



"Switch-Reference": Clause Combining in Central Pomo

Author(s): Marianne Mithun

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 59, No. 2 (Apr., 1993), pp. 119-136

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1265152>

Accessed: 22/04/2011 14:43

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of American Linguistics*.

“SWITCH-REFERENCE”:
CLAUSE COMBINING IN CENTRAL POMO

MARIANNE MITHUN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

1. Introduction. William Jacobsen’s early discussions of switch-reference (especially 1961 and 1967) have prompted the investigation of such systems in languages all over the world, as amply documented in the collections of papers in Haiman and Munro (1983). The languages indigenous to California have proved an especially fertile area for such investigation (Jacobsen 1983, Langdon and Munro 1979, McLendon 1975, Munro 1976, O’Connor 1987, and Oswalt 1976; 1983, among others). According to Haiman and Munro, “canonical switch reference is an inflectional category of the verb, which indicates whether or not its subject is identical with the subject of some other verb. . . . Functionally, switch-reference is a device for referential tracking” (1983: ix).

Central Pomo, one of seven languages of the Pomoan family of Northern California, contains a set of forms that appear to serve just this function. Several pairs of markers appearing at the ends of dependent clauses seem to alternate according to whether the subject of the clause is coreferent with the subject of the following clause or different. The alternation is quite systematic in elicited sentences, but apparent exceptions appear in spontaneous speech. A closer examination of the use of these markers in conversation and narrative recorded regularly over a period of eight years indicates that their primary function is not actually reference tracking but clause linking. Formal similarities between the Central Pomo markers and their equivalents in some other languages suggest that a number of the systems previously identified as switch-reference may in fact be clause-combining devices.

There are three pairs of markers: *hi* and *hla*, *in* and *da*, and *ba* and *li*. The first pair, *hi* and *hla*, appear in irrealis constructions. Both morphemes are translated ‘and’, ‘when’, or ‘if’. In (1) below, the first clause is followed by the marker *hi* and has the **same** subject as that of the following clause.¹ In (2), the first clause is followed by *hla* and has a **different** subject than the following clause.

¹ I am grateful to the following speakers of Central Pomo who have generously shared their language, their time, and their expertise: Mr. Jesse Frank, Mrs. Eileen Oropeza, and Mrs. Winifred Leal, of Point Arena; the late Mrs. Salome Alcantra, the late Mrs. Florence

- (1) *Mú·tu maqóhi, ?a. t̥é̆t̥e·n?k^he.*
mú·tu maqó·hi ?a. t̥é̆t̥e·-n=?k^he
 3.AGT find-SAME 1.AGT tell-IP=FUT

'If I see him, I'll tell him'.

SUBJECT=SUBJECT

- (2) *č^hé m̥úlaq^hla, ya č^hów?k^he hlíw.*
č^hé m̥úl-aq=^hla ya č^hó-w=?k^he hlí-w
 rain fall-PL=DIFF 1.PL not-P=FUT go.PL-P

'If it rains, we won't go'.

SUBJECT≠SUBJECT

The second pair of markers, *in* and *da*, appear in realis constructions describing events that coincide. They are generally translated 'while', 'when', or 'whenever'. The first clause of (3), containing *in*, has the **same** subject as the following clause. (The marker *in* loses its vowel after a vowel.) The first clause in (4), containing *da*, has a **different** subject than the following clause.

- (3) *Má·ta?el, ma?á yhé·dun k'úči. p^hdé·n.*
má·ta=?el ma?á yhé·-du-n k'úč-i. p^h-dé·-n
 woman=the food do-IP-SAME child-PL seeing-carry-IP

'While **the woman** cooked, **she** watched the children'.

SUBJECT=SUBJECT

- (4) *Má·ta?el ma?á yhé·nda báya·?el k'úči. p^hdé·n.*
má·ta=?el ma?á yhé·-n=da báya·=?el k'úč-i. p^h-dé·-n
 woman=the food do-IP=DIFF man=the child-PL seeing-carry-IP

'While **the woman** cooked, **the man** watched the children'.

SUBJECT≠SUBJECT

The third pair of markers, *ba* and *li*, appear in realis constructions describing consecutive events. These morphemes are often translated 'and then' or 'when'. In (5), the clauses containing *ba* have the **same** subjects as the clauses that follow them. In (6), the clause with *li* has a **different** subject than the clause that follows it.

Paoli, and the late Mrs. Clara Williams, of the Yokaya Rancheria; and the late Mrs. Alice Elliott and especially Mrs. Frances Jack, of the Hopland Rancheria, all in California.

Abbreviations appearing in glosses are the following: AFF emotional affect; AGT agent; CAUS causative; DIS distal possessor; DFOC defocus; EXP personal experience evidential; FAC factual evidential; FUT future; IMM immediate; IMPV imperative; INCH inchoative; INDF indefinite patient; INFER inferential evidential; IP imperfective aspect; MA multiple agency; ME multiple eventhood; OBL oblique; P perfective aspect; PAT patient; PL plural; PL.IP plural imperfectivizer; POSS possessor (kinsman); PRF performative evidential (speaker act); SML selfmefactive; TOP new topic; WIT personal witness evidential; 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person.

- (5) *ʔa· čáwyoba máʔi ʔčhá·čba maʔá*
ʔa· čáw=yó-ba máʔi ʔ-čhá--č-ba maʔá
 1.AGT in=go-SAME down by.gravity-sit-INCH-SAME food
qa·yúʔč'iw.
qa·-yúʔč'i-w
 biting-begin-P

'I came into the house, [I] sat down, and [I] started to eat'.

SUBJECT=SUBJECT

- (6) *ʔa· čáwyowli háyu ʔel ʔúda-w ʔo·*
ʔa· čáw=yó-w=li háyu=ʔel ʔúda-w ʔo·
 1.AGT in=go-P=DIFF dog=the really 1.PAT
sé.čmada.
sé.č-mad=a
 glad.to.see-AFF=IMM

'I came into the house and **my dog** was really glad to see me'.

SUBJECT≠SUBJECT

The markers appear to form the binary symmetrical system in (7).

- | | | |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| (7) | SAME | DIFFERENT |
| IRREALIS | <i>hi</i> | <i>hla</i> |
| REALIS | | |
| COINCIDENT | <i>in</i> | <i>da</i> |
| CONSECUTIVE | <i>ba</i> | <i>li</i> |

Alternations between markers in the left and right columns are systematic in elicited sentences like those in (1)–(6) above. In natural speech, however, the alternations do not correspond so consistently to the matches and mismatches of subjects across clauses. Markers on the left sometimes appear when subjects are different, and those on the right when subjects are the same.

2. The issue of subjecthood. As described by Haiman and Munro, canonical switch-reference markers specify reference relations between subjects. Case is overtly marked in Central Pomo on all pronouns and some nouns referring to human beings, but the case system is not based on syntactic subjecthood: it is based on agency. Participants who voluntarily instigate actions are classified grammatically as agents; those not in control are classified as patients. The case system can be seen in (8). The third-person pronoun *mu-l* in 'he woke me up' matches that in 'he is eating'; both are agents. The third-person pronoun in 'he forgot' is different; it is the patient pronoun *mú-tu*, the same as that in 'I woke him up'.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(8) <i>Mu·l</i> <i>ʔo·</i> <i>dawáyya.</i>
 <i>mu·l</i> <i>ʔo·</i> <i>dawáy=ya</i>
 3.AGT 1.PAT wake=WIT
 ‘He woke me up’.</p> <p><i>Mu·l</i> <i>qawá·n.</i>
 <i>mu·l</i> <i>qa-wá·n</i>
 3.AGT biting-go-IP
 ‘He is eating’.</p> <p><i>Mú·ʔu</i> <i>ʔná·ya.</i>
 <i>mú·ʔu</i> <i>ʔ-ná·=ya</i>
 3.PAT mentally-hide=WIT
 ‘He forgot’.</p> | <p><i>Mú·ʔu</i> <i>ʔa·</i> <i>dawáyla.</i>
 <i>mú·ʔu</i> <i>ʔa·</i> <i>dawáy=la</i>
 3.PAT 1.AGT wake=PRF
 ‘I woke him up’.</p> <p><i>ʔa·</i> <i>qawá·n.</i>
 <i>ʔa·</i> <i>qa-wá·n</i>
 1.AGT biting-go-IP
 ‘I am eating’.</p> <p><i>ʔo·</i> <i>ʔná·ya.</i>
 <i>ʔo·</i> <i>ʔ-ná·=ya</i>
 1.PAT mentally-hide=WIT
 ‘I forgot’.</p> |
|--|--|

Are switch-reference systems universally based on the category of subject, as proposed by Haiman and Munro, or are they sensitive to the case categories grammaticized by the language in which they occur? Oswalt (1983) reports that in Kashaya Pomo, a language closely related to Central Pomo, switch-reference operates in terms of agents. Of course, Central Pomo grammatical agents would often correspond to subjects if subjects were marked in the language. In examples (1)–(6) above, all Central Pomo agents were translated as English subjects. For such sentences, subject-based and agent-based switch-reference systems would yield the same patterns. The categories of subject and agent do not always coincide, however.

The primary participants in events like forgetting, getting hurt, or falling are classified as subjects in English but as patients in Central Pomo. They are not in control. In examples (1) and (2) above, the marker *hi* (SAME) appeared with coreferent agent subjects. *Hi* also appears when the coreferent subjects are grammatical patients.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(9) <i>č^hná·hi</i> <i>ʔe</i> <i>m^ʔo</i> <i>ʔ^hál</i> <i>báč^čiʔk^he.</i>
 <i>č^hná·-hi</i> <i>ʔe</i> <i>m^ʔo</i> <i>ʔ^hál</i> <i>bá-č^č-iʔk^he</i>
 fall-SAME COP 2.PAT hurt grow-INCH-P=FUT</p> | <p>SUBJECT=SUBJECT
 PATIENT=PATIENT
 no AGENT</p> |
|---|---|

‘If you fall down, you’re going to get hurt’.

Subjecthood rather than agency apparently governs switch-reference in Central Pomo after all.

Some Central Pomo clauses contain no agents because of a defocusing construction similar to passivization. When an agent is unknown, incidental to the discussion, or obvious, a derived intransitive verb may appear with only a patient. The sentence in (10) contains the verb ‘be chased out’, derived from a transitive verb ‘chase out’ (‘cause to go out’).

- (10) *Mé·n lówač'hi* *?e mu·l,*
mé·n lów-ač'-hi *?e mu·l*
 SO talk.PL-IP.PL-SAME COP that

qówyò·kamaw?k^he.

AGENT=AGENT

qów=yó·-ka-m-a-w=?k^he

SUBJECT≠SUBJECT

out=go-CAUS-MA-DEFocus-P=FUT

‘They’ll talk like that and then he’ll be chased out of here’.

These two clauses share agents but not subjects. Both speaker and audience knew that the talkers and the chasers were the same people, so the two events involve the same semantic agents. If subjects were marked in Central Pomo, the chasers would be the subject of the first clause, but the man chased would be the subject of the second. The appearance of the marker *hi* (SAME) in (10) indicates that agency takes precedence over subjecthood for switch-reference, contrary to the evidence in sentence (9).

The apparent paradox would be resolved if coreference between EITHER subjects or agents is sufficient to trigger the marker *hi* (SAME). Yet sentences with coreferent subjects or agents do occur with the marker *hla* (DIFF). In fact, *hla* (DIFF) sometimes occurs even with sets of clauses sharing BOTH coreferent subjects and agents, as in (11).

- (11) *Ma mu·l ?íw č^hówhla,* *ma ma· baséj'*
ma mu·l ?í-w č^hó-w=hla *ma ma· baséj'*
 2.AGT that do-P not-P=DIFF 2.AGT stuff bad

ʔ^habá·?č'iw *p^hwíw?k^he.*

SUBJECT=SUBJECT

ʔ^habá·?č'-w *p^h-wí-w=?k^he.*

AGENT=AGENT

happen-RFL-P seeing-perceive-P=FUT

‘If you don’t do that, you’re going to see bad things happen’.

Sentences like this cannot be dismissed as mistakes. The taped conversations and narratives in which they occur have all been transcribed and translated with the help of an excellent Central Pomo speaker, Frances Jack, who has judged them acceptable. They appear in the speech of all speakers recorded, and they recur too often to be ignored. A closer examination of the use of each marker indicates that while their distribution does typically coincide with same versus different subjects, specifying reference is not their primary function.

3. Irrealis: *hi* and *hla*. The irrealis markers *hi* (SAME) and *hla* (DIFF) appear in imperative, some future, and conditional contexts.

- (12) *Q^há·l* *yóhi* *maʔá* *q^ha·díwayim*.
q^há=·l *yó-**hi*** *maʔá* *q^ha·díway-im*
 water=to go-SAME food buy-IMPERATIVE

‘Go down (to town) **and** buy groceries!’

- (13) *Q^há·l* *yóhi* *maʔá* *q^ha·díwayʔk^he*.
q^há=·l *yó-**hi*** *maʔá* *q^ha·díway=ʔk^he*
 water=to go-SAME food buy=FUTURE

‘He’ll go down **and** buy groceries’.

- (14) *Q^há·l* *yóhi* *maʔá* *q^ha·díwayʔle*.
q^há=·l *yó-**hi*** *maʔá* *q^ha·díway=ʔle*
 water=to go-SAME food buy=CONDITIONAL

‘He could go down **and** buy groceries’.

It is the sense of the sentence as a whole, rather than the grammatical marking of the final verb, that triggers the selection of the irrealis markers. The future enclitic =ʔk^he is also used for purposive constructions. When it signals future time in an irrealis sentence, as in (13) above, *hi* appears on the dependent verb. When the same enclitic signals purpose in a realis sentence, as in (15), the realis marker *ba* appears.

- (15) *Q^há·l* *yóba* *maʔá* *q^ha·díwayʔk^he*.
q^há=·l *yó-**ba*** *maʔá* *q^ha·díway=ʔk^he*
 water=to go-SAME food buy=FUTURE

‘He went down **to** buy groceries’.

Clauses marked with *hi* and *hla* are grammatically dependent insofar as speakers do not feel they constitute complete sentences in themselves, but they are not necessarily semantically subordinate.

- (16) *Bá·* *ʔ^hín* *ʔe* *qóyohi,* *ʔé-yh̄ɔw* *qóyohi,*
ba· *ʔ^hi-n* *ʔe* *qó=yó-**hi*** *ʔé-y=h̄ɔw* *qó=yo-**hi***
 who not-IP COP hither=go-SAME far=side hither=go-SAME

maʔá *dóčhi,* *maʔá* *m̄ʔá·kahi,*
maʔá *dó-č-**hi*** *maʔá* *m-ʔá-·ka-**hi***
 food make-SML-SAME food heating-sense-CAUS-SAME

m̄ɔ *yówčowʔk^he*.
m̄ɔ *yów=čow=ʔk^he*
 2.PAT before=set-P=FUT

‘Nobody will come around, come from parts unknown, **and** fix your food, cook your food, **and** set it before you’.

The dependent clauses often precede the unmarked clauses, as would be expected in a predicate-final language, but they may also follow.

- (17) *ʔi wa ma šačóʔk^he*
ʔi=wa ma ša-čó-ʔ=ʔk^he
 do=Q 2.AGT swinging-hit-ME=FUT
yal ča·l démmahi?
ya-l ča=·l dé-m-ma-hi
 1.PL-PAT house=to take.PL-level-MA-SAME

‘Are you gonna whip us **when** you take us home?’

- (18) *ʔi wa ma yal šačóʔk^he*
ʔi=wa ma ya-l ša-čó-ʔ=ʔk^he
 do=Q 2.AGT 1.PL-PAT swinging-hit-ME=FUT
ya ča·l hlíw^hla.
ya ča=·l hlí-w=^hla
 1.PL house=to go.PL-P=DIFF

‘She’s gonna whip us **when** we go home’.

In spontaneous speech, the marker *hi* (SAME) occurs most often in series of clauses with coreferent subjects, as it does in elicited sentences. In (19) the agent and subject of ‘clean’ and ‘wash’ are the same.

- (19) *šá ʔel ʔá·mhi dasé·m.*
šá=ʔel ʔá·m-hi da-sé-·m
 fish=the clean-SAME pulling-wash-IMPV

‘Cut out the insides of the fish **and** wash it’.

The marker *hla* (DIFF) occurs most often in series of clauses with distinct participants. The sentence in (20) was said as speakers were wondering what to do with pits from the cherries they were sharing. The subject of ‘throw’ is ‘you’, but the subject of ‘sprout’ is the pits.

- (20) *Ma čalél qówʔnehla*
ma čalél qów=ʔ-né=^hla
 2.AGT just out=PL-set=DIFF
ʔá· mu·l báč'iʔle.
ʔá· mu·l bá-č-'=ʔle
 guess that grow-INCH-P=COND

‘If you just throw them out, I guess they would sprout’.

Exceptions to these tendencies occur sufficiently often, however, to indicate that their function cannot be to specify reference. In fact, their

that either *-hi* or *=hla* would be grammatical in (21) above, but with *-hi* (SAME) there is relative certainty that the bridge will be built, while with *=hla* (DIFF) there is no telling whether the bridge will be built or not: “If I build you a bridge, you can take them across.” The enclitic *=hla* is sometimes selected specifically for this implication, even when subjects are the same.

4. Coincident realis: *in* and *da*. The morphemes *in* and *da* are used when two or more realis events coincide. They are variously translated ‘when’, ‘while’, ‘whenever’, etc. Like *hi* and *hla* clauses, *in* and *da* clauses are grammatically dependent, in that they cannot stand alone as complete sentences, but they are not necessarily semantically subordinate. They usually precede the unmarked clauses they are associated with, but they sometimes follow, as in (23) and (24):

- (23) *Ya* *říka* *mi·* *hlářaqřamač'ač'*
ya *říka* *mi=·* *hlá-ř-aq-řa-m-ač'-ač'*
 1.PL in.fact that=at GO.PL-ME-PL.IP-MA-IP.PL-IP.PL

mú·řuyal *č'a-l* *q'óman.*
mú·řuya-l *č'a-l* *q'ó-ma-n*
 3.PL-PAT with drink-MA-SAME

‘We used to go there a lot drinking with them’.

- (24) *Me·n* *ř'a·* *říř'* *Bertha* *ni·n* *čáwhliwda.*
me·n *ř'a·* *ří-ř-?* *Bertha* *ni·n* *čá-w=hlí-w=da*
 so feel name-ME-P so house-in=go.PL-PL=DIFF

‘So I guess Bertha named them, like that, as they went inside’.

In spontaneous speech, *in* (SAME) tends to occur with clauses that share major participants, as it does under elicitation.

- (25) *čá·č' ?el,* *mu-l* *ba·dáq^ha·del* *q^hdé·?č' dun,*
čá·č'=?el *mu-l* *ba·-dáq^ha·d-el* *q^hdé·?-č'-du-n*
 man=the that POSS-wife-PAT fight-RFL-IP-SAME

mčóřin, *ma·* *p^hts'áday.*
m-čó-ř-in *ma·* *p^h-ts'áday*
 kicking-set-ME-SAME ground swinging-slam

‘The man, fighting with his wife, kicking her, slammed her to the ground’.

The marker *da* (DIFF) tends to occur with clauses containing different subjects.

- (26) *Dú·ɬayya, maʔá ʔel qawá·ʔyawda,*
dú·ɬay=ya maʔá=ʔel qa·wá·ʔ·ya-w=da
 other-PL=TOP food=the biting=go-IP.PL-DFOC-P=DIFF
- bal lá·la ʔčʰá·w, bap'q'élmadun.*
bal lá·la ʔ·čʰá·-w ba=p'qlél-ma-du-n
 this among by.gravity-sit-P INDF=ENVY-AFF-IP-SAME

'While the others were eating, he sat among them, wistfully'.

Exceptions to these tendencies occur sufficiently often, however, to demonstrate that the basic function of the markers cannot be to specify reference. Their distribution is a secondary effect of their primary function: to link clauses. Their principal difference is in the degree of cohesion they specify.

The marker *in* (SAME) is used to link actions that are presented as components of a single event, like the fighting, kicking, and slamming to the ground in (25) above. Not surprisingly, such actions typically share the same subjects and/or agents. Yet they need not. The clauses in (27) do not share subjects, agents, or patients.

- (27) *ʔá·kiy kʰe k'úči·ʔelɬayal,*
ʔa·=kiy kʰe k'ú=či·=ʔel=ɬayal
 1.AGT=too 1.OBL child=the=PL=PAT
- béda yáʔkʰe hínɬil kʰéʔel ba·néhdun,*
bé=da yá=ʔkʰe hínɬil kʰé=ʔel ba·-né-h-du-n
 this=at 1.PL=OBL Indian dance=the stepping-set-p-IP-SAME
- ʔúda·w šwáyli q'lúɬa·č'ač'. SUBJECT≠SUBJECT*
ʔúda·w šwáy=li q'lú·ɬ·a·č'·ač' AGENT≠AGENT
 really laughter=with die-ME-IP.PL-IP.PL PATIENT≠PATIENT

'Also, my grandchildren, when I dance an Indian dance, they just die laughing'.

The marker *da* (DIFF) indicates that two events coincide temporally, but each event retains some conceptual distinctness. As might be expected, events involving different sets of participants are usually considered sufficiently distinct to be linked by *da* (DIFF). Events involving the same participants may be presented as distinct, however. In (28), the speaker portrayed being alive and doing something for her daughter as two distinct events, even though they shared the same subject and agent.

- (28) *Mé·n ʔin ʔe ʔa· bal šʔ'ó, ʔa· qašóyda,*
mé·n ʔi-n ʔe ʔa· bal šʔ'o, ʔa· qašóy=da
 so be-SAME COP 1.AGT this now 1.AGT alive=DIFF

<i>ʔa·</i>	<i>mu-l</i>	<i>mk^he</i>	<i>yhé-n.</i>	SUBJECT=SUBJECT
<i>ʔa·</i>	<i>mu-l</i>	<i>mk^he</i>	<i>yhé--n</i>	AGENT=AGENT
1.AGT	that	2.OBL	do-IP	

‘That is why now, while I am still alive, I do this for you’.

The difference in semantic cohesion expressed by *in* and *da* is mirrored by a formal difference. The marker *-in* (SAME), which links closely associated actions, is a verbal suffix. The marker *=da* (DIFF), which links whole events, is an enclitic. Unlike *-in*, it can follow the perfective suffix *-w*, as in (29) and certain other enclitics, like the future in (30).

- (29) *K^hé* *me-néma-wda* . . .
k^hé *ma·-né-m-a-w=da*
 dance stepping-set-down-DFOC-PERFECTIVE=DIFF

‘While (people) were dancing . . .’

- (30) *Bal* *ʔul* *ʔaléya* *hʔówʔk^heda* . . .
bal *ʔul* *ʔaléya* *hʔó-w=ʔk^he=da*
 this now bead give-PERFECTIVE=FUTURE=DIFF

‘When they were going to give her beads . . .’

The enclitic *=da* occurs with not only clauses, but with other kinds of constituents as well. With nominals, it contributes a locative or temporal meaning: ‘in’, ‘at’, ‘on’, etc.

- (31) *Ma·* *k^híwda* *ʔnéman.*
ma· *k^hí-w=da* *ʔ-nē-m-an*
 place cold-P=IN by.hand-set-down-IP

‘Set it in a cold place’.

- (32) *Bél* *mačída* *k^hyá* *swé-laqaw.*
bé-l *mačí=da* *k^hyá* *swé-l-aq-a-w*
 this-at day=ON game play-PL-DFOC-P

‘This is the day they play’.

A core meaning can be discerned in all contexts: *=da* associates two entities or events in space or time. It indicates locative or temporal coincidence but does not specify duration.

The coincident realis markers *-in* and *=da*, like the irrealis markers, are not perfect semantic counterparts. The nature of the temporal overlap they specify differs slightly. Clauses marked by *-in* (SAME) represent activities or states that are in effect while other events take place. They are always imperfective and are often translated with present participles, like (25) above: ‘fighting . . . , kicking . . .’. Clauses marked by *=da* (DIFF) coincide

with the associated clause but not necessarily for its full duration. The two events may coincide for an extended period or a single point in time. Clauses containing *da* may accordingly be imperfective, as in (33), or perfective, as in (34).

- (33) ?á· ?óč' čanó·*nda*, ?é·yyoya.
 ?a· ?oč' čanó·-*n=da*, ?é·y=yó=ya
 1.AGT still talk-IMPERFECTIVE=DIFF away=go=WIT

'He left **while** I was talking'.

- (34) ?á· čá·*l* yó*wda*,
 ?a· čá·=*l* yó·-*w=da*
 1.AGT house=to go-PERFECTIVE=DIFF
 ma wáy mŕí·č'*ka*.
 ma wáy mŕí·-č'·=*ka*
 2.AGT already lie-INCH-P=INFER

'**When** I got back, you were already in bed'.

The suffix *-in* (SAME) shows another semantic idiosyncrasy. It often implies causality.

- (35) šá· ?ʔ^hálin, bal ǰáw^hal yhé·nʔk^he č^hów.
 šá· ?ʔ^hál-*in* bal ǰáw^hal yhé·-n=ʔk^he č^hó-w
 arm ache-SAME this work do-IP=FUT not-P

'His arm hurts, **that's why** he can't work'.

Because of this feature, it is sometimes chosen over *=da*, even if participants are clearly distinct.

- (36) Mú·ǰuya, ma· lówač'*in* ?á· carwi č^hmáw.
 mú·ǰuya ma· lów-ač'·-*in* ?á· car=wi č^hmá-w
 3.PL stuff talk.PL-IP-PL-SAME 1.AGT =in sit-P

'Because **they** had something to talk about, **I** stayed in the car'.

The realis coincident markers *-in* and *=da* are thus not perfect counterparts either formally or semantically. While *-in* (SAME) is a verbal suffix that links simultaneous actions or states, *=da* (DIFF) is a general enclitic that marks coincidence of either events or entities. While *-in* (SAME) marks an action or state in progress for the complete duration of that of the associated clause, *=da* (DIFF) indicates only overlap at some point, a meaning consistent with its meanings in other contexts. While *-in* can imply causality, *=da* does not.

5. Consecutive realis: *ba* and *li*. The final pair of markers, *ba* and *li*, appear with sequential realis events. They are typically translated 'and' or

‘and then’. Like *hi*, *hla*, *in*, and *da* clauses, *ba* and *li* clauses are grammatically dependent, in that they do not constitute complete sentences in themselves, but not necessarily semantically subordinate. While *ba* clauses always precede the unmarked clause, *li* clauses sometimes follow.

In spontaneous speech, *ba* occurs most often with clauses sharing the same subject. In (37), both clauses share the same agent subject. In (38), they share the same patient subject.

- (37) *Mu·l* *bá?dinba*, *ʔí·k^heʔ* *ʔí·ʔo*
mu·l *bá=?dí-n-ba* *ʔí·=k^he-ʔ* *ʔí·=ʔo*
 3.AGT INDF=take.PL-away-SAME OWN=OBL-DIS OWN=PAT
mačú·ts'aq' *má·ʔa yačól* *daqáw.*
ma-čú·ts'-aq' *má·ʔa=yačól* *daqá-w*
 POSS=M's.B-call-P woman=OBL give-P

‘He took it (money) away from people and gave it to his niece’.

- (38) *Mé·nda* *?doma* *mú·ʔu* *čalúščiba*
mé·n=da *?=doma* *mú·ʔu* *ča-lúš-či-ba*
 SO=at COP=HRYSY 3.PAT sitting-slip-SML-SAME
q^habé *?mil* *ʔʔésam.*
q^habé *?=mi-l* *?-ʔés-am*
 rock COP=there-on by.gravity-fall-down

‘So then he slipped and fell onto the rock’.

The marker *li* tends to appear with clauses containing different participants.

- (39) *Bal* *háw* *mčá·č'li*
bal *há=w* *mčá·-č·'=li*
 this mouth=in throw.PL-SML-P=DIFF
bal *mú·ʔu* *háw* *čóq'.*
bal *mú·ʔu* *há=w* *čóq'*
 this 3.PAT mouth=in sting-P

‘When he threw them [berries] into his mouth, it [the bee] stung him’.

Exceptions to these tendencies occur sufficiently often, however, to demonstrate that specifying reference cannot be their basic function. Their distribution is a secondary effect of their primary use: to link clauses. The major difference between *ba* and *li*, as between the other pairs, is in the degree of cohesion they specify.

The marker *ba* links components of what is portrayed as a single event. Such components usually share the same subject, but they need not. The subjects of ‘find’ and ‘buy’ are distinct in (40), but the speaker joined them with *ba* to form a single proposition.

- (40) *Béř'na* *ʔul* *maqówba*
béř'=na *ʔul* *maqó-w-ba*
 this=CONTR now find-P-SAME
- q^hadřway* *loq'* SUBJECT≠SUBJECT
q^hadřway *loq'* AGENT≠AGENT
 buy thing

'This time I found someone **and** she'll buy the thing' = 'This time I found someone to buy it'.

The remark in (41) was part of a discussion of legal issues. The clauses were packaged as a single event explaining the lack of documents, even though their subjects were different.

- (41) *Mu-l* *ʔe* *k^he* *pápilʔel* *sts'ába*
mu-l *ʔe* *k^he* *pápil=ʔel* *s-ts'á-ba*
 that COP 1.OBL paper=the with.liquid-destroyed-**and**
- čalél* *ʔa·* *qówmčawʔk^he* *č'ó·čya*.
čalél *ʔa·* *qów=mča-w=ʔk^he* *č'ó·č=ya*
 just 1.AGT out=throw.PL-P=FUT happen-SML=ESP

'My papers got wet **and** I just had to throw them away'.

The marker *li* links realis events that retain their distinctness. Events with different participants are usually portrayed as separate with *li*, but clauses sharing the same subject may also be linked with *li*.

- (42) *řo·* *loq* *masá-dawli* *ʔqá·č'wiya*.
řo· *lóq* *masá-d-a-w=li* *ʔqá·-č'=wiya*
 1.PAT thing steal-DFOC=DIFF lose-RFL=EXP

'I was robbed, **and** I just felt so lost'.

The difference in cohesion signaled by *ba* and *li* is mirrored by a formal difference. The marker *ba* (SAME), which links closely associated actions, is a verbal suffix, while *li* (DIFF), which links distinct events, is an enclitic. Unlike *-ba*, *=li* can follow the final perfective suffix (*masá-d-a-w=li* [steal-DFOC=DIFF] 'was robbed' in 42) and various other enclitics. It occurs not only with clauses but with other kinds of constituents as well. With nominals, it adds a locative or instrumental meaning: 'at, in, with'.

- (43) *q'dřřay* *čá* *řwé·y^hli* *nap^hóřač'*.
q'dřřay *čá* *řwé·y=li* *nap^hó-ř-ač'*
 good-PL house new=**in** live.PL-ME-IP.PL

'They are living **in** good new houses'.

- (44) *šá* *ʃ^hédu·* *č^há·kawla* *bayáqli.*
šá *ʃ^hédu·* *č^há·ka-w=la* *bayáq=li*
 fish lots catch-CAUS-P=PRF net=**with**

‘I caught a lot of fish **with** a net’.

- (45) *Mé·nli* *šwáyli* *q’lá·hduwan.*
mé·n=li *šwáy=li* *q’lá·-h-du-w-an*
 so=with laughter=**with** die-P-IP-P-IP

‘And she just died **of** laughter’.

Like the irrealis and coincident realis pairs, *-ba* and *=li* are not perfect semantic counterparts. Sequential *=li* (DIFF) often implies causation.

- (46) *ʔa·* *dúlu·haw* *yáq’* *čá·nli*
ʔa· *dúlu·haw* *yáq’* *čá·-n=li*
 1.AGT too fast run-IP=DIFF
č^hná·ba *to·* *šá·* *ts’á·ya.*
č^hná·-ba *to·* *šá·* *ts’á·=ya*
 fell-SAME 1.PAT arm break=**WIT**

‘I was going too fast **and** [because of that] fell and broke my arm’.

The causation may be implied whether the subjects of the two clauses are the same or not. The sentence in (39), ‘When he threw the berries into his mouth, the bee stung him’, was part of a story admonishing children to mind their parents. Bear Woman had taken her children out to pick berries, telling them to put all they picked into a basket. Her son failed to obey. Asked about the precise meaning of *=li* in this sentence, Mrs. Jack explained, “Whatever is going to happen is caused from his throwing this stuff into his mouth.”

Speakers sometimes select *=li* (DIFF) to link clauses precisely for this implication, even when the clauses share subjects, agents, and/or patients. An alternative translation given for (42) above was ‘I was robbed, that’s why I felt so lost’. Interestingly, the causative implication of sequential *=li* (DIFF) resembles that of the **same** coincident marker *-in*, rather than its DIFF counterpart *=da*. This implication is part of its core meaning across its various grammatical contexts. With nominals, it conveys both locative and instrumental association: (44) above could be translated either ‘I caught a lot of fish **in** a net’ or ‘I caught a lot of fish **with** a net’. Similar ambiguity appears with clauses. Sentence (47) could be translated ‘**When** he died, my uncle married her’ or ‘**Because** he died, my uncle married her’.

(47)	<i>Mé·n</i>	<i>ʔíwli</i>	<i>mú·ʔu</i>	<i>q'álá·wli,</i>
	<i>mé·n</i>	<i>ʔi-w=li</i>	<i>mú·ʔu</i>	<i>q'álá·-w=li</i>
	so	be-P=with	3.PAT	die-P=DIFF
	<i>čé·ki</i>		<i>mú·ʔu</i>	<i>ʔdúč'.</i>
	<i>čé·ki</i>		<i>mú·ʔu</i>	<i>ʔdú-č</i>
	father's.younger.brother		3.PAT	married-INCH

'So then **when/because** he [my father] died, my uncle married her [my mother]'.
[my mother]']

This semantic difference, too, is mirrored by a formal difference. Dependent clauses marked with *-ba* always precede the main clause, echoing the order of events. Dependent clauses marked with *=li* can follow the main clause when they indicate causation.

(48)	<i>Me·n</i>	<i>ʔin</i>	<i>ʔma</i>	<i>ʔa·</i>	<i>ʔiw</i>	<i>ʔe,</i>
	<i>me·n</i>	<i>ʔi-n</i>	<i>ʔ=ma</i>	<i>ʔa·</i>	<i>ʔi-w</i>	<i>ʔe</i>
	so	be-SAME	COP=FAC	1.AGT	be-P	COP
	<i>ʔo·</i>	<i>díyawli.</i>				
	<i>ʔo·</i>	<i>díy-a-w=li</i>				
	1.PAT	order-DFOC-P=DIFF				

'That's why I did it, because I was told to'.

The two markers *-ba* and *=li* are thus not perfect counterparts either formally or semantically. Formally *-ba* (SAME), which links closely associated actions, is a verbal suffix, while *=li* (DIFF), which links distinct events, is a general enclitic. Both can relate consecutive events, but *=li* is used for an additional function as well, to imply causation.

6. Conclusion. On the basis of elicited sentences, it would be easy to conclude that Central Pomo contains a prototypical switch-reference system consisting of three pairs of markers. An examination of spontaneous speech, however, indicates that the six morphemes—*hi*, *hla*, *in*, *da*, *ba*, and *li*—do not form a switch-reference system after all in the sense of Haiman and Munro (1983). Their primary function is to specify relations between actions, states, or events, not participants. They mark same versus different eventhood, rather than same versus different subject. The frequent cooccurrence of *hi*, *in*, and *ba* with coreferent subjects and of *hla*, *da*, and *li* with different ones is a secondary effect of this distinction. What is portrayed as a single event is more likely to involve a single subject.

Reference is signaled in Central Pomo by several other devices. A mechanism for indicating continuing or contrasting reference between third persons in successive clauses is simply the presence or absence of an overt nominal. As long as the primary participant remains the same

from clause to clause, and there is no shift in the line of discussion, no additional identification is necessary: absence is interpreted as coreference. Another mechanism serves to disambiguate reference to secondary and oblique participants. A special set of empathetic pronouns, similar to the non-clause-bounded reflexives or logophoric pronouns of some other languages, is used when third-person pronouns are coreferent with the subjects of their own or matrix clauses (Mithun 1990).

Even as markers of event linkage, *hi*, *hla*, *in*, *da*, *ba*, and *li* do not constitute a perfectly symmetrical system either formally or semantically. Formally, *-hi*, *-in*, and *-ba* are suffixes, while *=hla*, *=da*, and *=li* are enclitics. Semantically, the markers show various idiosyncrasies. Both *-hi* and *=hla* link irrealis clauses with different degrees of cohesion, but *=hla* can imply additional contingency. Both *-in* and *=da* relate coincident realis events with different degrees of cohesion, but *-in* implies ongoing simultaneity and/or a causal relationship. Both *-ba* and *=li* relate consecutive realis clauses with different degrees of cohesion, but *=li* can also imply causation. The special meanings of *=da* and *=li* are part of the core meanings that appear in their uses with other constituents as well.

Most of the idiosyncratic meanings also characterize conjunctions derived from combinations of the markers with pro-forms, in particular the adverbial *mé·n* 'thus, so', and the verb *?i-* (Coast dialect *ts'í-*) 'be, do'. These conjunctions, which usually link new sentences to previous material in the discourse, do not form symmetrical pairs either.

- (49) *mé·n ?ihi* 'after doing that', 'from then on', 'then', 'and then',
'and if', 'then if'
mé·n ?ihla 'if', 'again', 'still', 'also', 'furthermore'
mé·n ?ín 'because of that', 'that is why', 'that's how'
mé·nda 'and then', 'meanwhile', 'at/during that time', 'then',
'that's when'
mé·n ?íba 'and then', 'so then', 'after that'
mé·n ?íwli 'and then', 'so then', 'so that's why', 'and so', 'and then
because of that'

Finally, the six morphemes do not constitute a closed set. Relations among clauses are also expressed in Central Pomo by other markers. Among these are *=?íi* 'but', 'although', *=hlaw* 'after', *=hgow* 'from', 'when', 'as', and many more.

The fact that the primary function of the markers is not to specify reference, but rather to link actions, states, and events, is not altogether surprising, given their locations in the grammar. They appear attached to verbs and clauses, not nominals. Verbs in Central Pomo, unlike those in

many other languages with switch-reference, do not contain pronominal affixes. We know that the morphemes most likely to fuse formally are those that are most relevant to each other semantically (Bybee 1985). Verbal suffixes tend to pertain to predicates, and clausal enclitics to events. This is exactly the situation in Central Pomo.

REFERENCES

- BYBEE, JOAN. 1985. *Morphology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HAIMAN, JOHN, AND PAMELA MUNRO. 1983. Switch-reference and universal grammar. Proceedings of a Symposium on Switch Reference and Universal Grammar, Winnipeg, May 1981. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- JACOBSEN, WILLIAM, JR. 1961. Switch-reference: a Hokan-Coahuiltecan syntactic device. Paper presented at the Thirty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America.
- _____. 1967. Switch-reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan. *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics: Meaning and History in the Languages of the American Southwest*, ed. Dell Hymes and W. Bittle, pp. 238–63. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1983. Typological and genetic notes on switch-reference systems in North American Indian languages. Proceedings of a Symposium on Switch Reference and Universal Grammar, Winnipeg, May 1981, ed. John Haiman and Pamela Munro, pp. 151–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LANGDON, MARGARET. 1970. *A Grammar of Diegueño: The Mesa Grande Dialect*. UCPL 66. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- LANGDON, MARGARET, AND PAMELA MUNRO. 1979. Subject and (switch-) reference in Yuman. *Folia Linguistica* 13:321–44.
- MCLENDON, SALLY. 1975. *A Grammar of Eastern Pomo*. UCPL 74. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 1990. Third-person reference and the function of pronouns in Central Pomo natural speech. *IJAL* 56:361–76.
- MUNRO, PAMELA. 1976. *Mojave Syntax*. New York and London: Garland.
- O'CONNOR, MARY CATHERINE. 1987. *Topics in Northern Pomo grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- OSWALT, ROBERT L. 1976. Switch-reference in Maiduan: an areal and typological contribution. *IJAL* 42:297–304.
- _____. 1983. Interclausal reference in Kashaya. Proceedings of a Symposium on Switch Reference and Universal Grammar, Winnipeg, May 1981, ed. John Haiman and Pamela Munro, pp. 267–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- WINTER, WERNER. 1976. Switch reference in Yuman languages. *Hokan Studies*, ed. Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver, pp. 165–74, *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica*, no. 181. The Hague: Mouton.