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1. Introduction
This paper examines the Upriver Halkomelem process of cliticizing determiners onto the previous element in connected speech contexts. It presents two possible explanations, problematizes both approaches, and points out a related phenomenon with auxiliaries, indicating a need for a unified theory.

2. Upriver Halkomelem Determiners
Table 1: Upriver Halkomelem determiners (Wiltschko 2002:160; originally adapted from Galloway 1993:387)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male/unmarked</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present+visible</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near+not visible</td>
<td>kwthe</td>
<td>se, kwse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>kw’e</td>
<td>kw’he, kwse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>ye, (any of the above)</td>
<td>ye, (any of the above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All examples in the paper are from two texts, the ‘Sasq’ets’ narrative told by Yamalot and the ‘Cottonwood’ narrative told by Ts’ats’elexwot.
- However, te is used the majority of the time in the texts used for this study.

3. Textual Cases of Determiner Clisis
In spontaneous or connected speech contexts, Upriver Halkomelem determiners can cliticize onto the previous element, often a verbal complex, as in the following example:

(1) “oh my” éwe i-olu {qel=ye} {sásqets} NEG AUX-3SG.S ask? {bad=DET.PL} {sasquatch}

“The sasquatch is not as bad.’ (Sasq’ets, line 73)

The syntactic elements forming a constituent (determiner and noun phrase) are prosodically separated.

There are also examples where a determiner does not encliticize:

(2) s-pípew ye thqát STAT-freeze.DIM DET.PL tree

‘The trees were frozen.’ (Cottonwood, line 2)

4. Morphosyntactic Account
Perhaps the determiners are undergoing a diachronic change where they are being reanalyzed as part of the verb phrase rather than specifiers to the noun phrase, resulting in something like agreement markers.

Reasons this is not a good explanation:
- The properties of that the determiner system encodes (gender, number, ‘deictic’ properties of noun phrases) don’t match those of the agreement system (person and number).
- The syntactic distribution of agreement and determiners are different: agreement is located on complementizers, auxiliaries, or predicates, but determiners can appear elsewhere (cf. Galloway 1993, Wiltschko 2003).
- There are two different types of agreement morphemes for different clause types, while determiners are the same from one clause type to another.
- Determiners can encliticize to elements that are not verb phrases:

(3) li ye silyólexwe lolets’e álhtel li=te lálém AUX DET.PL old.people.PL one.DIM 3PRON PREP=DET house

‘The old people, they were alone in the house.’ (Sasq’ets line 2)

The above example assigns case, but the following one doesn’t even do that:

(4) lepéxw li=te axélesmel-s=te xélh thump PREP=DET front.of.house-3POSS=DET door

‘It thumped in front of their door.’ (Sasq’ets line 21)

There is no consistent syntactic category that hosts the enclitic determiners.

5. Prosodic Account
Determiners in Upriver Halkomelem consist of a single open syllable headed by a schwa. Perhaps the determiner clisis results from the word-level stress system of Upriver Halkomelem, which extends to a larger prosodic and morphological domain in running speech.

In the examples given so far, the vowel that precedes the encliticized determiner has been a full vowel. Where a reduced vowel occurs, there are examples where clisis does not occur.

(5) me kw’ets-lóxw-es kw’e tewátes come see-TRANS-1PLO-3ERG DET somebody

‘Somebody has seen us’ (Sasq’ets, line 15)

- This follows the Upriver Halkomelem pattern of stress where full vowels receive primary stress. Otherwise a trochaic pattern emerges where a series of reduced vowels are footed as $\dddot{ə}{\dddot{ə}}$.
- So we can posit that syntactic constituency will be respected by prosodic constituency, unless there is a noun with a full vowel in the initial syllable to...
repel the determiner, or a full vowel in the final syllable of the preceding word to attract the determiner.

- A reduced vowel in the preceding word and a full vowel in the following noun will produce ambivalent results where the determiner te doesn’t affiliate clearly with either.

\[(6) \] su qól-em te máqa
so scoop-INTRANS DET snow
‘So they scooped up some snow.’ (Sasq’ets, line 35)

Table 2: Predicted typology of clisis on prosodic account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Preceding</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Following</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Schwa</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Clisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Schwa</td>
<td>Non-stress</td>
<td>Clisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stress</td>
<td>Schwa</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stress</td>
<td>schwa</td>
<td>Non-stress</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But these predictions aren’t borne out by the corpus.

Table 3: Clisis in ‘expected’ contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Determiner tokens</th>
<th>Clitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sasq’ets</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Clisis in ‘variable’ contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Determiner tokens</th>
<th>Clitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sasq’ets</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. A Related Phenomenon

Perhaps then we need to look at a broader context. There are three auxiliaries in Upriver Halkomelen that exhibit the same sort of gradient cliticization as the determiners.

- Auxiliaries: me~mi (‘come to’); le (‘go, go to, going to’); i (‘here’); li (‘there’)
- Only me, li, and i participate in clisis.

\[(7)\] kwú-t-es má-x-es te steliq’éyus=the
take-TRANS-3ERG take-TRANS-3ERG DET horse=DET.FEM

xwelítem qesu=me te thqát...
white.person and.then=AUX DET tree

‘He fetched the white person’s horses and then he took the tree away...’
(Cottonwood, lines 14-15)

This suggests that a unified account of determiners and auxiliaries is needed.

7. Conclusions

- Determiners and auxiliaries in Upriver Halkomelem spoken narratives exhibit an unexplained process of encliticization to the previous word, where synactic elements that form a constituent are prosodically split.
- Neither a morphosyntactic explanation nor a prosodic explanation are satisfactory.
- More work needs to be done to develop a unified theory of determiners and auxiliaries, perhaps centering on information structure or discourse-level intonation.
- Other dialects of Halkomelem also have similar properties.

8. Reference