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This paper reviews the status of the copula wi in Upper Chehalis. Focussing on the basic use of the copula in inversion contexts, I demonstrate that the unmarked copula wi can fruitfully be reanalyzed as the discourse connective wi. This follows from reanalyzing copular inversion as and-fronting, a construction documented in Kroeber (1999) and found in several branches of Salish. After reviewing the Upper Chehalis and cross-Salish evidence, I conclude the paper with a formal treatment of the construction. Based on the available data, I propose that this structure is a type of left-dislocation.

1 Introduction

Boas’ (1934) presentation of the Upper Chehalis text “Bear and Bee” has several instances of a morpheme, wi, which he glossed “to be”, and which has since been known as the copula. In Kinkade’s (1983b) expansion and narrative verse analysis of this same text, it was demonstrated that a great bulk of the occurrences of wi could fruitfully be analyzed as examples of a particle used to mark the beginning of lines, what one might want to dub a discourse connective, generally translatable as “and (then)”. A representative slice of the text is given below, with both Boas’ and Kinkade’s glosses.1,2

1  a wi ḡāq̌ tanin?
   B It.is well ----­
   K and well now

1 I would like to thank Dale Kinkade, Henry Davis, Paul Kroeber, Martina Wiltschko, Rose-Marie Dechaine, Lisa Matthewson, the LING 518 class and the participants of the NWLC 2001 for helpful discussion of this material. I would also like to thank Dale Kinkade for supplying me with some unpublished Upper Chehalis materials. All errors are my own.
2 Boas didn’t offer a fluent English translation, and Kinkade didn’t supply glosses. Thus, the “Kinkade gloss” here is my own, based on Kinkade’s other work on Upper Chehalis. Furthermore, the transcription is based on Kinkade (1983b), and furthermore Kinkade also contains one word missing from Boas, tanin? ACT = actual, ASP = aspect, AUX = auxiliary, CAUS = causative, COP = copula, CTN = continuative, CTR = control transitive, DEF = definite, DEM = demonstrative, DET = determiner, EVID = evidential, EXIS = assertion of existence, FC = full control, FOC = focus, HAB = habitual, IMPF = imperfective, INCH = inchoative, IND = independent pronominal, INTR = intransitive, IRR = irrealis, LNK = link, MDL = middle, MUT = mutative, NCTR = non-control transitive NEG = negative, NOM = nominalizer, OBJ = object, OBL = oblique, PAS = passive, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, POS = possessive, PREP = preposition, PRG = progressive, PRT = particle, PST = past, RDP = reduplication, RFL = reflexive, SBJ = subject, SER = serial, ST = stative, SUCL = subject clitic, TR = transitive, YNQ = yes/no question. Language abbreviations: Cr = Coeur d’Alene, HIC = Cowichan (Island)/Halkomelem, Ka = Kalispel, Li = Lillooet, Lm = Lummi/Northern Straits, Ls = Lushootseed, Ok = Okanagan, Sa = Saanich/Northern Straits, Sg = Songish/Northern Straits, UC = Upper Chehalis. Note that I put infixes in curly brackets.
And well, now

b  načšpánxʷ Ḹa sḵ̓álači-s
B  one.year will(be) its.day
K  one.year FUT day-3.POS
one year will be daylight

c  Ḹo-čs mótə
B  one summer
K  one summer
One summer

d  wi Ḹo-čs sḵ̓álači
B  is one day
K  COP one day
is one day.

UC  Kinkade 1983: 255 #15-18

However, several instances of wi were not amenable to the discourse connective analysis, and Kinkade (1976, 1991, 2000) continued to use the term copula for this residue, although noting that it is in fact a “simplified label” (2000: 122). Kinkade (1976) played down a possible connection between the two wi’s, and Kinkade (2000) actually denied any connection. In his words, the discourse marker wi “is unrelated to the copula wi” (2000: 123).

My goals in this paper are to present some likely cross-Salish correlates of the copular wi construction, particularly its unmarked form used in inversion contexts, and show that they may in fact be better analyzed as instances of a discourse connective “and (then)”. In Section 2, I will lay out some of the basic facts of Upper Chehalis sentence structure and present the copula. I will then give some reasons why the copular analysis of wi may be problematic and ripe for reanalysis. In Section 3, I propose a novel and-fronting analysis, based on Kroeber’s (1999) discussion of the phenomenon within Salish, and explore its manifestations across the language family. This is a construction where some constituent, usually the subject, is set off to the left edge of the sentence to which it is connected by “and”. In Section 4 I take some steps towards a formal treatment of this structure and argue that and-fronting is a type of left-dislocation.

2 Background

2.1 Some Upper Chehalis basics

The normal word order in Upper Chehalis is VSO.

2  Ḹit qwil-am tat n-čáš
DET bleed-MDL DET 1S.POS-arm
my arm bled

UC  Kinkade 1976: 17 #2
Wildcat was carrying a hind leg

A woman goes out.

Words of any grammatical category may function as a predicate. This is a very characteristic feature of Salish languages (Kinkade 1983a). The examples in (5-7) are from Upper Chehalis, where an adjective or complex nominal is used as the main predicate, here enclosed in brackets.

They are heavy.

It's a big black dog.

She is a tall woman.

The one going along is a coyote.

The boss is a big man.

In fact, when discussing the VSO word order in Upper Chehalis, Kinkade (1976) points out that V does not straightforwardly stand for “verb” nor S and O for “nouns”, because in fact all elements are predicates. Kinkade further goes on to state that “if a
noun-verb dichotomy is relevant at all in Inland Olympic, it is a purely surface phenomenon developed through inversion of normal word order”. Inversion is performed by reversing the order of V and S, and placing the copula wi between. That is, $VS(O) \rightarrow S wi V(O)$, which is the quintessential environment for unmarked wi. From here on, I will enclose the inverted constituent in square brackets and indicate the copula with a solid underline.

10 [tit s-qit-ači] wi siw tó-m-l
DET NOM-day-? COP too short-INTR
The day is too short
UC Kinkade 1983b: 255 #6

11 [titxí néʔʔ] wi xáʔ
DEM here COP difficult
This here is difficult
UC Kinkade 1983b: 255 #67

12 [cáne] wi ?ac-táč-č̌e
3s.IND COP ST-sick-?
he is sick
UC Kinkade 1964: 34

13 [ʔánca] wi ?it sáwla-mi č̌n
1s.IND COP DET ask-2s.OBJ 1s.SUCL
I asked you
UC Kinkade 1976: 18 #15

14 [ʔelápa] wi sʔélán-alp
2p.IND COP sing-2p.SBJ
you are singing
UC Kinkade 1964: 33

15 [tet ʔelápa] wi s-čés-mes-alp tet cáne
DET 2p.IND COP S-come-3OBJ-2p.SSBJ DET 3s.IND
you are coming after him
UC Kinkade 1964: 33

Although not reported in Kinkade (1976), the copula wi is also sometimes used when an object is preverbal.3

---

3 These are the only examples of an object inverted with wi which I have found in Upper Chehalis. The fact that they occur with the strong quantifier xʷʔaqʷ may or may not be significant. One might want to analyze these cases as a type of Quantifier Raising instead.
16 [xʷáqʷ u wa-] wi nkʷs yucá-y-nš
all yet what COP HAB kill-?.-1S.SBJ
I always kill everyone.
   UC   M.D. Kinkade pc. 16.7.4-7.58

17 [xʷáqʷ u ti tala xáš] wi t t ?asú-xʷ čn
all yet DET ? house COP OBL DET take-CAUS 1S.SUCL
It is all your house that I will take.
   UC   M.D. Kinkade pc. 104.9.42-9.6

And furthermore, an adverbial appears before wi in the following example.

18 [qíćx] wi ṭsáy ṭat sāʔs tit támš ča t sšaaňálaxw
thus cop good must make det world and det people
Thus it is good for the world and the people to be made.

2.2 Examples of marked wi

Aside from the cases just mentioned, the other major use reported for the copula wi is in negative contexts. Kinkade (1976) was unable to determine what factors dictate the occurrence of wi in this construction. Some examples of this use are given below. Note that (19) and (20) are identical except for the occurrence of wi.

19 miňta t s-nám-nax-ʔnut-čł
   not DET NOM-done-promise-mind-1P.POS
he disagreed with me
   UC   Kinkade 1976: 19 #19

20 miňta t s-wi-ns ṭit nám-nax-ʔnut čł
   not DET NOM-COP-3S.POS done-promise-mind-1P.POS
he disagreed with me
   UC   Kinkade 1976: 19 #20

21 miňta t s-wi-ns ṭit kʷóčč-mən...
   not DET NOM-COP-3S.POS COMPL listen-IT
he didn't listen to them...
   UC   Kinkade 1976: 20 #34

22 ḥamaʔ miňta t s-wi-ns ṭac-kʷáňa-xʷ...
   if not DET NOM-COP-3S.POS ST-take-IT
if he doesn’t take it...
   UC   Kinkade 1976: 20 #35
Sometimes copular *wi* appears in non-inversion contexts, in which case it is usually marked with subject inflection, and very often with continuative/nominalizer inflection as well.

23  *wi*-n-n tan miłta tám t qa·ʔá qał cáxʷ-t-wali-s
    COP-EPEN-3SU now not DET water MOD go.through-TR-TO-3S.POS
    Then no water can go through
    UC  Kinkade 1990: 354 #18

24  s-wi-n-n ʔac-xʷé-n-ʔ
    NOM-COP-ʔ(EPEN)-3SU ST-weak-INTR
    he's becoming weak
    UC  Kinkade 1976: 20 #16

Yet other instances of the copula appear with various affixes and with a lengthened vowel in apparent lexical derivations of *wi*. These include:

- wé-náx “have, live, be, stay” (completive wé-x)

25  ʔac-wé-ʔ t čít-ns
    ST-COP-DEF DET older.brother-3.POS
    He has an older brother
    UC  Kinkade 1976: 22 #58

26  (cóni *wi*) ʔít wé-ʔ t káqtənł
    (DEM COP) DET COP-DEF DET long.time
    He stayed a long time
    UC  Kinkade 1976: 23 #61

- win-tn “home, place to live”

27  titxtí *wi* caníł win-tn
    DEM COP 3.POS cop-nom
    This is his home.
    UC  Kinkade 1976: 23 #64

28  (cóni *wi*) šání-ʔ win-tn-s
    (DEM COP) there-DEF DET COP-NOM-3.POS
    He's living there.
    UC  Kinkade 1976: 23 #65

- *wi*-t-xʷ “do, put”

29  ʔít *wi*-t-xʷ čn yáŋq
    DET COP-ʔ-CAUS 1S.SUCL around.neck
    I put it around my neck.
    UC  Kinkade 1976: 23 #67
2.3 Reasons for scepticism

There are in fact a number of reasons to doubt the analysis of *wi as a copula in Upper Chehalis. The following are some things worth considering.

I. No other Salish language uses a copula to license adjectival and nominal predicates (Henry Davis, pc). This makes Upper Chehalis remarkably unique in the family.

II. The distribution of *wi is not always consistent with a copular analysis. To take a simple-minded intuitive definition, a copula, as in English, is used to license a syntactically non-predicative element in a predicate position. For this reason, the ill-formed \( *I\ a\ man\) can be saved by inserting the copula \( I\ am\ a\ man\). It is not clear how the Upper Chehalis *wi is acting as a copula in this regard. First of all, it is clearly not needed to license predicate nominals, as seen in the examples in (6-7). Secondly, it is used in places that do not seem to require a copula, even in English. That is, it is used with very verb-like items, as in examples (13-17).

III. The unmarked copula makes an appearance only in sentences with a special word order. That is, it is only used when inversion of V and S occurs. This association of the unmarked copula with a specific curious syntactic environment makes it more reminiscent of a particle used in a syntactic operation like movement.4

In the remainder of the paper I offer a different take on unmarked copular *wi.

3 Proposal: And-fronting

As mentioned briefly in the introduction, there is another *wi in Upper Chehalis – a discourse connective, very commonly found in texts, and if translated at all into English, corresponding to “and (then)” In texts, this element is a good diagnostic for the beginning of a new line. Some examples of the discourse connective *wi in isolation are given below.

31 *wi tit \( q\w{a}\f i\)-tm
  and DET wound-PAS
  And they were wounded
  UC  Kinkade 1990: 345 #6

---

4 This suspicion is further supported by Kinkade's (2000) sentence schemata in which the pre-*wi is called FOCUS. Focus is very often associated with movement. Note also that copulas are very common in cleft constructions. I will elaborate on these points in Section 4.1.
This discourse connective *wi* and the unmarked copular *wi* may co-occur.

34 *wi* [tit tawl slanay] *wi* ñy t s-xáwô-m-s šał tit nultámš
and DET big woman COP good DET S-talk-MDL-3.POS to DET person
And the big woman talks nicely to the person
UC Kinkade 2000: 124 #19

35 *wi* [tit slána'y] *wi* tawl slána'y
and DET woman COP big woman
And the woman is a big woman.
UC Kinkade 2000: 123 #10

36 *wi* [ta(t) tómš] *wi* časákʷ tómš
and DET earth COP wild earth
And this land is wild country
UC Kinkade 2000: 123 #11

It is always tempting to try to reduce different morphemes with the same phonological shape to a single morpheme. Perhaps the temptation is at first not too great in the case of discourse connective *wi* and copular *wi*, given the apparent gulf in meaning between the two. Kinkade (1976, 2000) acknowledges the obvious homophony, but dismisses any direct link between them.

I believe there is actually quite good evidence to reduce the two morphemes to one. My suggestion is not to revert to Boas’ (1934) analysis, where all *wi*’s were considered copulas. Rather, I am proposing all instances of unmarked *wi* are examples of the discourse connective. I elaborate on this proposal in the following sections.

### 3.1 And-fronting in other Salish languages

There is a construction which is fairly widespread across Salish which Kroeber (1999) refers to as *and-fronting*. In this construction, some constituent at the left periphery is linked to the rest of the sentence by a conjunction “and” and there is no distinctively subordinating inflection to be found.
3.1.1 Lushootseed

Hess (1995) gives some discussion of this in Lushootseed. In this language, $g^\omega l$ (or $g^\omega la$) is used to connect sentences in discourse, and is usually translated as "and" or "then". The following examples contain instances of this discourse connective function.\footnote{Hess’ terminology is sentential adverbial.}

\begin{verbatim}
37 g\omega l g\omega l  la-l\tilde{e}il
then then PRG-arrive
And next he arrived.
Ls Barthmaier 2000: 16 # 26b

38 g\omega l  la-\omega \tilde{y}dx\omega  ti\omega ?c?e\tilde{d}il  s?ub\omega ?ubadi\tilde{i}?
then PRG-find DET DEM hunters
And next he found those hunters.
Ls Barthmaier 2000: 16 # 26c

According to Hess, $g^\omega l$ is also used in a topicalization construction. In this function the topic, which is located at the left periphery of the sentence (and appears to normally correspond to the subject) is connected to the rest of the sentence by $g^\omega l$. I have disambiguated these examples by underlining the topicalizing $g^\omega l$ and enclosing the topic in square brackets.

\begin{verbatim}
39 [ti?i\tilde{t}  tu=d-s-q^*iq^*q\omega \omega ali?]  g^\omega l  ?u-l\tilde{a}k\omega -t-\omega b  ?e=ci?i\tilde{t}=sa?  ad-q^*ist
DET PST-1S.POS-grass and PFV-eat-TR-ADOBL DET bad 2S.POS-cow
My grass was eaten by your bad cow.
Ls Kroeber 1999: 376, from DPS 439

40 [tiil=d-bad]  g^\omega la  \tilde{x}-tu-x^*ix\omega i  al=tii\tilde{t}=skig^*c
DET 1S.POS-father and HAB-PST-hunt PREP-DET deer
My father used to hunt for deer.
Ls Kroeber 1999: 376, from T18.12

Hess makes it clear that both the discourse connective and topicalization $g^\omega l$ functions can be found in the same sentence. He demonstrates this with the following short passage, and comments "the first and fourth sentences are topicalized, but in the second and third $g^\omega l$ is simply linking one sentence to another".

\begin{verbatim}
41  a  [ha?\omega c]  g^\omega l  hala?b  hik\omega  s?a\tilde{x}^*u?
horse.clam and really big clam?
As for the horse clam, it is a really big clam

b  g^\omega l  ?as\tilde{p}il  ti\omega ?e?  c'aw\omega \tilde{y}s.
and ST-flat? DET shell-3POS
And its shell is flat.
\end{verbatim}
3.1.2 Halkomelem & Northern Straits

I believe an analogous construction is to be found in the other Central Salish languages Halkomelem and Northern Straits. Leslie (1979) discusses the preposed adjunct construction. In this construction, a preposed constituent is conjoined to a following sentence by the “additive” morpheme ?i?, which is normally translated as “and”. There is always a coreference relationship between the preposed constituent and the following clause, such that it is interpreted as the subject of an intransitive verb or as an agent or experiencer of a transitive verb. Example (42) show ?i? functioning as a conjunction, and examples (43-45) show ?i? in the preposed adjunct construction.

42 nì c xʷàłəm ?i? xe? cən cə? wəl hiɪístəmə
come 2s.SUCL come back and again 1s.SUCL FUT already show
You come back and I will then show you again.
HIC Leslie 1979: 249 #275

43 (ni?) [tə pus-ct] ?i? (ni?) tə́y-ə tə smóyəθ
AUX DET cat-1P.POS and AUX eat-TR-3.TR.SBJ DET deer
Our cat - she eats deer meat.
HIC Leslie 1979: 259 #293

DET old and again LNK FOC just DET song AUX go-CAUS-3.TR.SBJ
The old man sang the same song again.
HIC Leslie 1979: 260 #294

45 [tə smóyəθ] ?i? təwə na-s-əʔiʔ-as
DET deer and NEG 1s.POS-NOM-like-3.DEP
I don’t like deer meat.
HIC Leslie 1979: 261 #295a

In the case of Northern Straits, a morpheme ?i? corresponds to the conjunction “and” or “then”.

274
  come 1SG and go 1SG
  I come and I go.
  Sa  Montler 1986: 194 #27

  and LNK ST-act-hide he OBL DET go.aboard OBL DET s-canoe DET s-young.man
  And the young man was still hiding in the canoe
  Sa  Montler 1986: 244 #23

48 ?i? ni?-la ce sciciw?l y?e?
  and exist-PERF DET BOY go
  Then some boys went
  Lm  Demers 1997: 192 #9a

?i? is also used to prepose a subject. In fact, Raffo’s (1972) grammar of the
Songish dialect of Northern Straits states that ?i? occurs “immediately following the
subject and preceding the predication” She (erroneously, in my opinion) analyzed
Songish as SVO, presumably on the basis of this pattern.

  DEM 1S.IND and hit-CTR 1S.SUCL
  I hit her
  Sg  Raffo 1972: 114

50 [to swéyqo?] i? t?qi?w-w-oj
  DEM man and cough-MDL
  the man is coughing
  Sg  Raffo 1972: 167

  DET canoe and already-LNK arrive OBL DET shore
  the canoe has already arrived at the shore
  Sg  Raffo 1972: 167

Furthermore, one also finds instances of a preposed demoted agent, as in these
examples.

  DEM and wake-CTR-PAS 1S.SUCL
  I am being awakened by him
  Sg  Raffo 1972: 124
Temporal adverbials can also appear in the same configuration with ʔiʔ.

Aside from the previous cases, ʔiʔ is also used in a construction Leslie calls the *additive emphatic* in Island Halkomelem. In this case, a small class of functional elements which occur towards the left edge of the sentence are followed by ʔiʔ. The elements partaking in this construction are mostly adverbials, including: *cašel* “almost”, *tʰʰaʔaʔ* “almost (non-control)”, *scékʷəʔ* “how, somehow”, *caʔxʷl* “sometimes”, *tamtam* “some time, when”, *nacexʷ* “once”. A few examples are given here. As seen in example (56), regular adverbials can occur to the left of an additive emphatic.  

---

6 Leslie divides additive emphatics into two classes based on the placement of clitics. As can be seen, Class 1 additive emphatics, as in (56-57) allow clitics to intervene between the adverbial and the ʔiʔ, whereas Class 2 in (58-59) do not allow clitics to intervene. Whether these additive emphatics are truly parallel to the Upper Chehalis copula is doubtful, but I include them for the sake of thoroughness. Their status will be discussed more fully in Section 3.2.1.

---
Once in a while I drink beer.

3.1.3 Southern Interior

The languages of the Southern Interior also have a construction that has been identified as and-fronting. In these languages, the construction appears to be more robust in that many more types of constituents can be and-fronted. Specifically, this construction is attested with not only direct arguments, but also with a variety of oblique phrases and interestingly with wh-questions as well. Most of this data is taken from Kroeber’s (1999) discussion of the phenomenon.

3.1.3.1 Kalispel

In Kalispel, the morpheme *u* is normally translated as “and”.

60 *u* čin-é1-é1-í či-qi-O ?et-n-qś-ap-amí
and 1s.sucL-again-try-INTR.CTN 1s.sucL-IRR-NOM-back-in-get.aboard-INCH-INTR.CTN
and I tried to get back into the canoe

Ka Kroeber 1999: 233, from KL T7.4

61 *u* t-uiése-s *lu?=tfqwóne? c-ón-tiyés
and thither-see-TR-3.TR.SBJ DET=duck hither-in-crawl/swim
and he saw Wood-Duck swimming towards him

Ka Kroeber 1999: 234, from KL T5.1927

This *u* is also used to set various constituents off to the left periphery, in what can be identified as cases of and-fronting.

- **and-fronted subject**

62 ... *u* [ci t=poxw-poxwút u ci t=t-še-šuʔtamí] *u* kʷé{ʔe}-i-s *u* ?i{ʔ}í-i-s
and DEM OBL=RDP-old and DEM OBL=DIM-DIM-girl and take{3p}-TR-3.TR.SBJ
and eat{3p}-TR-3.TR-SBJ

...that old man and that girl took it and ate it

Ka Kroeber 1999: 404, from KL T14.7127

- **and-fronted object**

63 *u* kʷénút pút *u* [lu?=tchéʔi-s] *u* číp-i-s
and then just and DET=penis-3POS and pinch-TR-3.TR-SBJ

Then he pinched off his (own) penis

Ka Kroeber 1999: 405, from KL T6.2

277
• **and-fronted PP**

64 [č'ă-?e] u téš-ilš stōlmatá
to-DEM and stand-INCH thunder
There Thunder stopped
Ka Kroeber 1999: 405, from KL T4.14

• **and-fronted wh-direct**

65 [t suwét] u kʷúl-i-s
OBL who and make-TR-3.TR.SBJ
Who did it?
Ka Kroeber 1999: 404, from KL 27

66 [suwét] u púls-t-xʷ
who and kill-TR-2.TR.SBJ
Who did you kill?
Ka Kroeber 1999: 405, from KL 27

• **and-fronted wh-oblique**

67 [č'ă-č'éni] u kʷ-es-al-ciʔ-i
to-where and 2S.SUCL-ASP-at-there-INTR(CTN/IRR)
Where have you been?
Ka Kroeber 1999: 405, from KL T3.8

### 3.1.3.2 Okanagaan

In Okanagan, *ut* is used for “and”.

68 ut kən=n-st-ils way t̕ix-əlx
and 1S.SUCL-in-think-mind PTC out.of.water-INCH
and I thought she was out of the water
Ok Kroeber 1999: 234, from GW 355

69 ut s-puʔus-amp p-k-s-təkʷ-təkʷʔ-út-aʔx
and NOM-wish-2P.POS 2P.SUCL-IRR-NOM-RDP-travel?-CTN
and it’s your wish to travel abroad
Ok Kroeber 1999: 232, from GW 11

Apparently, it is also used for and-fronting. Kroeber only supplies one example of this, with a fronted wh-object.
3.1.3.3 Coeur d’Alene

It is difficult to assess the case of Coeur d’Alene. In this language the residue of fronted constituents is sometimes introduced by a particle *hit* or *t* “and”. This item is used not only as a coordinating conjunction, but also more generally as a subordinator (Kroeber 1999). This may in fact be a different construction, but I tentatively include it anyways.

- **and-fronted subject**

71 eýnił u-mei [e=cénel] *hit*-púlu-stu-s
  because evidently *OBL-3s.IND* and-kill-*TR-3.TR.SBJ*
  because it is plain that he is the one who killed her

Cr Kroeber 1999: 406, from CA 703

  maybe *2s.IND* and-kill-*TR-2s.TR.SBJ* DET-sister-1s.POS
  You must be the one who killed our sister

Cr Kroeber 1999: 406, from CA 704

- **and-fronted demoted agent**

73 [leʔe=sčint] *hit*=ciʔ l-púlu-st-əm-1s
  DET *OBL* Indian and *DEM* and kill-*TR-AD-3P*
  The Indians were the ones by whom they were killed.

Cr Kroeber 1999: 408, from CA 673

- **and-fronted PP**

74 [leʔe-síkʷeʔ] l-hin-lošʷ-íčt-ctkʷeʔ
  DET-OBL-water and-in-thrust-hand-water
  It was into the water that he thrust his hand

Cr Kroeber 1999: 406, from CA 681

- **and-fronted oblique wh-expression**

75 [tgʷel=stiñ] l-ém-t-xʷ
  because.of-what and-feed-*2s.TR.SBJ*
  Why is it that you feed him?

Cr Kroeber 1999: 406, from CA 681
3.2 Back to Upper Chehalis

The parallels between the examples of and-fronting in other branches of Salish, and the use of the unmarked copula in Upper Chehalis seem to me to be rather striking. In all cases, an atypical word order is used to set aside one constituent off to the left, which is connected to the rest of the sentence by a morpheme that has the same form as "and". This suggests to me that Upper Chehalis wi is the discourse connective "and" - that in fact there is no copula in Upper Chehalis.\(^7\)

Specifically, I think the parallel is particularly strong in the case in the Central Salish languages, where an argument, normally the subject, is placed at the left periphery. In Lushootseed, Hess identified this as a topicalization construction, used to achieve a special interpretive effect. In fact, similar examples can be found in Halkomelem and Upper Chehalis where the effect of using the and-fronting construction amounts to a topicalization sort of translation into English.\(^8\)

\(^7\) I will discuss inflected instances of wi below.
\(^8\) Kinkade 2000 recognized the special interpretive effect of the copular wi construction. As mentioned in footnote 4, he named the constituent before the copula FOCUS. Focus and topic are often taken to mark different sorts of information, corresponding to "new information" and "old information" (see Section 3.2.1). Kinkade (PC) was not using the term focus in the narrow theory-bound sense of "new information". Rather, his use of this label was intended to mark the constituent as emphatic.
There was a good person travelling

He was [a] great talker of all people at this time.

His name was Syawýúwn.

3.2.1 A single phenomenon?

It is not entirely clear that all the cross-Salish examples above should necessarily be treated as the same phenomenon. First of all, the additive emphatics in Halkomelem and Northern Straits seem to be a packaged together with the adverbial as a single construction. The types of adverbials it is used with are very functional elements, and from this perspective are unlike the and-fronting of lexical arguments, or even lexical adverbial phrases for that matter. Furthermore, the use of Ji? with these adverbials appears to be automatic and I am not aware of any special interpretive effect approximating topicalization associated with their use.

The other class of examples which one may want to set aside as not completely parallel to Upper Chehalis are the wh-questions found in the Southern Interior. Once again, one must consider the interpretive effects involved. As discussed above, the topicalization of Lushootseed seems to be most parallel to the Upper Chehalis copular construction. Assuming this to be essentially correct, then there is an obvious problem if one blindly calls all the cases of argument and-fronting and wh-question and-fronting topicalization. The problem comes down to the division between topic constructions and focus constructions. Whereas topics are associated with old information, information that is already established in the discourse, focus is generally taken to be associated with new information being introduced to the discourse (Rochemont 1986). Wh-questions are normally analyzed as focus-constructions. Thus, there is a conflict between topicalization of arguments and wh-questions.

3.2.2 Marked wi

I have been restricting my discussion so far to the unmarked occurrences of wi, and its possible correlates across Salish. Although I do not really think the unmarked wi and the marked wi are the same, I will now discuss the possibility in a little more depth.

First, as Kinkade discussed in his 1976 article, an inflected form of wi is very common after the negative mitta.
So far, not much has surfaced in the survey of Salishan that really parallels this. One possible exception to this is the frequent use of the particle ?i? after the negative ?awo in Northern Straits (see also Demers 1997). The use of ?i? is not obligatory with the negative, but it very frequently occurs. I have not been able to figure out what dictates the occurrence of ?i? in these forms.9

The other group of examples of inflected wi are cases where wi carries some degree of lexical content. It is not clear to me that one would want to class these examples with the unmarked wi. As Kinkade (pc) drew to my attention, the case of witx? is particularly troubling if analyzed as a copula. Here, wi appears to be marked with a transitive suffix. Although maybe not inconceivable, this seems rather un-copular. Still, there does seem to be a vague meaning in common with these derived wi’s having to do with location/state which is not entirely removed from a copula. In fact, copulas often develop from very stative verbs such as stand, sit, live, become (Payne 1997: 117). Furthermore, Henry Davis (pc) also pointed out some likely cognates of Upper Chehalis winit “home” and we’na? “have, stay” in the Lillooet forms nwa?tan “dwelling” and wo?tan “have, keep” respectively. These Lillooet items are apparent lexical derivations of the progressive auxiliary wa? that also has many “copular” attributes (Davis 1996). Although Lillooet wa? does not really parallel the use of Upper Chehalis wi in inversion contexts, there may be some interesting diachronic connections to be investigated that will shed light on both languages.

9 Demers calls both this morpheme and the particle ?u? LINK. Montler 1986 calls these two morphemes in Saanich ACCOMPANYING and CONTEMPORANEOUS, respectively.
4 A few steps towards an analysis

In this section I review some of the syntactic facts surrounding the use of and-fronting in order explore their theoretical implications. This sort of material can be very difficult to glean from texts, and this section is necessarily sketchy. I will be drawing data from Upper Chehalis and the Central Salish languages, since I believe the evidence that this is a single phenomenon in these languages is stronger.

4.1 Syntactic evidence

As discussed above, the interpretive effect of and-fronting points towards a topicalization account. However, it would be nice if some syntactic evidence could be found to back this up. This is especially the case considering copulas are very frequently used in clefting constructions, which is one very common way to package focus. Thus, if in the end the and-fronting construction is found to be a cleft construction, the copula analysis of wi might be preferable after all.

Gardiner (1997) has proposed separate positions at the left periphery of Shuswap sentences corresponding to what he calls external topic and wh/focus positions. I will use this structure as a guide, although I cannot definitely argue for such a specific configuration for Upper Chehalis.

Let us now review some of the evidence.

4.1.1 It's high up.

Whatever structure this is, the and-fronted constituent is very high up in the tree. As seen in example (86), adverbials in Northern Straits normally occur leftmost within a clause. In the examples in (87-88), an and-fronted constituent precedes an adverbial.
86 yás ?u? čát-əŋ tsə qéq  
always and crawl-MDL DET baby  
the baby always crawls  
Sg Raffo 1972: 178

87 [suʔnil] ṭiʔ yás ?uʔ ny-?]–nóy-əŋ  
DEM and always LNK RDP-[ACT]-laugh-MDL  
She is always laughing  
Sg Raffo 1972: 177

88 [suʔnil] ṭiʔ kóʔ á kʷáí yéʔ  
DEM and again YNQ already go  
Is she going again?  
Sg Raffo 1972: 173

This suggests the and-fronted constituent is at the extreme left edge of the sentence.

4.1.2 May co-occur with clefts.

The normal focus construction in Salish languages is a cleft, in which the focused item is very often introduced by a focussing predicate and the non-focussed material has the form of a relative clause (Kroeber 1999). And-fronted material may occur in the same sentence as a cleft, and occurs to the left of it.

89 [suʔnil] ṭiʔ níʔ sʔélaxʷ txʷ ?áxʷ kʷsə sčéʔčəʔs  
DEM and FOC nom-old MUT-go.there DET relative-3.POS  
She is older than her cousin  
Sg Raffo 1972: 172

In the following example, the and-fronted constituent occurs to the left of an adverbial, which itself is to the left of the cleft.

90 [təʔ sʔélaxʷ] ṭiʔ əʔ ow níʔ al ʔə sfilam níʔ nérha-stxʷ-əs  
DET old and again LNK FOC just DET song AUX go-caus-3.TR.SBJ  
The old man sang the same song again.  
HIC Leslie 1979: 260 #294

Once again, this suggests the and-fronted constituent is left of the focus cleft position.

4.1.3 Lack of special extraction morphology

In many languages there is special morphological effects associated with extraction. In Central Salish, in subject-centred relative clauses, subject inflection is omitted from the embedded predicate (Kroeber 1999: 272). In a cleft construction, the focussed subject of a relative clause shows the same effects (the dotted line indicates where subject inflection is expected to occur).
In the and-fronting construction, there is no such effect.

92 [tsəʔ ñalé̱naxʷ] ʔin̓ čèw̓-q̕ə to siʔən̓-s
DETE people and admire-CTR-3SBJ DET chief-3POS
the people admire their chief
Sg Raffo 1972: 69

93 [tiʔəʔ ʔásə] ʔiʔ səʔ-t sən
DEM 1S.IND and hit-CTR 1S.SUCL
I hit her
Sg Raffo 1972: 114

This further supports the claim that this construction is not any sort of cleft. Moreover, if the morphological effects associated with clefting can be attributed to extraction, these data suggests that there is in fact no movement in these constructions.

4.1.4 Second position clitic placement

Gardiner (1997) uses the difference in 2nd position clitic placement as a diagnostic to distinguish two different preverbal position in Shuswap. 2nd position clitics occur immediately after a focus position.

94 [l-spéčn] nkə yiʔ l-nik-n-Ø-s ɣ-John
DETr rope EVID PRT DET-cut-FC-3OBJ-3SBJ DET-John
It must be the rope that John cut
Sh Gardiner 1997: 285 #59

95 [l-spéčn] n yiʔ l-nik-n-Ø-s ɣ-John
DETr rope YNQ PRT DET-cut-FC-3OBJ-3SBJ DET-John
Is it the rope that John cut?
Sh Gardiner 1997: 285 #61

In the case of an external topic, 2nd position clitics do not occur to immediately after the topic, but immediately after the first constituent following the topic.

96 [ɣ-John] m-xʷéyəm nkə-Ø ɣ-sqéxə-s
DETr-John PERF-bark EVID-3SBJ DET-dog-3POS
That John, I guess his dog barked.
Sh Gardiner 1997: 292 #100
That John, did his dog bark?

The data from and-fronting generally follow the pattern of Gardiner's external topic in that 2nd position clitics follow the first constituent after the "and" morpheme. Take the case of North Straits, where the subject clitics are strongly second-position. (Montler 1986, 1993). In the following example of a predicate nominal, the subject clitic actually appears in the middle of the complex nominal predicate.

98 čaq=sən swəʔqaʔ?
big 1S.SUCL man
I'm a big man.

Sa Montler 1993: 245 #8

99 čaq=sxʷ swəʔqaʔ?
big 2S.SUCL man
You're a big man.

Sa Montler 1993: 245 #9

In the case of and-fronting, the subject clitic does not occur after the and-fronted element, but after the first constituent after "and".

100 [tiʔə ʔəʔə] ?iʔ səʔ antioxid
DEM 1S.IND and hit-CTR 1S.SUCL
I hit her

Sg Raffo 1972: 114

101 [to nəkʷə] ?iʔ čəʔ-ələxʷ ?ə sxʷ
det 2S.IND and hit.with.fist-CTR-1P.OBJ YNQ 2S.SUCL
Are you going to hit us?

Sg Raffo 1972: 114

And-fronted constituents behave as Shuswap external topics with respect to 2nd position clitic placement.

4.2 Topicalization vs. Left-dislocation

So far, I have been using the terms "topic" and "topicalization" in a mostly theory neutral descriptive fashion. Yet, in formal analyses topicalization is used to refer to a very specific "topic construction". The following example from Prince (1985: 67) illustrates this structure.

102 Mary John saw yesterday.
This is distinguished from the distinct left-dislocation construction, which is illustrated below.

Mary, John saw her yesterday.

Prince (1985) gives the following schemata of topicalization and left-dislocation.

\[ [s_{NP} X1] [s_{NP} X2] \ldots ] \]

where: \( X1 \) and \( X2 \) are coreferential
\( X1 \) is nonvocative, and for topicalization
\( X2 \) is a gap, while for left-dislocation
\( X2 \) is a personal pronoun or a possessive adjective

Topicalization is further distinguished by a distinctive intonation contour in English, where secondary stress falls on the leftmost NP and primary stress within the following clause (Prince 1985: 68). Confining our attention to just these two possibilities in the case of Salish and-fronting, the evidence clearly points to a left-dislocation analysis. As discussed in Section 4.1.3, and-fronting structures are not associated with gaps. This is especially striking in examples (12-15) in Section 2.1, where the fronted constituent is an independent pronominal, which is coreferent with subject inflection lower in the clause. By the same non-gapping criterion, Gardiner's external topic qualifies as left-dislocation as well.

4.3 Why and-fronting?

Finally, the question of why “and” might be used in this construction must be considered. Kroeber (1999) puzzles over the status of and-fronting, and left it open whether this should be treated as a true coordination structure or not, and whether it should be treated as monoclausal or biclausal.

I think this construction makes a bit more sense if we abandon any idea of it being a true coordination structure. Rather, I would think it is the use of these “ands” as discourse connectives that licenses them in these constructions. In all the languages surveyed, the connective “and” can be used to connect sentences in discourse. In some, like Kalispel, North Straits and Halkomelem, this is a secondary function, and the “ands” in these languages seem to be used more often for constituent coordination (Kroeber 1999, Montler 1986, Leslie 1979). For others, like Lushootseed and Upper Chehalis, the “and” in question is never or very rarely used to conjoin anything other than utterances in discourse. So, assuming it is the discourse connective use that licenses these “ands”, here is some informal reasoning of why they would be used in this left-dislocation structure.

• Normally a discourse connective connects the utterance to discourse.

---

10 Prince argues that both topicalization and left-dislocation are used to mark an entity represented by the NP as being either already in discourse, or inferrable from discourse. She further distinguishes topicalization in that it “attributes a focus/presupposition...information structure to the proposition”. This subtle interpretive difference is unfortunately impossible to gather from texts.
In the case of and-fronting, the topic is already in the discourse although it makes an appearance in the sentence. It is in effect straddling previous discourse and the utterance.

It is set off to the left edge by the discourse connective.

Although this line of analysis might seem rather esoteric, even for Salish, I think parallels probably exist in other languages. Specifically, I think this sort of thing happens in English. As seen in the following examples, the English discourse connective now can be used to connect sentences in discourse.

105 Now, in those days we brought our lunch every day.

106 Now, what did you say your name was again?

Now can also be used to demarcate a topic. In this function, the topic is set off to the left edge of the sentence, and is followed by now.

107 [Mary], now, she's been very active in the community.

108 [John], now, he's a great guy.

109 [The butter clam], now, it's between the other two.

Although one may not want to analyze this as exactly the same as Salish and-fronting, it certainly seems to be a species of left-dislocation and generally supports the line of analysis offered here.

5 Conclusion

To conclude, I have argued that the unmarked copula of Upper Chehalis be re-analyzed as a construction found in other parts of Salish, which Kroeber (1999) calls and-fronting. The copula analysis was always slightly questionable, given the lack of a copulas elsewhere in Salish, and its otherwise peculiar distribution within Upper Chehalis. The alternative analysis sketched out here is unfortunately somewhat tentative, due to the general nature of the data sources available to me. More conclusive arguments for the left-dislocation analysis presented here will have to wait until more sophisticated and directed syntactic work can be carried out on these languages.
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