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Abstract:
Subject agreement morphology in Thompson River Salish (TRS) is shifting from clitic status to affix status. This study presents new fieldwork data from this critically endangered language, including the first ever systematic analysis of speech errors in a Native American language. This clitic-to-affix shift is occurring in nominalized clauses, and indicates that nominalization agreement morphology is changing syntactic position. The data thus offer a synchronous view of morphological changes that have previously only been considered from a historical-comparative perspective (e.g., Newman 1979, 1980, Davis 1999), and reveal insights into how agreement morphology is processed at the interface between phonology and morpho-syntax.

1. Introduction

Joe Stemberger (IJAL 1984: 345-346) on collecting speech errors:

Researchers such as myself must be willing to monitor constantly the speech around us and to behave oddly by writing things down in the middle of conversations .... In fieldwork by linguists, however, ... the linguist transcribes in detail everything that the consultant says. In other words, the situation requires the linguist to behave in the same odd way that the collector of speech errors does. This speech situation is perfectly adapted for collecting speech errors ....

Outline of talk:
- language background
- subject marking in Thompson Salish: possessive agreement marked via clitics
- data on nominalized clauses: possessive agreement often marked via affixes
- speech errors: possessive agreement sometimes marked as both clitic and affix
- conclusion: the phonology-morphosyntax interface

1a. The target language: N̓eʔkepmxciʔc (Thompson River Salish)
- one of 23 Salish languages; member of Interior Salish
- severely endangered; no more than a few 100 fluent elderly speakers (Kinkade 1992, Davis and Matthewson to appear)

* Many thanks to Flora Ehrhardt and Patricia McKay for their ever-patient teaching. This research was funded by Kinkade and Jacobs Research Grants from the Jacobs Research Fund, as well as funding from NSERC, SSHRC, and the DAAD to the author. Additional funding through SSHRC Research Grants to Henry Davis, Lisa Matthewson and Hotze Rullmann is gratefully acknowledged.
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2 (map from Mithun 1999)

- predicate initial: VSO
- 2nd position clitics with evidential, modal, aspectual, situational deictic meanings (CP)
- radical head-marking language (transitivity, subject and object agreement, etc.)
- overt lexical arguments are not required, and often pro once established in discourse

(1)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{VERB} & [2\text{CL}] & S & O \\
q^w\text{x-t-sm-s} & =nke=\text{xom}=xe? & \dagger=\text{Sára} & \dagger=n-\text{spún}.^1 \\
\text{borrow-TRANS-1SG.O-3TS} & =\text{EVID}=\text{PERF}=\text{DEM} & \text{DET}=\text{Sara} & \text{DET}=\text{my-spoon} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘Sara must have taken my spoon.’

Auxiliaries typically precede the verb and attract 2nd position clitics. Transitive suffixes remain attached to the verb:

(2)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{AUX} & [2\text{CL}] & \text{VERB} & S & O \\
w?q\text{ex} & =n=i?=q\text{ay}=\text{hw}=xe? & \text{céw}-\text{es} & \text{pro} & \ominus=nk^w\text{ñústn} \\
\text{PROG=YES/NO=yet=recollect=still}=\text{DEM} & \text{wash-TRANS.3O.3TS} & \text{pro} & \text{DET}=\text{window} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘I think she’s still out there washing the window.’

How to identify clitics:

(i) If an agreement morpheme occupies a variable position relative to a given predicate, it is a clitic.
(ii) Otherwise, it is an affix. (adapted from Davis 2000:502)

2. Subject-marking in Thompson River Salish

There are full subject agreement paradigms for indicative, conjunctive (i.e. subjunctive)\(^2\) and nominalized clauses. Clitics (=) mark intransitive subjects; suffixes (-) mark transitive subjects (TS).

---

1 See the Appendix for a key to the orthography and glosses.
2 In the Interior Salish tradition, “subjunctive” clauses and agreement morphology are labelled conjunctive to avoid confusion with “subject” in glosses.
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In transitive clauses, subject agreement is marked with a suffix encoding the person and number of the subject; as well as an expletive clitic encoding clause type (always 3rd person).

Table 1. Subject marking in Nte’zkepmxcin
(adapted from Thompson and Thompson 1992:58-61; Kroeber 1997:378)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Suffix</th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>2sg</th>
<th>1pl</th>
<th>2pl</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative Clitic</td>
<td>=kn</td>
<td>=k</td>
<td>=kt</td>
<td>=kp</td>
<td>=Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Clitic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>e?=</td>
<td>=kt</td>
<td>=ep</td>
<td>=s/=c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Clitic</td>
<td>=wn, =un</td>
<td>=ux</td>
<td>=ut</td>
<td>=up</td>
<td>=us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Thompson (and Proto-Salish) subjects (Davis 1999, 2000)

(4a) Possessive clitic (=s) surfaces after first prosodic word (future auxiliary):
... ?e s=xʷúy=s xʷúy-O-O-ne.
... and NOM=FUT=3PoCl look.for-trans-3OBJ-1SG.TRANS Subject (TS)
‘... and I’m gonna’ try and find it.’

(4b) Possessive clitic (=c) surfaces after first prosodic word (the verb tékt ‘rain’):
té [k s=tékt=c].
NEG COMP NOM=rain=3PoCl
‘It’s not raining.’

(5a) Conjunctive clitic (=us) surfaces after first prosodic word (progressive auxiliary):
... † wʔex=us cúx-x-a-O-ne t=l=n-ciťxʷ.
... COMP PROG=3CnCl show-APPL-DRV-3O-1SG.TS OBL=DET=1SG.POSS -house
‘... when I show him the house.’

(5b) Conjunctive clitic (=us) surfaces after first prosodic word (the verb wikts ‘see’)
... † čéw-a-O-ne=us he=nkʷoŋkʷoŋústn.
... COMP wash-TR-3O-1SG.TS=3CnCl DET=windows
‘...when I washed the windows.’

(6) Indicative clitic (=Ø) surfaces after first prosodic word (progressive auxiliary)
wʔex=Ø =xe? ?es-kʷén-s-t-sm s †=n-snúkʷe?
PROG=3InCl =DEM STAT-look-CAUS-TRANS-1SG.O-3TS DET=1SG.POSS-friend
‘My friend was watching me.’

3 The affricate [ʧ] (orthographic -c) appears after coronal fricatives [ʃ ʃ].
Syntactically, clitics (which encode clause type) are in C°; affixes, which encode person and number agreement, are in v° (e.g., Davis 2000, Wiltschko 2006, 2008):

![Diagram of agreement]

Figure 1. The “expletive” pattern of agreement: Expletive clitic and subject agreement suffix in Nteʔkpmxcin transitive clauses

There is a consistent link between the syntactic position of agreement morphology (C° or v°) and its phonological realization (clitic or affix).

3. The Problem: Nominalized clauses in Thompson Salish

We saw in (4-6) the expected pattern of agreement in nominalized clauses with an auxiliary:

NOM=Auxiliary=PoCl Verb

The expected pattern in nominalized clauses without an auxiliary is:

NOM=Verb=PoCl

In nominalized transitive clauses lacking an auxiliary, the expletive possessive clitic =s never surfaces:

(7) Possessive clitic does not surface after transitive verbs in absence of auxiliary:

... ?e s=wík-t-Ø-ne(*=s).
... and NOM=see-TRANS-3OBJ-1SG.TS(*=3PoCl)
‘... and then I saw her.’

Compare to (4a) or (8), where we have an auxiliary, and the expletive =s is obligatory:

(8) tetéʔ k s=xʷúyʔ*(=s) ?ʷey-t-Ø-éne.
NEG COMP NOM=FUT*(=3PoCl) burn-TRANS-3O-1SG.TS
‘I’m not gonna’ burn it.’

Compare (7) with the conjunctive clause in (5b), where the conjunctive clitic is obligatory, even in the absence of an auxiliary.

4. A solution: A clitic to affix shift

Q: Why does the expletive possessive clitic not surface after a transitive verb?
A: Because it is not a clitic, but has been reanalyzed as an affix. Transitive verbs already carry indicative subject agreement suffixes, so a possessive subject suffix can not co-occur. (see Brown et al. 2003, 2005, Wiltschko 2008, for a similar account of transitive gaps in Salish)
This pattern is observed in nominalized clauses in Southern Interior languages:
In Shuswap, Columbian and Okanagan Salish, possessive agreement clitics have been uniformly reanalyzed as affixes (Davis 1999, Kroeber 1999).

That is, nominalization agreement morphology has shifted syntactic position from Cº to vº.

\[
\text{CP} \quad - \quad \text{vP}
\]

subject affix

Figure 2. Southern Interior Salish: subject affix only (vº agreement)

But now we have a paradox:
- Possessive subject agreement morphology is processed as a clitic (CP agreement) in the presence of an auxiliary, but as an affix (vº agreement) otherwise.

Is there other evidence that nominalization morphology is variably treated?

5. Overt affixal behaviour: gapped clauses
In nominalized clauses containing a gap (eg. the relative clause in 9), the nominalizer s- itself often surfaces as a prefix to the verb (n- ‘give’ in 9) rather than as a proclitic to a preceding auxiliary (progressive ðex in 3). (Kroeber 1997, 1999)

By the Clitic Mobility Criterion (3), the nominalizer s- must be an affix in (9):

(9) ... ð=nkñmín [CP ð ?ex s-n-t-Ø-és ð=Máry].
    ... DET=fishing.rod COMP PROG NOM-give-TRANS-3O-3TS DET=Mary
    ‘... the fishing rod that he gave Mary.’

The CP with the wh-gap in (10) follows the same pattern:

(10) sté? [CP k xʷúy s-ník-n-Ø-xw].
    what COMP FUT NOM-cut-DRV-3O-2SG.TS
    ‘What are you going to cut it with?’ (adapted from Kroeber 1997: 395, ex. 43)

Complement clauses that are nominalized sometimes also behave this way:

(11) cú-ne xe? [CP k xʷúy s-kən-t-Ø-ém,
    think-TR.3O.1SG.TS DEM COMP FUT NOM-help-TR-3O-IDF.TS,
    tékm=us e=séytknmx, e=Bill] ....
    all=3CnCl DET=people, DET=Bill ...
    ‘I thought everyone was going to help Bill ....’

This pattern is not uncommon, and alternates with the clitic behaviour.

4 The same change has occurred in Bella Coola (Davis 2000:508, ft. 13).
By the Clitic Mobility Criterion, the morphemes \( s=...=s \) in (4a), (8) and (12) must be clitics.

(12) \[ \text{?éx=kn=xe? } \text{qe?nín} \quad [\text{CP } k \quad \text{...=}s \quad \text{PROG=}1\text{sgInCl=DEM hear} \quad \text{COMP NOM=}3\text{PoCl} \]
\[ \text{mát=m-t-s} \quad \text{k } \text{swét=us}. \quad \text{visit-rel-tr.2sgo-3ts} \quad \text{irl who=}3\text{CoCl} \]

‘I heard that somebody was visiting you.’

Thus, even in the presence of an auxiliary, nominalization morphemes are not uncommonly interpreted as affixes.

6. Speech errors

We would expect such a situation to be unstable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINALIZER</th>
<th>POSSESIVE AGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 1 (PROTO-SALISH, THOMPSON SALISH)</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 2</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 3</td>
<td>Affix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 4 (SOUTHERN INTERIOR SALISH, SOME THOMPSON)</td>
<td>Affix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Expected co-occurrence patterns of nominalizer and possessive agreement in nominalized transitive clauses

Speech errors show that the two parts of the nominalization system (the nominalizer \( s= \) and the possessive agreement clitic \( =s \)) are indeed sometimes produced in different phono-syntactic domains (vP, affixed to the verb; and CP, cliticized to the initial auxiliary).

6.1 Method

- I counted nominalized clauses produced during 31 fieldwork sessions spanning 15 months (two language consultants). Sessions were recorded and then transcribed in detail.
- Each instance of a nominalized clause was classified as transitive or intransitive, with or without auxiliary, and for which error type occurred (Pattern 2 or 3, or a variant thereof).
- Because transitives do not carry possessive agreement (see section 3), intransitive clauses with auxiliaries are the primary source of these errors.

6.2 Results

Total nominalized clauses: 1323
Intransitives: 950 No auxiliary: 739 With auxiliary: 211
Transitive: 373 No auxiliary: 316 With auxiliary: 57

Production rates were calculated as a percentage of overall productions with auxiliaries. I report only on intransitive forms here.
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PATTERN 1: Typical and expected clitic pattern (4a, 8) [nom=aux=PoCl verb] (34.1%)

(13) ... k s=xʷúy=s nés zéw-m t=Joe t=k=spiʔáwt
... COMP nom=fut=3PoCl go dipnet-intrans det=Joe obl=irl=day
‘... that Joe was gonna’ go dipnetting (fishing) tomorrow.’

PATTERN 2: Speech error: nominalizer as clitic (s=), possessive agreement as affix (-s) [nom=aux verb-poss] (2.4%)

(14) ... k s=nés púyt-s.
and nom=go lie.down-3poss
‘And she went to bed.’

PATTERN 2A: Speech error: possessive agreement surfaces twice (clitic =c and affix -s): [nom=aux=PoCl verb-poss] (1.9%)

(15) ... te s=xʷošš-s xʷúšš-s
... and nom=go=3PoCl return.home[intrans]-3poss
‘... and then he went home.’

PATTERN 3: Speech error: possessive agreement as clitic (=kt), nominalizer as prefix (s-): [aux=PoCl nom-verb] (4.3%)

(16) ... te xʷúy=kt s-kʷúkʷ
... that fut=1pl.poCl nom-cook
‘... that we’re going to cook.’

PATTERN 3A: Speech error: nominalizer surfaces twice (clitic s= and affix s-)
[nom=aux=PoCl nom-verb] (4.3%)

(17) stéʔ [cp k cʔ=s=xʷúy s-txʷ-ʔp].
what comp 2sg.poCl=nom=fut nom-buy-inch
‘What are you going to be buying?’

PATTERN 4: Southern Interior/Shuswap affix pattern [aux nom-verb-poss] (47.9%)

(18) ... tk smíyəc tk xʷúy:s-qáy̓-m-s.
... obl.irl deer obl.irl fut nom-shoot-intrans-3poss
‘... a deer that he was gonna’ hunt.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN</th>
<th>NOMINALIZER</th>
<th>POSSESSIVE AGREEMENT</th>
<th>RATE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 1</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 2</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>Clitic &amp; Affix</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 3</td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Clitic &amp; Affix</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERN 4</td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PATTERN 5)</td>
<td>Clitic &amp; Affix</td>
<td>Clitic &amp; Affix</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Attested co-occurrence patterns of nominalizer and possessive agreement in intransitive nominalized clauses with auxiliaries
Comparable speech errors are (never) made in the indicative or conjunctive paradigms, again suggesting that a reanalysis is underway in the nominalization paradigm.

(19) \[ e \ x^w \ "\text{ũy}=\text{wn} \ \text{nes} \ \text{páx-m}(*/-\text{wn}). \]
\[ \text{COMP FUT} = 1 \text{sg} \text{CnCl go hunt-TRANS}(*/-1 \text{sg.Conjunctive.Suffix}) \]
\[ \text{‘when I go hunting.’} \]

(20) \[ w^k \ x^x \ e \ x^w \ "\text{ú}=\text{wn} \]
\[ \text{PROG} = 2 \text{sg} \text{InCl} = \text{yes/no} = \text{yet}=\text{still make-TRANS}(*/-2 \text{sg}) \text{OBL.IRL}, \text{uh, ... prick=ear} \]
\[ \text{‘Are you still making, uh, earrings?’} \]

7. Stability over time

So far we saw:

In transitive nominalized clauses, nominalization morphology is sometimes treated as affixal, and sometimes as a clitic.

In particular, in the absence of an auxiliary, possessive agreement never surfaces. This suggests that it is analyzed as an affix. Transitive verbs carry indicative affixes, which block the possessive affix from surfacing.

The basic pattern is repeated here for convenience:

(21) With auxiliary, clitic behaviour
\[ ?e \ k \ s=nés=c \ mɪl-m-s \ t=\text{snúk}^w e^-s. \]
\[ \text{and COMP NOM }= \text{go}=3 \text{PoCl visit-REL}-3 \text{O}-3 \text{TS DET=friend}-3 \text{POSS} \]
\[ \text{‘And then (he wanted to) go meet his friends.’} \]

(22) No auxiliary, affix behaviour (possessive clitic does not surface)
\[ \text{NEG COMP NOM }= \text{LOC-believe-TR}-2 \text{GO}-3 \text{TS}(*=3 \text{PoCl}) \]
\[ \text{‘She doesn’t believe you.’} \]

(23) Transitive verb allows only one subject suffix
\[ [\text{CP } [v \text{P verb-TRANS-OBJECT.SUFFIX-SUBJECT.SUFFIX}]=\text{CLITIC }] \]

a. \[ * \ [\text{CP s=} [v \text{P ce-t-Ø-és-c}] ] \]
\[ \text{NOM=put-TRANS-3OBJ-3TS-3POSS.SUBJECT} \]
\[ \text{intended: ‘S/he put it’} \]
\[ \text{[nominalized]} \]

b. \[ [\text{CP s=} [v \text{P ce-t-Ø-és}] ] \]
\[ \text{NOM=put-TRANS-3OBJ-3TS} \]
\[ \text{‘S/he put it’} \]
\[ \text{[nominalized]} \]

c. \[ [\text{CP } [v \text{P ce-t-Ø-és}]=\text{us }] \]
\[ \text{put-TRANS-3OBJ-3TS}=3 \text{CnCl} \]
\[ \text{‘S/he put it’} \]
\[ \text{[conjunctive]} \]
Perhaps remarkably, this contrast has been robust for at least 130 years. We find it in Kroeber (1997, 1999), Thompson and Thompson (1992, 1996), and The Morning Prayer and the Evening Prayer 1878.

(24) Possessive clitic does not surface after transitive verbs: 1878 examples
... te s=cu-t-O-és(*=e) n † xé? ?e† n-Łeeye.
... OBL NOM-do-TR-3O-3TS(*=3PoCl) in DET heaven and LOC-here
“... maker of Heaven and Earth.”
[from The Apostles’ Creed in The Morning Prayer and the Evening Prayer 1878:20]

(25) o skwûk“pi?-kt xwón-t=us ?e s=kan-t-i-p(*=s).
o chief-1PL.POSS fast-IM=3CnCl and NOM=help-TR-1PL.O-2PL.TS(*=3PoCl)
‘O God, make haste to help us.’
[from The Lord’s Prayer in The Morning Prayer and the Evening Prayer 1878:16]

This suggests that the processing of the same agreement morphology in two different syntactic positions can be a stable part of the synchronous grammar.

8. Conclusion: Some speculations about the phonology-morphosyntax interface
It’s all well and good to suggest that nominalization morphology is processed in two different syntactic positions, but what does that tell us about the cognitive processing here?

Why are nominalized clauses the target for change, just like in Southern Interior Salish, and not conjunctive or indicative clauses?
(i) language contact?
(ii) homophonous NP possession paradigm (Davis 1999, Kroeber 1999)

The clausal and phrasal (eg. NP) nominalization paradigms are identical in terms of their segmental content (though not other formal features! -- see Davis 1999 for thorough discussion):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINALIZER</th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>2sg</th>
<th>1pl</th>
<th>2pl</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clausal Nmz.:</td>
<td>s=</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>e?=</td>
<td>=kt</td>
<td>=ep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Clitic (marks subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal Nmz.:</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>e?-</td>
<td>-kt</td>
<td>-ep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Affix (marks possessors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Clausal and phrasal possession marking in Nte?kepmxcin
(adapted from Thompson and Thompson 1992)
These are the three core transitive cases we need to explain:

(A) standard: \( \text{NOM}=\text{aux}=\text{PoCl} \quad \text{verb-} \text{TS} \) (complement clauses)

(B) affixal behaviour: \( \text{aux} \quad \text{NOM-verb-} \text{TS}(*-\text{POSS}) \) (gapped clauses)

(C) no auxiliary: \( \text{NOM-verb-} \text{TS}(*-\text{POSS}) \) (all nominalized clauses)

Some assumptions:
- Agreement features are parasitic on other functional heads (\( C^o \) and \( v^o \)) (Davis 2000, Wiltschko 2008, Chomsky 1995 in general, etc.)
- \( C^o \) and \( v^o \) each head a syntactic phase, which has a phonological spellout (e.g. Selkirk and Kratzer 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>morphosyntax</th>
<th>interface</th>
<th>phonology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C^o ) [clause type, subj agr.]</td>
<td>CP phase</td>
<td>= clitic (PoCl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v^o ) [subj agr.]</td>
<td>vP phase</td>
<td>- transitive suffix (TS), - possessive affix (POSS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The link between morphosyntax and phonology

Some crude speculation: I use 3rd person nominalization morphology \( s=\ldots=s \) to illustrate.

(A) standard: \( \text{NOM}=\text{aux}=\text{PoCl} \quad \text{verb} \) (complement clauses)
In complement clauses, nominalization is determined by the matrix clause, that is, external to the entire nominalized clause. (e.g. complements of the verbs say, think, hear.)

level of nominalization: \textit{CP phase} are clitics \( s=\ldots=s \) available? \textbf{yes}

(B) affixal behaviour: \( \text{aux} \quad \text{NOM-verb-} \text{TS}(*-\text{POSS}) \) (gapped clauses)
In gapped clauses (e.g. relative clauses), nominalization is determined by the vP-internal gap (e.g. oblique arguments extracted from (di)transitives result in nominalized clauses).

level of nominalization: \textit{vP phase} are affixes \( s-\ldots-s \) available? \textbf{yes}

(C) no auxiliary: \( \text{NOM-verb-} \text{TS}(*-\text{POSS}) \) (all nominalized clauses)
The overt phonological host for agreement morphology is a verb. First potential level to apply nominalization morphology is \( v \) (spellout in vP phase).

first linear level of nmz: \textit{vP phase} are affixes \( s-\ldots-s \) available? \textbf{yes}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \( \text{can affix appear? no (position occupied by TS trans. agr.)} \)
  \item \( \text{yes for intransitive verbs} \)
\end{itemize}
(D) errors:
Since both clitic and affix realizations of nominalization morphology are available and used, we expect the “wrong” forms to be accessed some of the time.

- Because conjunctive and indicative paradigms do not have homophonous affixal versions, (B-D) do not occur in the conjunctive or indicative subject marking paradigms.
- The selection of affix rather than clitic is done purely on the basis of segmental identity (Table 5); other properties of the two nominalization paradigms are otherwise distinct!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmental content</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Syntactic Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clausal Nominalization (subject marking)</td>
<td>/ʃ...ʃ/</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal Possession (possessor marking)</td>
<td>/ʃ...ʃ/</td>
<td>affix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Features of Clausal Nominalization and Phrasal Possession Paradigms

Joe Stemberger again (1984: 349):
Currently, however, many [fieldworkers] are simply ignoring errors. They wish to learn the rules of the language, and incorrect items obviously do not follow the rules. However, ... errors can be used to infer the regularities of the language .... they should not ignore errors, but write them down and collect them in a special place.

Appendix
Abbreviations in the glosses are based on Thompson and Thompson 1992, 1996, Kroeber 1997:

| * - ' | = affix | IRL = irrealis |
| * = | = clitic | LOC = locative |
| * | = ungrammatical | NEG = negation |
| APPL | = applicative [transitive suffix] | NOM = nominalizer |
| CAUS | = causative [transitive suffix] | O = object |
| CnCl | = conjunctive clitic | OBL = oblique |
| COMP | = complementizer | PERF = perfective |
| DEM | = demonstrative | PL = plural |
| D, DET | = determiner | PoCl = possessive clitic |
| DRV | = directive transitivizer | POSS, PS = possessive (affix) |
| EVID | = evidential | PROG, PRG = progressive |
| FUT | = future | REL = relational [transitive suffix] |
| IDF | = indefinite | SG = singular |
| IM | = immediate [intransitive suffix] | STAT = stative prefix |
| INCH | = inchoative [intransitive suffix] | TRANS, TR = control transitivizer |
| InCl | = indicative clitic | TS = transitive subject |
| INTRANS, INTR | = intransitive |
Data are presented in the orthography developed in Thompson and Thompson (1992, 1996). Acute accent ‘ indicates word-level stress. Symbols not listed are the standard IPA forms:

- $c = [tʃ]$ or $[c]$
- $ɔ = [ʌ]$
- $ʃ = [s]$
- $c = [ts]$
- $i = [i, ei, ai]$
- $u = [u, o, ə]$
- $ĉ = [ts']$
- $o = [o, ə]$
- $x = [χ]$
- $e = [e, æ, a, ə]$
- $s = [ʃ]$ or $[ʃ]$
- $y = [y, ı].$
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