ɬə́ŋ_cn   ʔuʔ_siʔám̓.
just like_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_rich
'I'm just like I'm rich. [context: getting a ride in a limousine]'

(23*g*) ɬə́ŋ_cxʷ   ʔuʔ_sqʷmə́y.
just like_2SUBJ   ʔuʔ_dog
'You're just like a dog. [an insult]'

(23*h*) ɬə́ŋ_cn.
detach_1SUBJ
'I'm off (what I was stuck on).'

For *čw̓ín̓* 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 *čw̓ín̓* 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 *čw̓ín̓* occurs alone it means 'even'. Examples of *čw̓ín̓* are shown in (24).

(24a) čw'íṅ_cn   ʔuʔ_čpaypsénts.
       even_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_have five cents
       'Even I have five cents.'

(24b) čw'íṅ   či_nsuʔčpaypsénts.
       not even   DET_my having five cents
       'I don't even have five cents.'

(24c) čw'íṅ_cn   ʔuʔ_k'ʷənnúŋə.
       even_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_see you
       'I even saw you.'

(24d) čw'íṅ   či_nsk'ʷənnúŋə.
       not even   DET_my seeing you
       'I didn't even see you.'

(24e) čw'íṅ_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 *x̣ə́n'* 'all' is very common and, though it usually does appear with the following *ʔuʔ*, it can appear without it and without a change in meaning. Unlike all of the other *ʔuʔ*-class adverbs, it seems that *x̣ə́n'* can occur as an adverb, a predicate, or as an adjective.

The final adverb, *ʔuʔúʔ*, 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: *čəyáy* 'almost', *híc* 'long since', and *x̣ʷə́ŋ* 'possibly'. A fourth member is derived from the first just mentioned, *k'ʷɬčəyáy* 'soon', with the 'realized' prefix *k'ʷɬ-*. These are illustrated in (25).

(25a) čəyáy_cn ʔiʔ_ƚáŋən.
    almost_1SUBJ ʔiʔ_miss
    'I almost missed (the target).'

(25b) híc_cn ʔiʔ_ʔíƚn.
    long since_1SUBJ ʔiʔ_eat
    'It's a long time since I ate.'

(25c) x̣ʷə́ŋ_cn ʔiʔ_hiyáʔ.
    possibly_1SUBJ ʔiʔ_go
    'I might go/I can go/It's possible for me to go.'

(25d) kʷƚčəyáy_cn ʔiʔ_hiyáʔ.
    soon_1SUBJ ʔiʔ_go
    'I go soon.'

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

(26)

	In ʔiʔ construction	In other constructions
čəyáy	almost	barely
híc	long since	long duration
x̣ʷə́ŋ	possibly, might, can	quick, fast

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

(27a) čəyáy cə_nsuʔƚáŋən.
    barely DET_my missing
    'I barely missed (the target).'

---

[14] Jelinek 1990:181 incidentally mentions x̣ʷə́ŋ as a 'modal predicate'. This is better analyzed as an adverbial 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 čəlél, the Northern Straits cognate for čəyáy, and lists it as one of the ʔuʔ 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 ʔuʔ.

(27b) híc   kʷi_nəsʔíɬn.
       long duration   DET_my eating
       'I ate a long time.'

(27c) xʷə́ŋ_cn   ʔəɬ_hiyáʔ-n.
       quick_1SUBJ   WHILE_go-1SS·
       'I'm quick when I go.'

The relationship between the two functions of čəyáy is very similar to the relationship between the two functions of the ʔuʔ 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 ʔiʔ adverbs have in common in contrast with the ʔuʔ adverbs is reference to time. Though čəyáy can be use for both time and space, when it has the 'realized' prefix in kʷɬčəyáy it refers only to time. This may be historically related to the semantics of the ʔiʔ proclitic.

4.4   ʔiʔ and ʔuʔ

There are at least two separate morphemes, proclitic or prefix, with the form ʔiʔ. One, probably cognate with the ýc- '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) xáɬ_cn   ʔiʔ_ʔiʔ-šə́təŋ_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) xáɬ_cn   ʔiʔ_ʔiʔ-šə́təŋ.
      sick_1SUBJ   COM_CONTIN-walking
      'I'm sick and walking.'

Note that the form of (29) is superficially the same as the ʔiʔ 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) čəyáy_cn   ʔiʔ_ƛáŋən_cn.
      barely_1SUBJ COM_miss_1SUBJ
      'I barely did it and I missed.'

The conjunction *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ* adverbs each have time-related semantics while none of the *ʔuʔ* adverbs do indicates that the *ʔiʔ* of the adverbial construction must be historically related to the conjunction *ʔiʔ*.

Thompson and Thompson 1971 and Montler 1986 call the *ʔuʔ* '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 *ʔuʔ* with an *ʔuʔ* 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 *ʔuʔ_šátəŋ_cn* 'I'm walking.' The sentence without the *ʔuʔ* is also translated 'I'm walking', but native speakers consistently use contrastive intonation in the English translation of the form with the *ʔuʔ*. Generally this initial *ʔuʔ* means something like 'contrary to what one might think' or 'in contrast to the previous context'. Out of context this *ʔuʔ* is optional. The *ʔuʔ* in the 'auxiliary' construction is *not* optional and never carries semantic or pragmatic function. It is strictly a construction formative.

When the *ʔiʔ* conjunction and *ʔuʔ* contrast marker both appear[15] before a second predicate the translation usually includes 'but' as in (31).

(31) x̣áɬ_cn   ʔiʔ_ʔuʔ_ʔiʔ-šátəŋ.
      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: *ʔáwə* 'not' and *ʔúʔaʔ* '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 *kə* 'unrealized'

---

[15] When *ʔiʔ* and *ʔuʔ* appear together the phonetic result is usually *yuʔ*.

(Thompson and Thompson 1992:150) particle and the Moses-Columbia 'unrealized' prefix *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 *c* is extremely limited--it occurs only before predicates following the *ʔáwə* and *ʔúʔaʔ*.[16] Examples of *ʔáwə*, a very common word, are shown in (32) and *ʔúʔaʔ*, much less common in the corpus, in (33).

(32a) ʔáwə c_həwíyŋ.
      not   C_return
      'She didn't return.'

(32b) ʔáwə_cn   c_xʷənítəm.
      not_1SUBJ C_white person
      'I'm not a white man.'

(32c) ʔáwə_cxʷ c_čáʔsə.
      not_2SUBJ C_two people
      'There aren't two of you.'

(32d) ʔáwə c_nə́kʷ.
      not   C_you
      'It's not you.'

(32e) ʔáwə_cn   c_k̓ʷə́nn-əŋ.
      not_1SUBJ C_see-PASSIV
      'I wasn't seen.'

(32f) ʔáwə_cn   c_ʔə́y̓.
      not_1SUBJ C_good
      'I'm not well.'

(32g) ʔáwə_yaʔ_st   c_skʷúkʷ1.
      not_PAST_1PLSUBJ C_go to school
      'We didn't go to school.'

(33a) ʔúʔaʔ_cn   c_ʔíɬn.
      not yet_1SUBJ C_eat
      'I didn't eat yet.'

---

[16] The situation in Klallam is clearer than in Northern Straits. The Northern Straits cognate is *s* (Montler 1986:191), merging phonologically with other *s* prefixes. Once all the *s*'s are properly sorted out, the pattern in Northern Straits seems to be the same as Klallam.

(33b) ʔúʔaʔ   c_X̌'úmʔ.
       not yet   C_enough
       'It's not yet enough.'

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

(33d) ʔúʔaʔ_cn   c_hiyáʔ.
       not yet_1SUBJ   C_go
       'I'm not going yet.'

ʔáwə 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) ʔáwə_cn.
       not_1SUBJ
       'I'm not/I didn't/I won't.'

(34b) ʔáwə   cə_k̓ʷáɬən.
       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_cxʷ   hiyáʔ ʔiʔ_hiyáʔ_caʔn.
        if/when_FUT_2SUBJ   go   COM_go_1FUTSUBJ
        'I'll go if/when you go.'

The *húʔ* root in (35) seems to pattern with the zero-class auxiliaries discussed in section 4.1--*húʔ* and its enclitics are immediately followed by a main predicate. It differs from them in two respects. First, *húʔ* is never predicative itself; it must always be followed by a predicate. So forms like **húʔ_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 **húʔ_caʔ_cxʷ hiyáʔ* are unacceptable alone. The two conjuncts must appear with the *húʔ* clause first so that **hiyáʔ_caʔn ʔiʔ húʔ_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) ʔənʔá_yaʔ_cn   k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ.[17]
     come_PAST_1SUBJ   see:3OBJ
     'I came to see him.'

(36b) ʔənʔá_yaʔ_cn   k̓ʷənn-úŋə.
     come_PAST_1SUBJ   see-2OBJ
     'I came to see you.'

(36c) ʔənʔá_yaʔ   k̓ʷə́nt-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 -*nəxʷ* '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.'

(37) ʔənʔá_yaʔ   k̓ʷə́nt-s   cə_snə́xʷɬ.
     come_PAST   look at:3OBJ-3SUBJ   DET_canoe
     'He came to look at the canoe.'

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) ʔənʔá_yaʔ   k̓ʷə́nt-əŋ   cə_snə́xʷɬ   ʔaʔ_cə_swə́yʼqaʔ.
     come_PAST   look at-PASSIV   DET_canoe   OBL_DET_man
     '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) čwíṅ_cn   ʔuʔ_c̓sə́t.
      even_1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_hit:3OBJ
      'I even hit him.'

(39b) čwíṅ_cn   ʔuʔ_c̓sə́c.
      even _1SUBJ   ʔuʔ_see:2OBJ
      'I even hit you.'

(39c) čwíṅ   ʔuʔ_c̓sə́t-s.
      even   ʔuʔ_hit:3OBJ-3SUBJ
      'He even hit him.'

(39d) čwíṅ   ʔuʔ_c̓sə́t-s   cə_ncə́t.
      even   ʔuʔ_hit:3OBJ-3SUBJ   DET_my father
      'He even hit my father.'

(39e) čwíṅ   ʔuʔ_c̓sə́t-əŋ   cə_ncə́t   ʔaʔ_cə_swə́yʼqaʔ.
      even   ʔuʔ_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 ʔuʔ-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 ʔuʔ-marked predicate. Compare (39d) with (40).

(40) čw̓ín̓ cə ncə́t   ʔuʔ_c̓sə́t.
      even   DET_my father   ʔuʔ_hit:3OBJ
      'My father even hit him.'

The adverb construction allows the agent determiner phrase to be explicitly mentioned without resorting to the passive. The agent precedes the main verb and the -s third person transitive subject marker is missing from the verb in this construction. Example (41) shows the auxiliary ʔənʔá in a construction parallel to that in (40).

(41) ʔənʔá cə_sw̓əy̓qaʔ k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ
      come   DET_man   see:3OBJ
      'The man that saw him came.'

The determiner phrase here cannot be interpreted as the subject of the second verb and this sentence cannot be interpreted as auxiliary/complex predicate construction. 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) sw̓əy̓qaʔ is the head and k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ is the restricting clause while ʔənʔá 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) c̓ə́q_cxʷ   sw̓əy̓qaʔ.
      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) c̓ə́q_cxʷ.
       big_2SUBJ
       'You are big.'

(43b) sw̓əy̓qaʔ_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 from for 'man' and (44b) shows the reduplicated plural.

(44a) čá?sa? swə́y̓qa?.
   two   man
   'two men'

(44b) čá?sa? sw̓wə́y̓qa?.
   two   men
   'two men'

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

(45) čáyq_cxʷ_hay   swə́y̓qa?.
   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   sw̓wə́y̓qa?.
   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) *čə́q_cxʷ_hay   sw̓wə́y̓qa?.
   big_2SUBJ_2PL   men

261

This agreement is required not only in predicates but also in determiner phrases. (48) shows the same pattern as (42), (45)-(47).

(48a) k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ_cn   cə_čə́q   swə́yʼqaʔ.
       see:3OBJ_1SUBJ DET_big   man
       'I see the big man.'

(48b) k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ_cn   cə_čáyq   swə́yʼqaʔ.
       see:3OBJ_1SUBJ DET_bigPL   man
       'I see the big men.'

(48c) k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ_cn   cə_čáyq   sʼwwə́yʼqaʔ.
       see:3OBJ_1SUBJ DET_bigPL   men
       'I see the big men.'

(48d) *k̓ʷə́nnəxʷ_cn   cə_čə́q   sʼwwə́yʼqaʔ.
       see:3OBJ_1SUBJ 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)   *swə́yʼqaʔ_cxʷ čə́q.

The adjectival *čə́q* must be in a separate category from the nominal *swə́yʼqaʔ*.

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 *čə́q* and *swə́yʼqaʔ* are **adjective** and **noun**, respectively.

7 Conclusion

By considering their surface syntactic and morphological distribution, the 'auxiliaries' of Thompson and Thompson 1971 are shown 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.

References

Doak, Ivy. 1997. Coeur d'Alene Grammatical Relations. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Efrat, Barbara S. 1969. A grammar of nonparticles in Sooke, a dialect of Straits Coast Salish. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1990. Quantification in Straits Salish. Papers for the 25th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages. Pp. 177-194. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers. 1994. Predicates and pronominal arguments in Straits Salish. Language 70.697-736.

Mattina, Nancy. 1997. Moses-Columbia imperative constructions: a working paper. Papers for the 32nd International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages. Pp. 325-337. Port Angeles, WA: Elwha Klallam Tribe.

Montler, Timothy. 1986. An outline of the morphology and phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 4. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

Montler, Timothy. 1993. Relative Clauses and Other Attributive Constructions in Saanich. In American Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson, ed. by A. Mattina and T. Montler. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguisitcs, No. 10. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

Montler, Timothy. 1996. Some Klallam paradigms. Papers for the 31st International Conference on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages. Pp. 257-263. Vancouver: Linguistics Department, University of British Columbia.

Poggi, Claudine. 1981. Klallam auxiliaries: a subclass of predicatives. Working Papers of the XVI ICSL. Pp. 63-69. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, No. 2. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

Raffo, Yolanda. 1972. A phonology and morphology of Songish, a dialect of Straits Salish. PhD dissertation, University of Kansas.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. On the development of auxiliaries in Salish. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 11:2.67-73.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: a preview. Studies in American Indian languages, ed. Jesse Sawyer. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 65.251-294.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. The Thompson Language. Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 8. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.