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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, ña-téte-n?khe.

mú-tu maqó-hi ña-téte-n=khe 3.AGT find-SAME 1.AGT tell-IP=FUT

‘If I see him, I’ll tell him’. SUBJECT=SUBJECT

(2) čhê múlaqhla, ya čhów?khe hlíw.

čhê múl-aq=hla ya čhó-w=khe 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) M dáʔa ?el, ma?d yhe’dun k’uci. phde.n.

má-ʔa=?el ma?d yhe-.du-n k’úč-i. pʰdé-n. woman=the food do-IP=SAME child-PL seeing-carry-IP

‘While the woman cooked, she watched the children’. SUBJECT=SUBJECT

(4) M dáʔaʔel ma?d yhe nda báya-ʔel k’úč-i. pʰdé-n.

má-ʔa=?el ma?d yhe-.n=da báya=ʔel k’úč-i. pʰ-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; INDEF 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 semelfactive; TOP new topic; WIT personal witness evidential; 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person.
(5) ?a. čáwyoba máti ?ćhá-ćba ma?á
?a. čáw=yó-ba máti ?ćhá-ć-ba ma?á
1.AGT in=go-SAME down by.gravity-sit-INCH-SAME food
qa-yú?ćiw.
qa...yú?ći-w
biting-begin-p
‘I came into the house, [I] sat down, and [I] started to eat’.  
SUBJECT=SUBJECT

1.AGT in=go-P=DIF dog=the really 1.PAT
sé-čmada.
se-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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAME</th>
<th>DIFFERENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>hla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COINCIDENT</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSECUTIVE</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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’.
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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.

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’).
SWITCH-REFERENCE IN CENTRAL POMO

(10) Mé·n lówač'hi ?e mu·l, mé·n lów-ac'-hi ?e mu·l
so talk.PL-IP.PL-SAME COP that
qówyó-kamaw?k'ee. AGENT=AGENT
qów=ýó-ka-m-a-w=?k'ee 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 ?ìw čhówhla, ma ma· baséʔ' ma mu·l ?ì-w čhó-w=hla ma ma· baséʔ'
2.AGT that do-P not-P=DIFF 2.AGT stuff bad
thab'.?c'ìw phwiw?khe. SUBJECT=AGENT
thabd.?-c'-w ph-wi-w=?khe. 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.
qhá=ma?á qhá-da?way-?khe
water=go-SAME food buy-IMPERATIVE

'Go down (to town) and buy groceries!'

qhá=ma?á qhá-da?way=?khe
water=go-SAME food buy=FUTURE

'He’ll go down and buy groceries'.

qhá=ma?á qhá-da?way=?le
water=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 =?khe 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.

qhá=ma?á qhá-da?way=?khe
water=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- t*i=n ?e qóyohi, ?e=ytow qóyohi,
ba- t*i=n ?e qó=yo?hi ?e=y=htow qó=yo?hi
who not-ip COP hither=go-SAME far=side hither=go-SAME

ma?á dó?chi, ma?á m?á-kahi,
ma?á dó-é?hi ma?á m?á-ka-hi
food make-SML-SAME food heating-sense-CAUS-SAME

m?o yówcow?khe.
mt?o yów=co-w=?khe
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) ?i wa ma šačój’k’e
    ?i=wa ma ša-čó-t=’k’e
    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) ?i wa ma yal šačój’k’e
    ?i=wa ma ya-l ša-čó-t=’k’e
    do=Q 2.AGT 1.PL-PAT swinging-hit-ME=FUT

    ya ča-l hlíwhla.
    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 ?el t’a-mhi dasé-m.
    šá=?el t’a-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 qów?nehla
    ma čalél qów=’né=hla
2.AGT just out=PL-set=DIFF

    t’a- mu-l báč’i=le.
    t’a- mu-l bá-č’=ile

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
distribution is a secondary effect of their primary function: to link clauses. The main difference between hi and hla is the degree of cohesion they specify.

Clauses linked with hi (SAME) describe closely associated actions, actions presented as components of a single event, as in (19) 'Cut out the insides of the fish and wash it'. It is not surprising that such actions typically involve the same subject. Even when the clauses linked by hi do not share subjects, the unity of the event can still be seen. The clauses in (21) do not share subjects, agents, or patients, but the speaker intended to make a single proposal.

(21) \( ?\cdot \ mkh^e \ k^h\hat{c}^e?=el \ d\hat{o}\hat{c}hi \)
\( \?a. \ mkh^e \ k^h\hat{c}^e?=el \ d\hat{o}\hat{-}\hat{c}\cdot\hat{hi} \)
1.AGT  2.AGT  bridge=the  make-SML-SAME
\( \text{m}i\text{-li} \ ma \ ?d\hat{i}\hat{m}^khe. \)
\( \text{m}i\text{=}\text{-li} \ ma \ ?d\hat{i}^m=?khe \)
that=with  2.PAT  take.PL-across=FUT

'I will build the bridge for you and on that you'll take them (across)' = 'I will build you a bridge to take them across on'.

Clauses linked with hla (DIFF) describe distinct events. Distinct events often but not necessarily involve different participants. Both clauses in (22) contain patient subjects, but the speaker chose to present them as distinct events.

(22) \( \text{m}to \ mu\cdot \ sm\hat{a} \ m\hat{t}i\cdot\hat{c}k\hat{a}\hat{y}hla \ m\hat{to} \)
\( \text{m}to \ mu\cdot \ sm\hat{a} \ m\hat{t}i\cdot\hat{c}-\hat{k}a\cdot\hat{y}=hla \ m\hat{to} \)
2.PAT  that  sleep  lie-INCH-CAUS-DEFOC=DIFF  2.PAT
\( \text{q}'\hat{o}\hat{\tilde{\imath}}i \ mad\hat{\hat{u}}\cdot\hat{m}a\cdot\hat{\tilde{\imath}}=?khe \ t^h\hat{n}i. \)  SUBJECT=SUBJECT
\( \text{q}'\hat{o}=\hat{\imath}i \ mad\hat{\hat{u}}\cdot\hat{ma}\cdot\hat{\tilde{\imath}}=?khe \ t^h\hat{n}i \)  AGENT=$\emptyset$
what=even awake-AFF-INCH=FUT  not-IP  PATIENT=PATIENT

'If you were put to sleep, you'd never wake up at all'.

The difference in cohesion expressed by hi and hla is mirrored by a formal difference. The marker -hi (SAME), which links closely associated actions, is a verbal suffix. The marker =hla (DIFF), which links whole events, is a clausal enclitic. Unlike -hi, =hla can follow the final perfective suffix -w (hli-w=hla [go.PL-P=DIFF] 'when we go home' in 18 above) and several other enclitics.

The two markers show an additional difference. Both -hi and =hla may be translated 'and', 'when', 'whenever', or 'if', but =hla (DIFF) conveys stronger contingency; it is more often translated 'if'. Mrs. Jack remarked
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 tika mi· hlátaqtamač’ače’
ya tika mi-· hlá-t-aq-τa-m-äch-ach’
1.PL in.fact that=at go.PL-ME-PL.IP-MA-IP.PL-IP.PL
mú-tuyal č’a-l q’óman.
mú-tuya-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 f’a- ští’ Bertha ni-n čáwhliwda.
me-n f’a-śtí’ 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’ ṭel, mu-l ba-dáqʰa-del qʰdéʔč’dun,
čá-č’=ʔel mu-l ba-dáqʰa-d-el qʰdéʔ-č’-du-n
man=the that POSS-wife-PAT fight-RFL-IP-SAME
mčójìn,
ma· pʰts’áday.
m-čó-t-in ma· pʰ-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) Du'tayya, ma?á ?el qawá:?yawda,
dú-?ay=ya ma?á=?el qa-=wá-=?ya-w=da
other-PL=TOP food=the biting=go-IP.PL-DFOC-P=DIFF

bal lá-la ?çhá-w, bap?qélmadun.
bal lá-la ?çhá-=w ba=p'qél-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 func-
tion: to link clauses. Their principal difference is in the degree of cohe-
sion they specify.

The marker in (SAME) is used to link actions that are presented as com-
ponents 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) ?á.- kiy khe k'uci.?elayal,
?á.=kiy khe k'ú=či.=?el=hayal
1.AGT=too 1.OBL child=the=PL=PAT

béda yá=khe hínfil k'hé=?el ba–néhdun,
bé=da yá=?khe hínfil k'hé=?el ba--né-h-du-n
this=at 1.PL=OBL Indian dance=the stepping-set-p-IP-SAME

?úda-w šwáyli q'lúta-čač. SUBJECT=SUBJECT
?úda-w šwáy=li q'lú-t-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 dis-
tinct events, even though they shared the same subject and agent.

(28) Mén ?in ?e ?a.- bal št'ó, ?a.- qašóyda,
mé-n ?i-n ?e ?a.- bal št'o, ?a.- qašóy=da
so be-SAME COP 1.AGT this now 1.AGT alive=DIFF

"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 func-
tion: to link clauses. Their principal difference is in the degree of cohe-
sion they specify.

The marker in (SAME) is used to link actions that are presented as com-
ponents 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) ?á.- kiy khe k'uci.?elayal,
?á.=kiy khe k'ú=či.=?el=hayal
1.AGT=too 1.OBL child=the=PL=PAT

béda yá=khe hínfil k'hé=?el ba–néhdun,
bé=da yá=?khe hínfil k'hé=?el ba--né-h-du-n
this=at 1.PL=OBL Indian dance=the stepping-set-p-IP-SAME

?úda-w šwáyli q'lúta-čač. SUBJECT=SUBJECT
?úda-w šwáy=li q'lú-t-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 dis-
tinct events, even though they shared the same subject and agent.
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-w**da** . . .
    k'hé  ma-né-m-a-w=**da**
    dance  stepping-set-down-DFOC-PERFECTIVE=DIFF
    'While (people) were dancing . . .'

(30) Bal  ?ul  ñ'aléya  h?òw?k'**eda** . . .
    bal  ?ul  ñ'aléya  h?ò-w=**k'**e=**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'i**wda**  ñéman.
    ma.  k'i-w=**da**  ñ-nè-m-an
    place  cold-P=in  by.hand-set-down-IP
    'Set it in a cold place'.

(32) Bél  ma'chída  k'hýá  swé-laqaw.
    bél  ma'chí=**da**  k'hýá  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).

?á. čá-l yó-w=da
1.AGT still talk-IMPERFECTIVE=DIFF away=go=wit

‘He left while I was talking’.

(34) ?á. čá-l yówda,
?á. čá-l yó-w=da
1.AGT house=to go-PERFECTIVE=DIFF

ma wáy mtí-č’ka.
ma wáy mtí-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. ?t’háln, bal táwhal yhé-n?kʰe čʰów.
šá. ?t’hál=in bal táwhal yhé=n=ʔkʰe čʰó-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.

mú-tyua ma- löw-ach’-in ?a. car=wi čʰmá-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,  
     **mu·l** ba=¿dí-n-ba  
     3.AGT INDF=take.PL-away-SAME  
     *mačú-ts’aq’*  
     *ma-čú-ts’-aq’*  
     POSS=M’s.B-call-P  
     woman=OBL  
     give-P  
     *He took it (money) away from people and gave it to his niece*.  

(38) **Me’nda** ?doma mú·tu čalúščiba  
     **mé-n=da** ?=doma mú·tu ča-lùš-či-ba  
     so=at COP=HRSY 3.PAT  
     *qhabe ?mil ?tésam.*  
     *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=li  
     this mouth=in throw.PL-SML-P=DIFF  
     *bal mú·tu háw 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.
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) *qʼdítay ca šwé-ylí napʰótač’.*

‘They are living in good new houses’.
Like the irrealis and coincident realis pairs, -ba and =li are not perfect semantic counterparts. Sequential =li (DIFF) often implies causation. 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) Mé-n ?l-wli mú-ju q’alá-wli,
mé-n ?l-w=li mú-ju q’alá-w=li
so be-p=with 3.PAT die-p=DIF
čé-ki mú-ju ?dúč’.
čé-ki mú-ju ?dúč
father’s.younger.brother 3.PAT married-INCH

‘So then **when/because** he [my father] died, my uncle married her [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) Me.n ?i-n ?ma ?a- ?i-w ?e,
me.n ?i-n =ma ?a- ?i-w ?e
so be-SAME COP=FAC 1.AGT be-p COP
čó. díyawli.
čó. díy-a-w=li
1.PAT order-DFOC-P=DIF

‘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, \textit{hi}, \textit{hla}, \textit{in}, \textit{da}, \textit{ba}, and \textit{li} do not constitute a perfectly symmetrical system either formally or semantically. Formally, \text{-hi}, \text{-in}, and \text{-ba} are suffixes, while \text{=hla}, \text{=da}, and \text{=li} are enclitics. Semantically, the markers show various idiosyncrasies. Both \text{-hi} and \text{=hla} link irrealis clauses with different degrees of cohesion, but \text{=hla} can imply additional contingency. Both \text{-in} and \text{=da} relate coincident realis events with different degrees of cohesion, but \text{-in} implies ongoing simultaneity and/or a causal relationship. Both \text{-ba} and \text{=li} relate consecutive realis clauses with different degrees of cohesion, but \text{=li} can also imply causation. The special meanings of \text{=da} and \text{=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 \text{mé-n} ‘thus, so’, and the verb \text{ʔi-} (Coast dialect \text{tsf-}) ‘be, do’. These conjunctions, which usually link new sentences to previous material in the discourse, do not form symmetrical pairs either.

\begin{align*}
\text{(49) mé-n ʔihi} & \text{ ‘after doing that’, ‘from then on’, ‘then’, ‘and then’, ‘and if’, ‘then if’} \\
\text{mé-n ʔihla} & \text{ ‘if’, ‘again’, ‘still’, ‘also’, ‘furthermore’} \\
\text{mé-n ʔín} & \text{ ‘because of that’, ‘that is why’, ‘that’s how’} \\
\text{mé-nda} & \text{ ‘and then’, ‘meanwhile’, ‘at/during that time’, ‘then’, ‘that’s when’} \\
\text{mé-n ʔiba} & \text{ ‘and then’, ‘so then’, ‘after that’} \\
\text{mé-n ʔiwli} & \text{ ‘and then’, ‘so then’, ‘so that’s why’, ‘and so’, ‘and then because of that’}
\end{align*}

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 \text{ʔi} ‘but’, ‘although’, \text{=hlaw} ‘after’, \text{=htow} ‘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.
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