

The Syntactic Functions of Person Marking in Lummi

Richard A. Demers  
 University of Arizona  
 and  
 Eloise Jelinek  
 University of Arizona

1. The subject enclitics and sentence mood.
2. The third person and ergativity.
3. First and second person and accusative marking.
4. The person predicates and emphasis.
  - 4.1. Main clause and direct adjunct.
  - 4.2. Oblique person marking.
5. Possessive person marking and derived predicates.
  - 5.1. Non-subject.
  - 5.2. Subject person marking via possessive affixes.
6. Non-finite or "reduced" person marking and subordination.
  - 6.1. In nominal adjuncts.
  - 6.2. In hypothetical clauses.
7. Person marking in complex sentences.
8. Person marking and control.
9. Imperatives and person marking.

Person marking is a pervasive feature of Lummi syntax. What is especially notable about this person marking is the range of syntactic functions which are associated with it. In this paper we survey the various systems of person marking in Lummi and point out the particular syntactic functions which each kind of person marking serves.<sup>1</sup>

1. The subject enclitics and sentence mood. The enclitics which mark person subject in main clauses also serve to mark the clause as finite, or indicative in mood. These enclitics are attached to the sentence initial predicates, as shown in (1).

(1)	yeʔ-sən	"I go"	swəyʔqəʔ-sən	"I am a man"
	yeʔ-sxʷ	"You go"	swəyʔqəʔ-sxʷ	"You are a man"
	yeʔ-ʔ	"We go"	swəyʔqəʔ-ʔ	"We are men"
	yeʔ	"He goes"	swəyʔqəʔ	"He is a man"

The examples in (1) show that third person subject marking is phonologically null. However, these forms in isolation may be interpreted as complete sentences, as constituting a declarative sentence, since they are not preceded by the determiner or complementizer that introduces non-finite expressions (see Jelinek and Demers, 1982):

(2)	cə yeʔ	"The (one that) goes"
	cə swəyʔqəʔ	"The (one that is a) man"

2. The third person and ergativity. The preceding examples have been intransitive constructions. The following is a transitive paradigm:

(3)	xči-t-sən	"I know it"
	xči-t-sxʷ	"You (sg. and pl.) know it"
	xči-t-ʔ	"We know it"
	xči-t-s	"He (she, they, it) knows it"

We have argued in earlier papers (1981, forthcoming) that the -s which appears in xči-t-s in (1) is not a third person subject enclitic, but rather an ergative marker. Two arguments may be given to support this claim. First, the -s only appears on third person transitive predicates, not intransitive ones:

(4)	*yeʔ-s	*swəyʔqəʔ-s
-----	--------	-------------

Second, the distribution of -s with respect to other suffixes differs from that of the other enclitics, indicating that it does not belong to the same particle set, as shown in (5) below.

(5)	ʔel-sən	ʔuʔ	xči-t	"I know it too"
	1	2	3 4	
	ʔel-sxʷ	ʔuʔ	xči-t	"You know it too"
	5			
	ʔel-ʔ	ʔuʔ	xči-t	"We know it too"
	6			
	ʔel	ʔuʔ	xčit-s	"He knows it too"
			7	
	*ʔel-s	ʔuʔ	xči-t	
			7	

1 - also	5 - 2nd person
2 - 1st person sg.	6 - 1st person pl.
3 - Connective Particle	7 - ergative
4 - know	

3. First and second person and accusative marking. While third person constructions in Lumli show ergative/absolutive case marking, as the examples in (5) show, first and second person show nominative/accusative case marking. Whereas subject marking morphemes have some degree of "mobility", as evidenced by the examples in (5), accusative marking is part of the predicate phrase. Examples are given in (6).

(6)	xči-t-ənəs-sən	"I know you"
	xči-t-ənəs-sxʷ	"You know me"
	xči-t-ʔ-sən	"I know it/him/her/them"

The accusative suffix -ənəs indicates first or second person object. Cases of ambiguity which would occur if this morpheme were to appear with a third person subject do not appear because of an agent

hierarchy which blocks such sentences.<sup>2</sup> In the sentence  $\chi\check{i}$ -t-s in (3) above, -s is the ergative subject marker, while the absolutive marking is phonologically null. The accusative suffix -oŋəs may be reduced to -s under morphologically regular conditions. One example is the combination of the -i- aspectual morpheme "durative" with -oŋəs. Some examples are given in (7).

(7) leŋ-t-i-s-sən "I watched you (for a long time)"  
 1 2 3 4 5

1 - see 4 - 2nd object  
 2 - trans. 5 - 1st subject  
 3 - aspect

leŋ-t-oŋəs-sən "I looked at you"

The subject and object person marking particles are displayed in Table 1 below:

	Nominative Enclitics		Accusative Suffixes	
Sg.	1	-sən	-oŋəs/-s	
	2	-sx <sup>w</sup>	-oŋəs/-s	
Pl.	1	-ŋ	-oŋəŋ	
	2	-sx <sup>w</sup>	-oŋəs	

Table 1  
 Nominative/Accusative Marking in Lummi

The accusative suffix -oŋəŋ, first person plural, appears only in subordinate clauses, where the agent hierarchy is suspended.

(8)  $\chi\check{i}$ -t-sən k<sup>w</sup> s-leŋ-n-oŋəŋ "I believe the man saw us"  
 cə swəyʔqəʔ

Ergative marking in the third person is a feature of main clauses only; in subordinate clauses, ergative -s does not appear. The

accusative suffixes appear in both main and subordinate clauses, unlike the nominative enclitics, which are confined to main clauses.

4. The person predicates and emphasis. An unusual feature of Salish grammar is the presence of predicates that refer to the semantic category of person. There are no independent pronouns in Lummi, only person marking affixes of various types and the person predicates, as follows:

(9) Sg. 1 ʔəs "Is me"  
 2 nək<sup>w</sup> "Is you"  
 3 niŋ "Is him, her"  
 Pl. 1 ʔəŋniŋəŋ "Is us"  
 2 ʔəliŋtən "Is you people"  
 3 nəniŋiʔə "Is them"

These predicates serve a variety of functions in Lummi syntax. Two of these are: (1) to place emphasis on a first or second person argument, as the reflexive pronouns are used in English; and (2) to express oblique first or second person arguments.

4.1. Emphatic constructions. As predicates:

(10) nək<sup>w</sup> sə nə-ten "You (yourself) are the one that's my mother"

Compare the non-emphatic sentence with a second person subject enclitic:

(11) nə-ten-sx<sup>w</sup> "You are my mother"

When these predicates serve as the base of a nominal adjunct, they also lend emphasis to the construction:

(12)  $\chi\check{i}$ -t-sən cə nək<sup>w</sup> "I know you (yourself)"

Compare (12) to the unmarked construction given in (6) above:

(13) x̄ci-t-oŋs-sən "I know you"

Person predicates appear in both main and subordinate clauses in Lummi, just as any other predicate in the language may do.

3.2. Person predicates in oblique adjuncts. There are no indirect or oblique person markers which attach to the predicate as the subject enclitics and object suffixes do. Nor are there independent pronouns which mark oblique case. Subject enclitics have nominative case, while object suffixes are accusative. Nominal adjuncts, on the other hand, show either absolutive (unmarked) or oblique case; the latter adjuncts are introduced with the case particle ə. When first, second or third person oblique arguments must be specified, nominal adjuncts based on the person predicates fill this function.

(14) leŋ-t-ŋ ə cə ʔəs "He was seen by me"

leŋ-t-ŋ ə cə nək "He was seen by you"

Since these are "marked" or unusual constructions, they also serve to place emphasis on the first or second person argument. Other uses of nominal adjuncts based on the person predicates are not emphatic; an example will be given in the next section.

5. Possessive person marking and derived predicates. The set of possessive person markers shows two principal functions. We turn now to a discussion of these functions.

5.1. Non-subject possessive person marking. In these constructions, the possessive affix marks the person possessor.

(15) nə-ten	"My mother"
ʔən-ten	"Your mother"
ten-s	"His/their mother"
ten-χ	"Our mother"

Predicate phrases such as those given in (15) may function as a sentence with a phonologically null third person subject marker, just as any other predicate may.

(16) nə-ten "It's my mother"

Example (8) above shows a predicate with a possessor affix and a second person subject enclitic, demonstrating that the possessive affix is distinct from the subject marking in these constructions.

There is a sentence type in which the possessive affixes might at first glance be taken as finite person markers.

(17) nə-sʔiʔ	"I like it"
ʔən-sʔiʔ	"You like it"
sʔiʔ-χ	"We like it"
sʔiʔ-s	"He likes it"

However, as the following examples show, the constructions in (17) have a possessor marked in the predicate phrase, and a phonologically null third person subject. In (18), other subjects appear:

(18) nə-sʔiʔ-sxʷ	"I like you (you are my liking)"
ʔən-sʔiʔ-sən	"You like me (I am your liking)"

Therefore, the -s that appears in the third person form is clearly the regular third person possessive affix, not to be confused with the ergative -s. Although these constructions are semantically transitive, they are syntactically intransitive. Sentences of this

type, where the "experiencer" is not the subject, are an interesting cross-language parallel.<sup>3</sup> The syntax of derived predicates such as *sli?* offers several interesting features. The first person plural subject enclitic and the first person plural possessive affix are homophonous. Therefore, constructions with the first person plural possessive affix followed by a subject enclitic are excluded, perhaps because it has the appearance of a construction with two subject enclitics:

- (19) \*sli?-ɣ-sx<sup>w</sup>                      "We like you (our liking is you)"

The construction that is employed to convey this idea is as follows:

- (20) sli?-ɣ cə nək<sup>w</sup>                      "We like you"

Here the predicate *nək<sup>w</sup>* appears in a nominal adjunct. This non-emphatic use of the person predicate in the nominal adjunct serves to fill out the paradigm.<sup>4</sup>

Since the predicate *sli?* is intransitive, it may have only one direct adjunct. If there is a second adjunct it must be oblique.

- (21) sli?-s sə sɣeni?

"He likes the woman"  
(It is his liking, the woman)

- (22) sli? ə sə sɣeni? cə swəy?qə?

"The woman likes the man"  
(It is the liking of the woman, the man)

Note that in (21), there is a third person possessive affix, marking the person possessor, while in (22) no possessor is marked. Both constructions have phonologically null third person "abstract" subjects.

Other examples of derived predicates that occur in similar constructions are:

- (23) ʃx<sup>w</sup>tin-s sə sɣeni?                      "He disliked the woman"  
nə-sčinəw? ti?ə sq<sup>w</sup>əməy?                      "The dog bothers me"

5.2. Subject person marking via possessive affixes. The possessive person markers serve an entirely different function in certain subordinate clauses, where they serve to mark the subject of the clause.

- (24) a. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> s-leŋ-nə-s cə swəy?qə? sə sɣeni  
"I know the man saw the woman" or  
"I know the woman saw the man"
- b. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> s-leŋ-nə-s cə swəy?qə?  
"I know he saw the man" or  
"I know the man saw him" (less frequent)
- c. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> s-leŋ-nəx<sup>w</sup> cə swəy?qə?  
"I know that the man saw him"
- d. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> nə-s-leŋ-nəx<sup>w</sup> cə swəy?qə?  
"I know that I saw the man"
- e. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> ?ən-s-leŋ-nəx<sup>w</sup> cə swəy?qə?  
"I know that you saw the man"
- f. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> s-leŋ-n-onəs cə swəy?qə?  
"I know the man saw you/me"
- g. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> nə-s-leŋ-n-ŋ ə cə swəy?qə?  
"I know that I was seen by the man"
- h. ɣčī-t-sən k<sup>w</sup> s-leŋ-n-ŋ-(s) ə cə swəy?qə?  
"I know that he was seen by the man"

Factual subordinate clauses are formed with the determiner (complementizer)  $k^v$  preceding a clause with a derived predicate with the prefix  $s-$ , and the possessive subject markers. We have argued in another paper (1982, ms.) that these  $k^v$  clauses are adjoined clauses and not embedded clausal arguments to the matrix predicate. Nominal adjuncts may be optionally separated by a pause from the main clause, which has its own phonological contour. The arguments of main clause predicates are always marked in the subject enclitics and object suffixes, and any nominal adjuncts are anaphorically linked to these person markers.

Several points regarding the sentences in (24) warrant mention. In (24a), the subordinate clause introduced by  $k^v$  has a derived predicate with  $s-$ , a possessive affix marking person subject, and lacks the ergative suffix that would appear in a corresponding independent sentence. The order of the nominal adjuncts to the  $k^v$  clause shows the same freedom as is found in the nominal adjuncts to main clauses. That is, this dependent clause is ambiguous just as the corresponding independent clause would be. With (24b), the situation is different. The  $k^v$  clause in (24b) is ambiguous, while the corresponding independent clause ( $len-n-as\ cə\ swəyʔqə?$  "He saw the man") is not. The non-ambiguity of the independent sentence follows from the agent hierarchy, which is suspended in subordinate clauses. The dependent clause in (24f) also shows the suspension of the agent hierarchy in subordinate clauses, with the accusative suffix  $-əŋəs$  and a third person subject. Sentence (24g) is a passive with an

oblique nominal adjunct which specifies the agent. Sentence (24h) presents a problem in the apparent optionality of the possessive third person suffix  $-s$ . We cannot exclude the possibility of a semantic contrast in sentences (25a) and (25b) parallel to that shown in sentences (21) vs. (22) above.

- (25) a.  $\check{x}ci-t-sən\ k^v\ s-len-n-ŋ\ ə\ cə\ swəyʔqə?$   
 "I know about it, the being seen by the man"  
 b.  $\check{x}ci-t-sən\ k^v\ s-len-n-n-s\ ə\ cə\ swəyʔqə?$   
 "I know about it, his being seen by the man"

Both (25a) and (25b) might be translated as shown in (24h). Whether such a semantic contrast in fact exists must await further research in the Lummi language, or perhaps corroborative data from related Salish languages.

6. Non-finite or "reduced" person marking and subordination. There is a set of subject marking suffixes that appear only in certain subordinate clause types. These person marking suffixes do not have the "mobility" of the subject enclitics found in main clauses.

	Subject Enclitics (Main clauses)	Subject Suffixes (Subordinate)
Sg.		
	1 $-sən$	$-ən$
	2 $-sx^v$	$-əx^v$
	3 $-β$	$-əs$
Pl.		
	1 $-ɣ$	$-ɣ$
	2 $-sw^v$	$-əx^v$
	3 $-β$	$-əs$

Table 2  
A Comparison of Subject Enclitics and Suffixes

Note that the first person plural markers are homophonous, and homophonous with the first person plural possessive marker. In the first and second person singular forms, the suffixes appear to be reduced forms of the enclitics. One is tempted to analyze the s- which appears in the first person singular and second person as a marker of finite clauses, as a copula of some sort, parallel to the role of the copula across languages.<sup>5</sup> We would need to account for several problems, however. One is the lack of the initial s- in the third person and first person plural. There is, in fact, some phonological support for the lack of s- sequences in strings of enclitics. A clitic s assimilates to ʃ when it precedes an ʃ. An example is given in (26)

(26) yeʔ-ʃə-ʃ < (yeʔ-sə-ʃ) "We will go"

The clitic final -s-s and ʃ-ʃ would presumably then undergo a word final consonant degemination rule. One problem with this account is that Lummi permits geminate consonants in final position.

(27) tsoss "To be poor"  
sʔ-oss "Face"  
itt "He sleeps or is sleeping"

Another phonological problem is the schwa that appears in the second and third person and not in the first person plural. There is no simple phonological solution which would account for its presence in the non-finite person markers and its absence in the finite ones. We will therefore maintain the conservative position that there are simply two different sets of person markers which are used in finite and some non-finite clauses.

6.1. Person marking in nominal adjuncts. There are certain derived nominal expressions in Lummi which resemble "headless" relative clauses. When the subject of a clause of this type is not the same as the "missing" head of the clause, then the subject is marked via a member of the set of subject suffixes:

- (28) a. wet k<sup>v</sup> leŋ-n-ən "Who did I see"  
b. wet k<sup>v</sup> leŋ-n-əx<sup>v</sup> "Who did you see"  
c. wet k<sup>v</sup> leŋ-n-əs "Who did he see"  
d. wet k<sup>v</sup> leŋ-nəx<sup>v</sup>-ʃ "Who did we see"

More accurate translations would be "Who is it, (the one) that I saw", etc. Compare:

- (29) niʃ cə leŋ-n-oŋəs "That's the one that saw me/you"  
niʃ cə leŋ-nəx<sup>v</sup> "That's the one that sees him"

In (29), the subject of the subordinate clause is the same as the "missing" head, and therefore, no subject marking appears on the subordinate predicate. These person marking suffixes never appear on intransitive predicates in these derived nominals, since the subject of the subordinate clause and the "missing" head are necessarily the same:

- (30) niʃ cə yeʔ "That's the one that goes"  
(\*niʃ cə yeʔəs)

We turn now to an aspect of third person marking in nominal adjuncts that presents several difficulties. Recall that sentence (24b) above, repeated here as (31), is ambiguous:

- (31) ʃi-t-sən k<sup>v</sup> s-leŋ-nə-s cə swəyʔqəʔ

"I know that he saw the man" or "I know that the man saw him"

That is, the nominal adjunct cə swəyʔqəʔ may be either subject-linked or object-linked to the derived predicate having the prefix s-. Compare the following:

- (32) a. wet k<sup>v</sup> x̣ci-t-s cə swəyʔqəʔ  
 "Who does the man know?"  
 b. wet k<sup>v</sup> x̣ci-t cə swəyʔqəʔ  
 "Who knows the man?"

Neither of these sentences is ambiguous, and the -s suffix in (32a) shows that the following nominal is subject linked, while only the object-linked interpretation is possible for the nominal in (32b). Compare also the main clause construction, with ergative -s:

- (33) x̣ci-t-s cə swəyʔqəʔ "He knows the man"

In (33), only the object-linked interpretation of the nominal is possible. How do we account for the contrast in (32)? One possible explanation must be as follows: the form x̣ci-t-s in (32a) is a nominal with a reduced third person suffix, and a more accurate translation might be:

- (34) "Who is it, the one that he (the man) knows him"

In (32b), the "missing" head of the nominal and its subject are the same, so that there is no subject suffix, and a better translation would be:

- (35) "Who is it, the one that knows him (the man)"

A problem with the identification of the -s in (32a) with the reduced subject suffix is its phonological shape. We are not as yet clear on the -s/-əs contrast in these clauses.

6.2. Person marking in hypothetical clauses. The "reduced" subject suffixes appear also in another kind of subordinate clause in Lumli: the hypothetical. In these constructions, there are no "missing" arguments, and the subject suffixes appear on all predicates, including intransitive ones.

- (36) čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> yeʔ-ən "They asked me if I went"  
 čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> yeʔ-ox<sup>v</sup> "They asked me if you went"  
 čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> yeʔ-əs "They asked me if he went"  
 čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> yeʔ-ɣ "They asked me if we went"  
 (37) čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> x̣ci-t-ən "They asked me if I know it"  
 čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> x̣ci-t-ox<sup>v</sup> "They asked me if you know it"  
 čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> x̣ci-t-əs "They asked me if he knows it"  
 čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> x̣ci-t-ɣ "They asked me if we know it"

In Lumli, the interrogative predicates that are used in "Wh-" questions are intransitive, and take only third person subjects.

- (38) wetʔ "Who is it" ʔəxin-lə "Where was it"  
 sten "What is it" sten-sə "What will it be"  
 ʔəxin "Where is it" ʔəxin-q "Where might it be"

As (38) shows, these interrogative predicates take certain predicative particles. These predicates appear in subordinate clauses, in hypothetical constructions, where they receive third person subject marking:

- (39) a. čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>v</sup> wet-əs k<sup>v</sup> yeʔ  
 "They asked me who went"



b. čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>u</sup> wet-əs k<sup>u</sup> xči-t-s sə sʎeni?  
 "They asked me who the woman saw"

c. čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>u</sup> wet-əs k<sup>u</sup> xči-t sə sʎeni?  
 "They asked me who saw the woman"

d. čte-t-ŋ-sən k<sup>u</sup> sten-əs k<sup>u</sup> s-ʎi?-s  
 "They asked me what he wanted"

In (39), the first k<sup>u</sup> clause is the hypothetical construction, while the subsequent adjuncts are simple derived nominal expressions, where intransitives do not receive a subject suffix (32a); where -s on a transitive predicate indicates that the following nominal is subject-linked (32b); where the absence of -s indicates that the following nominal is object-linked (39c); and where certain derived predicates carry a third person possessive -s (39d).

7. Person marking in complex sentences. In the preceding discussion, we have pointed out the anaphoric link between person marking affixes that appear on the predicate in main clauses and the optional nominal adjuncts which may follow main clauses. This anaphoric link is a syntactic bond between main and subordinate clauses. In this sense, the person marking affixes that occur on the predicate in main clauses may be said to have another function: that of determining the number of direct adjuncts that may optionally be present in a complex sentence. The following table exhibits this property of the person marking affixes:

Sentence Type	Subject Marker	Object Suffix	No. of Direct Adjuncts Possible
Intrans. (Simple)	—	—	1
"	-sən, -sx <sup>u</sup>	—	0
Intrans. (-ŋ)	—	—	1
"	-sən, -sx <sup>u</sup>	—	0
Trans. (-t, -nəx <sup>u</sup> )	-sən, -sx <sup>u</sup>	—	1
"	-sən, sx <sup>u</sup>	-oŋəs	0
"	-s	—	2

Table 3  
 Direct Adjuncts Permitted in Complex Sentences

The point of this section is just to show that the connection between main (finite) clauses and adjoined subordinate clauses is not just a semantic one. Adjoined clauses may be said to be in a "looser" syntactic relation to main clauses than embedded clauses are; and there are no embedded clauses in Lummi.<sup>6</sup> But it is not the case that just any adjunct may be adjoined to any main clause. There are syntactic restrictions on what adjuncts may optionally be present, and these restrictions are given overt marking via the person marking affixes. Similar restrictions obtain between the person marking that appears on subordinate predicates themselves and the adjuncts subordinate to them, as the preceding sections have demonstrated.

8. Person marking and control. Negative sentences offer an especially interesting set of facts relating to subject person

marking in that person marking functions to mark differences in "control". The semantic category of control has been well documented in Salish, and is especially prominent in the system of transitivity suffixes.<sup>7</sup> A negative sentence is formed with the initial predicate *ʔəwʔ* "is not" to which the subject clitics may be attached. The remainder of the sentence is a factual clause introduced by an optional *kʷ*.

- (40) a. *ʔəwʔ-sən (kʷ) s-leŋ-nəxʷ cə swəyʔqəʔ*  
 "I don't see the man"  
 b. *ʔəwʔ (kʷ) nə-s-leŋ-nəxʷ cə swəyʔqəʔ*  
 "I don't see the man"

The different location and type of subject marking marks a semantic contrast related to the notion of control. In sentence (40a), the subject has at least partial control over the situation. Either he avoided seeing the man on purpose, or if he had made an effort he could have seen the man (the man may have been in the next room). In sentence (40b), in contrast, conditions were such that it was impossible for the first person subject to see the man. This same type of contrast involving control obtains for second person marking.

The facts regarding negative sentences with third person subjects are not so clear. So far, attempts to elicit nuances of meaning in sentences analogous to those in (41) have been unsuccessful.

- (41) a. *ʔəwʔ kʷ s-leŋ-nəxʷ cə swəyʔqəʔ*  
 "The man doesn't see him"

- b. *ʔəwʔ kʷ s-leŋ-nə-s cə swəyʔqəʔ*  
 "He doesn't see the man" or "The man doesn't see him"  
 c. *ʔəwʔ kʷ s-yeʔ* "He didn't go"  
 d. *ʔəwʔ kʷ s-yeʔ-s* "He didn't go"

It may be the case that in (41b) and (41d) the presence of the possessive *-s* suffix indicates less control on the part of the (3rd person) subject; perhaps data from other Salish languages will shed light on this question. In any case, the judgments concerning the first and second person forms are firm and it appears that in these cases the location and type of the person marking particles is interacting with the semantic notion of control.

9. Person marking in imperatives. As is often the case across languages, the subject is not expressed in imperative sentences in Lummi. There are no imperative particles in Lummi. Imperative sentences consist simply of a predicate spoken with suitable emphasis, and an optional object-linked direct adjunct if the predicate is transitive. Accordingly, imperatives may be characterized by the absence of person marking.

- (42) *yeʔ* "Go!"  
*kʷələšt cə sməyəs* "Shoot the deer!"

Negative imperatives have the negative predicate *ʔəwʔ* as the imperative and a subordinate factual clause.

- (43) *ʔəwʔ kʷ s-yeʔ* "Don't go!"  
*ʔəwʔ kʷ s-kʷələšt cə sməyəs* "Don't shoot the deer!"

As in other languages, however, Lummi speakers may use sentences that are declarative in syntactic structure in order to convey a command; as an indirect speech act:

- (44) ?əw?-sx<sup>u</sup> (k<sup>u</sup>) s-ye? "You don't go"  
 ?əw?-sx<sup>u</sup> (k<sup>u</sup>) s-k<sup>u</sup>ələšt cə sməyəs "You don't shoot  
 the deer"

In these constructions, the Lummi speaker uses the negative construction identified in the preceding section, the one that implies greater control on the part of the actor. The negative construction where person subject is marked on the subordinate predicate rather than the negative predicate indicates less control on the part of the actor, and the felicity conditions for issuing commands require that whatever one is ordered to do be under one's control.<sup>8</sup> Person marking in declarative sentences used in indirect imperatives therefore also functions to mark differences in control in Lummi.

In conclusion, we note that from a cross-language perspective, the system of person marking in Lummi and other Salish languages is quite rich. At the other end of the spectrum, there are languages such as Japanese that are morphologically complex but have no person marking affixes at all. The person predicates are an unusual feature of Salish grammar, and the syntax of these predicates is of some interest. Lummi shares with some of the other Salish languages the presence of certain person markers that show ergative/absolute case marking; these case-marking systems differ according to person and to clause type. In an earlier paper (Jelinek and Demers, *IJAL*, forthcoming), we have shown how the

agent hierarchy in Lummi reflects the semantic category of person. We have outlined here some of the many other syntactic functions of the person markers in Lummi. The use of possessive person markers to mark subjects in certain subordinate clauses and in "experienter" sentence types are phenomena found frequently across languages. We have pointed out also the role of the person markers in marking sentence mood (indicative, hypothetical, and imperative) and in differentiating clause types (main vs. subordinate); in specifying the number of optional direct adjuncts that a sentence may have; and in marking emphasis and control in the language.

Footnotes

1. We would like to thank Mr. Aloysius Charles for his Lummi language contributions. Elizabeth Bowman was kind enough to check several points of Lummi grammar with Mr. Charles for us. Ken Hale provided stimulating and helpful remarks on the material in this paper. Finally, we would like to thank the Dean of Liberal Arts and the Vice-President for research of the University of Arizona for their financial support. In this paper, we generally provide interlinear translations of the Lummi material, although such translations have not been given in some instances where repetitious material appears.
2. The agent hierarchy (Jelinek and Demers, forthcoming) requires that the highest ranked argument in the sentence serve as subject. The Lummi hierarchy is: 1) first and second person; 2) third person, unspecified; 3) nominals and nominalizations.
3. Parallel constructions occur in Indo-European, Semitic, and Palauan, among other language families.
4. Thom Hess (1974) points out problems in the syntax of first person plural possessive constructions elsewhere in Salish.
5. Kuipers (1967) suggests that the initial element in the main clause subject marking in Squamish is a predicate.
6. See Davis and Saunders (1981) and Jelinek and Demers (1982) for discussion of adjoined clauses in Salish.
7. For a general discussion of the topic of 'control' in Salish see Thompson (1976).
8. For a discussion of speech acts and language use in general see Searle (1969).

References

- Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders. (1981) "Complex Expressions in Bella Coola", Ms.
- Hess, Thom. (1974) "How do you say 'You are our father' in Salish", 9th ICSL, Vancouver.
- Jelinek, Eloise and Demers, Richard. (forthcoming) "The Agent Hierarchy and Voice in Some Coast Salish Languages", IJAL.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1982) "Adjoined Clauses in Lummi", University of Arizona Ms.  
Kuipers
- Searle, John. (1969) Speech Acts. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Thompson