Interclausal and intraclausal linking elements in Hul'q'umi'num' Salish

by

Kevin Mark Bätscher

B.A., University of Zürich, 2011

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the

Department of Linguistics

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2014

Approval

Name:	**Kevin Mark Bätscher**
Degree:	**Master of Arts**
Title:	***Interclausal and intraclausal linking elements in Hul'q'umi'num' Salish***
Examining Committee:	**Chair:** Maite Taboada Associate Professor

Donna B. Gerdts
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

Nancy Hedberg
Supervisor
Associate Professor

Peter Jacobs
External Examiner
Assistant Professor
Department of Linguistics
University of Victoria

Date Defended/Approved: August 14, 2014

Partial Copyright Licence

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

c. as a co-investigator, collaborator or research assistant in a research project approved in advance,

or

d. as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

update Spring 2010

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 *ʔiʔ* and the subordinator *ʔəẇ*. 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 *ʔəẇ* are always monoclausal, while modal and adverbial constructions with *ʔiʔ* range from monoclausal to biclausal. I argue against an analysis that assumes homophones of *ʔiʔ*, 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.

Dedication

To all the warriors fighting for the perpetuity
of the Hul'q'umi'num' language

Acknowledgements

My first priority in doing research on Hul'q'umi'num' was to gain a working knowledge of the structure of the language. For this I relied on materials provided to me by Donna Gerdts and Thomas Hukari. Then, in August 2012, I started with an immersion course to become more proficient in Hul'q'umi'num'. Thank you to the teachers and students in the SFU cohort courses for welcoming me into your midst. I enjoyed participating in research and material developments for these courses.

My stay at SFU was made possible by a C.D. Nelson Memorial Graduate Scholarship. I thank my professors and fellow students at SFU for making my time in Burnaby a worthwhile experience. Thanks to Eugene Harry for teaching the Hul'q'umi'num' field methods course.

Many thanks to all the *Hul'q'umi'num'* native speakers who contributed to my study of Hul'q'umi'num' with their words. Special thanks to Ruby Peter and Delores Louie for their contemplative judgments, for their proactive cooperation, and for their patience during long elicitation sessions. Also, I want to thank Nelson Canute, Wayne Charlie, Bernard Joe, Thomas Jones and Willie Seymour for participating in interviews. *Huy tseep q'a, sii'em'.* My research on Hul'q'umi'num' was supported by SFU through a research assistantship and by grants from the Jacobs Research Fund and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

This thesis would not have been possible without the constructive criticism from my supervisor Donna Gerdts who forced me to stay on track and formulate my points in a concise and direct manner. I am furthermore indebted to the supervisory committee, as well as Thomas Hukari and Claire Turner, for their corrections, suggestions, inspiration and good company, and to Charles Ulrich and Albert J. Schütz for lending me their eagle eyes in revising the drafts.

I raise my hands to all my Coast Salish friends and teachers from the Malahat, Cowichan, Stz'uminus, Snuneymuxw and Capilano nations who enriched me not only as a linguist, but also as a person. I am deeply obliged to Paul Seward and Gary Smith who gave me a home during the time I was working on this thesis. *Huy tseep q'a, sii'em'.*

Last, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my family and close friends for their patience and unconditional support.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

Glosses:

0	inanimate third person
0s	inanimate third person singular
1	first person
1s	first person singular
1p	first person plural
2	second person
2s	second person singular
2p	second person plural
3	third person
3s	third person singular
3p	third person plural
ACT	activity
AOR	aorist participle
APPL	applicative
AUX	auxiliary
CERT	certainty
CJT	conjunct
CL	classifier
CN	connective
CNJ	conjunction
COP	copula
CS	causative

CVB	converb
DAT	dative applicative
DM	demonstrative
DIM	diminutive
DIR	directional
DT	determiner
DUB	dubitative
DUR	durative
ERG	ergative
FOC	focus
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
GER	gerund
HS	hearsay
INC	inchoative
INF	infinitive
INQ	inquisitive
IPV	imperfective
IRR	irrealis
ITR	intransitive
LNK	linker
LPFX	lexical prefix
MIR	mirative
N	noun prefix
NT	neutral gender

OB	oblique
OBJ	object
ORD	ordinal number
PAS	passive
PL	plural
PRET	preterite
PRF	perfect
PRG	progressive
PRO	independent pronoun
PS	possessive
PST	past tense
Q	interrogative clitic
REFL	reflexive
SBJ	subject
SER	serial
SUB	subordinate subject
ST	stative
TR	transitive
XACT	unspecified actor

Languages:

DRH	Downriver Halkomelem
IH	Island Halkomelem

Hul'q'umi'num' speakers cited:

EW	Ellen White
DL	Delores Louie
RP	Ruby Peter
RR	Robert Rice
TT	Theresa Thorne
WSa	Wilfred Sampson
WSe	Willie Seymour

Chapter 1. Hul'q'umi'num' 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'num', 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.

(1) ni? xʷi?=xʷ-məq̓ʷ-aləs-nəxʷ-əs θə sqe?əq-s
AUX MIR=LPFX-squash-eye-TR-ERG DT younger.sibling-3PS
tᶿə sƛ̓i?ƛ̓qəɬ.
DT child.DIM
'The boy accidentally poked his little sister's eye.' (RP)[2]

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: *ni?*). 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).[3] 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 (*sqe?əqs* '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: *tᶿə*).

[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, x̌ for χ, c for t̲s, č for t̲ʃ (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 ***ʔiʔ*** **'CNJ'** and ***ʔəẇ*** **'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:

(2) lem-ət-əs **ʔiʔ** wəɬ=šṯewəṅ θ**əẇ**-niɬ
see-TR-3ERG **CNJ** PRF=think DT.**CN**-3FOC
ʔiʔ haʔ=cən ʔəwə **ʔiʔ** x̌ʷəm **ʔiʔ** šṯewəṅ tᶿ**əẇ**-nəṅəlɬ
CNJ if=1s NEG **CNJ** can **CNJ** think DT.**CN**-3FOC.PL
ƙ̓ʷə=nə=s ṅan **ʔəẇ** sqiʔqəl̓.
DT-1s.PS-N too **CN** 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 *ʔiʔ* serves to coordinate two clauses (3), *ʔəẇ* subordinates one clause to another (4).

(3) [x̌teʔ-əm=ct=ceʔ ʔə kʷ̓ s-ʔəɬtən] **ʔiʔ** [ṁi=cən=ceʔ x̌ešət
make-ITR=1p=FUT OB DT N-eat **CNJ** come=1s=FUT invite
tᶿə swaẇləs.]
DT boy.PL
'We're going to make something to eat and I'll invite the young men.' (WSe)

(4) [niʔ=č cse-θaṁš] **ʔəẇ** [neṁ-ən neć-əẇtxʷ-əm.]
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) ƛ̓lim̓ ʔəw̓ t̓et̓iyəq̓ tᶿə swiw̓ləs.
really CN angry DT boy
'The young man is really angry.' (RP)

(6) cəlel ʔiʔ niʔ ƛ̓xʷ-ənəq.
almost CNJ AUX beat-people
'He almost won.' (DL)

In this usage, *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəw̓* 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 *ʔəw̓*-constructions and at least some *ʔiʔ*-constructions are monoclausal. The following example shows a *ʔəw̓*-construction that constitutes a single predication:

(7) ƛ̓lim̓=cən ʔəw̓ məq̓.
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) qəl̓et kʷeyəl ʔiʔ nem̓=ceʔ cam tʰə swəy̓qeʔ.
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 *ʔiʔ* 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*

明天我就去上課。

míng.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 *ʔiʔ* 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, *ʔiʔ* serves as a coordinator and *ʔəẇ* as a subordinator. Furthermore, I will introduce nominalization as a different method of subordination.

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

(10) wəɬ=sθəθiʔ-stxʷ-əs tᶿə snəxʷəɬ-s s-əẇ
PRF=prepare.ST-CS-3ERG DT canoe-3PS N-CN
ʔa:ɬ-stəxʷ-əs tᶿə qəx̌ sɬewən **ʔiʔ** tᶿə wəq̓ʷaʔɬ.
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) [x̌teʔ-əm=ct=ceʔ ʔə kʷ̓ sʔəɬtən] **ʔiʔ** [m̓i=cən=ceʔ λ̓ešət
make-ITR=1p=FUT OB DT food **CNJ** come=1s=FUT invite
tᶿə swaẇləs.]
DT boy.PL
'We're going to make something to eat and I'll invite the young men.' (WSe)

In both examples above, *ʔiʔ* links elements of the same syntactic category: two arguments (DPs) in (10), and two independent clauses in (11). Thus, a linkage with the marker *ʔiʔ* can be said to be symmetrical, and *ʔiʔ* can be established as a coordinator (cf. Haspelmath 2004).

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

(12) niʔ=ct ʔiməš ʔiʔ kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ.
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 *ʔiʔ* does not mark a comitative per se: the NP *kʷθə swəy̓qeʔ* does not function as an adjunct, but is

part of the subject, as indicated by the plural pronoun.[4] The same construction can be applied to the coordination of objects, subjects of passives, and even possessors:

(13) ni?=?ə=č ləm-nal̓xʷ ?i? ɬə=nə šxʷ?aq̓ʷa?.
AUX=Q=2s see-TR.1p.OBJ CNJ DT=1s.PS relative
'Did you see me and my sister?' (Leslie 1979:265)

(14) ni? ləm-naləm ?i? kʷθən̓ šxʷ?aq̓ʷa?
AUX see-TR.2p.PAS CNJ DT.2PS relative
kʷ=s ni? q̓ʷim.
DT=N AUX disembark
'You and your brother were seen disembarking.' (Leslie 1979:266)

(15) ni?=yəxʷ=?al̓ə scekʷəl̓ k̓ʷə ni? š-ləq-els
AUX=DUB=INQ how DT AUX N.OB-buy-ACT
təna ?ən̓=təməxʷ ?i? tθən̓ 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 *?ə*, as in the following example:
…nə-s ?əẇ nem̓ xʷə?aləm ?ə tθə=nə sil̓ə.
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 *ʔiʔ* 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) wəɬ=nem̓ həyeʔ ʔiʔ Johnny.
PRF=go leave CNJ J.
'He is going away with Johnny.' (Leslie 1979:268)

Thus, I conclude that *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ* in IH for an analogous structure is not possible:

(18) *niʔ=cən xʷ-ləm-šən ʔiʔ q̓ay-t kʷθə speʔəθ.
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.

(19) ni?=cən xʷ-ləm-šən ʔə kʷθə spɛʔəθ nə=s nəẇ
AUX=1s LPFX-see-foot OB DT black.bear 1s.PS=N AUX.CN
kʷən-nəxʷ ʔi? *(ni?)=cən q̓ay-t.
take-TR CNJ AUX=1s die-TR
'I tracked down the bear, got it, and killed it.' (RP)

The obligatory occurrence of the auxiliary *ni?* after the conjuction *ʔi?* indicates that the following is a separate clause, rather than just a separate verb. Thus, we can say that IH *ʔi?* is a coordinating conjunction like English *and*, but its distribution and function differ slightly from the latter.[5]

The linker *ʔəẇ* 'CN' is a connective used for complementation.[6] It is not translated into English in any consistent way.

(20) [ni?=č cse-θaḿš] **ʔəẇ** [neḿ-ən̓ neć-əẇtxʷ-əm.]
AUX=2s tell-TR.1s.OBJ **CN** go-1s.SUB different-house-ITR
'You told me to go visit.' (RP)

[5] Other differences in the use of IH *ʔi?* 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-θaməcən=ce? **ʔəẇ** kʷeyəl-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) [x̌te?-əm=ct=ce? ʔəḵʷ s?əɬtən] **ʔiʔ** [ṁi=cən=ce? x̣̂ešət
make-ITR=1p=FUT OB DT food **CNJ** come=1s=FUT invite
tᶿə swaẇləs.]
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 (*-əṅ* '1s.SUB'). This difference in subject marking is summarized in the following table.

Table 1: Halkomelem subject inflection

	main clause	**dependent clause**	**possessive**[7]
1st sg	cən	-ɛ:n̓	nə-
2nd sg	č	-əx^{w}	ʔən̓-
1st pl	ct	-ət	-ct
2nd pl	cɛ:p	-ələp	ʔən̓-...-ələp
3rd	(-əs)	-əs	-s

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-θam̓š] **ʔəẇ** [nem̓ *(-ən̓) nec̓-əẇtx^{w}-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).

(24) x̌te?-əm=ce? ʔə kʷ̓ sʔəɬtən.
make-ITR=FUT OB DT food
'He/they are going to make something to eat.'
*'We are going to make something to eat.' (RP)

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 *ʔəẇ* (26).

(25) skʷ̓ey **kʷ̓ə=nə=s** ləm-namə.
cannot **DT=1s.PS=N** see-TR.2s.OBJ
'I can't see you.' (RP)

(26) niʔ=cən neṁ q̓ʷim nə=s ʔəẇ x̌ʷčenəm.
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 *skʷ̓ey* '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 *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ* is described as a weak introducer in Gerdts and Werle (to appear), because in contrast to strong introducers, *ʔiʔ* may not serve as a host for second-position clitic placement. However, this description presumes that *ʔiʔ* occurs at the left edge of a clause, which is not established. In fact, *ʔiʔ* may lean either to the left or to the right. The subordinator *ʔəẇ*, 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 *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəẇ* both occur in interclausal linkage. Linkage by means of *ʔiʔ* is coordinative, such that both the clause before the conjunction and the clause after the conjunction are independent. Linkage

by means of *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ* or *ʔəẇ*. 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) tim-ət=č kʷ=ən̓=s ləmeʔ-t.
do.intense-TR=2s DT-2PS=N kick-TR
'You kick him hard.' (Hukari & Peter 1995)

(28) yəẇeṅ=č kʷ̓ə=s neṁ ʔiməš ʔə tᶿə qʷɬeẏ.
first=2s DT=N go walk OB DT log
'You go first to walk on the log.' (EW)

In the examples above, the verbs *timət* 'do intensely' and *yəẇeṅ* '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 *qəl̓et* 'again') does not usually co-occur with any linkers.

(29) neṁ qəl̓et q̓ʷəyiləš.
go again dance
'She went and danced some more.' (Gerdts & Werle to appear)

(30) ṁi=ct=ce? səwq̓-t qəl̓et.
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) qəl̓et=č=ce? c̓əl-cəs.
again=2s=FUT switch-hand
'You will have to switch [hands] again.' (WSe: Canoeing)

Besides *qəl̓et* 'again', another adverb of this type is *ƛ̓e?* 'also, again'. The following examples show that it occurs in pre-verbal (32), post-verbal (33) and clause-initial positions (34).

(32) ʔəwə=cən m̓i:n̓ ƛ̓e? p̓əkʷ.
NEG=1s come-1s.SUB again surface
'I might not be able to come back up.' (EW)

(33) ʔəẇ titəq̓ʷ ƛ̓e? ʔal̓.
CN bump.IPV again just
'He just kept hitting things.' (EW)

(34) ƛ̓e?=cən wəɬ=ʔa:ɬ ʔə tθə qəẇəcən̓.
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) ƛ̓limˀ ʔəẇ ɬeɬiyəq̓ tᶿə swiẇləs.
really CN angry DT boy
'The young man is really angry.' (RP)

(36) *ɬeɬiyəq̓ (ʔəẇ) ƛ̓limˀ (ʔəẇ) tᶿə swiẇləs.
angry CN really CN DT boy (RP)

(37) cəlel ʔiʔ niʔ ƛ̓xʷ-ənəq.
almost CNJ AUX beat-people
'He almost won.' (DL)

(38) *niʔ ƛ̓xʷ-ənəq (ʔiʔ) 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

Adverb		**Related form**	**Morphology of expanded form**
ƛ̓liṁ ‘really’	>	ƛ̓əliṁ ‘going the right way’	IPV
məkʷ̓ ‘all’	>	məkʷ̓ət ‘take it all’	TR
q̓eq̓əl̓ ‘barely’	<	q̓el̓ ‘believe’	ITR
x̌ʷəm ‘can / fast’	>	x̌ʷəmθət ‘become fast’	INC
t̓ᶿixʷəm ‘please’	<>	t̓ᶿxʷiməṯ ‘have pity on’	ITR/TR

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

(39) niʔ=cən q̓el̓ kʷ=s x̌ʷax̌ʷəm-s tᶿə sənixʷəɬ.
AUX=1s believe DT=N fast.PL-3SUB DT canoe.PL
‘I believe that the canoes are fast.’ (RP)

(40) ʔi=yəxʷ=ċə ʔəẇ yə=ƛ̓əl̓iṁ.
AUX=DUB=HS CN SER=right.IPV
‘They must have been going the right way.’ (WSa: Eagle Story)

Two of the adverbs listed above are themselves used as predicates, but are then translated differently: *x̌ʷəm* ‘fast’ (rather than ‘can’) and *t̓ᶿixʷəm* ‘take pity on’ (rather than ‘please’).

(41) x̌ʷəm tᶿə snəxʷəɬ.
fast DT canoe
‘The canoe is fast.’ (DL)

(42) niʔ=cən t̓ᶿixʷ-əṁ ʔə tᶿə xʷswen-əm sƛ̓iʔƛ̓qəɬ.
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 *q̓eq̓əl̓* ‘barely’ to the verb root *q̓el* ‘believe’ is somewhat speculative. Ruby Peter agrees to the idea that *q̓eq̓əl̓* ‘barely’ is etymologically related to *q̓el̓* ‘believe’, but she does not believe this reflects a transparent or regular process. The complement of *q̓el̓* is expressed in a determiner phrase, as example (39), repeated here as (43), shows:

(43) ni?=cən ḳeḷ kʷ=s x̌ʷax̌ʷəm-s tᶿə sənixʷəɬ.
AUX=1s believe DT=N fast.PL-3SUB DT canoe.PL
'I believe that the canoes are fast.' (RP)

I suggest that the *?i?*-construction with *ḳeḳəḷ* 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) ḳeḳəḷ ?əḷ kʷə-ct ni? ƛ̓xʷ-ənəq.
believe.PRG just DT-1p.PS AUX beat-people
'We barely won.' (RP)

Here, *ḳeḳəḷ* 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 *?i?*-constructions is apparent. The last step in the lexicalization process is to replace the determiner by *?i?* to arrive at the pattern that is prevalent now:

(45) ḳeḳəḷ ?əḷ ?i? ni?=ct ƛ̓xʷ-ənəq.
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, *ƛ̓limˀ* 'really' appears with *ʔəẇ* and not with *ʔiʔ*:

(46) ƛ̓limˀ=cən ʔəẇ t̓ᶿəy̓kʷ̓-θət.
really=1s CN startled-REFL
'I'm really startled.' (RP)

(47) *ƛ̓limˀ=cən ʔiʔ t̓ᶿəy̓kʷ̓-θət.
really=1s CNJ startled-REFL (RP)

The adverb *cəlel* appears with *ʔiʔ* and not with *ʔəẇ*:

(48) cəlel=cən ʔiʔ meƛ̓il.
almost=1s CNJ faint
'I almost fainted.' (RP)

(49) *cəlel=cən ʔəẇ meƛ̓il.
almost=1s CN faint (RP)

Table 3 lists these adverbs, along with the linker with which they appear.[8]

Table 3: Adverb + linker collocations

ʔəẘ	ʔiʔ
ƛ̓liṁ ‘really’	x̌ʷəm ‘can’
nan ‘very, too (much)’	cəlel ‘almost’
yaθ ‘always’	xʷeləq ‘almost’
məkʷ ‘all’	q̓eq̓əl̓ ‘barely’
	t̓θixʷəm ‘please’
	c̓əxʷleʔ ‘sometimes’

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 *ʔəẘ* 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 *x̌ʷəm* ‘can’ and *t̓θixʷəm* ‘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, *məkʷ* 'all' exploits the full degree of a given quantity, while *yaθ* 'always' refers to the complete set of possible times. *ƛ̓limˀ* '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 *ʔiʔ*, we see no such meaning associated with them. This picture is confirmed by data from Straits Salish, where the linker *ʔuʔ* co-occurs with other lexical items. Jelinek & Demers (2004) list the following items for Lummi: *siʔit* 'truly', *ʔənan* 'too (much), *ŋənˀ* 'big/many/very', *sc̓eyn* 'straight', *toxʷ* 'just', *məkʷ* 'all', *yos* 'always', *xʷəẇe* 'never'. Montler (2003) also gives further adverbs that are specific to Klallam: *ɬəŋ* 'just like', *sáɬəŋ* 'continuously', *słaxʷɬ* 'definitely', *čẇin* 'even', *xənˀ* '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 *ʔəẇ* 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 *(ʔəẇ) ṯəl̓iẇiʔəɬ.
always=1s CN pray
'I always pray.' (RP)

(51) ??ƛ̓lim̓=cən ___ t̓ᶿəy̓k̓ʷ-θət.

really=1s startled-REFL

'I am really startled.' (RP)

(52) ?x̌ʷəm=cən ___ x̌ʷčenəm.

can=1s run

'I can run.' (RP)

Example (50) is only grammatical if the adverb *yaθ* 'always' is followed by the linker *ʔəw̓*. 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 *ʔiʔ*. 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 *x̌ʷəm* 'can'. Compare the *ʔiʔ*-construction with *x̌ʷəm* (53) to the occurrence of *x̌ʷəm* in other constructions:

(53) x̌ʷəm=cən ʔiʔ x̌ʷčenəm.

can-1s CNJ run

'I can run.' (RP)

[9] Cf. Montler 2003 for the same observation for Klallam and Northern Straits.

(54) x̌ʷəm tᶿə snəxʷəɬ.
fast DT canoe
'The canoe is fast.' (DL)

(55) x̌ʷəm kʲʷə=nə=s ʔi x̌ʷaṅčənəṁ.
fast DT=1s.PS=N AUX run.IPV
'I'm running fast.' (RP)

Here, *x̌ʷəm* is translated into English as 'can' when used in a *ʔiʔ*-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 *x̌ʷəm*.[10]

In other cases, a similar variation in construction does not seem to have any effect on the meaning. Like *x̌ʷəm* 'can', the adverb *ċiməl̓* 'close' may occur either with a determiner-headed nominalized clause (56) or a clause introduced by *ʔiʔ* (57):

(56) wəɬ=ċiməl̓ kʲʷə=nə=s neṁ 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) wəɬ=ċiməl̓ ʔiʔ neṁ=cən=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 *x̌ʷəm* 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 *ʔiʔ* (59), or with the connective *ʔəẇ* (60):

(58) taxʷ=ce? ƙʷə=nə=s neṁ neċ-əẇtxʷ-əm.
exact=FUT DT=1s.PS=N go other-house-ITR
'I'll go and visit him later.' (RP)

(59) taxʷ=ce? ʔəl̓ ʔiʔ neṁ=cən neċ-əẇtxʷ-əm.
exact=FUT just CNJ go=1s other-house-ITR
'I'll go and visit him later.' (RP)

(60) taxʷ=cən ʔəẇ ɬx̌iləš ʔiʔ niʔ xʷ-yəx̌ʷ tᶿə šeɬ.
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 ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ* (59), but into 'just' in the construction involving *ʔəẇ* (60). Yet, compare (60) to the following sentence, where *ʔiʔ* is used instead, and *taxʷ* is still translated as 'just':

(61) tax^{w}=cən ʔiʔ ɬx̌iləš ʔiʔ niʔ x^{w}-yəx̌^{w} t^{θ}ə šeɬ.
exact=1s CNJ stand CNJ AUX LPFX-open DT door
'I just stood up and the door opened.' (RP)

Hence, we see that there are adverbial elements that occur with both *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəẇ* (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.[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 *təm̓tem* 'when' does not *need* to occur in a *ʔiʔ*-construction.

(62) təm̓tem=ceʔ ʔəl̓ yeɬ nə=s yəθ-əs-θamə
when=FUT just then 1s.PS=N tell.DAT-TR.2s.OBJ
'Some day I will tell you' (RP)

[11] As shown above, *q̓eq̓əl̓* 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 *ʔiʔ*-construction. Leslie (1979) mentions that *sc̓ek^{w}əl̓* '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 *ʔiʔ*-construction, but with a nominalization (cf. Chapter 3).

Here, the sentence-initial temporal expression is not followed by *ʔiʔ*, 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 təm̓tem kʷeyəl k̓ʷən̓=s həyeʔ.
AUX=FUT when day DT.2PS leave
'What day are you leaving?' (Leslie 1979:256)

(64) niʔ x̌ʷə<lə>nčenəm mək̓ʷ kʷθə sʌ̓l̓əl̓iqəɬ.
AUX <PL>run all DT child.DIM.PL
'All the children ran.' (Gerdts & Hukari, in prep.)

In example (63), *təm̓tem* directly modifies not the predicate or the whole clause, but the nominal *kʷeyəl* 'day'. Likewise, *mək̓ʷ* modifies not the VP as a whole, but rather the NP *kʷθə sʌ̓l̓əl̓iqəɬ* '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 *ʔəẇ* 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) ƛ̓̓lim̓=cən ___ ni? t̓ᶿəy̓k̓ʷ-θət.
really=1s AUX startled-REFL
'I was really startled.' (RP)

(66) x̌ʷəm=cən=p̓e? ___nem̓ ?əẇ nem̓ ?ə ƛ̓̓ nəwə
can=1s=CERT AUX CN go OB DT 2s.PRO
?i? ?əẇ q̓ay-θaməs=cən.
CNJ CN dead-TR.2s.OBJ=1s
'I can really come over to you and kill you.' (RP: Little Wren)

(67) na?ət ƛ̓̓lim̓ ___ wəɬ=sp̓əley̓ tᶿə k̓ʷələẇ ?ə tᶿəẇ
AUX really PRF=attach.ST DT skin OB DT.CN
nə=swe? nə=k̓ʷələẇ.
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*:

(68) *x̌ʷəm=cən=p̓eʔ ʔiʔ neṁ ʔəẇ neṁ ʔə x̓̌ nəwə.
can=1s=CERT CNJ go CN go OB DT 2s.PRO (RP)

This suggests that the occurrence of the linkers *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəẇ* 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; *ʔiʔ* is used in its clause-linking function, while *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ ʔəẇ*, but never *ʔəẇ ʔiʔ*. As I will point out in section 4.4, this is because the position of *ʔəẇ* falls within the verb phrase, while *ʔiʔ* may not.[13]

3.4. Summary

Predicate modification can be expressed in various ways in IH. For example, one strategy is that the modifer 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 *ʔiʔ* or the

[13] Alternatively, *ʔiʔ* may just be placed in a higher level within the verb phrase.

linker *ʔəẇ*. Furthermore, these adverbs always precede the element they modify, unlike other adverbs, which show more flexibility in placement. Comparing the distribution of *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəẇ*, we notice that *ʔəẇ* is used with adverbs that exhibit an absolute degree in their respective domain, while this is not true for adverbs that co-occur with *ʔiʔ*.

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 *ʔəẇ* are presented in Table 4, and illustrated by means of example (69).

(69) nan ʔəẇ ʔəẏ.
too CN good
'It's too/very good.' (RP)

Table 4: Working hypotheses for *ʔəẇ*-constructions

Hypothesis 1: monoclausal	**Hypothesis 2:**[14] **biclausal**
|nan ʔəẇ ʔəẏ|$_{\text{clause}}$	|nan|$_{\text{clause 1}}$ ʔəẇ |ʔəẏ|$_{\text{clause 2}}$ or |nan|$_{\text{clause 1}}$ |ʔəẇ ʔəẏ|$_{\text{clause 2}}$ or |nan ʔəẇ|$_{\text{clause 1}}$ |ʔəẏ|$_{\text{clause 2}}$

Likewise, I will consider the same options for adverbial constructions with *ʔiʔ*. This is illustrated in Table 5, by means of example (70).

(70) x̌^{w}əm ʔiʔ x̌^{w}čenəm.
can CNJ run
'He can run.' (RP)

[14] The exact placement of the linker (i.e. whether *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ*-constructions

Hypothesis 1: monoclausal	**Hypothesis 2: biclausal**
|x̌ʷəm ʔiʔ x̌ʷčenəm|$_{clause}$	|x̌ʷəm|$_{clause\ 1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌ʷčenəm|$_{clause\ 2}$ or |x̌ʷəm|$_{clause\ 1}$ |ʔiʔ x̌ʷčenəm|$_{clause\ 2}$ or |x̌ʷəm ʔiʔ|$_{clause\ 1}$ |x̌ʷčenəm|$_{clause\ 2}$

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) |x̌ʷəm=ʔə=č|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |ʔaːɬ-staṁš?|$_{Z2}$
can=Q=2s 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 *ʔəw̓*. 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) nem̓ šaqʷəl **kʷθə=nə stiwən**.
go cross **DT=1s.PS nephew**
'My nephew is going across.' (RP)

(73) ʔəy̓-stxʷ-əs **tᶿə speʔəθ tᶿə sq̓il̓ə**
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).

(74) neṁ=cən šaqʷəl.
go=1s cross
'I'm going across.' (RP)

The following example shows that this placement is not available for subject NPs.

(75) *neṁ **kʷθə=nə stiwən** šaqʷəl.
go **DT=1s.PS nephew** cross
Intended meaning: 'My nephew is going across.' (RP)

In complex sentences involving complementation, the subject of the main clause may occur either before the connective *ʔəẇ*, as in (76), or after the embedded clause, as in (77).

(76) [niʔ cse-θaṁš-əs **tᶿə=nə šəyəɬ**]$_{matrix}$
AUX tell-1s.OBJ-ERG **DT=1s.PS elder.brother**
[ʔəẇ xʷ-tqe-t-ən̓ tᶿə šeɬ.]$_{sub}$
CN LPFX-close-TR-1s.SUB DT door
'My brother told me to close the door.' (RP)

(77) [niʔ cse-θaṁš-əs [ʔəẇ xʷ-tqe-t-ən̓ tᶿə šeɬ]$_{sub}$
AUX tell-1s.OBJ-ERG CN LPFX-close-TR-1s.SUB DT door
tᶿə=nə šəyəɬ]$_{matrix}$
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) |ƛ̓liṁ|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |t̓ᶿəy̓k̓ʷ-θət **tᶿə** **qeq**.|$_{Z2}$
really CN angry-REFL **DT** **baby**
'The baby's really angry.' (RP)

(79) *|ƛ̓liṁ **tᶿə** **qeq**|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |t̓ᶿəy̓k̓ʷ-θət.|$_{Z2}$
really **DT** **baby** CN angry-REFL (RP)

(80) |x̌ʷəm|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌ʷčenəm **tᶿəẇniɬ**.|$_{Z2}$
can CNJ run **DT.CN.3FOC**
'He can run.' (RP)

(81) *|x̌ʷəm **tᶿəẇniɬ**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌ʷčenəm.|$_{Z2}$
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 *ʔiʔ* or *ʔəẇ*, 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|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |ṯəṯiẇiʔəɬ **θə=nə** **ten**.|$_{Z2}$
always CN pray **DT=1s.PS** **mother**
'My mother's always praying.' (RP)

(83) *|yaθ **θə=nə** **ten**|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |ṯəṯiẇiʔəɬ.|$_{Z2}$
always **DT=1s.PS** **mother** CN pray (RP)

(84) |cəlel|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ məx̣̌il **ɬə** **Mary**.|$_{Z2}$
almost CNJ AUX faint **DT** **M.**
'Mary almost fainted.' (RP)

(85) *|cəlel **ɬə** **Mary**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ məx̣̌il.|$_{Z2}$
almost **DT** **M.** CNJ AUX faint (RP)

(86) |xʷeləq|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ məx̣̌-il **ɬə** **Mary**.|$_{Z2}$
almost CNJ AUX faint **DT** **M.**
'Mary almost fainted.' (RP)

(87) *|xʷeləq **ɬə** **Mary**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ məx̣̌il.|$_{Z2}$
almost **DT** **M.** CNJ AUX faint (RP)

(88) |c̓əxʷle?|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ t̓iẇiʔəɬ **ɬə=nə** **məńə**.|$_{Z2}$
sometimes CNJ go pray **DT=1s.PS** **child**
'My daughter goes to church once in a while' (DL)

(89) *|c̓əxʷleʔ **ɬə=nə** **məńə**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ neṁ |t̓iẇiʔəɬ.|$_{Z2}$
sometimes **DT=1s.PS** **child** CNJ go pray (DL)

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.[16] 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) neṁ**=cən** šaqʷəl.
go**=1s** cross
'I'm going across.' (RP)

(91) *neṁ šaqʷəl**=cən**.
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) ṯaʔ-θət**=cən**=ceʔ kʷəʔeɬ.
try-REFL**=1s**=FUT indeed
'I'm going to try then.' (WSe: Canoeing)

(93) haʔ**=č** yə=ʔiʔšəl̓ ʔiʔ x̌ac-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.

(94) |ɬ̓liṁ=**cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |məq̓.|$_{Z2}$

really=**1s** CN full

'I'm really full.' (RP)

(95) *|ɬ̓liṁ|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |ʔiyəs=**cən**.|$_{Z2}$

really=1s CN full=**1s** (RP)

(96) |x̌^{w}əm=**cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌^{w}čenəm.|$_{Z2}$

can=**1s** CNJ run

'I can run.' (RP)

(97) *|x̌^{w}əm|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌^{w}čenəm=**cən**.|$_{Z2}$

can-1s CNJ run=**1s** (RP)

The examples above show that subject clitics are placed in Zone 1 in constructions involving *ʔiʔ* (94) or *ʔəẇ* (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) |yaθ**=č**|$_{Z1}$ ʔəw |x̌eːm̓.|$_{Z2}$
always**=2s** CN cry.IPV
'You're always crying.' (RP)

(99) *|yaθ|$_{Z1}$ ʔəw |x̌eːm̓**=č**.|$_{Z2}$
always CN cry.IPV**=2s** (RP)

(100) |cəlel**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ ʔəɬəp̓-cəs ʔə tʰə sceːɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost**=1s** CNJ AUX slip-hand OB DT fish
'The salmon almost slipped out of my hand.' (RP, confirmed by DL)

(101) *|cəlel|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=cən** ʔəɬəp̓cəs ʔə tʰə sceːɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost CNJ AUX**=1s** 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 *ʔəẇ*. I have shown in Chapter 2 that *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ*.

(102) [niʔ=č cse-θaṁš] **ʔəẇ** [neṁ**-əṅ** neċ-əẇtxʷ-əm.]
AUX=2s tell-TR.1s.OBJ **CN** go-**1s.SUB** different-house-ITR
'You told me to go visit.' (RP)

Therefore, if *ʔəẇ*-constructions were biclausal, we would expect dependent marking to occur in Zone 2.[18]

(103) |ƛ̓limṁ=č|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |x̌əɬ.|$_{Z2}$
really=2s CN hurt
'You really got hurt.' (RP)

(104) *|ƛ̓limṁ=č|$_{Z2}$ ʔəẇ |x̌əɬ-**əx^{w}**.|$_{Z2}$
really=2s CN hurt-**2s.SUB** (RP)

(105) |yaθ=č|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |x̌e:ṁ.|$_{Z2}$
always=2s CN cry.IPV
'You're always crying.' (RP)

(106) *|yaθ=č|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |x̌e:ṁ-**əx^{w}**.|$_{Z2}$
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.

(107) ʔəwə**=č** x̌e:m̓**-əxʷ!**

NEG**=2s** cry-IPV**-2s.SUB**

‘Don’t cry!’ (RP)

Thus, the absence of dependent marking in Zone 2 of adverbial clauses involving the linker *ʔəẇ* corroborates a monoclausal analysis of such structures.

4.4. Auxiliaries

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

(108) **ʔi**=ct ʔalməc-t ɬə x̌ʷəy̓qʷəl̓əɬ.

AUX=1p wait-TR DT ferry

‘We have to wait for the ferry.’ (RP)

In *ʔəẇ*-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.

(109) |**ni?**=cən ƛ̓limɯ̓|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |t̓^{θ}əẏk̓^{w}-θət.|$_{Z2}$
AUX=1s really CN angry-REFL
'I was really angry.' (RP)

(110) |ƛ̓limɯ̓=cən **ʔi**|$_{Z1}$ ʔəẇ |ʔiyəs.|$_{Z2}$
really=1s **AUX** 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]

Example (110) tells us more than just that *ʔəẇ*-constructions are monoclausal: since the auxiliary and the following verb form a constituent, the connective *ʔəẇ* proves to fall within that scope, because it occurs between the auxiliary and the main verb. That is, the syntactic position of *ʔəẇ* is *within* the predicate. In fact, because the collocation of auxiliary and *ʔəẇ* is so frequent, a portmanteau morpheme *nəẇ* (< *niʔ* + *ʔəẇ*) has been formed. An example of this is given below:

[19] Yet, considering just these data, there might still be a clause boundary immediately before the auxiliary.

(111) məkʷ=ct **nəẇ** ṯəṯiẇi?əɬ.
all-1p **AUX.CN** pray
'We all go to church.' (RP)

In *?i?*-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):

(112) |**ni?**=ct kwə?eɬ wəɬ=cəlel|$_{Z1}$?i? |həṅ-əmət.|$_{Z2}$
AUX=1p indeed PRF=almost CNJ arrive-be.home
'We had almost gotten home.' (WSe)

(113) |ċəxʷle?|$_{Z1}$?i? |**ni?**=cən meṁəl̓q ?ə θə=nə sqʷa?qʷəl̓.|$_{Z2}$
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 *?əẇ*. There is no reason from a syntactic point of view to discard any of groupings indicated by the brackets in the examples above. *?i?*-constructions analogous to (110) are not attested. Therefore, this test is not conclusive for *?i?*-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 *ʔəẇ* serves to introduce a dependent clause serving as a complement. Such complement clauses are overtly marked by dependent subject indexing. In contrast, the conjunction *ʔiʔ* coordinates when linking whole clauses. The clauses before and after *ʔiʔ* 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, *ʔəẇ* does *not* subordinate. Similarly, *ʔiʔ* 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, *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔiʔ* and *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ*-constructions present a very homogeneous picture. However, *ʔiʔ*-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 *ʔiʔ*-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 *ʔiʔ*-constructions to temporal adverbials, which deviate most sharply from the pattern described in Chapter 4. This range of structures refutes the idea that all *ʔiʔ*-constructions are monoclausal. Hence, I conclude in section 5.3 that *ʔiʔ*-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).

(114) |cəlel**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ ʔəɬəṗ-cəs ʔə tʰə sce:ɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost**=1s** CNJ AUX slip-hand OB DT fish
'The salmon almost slipped out of my hand.' (RP, confirmed by DL)

(115) *|cəlel|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=cən** ʔəɬəṗcəs ʔə tʰə sce:ɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
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) |cəlel**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ kʷən-nəxʷ tᶿə sce:ɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost**=1s** CNJ AUX take-TR DT fish
'I almost caught the fish.' (RP)

(117) ?? |cəlel|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=cən** kʷən-nəxʷ tᶿə sce:ɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost CNJ AUX**=1s** take-TR DT fish (RP)

Alhtough (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) |cəlel**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ ləm-namə.|$_{Z2}$
almost**=1s** CNJ AUX see-TR.2s.OBJ
'I almost saw you.' (RP)

(119) *|cəlel|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=cən** ləm-namə.|$_{Z2}$
almost 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) |wəɬ=cəlel**=cən**=ceʔ|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ**=cən**=ceʔ həyeʔ-sta:m.|$_{Z2}$
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 *ce?*) 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.[20] Yet this pattern is only true for *cəlel*, and different from what we find with *x̌ʷəm* 'can'.

(121) |x̌ʷəm**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌ʷčenəm **(*=cən)**.|$_{Z2}$
can=1s CNJ run **(*=1s)**
'I can run.' (RP)

Doubling the subject enclitic in *ʔiʔ*-constructions with *x̌ʷəm* has been consistently rejected and no corresponding data have been found in texts, either.

In view of such variation across different *ʔiʔ*-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 *x̌ʷəm* 'can', there is no evidence that it patterns any different from the structure described in Chapter 4. Relevant data are repeated below.

(122) |x̌ʷəm**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |x̌ʷčenəm.|$_{Z2}$
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).

(123) *|ǩʷəm|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |ǩʷčenəm**=cən**.|$_{Z2}$
can CNJ run**=1s** (RP)

(124) *|ǩʷəm**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |ǩʷčenəm**=cən**.|$_{Z2}$
can**=1s** CNJ run**=1s** (RP)

With *ǩʷəm*, 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, *cəlel* 'almost', has been shown to deviate from this pattern.

(125) |cəlel**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ ʔəɬəṗ-cəs ʔə tᶿə sce:ɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost**=1s** CNJ AUX slip-hand OB DT fish
'The salmon almost slipped out of my hand.' (RP, confirmed by DL)

(126) *|cəlel|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=cən** ʔəɬəṗcəs ʔə tᶿə sce:ɬtən.|$_{Z2}$
almost CNJ AUX**=1s** slip-hand OB DT fish (DL)

(127) |wəɬ=cəlel**=cən**=ceʔ|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |nem̓**=cən**=ceʔ həyeʔ-sta:m.|$_{Z2}$
PRF=almost**=1s**=FUT CNJ AUX**=1s**=FUT leave-CS.2s.OBJ
'It's almost time for me to start taking you along.' (EW)

While the structure analogous to (122), with a subject clitic in Zone 1, is also acceptable with *cəlel* (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 *cəlel* 'almost' is not the only one to deviate from the pattern described in Chapter 3. The modal *t̓ᶿixʷəm* 'please' exhibits the most versatile pattern:

(128) |t̓ᶿixʷəm**=č**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |xʷtqe-t tᶿə šeɬ.|$_{Z2}$
please**=2s** CNJ close-TR DT door
'Please close the door.' (RP)

(129) |t̓ᶿixʷəm|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |xʷtqe-t**=č** tᶿə šeɬ.|$_{Z2}$
please CNJ close-TR**=2s** DT door
'Please close the door.' (RP)

(130) |t̓ᶿixʷəm**=č**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |xʷtqe-t**=č** tᶿə šeɬ.|$_{Z2}$
please**=2s** CNJ close-TR**=2s** DT door
'Please close the door.' (RP)

(131) |t̓ᶿixʷəm|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |xʷtqe-t tᶿə šeɬ.|$_{Z2}$
please CNJ close-TR DT door
'Please close the door.' (RP)

[21] It would be interesting to know whether *xʷeləq* 'almost' patterns in the same way. However, *xʷeləq* differs from *cəlel* 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 *xʷeləq* "denotes an action performed without the speaker's full control," while *cəlel* is "semantically neutral." Because this semantic subtlety is not fully understood, I will not include *xʷeləq* 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 *q̓eq̓əl̓* 'barely', the options for subject clitic placement are yet slightly different.

(132) |q̓eq̓əl̓ ʔəl̓|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=ct** ƛ̓x^{w}-ənəq.|$_{Z2}$
barely just CNJ AUX**=1p** beat-people
'We just barely won.' (RP)

(133) |q̓eq̓əl̓**=ct** ʔəl̓|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ ƛ̓x^{w}-ənəq.|$_{Z2}$
barely**=1p** only CNJ AUX beat-people
'We just barely won.' (DL, confirmed by RP)

(134) |q̓eq̓əl̓**=ct** ʔəl̓|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ**=ct** ƛ̓x^{w}-ənəq.|$_{Z2}$
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 *c̓əx^{w}leʔ* 'sometimes', we obtain a picture that in fact contradicts the pattern described for adverbial constructions in Chapter 3.

(135) |c̓əxʷle?|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ**=cən** t̓iẇiʔəɬ.|$_{Z2}$
sometimes CNJ go**=1s** pray
'Sometimes I go to church.' (RP)

(136) *|c̓əxʷle?**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ t̓iẇiʔəɬ.|$_{Z2}$
sometimes**=1s** CNJ go pray (RP)

(137) |c̓əxʷle?**=cən**|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ**=cən** t̓iẇiʔəɬ.|$_{Z2}$
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 *təṁtem* 'when':

(138) |təṁtem=ce?|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ**=č** yə=ʔəṁməš?|$_{Z2}$
when=FUT CNJ go**=2s** SER=hunt.IPV
'When are you going to hunt?' (RP, confirmed by DL)

(139) *| təṁtem**=č**=ce?|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ yə=ʔəṁməš?|$_{Z2}$
when**=2s**=FUT CNJ go SER=hunt.IPV (RP)

(140) |təṁtem**=č**=ce?|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |neṁ**=č** yə=ʔəṁməš?|$_{Z2}$
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

Adverb (+ ʔiʔ)	**Placement of subject enclitic (Zone 1 / 2)**
x̌ʷəm	1
cəlel	1 (2)
q̓eq̓əl̓	1 / 2
t̓ᶿixʷəm	(1) / (2)
c̓əxʷleʔ	(1) 2
təm̓tem	(1) 2

On the one hand, we have the *ʔiʔ*-construction with *x̌ʷəm* '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 *ʔəẇ*-constructions. On the other hand, we see that other adverbs do allow subject clitics in Zone 2. In fact, for some adverbs (e.g. *c̓əxʷleʔ* '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 *ʔiʔ*-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 *c̓əxʷleʔ* 'sometimes' and *təm̓tem* '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 *ʔiʔ*. 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 tᶿə qəl̓et kʷeyəl|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ nem̓ cam
arrive OB DT again day CNJ AUX go go.up.mountain
tᶿə swəy̓qeʔ.|$_{Z2}$
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 *ʔiʔ* 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 (*qəl̓et kʷeyəl*).

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

(142) |qəl̓et kʷeyəl|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |nem̓=ceʔ cam tᶿə swəy̓qeʔ.|$_{Z2}$
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 *qəl̓et* (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 *swəy̓qeʔ* 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) |nəć̓a?=ce? skʷeyəl|$_{Z1}$?i? |neḿ=cən=ce? qʷi?qʷal̓.|$_{Z2}$
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 *nəć̓a?* '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 *ce?* '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) |* nəć̓a?(=cən)=ce? skʷeyəl|$_{Z1}$?i? |neḿ=cən=ce? qʷi?qʷal̓.|$_{Z2}$
one(=1s)=FUT day CNJ go=1s=FUT talk.IPV
'One day, I will speak.' (DL)

Consider another temporal expression, *xʷəṅ x̌ət̓ə* 'suddenly' and the structure becomes even less transparent:

(145) |xʷəṅ=x̌əɬ̓ə|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ=cən wəɬ=ləm-nəxʷ tᶿə niʔ yə=kʷaẏx̌-θət.|$_{Z2}$
still=do.IPV CNJ AUX=1s PRF=see-TR DT AUX SER=move-REFL
'Suddenly, I saw something moving.' (RP)

This is a fixed expression usually translated as 'soon', 'finally', or 'suddenly'. The elements in this expression are the proclitic *xwəṅ=* 'still' and the imperfective verb form *x̌əɬ̓ə* '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.

(146) |xʷəṅ=x̌əɬ̓ə=cən|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |wəɬ=ləmnəxʷ tᶿə niʔ yə=kʷaẏx̌-θət.|$_{Z2}$
still=do.IPV=1s CNJ PRF=see-TR DT AUX SER=move-REFL
'I was still speaking, then 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:

(147) |xʷəṅ=x̌əṯə=cən|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |wəɬ=ləmnəxʷ=cən tᶿə niʔ yə=kʷaẏx̌-θət.|$_{Z2}$
still=do.IPV=1s CNJ PRF=see-TR=1s =1s 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 *ċəxʷleʔ* 'sometimes' and *təṁtem* '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 *x̌ʷəm* (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 monoclausality on the one hand and biclausality on the other hand. At one extreme, we have the *ʔiʔ*-construction with *x̌ʷəm* '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 *cəlel* 'almost', pattern

closer to the monoclausal end and others, such as *c̓əxʷlɛʔ* 'sometimes', pattern closer to the biclausal end. Also, of course, the interclausal use of *ʔiʔ* discussed in Chapter 2 illustrates a biclausal construction.

Compared to *ʔiʔ*-constructions, *ʔəẇ*-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 polysyllablic adverbs, e.g. *xʷəṅ̓ x̌əɬ̓ə* 'suddenly', *c̓əxʷlɛʔ* 'sometimes', and *ɬ̓ᵋixʷəm* 'please', also pattern on the biclausal end of the cline. In contrast, all monosyllabic adverbs in both *ʔiʔ*- and *ʔəẇ*-constructions, e.g. *x̌ʷəm* 'can', *nan* 'very, too (much)', and *ƛ̓limṅ̓* 'really', pattern monoclausally.

Second, note that while the position before *ʔiʔ* in a biclausal construction tends to be an open frame, the element before *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ* or the linker *ʔəẇ*. 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 *ʔiʔ* 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, *ʔiʔ* is also used as a linker in adverb constructions (Chapter 3). Another use of *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ*-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 *ʔəẇ* 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	kʷəʔeɬ	həli-θət	tᶿəṅ	snəxʷəɬ	ʔiʔ	ƛ̓limṁ	ʔəẇ	c̓ən-əm.
	if	then	live-INC	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."[23]

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=əɬ ʔiʔ ƛ̓e? wəɬ=nem̓ šaǩʷ-əθeləm.
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.

(150) ni? kʷin skʷeyəl ʔi? m̓i wiḷ həṅ-əmət.
AUX how.many day CNJ come appear arrive-be.home
'After a few days, [his father] got home.' (EW)

In these examples, the temporal adverbials *netəɬ* '(it was) morning' and *ni? kʷin skʷeyəl* '(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 siḷanəm kʷə=nə=s teti?.
how.many year DT=1s.PS=N paddle.IPV
'I paddled for so many years.' (WSe: Canoeing)

(152) hiθ=c̓ə kʷsə=s nem̓ yə=ƛ̓əpəḷ tθəẇ-nəṅəɬ.
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 *ḵʷin siɬanəm* 'how many years' and *hiθ* '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 *ʔiʔ*:

(153) niʔ ḵʷin skʷeyəl ʔiʔ ṁi wiɬ həṅ-əmət.
AUX how.many day CNJ come appear arrive-be.home
'After a few days, [his father] got home.' (EW)

Thus, the consistent use of *ʔiʔ* 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 *ʔiʔ* 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)[24]

In example (154), *ēkwa* links two separate clauses. Wolvengrey (2011:277) states that the conjunction occurs in clause-initial position.[25] In addition, *ēkwa* co-occurs with temporal adverbs, in which case it often follows them:

(155) *Plains Cree*

anohc **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 **ēkwa** kā-nīmihito-hk kā-nīsosimo-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 *ʔiʔ* in temporal adverbial constructions, where we also find the conjunction following a sentence-initial adverbial:

(157) |qəl̓et kʷeyəl|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |nem̓=ce ʔ cam tᶿə swəy̓qeʔ.|$_{Z2}$
again be.day CNJ go=FUT go.up.mountain DT man
'The next day, the man went up the mountains.' (RP)

(158) |xʷən̓=x̌əl̓ə|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |niʔ=cən wəɬ=ləm-nəxʷ tᶿə niʔ yə=kʷay̓x̌-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 *ēkwa* is very similar to that of *ʔiʔ*. 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 *thì* in Vietnamese, *los* in Hmong, and *kɔ̂ː* 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). [26] 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 (*cái*, *dōu, yě*). 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

1p 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*

กินข้าวเสร็จแล้วก็กลับไปทำงานต่อ

kin k^{h}âːw sèt lɛ́ːw **kôː** klàp paj t^{h}am ŋaːn tòː

eat rice finish PRF **CNJ** return go do work continue

'After [I] finish eating, [I'll] go back to work.'

(162) *Mandarin*

然後。。找人以後，　就要記清楚是誰。

ránhòu zhǎo rén yǐhòu **jiù** yào jì qīngchǔ shì shéi

then search person after **CNJ** must remember clear COP who

'Then, after you've found someone, you have to remember who it is.'

(adapted from Hsieh 2003:184)

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 Sàigòn, **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*

ถ้าฝนตกผมก็ไม่ไป

(t^{h}âː) fŏn tòk p^{h}ŏm **kôː** mâj paj

if rain fall 1s **CNJ** NEG go

'If it rains, I'm not going.'

(166) *Mandarin*

如果老季來我就去。

(rúguǒ) lǎo Lǐ 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 *ha?*, and the conjunction *?i?* generally precedes the apodosis. (148) is repeated here as (167) to exemplify an IH conditional clause.

(167) ha? kʷə?eɬ həli-θət tʰəṅ snəxʷəɬ ʔiʔ ƛ̓liṁ ʔəẇ c̓ən-əm.
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.đó **thì** 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
pʰrûŋ.níː kɔ̂ː rák thɤː
tomorrow CNJ love 2s
'Tomorrow I still love you.'

(171) *Mandarin*

明天我就去上課。

míng.tiān wǒ **jiù** qù shàng.kè

tomorrow 1 **CNJ** go attend.class

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

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.

(172) |qəl̓et kʷeyəl|$_{Z1}$ ʔiʔ |nem̓=ceʔ cam tʰə swəy̓qeʔ.|$_{Z2}$

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

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

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 *xʷəm̓=* 'still' and the imperfective verb *x̌əl̓ə* 'doing, saying' to construct a temporal adverb with the meaning of 'suddenly' that appears in an *ʔiʔ*-construction.

(173) xʷəṅ=ǎəl̓ə ʔiʔ wəɬ=ləm-nəxʷ-əs tᶿə niʔ yə=kʷaẏ̌x-θət.
still=do.IPV CNJ PRF=see-TR-3ERG DT AUX SER=move-REFL
'Suddenly, [Owl] saw something moving.' (RP: Ruler of the Forest)

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.

(174) *Thai*
อยู่ๆมันก็พูดถึงแบบ...
jùː jùː man **kôː** pʰûːt tʰɯ̌ŋ ɓèːp...
stay stay 3 **CNJ** speak reach like
'Suddenly, he talked about...' (Iwasaki 2005:371)

(175) *Mandarin*
我說著說著天就亮了。
wǒ shuō-zhe shuō-zhe tiān **jiù** liàng le
1 talk-PRG talk-PRG sky **CNJ** bright PFV
'I talked and talked (even) until daybreak.'

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-adverbial 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** để chị.ở giặt quần.áo xong, chị.ấy sẽ rưa.
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 dì.fāng wǒ-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 *ʔiʔ*-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 conjuntion *ʔiʔ*, 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.

(179) *Kalispel*

úc ɬu? in-qéčč lə-ʔé **u** c-ən-ʔúɬxʷ.

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*

ti?iɬ tu=d-sqʷiqʷqʷali? **gʷəl** ʔu-ləƛ̓ʷ-t-əb ʔə=ci?iɬ=saʔ ad-qʷist.

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)*

tə snəxʷəɬ **ʔiʔ** kʷɬ-uʔ téčəl ʔə tə słélt.

DT canoe **and** already-CN arrive OB DT shore

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

Kroeber (1999) shows that this structure is widely attested in Salish languages, though few examples have been cited for IH:

(182) tᶿə sməyəθ ʔiʔ ʔəwə nə=s=ƛ̓̓i?-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) ɬeẏ̓x̌-t-əs tᶿə sməyəθ.

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 *ʔiʔ* to the auxiliary *ʔi* (and hence omits the auxiliary *niʔ*), but explicitly rejects the presence of a conjunction.

(184)	(niʔ)	ɬə	pus-ct	**ʔi**	ɬeɣ̓ǎ-t-əs	tᵊə	sməyəθ.
	AUX	DT	cat-1p.PS	**AUX**	eat-TR-3.ERG	DT	deer

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

I have not been able to elicit any instance of an *and*-fronted core argument, nor did I find any in narratives. This leads me to the conclusion that *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 *ʔiʔ* and the auxiliary *ʔi*).

In sum, the use of IH *ʔiʔ* appears to differ from the Southeast Asian conjunctions: *ʔiʔ* 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.[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.

[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 *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. *cəlel* 'almost' or *x̌ʷəm* '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 *ʔəẇ* are used both between clauses and within clauses. When used interclausally, *ʔiʔ* serves as a coordinator and *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ* are also used intraclausally.

Yet the adverbial constructions involving *ʔiʔ* do not form a homogeneous group. While adverbial constructions with *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ* discussed in this thesis might be unified has been left unanswered. This is in part because there are many uses for *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ* co-occurs have an absolute value in their respective domain and suggested that the function of *ʔəẇ* 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: *ʔəẇ* 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 *ʔəẇ* 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.

References

Bach, Emmon, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer & Barbara H. Partee. 1995. *Quantification in natural languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Beck, David. 2003. Conceptual autonomy and the typology of parts of speech. In Casad, Eugene H. & Gary B. Palmer (eds.), *Bringing Non-Indo-European languages into focus*, 135–56. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Biq, Yung-O. 1988. From focus in proposition to focus in speech situation: *cai* and *jiu* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 16(1). 72–108.

Chafe, Wallace J. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Li, Charles N. (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, 25–55. New York: Academic Press.

Clark, Marybeth. 1992. Conjunctions as topicalizers: More on Southeast Asian languages. *Papers from the First Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, 87–107. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Currie, Elizabeth J. 1997. *Topic time: The syntax and semantics of Sqwxwu7mish temporal adverbials*. University of British Columbia, MA thesis.

Davis, Henry. 2001. On negation in Salish. *Papers for the 36th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages, UBCWPL* 6, 55-90. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.

Davis, Henry & Lisa Matthewson. 2009. Issues in Salish syntax and semantics. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3(4). 1097–1166.

Demirdache, Hamida & Lisa Matthewson. 1995. Syntactic categories in St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish). *Papers for the 30th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages,* 69–75. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

Dyvik, Helge J. J. 1984. Subject or topic in Vietnamese? *Skriftserie (Universitetet i Bergen. Institutt for Fonetikk og Lingvistikk: Forskningsrapporter og originalarbeider*, vol. 13. Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen.

Féry, Caroline & Manfred Krifka. 2009. Information structure: Notional distinctions, ways of expression. In Sterkenburg, Piet van (ed.), 123–36. *Unity and diversity of languages*. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1977. *A dialect survey of Halkomelem Salish*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia, MA thesis.

Gerdts, Donna B. 1980. Some ergative phenomena in Halkomelem. *Papers for the 15th International Conference on Salishan Languages* (in Vancouver, BC).

Gerdts Donna B. 1988. *Object and absolutive in Halkomelem clausal organization.* New York: Garland Publishing.

Gerdts, Donna B. 2000. The combinatory properties of Halkomelem lexical suffixes. *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society,* 337–47. Berkeley CA: University of California.

Gerdts, Donna B. 2006. Argument realization in Halkomelem: A study in verb classification. *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Languages in the Americas*. UBCWPL 18, 61–81. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.

Gerdts, Donna B. & Thomas E. Hukari. In prep. *Hul'q'umi'num': A grammar of Island Halkomelem.*

Gerdts, Donna B. & Thomas E. Hukari. 2008. The Expression of noun phrases in Halkomelem texts. *Anthropological Linguistics* 50(3/4). 1–41.

Gerdts, Donna B. & Adam Werle. To appear. Hul'q'umi'num' clitic types. *Morphology*.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1974. *The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory*. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin dissertation.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1985. 'Shared Knowledge' and Topicality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9 (1). 83–107.

Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54(3). 564–89.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1968. *Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English: Part 3. Journal of Linguistics* 4(2). 179–215.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. Coordination. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and linguistic description*, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordination: An overview. In Haspelmath, Martin (ed.), *Coordinating constructions*. (Typological Studies in Language 58), 3–39. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hess, Thom. 1995. Lushootseed reader with introductory grammar. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics*. Tulalip Tribes.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticization: Opposite or orthogonal? In Bisang, Walter & Nikolaus Himmelmann (eds.), *What makes grammaticization? A look from its fringes and its components*, 21–42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hole, Daniel P. 2004. *Focus and background marking in Mandarin Chinese: System and theory behind* cái, jiù, dōu *and* yě. London: Routledge Curzon.

Horn, Laurence R. 1986. Presupposition, theme and variations. *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory. Chicago Linguistic Society [CLS]* 22. 186–92.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1990. *As time goes by: Tense and universal grammar*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Hsieh, Fuhui. 2003. Mandarin adverbial *jiu* in discourse. *Proceedings of the 17th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation.*

Huffman, Franklin E. & Trong Hai Tran. 1980. *Intermediate spoken Vietnamese.* Ithaca: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program.

Hukari, Thomas E. & Ruby Peter. 1995. *The Cowichan dictionary of the Hul'q'umi'num' dialect of the Coast Salish People*. Duncan, BC: Cowichan Tribes.

Iwasaki, Shoichi & Preeya Ingkaphirom. 2005. *A reference grammar of Thai*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, Peter. 2011. *Control in Sḵwx̱wu7mesh.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia dissertation.

Jacobs, Peter. 2013. Subordinate clauses in Squamish: Their form and function. *Northwest Journal of Linguistics* 7(2). 1–51.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1990. Quantification in Straits Salish. *Papers for the 25th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*, 177–96.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In Bach, Emmon, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer & Barbara H. Partee (eds.), *Quantification in Natural Languages*, 487-540. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Jelinek, Eloise & Richard A. Demers. 2004. Adverbs of quantification in Straits Salish and the LINK 'u'. In Gerdts, Donna B. & Lisa Matthewson Lisa (eds.), *Studies in Salish Linguistics in Honor of M. Dale Kinkade* (University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 10), 224–34. Missoula, MT: University of Montana.

Kinkade, Dale M. 1983. Salish evidence against the universality of 'noun' and 'verb'. *Lingua* 60. 25–39.

Klein, Wolfgang. 1994. *Time in language*. London: Routledge.

Koch, Karsten. 2007. Don't get stressed! Non-stress focus strategies in Nłe?kepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). *Proceedings of the 2007 Canadian Linguistic Association Annual Conference.*

Kroeber, Paul D. 1991. *Comparative syntax of subordination in Salish*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago dissertation.

Kroeber, Paul D. 1999. *The Salish language family: Reconstructing syntax*. University of Nebraska Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge University Press.

Le, Van Hao. 1986. Hoi An: Su hoi sinh... (Hoi An: The revival of an old town). *Hoi An*. 13–21. DaNang Publishing House.

Leslie, Adrian R. 1979. *A Grammar of the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem Salish*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria dissertation.

Milsark, Gary. 1977. Toward an explanation of certain peculiarities of the existential construction of English. *Linguistic Analysis* 3. 1–29.

Montler, Timothy R. 2003. Auxiliaries and other categories in Straits Salishan. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69. 103–34.

Nguyen, Van Ngoc. 1932. *Truyen Co Nuoc Nam [Old Tales of Vietnam]*, vol. 1. Hanoi: People.

Philip, Joy N. 2012. Subordinating and coordinating linkers. London: University College London dissertation.

Raffo, Yolanda. 1972. *A phonology and morphology of Songish, a dialect of Straits Salish*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria dissertation.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: The Free Press.

Shank, Scott. 2001. And-fronting and the copula in Upper Chehalis. *Papers for the 36th International Conference on Salish and Neigbouring Languages. UBCWPL* 4, 265–289. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.

Suttles, Wayne P. 2004. *Musqueam reference grammar*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Thompson, Ellen. 1994. The structure of tense and the syntax of temporal adverbs. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics.*

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. The control system: A major category in the grammar of Salishan languages. *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages*, 154–76. Victoria, BC: British Columbia Provincial Museum.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1985. Control in Salish grammar. *Relational Typology* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 28), 391–428. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wolvengrey, Arok E. 2011. *Semantic and pragmatic functions in Plains Cree syntax*. Utrecht: LOT.