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Abstract

This study investigates linking elements in Hul’q’umi’num’, the dialect of Halkomelem Salish spoken on Vancouver Island, British Columbia. Hul’q’umi’num’ has two interclausal linkers: the coordinator ?iʔ and the subordinator ?əw. In addition to occurring in straightforwardly biclausal constructions, these linking elements also occur between a variety of modals and adverbs and the elements they modify, raising the question: are such constructions monoclausal or biclausal? The morphosyntactic evidence, based on the placement of subject NPs, enclitics, auxiliaries and subordinate suffixes, reveals that these adverbial constructions do not form a homogenous group. Adverbial constructions with ?əw are always monoclausal, while modal and adverbial constructions with ?iʔ range from monoclausal to biclausal. I argue against an analysis that assumes homophones of ?iʔ, but instead propose that its range of uses can be related to the notion of topicality. I demonstrate that very similar multifunctionality is attested for conjunctions in other languages.

Keywords: Salish, Halkomelem, linkers, adverbs.
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</tr>
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<td>CNJ</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>causative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
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</tr>
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<td>determiner</td>
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<td>future</td>
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</tr>
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<td>gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>hearsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
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<td>INQ</td>
<td>inquisitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
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<td>IRR</td>
<td>irreals</td>
</tr>
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<td>ITR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNK</td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFX</td>
<td>lexical prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIR</td>
<td>mirative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>neutral gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>ordinal number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRET</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>independent pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>interrogative clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>serial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>subordinate subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>stative</td>
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<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
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<td>XACT</td>
<td>unspecified actor</td>
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**Languages:**
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<td>Delores Louie</td>
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<td>RP</td>
<td>Ruby Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Robert Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Theresa Thorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSa</td>
<td>Wilfred Sampson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSe</td>
<td>Willie Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1.  Hul’q’umi’nun’ linkers

This study is about Halkomelem, a language of the Central branch of the Salish language family spoken by around sixty elders in southwestern British Columbia. My focus is on the Island Halkomelem dialect, referred to by speakers as Hul’q’umi’nun’, henceforth abbreviated IH. Data for this study are drawn from published and unpublished materials, including grammar, dictionary, and texts, of Donna Gerdts and Thomas Hukari, and from my original field research with IH speakers.¹

Salish languages are well known for their complex morphosyntax. The example below demonstrates some key properties of IH.

¹ Much of the narrative data used in this thesis are from interviews with Willie Seymour of Stz’uminus First Nation conducted in fall of 2013. Elicited data are from a dozen field sessions with Delores Louie and/or Ruby Peter held between February and July 2014 in Duncan, British Columbia.
Like other Salish languages, Halkomelem is a head-first, head-marking language with complex morphology. In the example above, the predicate occurs in clause-initial position and is headed by an auxiliary (here: niʔ). The main verb exhibits multiple affixation, prominently featuring transitivity suffixes that distinguish for control (Thompson 1979, Thompson 1985, Gerdts 2006, Davis & Matthewson 2009, Jacobs 2011). Lexical suffixes internalize a core or oblique argument to the verb in various ways (Gerdts 2000). This is exemplified above by the suffix -aləs, which refers to a body part of the object (sqeʔəqs ‘his sister’). As above, all arguments follow the verb complex in clause-final position in unmarked word order and are headed by a determiner (here: təə).

2 This thesis follows the common practice of employing APA symbols for the transcription of Salish data. The deviations from IPA are the following: y for j, ǂ for χ, c for ts, č for tʃ (and the corresponding glottalized counterparts). Examples from non-Salishan languages are transcribed in IPA or in the orthography used in the source cited, except for Chinese, which is transcribed in standard Pinyin.

3 For the sake of conciseness, such distinctions will not be represented in the interlinear glosses. Other distinctions that are not relevant for this study and will therefore not be indicated in the glosses are gender and visibility for determiners. For the same reason, I choose not to represent the whole array of verbal derivational suffixes in the glosses. I will gloss the nominal prefix only when it is used to nominalize a clause (although it marks the majority of NPs, as well).
Not surprisingly, many studies of Salish languages have focused on their more polysynthetic aspects that set them apart from more familiar Indo-European languages. The present study focuses on two small functional elements, namely the two IH clause linkers \( ?i\? \text{ ‘CNJ’} \) and \( ?əw \text{ ‘CN’} \). These involve neither complex morphology nor unusual morphosyntactic mappings, but they are nonetheless intriguing for several reasons. First, these linkers are ubiquitous in the language. Take, for example, the following sentence from a narrative text:

\[
\text{(2)} \quad \text{lem-ət-əs} \quad ?i\? \quad wəl=\text{šəwən} \quad əw-nił
\]

\[
\text{see-TR-3ERG} \quad \text{CNJ} \quad \text{PRF=think} \quad \text{DT-CN-3FOC}
\]

\[
?i\? \quad \text{ha?=cən} \quad ?əwə \quad ?i\? \quad əwəm \quad ?i? \quad \text{šəwən} \quad əw-ənənəl
\]

\[
\text{CNJ} \quad \text{if=}1s \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{CNJ} \quad \text{can} \quad \text{CNJ} \quad \text{think} \quad \text{DT-CN-3FOC.PL}
\]

\[
\text{kʷə=nə=s} \quad \text{šən} \quad əwə \quad \text{sqi?qəl}.
\]

\[
\text{DT-1s.PS-N} \quad \text{too} \quad \text{CN} \quad \text{bad.ST}
\]

‘She looked at it and thought, “If I don’t do it, they will think I’m silly.”’(EW)

Second, they are functionally versatile, appearing in a wide variety of contexts. Third, they are understudied. While previous studies (Leslie 1979, Kroeber 1999, Suttles 2004, Jelinek & Demers 2004) have mentioned their occurrence in various constructions, no comprehensive investigation has been conducted. Finally, their array of functions lacks analogous counterparts in Indo-European languages, but has some surprising similarities in other languages of the world (cf. 6.2).
The term *linker* has been used to refer to various things in different languages. Studies on NP linkers are not scarce, with Mandarin *de* (的), Japanese *no*, and Tagalog *na* having attained some prominence (cf. Philip 2012). In all of these cases, the linker is used to link a modifier to its head within an NP. However, the function of the IH linkers is very different from this. In the rest of this introduction, I will outline the range of uses that the IH linkers have.

One use of the IH linkers is in interclausal linkage, i.e. in between separate clauses. This will be demonstrated in Chapter 2. While *ʔi* serves to coordinate two clauses (3), *ʔəw* subordinates one clause to another (4).

(3) \[xteʔom=ct=ceʔo \kappa w sʔetom] ?iʔ [mi=con=ceʔ \x{e}ʃə] \\
make-ITR=1p=FUT OB DT N-eat CNJ come=1s=FUT invite \\
tə swəwəs.

DT boy.PL

‘We’re going to make something to eat and I’ll invite the young men.’ (WSe)

(4) \[niʔe cseʔarə] ?əw [nɛmən necәwtxʷʔom] \\
AUX=2s tell-TR.1s.OBJ CN go-1s.SUB different-house-ITR

‘You told me to go visit.’ (RP)

In addition, both of these linkers are also used in what appear to be monoclausal sequences, such as the following:
(5) ƛ̓lim ʔəw ʔeʔiyəq tə swiwiłəs.
really CN angry DT boy
‘The young man is really angry.’ (RP)

(6) cələl ŋiʔ niʔ Ḵ̓xʷ-ənəq.
almost CNJ AUX beat-people
‘He almost won.’ (DL)

In this usage, ŋʔiʔ and ʔəw serve to link sentence-initial adverbial elements to the rest of
the sentence ((5), (6)). Chapter 3 situates linking constructions within a general
discussion of modificational strategies.

Chapter 4 raises the question: are adverbial constructions with linkers
monoclausal or biclausal? I bring in evidence from several syntactic tests (subject NP
placement, clitic placement, auxiliar placement and subordinate marking) to answer
this question. There is strong evidence that ʔəw-constructions and at least some ŋʔiʔ-
constructions are monoclausal. The following example shows a ʔəw-construction that
constitutes a single predication:

(7) ƛ̓lim=cnʔ ʔəw maq.
really=1s CN full
‘I’m very full.’ (RP)
This supports a major claim of the thesis: the same linkers are used for both interclausal and intraclausal linking.

As will be shown in Chapter 5, the data for $ʔiʔ$-constructions are actually quite heterogeneous. The evidence from subject clitic placement suggests that there are various stages between these two extremes. While some adverbial constructions are clearly monoclausal, others prove to be biclausal. In particular, this chapter discusses temporal adverbial constructions, such as the following:

(8) qəl̂et k*eyəl $ʔiʔ$ nemì=ceʔ cam tə swəyqeʔ.

again be.day CNJ go=FUT go.up.mountain DT man

‘The next day, the man went up in the mountains.’ (RP)

Chapter 5 ends with a discussion of what I refer to as the “cline of clausality,” showing that biclausality is associated with larger, open elements in the position before $ʔiʔ$, while monoclausality is associated with smaller, often lexicalized elements in the position before $ʔiʔ$.

Having established that $ʔiʔ$ is used in a variety of different constructions that range from monoclausal to biclausal, in Chapter 6 I look into the question of how these different uses are related to each other. We notice that $ʔiʔ$ is consistently and productively used with conditional clauses and temporal adverbials that mark a point of reference. I argue that both of these functions are related to the pragmatic notion of topic, because they have a frame-setting function for the following clause. Considering
the array of uses that \( ?i? \) exhibits from a cross-linguistic perspective, we see that this multifunctionality is not unique. I use data from Plains Cree and Southeast and East Asian languages to demonstrate close parallels. For example, Mandarin uses a linking construction to express a temporal adverbial:

(9) *Mandarin*

明天我就去上课。

\[\text{ming.tiān wǒ jiù qù shàng.kè}\]

tomorrow 1 CNJ go attend.class

‘Tomorrow I will go to class.’ (Hole 2004:13)

Especially for Southeast Asian languages, the case has been made that the conjunctions have a topicalizing function. Despite such close correspondences, IH also differs from Southeast Asian languages in that the conjunction \( ?i? \) is not used to topicalize arguments (although this is attested in other Salish languages) and in that it is used in adverb constructions.

I conclude in Chapter 7 with a summary of the main points made in this study. So far, intraclausal linkers have not been given much attention in the linguistic literature, and thus the IH data provide an empirical starting point for further study on this topic. My discussion of the function and distribution of linking elements in IH contributes to the typology and theory of linking elements in the world’s languages, which up to this point have centered mostly on the NP-internal and interclausal
domains. Furthermore, that IH has two linkers that are both used interclausally and intraclausally is of particular typological interest.

The data used come from a number of sources. Although an IH text corpus is not available to me at this point, data from various narratives have been considered. All of these have been compiled by Donna Gerdts, Thomas Hukari, or myself.
Chapter 2. Interclausal functions

One function of IH linkers is to connect clauses to each other. In this chapter, I will demonstrate that in interclausal linkage, \( ?i? \) serves as a coordinator and \( ?əw \) as a subordinator. Furthermore, I will introduce nominalization as a different method of subordination.

The first IH linker, \( ?i? \) ‘CNJ’, is a coordinating conjunction. It is normally translated into English as ‘and’, ‘but’ or ‘or’. Very much like English ‘and’, \( ?i? \) coordinates determiner phrases (DPs) (10) and whole clauses (11):

(10) \( wəɬ=sθəθi?-stxʷ-əs \) tʰə snəʔəɬʔʷəɬ-s s-əw
    PRF=prepare.ST-CS-3ERG DT canoe-3PS N-CN
    board-CAUS-3ERG DT many mat CNJ DT goat.wool.blanket

‘He had his canoe ready, and he loaded on a lot of mats and mountain goat wool blankets.’ (EW)

(11) \[ xte?-əm=ct=ce? \] tʰə kʷ sʔəɬəʔəɬʔ iʔ? [rɪɬ=ən=ce? ɬəɬəʔəɬəʔəɬəʔ]
    make-ITR=1p=FUT OB DT food CNJ come=1s=FUT invite
    tʰə swəɬəʔəɬəʔəɬəʔəɬəʔəɬəʔ.
    DT boy.PL

‘We’re going to make something to eat and I’ll invite the young men.’ (WSe)
In both examples above, ʔʔ links elements of the same syntactic category: two arguments (DPs) in (10), and two independent clauses in (11). Thus, a linkage with the marker ʔʔ can be said to be symmetrical, and ʔʔ can be established as a coordinator (cf. Haspelmath 2004).

In the examples above, ʔʔ seems to function exactly as English and does. However, the distribution of the two coordinators is not completely congruent. IH ʔʔ has other uses that sets it apart from English and. One of these is comitative conjunction:

(12) niʔ=ct ʔiməš ʔʔ kʷθə swəʔqe.
AUX=1p walk CNJ DT man
‘The man and I walked.’ (Gerdts & Hukari, in prep.)

This is an example of what Haspelmath (2000:30) calls a “split inclusory construction”: the coordinated element is part of the subject. Note that ʔʔ does not mark a comitative per se: the NP kʷθə swəʔqe does not function as an adjunct, but is
part of the subject, as indicated by the plural pronoun. The same construction can be applied to the coordination of objects, subjects of passives, and even possessors:

(13) $niʔ=ʔə=č ləm-naxʷ ?iʔ ɬə=nc šxʷʔəqʷaʔ?.
    AUX=Q=2s see-TR.1p.OBJ CNJ DT=1s.PS relative
    ‘Did you see me and my sister?’ (Leslie 1979:265)

(14) $niʔ ləm-naləm ?iʔ kʷʔən šxʷʔəqʷaʔ?
    AUX see-TR.2p.PAS CNJ DT.2PS relative
    $kʷ=sn $niʔ ɬʷim.
    DT=N AUX disembark
    ‘You and your brother were seen disembarking.’ (Leslie 1979:266)

(15) $niʔ=ʔəxʷ=ʔałə seekʷəl kʷə $niʔ š-ləq-els
    AUX=DUB=INQ how DT AUX N.OB-buy-ACT
    tənaʔən=təməxʷ ?iʔ təʔən men?
    DM 2PS=land CNJ DT.2PS father
    ‘How much is the cost of this land of yours and your father’s?’
    (Leslie 1979:267)

4 A true comitative would be introduced by the oblique marker $ʔə, as in the following example:

...ən-ʔəm ʔəm ʔəməʔələm ʔə tə=nc siłə.
1s.PS-N CN AUX return OB DT=1s.PS grandparent

‘... and I went back home with my grandfather.’ (Wse: Canoeing)
Note that in all of these cases the coordinator ʔi? adjoins an NP to a referent that is expressed by a suffix on the verb or a possessor affix. In fact, the other coordinant need not be expressed in any way at all:

(16) ʔəɬ=neʔ həyeʔ ʔiʔ Johnny.
   PRF=go leave CNJ J.
   ‘He is going away with Johnny.’ (Leslie 1979:268)

Thus, I conclude that ʔi? combines coordinants on a semantic level, instead of strictly on a syntactic level. English and may not be used in this way.

On the other hand, English and has functions that IH ʔi? does not. In the following example, and is used to coordinate verbs within the same verb phrase.

(17) I tracked down and killed the bear.

Employing ʔi? in IH for an analogous structure is not possible:

(18) *niʔ=cən xʷ-ləmʔən ʔiʔ qəy-t kʷθə speʔθə.
   AUX=1s LPFX-see-foot CNJ dead-TR DT black.bear
   Intended reading: ‘I tracked down and killed the bear.’ (RP)

Instead, a scenario like (17) would be rendered in IH by a sequence of clauses.
The obligatory occurrence of the auxiliary *niʔ* after the conjunction *ʔiʔ* indicates that the following is a separate clause, rather than just a separate verb. Thus, we can say that IH *ʔiʔ* is a coordinating conjunction like English *and*, but its distribution and function differ slightly from the latter.⁵

The linker *ʔəw* ‘CN’ is a connective used for complementation.⁶ It is not translated into English in any consistent way.

---

⁵ Other differences in the use of IH *ʔiʔ* and English *and* will be presented and discussed in the following chapter.

⁶ No study of subordination types in IH has been undertaken to date, but see Jacobs 2013 for a comprehensive study of subordination in the closely related Squamish language.
(21) temə-θamə=cən=ce? ḋə ḋwə yəŋ-əs.
call-2s.OBJ=1s=FUT CN be.day-3SUB
‘I will call you tomorrow.’ (RP)
Literally: ‘I will call you when it is day.’

The difference between independent clauses and dependent clauses is overtly marked in IH; note that the subjects of both clauses in (11), repeated below as (22), are indexed by subject enclitics (ct ‘1p’ and cən ‘1s’, respectively).

(22) [xte-əm=ct=ce? ḋəkʷ səətən] ḋi?
[mi=cən=ce? ə̊ešət
make-ITR=1p=FUT OB DT food CNJ come=1s=FUT invite
tə swəɫəs.]
DT boy.PL
‘We’re going to make something to eat and I’ll invite the young men.’ (WSe)

In (20), on the other hand, only the main clause bears a subject enclitic (č ‘2s’), while the dependent clause indexes its subject by means of a suffix (-ə 1s.SUB’). This difference in subject marking is summarized in the following table.
Table 1: Halkomelem subject inflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>main clause</th>
<th>dependent clause</th>
<th>possessive^7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) sg</td>
<td>cən</td>
<td>-cːn</td>
<td>cə-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) sg</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>-əxʷ</td>
<td>?ən-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) pl</td>
<td>ct</td>
<td>-ət</td>
<td>-ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) pl</td>
<td>ceːp</td>
<td>-əp</td>
<td>?ən-...-əp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd})</td>
<td>(-əs)</td>
<td>-əs</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First and second persons are all indexed by enclitics in main clauses, and suffixes in dependent clauses. Third person subjects do not have a corresponding enclitic for main clauses, but are likewise indexed by a suffix in subordinate clauses (see (21)). The same suffix is used in main clauses, but only for subjects of transitive clauses (i.e. ergative arguments, cf. Gerdts 1980). This subject indexing is obligatory. Thus, a dependent clause without a subject suffix is ungrammatical (23), and a main clause without any subject indexing needs to refer to a third person subject (24).

(23) [niʔ=č  cse-θəmš]  ?əw  [nečm *(-ən)  nec-əwtxʷ-əm.]

AUX=2s  tell-TR.1s.OBJ  CN  go  *(-1s.SUB)  different-house-ITR

‘You told me to go visit.’ (RP)

^7 This table also includes possessive marking, which is used for subject inflection in nominalized dependent clauses (see below).
Dependent clause suffixes do not occur in all types of dependent clauses. In nominalized clauses, the subject is indexed by a different paradigm of affixes, namely possessive markers. There are two types of nominalized clauses, one of which is introduced by a determiner (25), and the other by the linker ?əw (26).

(25) skwεy  kʷə=nə=s  ləm-nəmə.
   cannot  DT=1s.PS=N  see-TR.2s.OBJ
   ‘I can’t see you.’ (RP)

(26) niʔ=cən  nerń  qʷim  nə=s  ?əw  xʷčəməm.
   AUX=1s  go  debark  1s.PS=N  CN  run
   ‘I got off [the truck] and I ran.’ (WSe: Canoeing)

Determiner-headed nominalized clauses have a similar function to dependent clauses. For example, they serve as complement clauses with a number of higher verbs (such as skwεy ‘cannot’ in (25)). The distribution of these different types of subordinate clauses is an interesting (and under-studied) topic, but not directly relevant to this study. The important point is that all types of independent clauses are overtly marked as such. Despite its overt morphosyntactic marking as independent, the function of
nominalization with ᵃʷ is more coordinative than subordinative. This construction is used to describe a sequence of events (cf. Hukari 1982).

At this point, I refrain from claiming anything about the syntactic position of the two linkers. While they may very well form a constituent with one of the adjoining clauses, I choose to represent them as occurring in between the two in this study. The conjunction ᵃ⁻ is described as a weak introducer in Gerdts and Werle (to appear), because in contrast to strong introducers, ᵃ⁻ may not serve as a host for second-position clitic placement. However, this description presumes that ᵃ⁻ occurs at the left edge of a clause, which is not established. In fact, ᵃ⁻ may lean either to the left or to the right. The subordinator ᵃʷ, on the other hand, shows a slightly different distribution. Gerdts & Hukari (in prep.) describe it as a proclitic, which would place it in the verb phrase. Indeed, we notice that ᵃʷ occurs not exactly in between the main clause and the nominalized clause in example (26) above, but rather within the dependent clause, because it is preceded by the possessive marker and the nominal prefix. More relevant evidence will be discussed in section 4.4. In short, the representation used here does not necessarily reflect the syntactic structure of the examples given. This is important to bear in mind in the following section about the intraclausal use of the linkers.

To sum up, we have established in this chapter that ᵃ⁻ and ᵃʷ both occur in interclausal linkage. Linkage by means of ᵃ⁻ is coordinative, such that both the clause before the conjunction and the clause after the conjunction are independent. Linkage
by means of ?ow is subordinative and connects a matrix clause to its complement clause.
Chapter 3. Adverbial constructions

Adverbials may be manifested as different parts of speech in IH, and section 3.1 provides an overview of these different strategies. One construction consists of an adverb followed by a linker, either \( ?i ? \) or \( ?\hat{o} \). Adverbs are a small word class in IH, and as section 3.2 shows, many are related to verb roots. Section 3.3 focuses on the use of linkers in adverbial constructions. It shows that while linkers may occasionally be dropped or replaced, each of them occurs very consistently with a set of adverbs, depending on the semantic class of the adverb.

3.1. Types of predicate modification

In IH, there are various strategies for modifying a predication, as adverbs do in English. A frequent pattern is that the semantically modifying element functions as a higher predicate and is followed by a nominalized clause.

(27) \text{d}i\text{-}\text{me}\text{n}\text{-}t. \\
\text{do.intense-TR}=2\text{s} \quad \text{DT-2PS}=\text{N} \quad \text{kic}k-\text{TR} \\
‘You kick him hard.’ (Hukari & Peter 1995)
In the examples above, the verbs *timət* ‘do intensely’ and *yəweŋi* ‘first’ modify the predication expressed in the following nominalized clause. While in English this type of modification is expressed through adverbs, in IH it is expressed by a higher predication.

Besides this type of verb modification, IH has two types of true adverbs, i.e. predicate-modifiers that do not function as predicates themselves (cf. Montler 2003:119). The first type (including *qəlet* ‘again’) does not usually co-occur with any linkers.

(29) *nem* *qəlet* *qəyilaš*.
    go    again  dance
    ‘She went and danced some more.’ (Gerdts & Werle to appear)

(30) *mī=ct=ce?  səwəq-t* *qəlet*.
    come=1p=FUT  search-TR  again
    ‘We will come and look for him again.’ (Gerdts & Werle to appear)
As the examples above demonstrate, such adverbs exhibit flexibility in placement: they can occur either pre-verbally (29) or post-verbally (30). In the absence of an auxiliary, they can occur in clause-initial position, as in the following example.

(31) qəlet=č=ceʔ  čəl-cəs.
    again=2s=FUT switch-hand
    ‘You will have to switch [hands] again.’ (WSe: Canoeing)

Besides qəlet ‘again’, another adverb of this type is ƛeʔ ‘also, again’. The following examples show that it occurs in pre-verbal (32), post-verbal (33) and clause-initial positions (34).

(32) ?əwω=cən  mɪ:ʔ  ƛeʔ  ʔəkʷ.
    NEG=1s come-1s.SUB again surface
    ‘I might not be able to come back up.’ (EW)

(33) ?əw  tətəqʷ  ƛeʔ  ?aʔ.  
    CN bump.IPV again just
    ‘He just kept hitting things.’ (EW)

(34) ƛeʔ=cən  wəʕ=ʔa:ɬ ʔə təqəʔəcən. 
    again=1s PRF=go.aboard OB DT Cowichan
    ‘Then I got on the Cowichan [canoe] again.’ (WSe: Canoeing)
Adverbs of the second type, which are the focus of this study, are usually connected to the verb they modify with a linker. The word order of these constructions is fixed; these adverbs may only precede the phrase they modify.

(35) ƛliṁʔə li ʔə iyə tᶿə swiwləs.
really CN angry DT boy
‘The young man is really angry.’ (RP)

(36) *li ʔə iyə ƛliṁʔə (?əw) tᶿə swiwləs.
angry CN really CN DT boy (RP)

almost CNJ AUX beat-people
‘He almost won.’ (DL)

(38) *ni? ƛxʷ-ənəq (?i?) cəlel.
AUX beat-people CNJ almost (RP)

In this type of construction, the linkers do not seem to occur between clauses, but rather within clauses. However, the following chapter will demonstrate that the question of clausality is not so straightforward and will investigate it more thoroughly. Before that, I will provide further detail about the collocation of linkers and adverbs.
3.2. The categorial status of adverbs

Of the class of true adverbs that co-occur with linkers, many are related to verb roots. This is seen by the possibility of using the base form as a verb, or by expanding the base by means of verbal derivational or inflectional morphology. The following list gives some examples of adverbs that appear with linkers and the verbs to which they are related.

Table 2: Adverbs and their related forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Related form</th>
<th>Morphology of expanded form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʰliŋ ‘really’</td>
<td>ʰəliŋ ‘going the right way’</td>
<td>IPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>məkʷ ‘all’</td>
<td>məkʷət ‘take it all’</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qeqəl ‘barely’</td>
<td>qel ‘believe’</td>
<td>ITR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʰəm ‘can / fast’</td>
<td>ʰəmθət ‘become fast’</td>
<td>INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñixəm ‘please’</td>
<td>ñximət ‘have pity on’</td>
<td>ITR/TR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are some examples of such verb forms used as predicates.

(39) niʔ=çon qel kʷ=s ʰəəxʷəm-s tʰə sənixʷəł.
AUX=1s believe DT=N fast.PL-3SUB DT canoe.PL
‘I believe that the canoes are fast.’ (RP)
Two of the adverbs listed above are themselves used as predicates, but are then translated differently: $\tilde{x}^\omega m$ ‘fast’ (rather than ‘can’) and $i\tilde{t}\tilde{i}x^\omega m$ ‘take pity on’ (rather than ‘please’).

(41) $\tilde{x}^\omega m$ t$^\omega x$ sn$\tilde{x}^\omega t$.
    fast DT canoe
    ‘The canoe is fast.’ (DL)

(42) ni$=c\tilde{e}$ $i\tilde{t}\tilde{i}x^\omega m$ $t^\omega x$ x$^\omega$swen-$\tilde{e}$m sl$^\omega i\tilde{\lambda}q\tilde{e}t$.
    AUX=1s pity-ITR OB DT throw.out-ITR child.DIM
    ‘I felt bad for / took pity on the orphaned little child.’ (TT)

The relationship of the adverb $qe\tilde{q}d$ $\dot{\iota}$ ‘barely’ to the verb root $qe\tilde{l}$ ‘believe’ is somewhat speculative. Ruby Peter agrees to the idea that $qe\tilde{q}d$ $\dot{\iota}$ ‘barely’ is etymologically related to $qe\tilde{l}$ ‘believe’, but she does not believe this reflects a transparent or regular process. The complement of $qe\tilde{l}$ is expressed in a determiner phrase, as example (39), repeated here as (43), shows:
I suggest that the \textit{ʔi?-}construction with \textit{qeqəl'} might be derived from such a complement structure. Perhaps it was re-analyzed as an adverb in analogy to the other adverbs with linkers. The following example would represent an intermediate step in this lexicalization:

(44) \textit{qeqəl'} \textit{ʔə} kʷ-ct \textit{ʔi?} \textit{ƛxʷ-ənəq}.

\textit{believe.PRG just DT-1p.PS AUX beat-people}

‘We barely won.’ (RP)

Here, \textit{qeqəl'} lacks a subject and therefore may not qualify as a verb. However, the following proposition is structurally identical to the complement clause in (43). From this point, the analogy to \textit{ʔi?-}constructions is apparent. The last step in the lexicalization process is to replace the determiner by \textit{ʔi?} to arrive at the pattern that is prevalent now:

(45) \textit{qeqəl'} \textit{ʔə} \textit{ʔi?} \textit{ni?=ct} \textit{ƛxʷ-ənəq}.

\textit{barely just CNJ AUX=1p beat-people}

‘We just barely won.’ (RP)
Overall, what we see is that there is a small class of true adverbs in IH that do not usually function as predicates; and yet almost all of these relate to verb roots.

3.3. Adverbs with linkers

For the adverbs that regularly co-occur with linkers, the choice of linker appears to be lexically determined by the adverb, such that each adverb occurs either with one linker or with the other. Thus, ƛlim ‘really’ appears with òw and not with ?i:

(46) ƛlim=çon òw Ʂq̌y̌kʷ-ʔət.
really=1s CN startled-REFL
‘I’m really startled.’ (RP)

(47) *ƛlim=çon ?i? Ʂq̌y̌kʷ-ʔət.
really=1s CNJ startled-REFL (RP)

The adverb cəlel appears with ?i? and not with òw:

(48) cəlel=çon ?i? meƛil.
almost=1s CNJ faint
‘I almost fainted.’ (RP)

(49) *cəlel=çon òw meƛil.
almost=1s CN faint (RP)
Table 3 lists these adverbs, along with the linker with which they appear.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?əw</th>
<th>?i?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥli mh ‘really’</td>
<td>?xʷəm ‘can’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan ‘very, too (much)’</td>
<td>colel ‘almost’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaθ ‘always’</td>
<td>xʷeləq ‘almost’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>məkʷ ‘all’</td>
<td>qeqəl ‘barely’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔxʷəm ‘please’</td>
<td>ʔxʷəm ‘please’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔəxʷle? ‘sometimes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their discussion of closely related Straits Salish, Jelinek & Demers (2004:232) note that the adverbs used in linking constructions “tend to refer to a high degree or absolute value of some property.” I argue that we can obtain a more differentiated picture if we look at the two linkers separately and compare their distribution. If we consider the table above, we notice that only the adverbs that combine with ?əw have that absolute value to their meaning, in the sense that they

8 There is some disagreement about what to call this class. From a semantic point of view, it might seem more appropriate to speak of ?xʷəm ‘can’ and ʔxʷəm ‘please’ as modals, rather than adverbs. However, since they behave just like the adverbs discussed here, I will treat them as such. Suttles (2004), by contrast, refers to all of the elements listed in Table 3 as modals. Leslie (1979:251ff.) calls them “additive emphatics”. For Straits Salish, which has cognates with virtually the same distribution, Jelinek (1990) refers to these items as modals, whereas Montler (2003) comments that they should be considered adverbs, because they have “all the same syntactic and morphological characteristic of the other adverbs.”
refer to a complete, maximal, or exhaustive, degree in their respective domain. Thus, $mək^w$ ‘all’ exploits the full degree of a given quantity, while $yaθ$ ‘always’ refers to the complete set of possible times. Ħlun ‘really’ and $nan$ ‘very, too’ intensify the scope of the modified element to a full or even extreme degree. If we consider the adverbs that co-occur with $ʔi?$, we see no such meaning associated with them. This picture is confirmed by data from Straits Salish, where the linker $ʔu?$ co-occurs with other lexical items. Jelinek & Demers (2004) list the following items for Lummi: $siʔit$ ‘truly’, $ʔənan$ ‘too (much), $ŋən$ ‘big/many/very’, $səeyn$ ‘straight’, $toʔx^w$ ‘just’, $mək^w$ ‘all’, $yos$ ‘always’, $x^wəwe$ ‘never’. Montler (2003) also gives further adverbs that are specific to Klallam: $ɬəŋ$ ‘just like’, $səɬəŋ$ ‘continuously’, $sɬəx^w$ ‘definitely’, $cəwin$ ‘even’, $xən$ ‘all’. Including the data from Straits Salish give us a larger set of adverbs, which adds more weight to the conclusion that the adverbs co-occurring with $ʔəʔ$ all share some absolute value in their lexical content. It might be possible to relate this pattern to the notion of weak vs. strong quantifiers (proposed in Milsark 1977 and elaborated in Bach et al. 1995).

The occurrence of linkers with the adverbs listed in Table 3 is obligatory (50) or otherwise strongly preferred ((51)-(52)).

(50) $yaθ=$cən *(ʔəw) ʔəiʔιʔəl.
always=1s CN pray
‘I always pray.’ (RP)
(51) ?♀lĩm=cən ____ ḡvígʷ-ʔət.
   really=1s startled-REFL
   ‘I am really startled.’ (RP)

(52) ḡxʷəm=cən ____ ḡxʷčenəm.
   can=1s run
   ‘I can run.’ (RP)

Example (50) is only grammatical if the adverb yaθ ‘always’ is followed by the linker ḡəw. Ruby Peter accepts (51), but adds that it is not entirely complete. For (52), Ruby Peter expresses no concerns, but in comparison favours the same sentence with ?iʔ. However, Delores Louie claims that she favours neither. While such differences in the judgments of speakers exist, most natural (i.e. not elicited) data do include linkers.

Thus, it seems as if every adverb subcategorizes for a linker. However, some adverbs exhibit variation with respect to the type of construction in which they are used.9 This variation sometimes clearly affects the meaning of the sentence, as is the case with ḡxʷəm ‘can’. Compare the ḡiʔ-construction with ḡxʷəm (53) to the occurrence of ḡxʷəm in other constructions:

(53) ḡxʷəm=cən ḡiʔ ḡxʷčenəm.
   can-1s CNJ run
   ‘I can run.’ (RP)

9 Cf. Montler 2003 for the same observation for Klallam and Northern Straits.
Here, ʾxʷəm is translated into English as ‘can’ when used in a ?iʔ-construction, but as ‘fast’ when it is used as a main predicate or in combination with a determiner phrase. In this case, choice of construction clearly affects the interpretation of ʾxʷəm.10

In other cases, a similar variation in construction does not seem to have any effect on the meaning. Like ʾxʷəm ‘can’, the adverb ʾčiməl/‘close’ may occur either with a determiner-headed nominalized clause (56) or a clause introduced by ?iʔ (57):

(56) ʾwəl=ʾčiməl ʾkʷə=ṇə=s ʾnəm ʰəyeʔstamə.
PRF=close DT=1s.PS=N go leave-CS.2s.OBJ
‘It’s close to the time for me to take you away.’ (RP)

(57) ʾwəl=ʾčiməl ?iʔ ʾnəm=čən=ceʔ ʰəyeʔstamə.
PRF=close CNJ go=1s=FUT leave-CS.2s.OBJ
‘It’s close to the time for me to take you away.’ (RP)

10 While the notions of speed and ability/possibility are readily relatable, it is unclear whether we should posit a single vague lexical entry ʾxʷəm or rather two separate entries on a synchronic level.
Ruby Peter claims that the examples above have the same meaning.

The adverb *taxʷ ‘exact/now/soon’ shows even more flexibility; it occurs with determiner-headed nominalized clauses (58), with the conjunction ?i? (59), or with the connective ?əw (60):

(58) *taxʷ=ce? kʷə=nə=s neəm neč-əwtxʷ-əm.
    exact=FUT DT=1s.PS=N go other-house-ITR
    ‘I’ll go and visit him later.’ (RP)

    exact=FUT just CNJ go=1s other-house-ITR
    ‘I’ll go and visit him later.’ (RP)

(60) *taxʷ=can ?əw ṉ̃x̱ɬəš ?i? ni? xʷ-yəxʷ təə šel.
    exact=FUT CN stand CNJ AUX LPFX-open DT door
    ‘I just stood up when the door opened.’ (RP)

It may seem that the collocation of *taxʷ ?əw has a different meaning than *taxʷ used with any of the other constructions: *taxʷ is translated into ‘later’ in the constructions involving nominalization (58) and ?i? (59), but into ‘just’ in the construction involving ?əw (60). Yet, compare (60) to the following sentence, where ?i? is used instead, and *taxʷ is still translated as ‘just’:
Hence, we see that there are adverbial elements that occur with both ?i? and ?ow (and other constructions). In some cases we notice that the choice of construction alters the meaning slightly. As for the adverbs listed in Table 3, though, they co-occur with the same linker very consistently.\textsuperscript{11} As I have mentioned above, exchanging one linker for the other in these adverbial constructions often leads to ungrammaticality.

However, it would not be true to say that the adverbs listed in Table 3 co-occur with their respective linkers without exceptions. We see in the example below that \textit{təmtem} ‘when’ does not need to occur in a ?i?-construction.

(62) təmtem=ce?‿ compelled ye↓ no=s yəθ-əs-əmə
    when=FUT just then 1s.PS=N tell.DAT-TR.2s.OBJ

‘Some day I will tell you’ (RP)

\textsuperscript{11} As shown above, \textit{qeqəl} may also occur with a determiner phrase. Nonetheless I included it in Table 3, because Ruby Peter claimed that she prefers to use it in a ?i?-construction. Leslie (1979) mentions that \textit{scekʷəl} ‘how’ is used in different constructions. However, I did not include any discussion of this word due to the fact that it is prototypically used not in a ?i?-construction, but with a nominalization (cf. Chapter 3).
Here, the sentence-initial temporal expression is not followed by ṭiʔ, but rather by the temporal conjunction yeɬ. Despite such exceptions, the patterns from both natural texts and elicitation are very consistent with the description in Chapter 3, namely that each of the adverbs co-occurs with its respective linker.

While exchanging the linkers in adverbial constructions is normally not grammatical and their presence is strongly favoured, they are dropped under certain conditions. The first of these is when any adverb from Table 3 directly modifies not the predicate, but rather an NP.

(63) niʔ=ceʔ totem kʰeyʔl kʰɑʔ=s hɑyeʔ.
AUX=FUT when day DT.2PS leave
‘What day are you leaving?’ (Leslie 1979:256)

(64) niʔ Ċv<ɬ>e<ɬ>ncenom məkʷ kʰθə sɬəɬiqəɬ.
AUX <PL>run all DT child.DIM.PL
‘All the children ran.’ (Gerdts & Hukari, in prep.)

In example (63), totem directly modifies not the predicate or the whole clause, but the nominal kʰeyʔl ‘day’. Likewise, məkʷ modifies not the VP as a whole, but rather the NP kʰθə sɬəɬiqəɬ ‘the children’ in (64). In such cases, no linking element is regularly employed.12 This shows that the linkers are not an intrinsic part of the lexical

12 Yet the connective ʔəw may still occur in NP modifications. I suggest that in these cases, its use is strictly emphatic, because its appearance is optional.
entry for the adverbs, but that they are strictly an element of the specific adverbial construction they occur in.

Furthermore, linkers are commonly dropped if there is another element – like an auxiliary (65), enclitic (66), or proclitic (67) – between the adverb and the following main verb.

(65) ᴵ/liṃ=cən __ ni? ᵴʰᵒʔkʷθət.
really=1s AUX startled-REFL
‘I was really startled.’ (RP)

(66) xʷəm=cən=pe? __ nem ꞌʔw nem ꞌʔ l ꞌənəm
can=1s=CERT AUX CN go OB DT 2s.PRO
ʔii? ꞌʔw ꞌʔay-thəmə=cən.
CNJ CN dead-TR.2s.OBJ=1s
‘I can really come over to you and kill you.’ (RP: Little Wren)

(67) naʔə ᴵ/liṃ __ wəl=səpəleύ ᵴʰ ꞌkwəɬəw ꞌʔ ꞌkəw ꞌʔ
AUX really PRF=attach.ST DT skin OB DT.CN
nə=swe? nə=ɬ’əɬəw.
1s.PS=own 1s.PS-skin
‘The skin has become attached (and it’s growing) into my own skin.’
(Gerdts & Werle to appear)

The occurrence of a linker in such cases may in fact be *disfavoured*.
This suggests that the occurrence of the linkers \textit{ʔi?} and \textit{ʔə} is to some degree dependent on prosody. The exact nature of this effect needs further study.

Besides this possible prosodic effect, example (66) also shows us that the occurrence of the two linkers is not mutually exclusive. Note that in this example, none of the linkers occurs in an adverbial construction; \textit{ʔi?} is used in its clause-linking function, while \textit{ʔə} is used to delimit the scope of the following predication (along the lines of “I will kill you just like that (easily).” When the two linkers do occur together, they always appear in the order \textit{ʔi? ʔə}, but never \textit{ʔə ʔi?}. As I will point out in section 4.4, this is because the position of \textit{ʔə} falls within the verb phrase, while \textit{ʔi?} may not.  

\textbf{3.4. Summary}

Predicate modification can be expressed in various ways in IH. For example, one strategy is that the modifier is a higher verb followed by a nominalized clause. Another strategy is for an adverb-linker collocation to serve as a modifier. The same linkers that have been shown to occur in interclausal linking are also employed with this subset of adverbs. Each adverb regularly co-occurs with either the linker \textit{ʔi?} or the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{13}} Alternatively, \textit{ʔi?} may just be placed in a higher level within the verb phrase.
linker ?ə́v. Furthermore, these adverbs always precede the element they modify, unlike other adverbs, which show more flexibility in placement. Comparing the distribution of ?iʔ and ?ə́v, we notice that ?ə́v is used with adverbs that exhibit an absolute degree in their respective domain, while this is not true for adverbs that co-occur with ?iʔ.
Chapter 4. Monoclausal or biclausal?

Given that linkers are used for interclausal linkage (see Chapter 2) and that adverbial modification is often accomplished by means of a clause or a higher predicate, the question is raised whether the adverb linking constructions discussed in Chapter 3 are monoclausal or biclausal. I will consider two possible analyses of the adverbial structures presented above. The two hypotheses for adverbial structures with \( \ddot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \) are presented in Table 4, and illustrated by means of example (69).

(69) nan \( \ddot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \) \( \ddot{\omega} \dot{\gamma} \).

too CN good

‘It’s too/very good.’ (RP)
Table 4: Working hypotheses for ʔəw-constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1: monoclausal</th>
<th>Hypothesis 2: biclausal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nan ʔəw ʔəy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, I will consider the same options for adverbial constructions with ʔiʔ.

This is illustrated in Table 5, by means of example (70).

(70) ꠢwʔomʔiʔ ꠢwčenom.
    can CNJ run
    ‘He can run.’ (RP)

---

14 The exact placement of the linker (i.e. whether ʔəw is placed in clause 1 or clause 2 or between clause 1 and clause 2) under the biclausal analysis is not within the focus of this study. However, 4.4 provides some evidence from auxiliary placement that ʔəw falls within the scope of the predicate, which suggests that the linker is placed in clause 2. The same cannot be said for ʔiʔ.
Table 5: Working hypotheses for ?i?-constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1: monoclausal</th>
<th>Hypothesis 2: biclausal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| |\[\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{om}} \text{ ?i?} \]
| \[\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{c} }\hat{\text{enom}}\text{[clause]} \] | \[|\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{om}}\text{[clause 1] ?i?} \]
| | \[|\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{c} }\hat{\text{enom}}\text{[clause 2]} \] or \[|\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{om}}\text{[clause 1] | ?i?} \]
| | \[\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{c} }\hat{\text{enom}}\text{[clause 2]} \] or \[|\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{om}} \text{ ?i?}\text{[clause 1]} \]
| | \[\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{c} }\hat{\text{enom}}\text{[clause 2]} \]

In order to allow for an unbiased representation of the structures involved, I will use vertical lines to delimit the two parts of the construction on each side of the linking element. The following examplifies this notation:

(71) \[|\hat{x}^w\hat{\text{om}}=?\hat{\text{om}}=\hat{\text{om}}\text{=Č}|\text{Z}_1 \text{ ?i?} \]
\[|?a:4\text{-stanš}=?|\text{Z}_2 \]
\[\text{can=}Q=2s \quad \text{CNJ aboard-CS.1s.OBJ} \]

‘Can you give me a ride?’ (RP: Dict)

I will use the term Zone 1 (Z1) for the part before the linker, and Zone 2 (Z2) for the part after the linker. It is important to note that this is not representative of a syntactic analysis. On the contrary, it serves to allow for a neutral discussion of adverbial structures.

In the following sections, I will provide evidence from syntactic tests to show that these adverbial constructions are monoclausal. I will start with the most
conclusive evidence from the placement of subject NPs (section 4.1) and of subject clitics (section 4.2). After this, I will discuss additional evidence that further corroborates the monoclausal analysis specifically for adverbial constructions with ?əw. This evidence comes from patterns of dependent marking (section 4.3) and the placement of auxiliaries (section 4.4).

4.1. Subject NP placement

IH is fairly consistently head-initial. Canonically, noun phrases (NPs) appear post-verbally:

(72) ne ŋ̇ ŋ̇ əqʷə əl kʷθə-mort stiwən.
gο cross DT=1s.PS nephew
‘My nephew is going across.’ (RP)

(73) ?əɨ-stxʷ-əs tθə speʔəθ tθə ɭq产权
good-CS-3ERG DT bear DT dried.fish
‘Bear liked dried fish’ (RR: Bear and Raven)

By contrast, subject enclitics are placed in second position, and thus often appear directly following the auxiliary.¹⁵

¹⁵ The placement of subject enclitics will be discussed in more detail in the following section (4.2).
In complex sentences involving complementation, the subject of the main clause may occur either before the connective ?ǝw, as in (76), or after the embedded clause, as in (77).

(76) [ni? cse-thamš-ǝs tǝ=ne šǝyǝɬ]matrix
   AUX tell-1s.OBJ-ERG DT=1s.PS elder.brother
   [ʔǝw xʷ-tqe-t-ǝn tǝ= šeɬ]sub
   CN LPFX-close-TR-1s.SUB DT door

   ‘My brother told me to close the door.’ (RP)

(77) [ni? cse-thamš-ǝs [ʔǝw xʷ-tqe-t-ǝn tǝ= šeɬ]sub
   AUX tell-1s.OBJ-ERG CN LPFX-close-TR-1s.SUB DT door
   tǝ=ne šǝyǝɬ]matrix
   DT=1s.PS elder.brother

   ‘My brother told me to close the door.’ (RP)
Important for the following discussion is that there is a slot before the subordinate clause available for the subject NP of the matrix clause (as in (76)). Thus, if the adverbial constructions are monoclausal, we expect NPs to occur only at the very end of Zone 2. If the adverbial constructions are biclausal, we expect NPs to be able to occur at the end of Zone 1, as well.

(78) |ƛlin|Z1 ᵦʔw |tʰoʔkʷ-ʔə |tʰ eq|Z2
really CN angry-REFL DT baby
‘The baby’s really angry.’ (RP)

(79) *|ƛlin tʰ eq|Z1 ᵦʔw |tʰoʔkʷ-ʔə|Z2
really DT baby CN angry-REFL (RP)

(80) |ƛwɔm|Z1 ᵦʔ |ƛwɛnɔm tʰwνni|Z2
can CNJ run DT.CN.3FOC
‘He can run.’ (RP)

(81) *|ƛwɔm tʰwνni|Z1 ᵦʔ |ƛwɛnɔm|Z2
can DT.CN.3FOC CNJ run (DL)

Examples (78)-(81) show that subject NPs are invariably placed at the end of Zone 2 in constructions involving either ᵦʔ or ᵦʔw, and that placing the subject NP in Zone 1 instead is ungrammatical. This distributional pattern speaks against a biclausal analysis.
of the adverbial constructions. If Zone 1 constituted its own clause, it should be possible to fill in a subject at its right edge; but this is not the case. If, on the other hand, the whole construction is monoclausal, then indeed we would expect NPs to occur only at the end of Zone 2.

The same pattern is observed with other adverbs:

(82) |yaθ|Z₁ ?əw |ɨʔiwiʔəɬ θə=ənə ten.|Z₂
always CN pray DT=1s.PS mother
‘My mother’s always praying.’ (RP)

(83) *|yaθ θə=ənə ten|Z₁ ?əw |ɨʔiwiʔəɬ.|Z₂
always DT=1s.PS mother CN pray (RP)

(84) |cəl|Z₁ |iʔ niʔ məɬil tə Mary.|Z₂
almost CNJ AUX faint DT M.
‘Mary almost fainted.’ (RP)

(85) *|cəl tə Mary|Z₁ |iʔ niʔ məɬil.|Z₂
almost DT M. CNJ AUX faint (RP)

(86) |xeɬeʔq|Z₁ |iʔ |niʔ məɬ-ɬə tə Mary.|Z₂
almost CNJ AUX faint DT M.
‘Mary almost fainted.’ (RP)

(87) *|xeɬeʔq tə Mary|Z₁ |iʔ |niʔ məɬil.|Z₂
almost DT M. CNJ AUX faint (RP)
Thus, we see that all the adverbial constructions pattern the same way in this respect. The pattern is indicative of a monoclausal structure. However, we cannot completely exclude the possibility of a biclausal analysis. It might be possible that there is a subject slot in Zone 1, but it is not coreferent with the subject of Zone 2. Indeed, if the two Zones do not share the same subject, then they are a priori different clauses. Therefore, we need to consider further evidence.

4.2. Subject clitic placement

In main clauses, first- and second-person subjects are indexed by subject enclitics. These occur in second (“Wackernagel”) position, i.e. after the first word in a clause (Gerdts & Werle to appear). Since IH predicates are frequently introduced by an auxiliary, the subject enclitics often attach to auxiliaries:

16 However, assuming a subject slot in Zone 1 is somewhat speculative, because it is never filled with an overt NP.
(90) nem=con šaqʷəl.
go=1s cross
‘I’m going across.’ (RP)

(91) *nem šaqʷəl=con.
go cross=1s (RP)

Placing the subject enclitic after any other non-initial element in the verb complex (such as the main verb in (91)) is not grammatical.

The following examples show that the first word does not need to be an auxiliary, but could be the main verb (92) or a subordinator (93):

(92) iaʔ-θət=con=ce? kʷəʔet.
try-REFL=1s=FUT indeed
‘I’m going to try then.’ (WSe: Canoeing)

(93) haʔ=č yəʔ=?iʔšə?iʔ ťac-θət=č.
if=2s SER-paddle.IPV CNJ ponder-REFL=2s
‘When you’re paddling you have to really think.’ (WSe: Canoeing)

Therefore, if the adverbial constructions are monoclausal, we expect subject enclitics to occur only after the first word in Zone 1.
The examples above show that subject clitics are placed in Zone 1 in constructions involving ?i? (94) or ?əw (96), and that placing a subject clitic in Zone 2 is ungrammatical ((95), (97)). This distributional pattern speaks against a biclausal analysis of the adverbial constructions. If Zone 2 constituted its own clause, it should not only be possible to fill in a subject clitic, but it would indeed be required. But we do not find this. If, on the other hand, the whole construction is monoclausal, then indeed we would expect clitics to occur only in Zone 1.
This same pattern is observed with other adverbs:17

(98) \( \text{yaθ}=\hat{\epsilon}_1 \text{Z}_1 \text{ ?əw} \mid \text{xe:m}_1 \text{Z}_2 \)
\[ \text{always}=2s \text{ CN cry.IPV} \]
‘You’re always crying.’ (RP)

(99) *\( \text{yaθ}_1 \text{ Z}_1 \text{ ?əw} \mid \text{xe:m}=\hat{\epsilon}_1 \text{Z}_2 \)
\[ \text{always} \text{ CN cry.IPV}=2s \] (RP)

(100) \( \text{cəlel}=\text{cən}_1 \text{Z}_1 \text{ ?i?} \mid \text{ni?} \text{ ?əɬəcəs} \text{ ə tə} \text{ sce:htən}_1 \text{Z}_2 \)
\[ \text{almost}=1s \text{ CNJ AUX slip-hand OB DT fish} \]
‘The salmon almost slipped out of my hand.’ (RP, confirmed by DL)

(101) *\( \text{cəlel}_1 \text{Z}_1 \text{ ?i?} \mid \text{ni=?cən} \text{ əɬəɬəcəs} \text{ ə tə} \text{ sce:htən}_1 \text{Z}_2 \)
\[ \text{almost} \text{ CNJ AUX}=1s \text{ slip-hand OB DT fish} \] (DL)

Remember that considering just the evidence from NP placement, we could not completely exclude the possibility of a biclausal analysis, because the two Zones might have different subjects (with one being covert). At this point, however, we can exclude this possibility, because it is obvious from a semantic point of view that the clitics refer to the subjects of the verbs in Zone 2. Again, if the two Zones were independent clauses, a subject enclitic would be required in a clause that semantically includes a

17 Yet not all adverbs pattern the same way in this respect. Divergent cases will be discussed in Chapter 5.
first- or second-person subject, e.g. Zone 2 in all of the above examples. Since this is not the case, we can exclude the biclausal analysis.

4.3. Subordinate marking

In the sections above, I have provided evidence in favour of a monoclausal analysis of adverbial structures. In this and the following two sections, I will present additional evidence for this conclusion.

The first argument pertains to the adverbs that co-occur with ?əw. I have shown in Chapter 2 that ?əw functions as a subordinator when it links whole clauses (unless it occurs in a nominalized structure, which is overtly marked as such). I have also explained that in such a structure the dependent clause exhibits dependent marking. (And when it is used in a nominalized structure, it co-occurs with possessive marking.) Example (20) is repeated below as (102) to illustrate the dependent marking in complement clauses introduced by ?əw.

(102)[niʔ=č cse-θamš] ?əw [nem-ən neč-əwtxʷ-əm.]
AUX=2s tell-TR.1s.OBJ CN go-1s.SUB different-house-ITR
‘You told me to go visit.’ (RP)
Therefore, if ʔəw-constructions were biclausal, we would expect dependent marking to occur in Zone 2.\(^{18}\)

(103) ʔə li=č | Z1 ʔəw | xəɬ | Z2
really=2s CN hurt
‘You really got hurt.’ (RP)

(104) *ʔə li=č | Z2 ʔəw | xəɬ-xʷ | Z2
really=2s CN hurt-2s.SUB (RP)

(105) yaθ=č | Z1 ʔəw | x̕eːh | Z2
always=2s CN cry.IPV
‘You’re always crying.’ (RP)

(106) *yaθ=č | Z1 ʔəw | x̕eː-əxʷ | Z2
always=2s CN cry.IPV-2s.SUB (RP)

The examples above show that this is not the case. In fact, it is not grammatical ((104), (106)). One might suppose that this is due to a restriction on reference to the same person in both clauses. However, precisely this structure is found in negative sentences, which are biclausal constructions in IH (cf. Davis 2001).

\(^{18}\) This test is not applicable to ʔiʔ-constructions, since ʔiʔ does not co-occur with dependent clauses.
Thus, the absence of dependent marking in Zone 2 of adverbial clauses involving the linker ?əw corroborates a monoclausal analysis of such structures.

4.4. Auxiliaries

Another piece of supporting evidence also relates to constructions involving ?əw. In IH, there are two auxiliaries that function to anchor an event in space and time. They are ?i ‘here, now’ and ni? ‘there, then’. The following is a prototypical example of an IH clause, including an auxiliary in clause-initial position.

AUX=1p wait-TR DT ferry  
‘We have to wait for the ferry.’ (RP)

In ?əw-constructions, there are two possible placements for an auxiliary: either preceding the adverb (109), or directly following it (110). In either case, the auxiliary falls in Zone 1.
Example (110) tells us more than just that ʔə-constructions are monoclausal: since the auxiliary and the following verb form a constituent, the connective ʔə proves to fall within that scope, because it occurs between the auxiliary and the main verb. That is, the syntactic position of ʔə is within the predicate. In fact, because the collocation of auxiliary and ʔə is so frequent, a portmanteau morpheme ˪ə́w (˪niʔ + ʔə) has been formed. An example of this is given below:

\[(110) \mid \text{niʔ=cən } \hat{\text{λ}}\text{lɪʔn}_{\text{Z1}} \text{ } \text{ʔəw } \mid \text{ʔə́yə̆kʷ-θə̆t.}_{\text{Z2}} \]

\[\text{AUX}=1\text{s } \text{really } \text{CN angry-REFL} \]

‘I was really angry.’ (RP)

\[(109) \mid \text{niʔ=cən } \hat{\text{λ}}\text{lɪʔn}_{\text{Z1}} \text{ } \text{ʔəw } \mid \text{ʔə́yə̆kʷ-θə̆t.}_{\text{Z2}} \]

\[\text{AUX}=1\text{s really } \text{CN happy} \]

‘I’m really happy.’ (RP)

The conclusive data are examples like (110), where the auxiliary occurs at the end of Zone 1. IH auxiliaries always occur at the left edge of the predicate. Yet, if the two Zones in (110) represented syntactic constituents, the auxiliary would fall on the right edge of a constituent, not followed by any verb. This is not attested in any other construction in the language. Therefore, I exclude the possibility that there is a clause boundary after the auxiliary.\(^{19}\)

\(^{19}\) Yet, considering just these data, there might still be a clause boundary immediately before the auxiliary.
In ʔiʔ-constructions, too, the auxiliary has two possible sites: the first one is preceding the adverb in Zone 1 (112), but the other one is in Zone 2 (113):

   AUX=1p indeed PRF=almost CNJ arrive-be.home
   ‘We had almost gotten home.’ (WSe)

(113) |təxʷleʔ|Z1 ʔi? |ni?=cən məməɬq ʔə ʔə=ənə sqʷəʔʷəʔəɬ.|Z2
   sometimes CNJ AUX=1s forget.IPV OB DT=1s.PS speech.IPV
   ‘Sometimes I forget my words.’ (RP)

(112) is parallel to (107), but (113) exhibits a pattern not attested with ʔəʷ. There is no reason from a syntactic point of view to discard any of groupings indicated by the brackets in the examples above. ʔiʔ-constructions analogous to (110) are not attested. Therefore, this test is not conclusive for ʔiʔ-constructions.

4.5. Summary: Intraclausal linking

I have presented evidence that IH linkers are used in both interclausal and intraclausal contexts. In Chapter 2, I demonstrated that when linking whole clauses,
the connective ʔəw serves to introduce a dependent clause serving as a complement. Such complement clauses are overtly marked by dependent subject indexing. In contrast, the conjunction ʔi? coordinates when linking whole clauses. The clauses before and after ʔi? are symmetrical in that they are both inflected as main clauses. The two linkers are also used in intraclausal contexts, when linking an adverb to the phrase it modifies. When used thusly, ʔəw does not subordinate. Similarly, ʔi? does not coordinate when used to link an adverb, because one side (the adverb) modifies the other. In fact, we have found that when used as intraclausal linkers, ʔi? and ʔəw pattern very much alike. Based on evidence from the placement of subject NPs and enclitics, as well as from subordinate marking and auxiliary placement, I conclude that adverbial constructions involving either linker are monoclausal.
Chapter 5. The grey area

I established in the previous chapter that besides their interclausal function, the IH linkers ?i? and ?əɨ are also used within clauses, namely in collocation with a certain set of adverbs. This chapter discusses in more detail the issue of clausality with these structures. The data from ?əɨ-constructions present a very homogeneous picture. However, ?i?-constructions show more variety. This chapter will consider data that deviate from the generalizations made above.

In the following section (5.1), the whole array of patterns that we find with ?i?-constructions will be presented. I will show that with regard to subject clitic placement, some adverbs show unique patterns. The next section (5.2) expands the range of ?i?-constructions to temporal adverbials, which deviate most sharply from the pattern described in Chapter 4. This range of structures refutes the idea that all ?i?-constructions are monoclausal. Hence, I conclude in section 5.3 that ?i?-constructions range from monoclausal structures on the one extreme to biclausal structures on the other, but also that there are stages in between.
5.1. Subject clitics revisited

I have shown above that subject clitics are placed in Zone 1 in the discussed adverbial constructions. For example, it was shown for the adverb cəlel ‘almost’ that the subject clitic appears in Zone 1 (114), not in Zone 2 (115).

     almost=1s CNJ AUX slip-hand OB DT fish
     ‘The salmon almost slipped out of my hand.’ (RP, confirmed by DL)

     almost CNJ AUX=1s slip-hand OB DT fish (DL)

However, the situation is actually more complicated. Leslie (1979:252) suggests that adverbs (or “additive emphatics” in his words) can be “divided into two classes on the basis of the distribution of the enclitics.” He noticed that some adverbs attract the subject clitic (as described in section 4.2), while others do not. In the elicitation conducted for this study, I have found that the situation is more complex than that. In the following, I will show that there is more variation in the placement of subject clitics, with some adverbs being quite flexible in this respect. Furthermore, there is variation in judgments. Consider the following examples:
(116) \[ \text{almost}_{\text{Z1}} \text{CNJ AUX take-TR DT fish} \]
‘I almost caught the fish.’ (RP)

(117) \[ \text{almost} \text{CNJ AUX=1s take-TR DT fish} \] (RP)

Although (117) looks completely analogous to (115), it has been checked several times in different elicitation sessions, and is sometimes judged grammatical. Other sentences with analogous structure have been clearly rejected:

(118) \[ \text{almost}_{\text{Z1}} \text{CNJ AUX} \text{see-TR.2s.OBJ} \]
‘I almost saw you.’ (RP)

(119) *\[ \text{almost}_{\text{Z1}} \text{CNJ AUX=1s see-TR.2s.OBJ} \] (RP)

So where does the uncertainty about sentence (117) stem? While I have not been able to find any other examples that would support its grammaticality, we do find examples such as the following in free narratives:

(120) \[ \text{PRF=almost=1s=FUT CNJ AUX=1s=FUT leave-CS.2s.OBJ} \]
‘It’s almost time for me to start taking you along.’ (EW)
In example (120), the subject enclitic (along with the future enclitic ceʔ) is repeated, and present in both Zones. So while it is rather unnatural to have a subject enclitic only in Zone 2, it may occur there if it is also present in Zone 1. Yet this pattern is only true for colel, and different from what we find with xʷəm ‘can’.

(121) |xʷəm=can|z₁ ?i? |xʷčənəm (*=can)|z₂
can=1s       CNJ run       (*=1s)
‘I can run.’ (RP)

Doubling the subject enclitic in ?iʔ-constructions with xʷəm has been consistently rejected and no corresponding data have been found in texts, either.

In view of such variation across different ?iʔ-adverbs, this section will revisit subject clitic placement to determine the exact distribution of clitic clitics for each adverb under study. Starting with the adverb xʷəm ‘can’, there is no evidence that it patterns any different from the structure described in Chapter 4. Relevant data are repeated below.

(122) |xʷəm=can|z₁ ?i? |xʷčənəm.|z₂
can=1s       CNJ run
‘I can run.’ (RP)

20 Or at least, this is what I have found in texts. Ruby Peter does not accept example (120).
With *wəm*, the subject clitic may only occur in Zone 1 (122). Placing it in Zone 2, whether with a simultaneous placement in Zone 1 (124) or without (123), is ungrammatical.

In contrast, *čəlel* ‘almost’, has been shown to deviate from this pattern.

With *čəlel*, the subject clitic may only occur in Zone 1 (122). Placing it in Zone 2, whether with a simultaneous placement in Zone 1 (124) or without (123), is ungrammatical.

In contrast, *čəlel* ‘almost’, has been shown to deviate from this pattern.

While the structure analogous to (122), with a subject clitic in Zone 1, is also acceptable with *čəlel* (125), this isn’t the only acceptable structure; an additional
subject clitic may be present in Zone 2 (127). However, placing a single subject clitic in Zone 2 but none in Zone 1 is not grammatical (126).\(^{21}\)

The adverb \(cələl\) ‘almost’ is not the only one to deviate from the pattern described in Chapter 3. The modal \(į^8ix^wəm\) ‘please’ exhibits the most versatile pattern:

\[
(128) \quad [į^8ix^wəm\=č|\,\,Z1\,\,\,?i\,\,?\,\,|\,\,x^wq-e-t\,\,\,t^o\,\,\,še.\,\,|\,\,Z2
\]

\(\text{please=2s} \quad \text{CNJ close-TR} \quad \text{DT door}\)

‘Please close the door.’ (RP)

\[
(129) \quad [į^8ix^wəm|\,\,Z1\,\,\,?i\,\,?\,\,|\,\,x^wq-e-t=č\,\,\,t^o\,\,\,še.\,\,|\,\,Z2
\]

\(\text{please} \quad \text{CNJ close-TR=2s} \quad \text{DT door}\)

‘Please close the door.’ (RP)

\[
(130) \quad [į^8ix^wəm\=č|\,\,Z1\,\,\,?i\,\,?\,\,|\,\,x^wq-e-t=č\,\,\,t^o\,\,\,še.\,\,|\,\,Z2
\]

\(\text{please=2s} \quad \text{CNJ close-TR=2s} \quad \text{DT door}\)

‘Please close the door.’ (RP)

\[
(131) \quad [į^8ix^wəm|\,\,Z1\,\,\,?i\,\,?\,\,|\,\,x^wq-e-t\,\,\,t^o\,\,\,še.\,\,|\,\,Z2
\]

\(\text{please} \quad \text{CNJ close-TR} \quad \text{DT door}\)

‘Please close the door.’ (RP)

\(^{21}\) It would be interesting to know whether \(x^wəlq\) ‘almost’ patterns in the same way. However, \(x^wəlq\) differs from \(cələl\) in that its co-occurrence with first and second person subjects is somehow restricted, with its collocation sometimes being ungrammatical. Leslie (1979:252) suggests that \(x^wəlq\) “denotes an action performed without the speaker’s full control,” while \(cələl\) is “semantically neutral.” Because this semantic subtlety is not fully understood, I will not include \(x^wəlq\) in this discussion.
As demonstrated by the examples above, the subject clitic occurs freely in both zones, with no restrictions whatsoever. In fact, the subject enclitic may even be completely dropped (131).

With ܩܐܙܢܐ ‘barely’, the options for subject clitic placement are yet slightly different.

             barely  just  CNJ  AUX=1p  beat-people
                 ‘We just barely won.’ (RP)

             barely=1p  only  CNJ  AUX  beat-people
                 ‘We just barely won.’ (DL, confirmed by RP)

             barely=1p  just  CNJ  AUX=1p  beat-people
                 ‘We just barely won.’ (RP)

Here, the subject enclitic may either occur in Zone 1 (132), in Zone 2 (133), or in both of them at the same time (134). However, having no subject clitic present would not allow for the same reading (with a non-third person subject).

Moving on to ܩܐܙܢܐ ‘sometimes’, we obtain a picture that in fact contradicts the pattern described for adverbial constructions in Chapter 3.
(135) |ówi|le?|Z1 |i? | nem=CON ɬiwiʔəɬ|Z2
sometimes CNJ go=1s pray
‘Sometimes I go to church.’ (RP)

(136)*|ówi|le?=CON|Z1 |i? | nem ɬiwiʔəɬ|Z2
sometimes=1s CNJ go pray (RP)

(137)|ówi|le?=CON|Z1 |i? | nem=CON ɬiwiʔəɬ|Z2
sometimes=1s CNJ go=1s pray
‘Sometimes I go to church.’ (RP)

With this adverb, a subject clitic must be placed in Zone 2 (135). While there may be an additional subject clitic in Zone 1 (137), this may not be the only one (136).

Exactly the same pattern is observed with ɬənˈtem ‘when’:

(138)|ɬənˈtem=ce?|Z1 |i? | nem=če ɤəʔ=ʔənmaʔ|Z2
when=FUT CNJ go=2s SER=hunt.IPV
‘When are you going to hunt?’ (RP, confirmed by DL)

(139)*|ɬənˈtem=če=ce?|Z1 |i? | nem=če ɤəʔ=ʔənmaʔ|Z2
when=2s=FUT CNJ go SER=hunt.IPV (RP)

(140)|ɬənˈtem=če=ce?|Z1 |i? | nem=če ɤəʔ=ʔənmaʔ|Z2
when=2s=FUT CNJ go=2s SER=hunt.IPV (RP)
A subject clitic needs to be placed in Zone 2 (138), with an additional one in Zone 1 possible (140). However, placing a single subject clitic in Zone 1 is not grammatical (139).

To sum up this set of data, we can state that there is huge variation in the possible sites for subject clitics across different ʔiʔ-constructions. In fact, almost every conceivable structure is attested, as summarized in Table 6.

**Table 6: Adverbs and their subject clitic placement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb (+ ʔiʔ)</th>
<th>Placement of subject enclitic (Zone 1 / 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ūm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cəlel</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qeqə́l</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔixwə́m</td>
<td>(1) / (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔəxʷleʔ</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>təntem</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the one hand, we have the ʔiʔ-construction with ūm ‘can’, where subject clitics are always placed in Zone 1 and are never allowed in Zone 2. This is the same pattern that we found with ʔə́w-constructions. On the other hand, we see that other adverbs do allow subject clitics in Zone 2. In fact, for some adverbs (e.g. ʔəxʷleʔ ‘sometimes’) this is the preferred structure.
Before we turn to analyzing this range of data, there is another structure to consider: temporal adverbials. The following section is dedicated to their structure.

5.2. Temporal adverbials

Considering the whole range of variation found across different ?i?-adverbs, we notice that the placement of subject clitics is actually more complicated than the pattern described for adverbial constructions in Chapter 3. Instead of the subject clitic appearing only in Zone 1, in constructions with the adverbs čəxʷle? ‘sometimes’ and tantem ‘when’ the clitic is preferentially placed in Zone 2. However, with the same adverbs, it is also possible to have two subject clitics – one in Zone 1 and one in Zone 2.

This raises the question if there are any adverbs which consistently co-occur with a single subject clitic in Zone 2. Remember that the presence of a subject clitic in Zone 1 was used as an argument for the monoclausal analysis of adverbial constructions. So if in any construction subject enclitics consistently occur in Zone 2, that would speak against a monoclausal analysis. Indeed, we find that such a pattern is observed with some adverbial expressions that appear in sentence-initial position and are linked to the following clause by means of the conjunction ?i?. More precisely, these adverbials express a point of reference in time.\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\) These are treated differently from temporal adverbs referring to time spans, a fact which will be discussed in section 6.1.
(141) təs ʔə təqəlet kʷeyəl|Z1 ʔi? |ni? neʔən cam
arrive OB DT again day CNJ AUX go go.up.mountain
təqəswəʔqeʔ.|Z2
DT man
‘The next day, the man went up the mountains.’ (RP)
Literally: “When the next day arrived, the man went up the mountains.’

However, we can tell that the usage of ʔi? in this example is not intraclausal, but interclausal. Zone 1 in (141) constitutes an independent clause because it features both a predicate (təs ‘arrive’) and an NP (qəlet kʷeyəl).

In other examples, a biclausal structure is less evident. Compare (141) to the following sentence:

(142) qəlet kʷeyəl|Z1 ʔi? |neʔən=ceʔ cam təqəswəʔqeʔ.|Z2
again be.day CNJ go=FUT go.up.mountain DT man
‘The next day, the man went up the mountains.’ (RP)

This example differs only slightly from (141) in that we do not find a subject NP in Zone 1, but only a verb accompanied by the adverb qəlet (which does not regularly co-occur with any linker, cf. Chapter 3). Still, we would say that this structure is biclausal, because kʷeyəl ‘be.day’ serves as a predicate, and swəʔqeʔ could not conceivably be its subject.
The clausality of other structures, such as the following, is less obvious, although it differs only slightly from (142):

(143) |nəča?=ce? skʷeyəl|_{Z1} ?i? |nem=ce? q*ʔqʷa|_{Z2}
    one=FUT  day       CNJ  go=1s=FUT  talk.IPV

    ‘One day, I will speak.’ (DL)

Here, no element in Zone 1 is obviously a predicate. The first word word nəča? ‘one’ is a numeral, while the second one, skʷeyəl ‘day’ is a noun (notice the nominal prefix s-). Yet, both numerals and nouns (as basically any other content word, cf. Kinkade 1983, Demirdache & Matthewson 1995, Beck 2003, Davis & Matthewson 2009) may function as a predicate in IH. Considering the presence of the future clitic ceʔ ‘FUT’ in Zone 1, it seems reasonable to regard Zone 1 as an independent clause. Note that it is ungrammatical for a subject enclitic associated with a predicate in Zone 2 to occur in Zone 1:

(144) |* nəča?=ce? skʷeyəl|_{Z1} ?i? |nem=ce? q*ʔqʷa|_{Z2}
    one(=1s)=FUT  day       CNJ  go=1s=FUT  talk.IPV

    ‘One day, I will speak.’ (DL)

Consider another temporal expression, xʷənɨ ƛəɬə ‘suddenly’ and the structure becomes even less transparent:
This is a fixed expression usually translated as ‘soon’, ‘finally’, or ‘suddenly’. The elements in this expression are the proclitic $xwən$ = ‘still’ and the imperfective verb form $xə/ə$ ‘doing/speaking’. Therefore, a more literal translation of (145) would be “While this was still happening, I saw something moving.” In this example, it is not entirely clear what the subject is in Zone 1. Whereas in examples (141) to (143), it is clear that the subjects of the two Zones are not coreferent, this seems plausible in (145). The following example shows that placing a subject clitic in Zone 1 is in fact possible.

(145) $|x^wən=xə/ə|_Z1$ ?i? $|n_i=ɔn$ $wə=λəm-ənəx^w$ $tə^o$ ni? $yə=k^{*}a^īx-ət.|_Z2$

still=do.IPV CNJ AUX=1s PRF=see-TR DT AUX SER=move-REFL

‘Suddenly, I saw something moving.’ (RP)

However, (145) and (146) have different meanings: in the latter example, a more literal reading ‘still speaking’ is accessed, as indicated in the translation. Example (146) is not felicitous under the reading ‘Suddenly, I saw something moving’ (RP). So the subject clitic cannot climb from Zone 1 to Zone 2 in this example under the same reading. Yet, under the literal meaning, an additional subject clitic may occur in Zone 2:

(146) $|x^wən=xə/ə=ɔn|_Z1$ ?i? $|wə=λəmnəx^w$ $tə^o$ ni? $yə=k^{*}a^īx-ət.|_Z2$

still=do.IPV=1s CNJ PRF=see-TR DT AUX SER=move-REFL

‘I was still speaking, then I saw something moving.’ (RP)
Each of the examples discussed in this section differs only slightly from the previous example in its structure. Yet, directly comparing (141) to (146), the two structures seem to be quite different. If we compare next (146) and (147) to adverbial constructions with əlwentially ‘sometimes’ and tem ‘when’, we notice that the distribution of subject clitics is very similar. This discloses a cline of clausality, which ranges from clearly biclausal structures such as (141) over more ambiguous cases in the middle (see Table 6) to the clearly monoclausal structure with əm (122).

5.3. **Summary: Cline of clausality**

Given that it was the placement of subject clitics that served as the main argument for the monoclausal analysis of adverbial constructions in Chapter 4, the range of data presented in this chapter is at first perplexing. IH adverbial structures seem to plot on a cline between monoclasuality on the one hand and biclasuality on the other hand. At one extreme, we have the ?i?-construction with əm ‘can’ as the most clearly monoclausal: subject clitics are always placed in Zone 1 and are never allowed in Zone 2. At the other extreme, we see that many temporal adverbials constitute their own clauses, so the sentences in which they occur are clearly biclausal. Other adverbs pattern in between these two extremes; some adverbs, such as calel ‘almost’, pattern
closer to the monoclausal end and others, such as ṡəxʷ'leʔ ‘sometimes’, pattern closer to the biclausal end. Also, of course, the interclausal use of ?iʔ discussed in Chapter 2 illustrates a biclausal construction.

Compared to ?iʔ-constructions, ṡəw- constructions are well-behaved with respect to clausality. Adverb constructions are clearly monoclausal, as subject clitics only ever appear in Zone 1, and interclausal linking is clearly biclausal, as subject inflection is required in the clauses before and after the linker.

While it is difficult to give an explanation for why some constructions are monoclausal while others are biclausal, I can offer some thoughts on this issue. First, the cline of clausality is proportionate to the size of the element preceding the linker: the larger the element, the more biclausal its pattern of subject clitic placement. Thus, clauses, e.g. conditional clauses or temporal adverbial clauses, are relatively large and expressed in biclausal constructions. Phrasal and polysyllabic adverbs, e.g. xʷəm ʷəx̌ə ‘suddenly’, ṡəxʷ’leʔ ‘sometimes’, and ṭ̌ixʷəm ‘please’, also pattern on the biclausal end of the cline. In contrast, all monosyllabic adverbs in both ?iʔ- and ṡəw- constructions, e.g. xʷəm ‘can’, nan ‘very, too (much)’, and ḳim̓ ‘really’, pattern monoclausally.

Second, note that while the position before ?iʔ in a biclausal construction tends to be an open frame, the element before ?iʔ in a monoclausal construction consists of a small closed set of adverbs. Of all the different adjectives or verbs that can appear as higher predicates with a following nominalized clause, only a handful have grammaticalized into adverbs. These adverbs are not only used very frequently, but
also almost always used with either the linker ʔɨ? or the linker ʔə ámb. In fact, the pairing of certain adverbs and certain linkers is so common that most combinations have been lexicalized, in the sense of Himmelmann (2004). That is, the adverb-linker collocation is probably learned and stored in the mental lexicon and the use of the collocation is conventionalized as a clause-initial or phrase-initial framing device. We can speculate that the more lexicalized the adverb-linker collocation, the more likely it will appear in a monoclausal construction. That is what might have originated as a clause with adverbial function followed by an interclausal linker has grammaticalized into an adverbial phrase and then to an adverb.
Chapter 6.  Topicality and and-constructions

In the preceding chapters, I demonstrated that ?i? appears in a variety of constructions. As a coordinator, it is commonly used to conjoin two parallel constituents, e.g. two NPs or two clauses (Chapter 2). Furthermore, ?i? is also used as a linker in adverb constructions (Chapter 3). Another use of ?i? is to allow the expression of a sentence-initial temporal adverbial clause or phrase (Chapter 5). This chapter investigates the question of how these different constructions are related to each other in function. I argue that what unifies many uses of ?i? is the notion of topicality. That is, the element in Zone 1 can be interpreted as a given background or frame for which the following proposition (Zone 2) is true or that the proposition is about (Chafe 1976, Halliday 1968, Gundel 1974, Gundel 1985, Horn 1986, Lambrecht 1994). I also show that this proposal gains support based on a comparison of the use of conjunctions in several other languages of the world in a variety of construction types. We find that conjunctions in some languages have an analogous range of functions to IH ?i?-constructions and get used to link a sentence-initial subclausal constituent to the following clause to form an “and-construction.”
6.1. **Topicality in interclausal linkage**

As mentioned in Chapter 2, ʔiʔ contrasts with other interclausal linking methods when used to conjoin predications in a semantically coordinative manner (i.e. excluding complementation). While the linker ʔəw is used in a nominalized clause to express a continuous sequence of events (as in (26) in Chapter 2), linkage with ʔiʔ implies that the two conjoined clauses are somehow intrinsically related, either because they occur simultaneously, or because the second is a natural consequence or result of the first one (Donna Gerdts, p.c.). Hence, ʔiʔ often corresponds to a subordinating conjunction in the English translation (cf. Suttles 2004:114). A typical example that shows this relation between the two conjoined clauses is the IH conditional clause.

(148) haʔ kʰəʔeɬ həli-θəʔ təʔən sənəxʷəɬ ʔiʔƛ̕il̓il̓ ʔəw čən-əm.
if then live-INCl DT.2.PS canoe CNJ really CN shake-ITR
‘When your canoe comes to life, it really shakes.’ (WSe)

In IH conditional clauses, the protasis (condition) is introduced by the subordinator haʔ and linked to the following apodosis (consequence) with the conjunction ʔiʔ. The occurrence of ʔiʔ in conditional clauses is very consistent. Suttles (2004) relates this use of ʔiʔ in conditional clauses to its other uses by generalizing that ʔiʔ is used in “qualifying compound sentences.” Indeed, it does seem to be the case that when ʔiʔ is used interclausally, it functions to establish a relationship between two clauses in such
a way that the first clause is somehow relevant (as background information) for the second one. In pragmatic terms, the first clause is established as the common ground for the following one. This is equivalent to a topic-comment structure (Féry & Krifka 2009). Haiman (1978:564) argues explicitly that the notions of conditionals (more precisely, the protasis of a conditional) and topic are intrinsically related: “Conditionals, like topics, are givens which constitute the frame of reference with respect to which the main clause is either true (if a proposition), or felicitous (if not).” To add weight to this analysis, Haiman points out that “conditionals and topics are marked identically in a number of unrelated languages.”

The notion of topicality is also relevant for temporal adverbials (cf. section 5.2). Currie (1997) has argued for the closely related language Squamish that and-constructions are used to express a certain type of temporal adverbial, namely expressions indicating a temporal point of reference. An example of such a structure in IH is given below:

(149) net=əɬʔ! eʔwəɬ=nešaʷθeləm.
    night=PST CNJ again PRF=go bathe-PAS.1s.OBJ

‘The next morning, they bathed me again.’ (WSe: Canoeing)

---

23 A short sample of such languages is provided below.
In these examples, the temporal adverbials *netəl* ‘(it was) morning’ and *niʔ kʷin skʷey̓əl* ‘(when it was) a few days’ set the timeframe for the following clause. This notion has been called “reference time” by some authors (Reichenbach 1947, Hornstein 1990, Thompson 1994), but it was Klein (1994) who pointed out that the function of such an element is that of a topic, because it is the time for which the claim or assertion of the utterance is made, hence Klein’s designation “topic time”.

In contrast, Currie (1997) argues that other types of temporal expressions in Squamish, in particular ones that refer to a time span, rather than a *point* of time, appear in the syntactic role of predicate. A preliminary survey of IH data shows that this generalization also holds for IH.

(151) kʷin siłənəm kʷə=no=s tetiʔ.
  how.many year DT=1s.PS=N paddle.IPV
  ‘I paddled for so many years.’ (WSe: Canoeing)

(152) hiθ=čə  kʷə=no=s  neʔ  yə=ƛəpəl  tʰw̱-əʔəł.
  long.time=HS DT.AUX=N go SER.descend.IPV DT.CN-3FOC.PL
  ‘It took a long time for them to descend down.’ (WSa: Eagle Story)
In these examples, the adverbials \( k^\# in \) \( silanom \) ‘how many years’ and \( hi\theta \) ‘a long time’ describe the time span of the event, or the “event time” in the words of Currie (1997). The following example shows that this distinction is a truly structural one, and not lexically determined, because even if the fronted temporal expression may refer to a time span, it is interpreted as a point of reference when it is followed by the conjunction \(?i\)?:

(153)\( ni? \ k^\# in \ sk^\# eyol \ ?i? \ mi \ wi\# \ h\#n-\#\#m\#.

AUX how.many day CNJ come appear arrive-be.home

‘After a few days, [his father] got home.’ (EW)

Thus, the consistent use of \(?i\)? after conditional clauses and temporal adverbials can be linked directly to the idea of topicality, because in both cases the element in Zone 1 has a frame-setting function.

6.2. Linking constructions in cross-linguistic perspective

So far, we can summarize that two constructions in IH, conditional clauses and topic time adverbials, are expressed by \(?i\)? constructions. Both functions are related to the notion of topicality (Haiman 1978, Klein 1994). I now widen the scope of this discussion to the languages of the world, to show that we can find other cases where linking constructions are used to express topics of various sorts.
The first point of comparison is Plains Cree, an Algonquian language spoken primarily in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. According to Wolvengrey (2011), Plains Cree has a coordinating conjunction ēkwa ‘and/then’ that is used to mark temporal sequencing. It is frequently used to link clauses:

(154) Plains Cree

[nitawi-ihohtēw sīpiy ōma itē ē-pimihtiniyik, wā,]
ēkwa nama kīkway ay-ā-w ka-mīcimīhkahcikēsi-t, …
and NEG something have-3s>0-3s CJT-use.as.bait-3s
‘[He went to where the river was flowing by, oh,]
but he had nothing to use as his bait...’ (HP5:31-34)

In example (154), ēkwa links two separate clauses. Wolvengrey (2011:277) states that the conjunction occurs in clause-initial position. In addition, ēkwa co-occurs with temporal adverbs, in which case it often follows them:

(155) Plains Cree

anohe ēkwa kahkiyaw ēwako anima māci-pīkonikātē-w…
today and all that that start-broken-0s
‘Today all that is beginning to break down,...’ (HP2:65)

24 The source of the Plains Cree texts cited here is given by Wolvengrey (2011) as “House People texts.”
25 Wolvengrey (2011) does not provide a gloss for the first clause of (154).
(156) Plains Cree

kētahtawē ᕥkwa kā-nǐmihito-hk kā-nīsoso-hk ōma.

suddenly and CJT-dance-XACT CJT-jig-XACT FOC

‘Well, when the dancing, rather the jigging started.’ (HP10:48-9)

Note that this distribution parallels the usage of ᕥʔ in temporal adverbial constructions, where we also find the conjunction following a sentence-initial adverbial:

(157)|qəlet kʷeyəl|Z1 ᕥʔ |nem=ce? cam tʷo swəʔqeʔ.|Z2

again be.day CNJ go=FUT go.up.mountain DT man

‘The next day, the man went up the mountains.’ (RP)

(158)|xʷən̓=xət̓ə|Z1 ᕥʔ |ni?=cən wəl=ləm-ənəxʷ tʷo ni? yə=kʷəy̓əx̱-θət.|Z2

still=do.IPV CNJ AUX=1s PRF=see-TR DT AUX SER=move-REFL

‘Suddenly, I saw something moving.’ (RP)

Overall, we note that the distribution of ᕥkwa is very similar to that of ᕥʔ. It is used both as an interclausal coordinator and as a linker for temporal adverbials.

Turning now to another area of the world, we can see that multifunctional conjunctive elements are widely attested in the languages of Southeast Asia. Clark (1992:87) points out that a variety of languages in the area have a linker that expresses meanings such as ‘well’, ‘(and) then’, ‘(and) so’, ‘and it happens that’, or ‘and it turns
out that’, etc. She studies the conjunctions *thi* in Vietnamese, *los* in Hmong, and *kɔː* in Thai. All of these languages are in contact with each other and their conjunctive constructions closely resemble each other in function, even though the conjunctions are not cognates. Clark calls them “inchoative conjunctions” and describes their function as follows:

> “With these conjunctions, the marking of both background and foreground is so explicit as to leave no doubt of immediate reception on the part of the audience of the “inchoative” message. Such immediate reception is of course the purpose of topicalization.” (Clark 1992:100)

Although Clark limits the discussion of conjunctions to Vietnamese, Hmong and Thai, she suggests that there might be an analogous use of the linker *jiù* (就) in Mandarin. This Mandarin conjunction has been the focus of a number of studies (Biq 1988, Liu 1993, Hsieh 2003, Hole 2004). Based on these and further confirmation with native speakers, I add Mandarin *jiù* to this list of multifunctional conjunctives.27

We see that the use of these conjunctions is analogous to the use of IH ʔiʔ-constructions in several ways. First, the Southeast Asian linkers are used to conjoin independent clauses:

---

26 In particular, Hole (2004) provides a detailed study of the pragmatic functions not only of *jiù*, but also of other Mandarin linking elements (*cǎi, dōu, yé*). The same, or functionally similar, linkers can be found in other Sinitic languages.

27 In the following examples, I elicited Thai and Mandarin examples without sources from native speakers of the respective languages.
(159) **Vietnamese**

Người ấy đem mở ra xem

person DM take open out see

thì thấy vàng vẫn còn nguyên như trước.

CNJ see gold still intact as before

‘He opened it up to see and saw that the gold was still there as before.’

(Nguyen 1932:12)

(160) **White Hmong**

Peb los txog tim no

lp come reach place DM

los tsis muaj cov Hmoob nyob ntawm no.

CNJ NEG have group Hmong stay place DM

‘We’ve come over here and there aren’t any Hmong living here.’

(Clark 1992:90)

(161) **Thai**

กินข้าวเสร็จแล้วกลับไปทำงานต่อ

kin kʰâːw sêt lêːw kɔː klàːp paj tʰam ɐːn tɔː:

eat rice finish PRF CNJ return go do work continue

‘After [I] finish eating, [I’ll] go back to work.’
Clark (1992) describes the function of this type of clause linking as follows:

“When two grammatically independent sentences are related by an inchoative conjunction, the status of both sentences is in question as to whether or not subordination is involved. Although such sentences frequently translate into English with subordinate clauses, in their Southeast Asian structure they appear to be grammatically independent with a coordinate relationship. The conjunction serves to link them closely however, with the first clause being explicitly marked for special backgrounding.” (Clark 1992:98)

This “backgrounding” function can explain why the same conjunctions are used to link the protasis to the apodosis in conditional clauses in Southeast Asian languages:

(163) *Vietnamese*

Anh đi Sài Gòn, thì tôi đi với anh.

elder.brother go S. **CNJ** 1s go join elder.brother

‘If you go to Saigon, then I will go with you.’ (Dyvik 1984:29)
(164) White Hmong

Nws yuav tuaj los tsis txhob qhib qhov.rooj.
3s FUT come CNJ NEG PROH open door

‘If she’s going to come, then don’t open the door.’ (Clark 1992:97)

(165) Thai

ถ้าฝนตก ผมก็ไม่ไป
(tʰâː fon tòk pʰôm kâː mái paj
if rain fall 1s CNJ NEG go

‘If it rains, I’m not going.’

(166) Mandarin

如果老季来我就去。
(rúguó lâo Lî lái wǒ jiù qù
if old L. come 1 CNJ go

‘If Old Li comes, I will go.’ (Hole 2004:13)

Note that in Vietnamese (163) and Hmong (164) the protasis is not introduced by any subordinating marker (like English if), while in Thai and Mandarin a subordinating marker is optionally present. That is, conditional sentences are often not overtly marked as such, but correspond in structure to the examples of clause linkage presented above. As discussed above, conditional clauses in IH are introduced by the subordinator haʔ, and the conjunction ?iʔ generally precedes the apodosis. (148) is repeated here as (167) to exemplify an IH conditional clause.
(167) ha! kʷəʔ həli-θə təən səxʷəɬ ?i? ɬəli-θə təə! snəxʷəɬ həli-θə təə?
   if then live-INC DT.2.PS canoe CNJ really CN shake-ITR
   ‘When your canoe comes to life, it really shakes.’ (WS)

Hence, we see that the both the Southeast Asian conjunctions discussed here and IH
ʔiʔ are used to link the protasis and apodosis of a conditional clause.

Next, the East-Asian “inchoative conjunctions” occur after sentence-initial
temporal phrases:

(168) Vietnamese
   Trong khi.dó thi người Trung.Hoa không ngừng tăng lên.
   inside that.time CNJ person China NEG stop increase up
   ‘(Whereas) during that time the Chinese people did not cease to
   increase.’ (Le 1986:15)

(169) White Hmong
   Tamsim no los tseem no thiab.
   now DM CNJ still bold also
   ‘And right now, it’s still cold.’ (Clark 1992:95)

(170) Thai
   พรุ่งนี้ก็รักเธอ
   tomorrow CNJ love 2s
   ‘Tomorrow I still love you.’
In all of these examples, the adverbial expression sets a temporal frame for the following proposition and can thus be identified as topic time (Klein 1994, cf. section 6.1). In IH, too, we have found that ʔiʔ occurs with this type of adverbial construction.

There are some close parallels of quasi-idiomatic expressions between Southeast Asian languages and IH that add to the picture of functional parallels. Recall that IH uses the combination of the proclitic xʷəʔi ‘still’ and the imperfective verb əʔə ‘doing, saying’ to construct a temporal adverb with the meaning of ‘suddenly’ that appears in an ʔiʔ-construction.
Similarly, in the examples below, a progressive or imperfective verb referring to an ongoing action is followed by a conjunction to indicate that the following event happened suddenly or unexpectedly.

(173) $x^{\wedge}əʰ=\ddot{x}ʔʰ \; ?i? \; wə=\ddot{l}əm-\neg x^{\wedge}-əs \; tʰ \; ni? \; yə=k^{\wedge}a\ddot{y}x-θət.$
still=do.IPV CNJ PRF=see-TR-3ERG DT AUX SER=move-REFL
‘Suddenly, [Owl] saw something moving.’ (RP: Ruler of the Forest)

In sum, we see that both Plains Cree and several Asian languages have linkers whose primary function is interclausal linking, but, as in IH, they are also used in temporal-adverbal constructions.
6.3. NP-fronting and linking constructions

The above discussion has related the element appearing before the conjunctive linker to the notion of topicality. In fact, under Clark’s (1992) analysis the linkers in Southeast Asian languages serve as topicalizers. Given that a wide variety of elements serve as topics, we do not expect there to be any categorial restrictions on the element that may appear in sentence-initial position, because any content word can theoretically serve the pragmatic function of topic. Indeed, the following examples show that in Southeast Asian languages, linking constructions can be used to express other topics besides temporal phrases or conditional clauses, e.g. (176), objects (177), and locative phrases (178).
(176) *White Hmong*

Peb los tseem noj.qab.nyob.zoo li qub thiab.
1p CNJ still be.happy.and.well as old also

‘As for us, we’re still fine as usual.’ (Clark 1992:92)

(177) *Vietnamese*

Chén.bát thì dẹ chì.ơ giặt quàn.áo xong, chì.ỷ sể ruạ.
bowls CNJ leave maid wash clothes finish she will wash

‘The dishes – leave it for the maid to finish the laundry and she’ll wash them.’
(Huffman & Tran 1980:176)

(178) *Mandarin*

在這個地方我們就能玩。
zài zhè gè di.făng wò-men jiù néng wán
at DM CL place 1-PL CNJ can play

‘We can play here.’ (Hole 2004:15)

Thus, the conjunctive element marks various fronted constituents in Southeast Asian languages.

This raises the question if ?i?-constructions are used for fronted constituents in IH. The occurrence of arguments in the left periphery, separated from the rest of the sentence by the conjunction ?i?, is attested in several Salish languages. Kroeber (1991, 1999) described this construction type as “and-fronting” and its function has been described as topicalization by Hess (1995) for Lushootseed and Shank (2001) for Upper Chehalis.
Kroeber (1999) shows that this structure is widely attested in Salish languages, though few examples have been cited for IH:

(179) *Kalispel*

úc ɭu? in-qécc ɬə?-ɭ u c-ən-ʔútxʷ.
Q DT 1s.PS-elder.brother at-DM and hither-in-enter

‘Perhaps my older brother has been in here?’ (Kroeber 1999:405)

(180) *Lushootseed*

DT PST=1s.PS-grass and PFV-eat-TR-AD OB=DT=bad 2s.PS-cow

‘My grass was eaten by your bad cow.’ (Kroeber 1999:376)

(181) *Songish (Straits Salish)*

DT canoe and already-CN arrive OB DT shore

‘The canoe has already arrived at the shore.’ (Raffo 1972:167)

(182) təʔ sməʔəθʔiʔ? ʔəʔəʔə nə=sʔiʔ-əs.
DT deer CNJ NEG 1s.PS=N=dear-3SUB

‘I don’t like deer meat.’ (Leslie 1979:261)

(183) (niʔ) ɬə pus-ct ʔiʔ (niʔ) ɬɛy̥-t-əs təʔ sməʔəθ.
AUX DT cat-1p.PS CNJ AUX eat-TR-3.ERG DT deer

‘Our cat – she eats deer meat.’ (Leslie 1979:259)
In these examples, the fronted elements have the syntactic function of subjects. However, I have been unable to replicate these examples with Ruby Peter. Hearing (183), Ruby Peter corrects the \( ?i? \) to the auxiliary \( ?i \) (and hence omits the auxiliary \( ni? \)), but explicitly rejects the presence of a conjunction.

\[
(184)(ni?) \quad \text{AUX} \quad \text{pu-c}t \quad \text{\textsc{i}} \quad \text{\texttt{ley\text{-}x-t}\text{-}\text{\textsc{s}}} \quad \text{\textsc{t}}\text{\textsc{o}} \quad \text{\texttt{mo\text{-}y\text{-}\textsc{e}}}\text{\textsc{th}}.
\]

\[
\text{AUX} \quad \text{DT cat-1P.PS} \quad \text{AUX} \quad \text{eat-TR-3.ERG} \quad \text{DT deer}
\]

‘Our cat – she eats deer meat.’ (Leslie 1979:259)

I have not been able to elicit any instance of an \textit{and}-fronted core argument, nor did I find any in narratives. This leads me to the conclusion that \textit{and}-fronting either no longer exists in IH or that it is a very marginal phenomenon. This inconsistency might be due to various reasons: real language change, differences between speakers, or inaccurate transcription (note the similarity between the conjunction \( ?i? \) and the auxiliary \( ?i \)).

In sum, the use of IH \( ?i? \) appears to differ from the Southeast Asian conjunctions: \( ?i? \) is not readily used to front arguments into the left periphery. However, some marginal data in IH and patterns found in other Salish languages suggest that the function of NP-fronting is not completely foreign to IH.\textsuperscript{28} An issue for further study concerns the variety of constructions that are used to front constituents in various languages and what determines the choice between them.

\textsuperscript{28} Another type of extraction, namely clefting, has been well described for Salish languages (Gerdts 1988). However, the function of clefting has been shown to be related to focalization, which sets it apart from \textit{and}-fronting (Koch 2007).
6.4. Summary

This chapter started out with the observation that the IH conjunction ʔiʔ occurs in a variety of constructions that may look similar structurally, but whose functions seem distinct. I argued that there is a common thread—topicality—that unifies many of the uses of ʔiʔ-constructions. For example, topicality underlies both conditional clauses and topic time, based on the work of Haiman (1978) and Klein (1994). I pointed to parallels in and-constructions in Plains Cree and Southeast Asian languages, where conjunctions are used in a very similar variety of structures. Indeed, Clark’s (1992) analysis of Southeast Asian conjunctions suggests that their function is related to topicalization in such a way that the constituent before the conjunction serves as thematic background information for the following clause, which is often a direct consequence of it. This supports the analysis that many occurrences of ʔiʔ can be related to topicalization, such that an element in Zone 1 serves as a thematic frame for the proposition in Zone 2.

IH ʔiʔ nevertheless differs from the constructions in Plains Cree and Southeast Asian languages in two ways. First, in Southeast Asian languages, argument NPs may be topicalized, appearing in the left periphery followed by a conjunction. Some Salish languages allow NP topics with and-fronting constructions (Kroeber 1999). In fact, Leslie (1979) gives examples for IH data of this type. However, I have not been able to verify such structures with my consultants, and thus I suggest that this is a marginal pattern in IH.
Second, IH ʔiʔ is used in combination with adverbs, and this usage of conjunctions was not seen in the languages of comparison. It is unclear if the adverbs in ʔiʔ-constructions, e.g. çaḷel ‘almost’ or xa'm ‘can’, relate to the notion of topic. However, topics, adverbs, and even the first of a pair of conjoined clauses all have the function of restricting the possible semantic sphere expressed by the information following the conjunction. This vague connection between modification and topicality is perhaps reinforced by the syntactic parallelism of the various structures. Once the same conjunction is used not only for symmetrical linking (between whole clauses or subclausal constituents), but also for asymmetrical linking between a topical element and a following clause, it may generalize to other types of asymmetric linking, namely between an adverb and a following verb phrase. Perhaps this use of a conjunction is only peripherally related to the prototypical function of symmetric linking, which could explain why and-constructions have not extended to adverbial constructions in the other languages under discussion.
Chapter 7. Conclusion

To sum up the findings of this study, I propose that the IH linkers ʔiʔ and ʔəʔ are used both between clauses and within clauses. When used interclausally, ʔiʔ serves as a coordinator and ʔəʔ serves as a subordinator. Both linkers are also used in adverbial constructions, where the choice of linker seems to be at least partially determined by the semantic class of the adverb. On the basis of syntactic tests related to the placement of subject NPs, subject enclitics, auxiliaries, and subordinate suffixes, I demonstrated that many of these adverbial constructions are monoclausal. Thus, ʔiʔ and ʔəʔ are also used intraclausally.

Yet the adverbial constructions involving ʔiʔ do not form a homogeneous group. While adverbial constructions with ʔəʔ are always monoclausal, the placement of clitics varies across adverbs that co-occur with ʔiʔ, creating a complex picture with regard to the clausality of these structures. Looking at the whole range of variation, I conclude that some ʔiʔ-constructions are monoclausal, while others are biclausal, and also that there are constructions that pattern in between these two extremes. This “cline of clausality” is directly correlated with other features of IH structure. In monoclausal constructions, the small closed set of elements that appear before the linker are “light,” sometimes grammaticized from a verb root, and often lexicalized
with the linker. In biclausal constructions, the clause that appears before the linker is sometimes “heavy” and often topical.

Despite the wide range of uses of each of these linkers, I argue against the idea that each of the IH linkers represents a number of homophones. The notion of topic in fact unifies many instances of ʔiʔ-constructions. One argument for an integrated analysis of the IH linkers is related to cross-linguistic comparison. If we compare the IH linkers to functionally very similar elements in Plains Cree (Wolvengrey 2011) and Southeast Asian languages (Clark 1992, Hole 2004), we find that their range of uses is strikingly similar. It would be very unlikely that we find the same (or very similar) homophony in genetically and areally unrelated languages, especially ones that are so typologically diverse. Thus, I assume that there must be a common denominator to the interclausal and intraclausal uses of each linker.

The subject of how the two uses of ʔə discussed in this thesis might be unified has been left unanswered. This is in part because there are many uses for ʔə that do not seem to involve linking at all and this is a topic best left for a more comprehensive study. I have shown that all adverbs with which ʔə co-occurs have an absolute value in their respective domain and suggested that the function of ʔə in these collocations may be to emphasize this semantic property. Adopting the notion of weak vs. strong quantification (Milsark 1977) could prove to be helpful in describing the distribution of the two linkers in adverbial constructions: ʔə co-occurs with strong adverbs, whereas ʔiʔ co-occurs with weak adverbs. This leaves an unanswered question of how exactly
the interclausal (and especially the complementizing) functions of the connective ʔə are related to its scope-delimiting function.

Without a doubt, the function and distribution of linking elements in IH deserve further study and may likely contribute to the typology and theory of linking elements in the world’s languages, which up to this point have centered mostly on the NP-internal and interclausal domains. A pan-Salish study of the etymology and function of linkers might help to resolve some of the problematic aspects of my analysis. As Kroeber (1999) has noted, and-fronting exists in many Salish languages, though apparently it is no longer productive in IH. Furthermore, a preliminary investigation of other Salish languages suggests that many do not use linkers in adverbial constructions. So IH may provide a unique and robust source of data for the study of intraclausal linking.

It remains an open question whether languages like the ones discussed here are rare in having linkers that are used in both interclausal and intraclausal domains, or if the sparcity of literature on this phenomenon is an accidental lacuna caused by trends of investigation that have focused attention elsewhere. I hope this study of IH linkers gives some provisional thoughts on the topic that will prove illuminating to other researchers.
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