Pronominal Clitics and Indexability Hierarchies in Hanis and Miluk Coosan

Paul D. Kroeber

Anthropological Linguistics, Volume 55, Number 2, Summer 2013, pp. 105-157 (Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/anl.2013.0006

Pronominal Clitics and Indexability Hierarchies in Hanis and Miluk Coosan

PAUL D. KROEBER

Indiana University

Abstract. The subject and object pronominal clitics of the two Coosan languages, Hanis and Miluk, and their associations with inflectional affixes of the verb are examined on the basis of available text corpora, supplementing and correcting Frachtenberg's original description of the Hanis forms. In Hanis, an additional proclitic position must be recognized in certain imperative and transitive clauses, differing syntactically from the position of the ordinary proclitics; also, the Algonquian-like hierarchy privileging second person over first person that holds for singular enclitics requires modification for nonsingular ones. In Miluk, the pronominal enclitics differ dramatically from the Hanis proclitics in syntactic position and in some cases also in shape, but in most other respects seem comparable in behavior, as do patterns of inflectional suffixation of verbs. Brief comparative remarks are offered on other languages of the southerly Pacific Northwest.

1. Introduction. Hanis and Miluk, the so-called Coosan languages of the southern Oregon coast, are extinct but have been reasonably well documented. Hanis was described in a long grammatical sketch by Leo Frachtenberg (1922a), who had earlier published a collection of Hanis texts collected by himself and by Harry Hull St. Clair (Frachtenberg 1913). Melville Jacobs subsequently published small collections of Hanis texts (Jacobs 1939:19–38, 63–70, 1940:133–36, 227–38) and a much larger corpus of Miluk texts (the remainder of Jacobs 1939, 1940), although he produced no grammatical description of Miluk.[1]

The present article draws on these sources to examine subject and object pronominal clitics and their interactions with verb inflection in Hanis and Miluk. One principal purpose is to draw on the text corpus to extend the description of Hanis pronominal clitics beyond what is covered in Frachtenberg's grammar. Since the corpus is closed, it is often impractical to pursue any given topic in depth; crucial evidence may be scantily attested or absent. Instead, I discuss an assortment of topics ranging over the domain of pronominal clitic grammar. Sections 2–5 focus on Hanis. The sketch of Hanis clause structure in section 2 provides background to the subsequent discussion of both languages. The Hanis pronominal clitic (specifically, proclitic) paradigm, the basic patterns of pronominal clitic usage, and the interaction of proclitics with suffixal inflection of the verb and with negation are presented in section 3. These patterns are reminiscent of Algonquian; notably, in clauses that involve both a first person and a second person participant, pronominal proclitics obey a hierarchy in which expression of second person takes precedence over first person, while special

suffixation of various sorts is used in clauses with a first or second person object. Section 4 considers various complications that arise in imperative clauses and in transitive clauses involving nonsingular first and second person arguments: an additional proclitic position needs to be recognized, and simple second person prominence ceases to hold when nonsingular first person acts on second person. Possible approaches to more formal analysis of the Hanis clitics, including the role that indexability hierarchies might play, are examined in section 5.

Section 6 outlines the grammar of pronominal clitics in Miluk as I currently understand it. This will, I hope, facilitate more effective use of the Miluk text corpus for both synchronic and diachronic study—including the troublesome question of just what the nature of the relationship between Hanis and Miluk actually is. The wider areal distribution of Hanis and Miluk person marking patterns is considered programmatically in section 7; this includes the issue of what to make of the Algonquian-like aspects of those patterns.

Presentation of examples is modernized, rather than exactly reproducing the transcriptions of the sources. The representation of Hanis in examples taken from Frachtenberg's work (examples with sources noted as "FCoosT", "FGr") differs somewhat from that in examples from Jacobs ("JH"); this and other issues of transcription are discussed in an appendix.

2. Basic clause structure in Hanis. The order of constituents of the clause is quite free in Hanis, although it is common for the verb to precede nominals and adpositional phrases. Mithun (1987) has noted some pragmatic effects of different orders—indefinite expressions tend to occur early, as proposed by Dryer (1983), though new topics, contrastive foci, and expressions whose referents are relatively salient or important do so as well. Constituent order freedom is facilitated by an ergative case proclitic *x̌=* (Frachtenberg's "discriminative" [1922a:324–25]) for nominal subjects of transitive verbs, as in (1) and (2).[2] As can be seen in (1), the ergative proclitic follows articles (as does the locative proclitic *n=* [Frachtenberg 1922a:323]); it also follows possessive pronominal clitics when these are present. Moreover, as shown in (2), it precedes quantificational and adjectival modifiers.

(1) *kʸiɬú·w–it hə= wixʸí·lis lə=***x̌=** *hú·ʔmis*
see–TR ART= food ART=**ERG=** woman
'The woman saw the food.' (FCoosT 64.16–17; FGr 324)

(2) ***x̌=****yúxʷe· me· ƛ̓ú·hkʸin·–éiwat x̌=pqái–hi·č*
ERG=two person support–FREQ ADV=back=LOC
'Two men supported him from the back.' (FCoosT 40.9; FGr 425)

The ergative proclitic is not completely obligatory on subjects of transitives (at least those with human referents), as (3) shows; however, it never appears at all on the subjects of intransitive verbs, nor on objects, as (4) and (5) exemplify.

(3) *á·yu* ***yúxʷe·*** ***me·*** *ƛ'ú·hkʸin·–éiwat*
indeed two person support–FREQ
'Two men were supporting him.' (FCoosT 40.5–6; FGr 424)

(4) *pí·hpi·* ***lə=*** ***dé·miɬ***
go.home ART= man
'The man went home.' (FCoosT 56.11)

(5) ***tú·miɬ*** ***mé·*** *kʸiɬú·w–it*
old.man person see–TR
'He saw an old man.' (FCoosT 22.25)

Transitive verbs are often, but not always, marked as such by a transitive, causative, or other suffix, as in examples above. Nominals can act as predicates without a copula, as in (6a) and (6b).

(6a) ***hatá·yims*** *hé=ʔiɬ=* *áləš*
money ART=3P.PS= stake
'Their stake (in the game) is money.' (FCoosT 93.21)

(6b) *aʔyú* *=gʷə* ***éqe***, . . .
indeed =CJCTR corpse
'That must have been a dead person, . . .' (JH 23.2–3)

Some clause-level second position enclitics exist. The commonest is the future marker *=hanƛ* (Frachtenberg 1922a:384), seen in (7a) and (7b); also frequent is the customary marker *=he*, shown in (8). (When these two enclitics cooccur, they take a special contracted form *=hanƛawe*.)

(7a) *łkʼʷ–i·* ***=hanƛ*** *tə=* *ǩa·ʔp*
run.down–ANTICAUSATIVE =FUT ART= water
'That water shall run down.' (FCoosT 16.9)

(7b) *ǩá·ʔp–ač* ***=hanƛ*** *is=* *ƛʔãn*
water–ALL =FUT 1D.INCL= go.down.to.water
'We two will go down into the water.' (FCoosT 54.12)

(8) *in* ***=hé·*** *dí·ɬ* *kʸƛúh–c*
not =CUST what find(?)–TR(?)
'He never found anything.' (JH 230.4)

"Second position" is a convenient oversimplification. Clause-initial connectives are not counted in determining second position; the connective does not host enclitics, while the word following it does. Connectives of this sort include *ta* 'and', as in (9a), and the demonstrative particle *lau* 'then', as in (9b) (though *lau* has various other uses); subordinators such as *i* 'if, when' do host enclitics, however.[3]

(9a) ***ta*** *či·* ***=he*** *ɬac–ú·t–ẽm*
and there =CUST fetch–FREQ(?)–IMPERS
'And someone would go and get it.' (FCoosT 92.13)

(9b) . . . ***lau*** *x̌=we·nǰ* ***=he*** *e?=k^{w}isk^{w}í·?–iɬ* *lə=x̌=* *má·qa{χ}*
DEM ADV=thus =CUST 2S=RDP.inform–INV ART=ERG= crow
'. . . (then) Crow customarily thus informs thee.' (FCoosT 15.1–2)

It is also clear that second position enclitics can follow a phrase that consists of more than one full phonological word when that phrase is the first constituent of the clause, as in (10a) and (10b). (Phrases consisting of an article or possessive pronominal plus a noun are probably just a single phonological word. The phrases in (10a) and (10b) are more robust than that.)[4]

(10a) *cé·yux^{w}* *yix̌é·wəx̌* ***=hanχ*** *e?=hawh–c*
small house =FUT 2S=build–TR
'You shall build a small house.' (FCoosT 68.28)

(10b) *gous* *míle·č* ***=hanχ awe*** *x̌=lé?–ič* *e?=χ'é·–x̌əm*
all when =FUT.CUST INSTR=DEM–INSTR 2S=speak–RESULTATIVE(?)
'You shall be talking with it (this language) all the time.' (FCoosT 19.2)

I am aware of no evidence that enclitics such as *=hanχ* and *=he* can be inserted in the middle of such phrases. Presumably, then, no role is played in Hanis enclitic placement by phonologically driven processes analogous to the "prosodic inversion" that Halpern suggests switches the order of an enclitic and a following word in Serbo-Croatian (Halpern 1995:3–5, 13–23). While the fact that Hanis enclitics require some sort of overt host to their left may reflect a prosodic requirement of these enclitics, the processes by which enclitic and host end up in their surface order could well be ordinary syntactic ones, such as movement of a phrasal constituent to a syntactic position to the left of the syntactic position occupied by the enclitic.[5]

3. The Hanis pronominal proclitics: the basic set and its functions. Hanis has a set of pronominal proclitics used as both subjects and objects, presented in table 1. (The table follows Frachtenberg [1922a:321–22, 350–52], but notes some allomorphy detectable only in Jacobs's data. Not all types of allomorphy are shown; see below for further discussion.) There is a three-way number opposition for all persons, with dual in addition to plural; exclusive and inclusive are distinguished in the first person dual, but not the first person plural. The third person singular form is zero (not normally shown in examples).

As Doty (2011, 2012) points out, variation in the phonetic forms of some of the proclitics as they appear in Jacobs's texts, to a considerable extent, reflects systematic allomorphy: the first person singular proclitic appears as *(?)ən=* before coronal obstruents, while elsewhere it takes the shape *?nə=* (sometimes

nə=); the second person singular proclitic is normally *e=* (sometimes *eh=*) rather than *eʔ=* before obstruents (this proclitic often displays the vowel quality *a* before word-initial *ʔa*, and sometimes before other words with *a* in the initial syllable). Some less systematic variation appears in the first person dual exclusive, first person plural, and second person plural proclitics, where Jacobs sometimes records the vowel as *ə* rather than *i*; the first person dual exclusive also appears as *xʷun=*. None of these variants appear in Frachtenberg's texts; for instance, he writes the first person proclitic consistently as *ən=* (⟨n̥⟩, in his orthography) and the second person singular proclitic consistently as *eʔ=*. I assume (in part from having worked with Frachtenberg's Alsea material) that Frachtenberg was inclined to normalize the transcription of words and morphemes that he recognized, while Jacobs had a greater tolerance for recording variation—probably including both variation actually existing in speakers' pronunciations, and variation in his own perceptions.

Table 1. Hanis Pronominal Proclitics

	SINGULAR	DUAL	PLURAL
FIRST PERSON	*ən=*, *(ʔ)nə=*	*xʷin=* (EXCL) *is=* (INCL)	*ɬin=*
SECOND PERSON	*eʔ=*, *e(h)=*	*iš=*	*šin=*
THIRD PERSON	*Ø=*	*uxʷ=*	*iɬ=*

NOTE: The proclitics written with initial vowel in the table presumably actually have an initial glottal stop in most circumstances (*ʔən=*, *ʔeʔ=*, *ʔuxʷ=*, etc.), but, following Frachtenberg's and Jacobs's practice, I leave it unwritten after a word boundary (indicated by a space; see appendix, section A3).

Possessive pronominal proclitics within the NP, not examined in this article, are identical to the subject-object forms of table 1, except for second person singular *ye(ʔ)=* and third person singular *u=* (Frachtenberg 1922a:396–99).

Subject and object uses of proclitics are discussed in sections 3.1–3.3. All the proclitics of the basic set in table 1 can express the subject. They can also express the object, but when the object is first or second person, various complications arise: the verb requires various kinds of special suffixation in addition to a proclitic, and there are restrictions on the combinability of first and second person proclitics; in most cases, a first person subject or object is not expressed by a proclitic when the verb also has a second person argument. A further difference between third person proclitics, on the one hand, and first and second person proclitics, on the other, is that the third person proclitics are optional (see section 3.4). Finally, negative clauses present some special features (see section 3.5): the proclitics take the negator as their host, often contracting with it, and it can be separated from the predicate proper.

3.1. Basic position and functions of the proclitics. In general, the Hanis pronominal proclitics are fixed on the predicate of the clause, wherever the

predicate occurs; in (11a) and (11b), contrast the placement of the second position enclitic *=hanƛ̓* with that of first person *ən=*.

(11a) ***ən=****pí·hpi·* *=hanƛ̓*
1S=go.home =FUT
'I shall go home.' (FCoosT 146.12)

(11b) *báltiǰ–a* *=hanƛ̓* ***ən=****pí·hpi·*
ocean–DIRECTION =FUT 1S=go.home
'I am going home to the ocean.' (FCoosT 88.27–28)

Most often, the predicate is a verb. The proclitics may code the subject of either an intransitive verb, as in (11a) and (11b), or a transitive verb, as in (12a) and (12b).

(12a) ***ən=****ƛ̓'nóu–t* *hə=* *č̓ílə*
1S=open–TR ART= door
'I opened the door.' (FCoosT 74.9)

(12b) ***eʔ=****du·w–á·ya* *=u·ƛ̓* *=i·*
2S=want–TR =COND =YNQ
'Would you like her?' (FCoosT 70.10)

They also code the subjects of nonverbal predicates, such as the adjective in (13a), the simple nouns in (13b) and (13c), and the nominal phrases (or compounds?) *x̌=čí·č–u· me·* 'what sort of person' and *iluxqáinis me·* 'medicine-man' in (13d).

(13a) *cu·* ***eʔ=****láγi·*
now 2S=good
'Now you are all right.' (FCoosT 146.16)

(13b) *hac* *yu·* *gous* ***iɬ=*** *hu·ʔmé·kʸe*
just very all 3P= women
'They were all women.' (FCoosT 50.10–11)

(13c) ***eʔ=****šxʸimɬ* *=hanƛ̓* . . .
2S=black.bear =FUT
'You shall be a bear . . .' (FCoosT 172.26)

(13d) ***eʔ=****x̌=čí·č–u·* *mé·?* — ***ən=****(ʔ)iluxqáinis* *me·* *=il*
2S=ADV=how–WHQ person — 1S=medicine person =surely
'"What sort of person are you?" — "I am a medicine-man."' (FCoosT 10.2)

There is reasonably good evidence that adjectives such as *láγi* 'good' constitute a distinct part of speech, rather than being a type of stative verb. As modifiers within noun phrases, adjectives precede the modified noun, as in (14),

while verbs normally form relative clauses that follow the noun, as seen in (15a) and (15b).

(14) [$_{NP}$ *yíx̌ei* ***lə́γi·*** ***cé·yux^{w}*** *hú·ʔmis*] *lau* *=hanƛ̓* *łin=* *á·c-a* *tə=* *wínqas*
one good small woman DEM =FUT 1P= give-DAT ART= spider
u= *temísne·č*
3.PS= grandson
'We will give a pretty, little woman to Spider's grandson.' (FCoosT 70.3–5)

(15a) *sí·ht-c-a* [$_{NP}$ *lə=x̌=* *me·* ***qáqaƛ̓***]
scent-TR-DAT(?) ART=ERG= person sleep
'The man who slept scented it.' (FCoosT 102.8)

(15b) *hac* *k^{w}a* *líš-at* *x̌k^{w}ínauč* [$_{NP}$ *lə=* *quwáis* ***cx̌u·***]
just EVID shake-(?) in.appearance ART= board lie
'It seemed as if the board that lay (there) shook.' (FCoosT 58.21–22)

Inasmuch as the word that hosts a pronominal proclitic can be of any lexical category, provided that the word is serving as the syntactic predicate or as part of a phrasal predicate, the proclitics show "a relatively low degree of selection with respect to their hosts," a typical property of clitics according to Zwicky and Pullum (1983:503). On the other hand, they display some affix-like behavior in negative clauses (see section 3.5). For purposes of the present article, it is not crucial whether the forms in table 1 are best considered proclitics or prefixes; whichever they are, they are at any rate distinguishable from full-word independent pronouns (for some examples of the latter, see (32) and (33) in section 3.4), and the label "proclitic" is convenient.

As (16a) and (16b) and occasional examples elsewhere show, the pronominal proclitics are not possible hosts of second position enclitics such as *=hanƛ̓* 'future' and *=he* 'customary'; if a verb with a pronominal proclitic begins the clause, the enclitic follows the verb rather than the proclitic.

(16a) *eʔ=ƛ̓ú·w-iy-am* *=hanƛ̓*
2S=eat-(?)-DETR =FUT
'You shall eat.' (FCoosT 108.14–15)

(16b) *ux^{w}=* *címsimt* *=he*
3D= sleep.PL =CUST
'They two are sleeping.' (FCoosT 74.1)

The third person proclitics (dual or plural, since third person singular is zero) can be used as objects, as in (17a)–(17c). As seen in (17b) and (17c), a third person proclitic expressing the object precedes a first or second person proclitic expressing the subject (Frachtenberg 1922a:351–52), although text examples are few.

(17a) *yağá čí· iɬ=łuhd-áya hám·a*
still there 3P=watch-TR all
'She kept watching them there.' (JH 37.9)

(17b) *iɬ= eʔ=tú·h-ic*
3P= 2S=hit-TR
'you (sg.) hit them' (FGr 351)

(17c) *lau qac ux^{w}= ən=k^{w}iná?-eiwat*
DEM nonetheless 3D= 1S=see-FREQ(?)
'I just looked at them (two things).' (FCoosT 62.22)

First and second person proclitics can express object as well, but require special suffixal morphology on the verb (see sections 3.2 and 3.3).

The third person proclitics are not obligatory in either subject or object function (see section 3.4).

3.2. Inverse forms. When a third person acts on a first or second person (a "speech act participant"), the verb takes an inverse suffix *-u* or *-iɬ* (both written with long vowels by Frachtenberg) and a pronominal proclitic expresses the undergoer (Frachtenberg 1922a:350–52); examples of *-u* are seen in (18a)–(18c), and examples of *-iɬ* in (19a) and (19b).

(18a) *léu xú·x̌'u·š =hanx̌ **eh=**sğ-éc-**u***
DEM dangerous.being =FUT 2S=take-TR-INV
'Then (if I do that) a dangerous thing will take you.' (JH 22.3)

(18b) ***ən=**š?álšt-it-**u·** =hanx̌ he=?ən= x̌=mínkač*
1S=work-TR-INV =FUT ART=1S.PS= ERG=son.in.law
'My son-in-law shall work on me (to cure me).' (FCoosT 128.20)

(18c) . . . , *i **x^{w}in=** áiw-it-**u·***
if/when 1D.EXCL= kill.PL-TR-INV
'. . . , when they (pl.?) killed us two.' (FCoosT 120.23)

(19a) *ta **?nə=**mík^{y}meng^{y}-**iɬ***
and 1S=RDP.beat-INV
'and he (my husband) beats me' (JH 230.18)

(19b) *x̌=nousk^{y}íli· **ɬin=** mehé?-**i·ɬ***
ERG=giantess 1P= scare(?)-INV
'The (two) Giant Women scared us.' (FCoosT 84.9–10)

Just what determines the choice of inverse suffix is unclear. Frachtenberg points out that *-u* normally follows a transitive suffix such as *-(V)t* or *-(V)c*, while *-iɬ* does not. He further suggests that forms with transitive suffix and *-u* are used for "actions that have been performed once, or that are completed"

(perfective actions, approximately), while forms without transitive suffix and with *–iɬ* are used for an "action that has been performed more than once, or that has not been completed" (imperfective actions, approximately) (Frachtenberg 1922a:352). This may not account for all examples, however.[6]

When the third person actor of an inverse clause is nonsingular, a third person dual or plural proclitic, as in (20), may appear; as in direct (i.e., non-inverse) clauses with a third person object, the third person proclitic precedes the first or second person proclitic (Frachtenberg 1922a:351–52).

(20) . . . , *léu wenč* ***iɬ=****ʔən=cí·x̌tiʔ–it–u*
DEM thus 3P=1S=do–TR–INV
'. . . , that is what they did to me.' (JH 22.6)

Only a few textual examples of inverse clauses with an overt third person proclitic can be found, however, and it is clear that it is optional, like third person proclitics in other contexts; compare (19b) above and see the discussion in section 3.4.

I am not aware of any evidence that actor and undergoer in inverse clauses bear different syntactic relations than they do in direct clauses. Actor nominals in both types of clause are marked by the ergative proclitic *x̌=*, as is seen for inverse clauses in (18b) and (19b); while ergative marking in inverse clauses, such as (18a), is apparently optional, it is also optional in direct clauses (see section 2). While I do not rule out the possibility that some subtler evidence might emerge that actors in inverse clauses are not subjects, for present purposes I use the terms "subject" and "actor" interchangeably when speaking of transitive clauses, and likewise the terms "object" and "undergoer".[7]

3.3. Interactions of speech act participants. Special suffixes mark action of second person on first person and vice versa: *–a(·)ʔis* 'second person subject—first person object' (2→1), as in (21), and *–a·mi* 'first person subject—second person object' (1→2), as in (22). A suffix *–əm* is used instead of *–a(·)ʔis* when the object bears a dative or benefactive relation to the verb.[8] Regardless of which is subject/actor and which is object/undergoer, the second person pronominal proclitic appears (Frachtenberg 1922a:350–52). This implies that a hierarchy operates among the pronominal proclitics in which second person outranks first person. (Complications arise when the subject/actor is dual or plural; see section 4.2 and section 5 for fuller discussion of issues relating to person hierarchies.)

(21) ***eʔ=****piʔ–i·t–****á·ʔis*** *=hanx̌*
2S=take.home–CAUS–2→1 =FUT
'You shall carry me home.' (FCoosT 30.12)

(22) *halt' =hanx̌ xʷíl·uxʷ–i·č* ***eʔ=****x̌x̌'–c–****á·mi***
now =FUT head–LOC 2S=club–TR–1→2
'Now I will hit you over the head.' (FCoosT 66.2)

I suspect that *–a(·)ʔis* and *–a·mi* originally were simply object suffixes for first person and second person, respectively, and that they became limited to interactions between first and second person because the expression of third person acting on first or second person was taken over by the inverse construction.[9]

3.4. Optionality of the nonsingular third person proclitics. While Frachtenberg does not specifically note the point, it is clear from textual data that the third person proclitics are not obligatory. As subjects, they tend to be omitted when a subject nominal expression (underlined) is present, as is seen in the intransitive clauses in (23a)–(23b) and the transitive clauses in (24a)–(24b).

(23a) *x̌=qat* *me·* **Ø=** *til·áqai*
ADV(?)=below person Ø= dwell
'People were living down below.' (FCoosT 36.11)

(23b) *we·nǰ* **Ø=** *yá·la–ni·* *lə= tímiɬi·*
thus Ø= speak.PL–PRG ART= men.PL
'Thus the men were speaking.' (FCoosT 56.20)

(24a) *x̌=yúxʷe· me·* **Ø=** *x̌'u·hkʸin·–éiwat* *x̌=pqáih=ič*
ERG=two person Ø= support–FREQ ADV=back=LOC
'Two men supported him from the back.' (FCoosT 40.9)

(24b) *láu* **Ø=** *kʷná–iwat* *le= x̌= mé* *lé=* *ǰulé·ʔyex̌'* *kʷɬiʔyix̌*
then Ø= see–FREQ ART= ERG= people ART= wonderful(?) rock
'(Since that time) the people have seen these wonderful rocks.' (JH 69.4–5)

(In many of the clear examples of clauses with an overt nonsingular NP as subject/actor, the NP has *me·* 'person, people' as its head noun. However, other head nouns can occasionally be found, showing that neither occurrence nor nonoccurrence of a cross-referencing pronominal proclitic for subject/actor is an idiosyncrasy of *me·*.)

The third person proclitic may be present, however, "doubling" the subject NP, as is seen for the intransitive clauses in (25a)–(25b) and for the transitive clauses in (26a)–(26b).

(25a) *či·* ***uxʷ=*** *hél·aq* *lə= temísin*
there 3D= arrive ART= grandsons
'His grandchildren arrived there.' (FCoosT 20.12)

(25b) *yíx̌en* *qaɬimí·ye* *ci* *na·ʔnt* *ča·níya* ***iɬ=*** *yix̌enčene–hí·ye,* *lə=* *me·*
one morning many young.man 3P= together–INCH ART= person
n–x̌'tá·yas
LOC–village
'One morning many young men came together, people from the village.' (FcoosT 76.23)

(26a) *x=we·nǰ k^{w}e* ***ux^{w}=*** *i·ʔlt* *lə=x̌= təm·é·ƛ̓e*
ADV=thus EVID(?) 3D= tell ART=ERG= old.people.PL
'Thus the two old people said to him.' (FCoosT 132.7)

(26b) *ná·ʔnt me·* ***iɬ=*** *k'^{w}in–éiwat*
many person 3P= shoot–FREQ
'Many people were shooting at her.' (FCoosT 160.16)

Pending further investigation, I suspect that a subject nominal expression tends to be doubled by a subject proclitic when the referent is specific or topical, as has been claimed for object clitics in some Slavic languages (e.g., Franks and King 2000:251–58).

In the absence of an overt subject nominal expression, it is evidently normal (perhaps required) for a third person dual or plural proclitic expressing the subject to appear, as is seen for intransitive, direct transitive, and inverse transitive clauses in (27a)–(27d).

(27a) *cu· á·yu qanú·ča* ***iɬ=*** *ƛ'eič*
now indeed outside 3P= go.out
'So they went outside.' (FCoosT 50.11)

(27b) *á·yu* ***ux^{w}=*** *ƛʔãn*
indeed 3D= go.down
'Surely they two went down (into the water).' (FCoosT 54.16)

(27c) *aʔyú čwéɬ* ***iɬ=****kʸɬúw–it, . . .*
indeed fire 3P=see–TR
'Sure enough they saw fire, . . .' (JH 229.9)

(27d) *. . . , léu wénč* ***iɬ=****ʔən=cí·xʸtiʔ–it–u*
then thus 3P=1S=do–TR–INV
'. . . , that is what they did to me.' (JH 22.6)

For objects of transitive verbs, on the other hand, third person proclitics are normally avoided, even when the clause contains no overt nominal object, as in (28a) and (28b).[10]

(28a) *híni· =hanƛ eʔ=kʸiɬú·w–it, . . .*
there =FUT 2S=see–TR
(Context: 'Perhaps they (pl.) play there.) 'You will see them there, . . .' (FCoosT 98.13–14)

(28b) *du·w–á·ya hə=x̌= dé·miɬ*
want–TR ART=ERG= man
(Context: 'The (two) women were pretty.') 'The man liked them.' (FCoosT 126.17)

Third person object proclitics are not absolutely prohibited, however, as (29a) and (29b) show; since the evidence is limited, it is not clear what factors favor or disfavor the presence of a proclitic.

(29a) *yağá čí· **iɬ=**ɬuhd-áya hám·a*
still there 3P=watch-TR all
'She kept watching them there.' (JH 37.9)

(29b) *lau qac **ux^{w}=** ən=k^{w}iná^{ʔ}-eiwat*
DEM nonetheless 2D= 1S=see-FREQ(?)
'I just looked at them (two things).' (FCoosT 62.22)

Two nonsingular third person proclitics evidently never appear on one predicate, even when subject and object of the clause are both nonsingular third person, as in (30a) and (30b).

(30a) *x̌= wénč =hé· **iɬ=**ʔi^{ʔ}lt le= hí·me*
ADV= thus =CUST 3P=tell ART= children
'That is the way they tell their children.' (JH 68.5–6)

(30b) *cú **ux^{w}=**k^{y}ɬúw-it le= čán·γa le= x̌= ğéneč me*
now 3D=see-TR ART= youths ART= ERG= girls person
'Now the (two) girls saw the (two) young men.' (JH 236.6–7)[11]

In the few clauses in the corpus, such as (31), in which the subject and object are both nonsingular third person, but of different numbers, a proclitic that appears expresses subject rather than object—which is not surprising, given that third person objects tend not to be expressed by proclitics in any case.

(31) *ma· yúx^{w}e· me· ɬa, yíqa **iɬ=** cx̌aʔú·w-at*
even.if two person go nonetheless(?) 3P= kill-TR
'Even if two persons passed by, still they (five Grizzly brothers) would kill them.' (FCoosT 90.10)

As far as I can determine, first and second person subject proclitics are never omitted, even when an independent pronominal subject is present, as in (32a)–(33). There seem not to be clear examples in the corpus in which an object is represented by a first or second person independent pronoun, so I cannot say for certain that pronominal proclitics for the object are retained in this context—though I expect that they would be.

(32a) *his =hanx̌ ə́nne čí· **ən=**ɬa*
also =FUT 1S.INDP there 1S=go
'I too will go there.' (FCoosT 94.22)

(32b) ***ən=****kʸiɬú·w–it* *=hanƛ* *<u>náx̌kan</u>*
1S=see–TR =FUT 1S.INDP.ERG
'I want to see him.' (FCoosT 180.6)

(33) *his* *=hanƛ* *<u>éx̌kan</u>* *yix̌éi* ***eʔ=****kʷʔin–t*
also =FUT 2.INDP.ERG one 2S=shoot–TR
'You too ought to shoot one (arrow).' (FCoosT 13.1)

This might, of course, simply reflect the fact that first and second person arguments are intrinsically specific.[12]

3.5. Negative clauses. In negative clauses, pronominal proclitics appear on the negator *i·n* (Frachtenberg) ~ *in* (Jacobs) rather than on the verb or other predicate, as is seen in (34a)–(34d).

(34a) *ta* *lau* *kʷa* ***iɬ=*** ***i·n*** *cx̌aʔú·w–at* *lə=* *gʸé·we*
and DEM EVID 3P= not kill–TR ART= sea.otter
'So they did not kill the sea-otter.' (FCoosT 176.27–28)

(34b) ***uxʷ=*** ***i·n*** *kʷaʔá·n–i·ya*
3D= not know–TR
'They (two) did not know.' (FCoosT 74.23)

(34c) . . . , *léu* *ƛ̓éwe* ***xʷiʔín*** *ac–a*
DEM ever(?) 1D.EXCL.not give–DAT
'. . . , we never give them anything.' (JH 237.2)

(34d) . . . *y=anƛ* ***én=****q'aláu–t–á·ʔis*
if=FUT 2S.not=hurt–TR–2→1
'. . . if you do not hurt me.' (JH 134.2–3)

Several of the proclitics form special contractions with the negator (Frachtenberg 1922a:314); the paradigm of negative forms is shown in table 2, as far as it is known. (First person dual inclusive and second person dual forms do not seem to be attested, although there is little doubt about what they ought to be.) Some of the contractions reflect systematic processes, though not ones that appear in other contexts in the language as far as I am aware. Proclitics ending in *n* all lose the *n* before the negator. (The glottal stop that appears to replace the deleted *n* is presumably simply the word-initial glottal stop of the negator *i(·)n*, left unwritten in other contexts. Frachtenberg's spellings ⟨xwîˀn⟩, ⟨łîˀn⟩, and ⟨cîˀn⟩ may imply reduction or loss of the vowel *i(·)* of the negator, and my retranscriptions of examples from his data render it as such; however, Jacobs indicates that the negator's vowel is retained.[13]) The second person singular form, too, looks like a straightforward phonological reduction of the regular second person singular proclitic *eʔ=* plus the negator *i(·)n*, though again I am not aware of other contexts in the language in which this particular reduction occurs. The first

person singular form *ni·*, however, is a special portmanteau form, not explicable as the output of any ordinary phonological reduction of first person singular *ən=* plus negative *i(·)n*.

Table 2. Hanis Combinations of Pronominal Proclitics with Negator

	SINGULAR	DUAL	PLURAL
FIRST PERSON	*ni·*	*x^{w}i?(i)n* (EXCL.) (*is= i(·)n* (INCL.)?)	*łi?(i)n*
SECOND PERSON	*ẽn, en*	(*iš= i(·)n*?)	*ši?(i)n*
THIRD PERSON	*ø i(·)n*	*ux^{w}= i(·)n*	*iɬ= i(·)n*

NOTE: The forms written with initial vowel in the table presumably actually have an initial glottal stop in most circumstances (*?en, ?i(·)n, ?ux^{w}= ?i(·)n*, etc.), but I leave it unwritten after word boundary (see appendix). Jacobs typically writes the first person dual exclusive, first person plural, and second person plural negative forms as two words (usually separated by a dash: ⟨xwi–in⟩, ⟨łi–in⟩, ⟨ci–in⟩); these forms presumably represent *x^{w}i?in, łi?in, ši?in*, and are rendered thus in retranscriptions.

The fact that the proclitics form morphophonologically idiosyncratic combinations with a negator host is, of course, an affix-like rather than clitic-like trait according to Zwicky and Pullum (1983:504). On the other hand, the fact that the negator rather than the verb hosts the proclitic is a further instance of the proclitics being unselective as regards the lexical category of their host, a clitic-like property. (Recall that, besides the verb and the negator, nonverbal predicates of various categories—including phrases—host proclitics, as is pointed out in the discussion of (13) in section 3.1.) I therefore continue to speak of these pronominals as proclitics.[14]

A property of the negator not explicitly discussed by Frachtenberg but robustly exemplified in the text corpus is that, while the negator (along with its associated proclitics) always precedes the verb, it need not immediately precede it. That is, the negator is not simply another proclitic placed between the pronominal proclitics and the verb. Negator and verb can be separated not only by enclitics, as in (35a) and (35b), but also by more substantial material, such as the adverbs *asú·* 'again' in (36a) and (36b) or *či·č* 'somehow, anyhow' in (36b).

(35a) *ẽn* ***=hanƛ*** *qalau–t–á·mi*
2S.not =FUT hurt–TR–1→2
'I won't hurt you.' (FCoosT 180.27)

(35b) *lau iɬ= ni·* ***=hanƛ*** *k^{w}ína?–i·ł, . . .*
DEM 3P 1S.not =FUT see–INV
'They shall not see me . . .' (FCoosT 128.23–24)

(36a) *ẽn =hanƛ* ***asú·*** *k^{y}iłu·w–it–á·?is*
2S.not =FUT again see–TR–2→1
'You will not see me again.' (FCoosT 56.27)

(36b) *ní·* ***čí·č*** ***asú·*** *wútxe*
1S.not how again return
'I cannot come back.' (FCoosT 56.24)

Pronominals, nouns, or even short nominal phrases can appear between negator and verb, as in (37a)–(37c).

(37a) *i·n* ***qanč*** ***di·ʔɬ*** *kʷináʔ–eiwat*
not where what see–FREQ(?)
'Nowhere could he see anything.' (FCoosT 22.12–13)

(37b) *ma·* *áiwa* *iɬ=* *i·n* ***kʷek'ʷ*** *kʸiɬú·w–it*
at.all still 3P= not herring see–TR
'Still they (pl.) did not see any herring.' (FCoosT 32.2–3)

(37c) *ní·* *=hanƛ* ***kʷí·newéƛ'*** ***mehén·ehd–ič*** *ʔéikʸ*
1S.not =FUT poor people(?)–LOC be.among
'I will not mingle with poor people.' (JH 65.1–2)

Proclitics that are separated from the verb in negative clauses relate to the suffixal morphology of the verb in the same way as proclitics in nonnegative clauses: when first person acts on second person, the negator takes a second person proclitic and the verb takes the suffix *–a·mi*, as in (35a); when first person acts on second person, the negator takes a second person proclitic and the verb takes the suffix *–a(·)ʔis*, as in (36a); when third person acts on first, the negator takes a first person proclitic and the verb takes an inverse suffix, as in (35b); and so on.

Nonenclitic material between the negator and the verb is generally within the scope of negation. The narrative context of (36a), for instance, makes it clear that the speaker—a woman who is ending a visit to her family to return permanently to the seals with whom she is now living—means 'there will be no occasion on which you see me again', not 'there will again be an occasion on which you do not see me'. Nominals, pronominals (e.g., *di·(ʔ)ɬ* 'something, anything'), and adverbs of manner and location (e.g., *qanč* 'somewhere, anywhere', *či·č* 'somehow, anyhow') in this position are typically nonspecific or nonreferential, as in the above examples.

Adverbs and indefinite nominals can precede the verb in nonnegative clauses, too, as seen in (38a) and (38b); in some cases, such as (39), they clearly have nonspecific or nonreferential interpretations analogous to those in negative clauses. But in the nonnegative cases, the pronominal proclitics attach directly to the verb rather than precede the indefinite nominal or adverb.

(38a) ***asú·*** *=hanƛ* ***qáxanč*** *eʔ=ƛuwítat*
again =FUT up 2S=run(?)
'You shall run up again.' (FCoosT 92.6–7)

(38b) ***mé*** *ʔni=kʸɬúʔw-ut*
person 1S=see–TR
'I saw a person (spy).' (JH 36.2)

(39) *y=anx̌awe* ***me·*** *eʔ=kʷináʔ-eiwat, . . .*
if=FUT.CUST person 2S=see–FREQ(?)
'When you see a person, . . .' (no particular person is meant) (FCoosT 19.5)

A usefully close contrast is seen in (40) and (41). In both, the indefinite adverbial *x̌=čí·č* 'somehow, anyhow' (a fuller variant of *čí·č*) occurs before the verb and after an operator-like element—the negator in (40)[15] and the modal particle *naci·* 'it is doubtful that . . .' in (41). And in both examples, the indefinite adverbial is clearly not referential. (Though Frachtenberg did not directly render it in his own free translations, it evidently means something like 'in any way' or 'at all', within the scope of the operator-like element and emphasizing the impossibility or unlikeliness of the event.) But in (40), the first person plural proclitic attaches to the negator and precedes the indefinite adverbial, while in (41) the same proclitic follows the indefinite adverbial and attaches to the verb.

(40) ***ɬiʔn*** *=šanx̌* ***x̌=čí·č*** *sq–ac*
1P.not EXPECTED ADV=how seize–TR
'We cannot seize her at all.' (FCoosT 56.18)

(41) *naci·* ***x̌=čí·č*** ***ɬin=*** *sq–ac*
DOUBT ADV=how 1P= seize–TR
'We doubt whether we shall catch her at all.' (FCoosT 56.19–20)

In other words, separation of the pronominal proclitics from the verb in negative clauses is clearly due to the presence of the negator, not to the presence of nonspecific or nonreferential expressions before the verb. Possibly, then, informally speaking, the syntactic position of the proclitics differs in positive and negative clauses: immediately before the verb in a positive clause, but in some sort of earlier position, preceding the negator and indefinite material, when the negator is present. (In a movement-based syntactic framework, one might wish to explore the possibility that the proclitics are base-generated immediately before the verb, but move up to the negator in negative clauses.)[16]

4. An additional proclitic position in Hanis. Besides the positions occupied by the proclitics of the basic set as discussed in section 3, an additional proclitic or prefixal position must be recognized; it is occupied by a second person morpheme that resembles, but still must be distinguished from, the second person singular proclitic of the basic set. Such a second person morpheme appears in certain imperative clauses (see section 4.1), and in transitive clauses where nonsingular first person acts on second person nonsingular (see section 4.2). In the transitive clauses, moreover, the otherwise valid generalization that second person prevails over first person in proclitic choice partially breaks down.

4.1. Imperatives. Hanis has a variety of imperative formations. For present purposes, many details are not crucial; a rapid survey suffices.

Some intransitive imperatives, such as those in (42a) and (42b), are marked by suffixes (Frachtenberg 1922a:348).

(42a) *łáʔ-**ax̌***
go-IMV
'Go on!' (JH 25.10)

(42b) *hac ƛ̓u·w-**ẽn***
just eat-IMV
'Just eat!' (FCoosT 104.13)

For transitive imperatives with third person object, as in (43), a suffix *-ə* is used for most transitives (Frachtenberg 1922a:347; the suffix also appears as *-a* or *-e* in Jacobs's material).

(43) *kʷíʼyałʼ asúʼ kʼʷín-t-**ə***
now again shoot-TR-IMV
'Shoot it again!' (FCoosT 13.3–4)

Some transitive imperatives with first person object (not of a dative or benefactive sort) use a special variant of the second-person-acting-on-first-person suffix, namely, *-əʔis*, as in (44), at least according to Frachtenberg (1922a:349).[17] (This form does not appear in Jacobs's texts.)

(44) *teʔ=ʔən= n=qátqaiƛ̓ yiǰuxʷ-**áʔis***
ART=1S.PS LOC=belt hold.on-1→2.IMV
'Hold me by this my belt.' (FCoosT 54.12)

However, sometimes the ordinary form of this suffix, *-a(·)ʔis*, appears in imperatives, as seen in (45).

(45) *ǰtemáʔač ǰƛ̓-c-**áʼʔis***
crossways club-TR-2→1
'Hit me crossways.' (FCoosT 64.28–29)

As seen in the examples above, with all these types of imperative, the second person singular proclitic *eʔ=* is not used. Transitive imperatives with first person object, as in (44) and (45), have no first person proclitic, either (see section 5 for discussion).

Dual or plural subjects of imperatives of the above types are marked by a second person dual or plural proclitic, in addition to the imperative suffix (if any), as is seen for intransitive verbs in (46a) and (46b) and for a transitive verb in (47).

(46a) *gʸí·kʷa* *qáinas* ***iš=*** *tʰailc-**ãn***
a.little.bit towards.fire/river 2D= dance-IMV
'You two dance somewhat closer (to the fire)!' (FCoosT 82.19)

(46b) *kʷi·yał* ***šin=*** *łá?-**əx̌***
now 2P= go-IMV
'Now go!' (FCoosT 32.6)

(47) *tei* ***iš=*** *q'm-íc-**ə***
DEM 2D= eat-TR-IMV
'You two eat this!' (FCoosT 120.16; FGr 347)

As far as can be determined, in negative imperative clauses, the second person dual or plural proclitic attaches to the negator, as in (48) (unfortunately, this may be the only relevant example in the corpus).

(48) ***ši?n*** *q'm-íc-**ə*** *tə=* *míłax̌*
2P.not eat-TR-IMV ART= lunch
(Then he said to his relatives:) 'Don't you eat this lunch.' (FCoosT 148.15)

For most intransitives, no special imperative suffix is used; a proclitic (or prefix) *e?=* appears instead (Frachtenberg 1922a:347), as in (49a) and (49b).

(49a) *yíhelq* ***e?=****alíšani·*
nearby IMV=play
'Play close by here!' (FCoosT 60.21)

(49b) *kʷí·yał* ***e?=****qáqał*
now IMV=sleep
'Now you sleep!' (FCoosT 102.3)

This imperative proclitic looks like the ordinary second person singular proclitic *e?=*, but must be distinguished from it on at least two grounds. For one thing, dual and plural imperatives of this sort combine imperative *e?=* with the second person dual and plural proclitics (Frachtenberg 1922a:321), as seen in (50) and (51); in nonimperative clauses, the dual and plural second person proclitics do not combine with second person singular *e?=*.[18]

(50) ***iš=e?=*** *stouq*
2D=IMV= stand
'You two stand up!' (FCoosT 120.15)

(51) ***šin=e?=*** *x̌ouq*
2P=IMV= get.up
'You (pl.) get up!' (FCoosT 68.21, 122.8–9)

For another thing, in negative intransitive imperatives, the element *e?=* consistently attaches to the verb rather than to the negator, as is shown in (52a)–(52c); the ordinary second person singular proclitic *e?=* attaches to (and contracts with) the negator (see section 3.5).[19]

(52a) ***i·n*** *či·č* ***e?=****x̌ałał* *temísi·*
not how IMV.INTR=do.RDP(?) grandson
'Don't you do anything, grandson.' (FCoosT 100.25)

(52b) ***ín*** ***é=****cix*^{y}
not IMV.INTR=(be).here
'Don't stay here!' (JH 32.1–2)

(52c) ***ín*** *gu·s* *ǰí·č* ***e=****ƛ?é-x̌em*
not all how IMV.INTR=speak-RFL
'do not be talking every which way!' (JH 238.3)

One would certainly like to know what happens in negative dual and plural imperatives of predicates that form the imperative with *e?=*, but there do not seem to be any relevant examples in the corpus.

As Frachtenberg notes, imperative morphology also cooccurs with the hortative particles, first person dual (inclusive) *k*^{w}*is* (in Jacobs's transcription, *g*^{w}*əs*) and first person plural *k*^{w}*in*, seen in (53a)–(53b) and (54), respectively;[20] these particles historically must represent contractions of some modal element with the corresponding pronominal proclitics (1922a:393). Unlike the ordinary pronominal proclitics, while they precede the verb, they need not do so immediately; various kinds of adverbs, at least, may intervene. (Too few examples are attested to determine what the range of possible intervening elements is. In all of them, the hortative particles are clause-initial.)

(53a) ***k*^{w}*is*** *k*^{w}*í·yał* *asú·* *łá?-****əx̌***
HORT.1D.INCL now again go-IMV
'Now let us two go again.' (FCoosT 124.22)

(53b) ***k*^{w}*is*** *ƛx̌-át-****ə***
HORT.1D.INCL chop-TR-IMV
'Let us two chop wood!' (FCoosT 26.15–16)

(54) ***k*^{w}*in*** *ƛe* *cx̌éw-****ə***
HORT.1P quickly kill-IMV
'Let us kill him quickly!' (FCoosT 68.3; FGr 393)

While in most examples, the verb is of a type that marks imperative by a suffix, a single example (55)—probably the only hortative example in Jacobs's texts—evidently has the imperative proclitic *e?=* (here realized as *?a=*).[21]

(55) *ʔéǰi!* ***gʷə́s=ʔa=****ʔálišáʔni*
come! HORT.1D.INCL=IMV.INTR=play
'Come! let us play a game.' (JH 29.6)

4.2. Interactions of nonsingular speech act participants. In a transitive clause where first person acts on second person, or vice versa, and both arguments are singular, the pronominal proclitics follow a person hierarchy such that a second person proclitic appears regardless of whether the second person argument is the subject/actor or the object/undergoer (see section 3.3). However, in some of the cases where one or both of the arguments is dual or plural, a first person proclitic appears.

When first person singular acts on second person dual or plural, the hierarchy is followed, as in (56) and (57); a second person proclitic of the appropriate number appears, but no first person proclitic.

(56) *ci* ***íš=*** *maǧán-yaxd-****a·mi***
just 2D= tease(?)-TR-1→2
'I was just playing with you (two).' (JH 228.8)

(57) *tei* *yiqánčəm* *di·s* *=hanƛ* *t'eht* ***šin=*** *qašč-****á·mi***
this.here behind always =FUT meat 2P= give.food-1→2
'After this I will always give you (pl.) meat.' (FCoosT 166.18–19)

The hierarchy is also followed when second person dual or plural acts on first person singular, as in (58).[22]

(58) ***ši ʔn*** *=hanƛ* *asú·* *kʸiłú·w-it-****á·ʔis***
2P.not =FUT again see-TR-2→1
'You (pl.) will not see me again.' (FCoosT 130.21)

It is also followed when nonsingular second person acts on nonsingular first person—or at any rate that is what (59) indicates, though unfortunately it seems to be the sole clear attestation of such clauses in the corpus.[23]

(59) *y=ánƛ* ***iš=****dúw-ayaxd-****á·ʔis*** ***iš=****sgʷíy-****aʔis*** *=hanƛ* *x̌=ǰí·č* *iš=x̌áłał*
if=FUT 2D=want-TR-2→1 2D=inform-2→1 =FUT ADV=how 2D=do.RDP(?)
'If you (two) want us (two), you must explain to us what you do.' (JH 236.12)

Clauses in which singular second person acts on dual or plural first person seem to be unattested in the corpus.

When first person dual or plural acts on second person, however, the hierarchy of section 3 is not followed. A first person dual or plural proclitic appears, along with a special second person object proclitic (or prefix) *eʔ=*, as seen in (60) and (61).

(60) *cu·* *=hanƛ* *náx̌kan* ***x^{w}in=*** ***e^{ʔ}=****i·^{ʔ}lt-****á·mi****, . . .*
now =FUT 1.INDP.ERG 1D.EXCL= 2.OB=tell-1→2
'When we two tell you (sg.), . . .' (FCoosT 126.21–22)

(61) *k'^{w}ányau* *=hanƛ* ***łən=^{ʔ}é=****q'ašǰ-****á·mi****, . . .*
food =FUT 1P=2.OB=give.food-1→2
'We will give you (sg.) food, . . .' (JH 229.20)

The *e^{ʔ}=* in these forms, like the imperative *e^{ʔ}=*, at first glance looks like the ordinary second person singular proclitic *e^{ʔ}=* (and in Jacobs's material it shows similar allomorphy, with final *^{ʔ}* lost before obstruents). In fact, however, second person object *e^{ʔ}=* must be distinguished from the ordinary second person singular proclitic. For one thing, the *e^{ʔ}=* that appears with nonsingular first person subject/actor is indifferent to the number of the object/undergoer; *e^{ʔ}=*, rather than a second person dual or plural proclitic, appears even when the object is dual or plural, as in (62) and (63).[24]

(62) *x^{w}ún=^{ʔ}é=duw-áyax̌d-á·mi*
1D.EXCL=2.OB=want-TR-1→2
'We (two) want (as wives) you (two).' (JH 236.11)

(63) *ci* *łin=* *e^{ʔ}=sici·^{ʔ}n-t-á·mi*
just 1P= 2.OB=visit-TR-1→2
'We just came to see you (pl.).' (FCoosT 130.19–20)

Moreover, it also seems that in negative clauses this *e^{ʔ}=* is fixed on the verb, like imperative *e^{ʔ}=*, rather than being attached to the negator like ordinary pronominal proclitics, while the nonsingular first person proclitic appears in the normal proclitic position before the negator. Unfortunately, the evidence is limited to the single example in (64).

(64) ***łi^{ʔ}ín*** ***e=****dúw-ayax̌d-a·mi*
1P.not 2.OB=want-TR-1→2
'We do not want you (sg.?)!' (JH 32.1–2)

In short, the *e^{ʔ}=* that appears in the context of a nonsingular first person subject/actor is a special element comparable to the *e^{ʔ}=* in imperatives. (Presumably, though, it is not a coincidence, at least diachronically, that these various distinguishable second person forms share the shape *e^{ʔ}=*.)[25]

5. Indexability hierarchies and related issues in Hanis. I do not attempt a formal analysis of the Hanis proclitics and the correlated verb morphology here. Since there are gaps in the data, especially for the phenomena surveyed in section 4, there may well not be enough evidence to conclusively support one analysis over others. Instead, I identify some things that a formal analysis would need to account for—especially, but not exclusively, the question of what

role indexability hierarchies might play among the principles governing proclitic occurrence in Hanis.[26]

The paradigmatic positions of pronominal proclitics and other person-marking morphology are summarized in the informal template in figure 1. Third person proclitics (dual and plural only, since third person singular is zero), in slot A, precede the ordinary first and second person proclitics, in slot B; the negator and material within its scope intervene in slot C between these elements and the special imperative marker of section 4.1 or the special second person object marker of section 4.2 (slot D), the verb and its derivational morphology (slot E), and the verb's inflectional suffixes (slot F).[27] The issue of an indexability hierarchy arises for several slots within this template, and these need to be considered separately; as Macaulay (2009:358) points out for Algonquian, it is more useful to think in terms of local hierarchies relevant to particular parts of the system, rather than a global hierarchy valid for the whole language.

A	B	C	D	E	F
3D 3P	1 2	negator . . .	IMV 2.OB	verb	INV 2→1 1→2 IMV

Figure 1. Informal template for Hanis proclitics and person marking.

For the inflectional suffixes, a simple hierarchy where first and second person outrank third person is relevant: an inverse suffix *-u* or *-iɬ* is used when third person acts on first or second, but not otherwise (see section 3.2). This hierarchy plays no role for the proclitics; third person proclitics (slot A of the template) can freely cooccur with other proclitics. Although third person proclitics are sometimes omitted, this has nothing to do with what the other arguments in the clause are: third person proclitics tend to be omitted when they are objects, regardless of what the subject is, and also when they would double an independent NP in the same argument role, regardless of what the person of the other argument in the clause is (see section 3.4).

The suffixes *-u* and *-iɬ* are not used for combinations of first and second person. There is no strong reason to think of either the second-person-acting-on-first suffixes *-a(·)ʔis* and *-m* (dative) or the first-person-acting-on-second suffix *-a·mi* as inverse. True, in many clauses with *-a·mi*, the proclitic occupying slot B represents the object/undergoer, as it does in clauses with *-u* or *-iɬ*, and this might suggest that *-a·mi* is a sort of inverse marker, as is sometimes suggested for first-person-acting-on-second-person "thematic" suffixes in Algonquian languages. However, the correlation of *-a·mi* with an object proclitic in slot B does not hold in all cases; in some *-a·mi* clauses the slot B proclitic is the

subject/actor—namely, when the subject/actor is dual or plural first person (see examples (60)–(64) in section 4.2). Hence, I reject the idea that *-a·mi* is an inverse.[28] More generally, the choice of proclitic is best seen as independent of the choice of suffix.[29]

Turning to the first and second person proclitics, there is a sense in which second person is uniformly prominent over first person in Hanis: in any nonimperative clause containing a second person argument and a first person argument, some sort of second person marker will occur among the proclitics—either one of the ordinary second person proclitics in slot B of the template, or the special second person object marker in slot D—whereas a first person argument is in many cases left unrepresented among the proclitics in the presence of a second person argument. (Slot D is in part a place where second person is morphologically represented when it is excluded from slot B.)

More narrowly, there is the matter of determining whether it is a first person argument or a second person argument that is represented in slot B, where the two are mutually exclusive. An indexability hierarchy that references only person, and in which second person outranks first (2 > 1)—meaning that slot B is always occupied by a second person proclitic if the clause contains a second person argument—accounts for many clauses in Hanis, but fails when a nonsingular first person acts on second person (again, see examples (60)–(64)). One might try to account for these clauses by revising the indexability hierarchy so that dual or plural first person outranks second person, while second person continues to outrank first person singular: 1D/1P > 2 > 1S. However, this reformulation of the hierarchy is not adequate either, if we can trust the evidence of (59). There, in a clause in which the nonsingular first person is the object rather than the subject, a second person rather than a first person proclitic appears in slot B. Example (59), especially its first clause, forms a near-minimal contrast with (62). The clauses are identical in terms of the person and number features of their arguments—all are transitive clauses with a first person dual argument and a second person dual argument—but which of these arguments is represented by a slot B proclitic depends on which one is the subject. While it is unfortunate that conclusions have to rest on just two crucial examples, still, as far as the evidence goes, it seems that the principles that determine whether slot B is occupied by a first person or a second person proclitic must refer to the grammatical relations of the arguments, not just to an indexability hierarchy that takes account only of their referential properties such as person and number. Informally, the rules for slot B in nonimperative clauses are as follows: it is occupied by a nonsingular first person proclitic expressing the subject; if there is no such subject, then it is occupied by a second person proclitic if any argument is second person; and if there is no second person argument, it is occupied by a first person proclitic if any argument is first person.

Transitive imperatives with singular subject and a first person singular object (see examples (44) and (45), and discussion in section 4.1) clarify further

the nature of the principles that determine occupancy of slot B. In nonimperative clauses, one might think that second person prominence—the failure of singular first person arguments to be represented by a proclitic in a transitive clause in which the other participant is second person—results from competition between first and second person proclitics to occupy slot B, with a first person proclitic being blocked when a second person proclitic has preempted the slot. But imperative clauses such as (44) and (45) rule out this analysis: no second person proclitic appears, but neither does a first person proclitic. Rather, insertion of a first person singular proclitic in slot B is evidently prohibited when the subject of the clause is second person, regardless of whether that second person subject is coded by a proclitic or not. This implication is clear even though no information is available as to what happens when the first person object of an imperative is dual or plural.[30]

Another sort of complication that a more formal account would need to deal with is the fact that the pronominal proclitics (slots A and B) can be syntactically separated from the verb, at least in negative clauses (see section 3.5). The principles of proclitic occurrence, therefore, are not simply rules for the phonological exponence of morphological features of the verb. (As is seen in section 6, this problem is even more acute in Miluk, where the pronominal clitics are always second position enclitics, and thus can never be analyzed as part of the verb morphology.)[31]

It is clear, then, that while prominence of second person over first person figures among the factors governing proclitic choice and occurrence, it cannot be the whole story. Those who have carefully studied person and number marking in the Algonquian family are, of course, well aware that what is sometimes alleged to be a straightforward system of second person prominence in those languages is, in fact, considerably more complicated than that,[32] but complications arise, too, in the morphologically simpler system of Hanis.

Algonquian patterns of person marking are an obvious typological point of reference in the discussion above. Section 7 raises the question of whether these similarities of pattern, some of which extend to Miluk as well (see section 6), might have diachronic significance.

6. Miluk. The only published sources from which substantial information on Miluk grammar or lexicon can be derived are the text collections published by Melville Jacobs (1939, 1940); discussion here is based on these texts. It should be borne in mind that Annie Miner Peterson, from whom Jacobs obtained this corpus in 1933 and 1934, was a last or near-last speaker of Miluk whose primary language in her adult life had been Hanis (e.g., Jacobs 1939:4). (She was also the source of Jacobs's smaller corpus of Hanis texts.) Grant briefly discusses how reliable Mrs. Peterson's picture of Miluk may have been, concluding that it seems consistent with that seen in other sources, to the extent that the very limited nature of the latter make it possible to judge (1997:149). My own assess-

ment is that, as far as the phenomena focused on in the present article go, Mrs. Peterson's Miluk on the whole seems internally consistent and also displays regular patterns of similarities to and differences from the corresponding Hanis phenomena; it seems safe enough to take it as a reliable source of information about Miluk in these respects. How far that holds for other aspects of her Miluk remains to be determined.[33]

It is problematic just how Miluk is related to Hanis. Grant observes that "the extant data indicate that Miluk Coos was different in many structural respects (for instance, in clitic placement) from Hanis. It also differed greatly in lexicon. As a rule, words in Miluk are identical, or almost so, to their Hanis counterparts, or else are completely different" (1997:149); "Hanis and Miluk Coos . . . were unambiguously separate, and mutually unintelligible, languages, despite sharing a majority of their free and bound morphemes" (1997:150). Exactly how far apart the languages were remains difficult to assess. Grant's estimate that "the time depth between Hanis and Miluk was probably on the order of that between Upper and Lower Chinookan or between the three branches of Kalapuyan" (1997:150) seems too shallow. Pierce, on the other hand, had earlier argued that the divergences between Hanis and Miluk were so great as to imply that the the languages were not actually related to each other, but had converged due to their geographical proximity (1965:325).[34] Recently, Doty (2011, 2012) has expressed similar doubts about whether Miluk is related to Hanis, arguing further that Miluk is related to the Salish family. My working assumption remains that Miluk is related to Hanis, given that a fair amount of the grammatical machinery of the two languages—some of the suffixes of verbs, in particular—looks quite similar. The relationship, however, may well not be particularly close (contra Grant, and contra Thompson and Kinkade [1990:42]), given that some Miluk grammatical morphology, such as the subject-object clitics discussed below, diverges sharply from the functionally equivalent elements of Hanis; contact is likely to be responsible for many obvious resemblances between the languages, such as shared vocabulary and their largely identical syntactic patterns. (And, while Doty's work to date has not convinced me that there is an actual genetic relationship between Miluk and Salish, he certainly adduces much evidence that suggests some sort of direct or indirect historical connection.) A better understanding of the historical position of Miluk will require a thorough synchronic investigation of Miluk morphology (especially its verb morphology) and lexicon. (See Doty [2012] for some initial steps in this direction.)

While my understanding of Miluk morphology remains provisional, especially as regards the segmentation and identification of suffixes in the verb other than those explicitly discussed below, this should not seriously affect the analysis of pronominal clitics. A short and oversimplified summary of the rest of this section is that, although the syntactic position of the Miluk pronominal clitics, and the forms of most of them, are quite different from those of the

corresponding Hanis proclitics, in many other respects the Miluk pronominal clitics pattern quite similarly to the Hanis ones.

6.1. Basic clause structure. The most obvious aspects of Miluk syntax are quite similar to Hanis. Constituent order is again rather free, and nouns expressing the subject/actor of transitive verbs are frequently marked with ergative *x̌=*, as in (65).

(65) *λəɬǰəl·-at ƛ̓ə= yék'ʸɬu ƛ̓e=**x̌=** dí·lúɬ*
fight-TR(?) ART= dog ART=ERG= young.man
'The young man kept fighting the dog.' (JH 180.1–2)

Nominal predicates occur without copula, as in (66a) and (66b).

(66a) *gʷéis hethé·de di=k'ʸíl·ga*
girl wealthy.headman 3.PS=child
'A girl was the child of a wealthy headman.' (JM 159.1)

(66b) *áN yék'ʸlu ƛ̓ə= ʔən=dé·miɬ*
not dog ART= 1S.PS=husband
'My husband was not a dog.' (JM 162.9)

My impression—based in part on texts for which Jacobs collected versions in both languages—is that overall the order of nonclitic constituents in Miluk, including the pragmatic effects of placing constituents in particular positions, is comparable to Hanis.

As in Hanis, the future enclitic is *=hanƛ̓*, exemplified in (67), though its initial *h* is often deleted in Miluk, as is seen in various examples later on—regularly after singular pronominal enclitics and the subordinator *i* 'if, when', and optionally after other enclitics. The customary or habitual enclitic is *=du*, quite different from Hanis *=he*.

(67) *cú **=hanƛ̓** wás·i ƛ̓ə= dí·lúɬ*
now =FUT return ART= young.man
'Now the young man was going to return home.' (JM 164.11)

Also as in Hanis, enclitics follow the first phrase of the clause, rather than the first word, as seen in (68), and certain clause-initial discourse connectives, notably *wi* 'then', are not counted in determining clausal second position—the enclitic appears after the word or phrase that follows the connective, not on the connective itself, as in (69). Subordinators such as *i* 'if, when' and *naim* 'because' (both identical to Hanis forms) do host enclitics, however.[35]

(68) *qɬámniyu k'á **=hanƛ̓** kʷi· λá·u*
later people FUT DEM(?) eat
'The next people (the Indians to come) will eat these.' (JM 195.14)

(69) . . . *wí* *kʸíl·et* ***=hanƛ***
then recover(?) FUT
'. . . then she will get well.' (JM 197.17)

6.2. The pronominal enclitics. Miluk has pronominal enclitics for subject and object roles, rather than proclitics; the inventory is shown in table 3. Third person plural *=(ʔ)iɬ* is essentially the same as the corresponding Hanis proclitic, second person dual *=(ʔ)is* is very similar to Hanis *(ʔ)iš=*, and the first person dual and plural enclitics might be interpreted as reductions of the corresponding Hanis proclitic forms (or else the Hanis forms might involve the accretion of additional material). But the other Miluk enclitics (in bold type in the table) do not resemble the Hanis proclitics at all. The singular enclitics are particularly striking: Miluk second person *=n(V)* resembles Hanis first person *ən=*, while the Miluk first person singular form resembles nothing in Hanis.[36]

Table 3. Miluk Subject-Object Pronominal Enclitics

	SINGULAR	DUAL	PLURAL
FIRST PERSON	***=(ʔ)u, =wu***	*=nə, =(ʔ)ən* (EXCL) *=s* (INCL)	*=ɬ*
SECOND PERSON	***=nə, =(ʔ)ən***	*=(ʔ)is*	***=čil***
THIRD PERSON	***=ø***	***=(ʔ)ič***	*=(ʔ)iɬ*

NOTE: The vowel qualities for the vowel-final forms of the second person singular and the first person dual exclusive enclitics vary (e.g., *e* or *i*); I assume that this variation is not significant. The enclitics written with initial *(ʔ)* plus vowel presumably actually have an initial glottal stop in most or all circumstances, but (following Jacobs) I leave it unwritten after word boundary (indicated by a space; see the appendix, section A3). The first person singular form occasionally appears as *=ʔwu*.

The Miluk pronominals occur in the same position in the clause as other enclitics. In (70a), the verb is the initial constituent in the clause and hosts the second person subject enclitic; in (70b), the subordinator *náim* 'because' is the initial constituent in the clause and hosts the same enclitic.

(70a) *héwes–e·nu·****=nə***
falsehood–PRG(?)=2S
'You lie!' (JM 214.4)

(70b) *náim* ***=nə****=héwes–e·nu*
because =2S=falsehood–PRG(?)
'because you are lying' (JM 195.8–9)

Pronominal enclitics do not need to be adjacent to the verb, as (71a)–(71b) and various examples later on show. They precede the tense-aspect enclitics *=hanƛ* 'future', shown in (71a), and *=du* 'customary'.

(71a) *á·yu* ***=w****=anƛ̓* *ğé·* *k'x–á·t*
indeed =1S=FUT there shoot–TR
'Indeed I will shoot him right there.' (JM 218.10)

(71b) *wí* *yu* ***=wu*** *x̌=* *há·niya* *í·ğei* . . .
then if/when =1S from= Empire(?) depart
'When I had left Empire . . .' (JM 110.11)

Morphosyntactically, the pronominal forms of table 3 are clearly enclitic; they must be preceded by an overt element, while, as (70a) shows, they need not be followed by one. Jacobs's transcription implies that they may be phonologically proclitic to a following word, however; he often writes the pronominal enclitics close with the following word, without space or dash, and my retranscription reflects this by connecting the enclitic to the following word without a space, as for *=nə* in (70b).[37]

The Miluk negator *an* (also *aN*, with devoiced final consonant) has no special effects on the pronominal enclitics. Like other syntactic elements, it hosts enclitics when it is the initial constituent in the clause, as in (72a), but not if it is later in the clause, as in (72b). (The position of the negator itself seems comparable to what it is in Hanis.)

(72a) *aN* ***=wú*** *ǰi* *wə́s·i*
not =1S how return
'I cannot get back.' (JM 219.15)

(72b) *má* ***=u*** *áN* *hewes–é·nu*
but =1S not falsehood–PRG(?)
'But I am not lying.' (JM 214.4–5)

While their position in the clause is different, in most other respects Miluk pronominal enclitic usage parallels that of the Hanis proclitics. The Miluk enclitics code the subjects of intransitive verbs, as in examples above; they can also code the subjects (actors) of transitive verbs, as in (73a) and (73b).

(73a) *áN* ***=wú*** *hadái'mis* *dú·h–a'ya*
not =1S money want–TR
'I do not want money.' (JM 89.8)

(73b) . . . , *k^{w}i·* ***=n****=ánƛ̓* *ğálám*
DEM(?) =2S=FUT take
'. . . , you ought to be able to catch it.' (JM 213.19)

The enclitics are also attested as subjects of nonverbal predicates, as in (74a)–(74c).

(74a) *an* ***=íɬ*** *gíye?we*
not 3P sea.otter
'They are not sea-otters.' (JM 51.8)

(74b) *adᶻú·yah****=nə***
two=1D.EXCL
'We are two.' (JM 54.7)

(74c) *aN* ***=ú*** *nə–ƛ'íy–e* *dič,* *k'áh* ***=u***
not =1S HAVE–wing–HAVE something person =1S
'I am not a winged thing, I am a person.' (JM 163.16–17)

Like the other enclitics, the pronominal enclitics follow the initial phrase rather than the initial word of the clause. This is seen with phrasal nonverbal predicates, such as the modifier-plus-noun phrase in (75a) and the possessive phrase in (75b).

(75a) *kʷí·?ne?weƛ'* *k'á·* ***=ɬ***
poor person =1P
'We are poor people.' (JM 85.18)

(75b) *c'mí·x̌ʷən* *di=kʸíl·ga·h****=nə***
trickster 3.PS=child=2S
'You are the trickster's child.' (JM 202.11)

Various examples below—namely, (85), (88c), and (100b)—show that the pronominal enclitics can follow phrases that are not predicates, as well.

As in Hanis, third person dual and plural enclitics *=(?)ič* and *=(?)iɬ* are not normally used as objects, as (76a) and (76b) exemplify.[38]

(76a) *húmekʸe* *=w=ánƛ* *dᶻáic–t,* *wén* *=w=anƛ* *=du·* *sín·a?na* *"nə=x̌=*
women =1S=FUT make–TR thus =1S=FUT =CUST call(?) 1S.PS=VOC=
hí·me"
children
'I will make some women, and I will call them "my children".' (JM 186.13–14)

(76b) *hámaq'=ni=?í*
see=2S=YNQ
'Did you see them (two people whom the speaker is pursuing)?' (JM 155.8)

The presence of a first or second person enclitic in (76a) and (76b) is probably not responsible for the absence of a third person enclitic. Combinations of a third person enclitic plus a first or second person enclitic are possible in inverse constructions, at least (see section 6.3).[39]

Even in subject function, the nonsingular third person enclitics are not obligatory when there is an independent noun subject, as in (77a) and (77b);

omitting the third person enclitics certainly seems to be the most common option in this context.

(77a) *wén γa·l–á·nu ƛ̓ə= k'áh*
thus speak–PRG(?) ART= people
'That is what the people said.' (JM 197.6–7)

(77b) *x̌= wén íld–(u)wa ƛ̓e= x̌= təm·eƛ̓'e*
ADV= thus tell–(?) ART= ERG= old.people
'That is what the (two) old people said to him.' (JM 215.1–2)

However, doubling of an independent nominal subject is not absolutely ruled out, as is shown by (78a)–(78d) (the subject nominal is underlined).

(78a) *wí· ca·kán***=ʔič** *ƛ̓ə= də=k'xái <u>ƛ̓e= x̌= húmé·kʸe íl·áx̌q'ain</u>, . . .*
then help=3D ART= 3.PS=pain ART= ERG= women shaman
'Then those two women shamans helped him with his pain (power), . . .' (JM 94.16–17)

(78b) *x̌= wé·n* **=iɬ** *=du íld–(u)wa <u>ƛ̓é= x̌= k'áh</u> ƛ̓ə= sλá·lis*
ADV= thus =3P =CUST tell–(?) ART= ERG= people ART= snow
'That is how the people spoke about the snow.' (JM 100.10–11)

(78c) *wí <u>ƛ̓ə= hí·me húme·kʸe</u> wi yuqʷsíl* **=iɬ***=yúǧʷa*
then ART= children wives then fruits.and.berries =3P=pick/dig
'The girl (younger) wives picked berries and fruits.' (JM 84.4–5)

(78d) *<u>ƛ̓ə= de=x̌= má·niʔya·s ƛ̓e= hethé·de di=kʸílga</u> an* **=iɬ** *=du*
ART 3.PS=ERG= parent ART= wealthy 3.PS=child not =3P =CUST

dič wá·wa . . .
something make(?)
'The parents of a very rich person's child did not concern themselves (about her?) . . .' (JM 88.12)

First and second person enclitics are evidently obligatory even when they double an independent first or second pronoun subject, or so (79a)–(79c) indicate. (At least this is true of the singular enclitics; I have not discovered any evidence in the corpus as to whether this is true for dual and plural first and second person.)

(79a) *helt'* ***=w****=anƛ̓ <u>én·e</u> gʸikʸšú·wi*
in.turn =1S=FUT 1S.INDP RDP.gamble
'Now I myself will gamble.' (JM 182.3–4)

(79b) *hís* ***=w****=anƛ̓ <u>én·é</u> ɬa*
also =1S=FUT 1S.INDP go
'I am going to go too.' (JM 181.12)

(79c) *his* **=*n*=*anƛ*** *<u>néu</u>* *x̌=* *wé·n, . . .*
also =2S=FUT 2S.INDP ADV= thus
'You too will be like that, . . .' (JM 201.6)

As in Hanis (see section 3.4, n. 12), it is difficult to determine whether doubling by a pronominal enclitic makes any difference to the syntactic positions of nominals, especially third person nominals. The doubled nominals in (78c) and (78d) are evidently left-dislocated, since they precede the hosts of enclitics, but the doubled pronouns of (79a)–(79c) are evidently clause-internal, since they intervene between enclitics and the verbal or nonverbal predicate of the clause; it is not clear just what sort of position the doubled postverbal nominals in (78a) and (78b) occupy. I leave this question open.[40]

6.3. Inverse forms and interaction of first and second person. Miluk transitive clauses in which the object/undergoer is first or second person closely parallel Hanis, at least when first or second person arguments are singular. (Doty [2012: chap. 6] has independently reached the same conclusions; besides the inverse and the first and second person object suffixes, he discusses various other aspects of transitive verb morphology.) When third person acts on first or second person, an inverse construction is used. The verb is marked with a suffix *–u(·)n*, or sometimes *–en* or *–i(·)n*, and the first or second person object (singular, in the clearest examples) is coded by a pronominal enclitic; first person singular object is seen in (80a) and (80b), and second person singular object in (81a) and (81b).

(80a) *x̌=* *wén* **=*wi*** *íl·d–**u·n*** *k^{w}ə=* *ʾnə=**x̌**=* *g^{w}áns*
ADV= thus =1S tell–INV DEM= 1S.PS=ERG= dream
'That is what my dream has told me.' (JM 91.10)

(80b) *á·yu* **=*u*=*ní·–*wun*** *ƛ̓ə=* *ɬt̓áyau* *də=ǧ^{w}álag^{w}í·da*
indeed =1S=give=INV art= paper 3.PS=payment(?)
'So then he gave me the payment for the (divorce) papers.' (JM 113.11–12)

(81a) *wí* *i**=n**=anƛ* *wé·n* *íld–**u·n*** . . .
then when=2S=FUT thus tell–INV
'Then when he says (lit., "will say") to you . . .' (JM 216.6)

(81b) . . . , *t̓í·šǰi* **=*n*=*anƛ*** *ní·–**wun*** *gíyeʾwe* *di=dᶻé·ƛ̓is*
ten =2S=FUT give–INV sea.otter 3.PS=hide
'. . ., he is to give you ten sea otter hides.' (JM 134.9)

When the subject of an inverse verb is third person dual or plural, the appropriate third person enclitic may appear as well, preceding the first or second person enclitic, as in (82)–(83b); such clauses are fairly frequent in the texts.

(82) *an* ***=íč=ʔwu****=cúʔw-****en***
not =3D=1S=kill-INV
'They (two, 'your parents') did not kill me then.' (JM 220.8)

(83a) *wén* ***=iɬ=ʔu****=ʔíl·d-****u·n***
thus =3P=1S tell-INV
'That is what they say to me.' (JM 203.19)

(83b) *úmid-id-****í·n=ʔiɬ=ne***
follow-TR-INV=3P=2S
'They are following you.' (JM 156.9)

As with noninverse verbs, a third person enclitic may double an overt noun subject, as in (84), although again the enclitic is not obligatory, as in (85).

(84) *x̌=* *wé·n* ***=iɬ=ʔu****=g^{w}i·g^{w}í·y-****u·n*** *ƛe=* *x̌=* *čáx̌^{w}čax̌^{w}* *di=hí·me*
ADV= thus =3P=1S=mock(?)-INV ART= ERG= cottontail 3.PS=children
'This is the way those children of cottontail mock me.' (JM 203.18–19)

(85) *x̌=* *qɬə́mniyu* *k'á·* ***=n****=anƛ* *g^{y}íla·-d^{z}-****u·n***
ERG= afterwards(?) person =2S=FUT take.aboard-TR(?)-INV
'The next persons[41] will take you.' (JM 219.15–16)

The inverse suffix *-u·n* looks like the Hanis inverse suffix *-u* (whether by inheritance or by borrowing) plus an accreted *n*, which it is tempting to see as a reanalyzed pronominal enclitic. A similar source might be proposed for the other Miluk inverse suffixes *-i(·)n* and *-en*. However, it is even less clear what governs the choice between the inverse suffixes than it is in Hanis, which makes it difficult to securely connect either *-i(·)n* or *-en* with Hanis *-iɬ*.

When second person acts on first person, or vice versa, the verb takes a special suffix, *-ai* for second person acting on first person, as in (86), or *-m* when the first person is a dative recipient or a beneficiary, as in (87), and *-a·mi* for first person acting on second person, as in (88a)–(88c). As in Hanis, a second person clitic but not a first person clitic appears with all these forms—or at least that is the case when both arguments are singular; see section 6.5 for clauses in which one or both arguments are nonsingular.

(86) *ú··* *k^{y}x^{y}-id-****ái=nə***
oh shoot-TR-2→1=2S
'Oh you (sg.) shot me!' (JM 218.11)

(87) ***i=n****=anƛ* *án* *ní·-****m*** *k^{w}ə=* *ʔnə=húma·ka*
if/when=2S=FUT not give-DAT.2→1 DEM= 1S.PS=wives
'if you (sg.) do not give me my wives' (JM 146.12–13)

(88a) . . . , *t'ə́ma ğatqái* ***=n****=anƛ ɬá·dᶻa–d–****á·mi****,* . . .
then(?) evening =2S=FUT get–TR–1→2
'. . . , (In five days,) on that evening I will come to get you, . . .' (JM 204.2)

(88b) *ca·kʸín–d–****a·mi*** ***=n****=anƛ* . . .
help–TR–1→2 =2S=FUT
'I will help you (sg.) . . .' (JM 193.13)

(88c) *máqƛ' bá·saq'* ***=n=anƛ*** *lağáwiyat'–****á·mi***
crow myth =2S=FUT narrate–1→2
'I will tell you a crow myth.' (JM 170.10 [title])

The Miluk suffixes certainly resemble the corresponding Hanis ones closely enough to imply a historical connection, whether by inheritance or by borrowing (and, like the Hanis suffixes, could well have originated as simply first or second person object suffixes). The fact that *–a·mi* and *–m* are identical to the corresponding Hanis forms suggests that these two suffixes might have been relatively recently borrowed in one direction or the other. The second-person-acting-on-first suffix *–ai* seems more likely to be cognate with its Hanis equivalent *–a(·)ʔis* (or at least to reflect old borrowing), given that it is similar but not identical to the latter.

6.4. Imperatives. While a good many clauses with imperative translations occur in the corpus, their structure is difficult to interpret, though a suffix *–í·yiǐ* (or *–í·yəǐ*, etc.) appears on many intransitive imperatives. Still, it is clear that, as in Hanis, a pronominal clitic is not used for the subject of a singular imperative, whether intransitive, as in (89), or transitive, as in (90), and that a first person (at least, first person singular) clitic is not used for the object of an imperative, even when there is no second person clitic, as in (91a) and (91b).

(89) *ƛ'é silt'–í·yiǐ*
quickly go.out–INTR.IMV(?)
'Get outside quickly!' (JM 25.10)

(90) *há·p'–əč c'ú·–t kʷə= nə=ʔén·e*
water–INSTR(?) wash–TR DEM= 2S.PS=mother
'Go wash your mother with water.' (JM 217.3)

(91a) *ní·–m kʷə= nə=hadáiʔməs*
give–DAT.2→1 DEM= 2S.PS=dentalia
'Give me your money (large dentalia).' (JM 225.5–6)

(91b) *helq'–d–éi*[42]
name–TR–2→1
'Name me (i.e., call me by a kin term)!' (JM 193.13)

When the addressee is nonsingular, it seems that a nonsingular second person pronominal enclitic is used at least some of the time, as in (92)–(93b).[43]

(92) *éǰi* *úmid–əd–ái***=ʔis**
come follow–TR–2→1=2D
'Come (dual) follow me!' (JM 140.14–15)

(93a) *ǧél–id–éi***=čil**[44]
cross(?)–TR–2→1=2P
'Ferry me across!' (JM 149.2)

(93b) *an* **=číl**=*kʸím·iʔ*–***í·yəx̌***
not =2P=weep–INTR.IMV(?)
'Do not weep (for me).' (JM 149.14–150.1)

The form *é(h)ǰi(h)* 'come here!' is fairly frequent (e.g., JM 221.6) in Miluk as in Hanis. In Hanis it is transparently composed of *e(ʔ)=* 'second person imperative' plus *ǰi* '(come) hither', but there is no evidence that it has any internal structure in Miluk; the form was probably borrowed from Hanis as an unanalyzed unit. At least some of the time, Miluk *é(h)ǰi(h)* is evidently a quasi-interjectional particle outside the clause proper; this is seen in (92) above, where *é(h)ǰi(h)* is not the host of the enclitic *=ʔis*.[45]

I have not identified any Miluk equivalents of the Hanis dual and plural hortative particles $k^{w}is$ ($g^{w}əs$) and $k^{w}in$.

6.5. Interactions of nonsingular speech act participants. Clauses in which first person acts on second person or vice versa and at least one of the arguments is dual or plural are difficult to locate in the texts, and can also be difficult to interpret when found. Variation occurs for which there is no obvious principled explanation. Possibly this is a domain in which Mrs. Peterson's command of the language was less secure, or one that was undergoing change at the time when she acquired Miluk.

Scrappy evidence suggests that when nonsingular second person acts on singular first person, as in (94)–(95b), or vice versa, as in (96), a second person nonsingular enclitic is used, but no first person enclitic; this would parallel Hanis.

(94) *í***=·*s*** *=hánƛ* *dúh–id–**ai***, . . .
if=2D =FUT want–TR–2→1
'If you (dual) want me, . . .' (JM 140.14)

(95a) . . . , *wí·* *łu* ***=číl*** *=hanƛ* *=du* *ní·–**m*** *dáhai*, . . .
then that.kind(?) =2P =FUT =CUST give–2→1 tobacco(?)
'. . . , then you (pl.) are to give that tobacco to me, . . .' (JM 97.13)

(95b) . . . *wé·n də=hé·niye?es***=číl** *=hanƛ g^{y}íɬúw-***ai**, . . .[46]
thus 3S.PS=length=2P =FUT see–2→1
'. . . for that long a time you (pl.) will see me, . . .' (JM 51.11)

(96) *cú* **=čil**=*anƛ wén íl·d-***á·mi**, . . .
now =2P=FUT thus tell–1→2
'When I tell you (pl.), . . .' (JM 147.4–5)

In (97), however, the second person enclitic unexpectedly takes the form *=čn* (contrast *=čil* in (95b)).

(97) *dá·s* **=čn**=*anƛ k^{y}ɬú·–d-***ai**
again =2P(?)=FUT see–TR–2→1
'You (pl.) will see me again.' (JM 48.2)

If it is not a mishearing for *=čil*, the form *=čn* might possibly represent conflation of expected *=čil* with the second person singular enclitic (not the first person singular enclitic, since that is *=u* or *=wu* in Miluk), or nonce influence of the Hanis first person singular proclitic *ən=*.[47]

I have not located any clear instances of second person acting on dual or plural first person.

Evidence about clauses in which a nonsingular first person acts on second person is both limited and contradictory. In (98), no second person enclitic appears.

(98) *án* **=ɬ**=*duh–id-***a·mi**
not =1P=want–TR–1→2
'We do not want you (sg.)!' (JM 32.2)

(It does not seem likely that a second person singular enclitic *=n(V)* has been phonetically absorbed by the negator *an* in this example. That would imply that the second person enclitic precedes the first person enclitic, which is contradicted by examples below.) In (99), it is impossible to tell whether *=ni* is the first person dual exclusive enclitic or the second person singular enclitic, the two being homophononous in Miluk; I tentatively gloss it as the former.

(99) *g^{w}é·g^{w}i!* *x̌=* *məsá·* **=ni**=*su?l-***á·mi**
mother's.sister ERG= both =1D.EXCL(?)=like–1→2
'Mother's sister! we both like you (sg.).' (JM 49.7)

Other examples appear to have both a first person plural enclitic and a second person singular enclitic, in that order (with a transitional vowel *i* before or after the first person plural form), as in (100a) and (100b). (In available examples, the object appears to be singular semantically as well as formally.)

(100a) *sk'–id–**a·mí·=ɬ=in***
compensate–TR(?)–1→2=1P=2S
'We are compensating you (sg.).' (JM 97.10)

(100b) *ğenč'ín·si ğahá·is **=iɬ=n**=ánƛ hís níy–**a'mi** . . .*
five day =1P=2S=FUT also give–1→2
'We will give you (probably sg.)[48] five days . . .' (JM 60.14)

It is not attractive to suppose that *=ɬ(i)n* in these two examples is a nonce borrowing of the Hanis first person plural form *ɬin*. One would then expect to find occasional instances of *=ɬin* in the Miluk corpus for first person plural also where there is no second person argument, and I am not aware of any such instances. If (100a) and (100b) are valid Miluk, the construction is reminiscent of that in corresponding Hanis clauses, where both a nonsingular first person proclitic and a second person proclitic appear (see section 4.2); however, the second person form in the Miluk examples appears to be the ordinary second person singular enclitic, rather than a special clitic or affix fixed on the verb as in Hanis.

Yet another instance of nonsingular first person acting on second person, seen in (101), shows essentially the same surprising form of the second person plural enclitic, *=č(i)n*, as in (97) above. The discourse context fairly clearly implies that the first person subject of (101) is plural, not dual, so it is not possible to explain the *n* of the enclitic as exclusive dual *=n*.[49]

(101) . . . *wí· ƛ̓íl–d–**a·mi=čin** =hanƛ*
then fight–TR(?)–1→2=2P(?) FUT
'. . . then we (pl.) will fight you (pl.)' (JM 60.8)

The fact that the second person argument in (101) is evidently understood as plural constitutes a contrast with (100a)–(100b), where it is singular. Conceivably *=č(i)n* might be a special portmanteau form for plural (nonsingular?) first person acting on plural (nonsingular?) second person, though that will not explain the occurrence of *=čn* in (97).

7. Areal perspectives. Many aspects of the marking of pronominal categories in Hanis and Miluk are reminiscent of patterns found in other languages of the Northwest. I briefly note here a few such resemblances (mostly of grammatical pattern, not of the actual form of morphemes) to suggest directions for typologically or areally oriented research.[50]

Pronominal clitics for subjects appear widely in Northwestern languages, including Siuslawan and Alsea on the Oregon coast (Frachtenberg 1920, 1922b: 467–72, 479–80, n.d.:127–34), Sahaptin in the southern Plateau area (Rigsby and Rude 1996; Jacobs 1931), in much of the Salish family, and so on. Mostly these are second position enclitics of some sort; Hanis is unusual in having

proclitics that are more or less fixed on the verb or other predicate. (The Chinookan languages on the lower Columbia River inflect verbs with an elaborate system of pronominal prefixes rather than using clitics [Boas 1911:580–84; Dyk 1933:30–39; Silverstein 1976]; within the Salish family, some languages such as Tillamook [Edel 1939; Egesdal and Thompson 1998; Thompson 1979: 739–40; Kroeber 1999:54–57] have fixed pronominal clitics on the predicate. But none of these are adjacent to Hanis.)

Pronominal clitics in Salish languages are typically limited to the subject role, but Sahaptin, Alsea, and Siuslawan to varying degrees and in different ways allow at least some of their clitics to express objects (or undergoers) as well. These languages differ as to how they use affixal verb morphology to reduce or eliminate ambiguity as to the grammatical roles of the clitics. Inverse morphology comparable to that of Hanis and Miluk is not found in Alsea (where only the nonsingular clitics can be used as objects) and Siuslawan, for instance; on the other hand, transitive verbs in both these languages take object suffixes that distinguish person but not number. (I suspect that such object inflection was the historical source of the Coosan suffixes for first person acting on second and vice versa; see section 3.3.)

Some of the Hanis and Miluk patterns reviewed in this article are strikingly reminiscent of Algonquian—or more precisely, of the inflection of Algonquian verbs in the independent order.[51] The Algonquian pronominal prefixes can represent either subject (actor) or object (undergoer), like the Hanis and Miluk pronominal clitics, and an inverse suffix is used when third person acts on first or second. The Algonquian "thematic" suffixes that mark action of second person on first or vice versa parallel Hanis *-a(·)ʔis* and *-a·mi* (see section 3.3) and Miluk *-ai* and *-a·mi* (see section 6.3), and like these can equally well be construed as first or second person object suffixes (see section 3.3 and n. 9). Second person prominence in the pronominal prefix paradigm is, of course, a well-known trait of Algonquian—even if not quite as pervasive in Algonquian inflection overall as is sometimes assumed—and this parallels the rather strong second person prominence seen in the Hanis and Miluk pronominal clitics (see sections 5 and 6.3). The idea that there might be some sort of historical connection between Hanis and Miluk, on the one hand, and Algonquian, on the other, is not as absurd as it might initially seem, either. Yurok and Wiyot, which along with Algonquian constitute the Algic family, are located on the northwestern California coast, not far from the location of Hanis and Miluk—the Athabaskan languages that now intervene are certainly recent arrivals—while there is some reason to think that Algic, including Algonquian, originated somewhere in the Plateau region.[52]

The Coosan patterns most closely match Algonquian proper, rather than the attested states of the nearby Yurok and Wiyot: inverse constructions, for instance, are not employed as extensively in Yurok as in Algonquian or the Coosan languages, and Wiyot has no inverse construction. Second person prominence is

not characteristic of Yurok (Robins 1958:69–71); in Wiyot, it appears solely in the negative construction, the only remaining construction in which Wiyot verb inflection retains relics of the pronominal prefixes (Teeter 1964:37, 89). (Still, the very fact that second person prominence is vestigial in Wiyot suggests that it is an old trait of Algic, not something that developed specifically in the Algonquian branch.) And, on the other hand, Hanis shows a fuller array of resemblances to Algic than does Miluk. The Hanis pronominal clitics are proclitic to the verb, a closer resemblance to the position of the Algic personal prefixes than the clausal enclitic positioning of the Miluk pronominals. The negator is the only element that attracts proclitics away from the verb in Hanis, and this is reminiscent of Wiyot, where the negator is the only predicate element on which pronominal prefixes ever appear. And, finally, the third person singular possessive proclitic of Hanis (except when preceded by an article with which it contracts) is *u=* (Frachtenberg 1922a:396–98)—strikingly similar to the third person (especially possessive) prefixes of Algic: Algonquian **we-* (Bloomfield 1970:451), Yurok *ʔu-* ~ *(ʔ)we-* (Robins 1958:25), Wiyot *huh-* (phonetically [huʔ-]) ~ ∅- (Teeter 1964:79),[53] and quite different from the Miluk third person possessive proclitic *də=*.[54]

There are certainly significant differences between Algic and the Coosan languages as well. The pronominal prefixes of Algic, for example, mark only person and not number, unlike the elaborate clitic paradigms of Hanis and Miluk; nor do the Algic prefixes ever cooccur, while the Oregon languages allow at least limited possibilities for two clitics to appear together. And, on the other hand, there is no real Coosan equivalent for Algonquian's complex suffixation marking subject and object number. (Wiyot totally lacks number suffixation, however.) Still, the possibility of diffusional connections between the Coosan languages and Algic, or particular branches of Algic, seems worth investigating further.

Appendix: Transcription of Hanis and Miluk Examples

A1. General remarks. Choice of transcription for Hanis data, in particular, is a problem without an ideal solution. Frachtenberg's and Jacobs's transcriptions differ not only in their choices of symbols (especially for vowels) but to some extent also in the nature of the phonological systems that they imply. Jacobs's transcription is doubtless the more accurate on the whole, but not all Frachtenberg's vocabulary is attested in the smaller body of Jacobs's Hanis material. Moreover, Frachtenberg and Jacobs recorded their Hanis data from different speakers. For these reasons, I have not tried to unify the transcription of Hanis forms in the present article.

On the other hand, given that the Frachtenberg and Jacobs texts are accessible in academic libraries, it does not seem essential to retain their exact transcriptions here—which would force the reader to remember two different sets of symbols, both different from more current systems. I consequently retranscribe examples in a more recent version of Americanist orthography. While this also entails various complications, they should not be important for the purposes of the present article. The retranscription is not intended as a phonological analysis of either Hanis or Miluk, which would require more careful comparison of Frachtenberg's and Jacobs's transcriptions of particular lexical

items and grammatical forms than I have so far been able to undertake; examples deriving from Frachtenberg's data, in particular, do not allow precise phonological implications to be drawn.

The rest of this appendix discusses in more detail problems that arise in retranscription and the policies I have followed. Abbreviations identify a particular author's usage: F for Frachtenberg, J for Jacobs.

A2. Segmental transcription. For consonants, retranscription is largely a straightforward matter of replacement—of ⟨c⟩ by *š*, ⟨ts⟩ by *c*, ⟨tc⟩ by *č*, ⟨tc!⟩ (F) or ⟨t'c⟩ (J) by *č'*, ⟨p!⟩ (F) or ⟨ṗ⟩ (J) by *p'*, ⟨ʟ⟩ (F) or ⟨tɬ⟩ (J) by *λ̂*, ⟨dl⟩ (J) by *λ*, ⟨k·⟩ (F) or ⟨k̰⟩ (J) by *kᵛ*, ⟨x̣⟩ by *x̌*, ⟨ɛ⟩ (F) or ⟨'⟩ (J) by *ʔ*, and so on. Vowels in Jacobs's data require little modification, though I replace his ⟨ɛ⟩ by the simpler *e*, since he records no contrast between [e] and [ɛ]. Frachtenberg's more complicated array of vowels is doubtless overdifferentiated. I represent both his ⟨i⟩ (mostly in diphthongs) and his ⟨î⟩ by short *i*, and his ⟨û⟩ and his ⟨u⟩ by short *u*. Frachtenberg's ⟨ä⟩ is represented here as *e·* (corresponding to Jacobs's ⟨ɛ·⟩), his ⟨ᴇ⟩ by *ə*, and his diphthongs ⟨ē^{i}⟩ and ⟨ō^{u}⟩ by *ei* and *ou* (though on the basis of Jacobs's transcriptions, I suspect that these last are actually phonetic variants of *i·* and *u·*, respectively); otherwise, I assume that Frachtenberg's ⟨ū⟩ and ⟨ō⟩ are not distinct, and represent both as *u·*. The syllabic *n* that both authors represent as ⟨n̥⟩ (with subscript circle) is replaced here by *ən*.

For Miluk, effectively the only source is Jacobs's data, which can be straightforwardly reproduced with the kinds of substitutions noted above; variation in my retranscription of Miluk forms reflects variation in Jacobs's own transcriptions of those forms. In Hanis, the same word or morpheme may appear in a somewhat different form depending on whether the example comes from Frachtenberg's or Jacobs's material. The most common types of discrepancy between the Hanis sources are as follows.

(i) Frachtenberg records more long vowels than Jacobs did; they are marked with a macron in Frachtenberg's transcription: ⟨ī⟩, ⟨ā⟩, etc., except that he uses ⟨ä⟩ for [ɛ·]. Probably Frachtenberg was perceiving some distinction of quality and interpreting it as length. Jacobs, on the other hand, records stress much more frequently than Frachtenberg did; Jacobs may have overrecorded stress. Frachtenberg systematically omits marking of stress in monosyllables, even full words that presumably would have been stressed in sentential context.

(ii) Frachtenberg frequently writes voiceless symbols (⟨t⟩, ⟨q⟩, etc.) where Jacobs writes voiced ones (⟨d⟩, ⟨g̣⟩, etc.). Since the "voiced" stops and affricates in Coosan were evidently primarily unaspirated, and only partly or sometimes voiced (Jacobs 1939: 11–12), Frachtenberg's voiceless symbols probably represent mishearings on his part. To what extent there was a genuine phonological contrast between "voiced"-unaspirated and "voiceless"-aspirated consonants in either Hanis or Miluk remains to be determined. If there was such a contrast, its functional load was low.

(iii) Frachtenberg does not distinguish between velar and uvular fricatives (voiceless), writing only ⟨x⟩. In his day, this was the symbol for the voiceless uvular fricative, so I retranscribe the unrounded version as *x̌*. On the other hand, Jacobs's material suggests that the rounded voiceless velar fricative was more common than the rounded uvular fricative, so I retranscribe Frachtenberg's ⟨xw⟩ or ⟨x^{u}⟩ (and sometimes also ⟨x⟩ in the context of a rounded vowel) as velar *x^{w}*. The functional load of the velar-uvular opposition for fricatives was evidently low, judging again by Jacobs's data.

(iv) In examples from Frachtenberg, a tilde (as in *ẽ*) represents rising pitch accent (e.g., Frachtenberg 1913:4); this is not distinguished from ordinary stress by Jacobs.

Comparison with Jacobs's data indicates that Frachtenberg's transcription drastically underrepresents glottal stops. In fact, certain sequences of vowels in Frachtenberg's transcription, such as ⟨aî⟩, ⟨eî⟩, and ⟨aû⟩, evidently have a glottal stop between the

vowels, and I have so retranscribed them (*aʔi*, *eʔi*, *aʔu*), whereas his ⟨ai⟩ and ⟨au⟩ are diphthongs (*ai*, *au*). It is not always clear how to interpret Frachtenberg's sequences of vowel plus superscript vowel (⟨îⁱ⟩, etc.). While I generally retranscribe these as a sequence of vowel plus glottal stop, some of these may actually represent a sequence of vowel plus glottal stop plus vowel (e.g., *iʔi*), and others perhaps simply represent a long vowel. (See, for instance, the discussion of contractions of plural pronominal proclitics with the negator in section 3.5.) Further problems with glottal stops arise at word boundary and with clitics and prefixes (see section A3 below).

Besides differences in the transcription systems, Jacobs's texts show more variability in the form of particular words and morphemes than Frachtenberg's do. While some of this might reflect an especially great degree of variation in the pronunciation of the speaker from whom Jacobs recorded his texts, probably Frachtenberg was more inclined to impose a consistent transcription on particular elements that he recognized. For example, while Frachtenberg always writes the Hanis second person singular proclitic with a final glottal stop (⟨eᵋ⟩, *eʔ*), Jacobs records forms with final glottal stop and without it (*eʔ=* ~ *e=* ~ *eh=*), and this variation clearly reflects the application of phonological rules (see the introduction to section 3). Frachtenberg's practice was not a phonologically-based restoration of "underlying" forms. Rather, as I deduce in part from experience with his Alsea material, he simply tended to give a constant written form to words or morphemes that he recognized; sometimes, as for the second person singular proclitic, the constant form selected is close to the likely underlying phonological form of the morpheme, but this is not necessarily always the case.

A3. Word boundary and clitic boundary. Spaces in Frachtenberg's and Jacobs's originals correspond to spaces in my retranscriptions. Jacobs frequently joins together with dashes a series of words (not necessarily clitics) that struck him as a prosodic phrase (1939:5); I treat these as separate words, using a space instead of reproducing the dash. (Instances of this can be seen in several of the examples below. For instance, in (A1) Jacobs connects by dashes the entire phrase *x̌= wénč =hé· iɬ=ʔiʔlt*, which contains at least two full words, the adverb *wenč* and the verb *(ʔ)iʔlt*). In my retranscriptions, the symbol = connects clitics with their morphosyntactic hosts; if the source writes the clitic as a separate word (marked off by a space or a dash), I write a space in addition to =.

Frachtenberg and Jacobs differ as to how they treat particular clitics; while I reproduce these differences in the retranscribed examples, they are unlikely to be meaningful. For instance, Frachtenberg tends to write the dual and plural pronominal proclitics of Hanis as separate words (separated by space), whereas Jacobs typically writes them close with their hosts (no space or dash). On the other hand, Jacobs normally separates the case-marking proclitic *x̌=* (ergative, instrumental, adverbial, etc.) from the following word and from a preceding proclitic by dashes, whereas Frachtenberg normally writes it close with one or the other.

Neither Frachtenberg nor Jacobs normally write glottal stops at the beginning of a word, and my retranscription reproduces this. Full words and clitics that Frachtenberg or Jacobs write with initial vowel, following either a space or a dash, probably normally have an initial glottal stop; Jacobs indeed says as much (1939:17). (One clear exception to this is the Hanis third person possessive proclitic *u=*, which in Jacobs's texts clearly lacks an initial glottal stop and syllabifies with the preceding word.) The glottal stop sometimes surfaces in Jacobs's transcription at the beginning of a word that is written together with an immediately preceding word or proclitic, without intervening space or hyphen. This can be seen for the verb *(ʔ)ališaʔni* after a pronominal proclitic in the Hanis example (A1), whose first line reproduces Jacobs's original transcription. (Jacobs writes the glottal stop as an apostrophe, but for clarity in the examples below I use the more salient symbol ⟨ʔ⟩.)

(A1) ⟨x̌–wɛ′ntc–hantł isʔa′lica′ʔni.⟩ (Hanis)
x̌= wénč =hanƛ is=ʔálišáʔni
ADV= thus =FUT 1D.INCL=play
'This is the way we'll play.' (JH 29.7)

The Miluk examples in (A2a) and (A2b) show the initial glottal stops of the pronominal enclitics *=(ʔ)is* and *=(ʔ)iɬ*.

(A2a) ⟨łaʔi′s–hantł, . . .⟩ (Miluk)
ɬa=ʔís =hanƛ . . .
go=2D =FUT
'You (two) must go, . . .' (JM 222.4)

(A2b) ⟨u′mididi·′nʔiłnɛ.⟩ (Miluk)
úmid–id–í·n=ʔiɬ=ne
follow–TR–INV=3P=2S
'They are following you.' (JM 156.9)

Frachtenberg, on the other hand, writes no glottal stop at the beginning of a vowel-initial word even when it is preceded by a proclitic or a prefix that he writes close with its host. Thus, for example, the Hanis stem meaning 'canoe' is evidently phonetically [ʔix^{y}]; in Jacobs's spelling, the glottal stop is written overtly in (A3a), and is implied in (A3b) by the dash that separates the instrumental proclitic *x̌=*.

(A3a) ⟨lɛ·′ɬʔi′x̌⟩ (Hanis)
ɬé=·ɬ=ʔíx^{y}
ART=3P.PS=canoe
'their canoes' (JH 69.12)

(A3b) ⟨x̌–ix̌ɛ·′tc⟩ (Hanis)
x̌= (ʔ)ix^{y}–é·č
INSTR= canoe–INSTR
'by canoe' (JH 64.16)

But Frachtenberg gives no indication of a glottal stop in (A4), which like (A3b) is formed with the circumclitic *x̌=. . .–əč* 'instrumental'.

(A4) ⟨xîx·ɛ′tc⟩ (Hanis)
x̌=ix^{y}–áč
INSTR=canoe–INSTR
'in/with a canoe' (FCoosT 90.3)

This practice probably reflects Frachtenberg's tendency to normalize; phonetically and phonologically accurate transcriptions of (A4) would almost certainly have a glottal stop at the beginning of the stem (*x̌=ʔix^{y}=áč*). I have added glottal stops to retranscriptions in a few such instances.

Jacobs's transcription implies in some cases that the phonological host of a clitic is different from its morphosyntactic host. For example, he frequently writes the Miluk subject-object enclitics close with a following full word, and the allomorphy of these enclitics is evidently in part determined by the following word; see (70b) and n. 37 in

section 6.2. (Similarly, though examples do not occur in the present article, he tends to write the Hanis possessive proclitics close with a preceding full word, even one outside the NP of which the proclitic is a part.)

A4. Other aspects of the presentation of examples. I am responsible for morphological analysis and glossing of examples; free translations do not necessarily exactly reproduce those of the sources, either. Queries ("(?)") in the transcription line of an example indicate particularly serious doubt as to the proper transcription or segmentation of a word; queries in the morpheme-gloss line indicate doubt as to the best glossing of the queried morpheme.

Notes

Acknowledgments. An early version of this article was presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas, Pittsburgh, 8 January 2011. Thanks to Matthew Dryer, Amy Dahlstrom, and others there for discussion; thanks as well to Philip LeSourd for feedback at various points during the gestation of the article, to Chris Doty for discussion of Miluk and for sending me drafts of his dissertation and other work, and to Matthew Dryer and an anonymous reviewer for their useful comments on written drafts. Honoré Watanabe kindly supplied me with typed (electronic) versions of the Hanis and Miluk text corpora that were prepared under his supervision as part of the Linguistic Dynamics Science Project (LingDy) at the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies; these have greatly facilitated text searches.

Grammatical abbreviations: 1= first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; 1→2 = first person acting on second person (first person subject, second person object); 2→1 = second person acting on first person (second person subject, first person object); ADV = adverb-marking proclitic; ALL = allative; ART = article; BEN = benefactive; CAUS = causative; CJCTR = conjectural; COND = conditional; CUST = customary; D = dual (in pronominal glosses); DAT = dative (indirect object inflection of verb); DEM = demonstrative; DETR = detransitive; DIR = direct; DUR = durative; ERG = ergative; EVID = evidential; EXCL = exclusive; EXHORT = exhortative; FREQ = frequentative (transitive); FUT = future; IMPERS = impersonal subject; IMV = imperative; INCH = inchoative; INCL = inclusive; INDP = independent pronoun; INTR = intransitive; INV = inverse; LOC = locative; NEG = negative; P = plural (in pronominal glosses); OB = object; PL, pl. = plural; PS = possessive; PRG = progressive; PROX = proximate; RDP = reduplication; RFL = reflexive; S = singular (in pronominal glosses); SB = subject; SG, sg. = singular; TA = transitive animate; TR = transitive; VOC = vocative; YNQ = yes-no (polarity) question particle.

Abbreviations for sources of examples: FCoosT = Frachtenberg (1913); FGr = Frachtenberg (1922a); JH = Jacobs's Hanis texts (1939:19–38, 63–70, 1940:133–36, 227–38); JM = Jacobs's Miluk texts (1939:19–33, 39–62, 71–122, 1940:133–226). (Since Jacobs's 1939 and 1940 volumes are continuously paginated, as pp. 1–126 and 127-260, respectively, it is not necessary to distinguish them in example source abbreviations. Page numbers for Hanis and Miluk overlap because Jacobs recorded some narratives in both languages.) Examples are normally located by page and line number; headings and titles are not included in the line count.

Transcription. More or less modern symbols, mostly Americanist, replace those of the sources. Among the less familiar symbols, *ǧ* and *x̌* are uvular (voiced or unaspirated stop and voiceless fricative, respectively); *λ* and *λ̊* are voiced and voiceless lateral affricates; *N* and *L* are voiceless sonorants; *p', t',* etc., are glottalized; tilde ˜ represents rising pitch accent (only in examples from Frachtenberg). Occasional corrections are enclosed in braces { }. See the appendix for fuller discussion of issues in the retranscription

and presentation of examples. The symbol = connects clitics with their hosts; see appendix section A3 for discussion of word and clitic boundaries.

1. For a sketch of the limited ethnographic information available, see Zenk (1990).

2. Certain other uses of a proclitic *x̌=* are presumably historically related to the ergative—as a mark of certain manner adverbs (glossed "ADV"), as part of an instrumental circumfix *x̌= . . . –č* (glossed "INSTR") (Frachtenberg 1922a:326, 370), and as part of a locative-directional circumfix *x̌= . . . –i·č* 'from' (Frachtenberg 1922a:323); for more on the historical relations of such forms on the Oregon coast, see Mithun (2005).

3. As is pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, it is cross-linguistically common for connectives not to be counted in determining "clause-initial position," and the specific pattern whereby coordinator-like elements do not count while subordinators do is reminiscent of Dutch and German. On the other hand, in Alsea, somewhat further to the north on the Oregon coast, connectives such as *təm* 'then' can host enclitics.

4. The absence of stress marking on *gous* 'all' in (10b) reflects Frachtenberg's general practice of never writing stress on monosyllables. Jacobs does write stress on such monosyllabic words, as can be seen in various examples in this article.

5. In Miluk, where as in Hanis enclitics require some overt element to their left and do not break up phrases, there is evidence that at least some enclitics phonologically interact with elements to their right; see section 6.2 (n. 37).

For some discussion of syntactic accounts of enclitic positioning in Slavic and Warlpiri, including the question of whether enclitics in a given language always occupy the same position in the clause (e.g., C^0 or adjacent to it), see Franks and King (2000: 287–310, 369–70), Progovac (1996), and Legate (2008). I take no stand on such issues here.

6. Mithun (1999:398) proposed that *–u* is used when the subject is third person singular, while *–iɬ* is used when the subject is third person plural. This covers a good many cases, but occasionally *–iɬ* appears in clauses with a singular subject, such as (19a). More recently Mithun has evidently abandoned the idea that *–iɬ* is plural (2005).

Given the phonetic resemblance, one might speculate that there is an etymological connection between inverse *–iɬ* and the third person plural pronominal proclitic *iɬ=*. Perhaps some transitive clauses with third person plural actor/subject were reinterpreted as passive, and these in turn as inverse. (This proposal would only make sense if the third person plural pronominal had earlier been an enclitic, as it is in Miluk [see section 6.2].) While this speculation may have merit for purposes of diachrony, a synchronic connection between inverse *–iɬ* and third person plural *iɬ=* in attested Hanis seems unlikely.

7. Presumably the inverse suffix *–u* is etymologically connected with the present passive suffix *–u(·)* (Mithun 2005). However, the two should be distinguished synchronically. According to Frachtenberg the passive *–u(·)* "is added directly to the verbal stem with initial reduplication" (1922a:343), as in (i) below, whereas inverse *–u* usually follows a transitive suffix such as *–(V)t* or *–(V)c* and is not associated with stem reduplication.

(i) *asú· či· tə–tí·k'–u· lə= č'íłə*
again there RDP–shut–PASS ART= door
'The door was shut again.' (FCoosT 74.27; FGr 343)

In addition, I have the impression that the true passives in Hanis are normally or always agentless, although that remains to be confirmed by more careful examination of texts.

8. Frachtenberg's claim (1922a:348) that the dative suffix *–əm* is limited to imperative clauses is erroneous.

9. In fact, *–a(·)ʔis* and *–a·mi* can still be regarded as simply first and second person object suffixes synchronically if one is willing to suppose that the morphological rules adding these suffixes follow the rules that add the inverse suffixes within a single block of disjunctively ordered rules. This is essentially what Anderson proposes in his account of functionally similar "thematic" suffixes in the transitive verbs of Algonquian languages (1992:175).

10. Nonsingular number of an object can be indicated through stem suppletion (e.g., *aiw–* 'kill (pl. object)') or suffixation (e.g., *–i·təx̌* 'plural object' [Frachtenberg 1922a:358]), reducing the need for third person dual or plural proclitics to specify the number of an object.

11. Jacobs's free translation of this clause has 'the young man', but in the narrative context it is clear that it is two young men who are being referred to.

12. Various versions of the "Pronominal Argument Hypothesis," under which argument positions are occupied by pronominal affixes (Jelinek 1984) or by *pro* (Baker 1996) while independent nominals are adjuncts, predict that nominals that are doubled by a pronominal proclitic should be in some sort of dislocated or adjoined position. (Compare Bresnan and Mchombo's [1987] finding that in the Bantu language Chichewa, object nominals that are doubled by an object prefix in the verb must be outside VP, while object nominals that are not doubled are within VP.) It is clear that doubled first or second person independent pronouns are not dislocated or adjoined, given that they can intervene between a clause-level second position enclitic and the verb, as in (32a) and (33). The corpus may well not provide enough evidence to answer the question for third person nominals. (Since there is no overt third person singular proclitic, such evidence can be provided only by clauses containing an overt or understood dual or plural third person argument.) It is at least clear that doubled nominals do not need to be clause-peripheral, as various examples above show.

13. Jacobs regularly writes the negator with a short vowel ⟨in⟩; consequently the fact that it also appears with a short vowel after pronominal enclitics (contracted or not) in his data does not imply any special shortening process.

14. But I have no great objection if others prefer to give greater weight to the morphological idiosyncrasy criterion and label them prefixes; either "proclitic" or "prefix" will do as a label that distinguishes these forms from the independent pronouns.

15. Presumably *=šanƛ̓* 'expectably, I hope' is a modal operator that takes scope over *x̌=či·č*, but since the behavior of *=šanƛ̓* elsewhere shows it to be an enclitic, I ignore it for purposes of the brief discussion here.

16. In the following example (i), a pronominal proclitic exceptionally remains on the predicate in a negative clause. This might perhaps represent an optional or erroneous failure to apply a rule that ordinarily moves proclitics up to the negator.

(i) *iniye* *=he·* ***íɬ=*** *ǧeihc*
no.longer =CUST 3P= inside
'They no longer stayed inside.' (JH 23.8)

(The special negator *iniye* 'no longer'—etymologically the negator *i(·)n* plus an inchoative suffix [Frachtenberg 1922a:339]—normally does attract pronominal proclitics just as *in* does; see, e.g., FCoosT 116.23.)

In examining the behavior of proclitics in negative clauses, one needs to exclude imperative clauses, and also transitive clauses with a first person nonsingular subject plus second person object; the marking of second person in these clauses has special properties, as is discussed in section 4.

17. First person dative or benefactive object (i.e., recipient or beneficiary) is indicated by a suffix *–əm* in both imperative and nonimperative clauses.

18. Frachtenberg writes these dual and plural imperative forms without space or hyphen before *eʔ*: ⟨îceᵋ⟩, ⟨cîneᵋ⟩ in his orthography. This might suggest that in these forms there is no phonetic glottal stop before the *e*. However, Frachtenberg frequently left word-internal glottal stops unwritten after a prefix or proclitic boundary; see discussion in the appendix (section A3). Unfortunately the dual and plural imperative markers do not seem to be clearly attested in Jacobs's Hanis corpus, so it is impossible to use his transcription to determine whether imperative *eʔ*= has an initial glottal stop. Jacobs's corpus does include the Hanis nonsingular imperative clause in (i), in which the imperative marker does have an initial glottal stop.

(i) ⟨cinʔɛ''dji!⟩
šin=ʔéh=ǰi
2P=IMV=come.here
'Come here (pl.)!' (JH 228.2)

However, it is possible that *ʔéhǰi* 'come here' (imperative) is a fixed form—Miluk apparently borrowed it from Hanis as a unit—and if so, it does not provide reliable evidence about imperative *(ʔ)e(ʔ)*= in general.

As far as I can tell, the allomorphy of imperative *eʔ*= in Jacobs's texts is the same as that of the ordinary second person singular proclitic, losing its final glottal stop before obstruents.

19. Negated singular examples are available for at least some imperatives that are formed with suffixes rather than *eʔ*= (only transitive examples could be found, unfortunately); as shown in (i), these too have no second person proclitic on the negator.

(i) ***i·n*** *ƛ̓* *čiˑč* *x̌áɬ-t-**ə*** *te=ʔən=* *déˑmiɬ*
not EXHORT how do-TR-IMV DEM=1S.PS= husband
'Don't you do anything to my husband.' (FCoosT 26.15)

The fact that intransitive imperative *eʔ*= is fixed on the verb might make it reasonable to consider it a prefix rather than a proclitic, though I arbitrarily continue to label it a proclitic.

20. In the hortative example in (i), exceptionally, the verb *ɬa* is not in imperative form (which would be *ɬáʔ-əx̌*, as in (53a)).

(i) *eʔǰiˑ*, *kʷis* *ɬa*
come! HORT.1D.INCL go
'Come, let us two go!' (FCoosT 184.15)

21. If *ʔa*= in (55) were not the imperative proclitic (but, say, a reduplication), that would leave the verb apparently without any imperative marker, unexpectedly for an intransitive verb.

22. In another example of second person plural acting on first person singular, shown in (i), the proclitic *šin*= is separated from the verb, even though the clause is not negative.

(i) *lau* *weˑnǰ* *tə* ***šin=*** *gous* *míleˑč* *kʷin-**áˑʔis***
DEM thus ART 2P= all when see-2→1
'This is the reason why you always see me.' (FCoosT 26.10–11)

It is not clear whether this example is an error, or whether it indicates that there may be some flexibility in the placement of (nonsingular?) pronominal proclitics.

23. In (59), the speakers are two youths, addressing two young women; both sets of characters are frequently referred to by dual pronominal proclitics (third person in narrative, first or second person in quoted speech) in the nearby context.

24. Narrative context makes it clear that the second person participants in these examples are nonsingular. Example (62) comes from the same narrative passage as (59); the speakers are again the two youths addressing the two young women. In the narrative context of (63), the speaker and his wives and children are visiting his parents and siblings; the parents and siblings are being addressed. Two lines later, the same speaker utters (58) to the same addressees, with an unambiguous second person plural marker ('you [pl.] will not see me again').

25. One might try to explain (64) by proposing that, in negative clauses where there are two pronominal proclitics, the first proclitic goes on the negator, while the second goes on the verb. However, this is evidently not a general principle of Hanis grammar. In (35b) (repeated as (i) below for convenience), both the third person plural proclitic and the first person singular proclitic attach to the negator (first person singular plus negator as usual appearing as the portmanteau form *ni·*).

(i) *lau* ***iɬ=*** ***ni·*** *=hanɬ* *kʷína?–i·ɬ*
DEM 3P 1S.not =FUT see–INV
'They shall not see me . . .' (FCoosT 128.23–24)

Unfortunately, (35b) may be the only relevant example in the corpus. Still, it does strongly suggest that the position of the special second person object proclitic *e?=* in negative clauses cannot be made to follow from the same positioning principles that apply to the ordinary pronominal proclitics.

26. The term "indexability hierarchy," advocated by Bickel and Nichols (2007:224–25) and Zúñiga (2006:20–22), is more inclusive than "person hierarchy," allowing for reformulations that reference number in addition to person.

27. The template in figure 1 is intended as a reminder of the paradigmatic classes of grammatical elements involved in person marking, not as a formal account of the position of those elements. In particular, placing the negator and following material in slot C abstracts away from the contractions of proclitics with the negator and, more seriously, ignores the possibility, discussed in section 3.5, that the syntactic position of proclitics in negative clauses differs from that in positive clauses.

28. Zúñiga devotes a chapter of his 2006 book to a survey of Algonquian; he concludes that in Algonquian, too, there is no reason to interpret the first-person-acting-on-second-person suffixes as inverses (2006:127–28). Macaulay (2009) reaches a similar conclusion. As is noted in section 3.3 above, I suspect that the Hanis "second-person-acting-on-first" and "first-person-acting-on-second" suffixes were originally simply first person object and second person object suffixes, respectively.

29. In a formal analysis of Hanis, in large part the set of rules for clitics and the set of rules for verb inflection would probably not need to interact with each other at all; instead each set would separately refer to the argument structure of the clause (and also to its modality, since as noted below proclitic occurrence in imperative clauses differs from that in nonimperative clauses). This suggestion is partly stimulated by the system of morphological rules proposed by Anderson for verb inflection in the Algonquian language Potawatomi (1992:156–79), in which morphological rules for the personal prefixes, or proclitics, are independent of those for the suffixal morphology. Whatever the merits of Anderson's analysis overall (Algonquianists of my acquaintance are not entirely enthusiastic about it), this particular aspect of it makes sense for Hanis.

30. To put these observations in slightly more formal terms: in nonimperative clauses, the fact that a first person object proclitic fails to appear in clauses with a second person subject could be accounted for by assuming that the morphological rules that insert proclitics in slot B constitute a disjunctively ordered block, and that the rules that insert second person proclitics are ordered before the rules that insert first person object proclitics within that block; this, in essence, is Anderson's approach to second person prominence in the Algonquian pronominal prefixes (1992:166, 173). But disjunctive ordering cannot be exploited in this way to explain the absence of a first person object proclitic in singular imperative clauses, where there is no second person proclitic to preempt slot B; some additional rule or principle is needed.

It would be undesirable to posit a special phonologically null second person singular proclitic that occupies slot B in imperative clauses and blocks the insertion of a first person proclitic; one would want to see some independent evidence for the existence of such a null element.

31. The separability of pronominal prefixes from the verb has its analogues in Algonquian languages, too, where the pronominal prefixes may appear on preverbs that need not be adjacent to the suffixally-inflected verb (e.g., Hockett 1948:9; Anderson 2005:86)—something that is not always allowed for in attempts at formal morphological accounts of Algonquian verb morphology. (Thanks to Philip LeSourd for discussion of various aspects of Algonquian morphology and preverb behavior.)

The suggestion in n. 29 above that rules for clitics and rules for verb inflection each refer separately to the argument structure and the imperative vs. nonimperative status of the clause would probably go some way toward solving the problem of the syntactic separation of the A and B slots from the verb.

32. Zúñiga aptly remarks at the end of his survey of Algonquian inversion and person hierarchy phenomena that the idea that Algonquian languages have an overall "person hierarchy 2 > 1 > 3 is . . . at best an oversimplification and at worst an urban legend" (2006:127). Similarly, Macaulay (2009) argues that ranking of second person over first person in Algonquian languages applies in some, but not all, parts of the morphology.

33. Youst, in his short biography of her, reports varied assessments by later linguists of how good Annie Miner Peterson's command of Miluk may have been—rather negative from Howard Berman, more positive from Anthony Grant and Troy Anderson (Youst 1997:186–87). Jacobs proposes that inconsistencies in her Miluk forms (I suspect Jacobs mainly means lexical variants) stem from local dialect variation within Miluk that became confused during the reservation period (1939:4). For the phenomena examined in the present article, the only place where significant inconsistency appears is transitive clauses with first or second person nonsingular participants (see section 6.5).

34. Pierce also suggests (1965:324–25) that comparison of earlier lexical material (as published by Frachtenberg) with Melville Jacobs's materials suggests that the later version of Miluk recorded by Jacobs has converged to Hanis to some degree in both vocabulary and morphology.

I would be happier about accepting Pierce's assessments if the few Miluk grammatical morphemes that he cites were more accurately analyzed. The possessive pronouns that he claims (p. 324) to have identified in Jacobs's texts mostly seem to be wrong—first person singular allegedly *da* or *dai nə* (it is actually *(ʔ)ən=* before coronals and *(ʔ)nə=* elsewhere, identical with the Hanis form), second person singular allegedly *wiˑ* or *kwə* (it is actually *nə=*), etc. (He did get third person singular possessive *də=* right, however.)

35. Occasionally *wi* 'then' appears to host an enclitic. Actually, these are instances where *wi* is immediately followed by a subordinate clause beginning with enclitic-hosting *i* 'if, when' and *wi* has contracted with *i*.

36. The Miluk first person singular possessive proclitic is identical to that of Hanis, though the other singular possessive proclitics do not resemble Hanis (see n. 34 above).

37. Some of the enclitics interact phonologically with a following full word. In particular, the Miluk second person singular enclitic often, though not invariably, displays allomorphy similar to that identified by Doty for the Hanis first person singular proclitic: *=(ʔ)ən* before a coronal, but *=nə* (*=ne*, etc.) otherwise. This makes sense if the phonological host of the enclitic is the following word, although the enclitic nonetheless requires an overt morphosyntactic host to their left. (As noted above, there is also phonological interaction within the enclitic string: the future enclitic *=hanƛ* loses its *h* after some pronominal enclitics, and syllabifies with them—first person singular *=w=anƛ*, second person singular *=n=anƛ*.)

38. I have located only a very few possible instances of third person enclitics used as objects in the Miluk corpus (perhaps four), and these are difficult to parse. In all these instances, the enclitic involved is third person dual *=(ʔ)ič*. One of the less complicated clauses of this sort is shown in (i); analysis of the morphology of the verb is tentative. The third person plural enclitic *=(ʔ)iɬ* that one might expect to express the subject is absent.

(i) *wí·* *ğeh* ***=ič***=*gíl·–ya*
then there =3D=find(?)–TR(?)
'and they (plural or generic, not dual) found them (two) there.' (JM 102.2)

Miluk has a discourse particle *=(ʔ)ič*, probably equivalent to Hanis *hič* 'surprisingly' (Frachtenberg 1922a:391). However, this discourse particle normally follows the verb or other predicate of its clause. The *=(ʔ)ič* in (i) occurs in clausal second position (not counting connective *wi* 'then'), and so is presumably the third person dual enclitic.

39. Doty (2012:76–77 [section 6.2.4]) points out that Miluk transitive verbs can take various suffixes that mark a nonsingular object: *–ʔəme* (also *–ʔama*), which marks third person plural of either subject or object (and occasionally appears on nouns; it probably has some connection with the rare Hanis object-pluralizing enclitic *hə́m·a* [Frachtenberg 1922a:409]), and *–t'a*, which marks third person nonsingular objects (specifically dual, according to Doty, but there appear to be some instances in which it is plural). While detailed investigation of Miluk verb morphology remains to be done, Doty is surely right that it includes ways of marking the number of objects that are probably more productive than Hanis pluralizing affixes. (Probably some transitive verb stems also have suppletive forms implying a nonsingular object, as in Hanis.) This presumably reduces the need for object number to be coded by the third person pronominal clitics.

40. If I am right that the possibilities for placement of the verb and for preverbal placement of NPs and other constituents are similar in Miluk and Hanis, that implies that the different positions of the pronominal clitics are due to differences in the syntactic properties of the clitics themselves, not to differences as to how far up in clausal structure nonclitic constituents such as the verb or NPs are placed. The same conclusion is suggested by the fact that the clausal second position occupied by the nonpronominal enclitics of Hanis (*=hanƛ* 'future', *=he* 'customary', etc.) seems comparable to the position that in Miluk is occupied by both pronominal and nonpronominal enclitics.

41. While *k'á(·)(h)* 'person, people' can be singular in reference, in the narrative context of (85), *qɬə́mniyu k'á·* 'next persons' refers to a sequence of persons in canoes, each canoe apparently containing more than one person. Those who finally take the addressee of (85) aboard are referred to with a plural enclitic: *géh* ***=iɬ*** *ʔwá·sd–a* [there =3P return–TR(?)] 'they had brought him back there' (JM 220.3–4).

42. The second-person-acting-on-first-person suffix *–ei* in this example (apparently also causing ablaut of a root vowel *a* to *e*) may be a special imperative form. Contrast *–ai*

in the indicative clause *i=n=anʎ halq'-d-**ái*** [if=2S=FUT name-TR-2→1] 'if you name me' (JM 193.13). The form *-ai* appears in some imperative clauses, however, as in (92) below.

43. But perhaps not all of the time: in the second clause of (i), the transitive imperative lacks a subject enclitic, even though the context suggests that its subject is second person dual.

(i) *ámi =is dič =í? halkʷdí·-m*
not.have =2D something =YNQ give(?)-DAT.2→1
'Do you (two) not have something? Give me something!' (JM 145.5)

44. Again, the second-person-acting-on-first-person suffix *-ei* may be a specifically imperative form.

45. However, *é(h)ǰi(h)* is also attested by itself with a nonsingular enclitic, as in (i).

(i) *eǰí**=ʔis***
come=2D
'come (dual)!' (JM 140.15)

46. Jacobs erroneously places a word break between *hé·niye* and *(ʔ)esčíl*. I assume that *wé·n də=hé·niyeʔes* counts as a phrase ('such a length', or 'its being so long'), and that this is why enclitics are placed after it.

47. For another possible instance of nonce Hanis influence, consider (i), where the second person dual enclitic has the shape *iš*, like the corresponding Hanis proclitic, rather than the expected Miluk form *=is*.

(i) . . . , *i **=iš**=tb-ád͡zˀ-**ai** . . .*
when =2D(?)=bury-TR-2→1
'. . . , when you [two] bury me . . .' (JM 187.5)

48. In the narrative context of (100b), a group of people is being addressed in some sense, but the sentence that immediately follows (100b) in the speech unambiguously uses a second person singular enclitic. Probably a single person is being addressed as a representative of the group.

49. In dialogue preceding (101) in the narrative, the group of speakers that utter (101) are referred to by first person plural or second person plural (not dual) pronouns, e.g., *kʷi= **čílnə=**hadáiʔməs* [DEM= 2P.PS=money] 'your (pl.) money' (JM 60.7).

50. For an introduction to the Northwest Coast as a linguistic area and regions within it, see Thompson and Kinkade (1990).

51. The remarks that follow were stimulated in part by Garrett's recent paper (2010) on the position of Yurok within the Algic family and its areal relations with other languages of northwestern California; Garrett does not examine potential contacts in Oregon.

52. Golla (2007:72–74) draws on recent archaeological work to propose that Wiyot and Yurok reached their present positions by moving down from the Plateau via the Oregon coast, Wiyot first and Yurok somewhat later (he suggests a date after about 500 AD for the arrival of Yurok; see Hildebrandt 2007:93). He further assumes that Proto-Algic itself was located somewhere in the southern Plateau region, again not too far from the Oregon coast. This proposal is speculative, but has the merit of explaining how Wiyot and Yurok—clearly related, but nonetheless very different—should have ended up next to each other in northwestern California. (For what my nonexpert opinion is worth, the differences between Wiyot and Yurok seem great enough that it is not likely that both

languages have been in exactly their present-day adjacent locations for their entire history.) If one accepts Golla's scenario, diffusion could have taken place directly between ancestral Wiyot or Yurok and other languages along the route that they followed, such as Hanis and Miluk.

53. Wiyot [h] is automatically inserted before word-initial vowels, so the third person prefix is presumably underlyingly *u?–*.

54. The phonological systems of Hanis and Miluk, on the one hand, and of Yurok and Wiyot, on the other, though not particularly similar overall, do share one detail—a voiced velar fricative *γ* (Robins 1958:2; Teeter 1964:13–14; these sources spell the sound as *g*). This sound appears in no other languages of the region, except for some Athabaskan languages (Tolowa-Tututni [Collins 1989:327 n. 2], but not Galice [Hoijer 1966] or Hupa [Golla 1996:367–68]).

References

Anderson, Stephen R.
1992 A-Morphous Morphology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2005 Aspects of the Theory of Clitics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, Mark
1996 The Polysynthesis Parameter. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bickel, Balthasar, and Johanna Nichols
2007 Inflectional Morphology. *In* Language Typology and Syntactic Description. 2d ed. Vol. 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon, edited by Timothy Shopen, 169–240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, Leonard
1970 Algonquian. *In* A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology, edited by Charles F. Hockett, 440–88. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Corrected reprint; originally published in 1946.)

Boas, Franz
1911 Chinook. *In* Handbook of American Indian Languages, edited by Franz Boas, part 1, 559–677. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, part 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Bresnan, Joan, and Sam A. Mchombo
1987 Topic, Pronoun and Agreement in Chichewa. Language 63(4):741–82.

Collins, James
1989 Nasalization, Lengthening, and Phonological Rhyme in Tolowa. International Journal of American Linguistics 55(3):326–40.

Doty, Christopher S.
2011 The Curious Case of Coos: Reevaluating Linguistic Relationships on the Oregon Coast. MS (qualifying paper), University of Oregon.
2012 A Reassessment of the Genetic Classification of Miluk Coos. Ph.D. diss., University of Oregon. (Pre-defense draft.)

Dryer, Matthew
1983 Coos Word Order. Paper presented at the Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL), University of Oregon, Eugene.

Dyk, Walter
1933 A Grammar of Wishram. Ph.D. diss., Yale University.

Edel, May M.
1939 The Tillamook Language. International Journal of American Linguistics 10(1):1–57.

Egesdal, Steven M., and M. Terry Thompson
1998 A Fresh Look at Tillamook (Hutyéyu) Inflectional Morphology. *In* Salish Languages and Linguistics: Theoretical and Descriptive Perspectives, edited by Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins and M. Dale Kinkade, 235–73. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Frachtenberg, Leo J.
1913 Coos Texts. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 1. New York: Columbia University Press.
1920 Alsea Texts and Myths. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 67. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
1922a Coos. *In* Handbook of American Indian Languages, part 2, edited by Franz Boas, 297–429. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, part 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
1922b Siuslawan (Lower Umpqua). *In* Handbook of American Indian Languages, part 2, edited by Franz Boas, 431–629. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40, part 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
n.d. Yakonan (Alsea). [Grammatical sketch; copy includes marginal notes by Melville Jacobs.] MS. Melville Jacobs Papers (1693–71–13), box 101, folder V205c. Manuscripts, Special Collections, and University Archives, University of Washington Libraries.

Franks, Steven, and Tracy Holloway King
2000 A Handbook of Slavic Clitics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garrett, Andrew
2010 Reconstructing the Place of Yurok. Paper presented at the Thirteenth Spring Workshop on Theory and Method in Linguistic Reconstruction, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 9 April 2010.

Golla, Victor
1996 Sketch of Hupa, an Athapaskan Language. *In* Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 17: Languages, edited by Ives Goddard, 364–89. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
2007 Linguistic Prehistory. *In* California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, 71–82. Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press.

Grant, Anthony P.
1997 Coast Oregon Penutian: Problems and Possibilities. International Journal of American Linguistics 63(1):144–56.

Halpern, Aaron
1995 On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.

Hildebrandt, William R.
2007 Northwest California: Ancient Lifeways among Forested Mountains, Flowing Rivers, and Rocky Shores. *In* California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, 83–97. Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press.

Hockett, Charles F.
1948 Potawatomi I: Phonemics, Morphophonemics, and Morphological Survey. International Journal of American Linguistics 14(1):1–10.

Harry Hoijer
1966 Galice Athapaskan: A Grammatical Sketch. International Journal of American Linguistics 32(4):320–27.

Jacobs, Melville
1931 A Sketch of Northern Sahaptin Grammar. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 4(2):85–292. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
1939 Coos Narrative and Ethnologic Texts. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 8(1):1–126. Seattle: University of Washington.
1940 Coos Myth Texts. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 8(2):127–260. Seattle: University of Washington.

Jelinek, Eloise
1984 Empty Categories, Case, and Configurationality. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 2:39–76.

Kroeber, Paul D.
1999 The Salish Language Family: Reconstructing Syntax. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Legate, Julie Anne
2008 Warlpiri and the Theory of Second Position Clitics. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 26:3–60.

Macaulay, Monica
2009 On Prominence Hierarchies: Evidence from Algonquian. Linguistic Typology 13(3):357–89.

Mithun, Marianne
1987 Is Basic Word Order Universal? *In* Coherence and Grounding in Discourse: Outcome of a Symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984, edited by Russell S. Tomlin, 281–328. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
1999 The Languages of Native America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2005 Ergativity and Language Contact on the Oregon Coast: Alsea, Siuslaw, and Coos. *In* Special Session on Syntax and Semantics of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas: Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, February 18–21, 2000, edited by Andrew K. Simpson, 77–95. Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Pierce, Joe E.
1965 Hanis and Miluk: Dialects or Unrelated Languages? International Journal of American Linguistics 31(4):323–25.

Progovac, Ljiljana
1996 Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the Second Position. *In* Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena, edited by Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky, 411–28. Stanford, Calif: CSLI Publications.

Rigsby, Bruce, and Noel Rude
1996 Sketch of Sahaptin, a Sahaptian language. *In* Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 17: Languages, edited by Ives Goddard, 666–92. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Robins, R. H.
1958 The Yurok Language: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon. University of California Publications in Linguistics 15. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Silverstein, Michael
1976 Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity. *In* Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages, edited by R. M. W. Dixon, 112–71. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Teeter, Karl V.
1964 The Wiyot Language. University of California Publications in Linguistics 37. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thompson, Laurence C.
1979 Salishan and the Northwest. *In* The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment, edited by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, 692–765. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Dale Kinkade
1990 Languages. *In* Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 7: Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, 31–51. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
Youst, Lionel
1997 She's Tricky Like Coyote: Annie Miner Peterson, an Oregon Coast Indian Woman. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Zenk, Henry B.
1990 Siuslawans and Coosans. *In* Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 7: Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, 572–79. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
Zúñiga, Fernando
2006 Deixis and Alignment: Inverse Systems in Indigenous Languages of the Americas. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Zwicky, Arnold M., and Geoffrey K. Pullum
1983 Cliticization vs. Inflection: English *n't*. Language 59:502–13.