

Double subject marking in Ntəʔkepmxcin: Synchronic evidence for subject paradigm shifts*

Karsten A. Koch
University of British Columbia

Ntəʔkepmxcin has been claimed to closely approximate the Proto-Salish pattern of transitive subject marking via suffixal agreement and expletive (3rd person) clitic (Newman 1980, Davis 1999, Kroeber 1999). In Central (Coast) Salish, however, transitive subjects tend to be marked with a clitic rather than an affix; in Lushootseed, subjects in all clause types and for all persons are marked as clitics. This paper sheds light on how this shift from Proto-Salish to Lushootseed may have begun by presenting previously undocumented evidence from Ntəʔkepmxcin. In conjunctive transitive clauses, expletive clitics are sometimes reanalyzed as agreement markers. I argue that this real-time evidence for synchronic change supports an analysis of apparent “person hierarchy” effects as natural results of morpho-syntactic change, since clitics are in a different structural position than suffixes. As a result, the person hierarchy is epiphenomenal (Wiltschko 2003a, Brown et al. 2003).

1 Introduction

When we travel through the Salish language family, from Ntəʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish) in the Northern Interior of the Salishan area, to Lushootseed in the Central (Coast) Salish area, subject marking in transitive clauses shifts from entirely suffixal to entirely composed of clitics (Davis 1999, Kroeber 1999).¹

This paper presents previously undocumented data from Ntəʔkepmxcin showing a shift in transitive subject marking from suffix only to, optionally, suffix and clitic. This double subject marking occurs in conjunctive transitive clauses. Though similar optionality is apparent in other languages (for example,

* I wish to thank Flora Ehrhardt and Mandy Jimmie for sharing their language with me. This paper has benefited from comments by Henry Davis, Martina Wiltschko, and Peter Jacobs. All errors are my own. Research for this paper has been supported by SSHRC grant #12R27106 awarded to Lisa Matthewson.

¹ Davis (1999) characterizes this as a Type A to B shift, where Ntəʔkepmxcin exemplifies the Northern Interior Type A pattern and Central Salish the Type B pattern. Southern Interior Salish constitutes a third (Type C) pattern of subject marking. I don't discuss Type C in this paper; see Davis (1999).

in negative conjunctive clauses in Halkomelem and Comox - see Davis 1999), the Nt̓eʔkepmxcin case is interesting since Thompson has been claimed to most closely follow the Proto-Salish pattern of transitive subject marking via suffix only (Newman 1980, Kroeber 1999, Davis 1999, 2000). Thus, the new data presented here address how, in the synchronic grammar of a particular Salish language, the historical shift in transitive subject marking strategy may begin.

In between Nt̓eʔkepmxcin and Lushootseed, we find a mish-mash of strategies. For example, in Lillooet, Squamish and Halkomelem, matrix transitive clauses carry suffix agreement only for 3rd person subjects, while 1st and 2nd person subjects are marked as clitics (Kuipers 1967, Gerds 1988a, Galloway 1993, Davis 1999).

Such person splits have been claimed to arise due to a 'person hierarchy' that is a primitive component of the grammar (Silverstein 1976, Dixon 1979, Aissen 1999), whereby persons higher on the hierarchy (1st and 2nd) are more likely to function as transitive agents or subjects.

- (1) The person hierarchy
 1st > 2nd > 3rd Pronoun > Proper Noun > Human > Animate > Inanimate

←—————
 likelihood of functioning as transitive agent or subject

In a split ergative system like Halkomelem, 3rd person is the only transitive subject suffix marked with overt suffix morphology. Under a person hierarchy account, this is because 3rd person subjects are more "marked" as agents on the person hierarchy in comparison to 1st and 2nd person subjects. "Markedness" on the person hierarchy, in turn, corresponds to overt morphological marking. However, I argue, following Davis (1999, 2005) and Brown et al. (2003, this volume) that so-called person hierarchy effects are more naturally explained by the synchronic and diachronic changes documented here.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, I summarize the shift in subject marking in transitive clauses from Northern Interior to Central Salish, as outlined by Davis (1999, 2000). I present data from Nt̓eʔkepmxcin to illustrate the workings of subject and expletive marking in that language. Section 3 details cases of double subject marking in Nt̓eʔkepmxcin conjunctive environments. In section 4, I speculate how this change may lead to person splits, and the eventual replacement of subject suffixes by subject clitics in all environments (as in Lushootseed; Hess 1995, Davis 1999). Section 5 considers the theoretical implications, and I argue that the 'person hierarchy' is epiphenomenal (Wiltschko 2003a, Brown et al. 2003, this volume; Wiltschko and Burton, 2004). Section 6 concludes.

2 Subject marking in Salish

Reconstructions suggest that, in Proto-Salish, subjects were marked with clitics in intransitive clauses, and with suffixes and an expletive clitic (the 3rd person) in transitive clauses. This is summarized in the table in (2), taken from Davis (1999; see also Newman 1980, Kroeber 1999).

- (6) $\dot{y}é$ xeʔ (w)ʔéx e sx^wáwk-s † n-snúk^weʔ
 good dem prog det heart-3sgposs det 1sgposs-friend
 † wʔéx-us cú†-x-ə-Ø-ne †† n-cítx^w
 det prog-3sgCnCl show-appl-drv-3o-1sgTS obl.det 1sgposs-house
 "My friend is always happy when I always show him the house."

In Central (Coast) Salish and Lillooet, we find a different pattern. In general, subject clitics are used in transitive main clauses; Davis calls this the "raising" pattern (R), in that agreement marking has "raised" from suffix to clitic. In subordinate clauses, subject suffixes are used. There is, however, considerable variation according to person (1st/2nd versus 3rd). In addition, some types of clauses optionally have both a suffix and a clitic (the "copy" pattern - C); when this occurs only in negative clauses, Davis calls this the "negative copy" pattern (C*). In Lushootseed, the logical culmination of the Central Salish pattern is evident: transitive subjects are always marked as clitics, and never as suffixes, for all persons and types of clauses (Davis 1999). The following table summarizes Davis's findings; the Thompson column serves as a reminder of the likely Proto-Salish origin of the patterns found in the other languages given in the table.

(7) Transitive subject marking in Central Salish languages (Davis 1999)

		Th	Li	Sq	Hk	Se	Lu
Indicative main	1&2	X	R	R	R	C+R	R
	3	X	X	X	X	C+X	R
Conjunct.	1&2	X	R	R	R+C*	R+C*	R
	3	X	X	X	X+C*	X+C*	R
Nominalized	1&2	X	X+R	C+R	R	R	R
	3	X	X	C+X	X	X+R	R
Indicative subord.	1&2	X	X	X	R	X	R
	3	X	X	X	X	X	R

Key: X=expletive, R=raising, C=copy, C*=negative copy,
 Th=Thompson (Nt̥eʔkepmxcin), Li=Lillooet (St'at'imcets),
 Sq=Squamish, Hk=Halkomelem, Se=Sechelt, Lu=Lushootseed

Since subordinate clauses are generally resistant to raising, Davis concludes, firstly, that raising has spread from main to subordinate clauses. Secondly, 3rd person subject suffixes are more resistant to replacement by raising, which accounts for the appearance of "person splits." In the next section, I furnish new evidence from Nt̥eʔkepmxcin to support these conclusions.

3 Optional double subject marking in Nt̥eʔkepmxcin conjunctives

Recall that in Nt̥eʔkepmxcin, clitics in clauses with transitive marked verbs are expletives. That is, when the subject is a first or second person, the clitic remains in 3rd person form. (8) illustrates this pattern with a conjunctive temporal clause, where 3CnCl -us appears alongside a verb marked for a 1sg

subject (*zíkəne* ‘I chopped it down’). (8) is therefore an example of a “well-behaved” Ntəʔkepmxcin clause.

- (8) wʔéx xeʔ ʔes-kʷéń-s-t-sm-s † n-snúkʷeʔ
 prog dem STAT-look-caus-trans-1sgo-3TS det 1sgposs-friend
 † uʔéx-us zík-ə-Ø-Ø-ne † syáp
 det prog-3sgCnCl fall-drv-trans-3o-1sgTS det tree
 “My friend was watching me while I was chopping the tree down.”

However, in transitive marked conjunctive clauses with 1st or 2nd person subjects like (8), the expletive 3rd person conjunctive marker *-us* is sometimes replaced with the 1st or 2nd person conjunctive marker. This corresponds to the “copy” pattern discussed in section 2. Copying is unexpected, since the subject is now doubly marked: once as a suffix to the transitive verb, and once as a conjunctive clitic. (9) shows an example with a 1sg subject, marked once as clitic *-wn* and once as suffix *-ne*.

- (9) % wʔéx xeʔ ʔes-kʷéń-s-t-sm-s † n-snúkʷeʔ
 prog dem STAT-look-caus-trans-1sgo-3TS det 1sgposs-friend
 † uʔéx-wn zík-ə-Ø-Ø-ne † syáp
 det prog-1sgCnCl fall-drv-trans-3o-1sgTS det tree
 “My friend was watching me while I was chopping the tree down.”

To my knowledge, this Ntəʔkepmxcin alternation has not been recorded elsewhere (see Thompson & Thompson 1992, Kroeber 1999). To be sure, similar optionality to that apparent in (8-9) does appear in other languages (see Davis 1999, and the table in 7). However, the finding presented here is interesting in two respects. First, Ntəʔkepmxcin allegedly has no copying or raising patterns in any transitive clause type, and closely represents the Proto-Salish pattern in this regard (Newman 1980, Davis 1999, Kroeber 1999). The finding in (9) is significant in this regard.

Secondly, the pattern is not robust enough to be called “optional” (I don’t know to what extent it is true of other speakers), yet is too common to be considered merely a rare speech error. In my data corpus, the copy pattern found in (9) is sometimes spontaneously produced, sometimes accepted and reproduced, and sometimes rejected (hence I mark it with ‘%’). As such, the pattern in (9) represents a weakness in the Proto-Salish expletive pattern outlined in section 2, and an earlier stage than the optionality documented in Central Salish languages in Davis (1999).

Below I give details on the documented occurrences of the copy pattern in (9). (10) and (11) give further examples with a 1sg subject.

- (10) % wʔéx xeʔ séq-m † n-spápzeʔ te súypm
 prog dem chop-middle det 1sgposs-grandfather obl wood
 † uʔéx-wn ncéweʔ cu-t-Ø-éne † n-káh
 det prog-1sgCnCl 1sgemph fix-trans-3o-1sgTS det 1sgposs-car
 “My grandfather was chopping wood while I was fixing my car.”

- (11) % néx^{wə} ʔe s-ték†-c † wʔéx-wn
 much INT nom-rain-3PoCl det prog-1sgCoCl
 ník-ə-Ø-ne † súypm
 cut-drv-3o-1sgTS det wood
 "It was really raining hard when I was cutting the log."

In (12), (13) and (14), 2sg subjects are doubly marked, once as transitive suffix *-ex^w* and again as 2sg conjunctive clitic *-ux^w*.

- (12) % wʔéx xeʔ cu-t-Ø-éne † n-seʔlís
 prog dem fix-trans-3o-1sgTS det 1sgposs-knife
 † uʔéx-ux^w q^win-t-Ø-éx^w † n-skíxzeʔ
 det prog-2sgCnCl talk-trans-3o-2sgTS det 1sgposs-mother
 "I was fixing my knife while you were talking to my mother."
- (13) % ʔaʔxáns-kn xeʔ † nu-p=íkñ us
 eat(intrans)-1sgInCl dem det lunch-inch=back 3sgCnCl
 † wʔéx-ux^w kən-t-Ø-éx^w † scmémíʔt
 det prog-2sgCnCl help-trans-3o-2sgTS det child
 "I had my lunch while you were helping the kids."
- (14) % wʔéx-kn ʔaʔxáns † ʃáp
 prog-1sgInCl eat det nom-dusk
 † uʔéx-ux^w páq^w-n-Ø-x^w † s-páq^w
 det prog-2sgCnCl watch-drv-3o-2sgTS det nom-watch
 "I ate supper while you were reading a book."

Example (15) involves the 1pl subject marker, once as conjunctive clitic *-ut* and once as suffix *-m*.⁴

- (15) % wʔéx xeʔ k^wúk^w † n-kzé
 prog dem cook det 1sgposs-grandmother
 † wʔéx-ut ník-ə-t-Ø-m † súypm
 det prog-1plCnCl cut-drv-trans-3o-idfTS det wood
 "My grandmother is cooking while we're cuttin' up the wood."

In (16), 2pl is marked as conjunctive clitic *-up* and again as suffix *-ep*.

- (16) % wʔéx xeʔ wúx^wt te néx^w † wʔéx-up
 prog dem snow obl much det prog-2plCnCl
 cu-t-Ø-ép †e s-kíx
 fix-trans-3o-2plTS det nom-fence
 "It was snowin' hard while you guys were fixin' the fence."

⁴ In Ntəʔkepmxcin, the 1pl subject suffix *-t* does not co-occur with 3rd person objects. This amounts to a *1pl/3 constraint. Instead, the indefinite subject suffix, or "passive," is used to express 1pl as well (see Thompson and Thompson 1992, Brown et al., this volume, for more details on this constraint).

The above examples all involve temporal conjunctive clauses. A second type of conjunctive clause has also shown double subject marking. Clauses introduced by *ʔe* (what Thompson & Thompson 1992 refer to as the “introductory predicate” INT) and then marked with the conjunctive receive a conditional (‘if’) interpretation. Examples (17-18) below involve a 2sg subject, and (19) a 1pl subject.

(17) % x^wúy̓ xeʔ pín̄t-ə-Ø-ne e n-cítx^w
 FUT dem paint-dr̄v-3o-1sgTS det 1sgposs-house
 ʔe x^wúy̓-ux^w kən-t-sém-x^w
 INT FUT-2sgCnCl help-trans-1sgo-2sgTS
 “I’m gonna’ paint my house and are you gonna’ help me? / if you’re gonna’ help me.”

(18) % x^wúy̓ xeʔ ʔúpi-Ø-Ø-ne † épl̄ʂ
 FUT dem eat-trans-3o-1sgTS det apple
 ʔe x^wúy̓-ux^w heʔwí ʔúpi-n-Ø-x^w † sqyéytn
 INT FUT-2sgCnCl 2sgemph eat-trans-3o-2sgTS det salmon
 “I will eat the apple if you’re gonna’ eat the salmon.”

(19) % keʔ x^wúy̓ k ʂ-čáx̄-t-éx^w
 what FUT irl nom-clean-trans-3o-2sgTS
 e cítx^w ʔe kən-t-sí-t-ut
 det house INT help-trans-2sgo-1plTS-1plCnCl
 “Will you clean the house if we help you?” 638a

What generalizations can we draw from the data in this section? First, the copy pattern has only been found in conjunctive clauses. Nominalized (20) and indicative clauses (main or subordinate - 21) have shown no such double subject marking. In these instances, only the expletive clitic surfaces; 3PoCl -s in nominalized clauses (20), and the null 3InCl in main and subordinate indicative clauses (21).

(20) wʔéx-kn xeʔ ʔes-núye ʔe
 prog-1sg dem stat-beaver INT
 (* /n-)s-x^wúy̓-s ʔúz-Ø-Ø-ne he cítx^w
 (* /1sgPoCl)-nom-FUT-3PoCl buy-trans-3o-1sgTS det house
 “I got money, I’m gonna’ buy the house.”

(21) q^win-t-Ø-éne-Ø (* /-kn) xeʔ † sk^wúk^wmiʔt
 talk.to-trans-3o-1sgTS-3InCl (* /-1sgInCl) dem det child
 †-ex-Ø (* /-kn) wik-t-Ø-ne
 det-prog-3InCl (* /-1sgInCl) see.trans.3o.1sgTS
 “I talked to the child that I saw.”

Note that there is no copying of the indicative clitic in the subordinate clause in (21), which is consistent with Davis’s (1999) conclusion that raising in Central Salish was generalized from main to subordinate clauses.

Second, only 1st and 2nd subject have undergone double subject marking. With 3rd person, it is of course impossible to distinguish the expletive from the copy pattern, since the clitic is 3rd person in either case. This fact is also consistent with Davis's (1999) finding that 3rd person is more resistant to raising in Central Salish.

Thirdly, while the copy pattern has been found, the raising pattern has not, even though raising seems to be the more robust option as we move through Central Salish (see the table in 7, Davis 1999). This suggests that the copy pattern, though it may be a first stage in language change, is inherently unstable.

Finally, almost all observed cases of double subject marking (copying) occur when the clitic follows an initial auxiliary rather than an initial verb (19 is an exception in this regard). This auxiliary is dominantly the progressive *wʔex* in temporal adjuncts, and the future marker *xʷuʔ* in conditionals. I'm not certain if this is an accident of the corpus, a feature of temporal or conditional constructions, or a peculiarity of these particular auxiliaries. Certainly more research needs to be done in this regard; at this point it seems plausible that other auxiliaries would furnish similar results in the proper contexts. In any case, it appears that physical separation of the enclitic from the suffixed transitive verb leaves the expletive clitic more vulnerable to reinterpretation as an agreement marker.

In this section I have documented the start of a shift from subject suffix marking in transitive clauses (the "expletive" pattern) to subject marking as both clitic and suffix (the "copy" pattern). This double subject marking has been observed in Ntɛʔkepmxcin conjunctive clauses. Though the data represent a very preliminary stage of language change, I speculate in the next section how this change may progress through a Central Salish 'raising' pattern to end at a system like Lushootseed, where subject suffixes have been eliminated altogether (Hess 1995, Davis 1999; table 7 above).

4 A template for change from Ntɛʔkepmxcin to Lushootseed

The optional copy pattern documented in section 3 represents the first stage of a potential shift in subject marking strategy in a Salish language. This is because, as already noted, Ntɛʔkepmxcin closely approximates the Proto-Salish pattern of subject marking in transitive clauses via suffix only (Newman 1980, Davis 1999, Kroeber 1999). How then might we end up with a system like that in Lushootseed, where subjects are marked as clitics only? Of course, there are many potential pathways we may imagine; I sketch one possible course here.

It will be useful to repeat the table in (7) here, to compare potential stages in Ntɛʔkepmxcin to the synchronic patterns evident in Type B (raising) languages. I have modified the table to indicate the sometime optionality of the copy strategy in Thompson conjunctives. I mark 3rd person as being optionally a copy pattern also, though it is of course impossible to tell since expletive and agreement marking is equivalent for 3rd person.

(22) Transitive subject marking in Central Salish languages (Davis 1999)

		Th	Li	Sq	Hk	Se	Lu
Indicative main	1&2	X	R	R	R	C+R	R
	3	X	X	X	X	C+X	R
Conjunct.	1&2	%C+X	R	R	R+C*	R+C*	R
	3	%C+X	X	X	X+C*	X+C*	R
Nominalized	1&2	X	X+R	C+R	R	R	R
	3	X	X	C+X	X	X+R	R
Indicative subord.	1&2	X	X	X	R	X	R
	3	X	X	X	X	X	R

Key: X=expletive, R=raising, C=copy, C*=negative copy, %=sometimes produced/accepted, Th=Thompson (N \acute{t} e?kepmxcin), Li=Lillooet (St'at'imcets), Sq=Squamish, Hk=Halkomelem, Se=Sechelt, Lu=Lushootseed

In Stage One (the beginnings of which are attested in Thompson), expletive clitics in the conjunctive paradigm are reinterpreted as overt agreement markers for transitive subjects. This results in the optional copy pattern outlined in section 3. A similar optional copy pattern is found in nominalized clauses in Squamish (Davis 1999, Peter Jacobs p.c.), in negative conjunctives in Halkomelem and Sechelt, and in indicative main clauses in Sechelt (Davis 1999, table 22).

In Stage Two (not attested in N \acute{t} e?kepmxcin), the copy pattern in conjunctive clauses is generalized to other types of clauses (indicative and nominalized). This stage has occurred to various extents in all of the other languages in table (22), though indicative subordinate clauses have been resistant to generalization. 3rd person has also been resistant to generalization in numerous cases, leading to apparent "split ergativity" (Davis 1999, 2005).

In Stage Three (not attested in N \acute{t} e?kepmxcin), subject suffixes are dropped altogether. Transitive subjects are marked as clitics only (the raising pattern). Lushootseed represents the logical culmination of this stage, while Lillooet, Squamish, Halkomelem and Sechelt are all at some intermediate position between stage two and stage three.

5 Consequences of a new subject marking strategy

In this section, I briefly discuss two consequences of the changes in transitive subject marking outlined in sections 2 through 4. I contrast the account above with an approach which claims that the person hierarchy is a primitive component in the grammar, and is responsible for phenomena like split ergativity and constraints on certain logically possible person combinations (Aissen 1999).

5.1 Split ergativity is an accident

Under the approach advocated in this paper, split ergativity amounts to a sub-stage somewhere between stages two and three as outlined in section 4. In a split ergative system like Halkomelem, only 3rd person is marked as a

transitive subject suffix (Gerdt 1988, Galloway 1993, Wiltschko 2003b, to appear). Under a person hierarchy account, this is because 3rd persons are more “marked” as transitive subjects, so “markedness” on the person hierarchy corresponds to overt morphological markedness (c.f. Aissen 1999).

However, as outlined in this paper, split ergativity of the type found in Salish languages like Halkomelem is not due to a person hierarchy, but because expletive subjects happen to be marked with 3rd person clitics (c.f. Davis 1999, 2005). If the optionality observed in Thompson conjunctive clauses is not generalized to 3rd person, we might expect a split ergative system to develop. In this case, expletive marking in a transitive clause with a 3rd person subject would not be reinterpreted as agreement.

5.2 Constraints on person combinations are tied to overt suffixes

In certain Salish languages, there are constraints on logically possible combinations of persons. For example, in Halkomelem and Squamish, transitive clauses with a 3rd person subject and 2nd person object are banned (*3/2; Gerdt 1988b on Island Halkomelem, Galloway 1993 on Upriver Halkomelem, Jelinek and Demers 1983 on Squamish). The passive is used to express the intended meaning. An account using the person hierarchy in (1) explains this fact by arguing that 3rd person subjects are marked, as are 2nd person objects; the combination of the two is thus especially marked and is therefore ruled out altogether (see Aissen 1999 for a formal treatment incorporating the person hierarchy as a primitive of the Squamish grammar).

I assume that, since clitics and affixes are in different syntactic positions (c.f. Kroeber 1999, Davis 2000, Jelinek and Carnie 2003, Brown et al., this volume), the reanalysis of expletive clitics as agreement markers means that agreement features change syntactic position. Furthermore, where subject and object suffixes are in the same structural position (like 3rd subject and 2nd object agreement in Halkomelem), the clause is banned (Wiltschko and Burton 2004, Brown et al. 2003). If subject suffix markers are lost altogether in favour of subject clitics (in a different structural position), we would then expect such person restrictions to disappear also. This is indeed the case: in Lushootseed, which has no subject suffixes, there are no restrictions like *3/2 (see Brown et al., this volume).

I discuss a further case from Nt̓eʔkepmxcin. In Thompson, the 1pl subject suffix *-et* does not appear in conjunction with a 3rd person object (*1pl/3). Rather, the indefinite subject suffix is employed. Similar constraints appear in Shuswap (Gibson 1973) and Spokane (Carlson 1972) (see Brown et al., this volume, for discussion).

- (23) 1pl transitive subjects (Thompson & Thompson 1992)
- a. kən-t-sí-t
 help-trans-2sgo-1plTS
 “We helped you (sg).”

- b. kən-t-úym-et
help-trans-2plo-1plTS
We helped you (pl.).”
- c. * kən-t-Ø-ét
help-trans-3o-1plTS
intended: “We helped him/her/it.”
- d. kən-t-Ø-ém
help-trans-3o-idfTS
“We helped him/her/it; someone helped him/her/it.”

This case is problematic for a grammar in which the person hierarchy is a primitive. 1st person subjects and 3rd person objects are allegedly the least “marked” construction, yet this logically possible and ideal combination of suffixes is ruled out in Thompson. However, if the 1pl transitive subject suffix and 3rd object suffix are in the same structural position, we expect that they may not co-occur. Instead, the closest alternative in meaning is employed: the ‘indefinite’ (idf) suffix *-em*. The indefinite subject suffix and 3rd person object suffix may co-occur if these have been reinterpreted as a portmanteau morpheme meaning idf/3 (see Brown et al., this volume).

If this analysis is on the right track, then we expect that in languages where 1st person is no longer marked as a subject suffix, but only as a clitic (the “raising” strategy), no *1pl/3 constraint will hold. To my knowledge, no such constraint holds in any of the languages in the table in (22) other than Ntəʔkepmxcin. This fact is expected if 1st person agreement is now in a different position due to raising.

5.3 Summary

In this section, I have argued that two consequences of the historical shift in subject marking in Salish (rise of split ergativity and loss of person constraints) are not due to the presence of a person hierarchy in the grammar. This conclusion is strengthened by observing that the same process (shift in subject marking strategy) gives rise to an apparent person hierarchy effect (split ergativity) on the one hand, but also eliminates an alleged person hierarchy effect (*1pl/3) on the other hand, a fact that the person hierarchy fails to explain. However, the facts follow naturally from the morpho-syntactic approach advocated here.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have documented a weakness in the expletive pattern of subject marking in Ntəʔkepmxcin (and, by extension, Proto-Salish) transitive clauses. Conjunctive clauses are sometimes produced or accepted (and sometimes rejected) with a copy pattern of subject marking. This amounts to double subject marking: once as clitic, and again as suffix to the verb. This change has been documented for 1st and 2nd persons, singular and plural, in

temporal adjuncts and conditionals. For 3rd person, it is not apparent whether copying has occurred, since expletives are already 3rd person.

I suggested how the observed pattern may develop into the raising pattern observed in Central Salish, with its culmination in Lushootseed (see Davis 1999, table 22). Furthermore, the data suggest, supporting Davis (1999, 2005), that so-called “person splits” are natural phenomena resulting from synchronic reanalysis of expletive markers as agreement markers. Moreover, the same diachronic change can produce a *loss* of person marking constraints that are also claimed to arise due to the “person hierarchy” (Aissen 1999); for example, Ntɛʔkepmxcin disallows the co-occurrence of 1pl subject and 3 object suffixes in transitive clauses (Thompson & Thompson 1992), whereas no restriction involving 1st person subjects is found in any Salish language where transitive 1st person subjects are marked as clitics rather than subjects (Brown et al., this volume).

Thus, I reject a person hierarchy approach in favour of a morpho-syntactic account, where the reanalysis of expletive clitics as agreement markers means that person agreement features change syntactic position.

Appendix

Table 1: Key to abbreviations used in gloss (based on Thompson and Thompson 1992, 1996, Kroeber 1997, Jimmie 2002, 2003, Koch 2004)

-	<i>affix or clitic</i>	irl	<i>irrealis</i>
=	<i>lexical suffix</i>	LOC	<i>locative</i>
appl	<i>applicative</i>	neg	<i>negation</i>
AUT	<i>autonomous</i>	nom	<i>nominalizer</i>
caus	<i>causative</i>	o	<i>object</i>
CnCl	<i>conjunctive clitic</i>	obl	<i>oblique</i>
conj	<i>conjunctive</i>	PERS	<i>persistent</i>
dem	<i>demonstrative</i>	PoCl	<i>possessive clitic</i>
det	<i>determiner</i>	poss	<i>possessive</i>
drv	<i>directive transitivizer</i>	prog	<i>progressive</i>
emph	<i>emphatic</i>	PRP	<i>proportional -iʔCeʔ</i>
FUT	<i>future</i>	Q	<i>y/n question marker</i>
conj	<i>conjunctive</i>	red	<i>reduplicant</i>
idf	<i>indefinite</i>	refl	<i>reflexive</i>
IM	<i>immediate</i>	REL	<i>relational transitivizer</i>
inch	<i>inchoative</i>	RFM	<i>reaffirmative</i>
InCl	<i>indicative clitic</i>	STAT	<i>stative</i>
instr	<i>instrumental affix</i>	trans	<i>transitivizer</i>
INT	<i>introductory predicate</i>	TS	<i>transitive subject</i>

Table 2: Orthography and phonemic correspondence (based on Thompson and Thompson 1992, 1996)

orthography	phonemic	orthography	phonemic
ʔ	ʔ	p̄	p̄
a	a	q	q
c	tʃ, č	q̄	q̄
ç	ts	q ^w	q ^w
č	ts'	q̄ ^w	q̄ ^w
e	e, æ, a, ε	s	ʃ, š
ə	ə	š	s
ə̄	Λ	t	t
h	h	t̄	t̄
i	i (ei, ai before y)	u	u, o
k	k	w	w
k̄	k̄	w̄	w̄
k ^w	k ^w	x	x
k̄ ^w	k̄ ^w	x ^w	x ^w
l	l	x̄	x̄
l̄	l̄	x̄ ^w	x̄ ^w
t̄	t̄	y	y, i
χ̄	χ̄	ȳ	ȳ
m	m	z	z*
m̄	m̄	z̄	z̄
n	n	ʃ	ʃ
n̄	n̄	ʃ̄	ʃ̄
o	o, ɔ	ʃ ^w	ʃ ^w
p	p	ʃ̄ ^w	ʃ̄ ^w

References

- Aissen, Judith. 1999. Markedness and Subject Choice in Optimality Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17:673-711.
- Brown, Jason, Koch, Karsten, and Wiltschko, Martina. This volume. On Certain Unexpected Gaps in Transitive Paradigms and their Implication.
- Brown, Jason, Koch, Karsten, and Wiltschko, Martina. 2003. The Person Hierarchy: Primitive or Epiphenomenal? Evidence from Halkomelem Salish. *Proceedings of the 34th Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*. Eds. Keir Moulton and Matthew Wolf. UMass, Amherst: GLSA.
- Carlson, Bary F. 1972. A Grammar of Spokane: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* vol. 4, number 4.
- Davis, Henry. 2005. Where do Salish Person Splits Come From? Ms., UBC.
- Davis, Henry. 2000. Remarks on Proto-Salish Subject Inflection. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 66:499-520.

- Davis, Henry. 1999. Subject Inflection in Salish. UBC Working Papers in Linguistics 1:181-240. Vancouver: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 2000. Agreement. Ms. UBC.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55:59-138.
- Galloway, Brent. 1993. *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1988a. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. New York: Garland.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1988b. A nominal hierarchy in Halkomelem clausal organization. *Anthropological Linguistics* 30:20-36.
- Gibson, James A. Shuswap Grammatical Structure. Ph.D. dissertation. *University of Hawaii. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* vol. 5, number 5.
- Hess, Thom. 1995. Lushootseed Reader with Introductory Grammar, Vol. 1. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 11, Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Jelinek, Eloise, and Demers, Richard. 1983. An Agent Hierarchy and Voice in Some Coast Salish Languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49:167-185.
- Jelinek, Eloise, and Carnie, Andrew. 2003. Argument Hierarchies and the Mapping Principle. In *Festschrift for Jelinek*.
- Jimmie, Mandy N. 2003. FNLG 100G N̄teʔkepmxcin. UBC course.
- Jimmie, Mandy N. 2002. FNLG 100G N̄teʔkepmxcin. UBC course.
- Koch, Karsten A. 2004. On Predicate Modification in N̄teʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). *Papers for the 39th ICSNL*. Eds. J.C. Brown and T. Peterson. *UBC Working Papers in Linguistics* 14:269-282. Vancouver: Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia.
- Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax*. Studies in the Anthropology of North American Indians. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press in cooperation with the American Indian Studies Research Institute Indiana University Bloomington.
- Kroeber, P. 1997. Relativization in Thompson Salish. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 39(3), 376-422.
- Kuipers, Aert. 1967. *The Squamish Language. Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Newman, Stanley. 1980. Functional Changes in the Salish Pronominal System. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:155-167.
- Silverstein, Martin. 1976. Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity. In *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*. Ed. Robert M. W. Dixon. 112-171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies and New Jersey Humanities Press.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. The Thompson Language. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 8, Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1996. Thompson River Salish Dictionary. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 12, Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Wiltschko, Martina. to appear. *Ergativity in Halkomelem (and How to Split and Derive It)*. Mouton.

- Wiltschko, Martina. 2003a. Person Hierarchy Effects Without a Person Hierarchy. Ms. UBC.
- Wiltschko, Martina. 2003b. On Ergative and Other Splits in Salish. In *Proceedings of WSCLA 8*, Brandon University.
- Wiltschko, Martina, and Burton, Strang. 2004. On the sources of Person Hierarchy effects in Halkomelem Salish. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 49:51-71.

*Department of Linguistics
Buchanan E270 UBC
1866 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
CANADA*

karstenak@hotmail.com