HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	On Possessive, Existential and Locative Clause Types in the Haisla Language
Author(s)	Vattukumpu, Tero
Citation	北方言語研究, 10, 255-274
Issue Date	2020-03-20
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/93120
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/77594
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	15_255_274.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Northern Language Studies 10: 255-274（Japan Association of NoLS, 2020）

On Possessive, Existential and Locative Clause Types in the Haisla Language

Tero VATTUKUMPU
(Kyoto University, Ph.D. student)

Keywords: Haisla, possessive clause, existential clause, locative clause, inalienable possession

1. Introduction

The intention of this paper is to give a preliminary overview of the possessive, existential and locative clause types in the Haisla language (endonym: x̄a'isela)[1] by describing all the possible means of forming these three clause types recognized so far by the author of this paper. There is no previous description of these three clause types in Haisla.

I will point out that clauses expressing possession and existence have essentially the same construction in Haisla and that there are at least two main means of forming these clauses: (1) Deriving a denominal verb with the meaning 'to have X'/'there is/are X' with a derivational suffix. (2) Using a clause in which the predicate expresses the number, the quantity or a quality of the possessee or the entity whose existence is in question. There are two verbalizing suffixes, *-nux̲^{w}* and *-[z]ad*, which can both be used to form possessive clauses. I will show that according to the data I have managed to collect, *-nux̲^{w}* is used much more productively to form possessive clauses compared to *-[z]ad*. I will also show that *-[z]ad* has extremely low productivity when it comes to forming existential clauses while *-nux̲^{w}* is used very productively for not only forming possessive but also existential clauses.

I will show that locative clauses in Haisla can be formed not only by using the locative verb *laa* but also with locative stems as the predicate. At the end of this paper I will also point out some problematic open issues concerning the three clause types that remain to be explained and yield more research to be done, such as questions about expressing alienability, the difference between possession and belongingness and the word order in the locative clauses.

In the following two subsections (§1.1. and §1.2.) I will introduce the Haisla language briefly and discuss some key concepts (possession, existential and locative clauses) related to the topic of this paper in more detail.

[1] The endonym is written with the orthography used in this paper. Cf. §1.1.

The analysis of this paper is based on the data collected by the author during three field trips between 2017 and 2019[2] with references to the previous study on the language. All the examples used in this paper have been collected by the author by the means of elicitation unless specified.[3]

1.1. About the Haisla language

In this subsection I will first introduce some basic information on the Haisla language. Haisla is a member of the Upper Northern Wakashan languages of the Northern subgroup belonging to the Wakashan language family. Once spoken over a larger area, Haisla is nowadays spoken mainly in Kitamaat village being the northernmost language of its family.

Map 1 – The location of Kitamaat village

Originally Haisla was spoken not only in Kitamaat but also in the village of Kitlope which both had their own varieties of the language. The two communities were later amalgamated so that the Haisla population of Kitlope were made to move to Kitamaat where the two dialects have continued to coexist. Kitamaat is located on the shore of the Douglas Channel which is a fjord on the Pacific coast of British Columbia. Kitamaat lies ca. 11 kilometers south from the town of Kitimat which in turn is located at the end of the fjord. (Cf. Map 1.)

Haisla is a severely endangered language with 87 speakers.[4] It is a head-marking and agglutinating, exclusively suffixing language with a basic VSO word order and a high degree of synthesis. Haisla has been described as a polysynthetic language (Bach 1995: 13), even though it lacks some of the typical characteristics of a polysynthetic language such as noun incorporation by compounding. Subject and object(s) are expressed by anaphorical enclitic in the predicate unless there is an independent noun phrase expressing subject or object. Its other typological key features include lexical

[2] These trips and this work were financially supported by the Nomura Foundation and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Grant-in-Aid # 19J14298).
[3] All the data was kindly provided by Mr. Nelson Grant and another consultant who wishes to remain anonymous. I would like to thank both of my consultants for their valuable teachings and willingness to help me with my research.
[4] Information obtained by personal communication with Mrs. Teresa Windsor, Haisla Nation Council's Community Cultural Coordinator in August 2018.

affixes and a large inventory of consonant phonemes, which can both be seen as areal features shared with Salishan and Chimakuan language families spoken in the same Pacific Northwest linguistic area.

A modified version of an orthography of the Haisla language by Bach (2001: 72) will be used in this paper. The graphemes of this version for the consonant phonemes are listed below:[5]

/p/:	⟨b⟩	/p^{h}/:	⟨p⟩	/p'/:	⟨ṗ⟩	/k^{j}/:	⟨g⟩	/k^{jh}/:	⟨k⟩	/k^{j}'/:	⟨k̇⟩	/ʔ/:	⟨'⟩
/t/:	⟨d⟩	/t^{h}/:	⟨t⟩	/t'/:	⟨ṫ⟩	/k^{w}/:	⟨g^{w}⟩	/k^{wh}/:	⟨k^{w}⟩	/k^{w}'/:	⟨k̇^{w}⟩	/h/:	⟨h⟩
/t͡s/:	⟨z⟩	/t͡s^{h}/:	⟨c⟩	/t͡s'/:	⟨ċ⟩	/q/:	⟨g̱⟩	/q^{h}/:	⟨q⟩	/q'/:	⟨q̇⟩	/s/:	⟨s⟩
/t^{l}/:	⟨λ⟩	/t͡l/:	⟨ƛ⟩	/t͡l'/:	⟨ƛ̇⟩	/q^{w}/:	⟨g̱^{w}⟩	/q^{wh}/:	⟨q^{w}⟩	/q^{w}'/:	⟨q̇^{w}⟩	/ɬ/:	⟨ɬ⟩
/m/:	⟨m⟩	/m'/:	⟨ṁ⟩	/w/:	⟨w⟩	/w'/:	⟨ẇ⟩	/x^{j}/:	⟨x⟩	/χ/:	⟨x̄⟩	/l/:	⟨l⟩
/n/:	⟨n⟩	/n'/:	⟨ṅ⟩	/j/:	⟨y⟩	/j'/:	⟨ẏ⟩	/x^{w}/:	⟨x^{w}⟩	/χ^{w}/:	⟨x̄^{w}⟩	/l'/:	⟨l̇⟩

The graphemes for the vowel phonemes (/a/, /i/ and /u/) are ⟨a⟩, ⟨i⟩ and ⟨u⟩. The epenthetic vowels with a wide range of phonetic variation, including vowels such as [ɪ], [ʊ] and [ə], are written as ⟨e⟩. The stress is marked with an acute accent.

There is one major morphophonemic sound change which is reflected in the orthography used in this paper. Namely, all the morpheme-final aspirated dorsal plosives (/k/, /k^{w}/, /q/, /q^{w}/) are realized as homorganic fricatives (/x/, /x^{w}/, /x̄/, /x̄^{w}/) in word-final position and before consonants. Before phonetic vowels they are pronounced as plosives. Whenever there is a dorsal fricative which is a result of this sound change it is underlined to indicate that the underlying sound is a homorganic plosive. For example, the suffix -nux̲^{w} which plays a key role in this paper has its final x^{w} underlined for this reason.

1.2. On the key concepts of this paper

Concepts which need to be defined here are the three clause types described in this paper, i.e. possessive, existential and locative clause. In this paper I will adopt the view of Clark (1978) that all these three clause types can be seen as representations of the same underlying structure called *locational construction*. This locational construction can in turn be defined as a construction that has a *locative element* (LOC) which indicates the location of a *nominal* (NOM), these two being the main elements of the locational construction.

The difference between the three types of the locational construction is defined here according to the relation between LOC and NOM as well as the relation between the

[5] The consonant phonemes with the greatest allophonic variation are /p/, /t/, /k^{j}/, /k^{w}/, /q/, /q^{w}/, /t͡s/ and /t^{l}/ which have the following allophones: [p~b], [t~d], [k^{j}~g^{j}], [k^{w}~g^{w}], [q~ɢ], [q^{w}~ɢ^{w}], [t͡s~d͡z] and [t^{l}~d^{l}].

information structure and LOC. Thus, whenever a LOC is not only indicating the location but also the owner of a NOM, the clause is regarded as a possessive clause. When there is no ownership between LOC and NOM the clause is either an existential clause or a locative clause depending on whether the intention of the clause is to introduce the existence of something as new information or to give new information about the whereabouts of some entity which is no longer new information.

As it can be seen from the data in this paper, existence and possession are expressed by using the same strategies in Haisla. In contrast to this, locative clauses are formed with a different strategy. All these three concepts (existence, possession and location) are expressed with a reference to a locative element (LOC) and a nominal (NOM) whose existence or location is in question. Clauses expressing existence or possession are used to introduce new information about the nominal (NOM), i.e. the existence of the nominal — either possessed or not. Locative clauses can only be used to express new information about the locative element (LOC), i.e. the location of the nominal.

2. Possessive clauses

In this section I will illustrate three ways of expressing possessive clauses in Haisla recognized so far based on the data collected by myself.

One of the two main means of forming possessive clauses is to use the suffix *-nux̲*^{w}; the other one is to use *-[z]ad*.[6] These two suffixes both have the meaning 'to have' and they are attached to nouns to create denominal intransitive verbs with the meaning 'to have X'. This denominal verb is used as a predicate of a possessive clause in the clause-initial position or after a clause-initial auxiliary verb. In order to make it clear in the gloss that the usages of these suffixes are not instances of noun incorporation by a compound of a nominal and a verbal root, they are marked to be suffixes with an appropriate abbreviation (S).

There is a third method to form clauses that can express possession. This involves a predicate that expresses the number, the quantity or a quality of the possessee which is expressed by the subject noun phrase of the same clause.

In the following subsections I will first introduce the usage of the above-mentioned suffixes (§2.1. and §2.2.) and how they possibly differ morphologically (§2.3.), after

[6] *-[z]ad* has two allomorphs: *-ad* which is used after non-syllabic consonants and *-zad* which is used after vowels and syllabic consonants, i.e. resonants following an epenthetic vowel. This is indicated by putting *z* inside brackets. There are no examples of *-[z]ad* in my data that could be analyzed to be the allomorph *-zad* without a doubt, but there is an example of a denominal verb derived from a stem ending with a syllabic resonant (*sasem* 'children' + *-[z]ad* → *sasemzád* 'to have children') in the dictionary of Lincoln & Rath (1986b: 327). Since it is also known that suffixes in Haisla commonly have two allomorphs which are selected according to whether the suffix is attached to a vowel/syllabic consonant or not (Bach 2001: 55), *-[z]ad* is considered as such a suffix in this paper.

which I will introduce the third method of forming clauses expressing possession in §2.4.

2.1. Possessive clauses formed with the suffix *-nux̲ʷ*

The suffix *-nux̲ʷ* is very productive and according to the data collected by the author so far, there has not yet been a semantically nominal[7] base with which it could not co-occur.[8] The base to which it can attach may be a root or a stem formed from a root with another derivational suffix (For example in (1), (2) and (5) below the base *hemcaʼnu* 'spoon' can be analysed to be formed with the root *hems-* 'to eat' (Lincoln & Rath 1986b: 444) and the nominalizing suffix *-saʼnu* which is used to derive nouns denoting instruments. The root-final /s/ and the suffix-initial /s/ have combined into /c/).

There are some examples of possessive clauses formed with the suffix *-nux̲ʷ* below with different kinds of possessee.[9]

(1) hemcaʼnú-nux̲ʷ=nugʷa
spoon-S.to.have=1SG
'I have a spoon.'

(2) ǩu=n hemcaʼnú-nux̲ʷ
AUX.NEG-1SG spoon-S.to.have
'I don't have a spoon.'

(3) ẇap-nux̲ʷ=nugʷa
water-S.to.have=1SG
'I have water.'

(4) ḡeném-nux̲ʷ=nugʷa
woman/wife-S.to.have=1SG
'I have a wife.'

(5) hemcaʼnú-nukʷ=i
spoon-S.to.have=3SG/PL.DIS
'(S)he/They has/have a spoon.'

(6) sa=s gelẇa-nux̲ʷ ha ?
AUX.PQ=2SG/PL canoe-S.to.have QP
'Do you have a canoe?'

It seems to be possible to use *-nux̲ʷ* regardless of the alienability of the possession in question since it can be used in the example (4). Also, the example with a body part

---

[7] It has been argued that the distinction between nouns and verbs is somewhat ambiguous in Haisla (Bach 1995: 13). This is most likely due to the omnipredicative nature of the language, i.e. the ability of semantically noun-like roots to act productively as predicates with the meaning 'to be X'. The term "nominal" is used in this paper to refer to these kinds of roots with a semantically noun-like meaning which can become a host to verbalizing suffixes such as *-nux̲ʷ* and *-[z]ad*.

[8] This is the case when all the examples of *-nux̲ʷ*, including all the instances where it is used to form existential clauses, are taken into consideration (cf. §3.1.).

[9] Examples (1–6) have an anaphorical clitic indicating the subject but examples with a noun phrase in the subject position are also possible, such as the sentence below whose phrase (NP) includes a relative clause (REL).

(i) ǩus sásem-nux̲ʷ [sáak-i [ketá-su=s John-a]REL]NP
AUX.NEG children-S.to.have [grizzly-DIS[shoot-PASS=PREP John-DIS]REL]NP
'The grizzly that was shot by John had no cubs.'

as a possessee below can have either an alienable or inalienable interpretation according to the consultant.

(7) gēgēs-nux̲^{w}=nug^{w}a
eye-S.to.have=1SG
'I have an eye (of an animal, etc.)' / 'I have eyes (in my head)'

There will be more discussion about alienability in §5.

2.2. Possessive clauses formed with the suffix *-[z]ad*

In this subsection I will introduce *-[z]ad* which is another suffix that can be used to derive denominal intransitive verbs with the meaning 'to have X'. It has a very low productivity compared to *-nux̲^{w}* as the number of stems that it can attach to seems to be very limited. There is still no clear explanation why the productivity of *-[z]ad* is so low, but some speculation about the possible reasons are pointed out in §2.3.

In some cases *-[z]ad* may cause a morphophonological sound change to the stem which it is attached to. This change is one of the so-called *end effects* which cause the stem-final aspirated obstruents and all the other consonants except for plain and ejective obstruents to undergo a certain kind of change. The end effect of *-[z]ad* causes the stem-final aspirated obstruents to lose their aspiration and all other consonants, except for plain and ejective obstruents, to undergo another kind of change depending on the phoneme.

I have managed to find examples of only seven words/roots which have a denominal verbal counterpart formed with *-[z]ad* with the meaning 'to have X' in my own data. These words/roots are:

ẇap	'water'	*gux̲^{w}*	'house'	*ċúła*	'knife'
x̄enúx̲^{w}	'child'	*łáwanem*	'husband'	*gēném*	'woman/wife'
gen(c)-	'owner'				

All the stems' co-occurrences with *-[z]ad* was judged to be grammatical with the meaning 'to have X' — except for *ċúła* 'knife' and *gen(c)-* 'owner' — by both of my consultants.[10] Examples of each seven stems are shown below.

[10] One of the two consultants considered it to be ungrammatical for *ċúła* 'knife' to be used with *-[z]ad* while stating that it is grammatical to use *gen(c)-* with *-[z]ad* with the meaning 'to own', not 'to have an owner'.

(8) ẇab-ád=nug^{w}a
water-S.to.have=1SG
'I have water.'

(9) gug^{w}-ád=nug^{w}a
house-S.to.have=1SG
'I have a house.'

(10) c̓uł-ád=nug^{w}a
knife-S.to.have=1SG
'I have a knife.'

(11) x̄eng^{w}-ád=nug^{w}a
child-S.to.have=1SG
'I have a child.'

(12) sa=s ḡegád ha ?
AUX.PQ=2SG/PL to.have.a.wife QP
'Do you have a wife?'

(13) ławád=n(ug^{w}a)[11]
to.have.a.husband=1SG
'I have a husband.'

(14) k̓us genzád k̓ati-u[12]
AUX.NEG to.have.an.owner book-MED
'That is no one's book'
(lit. 'That book does not have an owner.')

-[z]ad seems to be able to be used — just like *-nux^{w}* — regardless of the alienability of the possession in question as it can be seen from the examples (11), (12) and (13). The consultant did not point out any semantical difference between the predicates in examples (4) (*ḡenémnux^{w}*) and (12) (*ḡegád*) which both mean 'to have a wife', nor in examples (3) (*ẇapnux^{w}*) and (8) (*ẇabád*) which both mean 'to have water'. It is also reasonable to ask whether (14) actually is an example of a possessive construction. This example is discussed in more detail in §5.

The examples above raise certain questions about the morphological nature of the suffix *-[z]ad* and its differences with *-nux^{w}*. These questions are discussed in detail in §2.3.

2.3. On the host stems of *-nux^{w}* and *-[z]ad*

In addition to the difference between *-nux^{w}* and *-[z]ad* in their capability of causing an end effect to the host stem, it seems possible to make a hypothesis about the difference between them when it comes to their morphological behaviour.

---

[11] The anaphorical subject clitic for the 1st person singular has two allomorphs *=n* and *=nug^{w}a* which are in free variation. They were both uttered by the consultant.

[12] Noun phrases in Haisla are obligatorily marked for spatial deixis by attaching a demonstrative suffix to the head noun. Some of these suffixes have several allomorphs whose distribution is still unclear. The suffix *-u* in (14) is an example of a demonstrative suffix denoting the medial (MED) category. Whenever there is a possessive suffix attached to the head noun, the demonstrative suffix precedes it and takes a form which differs from the form used when there is no possessive suffix following it, and which has variants depending on the person denoted by the following possessive suffix. In addition to the conventional three-way system of proximal (PROX), medial (MED) and distal (DIS), there is also fourth category (that does not show up in the examples of this paper) which has been described as spatiotemporal category having the meaning of "just gone" (Bach 2006: 267, 279). The further details of the demonstrative suffix system of Haisla are not discussed here as it is not relevant to the topic of this paper.

As can be seen from the examples in §2.2., it appears that *-[z]ad* adds a more drastic change to the stems *x̄enúx̲ʷ*, *łáwenem* and *ḡeném* than a mere end effect. The latter two of these apparent changes are likely explainable, but in *x̄engʷád* it is unclear why the /u/ has been lost.[13] According to the information available from Lincoln & Rath (1986a: 109, 257; 1986b: 441, 467), it is possible to conclude that *ławád* (13) is formed by attaching *-ad* to a root *łaxʷ-* 'to love'[14] without the suffix *-[a]nem*[15] while *ḡegád* (12) is formed by adding *-ad* to a root *gex̲-* 'female' which is different from the root used in *geném* 'woman/wife'.[16] I have not indicated the morpheme boundary in the examples of *ławád* 'to have a husband' and *ḡegád* 'to have a wife' because of the possible lexicalization of the combination of the root and *-[z]ad* in them.[17]

The reason for not indicating the morpheme boundary in the example of *genzád* 'to have an owner' is that it is not completely clear which one of the following analyses is correct.

(15) genzád
gen-zád
owner-S.to.have

(16) genzád
genc-ád
owner-S.to.have

It can be understood from the description of Lincoln & Rath (1986b: 438) that *genzád* 'to have an owner' could be derived from a root *gen-*. According to Lincoln and Rath (1986b: 438), the root *gen-* has the following meanings: 'to own', 'to look after'/'be responsible for (e.g. children)'. If this was the case, it would mean that (15) would be correct.[18] However, Lincoln & Rath (1986a: 93) also state that the root *gen-* would not be used in a bare root form with any of the meanings mentioned above but as a lexeme *genc*.[19] It is also unclear whether Lincoln & Rath (1986a: 93) also implies that *genzád* 'to have an owner' could be a derivation from *genc* instead of the root *gen-*. If *genzád* were thought to be a derivation of *gen(c)-*, (16) would be correct.[20]

There seems to be some evidence to form a hypothesis that the suffix *-[z]ad* differs

[13] According to Lincoln & Rath (1986b: 505), the root for *x̄enux̲ʷ* 'child' is *x̄enx̲ʷ-* without /u/. However, *x̄enux̲ʷ* with /u/ is listed as a lexeme for 'child'/'offspring' (Lincoln & Rath 1986b: 411).
[14] Only one of its meanings (Lincoln & Rath 1986b: 467).
[15] *łaxʷ-* 'to love' + *-anem* (nominalizing suffix) (Vink 1977: 130) → *łáwanem* 'a loved one' = 'husband". The root-final /xʷ/ is changed to /w/ due to the end effect.
[16] *ḡeném* 'woman'/'wife' is based on a root *ḡen-* also with the meaning 'female' (Lincoln & Rath 1986a: 113, 1986b: 441).
[17] In other words, it can be argued that the meaning of the derived verb ('to have a husband' and 'to have a wife') is no longer directly understood from the meaning of the root ('to love' and 'female').
[18] In this case the allomorph *-zad* of *-[z]ad* would be used because of the root-final syllabic resonant *en*.
[19] It is unclear to the author of this paper, what the function of *-c* in *genc* is.
[20] In this case the allomorph *-ad* of *-[z]ad* would be used because of the root-final aspirated plosive /c/ which would change to *z* because of the end effect.

from *-nux*^{w} in that it is more difficult for it to have anything else but bare roots with no derivational suffixes as its host stem whereas *-nux*^{w} attaches commonly not only to bare roots but also to stems comprising a root and an additional derivational suffix. If this hypothesis was correct, it would support the idea that the correct morphological analysis of *genzád* would be *gen-zád*. At this point, *ławád* having a bare root as its host instead of *ławanem* is not the only example suggesting the hypothesis to be correct. The example of *ċułád* 'to have a knife' also suggests the same. According to Vink (1977: 122), most of the root morphemes cannot occur as free forms. The word *ċúła* 'a knife' seems to contain this kind of a root, at least if we adopt the view of Lincoln & Rath (1986a: 67) which describes *ċúła* to be derived from a root *ċúł-*.[21] This would explain why we have *ċułád* instead of **ċułazád* which would be the expected form if *-[z]ad* could have a stem — not a bare root — as its host.

One problem regarding this analysis might be that if *-[z]ad* was attached directly to the root *ċúł-* it would cause the root-final /ɬ/ to change to /l/ due to the end effect but the consultant pronounced *ċułád* without the effect. However, when asked whether it could be pronounced as /ċulád/, i.e. with the end effect, the answer was affirmative. This suggests that there is some inconsistency in whether *-[z]ad* causes end effect or not – at least in the case of the root *ċúł-* 'knife'.

Outside my own data, there actually is at least one example of *-[z]ad* that does not have a bare root as its host (Lincoln & Rath 1986b: 327). This example (*sasemzád* 'to have children') is derived from the stem *sásem* 'children' (Lincoln & Rath 1986b: 327) which in turn is derived from the root *sas-* 'offspring (of one couple)' (Lincoln & Rath 1986b: 487). It is possible that *sásem* includes a suffix *-m*[22] which is a "nominal formative suffix" according to Vink (1977: 130) without any apparent lexical meaning. This raises some thoughts since it seems to be a counterexample to the hypothesis I made based on my own data. It would perhaps be better to hypothesize that there is a semantic restriction instead on which suffixes can be included in a stem that is used as a host to *-[z]ad*. For example, if it could be shown that there was a rule that only certain type of non-lexical suffixes can be included in a stem hosting *-[z]ad* it might be possible to explain why *sasém* 'children' can host *-[z]ad* with a suffix in it but *ċúła* 'knife' cannot.

2.4. Possession expressed by clauses with a modifier as the predicate

Another way of expressing possession in Haisla beside the usage of the suffixes

[21] According to Lincoln & Rath (1986b: 432), the root *ċúł-* has the meaning 'black'. Lincoln and Rath (1986a: 67) hypothesized that the word *ċúła* 'knife 'is derived from the root *ċúł-* 'black' since the same word can also mean "*any iron object*" because of the dark color. The word *ċúł-a* can be analyzed to have a suffix *-a* which has no lexical meaning being a so-called completive "empty morpheme" (Bach 1995: 13).

[22] *sas-* 'children' + *-m* → *sásem*. An epenthetic vowel appears between the two morphemes.

discussed above is to use clauses in which the predicate expresses the number, the quantity or a quality of the subject. In these cases, the predicate is either a numeral, a quantifier or an adjective.[23] When a clause like this is used to express possession, the subject noun phrase expresses the possessee and the predicate the number, the quantity or a quality of the possessee. The possessor is expressed by a possessive suffix attached to the subject noun phrase. It seems that clauses with this structure can also have a non-possessive meaning when the predicate is an adjective. For example, (21) can mean either 'I have (a) white couch(es)' or 'My couch(es) is/are white'. For this reason, I do not call this construction a possessive clause. Also, this construction is not be mixed up with a noun phrase with a numeral, a quantifier or an adjective as its modifier. Modifiers precede their head nouns in a noun phrase and predicates precede the subject noun phrase in a clause, but the difference is that there is a connective moprheme *-s* attached to a modifier before the head noun in a noun phrase. In contrary, there is no connective *-s* when a numeral, a quantifier or an adjective precedes a (subject) noun phrase as a predicate.

The number of examples of this third strategy that I have managed to collect is not very large as it was quite difficult to collect examples with complex noun phrases and modifiers. Some examples of clauses expressing possession with a numeral or a quantifier as the predicate can be seen below.

(17) yudúx̲ʷ mayás-Ø-enc
three cat-DIS-POSS.1SG
'I have three cats.'
(lit. 'My cats are three.')

(18) q̓ínem[24] mayás-Ø-enc
many cat-DIS-POSS.1SG
'I have many cats.'
(lit. 'My cats are many.')

(19) q̓ínem TV-a'-enc
many TV-MED-POSS.1SG
'I have many TVs.'
(lit. 'My TVs are many.')

(20) géncukʷi sásem-Ø-us ?
how.many children-DIS-POSS.2SG/PL
'How many children do you have?'
(lit. 'How many are your children?')

An example with an adjective as the predicate is shown below.

(21) ṁúx̄ʷsdu k̓ʷáxdemi-a'-enc
white couch-MED-POSS.1SG

[23] The term *adjective* is not used here as a label for a lexical category, but merely as a convenient way of referring to a subset of stative verbs denoting quality.
[24] *qínem* can be used regardless of the countability of the subject, so it could also mean 'a lot', 'much', etc. depending on the meaning of the subject. Despite this, it is simply translated as 'many' for the sake of convenience.

'I have a white couch/white couches.'
(lit. 'My couch(es) is/are white.')

All the examples with an adjective and a numeral as a modifier have the numeral as the predicate. Examples are shown below.

(22) má'elau<u>x</u>^{w} m̓úx̄^{w}sdu-s mayás-Ø-enc
two white-CON cat-DIS-POSS.1SG
'I have two white cats.'
(lit. 'My white cats are two.')

(23) yudú<u>x</u>^{w} m̓úx̄^{w}sdu-s k̓^{w}áxdemi-a'-enc
three white-CON couch-MED-POSS.1SG
'I have three white couches.'
(lit. 'My white couches are three.')

I have not managed to collect any examples with an adjective as a modifier inside the subject noun phrase and a quantifier as the predicate instead of a numeral.

3. Existential clauses

Based on the data, it can be concluded that the existential clauses in Haisla are formed according to the same two strategies as clauses expressing possession, i.e. with a suffix or by having a modifier as the predicate of the clause. Thus, the possessive and existential clause types have no clear distinction in Haisla.

3.1. Existential clauses formed with a suffix

Examples of existential clauses formed with *-nu<u>x</u>^{w}* are shown below.

(24) mayás-nu<u>x</u>^{w} wíl̓i-ax̄i
cat-S.to.have beach-DIS
'There is a cat on that beach (over there).'
(lit. 'That beach over there has a cat.')

(25) beg^{w}ánem-nu<u>x</u>^{w} guk^{w}-i
person-S.to.have house-DIS
'There are people in that house (over there).'
(lit. 'That house over there has people.')

(26) mayás-nux̲ʷ qix
cat-S.to.have here
'There is a cat here.'
(lit. 'Here has a cat.')

(27) ẇap-nux̲ʷ 'ugʷeliɬ-ax̄u
water-S.to.have floor-MED
'There is water on that floor.'
(lit. 'That floor has water.')

One interesting observation is that it seems to be almost impossible to use *-[z]ad* to form existential clauses. One of the consultants denied the grammaticality of all the sentences which were intended to express existence with a combination of *-[z]ad* and one of the seven stems introduced in §2.2. except for the following one sentence.

(28) k̇us gugʷ-ád ḡida
AUX.NEG house-S.to.have over.there
'There is/are no house(s) over there.'
(lit. 'Over there has no house(s).')

Also, the other consultant judged the following two sentences to be grammatical.[25]

(29) ẇab-ád ẇax̄ wíi-u
water-S.to.have all/every(thing) place-MED
'There is water everywhere.'
(lit. 'Everywhere has water.')

(30) ẇab-ád 'uabúlsi
water-S.to.have under.a/the.house
'There is water under the house.'
(lit. 'Under the house has water.')

It is unclear why the three above-mentioned sentences were judged to be grammatical by at least one of the consultants. There is still not enough data to make any definite conclusions about whether *-[z]ad* can really be used to form existential clauses or not, but it seems to be safe enough to conclude that there is a clear difference between *-nux̲ʷ* and *-[z]ad* when it comes to the productivity of forming existential clauses.

3.2. Existential clauses with a modifier as the predicate

This strategy is essentially the same construction dealt with in §2.4. The number of examples of existential clauses with a modifier as the predicate that I managed to collect

[25] The grammaticality of the same two sentences was denied by the other consultant.

is somewhat larger than the number of clauses with this same structure expressing possession.

When this strategy is used to structure an existential clause, it is common that the entity whose existence is in question is made the subject of the clause without carrying the normally obligatory demonstrative suffix. The location is usually expressed after the subject either as a noun phrase (35) or a prepositional phrase with the preposition *la* preceding the noun that indicates the location (31 and 33). It seems that the subject carries the demonstrative suffix if there is no noun phrase or prepositional phrase after it that expresses the location, in which case the demonstrative suffix functions as the indicator of the location (32 and 34).

(31) q̓ínem nai la qalás-ax̄u
many snow PREP road-MED
'There is a lot of snow on the road over there.'
(lit. 'Snow is a lot on the road over there.')

(32) q̓ínem nái-gax̄
many snow-PROX
'There is a lot of snow here.'
(lit. 'The snow here is a lot.')

(33) ma'elaux̲ʷ násnax̄ la wá-ix̄i
two mallard PREP river-DIS
'There are two mallards in a river over there.'
(lit. 'Mallards are two in a river over there.')

(34) ẇiẇáx̄ ẇáp-ax̄i
how.much water-DIS
'How much water is there (over there)?'
(lit. 'How much is the water over there?')

(35) ma'elaux̲ʷ mayás gukʷ-i
two cat house-DIS
'There are two cats in the house over there.'
(lit. 'Cats are two in the house over there.')

It is also possible to have only a numeral or a quantifier with an anaphoric clitic as a predicate without any subject or locative noun/prepositional phrase after the predicate.

(36) ẇiẇáx̄=u
how.many=3SG/PL.MED
'How much is there (near you)?'
(lit. 'How much is it there?')

(37) yudúk^{w}=i[26]
three=3SG/PL.DIS
'There are three of them (over there).'
(lit. 'They are three over there.')

The author has not obtained any clear examples of existential clauses with an adjectival predicate.

4. Locative clauses

There seems to be at least two ways of forming locative clauses in Haisla. The main difference with the strategies to form an existential clause is that locative clauses are formed with predicates denoting a location.[27] The first and the most common way is to use the verb *laa* 'to (be) locate(d) in/at' as a predicate. The predicate is followed by a subject noun phrase, if any, which in turn is followed by a noun denoting a location. This noun may appear as a noun phrase or as a prepositional phrase with the preposition *la*.

(38) laa mayás-Ø-enc guk^{w}-i
to.locate cat-DIS-POSS.1SG house-DIS
'My cat is in the house.'

(39) sa=s laa Ċimauċ-ix̄u ha ?
AUX.PQ=2SG/PL to.locate PN.Kitamaat-MED QP
'Are you in Kitamaat?'

(40) laa gelẇ-ix̄u la wá-ix̄u
to.locate canoe-MED PREP river-MED
'The canoe is in that river.'

---

[26] According to the consultant, *yudúk^{w}i* 'There are three of them.' can refer only to animate entities while in the case of an inanimate referent *yudúx^{w}i* would be used. This is a very interesting statement as this seems to violate the aformentioned morphophonemic rule due to which the underlying word-final plosive of *yudúx^{w}* should be pronounced as a plosive (k^{w}) before a vowel as it does in *yudúk^{w}i*. It is also curious that a distinction between an animate and an inanimate referent is made here since animacy does not play a huge role in the grammar of Haisla as even the 3rd person anaphoric clitics can be used to refer to either an animate or an inanimate entity. Also, the author has not found any data suggesting that animacy would play any role in the possessive clauses.

[27] Predicates that can be used to form locative clauses, i.e. clauses that introduce the location of the subject as a new information while the subject expresses old information, include also (derived) verb stems that express not only the state of being located somewhere but also the manner, such as *k^{w}a'ił* 'to sit indoors'. In this paper, only locative clauses that focus on expressing only the location of the subject are dealt with, so clauses with predicates like *k^{w}a'ił* are not discussed.

It seems that another way of forming locative clauses in Haisla is to use a locative root or stem as predicate. Currently the sentence shown below is the only example of this strategy found in my data.

(41) gícua-iɬ[28] nag̱ekʷ-u [la hemsdem-íx̄u]
to.be.on.-LS.indoors alcohol-MED [PREP table-MED]
'The alcohol is on something (indoors) [on the table].'

In this example, the interpretation would be that the alcohol is on a table even without the prepositional phrase which is optional according to the consultant.

5. Open issues

In this section I will point out some questions about the three clause types discussed in this paper that remain unsolved. I will also show some data which may be problematic in regard to the description and generalizations I have given.

First, I will discuss how alienability is treated in the possessive clauses. There is a piece of data suggesting that a distinction may be made between an alienable and an inalienable possession at least in some cases. After that, I will point out some data on uncommon locative clauses.

5.1. Possessive clauses and alienability

As mentioned in §2., it seems to be possible to use the suffix *-nux̲ʷ* to form a possessive clause regardless of the alienability of the possession in question. However, there is one example which suggests that some possessive clauses formed by *-nux̲ʷ* might not be possible to be interpreted as expressing an inalienable possession. This example is shown below.

(42) hixt̓i-nux̲ʷ=nugʷa
head-S.to.have=1SG
'I have a head (of a fish etc.).'

According to the consultant who gave the example (42), it cannot mean 'I have a head'/'I am not headless', so only an interpretation of an alienable possession seems to be possible.

When asked how to say 'I have a head' in the sense of inalienable possession, the following expression was given.

[28] According to Lincoln & Rath (1986a: 90), *gílcua* means 'to be situated inside a container', but the consultant was using it in the meaning 'to be on something'.

(43) hixt̓i-g-enc
head-PROX-POSS.1SG
'I have a head/my own head.'
(lit. 'My head (which is here)')

There are at least two important observations to be made: (1) In (43), the noun phrase seems to be used as the predicate. (2) This expression resembles the construction we saw earlier in which a modifier of the possessee takes the role of the predicate in the clause except that in this case there is no modifier as a predicate. There is only the possessee with the possessive suffix indicating the possessor.

Since there are no other examples like this, it is difficult to say anything conclusive about this example. However, at least the following questions should be made: Can this kind of seemingly predicateless possessive expression be used only in cases of an inalienable possession? Is there any relation between this kind of expression and clauses expressing possession which are formed with a modifier as a predicate? Which stems require this kind of expression in order to form a possessive clause with a meaning of an inalienable possession? Why can *gēgēs* 'an eye' have an inalienable interpretation with *-nux̲ʷ*, as in (7), when *hixt̓i* 'a head' cannot? What is the relation between alienability and the suffix *-[z]ad*?

To answer these questions more research needs to be done and more examples of possessive clauses with an inalienable meaning need to be collected.

5.2. Possession and belongingness

The example (14) (presented again below) in which the suffix *-[z]ad* was used raises the question whether it should be considered as an example of a possessive clause at all in spite of being identical to the possessive clauses formed with the suffix *-[z]ad*.

(14`) k̓us genzád k̓atí-u
AUX.NEG to.have.an.owner book-MED
'That is no one's book'
(lit. 'That book does not have an owner.')

Heine (1997: 29–33) points out a difference between possession ("have-constructions") and belongingness ("belong-constructions"). According to Heine (1997: 29–30), the main characteristics of the belongingness constructions are: (1) The possessee is encoded as the subject. (2) The possessee is definite while the possessor may be indefinite. (3) The possessee receives the emphasis over the possessor. Heine (1997: 29) gives the following two English examples to illustrate the difference between these two constructions with (a) as a possession construction and (b) as a belongingness

construction:

(44) a. Peter has a car.
b. The car is Peter's. / The car belongs to Peter.

It seems to be possible to analyze the example (14) as an example of belongingness as it fits well to the description given by Heine (1997: 29–33). This is because: (1) The possessee (book) is encoded as the subject. (2) The possessee (book) is definite while the possessor is indefinite. (3) The possessee (book) can be considered to have received the emphasis over the (indefinite) possessor. This makes us ponder what is the main factor contributing to the belongingness interpretation in this very example. Did it arise from the meaning ('to have an owner') of the stem *gen(c)-* which forces the characteristics of a belongingness construction upon the sentence? It is also unclear how meaningful the fact that the suffix *-[z]ad* is used is.

5.3. Locative clauses and the word order

There are some examples of locative clauses with a marked word order. In (45) and (46), the locative noun phrase takes the clause-initial position coming before the predicate.

(45) hemsdem-íx̄u laa mayás-u
table-MED to.locate cat-MED
'That cat is on the table.'

(46) wíl̓i-ax̄I laa m̓ál̓inix̄ʷ-ax̄i
beach-DIS to.locate hunter-DIS
'The hunter is on the beach (over there).'

It is still unclear why locative sentences with this kind of word order is possible and what is the purpose of putting the locative noun phrase in the clause-initial position, but at this point, the best hypothesis may be that this phenomenon has something to do with information structure and/or topicality.

6. Summary

In this section I will briefly summarize the three clause types and the possible problems of their description that still remain.

Summary of the possessive and existential clauses:

- In general, clauses expressing possession and existence are formed according to the same two methods.

- These methods are: (1) Using a suffix to derive denominal intransitive verbs with the meaning ‘to have X’, ‘there is/are X’ (2) Using a clause in which the predicate expresses the number, the quantity or a quality of the possessee or the entity whose existence is in question while the possessee or the entity whose existence is in question is the subject noun phrase of the same clause. The subject noun phrase is accompanied by a possessive suffix expressing the possessor or a demonstrative suffix expressing the location in a case of existential clause. The location can also be indicated with a noun phrase or prepositional phrase within the same clause when it expresses existence.
- There are two suffixes *-nux*^{w} and *-[z]ad* which can both be used to derive denominal verbs with the meaning ‘to have X’, i.e. to form possessive clauses, while it seems to be very difficult for verbs derived with *-[z]ad* to have the meaning ‘there is/are X’, i.e. to be used to form existential clauses.
- It is unclear why *-[z]ad* has so much lower productivity than *-nux*^{w} but it may have something to do with what kind of stems it can have as its host.
- It may be impossible to form possessive clauses with an inalienable meaning by using *-nux*^{w} with certain stems. At this point the only example suggesting this is *hixt̓i* (‘head’). Another example of this very stem (*hixt̓i* ‘head’) implies that inalienable possession could be expressed by using a single noun phrase made of the stem and a possessive suffix as a clause. However, because of lack of any further data, it is too early to say whether this is really the case.

Summary of the locative clauses:

- Locative clauses are structured by using the locative verb *laa* ‘to (be) locate(d) in/at’ as a predicate or by using a predicate which is based on a locative stem.
- The location is expressed by using a locative noun within the locative clause as a noun phrase or as a part of a prepositional phrase preceded by the preposition *la* after the subject when the locative verb *laa* is used.
- There are examples of locative clauses with an unusual word order in which the locative noun phrase is put in the clause-initial position coming before the locative verb *laa* as the predicate. It is unclear to what extent this kind of word order is possible and what its function is.

Abbreviations

-	Morpheme boundary	NOM	Nominal
=	Clitic boundary	NP	Noun phrase
1	1st person	PASS	Passive voice
2	2nd person	PL	Plural
3	3rd person	PN	Place name
AUX	Auxiliary verb	POSS	Possessive suffix
CON	Connective	PQ	Polar question
DIS	Distal	PREP	Preposition
EP	Epenthesis	PROX	Proximal
lit.	Literally	QP	Question particle
LOC	Locative element	REL	Relative clause
MED	Medial	SG	Singular
NEG	Negative	S	Suffix

References

Bach, Emmon (1995) A note on quantification and blankets in Haisla. In: Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer and Barbara H. Partee (eds.) *Quantification in Natural Languages* 13-20. Dodrecht: Kluwer.

Bach, Emmon (2001) Building words in Haisla. *University of Massachusetts Occasional Publications* 20: 51-73.

Bach, Emmon (2006) Paradigm Regained: Deixis in Northern Wakashan. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 14. 267-281.

Clark, Eve V. (1978) Locationals: Existential, Locative and Possessive Constructions. In: Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson, Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.) *Universals of Human Language, Vol.4: Syntax* 85-126. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Heine, Bernd (1997) *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Neville J. and Rath, John C. (1986a) *Phonology, Dictionary and Listing of Roots and Lexical Derivates of the Haisla Language of Kitlope and Kitimaat [sic], B.C. Volume 1. Canadian Ethnology Service Paper* 103. Ottawa, ON: National Museum of Canada.

Lincoln, Neville J. and Rath, John C. (1986b) *Phonology, Dictionary and Listing of Roots and Lexical Derivates of the Haisla Language of Kitlope and Kitimaat [sic], B.C. Volume 2. Canadian Ethnology Service Paper* 103. Ottawa, ON: National Museum of Canada.

Vink, Hein (1977) A Haisla phonology. *International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages* 12: 111-131.

Summary

This paper is intended to provide a preliminary overview of how possessive, existential and locative clause types are structured in Haisla, a Wakashan language spoken in British Columbia, Canada. Possessive and existential clauses are structured according to two patterns: (1) Deriving a denominal verb with the meaning 'to have X'/'there is/are X' with a derivational suffix. (2) Using a clause in which the predicate expresses the number, the quantity or a quality of the possessee or the entity whose existence is in question. The very productive suffix *-nux*^{w} can be used to form both possessive and existential clauses while another suffix *-[z]ad* seems to be possible to be used mainly for possessive clauses only. Locative clauses are structured with the locative verb *laa* 'to (be) locate(d) in/at' or with a locative stem as the predicate. When the locative verb is used, the location is expressed with an independent noun phrase or prepositional phrase. Some problematic data concerning word order in locative clauses and inalienability in the possessive clauses is shown. Also, the difference between possessive constructions and constructions denoting belonging is discussed.

(terova@gmail.com)