Southern Pomo switch-reference and its origins within Pomoan

Southern Pomo switch-reference and its origins within Pomoan[1]

[AUTHOR'S NAME]

1. Introduction

This study describes the switch-reference system of Southern Pomo within its broader Pomoan context and provides evidence that switch-reference was not a feature of Proto Pomo. Instead, switch-reference developed from Proto Pomo clause-combining morphemes in different ways in the daughter languages without any evidence for non-Pomoan influence. The southernmost Pomoan languages came to restructure these clause-combining morphemes as subject-tracking suffixes, whereas more northerly Pomoan languages did not.

[1] [ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS]

Switch-reference (SR), a term first coined by Jacobsen (1967), can be divided into canonical switch-reference (CSR) and non-canonical switch-reference (NCSR). Haiman and Munro provide a succinct definition of "canonical switch-reference" as "an inflectional category of the verb, which indicates whether or not its subject is identical with the subject of some other verb" (1983:ix). This basic definition of CSR is still accepted broadly and for individual languages (Dixon 2012:204; Aikhenvald 2012:344-345). A more recent definition of CSR is provided by McKenzie, who removes the requirement that the argument being tracked may only be the subject (2015:409):

> Switch-reference (SR) can be defined as a set of morphemes associated with the juncture of two clauses that indicates whether a certain prominent argument in each clause co-refers. Typically, that argument is a subject.

De Sousa (2016) (re)defines CSR on the basis of seven identifying features, only one of which includes subject tracking. According to de Sousa's definition, SR systems are more or less canonical rather than cleanly split in a CSR-versus-NCSR dichotomy. This paper, however, accepts the more conservative definition of CSR in which special morphology must minimally track arguments as being shared or not shared across clauses. CSR hereafter refers only to clause-combining morphology that tracks an argument (generally, but not necessarily, the subject) as being shared or not shared between clauses.

NCSR refers to systems in which verbal morphology indicates something is same or shared across clauses, but that something is not any type of argument. Mithun (1993), for example, describes the Central Pomo system in which events are marked as more closely or loosely connected on the basis of dependent clause suffixes that do not function as argument-tracking SR morphemes. Any SR system that is not reported to consistently track arguments across clause boundaries is treated as a NCSR system throughout this paper.

Despite the inability to conduct fine-grained tests on the semantics of SR in all domains of languages with no living speakers, what can be learned about such languages is still critical to an improved understanding of SR typology. McKenzie (2015) notes that his survey of SR across North America "is about what we do not know as much as it is

about what we do know" (411). This paper adds an additional detailed description of SR in a North American language as one step toward a future state of affairs where what we know about SR in the continent will be greater than what we do not know.

1.1. Importance of Pomoan in discussion of SR

The Pomoan languages have featured prominently in the discussion of SR, and several languages have detailed published descriptions of their SR systems: McLendon (1978) for Eastern Pomo, Oswalt (1983) for Kashaya, Mithun (1993) for Central Pomo, and O'Connor (1993) for Northern Pomo. SR is a feature strongly correlated with geography: it is found in clusters with unrelated families in contact sharing the feature, and areal diffusion is suspected to be responsible for the spread of SR into many languages (McKenzie 2015:423).

However, the only non-Pomoan language bordering on the Pomoan family with any sort of SR system is Yuki, which has a poorly developed system that serves mainly to indicate change of topic between sentences (Balodis 2016:4, 367-379). The Pomoan languages therefore form an island of SR not in contact with the huge area of SR-bearing languages that spreads from the eastern edge of California's Central Valley across to the Great Plains (McKenzie 2015:422). As such, the Pomoan languages provide a control group of sorts that allows research into the paths of grammaticization for SR without strong areal influence as a factor.

The SR systems already described for Pomoan languages show a great deal of diversity. Central Pomo's SR morphemes are reported to track events rather than subject (Mithun 1993). Northern Pomo SR markers are less elaborated than those of Southern Pomo, Kashaya, and Central Pomo, and only two suffixes consistently track shared same subject between clauses (O'Connor 1982, 1987, 1993). Eastern Pomo SR is reported to be sensitive to agents rather than subjects (McLendon 1978). In Southeastern Pomo, the suffixes which are cognate with SR morphemes in five sister languages have no reported reference-tracking function (Moshinsky 1974). Isolated Northeastern Pomo shows no

evidence of SR despite having morphemes which are probably cognate with some of the SR morphemes of its sister languages.

The more elaborate SR systems of some modern Pomoan languages must have developed after the separation of Proto Pomo, and there is no evidence that neighboring languages influenced their development. Yuki's nearest putative relative is Wappo, which lacks SR despite being in contact with three of the four Pomoan languages with the most developed SR systems (Thompson et al 2006). The separate paths of development within each of the Pomoan daughter languages and the final differences in their SR systems must therefore have happened due to Pomoan-internal factors.

Some of the reported differences among the recorded SR systems in Pomoan might be the result of different data sources. Narrative texts are more likely to show canonical SR than dialogic data or other genres, as noted by Watkins (1993:148) and McKenzie (2012:176). The differences in SR canonicity among the Pomoan languages might therefore be an artifact of the various databases on which studies have been based. However, the reported differences are extreme enough in some of the languages to necessitate acknowledging that data sources alone cannot explain the full range of reported variation.

This paper proposes a language(s)-internal origin for switch reference in Proto Pomo, for which I reconstruct two verbal suffixes, *-Vn and *-p^{h}i, the first of which had a participial function and came to be analyzed as attaching to verbs which shared their subject with the finite verb in the sentence.[2] This process did not happen in all Pomoan languages, and the exact semantics of the reflexes of these two morphemes shifted over time in each daughter language. In some Pomoan languages, these two same subject (SS) markers came to be paired with different subject (DS) markers (or at least morphemes which could be interpreted as DS markers in many instances). In some languages,

[2] Southern Pomo has 28 consonantal phonemes: *p, p^{h}, ṗ, b, m, w, t̪, t̪^{h}, ṭ̇, t̪, ṭ^{h}, ṭ̇, c (=[ts]), ċ, s, d, n, l, č, č^{h}, c̆, š, y (=[j]), k, k^{h}, k̆, ʔ, h*. There are five vowel qualities: *i, e, a, o, u*, and length can be applied to both vowels and consonants. The last speakers also had *r* and *f* in Spanish loanwords.

including Southern Pomo, a rich system of fusional SR morphemes developed which became crucial to reference tracking in narratives. The possible paths of grammaticization for Pomoan SR morphemes is explored in greater detail after the discussion of the synchronic SR system in Southern Pomo.

2. SR in Southern Pomo

Southern Pomo (peq) is one of seven mutually unintelligible Pomoan languages once spoken in Northern California in the vicinity of the Russian River area and Clear Lake. Southern Pomo was spoken along the Russian River, its tributaries, and along a small stretch of the Pacific coast. The last fluent speaker passed away in 2014, and the last partial speaker with native phonology passed away in 2019.

Map 1: Southern Pomo territory and adjacent Pomoan languages

Most of the Pomoan languages had dialects of their own, and Southern Pomo had several dialects (Walker 2020: 15-16). Only the dialects of the historic villages of *mih:ilaʔkʰawna* 'western creek' (present-day Dry Creek; now under water as part of a reservoir) and *ma:kʰahmo* 'salmon-hole' (present-day Cloverdale) were documented in sufficient detail to allow a description of the language. This study includes data from both dialects as they agree in their usage of the system.

2.1. Data and methodology

The data for Southern Pomo come from traditional narrative texts uttered by the last generation of speakers whose first language was not English. A comprehensive investigation of these texts demonstrates that Southern Pomo narratives have CSR that functions similarly to the system of its nearest congener, Kashaya Pomo, as reported by Oswalt (1983) and confirmed by Olsson (2010).

The data were collected by two twentieth-century linguists, Abraham M. Halpern and Robert L. Oswalt. Most of their work is in the form of unpublished field notes, which are housed in the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages at the University of California at Berkeley. All of these sources that are used herein reflect the same narrative genre. Table 1 summarizes these data sources and how they are abbreviated throughout this paper.

Table 1: Data sources

CITATION	COLLECTOR	CONSULTANT	DIALECT	GENRE
(H I-IX)[3]	Halpern	Annie Burke	Cloverdale	Traditional narrative texts
(H EA)[4]	Halpern	Elsie Allen	Cloverdale	First-person narratives; elicited words
(O I)	Oswalt	Elizabeth Dollar	Dry Creek	Traditional narrative text (Oswalt 1978)

[3] The Halpern data include the line number in Halpern's original notes for his texts collected from Annie Burke. Thus (H V:3) = Halpern text 5, line 3.

[4] Halpern's transcription of Elsie Allen include page numbers added in the transliteration of this work for the appendices to Walker (2013). Thus (H EA:7a) = Halpern's transcription of Elsie Allen, page 7a in the transliterated version appended to Walker (2013).

(O II)	Oswalt	Elsie Allen	Cloverdale	Short narrative text

Annie Burke and her daughter, Elsie Allen, were both speakers of the Cloverdale dialect. Elizabeth Dollar was a Dry Creek dialect speaker. The differences between these dialects were minimal—they differed less than any two American English dialects do from each other. The data from both dialects are used together in this study .

2.1.1. Methodology

As stated in the introduction, the sole determining factor for CSR involves the tracking of arguments as being the same or different across clausal boundaries, whether or not that argument is the subject. The Southern Pomo data used for this study confirm the use of a CSR system—arguments are what is tracked by Southern Pomo SR suffixes—and, specifically, subjects are indicated as being shared or not shared with a main clause via these SR suffixes.

The definition of subject in Southern Pomo used in this study is adapted from Walker (2020:295), who defines it as "the single core argument of an intransitive" clause or "the least patient-like argument of" transitive clauses. Walker includes a partially semantic component to the definition of subject for Southern Pomo due to "there being no fixed word order upon which to hang a syntactic definition" (2020:295). This definition fails for a handful of transitive verbs whose objects are not patient-like and are not obviously less patient-like than the subject (e.g. verbs of perception such as 'to see', 'to hear', etc.). This paper therefore uses a slightly altered definition of subject for Southern Pomo: the subject is the single core argument of an intransitive verb, the least patient-like core argument of a transitive verb, or, in verbs of perception, it is the perceiver.

The subject-sensitive argument tracking of Southern Pomo SR was ascertained through a careful examination of only those extant texts for which Southern Pomo speakers had provided a free translation in English, which include (H I-IX) and (O I-II), but exclude (H EA). Each clause with a SR suffix was checked against the main clause to see whether the subject in the English translation was shared or not across clausal boundaries.

It must be noted that additional grammatical phenomena in Southern Pomo are also sensitive to subjecthood, including third-person coreferential pronouns, third-person coreferential pertensive prefixes on kinship terms, and a set of nominative-accusative case marking determiner enclitics (Walker 2020:140-142, 168-169, 276-280). Indeed, Walker states that the third-person coreferential pertensive prefix of kinship terms "works in concert with the switch-reference suffixes…and the third-person coreferential pronouns to track subjects across multi-clause sentences" (2020:141).

Though most sentences with SR marking in the data used for this study do include these additional evidences for which argument is the subject and whether it is shared across clauses, only the use of the Southern Pomo speakers' free translations into English allows for the avoidance of circular argumentation in determining which arguments are shared or not shared across clausal boundaries. This is because Southern Pomo discourse allows for the omission of understood arguments and its verbs do not show person or number agreement.

This study thus makes use of every extant Southern Pomo clause with SR marking within a narrative for which adequate glossing and translations exist. No qualifying data were omitted. The results of this counting are given later in the discussion of SR suffixes.

2.1.2. Presentation of data

Southern Pomo's complex phonological alternations can obscure the fundamentally agglutinative nature of the language. Where it is not necessary to emphasize these alternations, I give a transliteration of the original source and phonemic transcription with morpheme breaks. However, where phonological alternations do not allow simple parsing within phonemic transcription, I use morphophonemic transcription. Double pipes || || enclose morphophonemic transcriptions (functionally a language-internal reconstruction of morphemes).[5] Angled brackets < > enclose the original symbols of a source.

[5] Abbreviations: 1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, 3c third-person coreferential, A transitive subject, ABL ablative, ACC accusative, AGT agent, AUX auxiliary, CAUS causative, COLL collective, COP copula, CSR canonical switch-reference, D different, DEFOC defocus, DENOM denominalizer, DET determiner, DIR directional, DS different

Example of data presentation

(1a) hwadém?du

||hu:w–aded–wadu||

hw–adem–?du

go–DIR–HAB

'always going about'

In examples, original text is transliterated with the following conventions: The original symbols are converted to the Americanist sytem used throughout this paper, and material missing in the original is supplied within square brackets [ ]. Segments or spaces in the original that I feel should be omitted are enclosed in parentheses ( ). Free translations are unchanged from the original sources. Example (1b) gives a sample of these conventions.

(1b) kʰa?[:]á:le[?]wa?( )máya kú:lun hó:lip[ʰ]i (H II:1)

kʰa?:a:le=?wa=?maya ku:lu–n ho:li–**pʰi**

tomorrow=COP.EVID=2PL.AGT outside–GOAL leave–**S.IRR**

''Tomorrow, you women will go to the outside…'

2.2. Description of the SR system of Southern Pomo

Oswalt (1978) provides the first published description of the Southern Pomo SR system. He analyzes the Southern Pomo system of dependent markers as consisting of "pairs of subordinating verbal suffixes…indicat[ing] that the agent [=subject] of the subordinate verb is the same as that of the superordinate…[or] different" (1978:12). However, unlike

---

subject, DVS default verbal suffix, EVID evidential, FUT future, GS generational suffix, HAB habitual, IMP imperative, INCH inchoative, INSTR instrumental, IRR irrealis, LOC locative, N noun, NOM nominative, NCSR non-canonical switch-reference O transitive object, OBJ object, PAT patient, PFV perfective, PL plural, PL.ACT plural act, POSS possessive, PURP purposive, S single intransitive argument, S same, SEM semelfactive, SEQ sequential, SG singular, SIM simultaneous, SR switch-reference, SS same subject, TAM tense-aspect-mood, V verb, VOC vocative.

his later detailed and thoroughly explained analysis of the Kashaya Pomo SR system in Oswalt (1983), the analysis of SR in Southern Pomo in Oswalt (1978) does not include significant amounts of detail or examples and occupies a tiny fraction of the publication. Careful investigation shows that the Southern Pomo SR suffixes do function as described by Oswalt in terms of subject tracking, though his terms "subordinate" and "superordinate" for verbs are herein termed dependent and main verbs respectively.

Southern Pomo dependent verbs which take these SR suffixes are marked in relation to a single main verb, just as Oswalt (1983) describes for the SR system in Kashaya Pomo. The main verb is most often final in the sentence, but it need not be in that position. Dependent verbs are therefore not marked as having the same or different subject as an adjacent dependent verb.

Six SRs suffixes are considered in this study. These six suffixes are organized into three pairs of contrasting same subject vs. different subject markers; they are further divided into realis suffixes (two pairs) and one pair of irrealis suffixes. Table 2 gives each suffix together with all surfacing allomorphs in italics.

Table 2: SR suffixes in Southern Pomo

		SAME SUBJECT	DIFFERENT SUBJECT
REALIS	SEQUENTIAL	‖–ba‖ *-ba*	‖–ːli‖ *-ːli, -ːni*
	SIMULTANEOUS	‖–Vn‖ *-in, -an, -on, -un, -n*	‖–wen‖ *-wen, -en*
IRREALIS		‖–pʰi‖ *-pʰi*	‖–pʰla‖ *-pʰla*

Oswalt (1978) also considers four additional bound morphemes to be SR morphemes, which are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Additional morphemes treated as SR markers by Oswalt

	SAME SUBJECT	DIFFERENT SUBJECT
OPPOSITIVE	‖=ʔnaṯi‖	‖–eṯi‖
INFERENTIAL	‖–mna‖	‖–ben‖

There are few clear examples of three of these four morphemes, and ||=ʔnaṯi||, the only enclitic purported by Oswalt to have SR, does not pattern with the suffixes of Table 2; these four morphemes are not considered further in this paper.

I found a total of 547 clear examples of the SR suffixes from Table 2 in my database. There were also 11 questionable examples, which are not considered further. This corpus includes all natural speech data with multi-clause sentences which have glossing and translation. Though this corpus is small compared to what might be available for living languages with extensive documentation, it is comparable to those used in similar studies involving languages with few or no living speakers. For example, this corpus is more than triple the number of SR-marked clauses in Westerlund's (2019) description of Ngarla's SR system, and it is close to Olsson's (2010) sample of 649 SR markers for Kashaya Pomo.

Note that all instances of SR suffixes affixed to dependent verbs were separated from those affixed to the pro-verb *ha:mini-* in my tally. This pro-verb is used for recapitulation, which Sterling notes is a "widespread device" that "allows the SR marking to be carried over from one sentence to the next" (1993: 17). The use of the pro-verb for recapitulation was separated from other dependent clauses because their exact functions differed; however, the sentences with the pro-verb were checked and found to conform to the same strictly canonical subject-tracking function observed on dependent verbs. The totals are given in Table 4 below. All but one of the 298 SR suffixes on dependent verbs clearly conformed to the description given here.

Table 4: SR affix totals for (H I-IX) and (O I-II) [Q = QUESTIONABLE]

	DEPENDENT VERB-	*ha:mini-*	TOTAL
||-ba||	192 (+5 Q)	165	357 (+5 Q)
||-:li||	44 (+6 Q)	74	118 (+6 Q)
||-Vn||	38	0	38
||-wen||	10	1	11
||-pʰi||	10	8	18
||-pʰla||	4	1	5
TOTAL	298 (+11 Q)	249	546 (+11 Q)

The remainder of this section focuses on the well-attested SR suffixes provided in Table 2 and counted in Table 4. The basics of the Southern Pomo SR system are laid out below and followed by detailed examples of each pair of suffixes from Table 2.

Southern Pomo dependent verbs marked with SR suffixes are marked in relation to one and only one main verb. This is what Oswalt (1983) termed "focal reference" in Kashaya Pomo. The main verb carries TAM marking, whereas the dependent verbs marked with SR suffixes do not carry such marking, but are marked as dependent upon the main verb for TAM information. It should be noted at the outset, however, that the main verb, though usually represented by a sentence-final verb in the data, is not always final. Sentences may include more than two dependent clauses marked with SR suffixes, but lengthy clause chains are rare. Different sentences may be combined by means of the pro-verb *ha:mini-*, to which SR suffixes are added. This recapitulation construction is discussed in detail separately after the introduction of each pair of SR suffixes.

2.2.1. Same subject and different subject sequential suffixes

The same subject sequential (S.SEQ) SR suffix ||-ba|| and the different subject sequential (D.SEQ) SR suffix ||-ːli|| mark dependent verbs as having been completed prior to the action of the main verb and attach after all other suffixes on dependent verbs, though the quotative evidential *-do* may attach after ||-ːli||. Example (2) has the ||-ba|| suffix on the dependent verb *pʰaʔc̓i-* 'to grab', which indicates that the grabbing finished prior to the main verb, *nih[ː]i-* 'to say', and shares its subject with it.

(2) šinːákʰle héʔ[ː]e pʰ[ʰ]aʔc̓iba maːt̓íkin, (H VI:3)

šinːa–kʰle	heʔːe	pʰa–ʔc̓i-**ba**	ma–ːt̓i–ki–n
head–crown	hair	with.hand–grab–**S.SEQ**	3C–younger.sibling–GS–PAT

ká:liŋhkʰay huʔ[ː]úːčin nih[ː]iw.

kaːli–nhkʰay	huʔːu–ː–č–in	nihːi–w
up-ward	face-DENOM-SEM?-SG.IMP	say-PFV

‘Having grabbed the hair on top of his head, he said to his y[ounger] bro[ther], ‘Look upwards[!]’’

Example (3) showcases the different subject sequential SR suffix ||-:li|| on the dependent verb *duw:e(y)-* ‘night to fall’, which indicates that the action was completed prior to the main verb, *mi:ṭi-* ‘to lie (down)’, and shares its subject with it.

(3) hám:un hniba duw:é:li (H VI:12)

ham:un	hni–**ba**	duw:e–**:li**
3SG~this	say–**S.SEQ**	night.falls–**D.SEQ**

ǰá:ṭon mis:íbo mí:ṭiw.

ǰa:=ṭon	mis:ibo	mi:ṭi–w
one=LOC	three	lie.COLL–PFV

‘Having said this, when night came on, (the) three lay down in one (place).’

The suffix ||-:li|| can also have an overtone of cause (when/because), which is well-attested for temporal clauses in the world’s languages (Dixon 2009:9-14). If a nasal (synchronically or historically, e.g. Pomoan /d/, which descends from Proto Pomo *ṅ) precedes ||-:li|| within a word, it surfaces as /-:ni/ due to nasal spreading. An example of this is given in (4), where the dependent verb, *čanhoded-* ‘talking’ is marked with the /-:ni/ allomorph of ||-:li|| due to the final /d/ (the main verb in the sentence is *haʔċaṭ́* ‘to whip’).

(4) ʔa hiṇṭil( )ku čahnu čanhode:niʔṭo haʔċa:yaw (H EA:7a)

||ʔa hiṇṭilku čahnu čahnu-aded-:li=ʔaṭ:o haʔċaṭ-ya-w||

ʔa	hiṇṭilku	čahnu	čanho–de–**:ni**=ʔṭo	haʔċa: –ya–w
1SG.AGT	Indian	word	talk-DIR-**D.SEQ**=1SG.PAT	whip-DEFOC-PFV

‘when I spoke the Indian language, they strapped me’

2.2.2. Same subject and different subject simultaneous suffixes

The same subject simultaneous (S.SEQ) SR suffix ||-Vn|| and the different subject simultaneous SR suffix ||-wen|| attach after all other suffixes on dependent verbs and mark them as having temporal overlap with the action of the main verb. Example (5) has the same subject simultaneous SR suffix ||-Vn|| on the dependent verb *ča:ded-* 'to look around', which indicates that the looking around occurred simultaneously with the main verb, *hwad:u* 'walked around', and shares its subject with it.

(5) ča:dédun hwád:u (H VI:17)
||ča:de–ad–Vn hu:w–aded–u||
ča:de–d–**un** hw–ad: –u
look–DIR–**S.SIM** go–DIR–PFV
'He walked around looking around.'

The same subject simultaneous SR suffix ||-Vn|| has a number of allomorphs, which are selected on the basis of the preceding segment: *-n* after vowels, *-an* after /ak/ and /m/, *-on* after /ok/, *-un* after /d/, and *-in* elsewhere (for a discussion of this ||V||, see Walker 2020: 84-93).

The different subject simultaneous SR suffix ||-wen|| has only two allomorphs: *-wen* after vowels and *-en* after consonants, as seen in (6), where the dependent verb *mi:mač-* 'to cry' is suffixed with the *-en* allomorph, and the dependent verb *či:yo-* 'to sit, stay' is suffixed with the *–wen* allomorph,

(6) ʔaṭ̲:iṭ̲on mi:mačen, či:yowen, (O I:9)
||ʔaṭ̲:i=ṭ̲on mi:mač–en či:yo–wen||
ʔaṭ̲:i=ṭ̲on mi:mač–**en** či:yo–**wen**
3C.SG=LOC cry–**D.SIM** sit–**D.SIM**

daʔṭ̲̓aba, čoh:omba, šudʔeduy.
||da–ʔṭ̲̓a–ba čoh:oN–ba šu–ʔde–aduč–Ø||

da–ʔt̪̂a–**ba** čoh:om–**ba** šu–dʔe–duy–Ø
with.eyes-encounter–**S.SEQ** marry–**S.SEQ** by.pulling–move–DIR–PFV
'Having found her sitting, crying for him, he married her and led her away.'

In (6), the main verb is *šudʔeduy* 'drag away' (here translated as 'lead...away'), with which the dependent verbs suffixed with ||-wen|| do not share a subject. Note that the temporal overlap between dependent verbs marked with ||-wen|| and other verbs in the sentence might only extend to an adjacent dependent verb rather than the main verb, as in (6) above, where the woman is sitting and crying when she is found but not while she is dragged away. However, it is still in relation to the subject of the main verb to which all dependent verbs marked with ||-wen|| are marked.

2.2.3. Same subject and different subject irrealis suffixes

The same subject irrealis (S.IRR) SR suffix ||-pʰi|| and the different subject irrealis (D.IRR) SR suffix ||-pʰla|| indicate that dependent verbs could occur prior to an irrealis main verb. In (7) the dependent verb *ho:li-* 'to leave' is marked with the same subject irrealis SR suffix ||-pʰi||, which indicates that the leaving would precede the main verb, *ʔehčʰe-* 'dig', which is marked with the future suffix ||-kʰ:e||.

(7) kʰaʔ[:]á:le[ʔ]waʔ( )máya kú:lun hó:lip[ʰ]i (H II:1)
kʰaʔ:a:le=ʔwa=ʔmaya ku:lu–n ho:li–**pʰi**
tomorrow=COP.EVID=2PL.AGT outside–GOAL leave–**S.IRR**

baʔ[:]á:yey híʔbu [ʔ]ehčʰékʰ[:]e
baʔ:a:=yey hiʔbu ʔehčʰe–kʰ:e
woman=AGT potato dig–FUT
'Tomorrow, you women will go to the outside and dig wild potatoes'

In (7) above, the subject, 'women', is shared between 'leave' and 'dig', and this is indicated by the same subject irrealis SR suffix ||-pʰi||. In (8) below, the dependent verb

das:e- ‘to wash’ is marked with the different subject irrealis SR suffix ||-pʰla||, which indicates that the washing would precede the main verb, *mehše-* ‘to smell’, which is marked with the future suffix ||-kʰ:e||.

(8) mič:áċyey mehšekʰ[:]é?wa (H V:26)
mi–č:a–ċ–yey me–hše–kʰ:e=?wa
2-mother’s.father-GS-PL.AGT with.nose-smell-FUT=COP.EVID

[?]á:maya hí?t̪a das:ép[ʰ]la.
?a:maya hi?t̪a da–s:e–**pʰla**
2PL.AGT nearby with.palm–wash–**D.IRR**
‘Your grandfathers will smell (it) if you wash them nearby.’

In (8) above, the subject of the dependent verb *das:e-* ‘to wash’ is the children of Skunk Woman, who are referenced by the second-person plural pronoun *?a:maya*, but the subject of the main verb *mehše-* ‘to smell’ is the children’s mother’s father and his elder brothers (referenced by the kinship term *mič:aċyey*). In this sentence, the presence of overt subjects removes ambiguity, and the use of the different subject irrealis SR suffix functions primarily as a clause-combining tool in addition to confirming the change in subject between the combined clauses.

These irrealis SR suffixes may be present on dependent verbs when the main verb is suffixed with the future ||-kʰ:e||, the singular imperative ||-Vn||, the plural imperative ||-le||, the near future ||-t̪i||, the performative ||-l:a||, or the conditional ||-V:ba||. When the main verb takes the future suffix, the dependent clauses marked with irrealis SR suffixes cause sentences to have ‘if…then…’ meanings, as seen previously in (8).

2.2.4. SR on the pro-verb ha:mini-

In addition to dependent verbs which take SR suffixes, Southern Pomo has a pro-verb, *ha:mini-* (and its dialectal variants *hni- ~ ni-*), which links sentences together with the aid

of SR suffixes—a recapitulative function for SR, as noted for other languages by Stirling (1993:17). This pro-verb can be roughly translated as ‘and then’ or ‘and it came to pass’. Its main function is to break up sentences into units of discourse.

In this role, it is interchangeable with repeating the TAM-marked main verb of a preceding sentence with a SR suffix marked in relation to the main verb of the following sentence in the texts. However, SR markers suffixed to *ha:mini-* relate to the last clause of the previous sentence and the first clause of the following sentence.

In (10) below, two sentences are linked via the pro-verb *ha:mini-*, which is in bold.

(10) [ʔ]ahšáʔwan [ʔ]áč:a mí:haṭaḵ. (H VI:3)
ʔahša=ʔwan ʔač:a–Ø mi:ha<ṭa>ḵ–Ø
fish=DET.OBJ house-DIFFUSE bring<PL.ACT>-PFV

ha:mini:li kʰáʔbekʰáč:on ċa:yíyey [ʔ]uhṭéhṭew,
ha:mini–:li kʰaʔbekʰač=čon ċa:yi=yey ʔuhṭe–hṭe–w
and.then–D.SEQ raptor.species=PAT scrubjay=AGT tell~tell–PFV
‘They brought in the fish. They having done so, the Jay told Fish Hawk’

In (10) above, the verb of the first sentence, *mi:hak-* ‘to bring’, does not share its subject with the verb of the final sentence, □*uht*□*eht*□*e-* ‘to tell’. This is made clear by the addition of the different subject sequential SR suffix ||-:li|| to the pro-verb *ha:mini-*. Thus this *ha:mini-* construction works together with SR suffixes to combine sentences, whereas the SR suffixes on regular verbs (i.e. not on the pro-verb *ha:mini-*) can only combine clauses into a single sentence. Hereafter, unless otherwise noted, the examples of SR suffixes are largely restricted to those which are applied to dependent verbs as part of their being combined into a single sentence.

2.3. Summary of the Southern Pomo SR system

There are five key aspects of the Southern Pomo SR system, which are summarized in (i-v), each of which is discussed individually thereafter:

(i) The system is not sensitive to the agent/patient case-marking system found on

animate arguments;
(ii) It does not indicate the closeness or lack of closeness between events;
(iii) It is sensitive to the category of subject, and it is subjects which are marked as being shared or not shared with the TAM-bearing main verb (the singular subject of a verb may be marked as same if part of the plural subject of another);
(iv) SR suffixes may occur without any core arguments being overtly present in the sentence;
(v) Dependent verbs are marked with SR suffixes in relation to a single main verb, and they are not marked in relation to other dependent verbs

2.3.1. SR suffixes and agent-patient case-marking

The SR suffixes of Southern Pomo are sensitive to subjects and are not sensitive to agent-patient case marking in the language. Southern Pomo allows agent-patient case marking on highly animate nouns (Walker 2020:292-295).[6] This agent-patient case marking is obligatory on kinship terms and pronouns; highly animate common nouns may also take agent-patient case marking. Single arguments of intransitive verbs over which participants do not have complete control and are significantly affected take the patient case.

In example (11) below, 'Rock [Man]' does not have control over his falling asleep and is therefore marked with the ||=yčon|| PAT enclitic.

(11) ha:mini(:)ba kʰaʔbéyčon sí:ma mí:ṭiw (H VIII:8)
ha:mini–ba kʰaʔbe**=yčon** si:ma mi:ṭi–w
and.then–S.SEQrock**=PAT** sleep lie–PFV
'Having done so, Rock [Man] went to sleep.'

In (12), the same 'Rock [Man]' does not have control over his dying after Gray Squirrel, the narrative's protagonist, has shot him.

(12) ha:mini:li kʰaʔbéyčon ḵál:aw. (H VIII:9)

[6] See Mithun (2008) for a discussion of this argument-marking strategy across the world's languages. For examples of more recent grammars of North American languages with agent-patient systems, see Martin (2011) and Balodis (2016).

ha:mini–:li k^{h}aʔbe=**yčon** ḱal:a–w
and.then–D.SEQ rock=**PAT** die–PFV
'He having done so, Rock [Man] died.'

Note that in (12) above the patient case enclitic ||=yčon|| is used because Rock Man has no control of his dying. In examples (11) and (12), 'Rock [Man]' is the single argument of intransitive verbs over which he has no control. In (13) below, 'barn owl' is the direct object of the verb 'hug' and therefore takes the patient case suffix.

(13) miy[:]á[ṭ^{h}]k^{h}an wéč:éičon bé:new (H I:6)
miy:a–ṭk^{h}an–Ø weč:e=**yčon** be–:ne–w
3–spouse–AGT barn.owl=**PAT** with.opposing.forces–grasp-PFV
'his wife was…hugging [barn owl]'

In examples (11) through (12), 'Rock [Man]' appears in the patient case; in example (13) it is 'barn owl' that takes patient case marking. Though the true thematic roles may vary from undergoer or experiencer in (11) to semantic patient in (12) and (13), the patient case can never be used on an argument that is unaffected or has volition. Note that in (11) and (12) the argument in the patient case is the single argument of an intransitive verb; in (13) the NP in the patient case is the least-agentive argument of a transitive verb.

When the single argument of an intransitive verb is animate and has some control over the action, is the perceiver for a verb of perception, or is not significantly affected, the agentive case may be used, as in (14), where Rock Man is leaving.

(14) k^{h}aʔbéyey hó:liw (H VIII:2)
k^{h}aʔbe=**yey** ho:li–w
rock=**AGT** leave–PFV
'Rock [Man] went off.'

In clauses where more than one argument is overtly present, the agentive case marker ||=yey|| is placed on the argument with control over the action (including intentional and unintentional perception) or which is least affected in a clause (e.g. copular clauses such as 'I am Native American'). In (15) below, Rock Man is the subject of a ditransitive

clause and takes the agentive case enclitic *=yey* because he has control over the giving of the arrow to Gray Squirrel.

(15) kʰaʔbéyey čú:maṭ̓čon [ʔ]óh:ow [ʔ]aṯ:í:kʰe ċú:ʔu. (H VIII:3)

kʰaʔbe**=yey**	ču:maṭ̓=čon	ʔoh:o-w	ʔaṯ:i-:kʰe	ċu:ʔu
rock**=AGT**	gray.squirrel=PAT	give–PFV	3C.SG–POSS	arrow

'Rock [Man] handed his arrow to Squirrel.'

The above examples demonstrate that the Southern Pomo agentive case can be applied to arguments with some or full control over the action, those which are perceiving, or which are not significantly affected by an action, whether as the single argument of an intransitive clause or one of the arguments of a transitive clause. They also demonstrate that the patient case is applied to arguments which have little or no control over the action or which are significantly affected by it, whether as the single argument of an intransitive verb or the direct object or the indirect object of a transitive or ditransitive verb.

If the SR markers of Southern Pomo were sensitive to the agent/patient case marking system, the use of same or different SR suffixes should agree with the use of the agent/patient case morphemes, as reported by McLendon (1978) for the Eastern Pomo SR system. In (16), two mono-clausal sentences are linked via the pro-verb *ha:mini-*. The first sentence has 'Rock [Man]' overtly marked as the subject of the verb *či:yo-* 'sit~stay' by the nominative determiner (DET.SUBJ) enclitic *=□wam:u*. The final sentence also has 'Rock [Man]' as its subject, but in this case he is marked with the patient case enclitic *=yčon* because he is the subject of the verb *si:mia mi:□i-* 'sleep', an action over which he has no control.

(16) kʰaʔbéʔwam:u [ʔ]iy:óṯow čí:yow. (H V:7&8)

kʰaʔbe=ʔwam:u	ʔiy:o=ṯow	či:yo–w
rock=DET.SUBJ	under=ABL	stay–PFV

ha:mini(:)ba kʰaʔbéyčon sí:ma mí:ṭiw
ha:mini–**ba** kʰaʔbe**=yčon** si:ma mi:ṭi–w
and.then–**S.SEQ** rock=**PAT** sleep lie–PFV
'Rock [Man] sat below. Having done so, Rock [Man] went to sleep.'

In (16) above, the two sentences are linked by the pro-verb *ha:mini-,* which is suffixed with the same subject sequential SR suffix ||-ba|| and indicates that the subject is shared between the TAM-bearing main verb of the first sentence, *či:yo-w* stay-PFV, and the TAM-bearing main verb of the second sentence, *mi:ṭi-w* lie-PFV. This example shows that it is the subject that is tracked across clauses by switch-reference regardless of whether that subject is marked with agentive case or patient case.

2.3.2. SR suffixes and closeness between events

According to Mithun (1993), the dependent clause markers of Central Pomo which are cognate with those of Southern Pomo indicate events as being more closely or loosely bound together. Most examples of dependent verbs in the Southern Pomo texts do not counter Mithun's analysis for Central Pomo. It is to be expected that dependent verbs with different subjects might be less closely bound to the event described by the main verb than dependent verbs which share their subject with the main verb.

The lengthy sentence in example (17) displays several dependent clauses marked in relation to a single TAM-bearing main verb by means of SR suffixes.

(17a) mi:má:ba( )kʰmá:yow (H VI:6)
mi:ma:–**ba**=kʰma:yow
cry–**S.SEQ**=after

(17b) [ʔ]óh:o bá:maba,
ʔoh:o ba:ma–**ba**
fire build–**S.SEQ**

(17c) kʰáʔbe ču:má:ba,

kʰaʔbe ču:ma:–**ba**
rock set–**S.SEQ**

(17d) čó:low:i [ʔ]ahkʰa [ʔ]ohčóba,
čo:low=wi ʔahkʰa ʔohčo–**ba**
baby.bath.basket=INSTR water place.shapeless.mass–**S.SEQ**

(17e) kʰaʔbéʔwan [ʔ]oh:o ṯí:li, kʰaʔbe [ʔ]oh:óʔwan
kʰaʔbe=ʔwan ʔoh:o ṯi–**:li** kʰaʔbe ʔoh:o=ʔwan
rock=DET.OBJ fire INCH–**D.SEQ** rock place.shapeless.mass=DET.OBJ

(17f) čó:low [ʔ]áhkʰa [ʔ]ohčó:yawa:níwi
čo:low ʔahkʰa ʔohčo: –ya=wa:ni=wi
baby.bath.basket water place.shapeless.mass–DEFOC=LOC=INSTR

(17g) kʰaʔbéʔwan čó:low[:]a:níwi
kʰaʔbe=ʔwan čo:low=wa:ni=wi
rock=DET.OBJ baby.bath.basket=LOC=INSTR

(17h) kʰáʔbe [ʔ]oh:óʔwan mi:ṯálaw,
kʰaʔbe ʔoh:o=ʔwan mi:ṯa–la–w
rock fire=DET.OBJ put.several–DIR–PFV

(17i) [ʔ]ahkʰá [ʔ]oh:o ṯikʰṯi.
ʔahkʰa ʔoh:o ṯi–kʰ–ṯi
water fire INCH–CAUS–PURP

‘(17a) After **having wept**, (17b) **having built** a fire, (17c) **having placed** rocks in it, (17d) **having put** water into a baby-bath basket, (17e) **when** the rocks **became hot**—the hot rocks— (17f) the baby-bath basket into which they had put water—(17h) they **dropped** the rocks, the hot rocks,[7] (17g) into the baby-bath basket, (17i) in order to have

[7] Halpern reversed the order of these items in his English translation; the reversed order is reflected in the numbering of Halpern’s free translation by flipping (g) and (h).

617 the water become hot.'
618
619 In (17a-d) above, the crying, the making of the fire, the putting of rocks into the fire,
620 and the placing of the same rocks into the water in the baby-bath basket are marked as
621 same with the same subject sequential SR suffix ||-ba|| in relation to the main verb in
622 (17h), *mi:ʈa-la-w* put.several-DIR-PFV 'dropped'. It is unquestionably the case that this
623 series of events might be construed as closely related; however, in (17e) the clause *kʰaʔbe*
624 *ʔoh:o ʈi-:li* rock fire INCH-D.SEQ 'when the rocks became hot' is marked with ||-:li|| D.SEQ
625 as different in relation to the same main verb. An analysis that relies on events as more
626 tightly or loosely bound does not work with example (17).[8]
627
628 *2.3.3. SR suffixes and the category of subject*
629 As has already been stated, Southern Pomo SR markers are sensitive to the category of
630 subject. It must be noted that there are other grammatical phenomena in Southern
631 Pomo that work together with the SR to track subjects within and across clauses. As
632 mentioned earlier, these phenomena include special coreferential third-person
633 pronouns, coreferential third-person pertensive prefixes on kinship terms, and
634 determiner enclitics that mark NPs according to nominative-accusative case, with the
635 nominative case corresponding to subject.[9] Table 5 summarizes these additional
636 subject-sensitive grammatical phenomena.

[8] A reviewer suggested that the change from a cause to its effect might explain DS marking on 'became hot' due it its being "a very local scene-shift." Whether it is considered a "local scene-shift" or not, the subject of 'became hot' is not shared with the main verb in the clause chain and thus the use of DS marking is canonical and would not be non-canonical with or without a scene-shift-based analysis.

[9] For a complete discussion of these phenomena, see Walker (2020:138-142, 168-169, 295-301).

Table 5: Non-SR Subject-sensitive grammatical phenomena in Southern Pomo

3-PERSON PRONOUNS	COREFERENTIAL	*ʔaṭ̂:i-* 's/he, it'
	NON-COREFERENTIAL	*ham:u-* 'he, it'
		ham:ad- 'she'
KINSHIP TERM PERTENSIVE PREFIXES	COREFERENTIAL	||maH-|| 'his, her, their own'
	NON-COREFERENTIAL	*miy:a-* 'his, her, their'
NOM-ACC DETERMINER ENCLITICS	NOMINATIVE	=□*wam:u* 'the' (NOM)
		=□*yo:mu* 'that (one)' (NOM)
	ACCUSATIVE	=*ʔwan* 'the' (ACC)
		=*ʔyowan* 'that (one)' (ACC)
PRESENCE OF OVERT NPS	The presence of a full NP that might include subject-sensitive prefixes and enclitics	

As shown in Table 5, the third-person pronouns and third-person pertensive prefixes on kinship terms are split into coreferential and non-coreferential. The coreferential pronouns and pertensive prefixes indicate that a third-person argument is coreferential with the subject of the TAM-bearing main verb. The non-coreferential third-person pronouns and pertensive prefixes indicate a third-person argument that is not coreferential with the subject of the TAM-bearing main verb. Together with SR, these third-person coreferential strategies are the only means of tracking subject across clausal boundaries beyond the overt presence of the intended subject as a NP.

The nominative-accusative determiner enclitics do not aid in the cross-clausal tracking of subjects, but they are the only case-marking strategy in the language that correlates with subjecthood: NPs with one of the nominative enclitics are subjects; NPs with one of the accusative enclitics are not the subject. This is quite different from the agent-patient case-marking system that is restricted to highly animate nouns. In that

system, arguments in the agentive case are always subjects, but subjects may also appear in the patient case when they have no control over an action.

It is not the case that all of these subject-sensitive grammatical strategies are present in all clauses with SR suffixes, but there is enough overlap to aid the listener in discerning the subjects in connected discourse. In the text (OI), for example, there are 32 clauses with SR suffixes, 25 clauses include one or more of the subject-sensitive grammatical phenomena listed in Table 5, a number which includes only 3 instances of full NPs.

2.3.4. SR suffixes and overtly present core arguments

Multi-clause sentences in Southern Pomo need not include any overtly present core arguments. Southern Pomo has neither person nor number agreement with subjects on verbs, and multi-clause sentences may omit overt NPs (including pronouns). Context and SR suffixes are often all that allow a listener to discern who does what to whom in multi-clause sentences. Example (18) contains just three words: the pro-verb *ni-* (truncated form of *ha:mini-*), the dependent verb *daƥ:om-* 'steal', the main verb *šudʔeduy-* 'drag away'.

(18) niba daƥ:omba, šudʔeduy. (O I:10)

ni–**ba**	daƥ:om–**ba**	šu–dʔe–duy–Ø
and.then–**S.SEQ**	steal–**S.SEQ**	by.pulling–move–DIR-PFV

'Having done so, having stolen her, he [dragged] her away.'

In (18) above, it is only the same subject sequential SR suffix ||-ba|| that confirms that 'steal' shares its subject with 'drag away'. As this example demonstrates, many Southern Pomo sentences would be difficult to understand without the disambiguating functions of the SR system in the language.

2.3.5. SR markers and dependent verbs relative to the main verb

The first dependent verb and all subsequent dependent verbs are marked with SR suffixes in relation to one main verb (which is often final) and never in relation to adjacent dependent verbs. This is identical to the system in Kashaya described by Oswalt (1983:278). This differs substantially from some SR systems outside of Pomoan, including many New Guinea languages, in which medial verbs are marked with SR suffixes that indicate whether or not an adjacent medial verb shares a subject (Foley 1986:183; MacDonald 1990:6).

3. SR within Pomoan

As discussed in the introduction, several Pomoan languages have well-described SR systems, and those of Kashaya and Central Pomo are largely cognate with the Southern Pomo system. Table 6 lists the morphemes in all three languages; data for Central Pomo have been adapted from Mithun (1993); Kashaya Pomo data have been adapted from Oswalt (1983).

Table 6: Southern Pomo SR suffixes and cognates

	REALIS				IRREALIS	
	SEQUENTIAL		SIMULTANEOUS			
	SAME	DIFFERENT	SAME	DIFFERENT	SAME	DIFFERENT
KASHAYA	*-ba*	*-...li*	*-in ~ -an ~ -on ~ -un ~ -n*	*-em ~ -wem*	*-pʰi ~ -čʰi ~ -hi*	*-pʰila ~ -čʰila ~ -hila*
CENTRAL POMO	*-ba*	*=li*	*-in*	*=da*	*-hi*	*=hla*
SOUTHERN POMO	*-ba*	*-:li ~ -li ~ -:ni*	*-in ~ -an ~ -on ~ -un ~ -n*	*-en ~ -wen*	*-pʰi*	*-pʰla*

As seen in Table 6, there is little difference in these six morphemes across these three sister languages. Central Pomo is the most divergent among the three: its D.SIM morpheme *=da* has no cognate in either Kashaya or Southern Pomo, and all three of its

different morphemes are enclitics rather than suffixes.[10] The different enclitics in Central Pomo actually attach after the perfective *-w* (which appears to have roughly the same allomorphy as the perfective *-w* in Southern Pomo).

In actuality, both Kashaya and Southern Pomo show fossilized phonological alternations in their different subject SR suffixes which indicate that they, too, once had different markers which attached after the perfective suffix. In Southern Pomo, this evidence lies in the /:/-initial shape of the different subject sequential suffix ||-ːli|| and the postvocalic [-wen] allomorph of the different subject simultaneous suffix ||-wen||. Though ||-w|| perfective in modern Southern Pomo must always be the final suffix when present on a verb, the expected allomorph of ||-w|| before a following consonant would be /ː/as this is the pattern seen elsewhere with many consonantal or consonant-final suffixes in the language (Walker 2013, 2020). And the [w] in the postvocalic allomorph of ||-wen|| would be the expected allomorph of the perfective after a vowel. The lack of a [w] in the post-consonantal allomorph [-en] would also fit as the perfective takes a zero allomorph after all consonants other than /d/.

The Kashaya SR system is quite similar to Southern Pomo in both form and function, as shown in Table 6. However, this can be obscured by Oswalt's (1983) description of Kashaya, which uses idiosyncratic terminology. His "subject" is roughly equivalent to an overt nominal in the agentive case in Southern Pomo, and his "agent" is equivalent to what would be the subject of a verb in Southern Pomo. Thus his use of "coagency" and "disagency" is the terminological equivalent of same subject and different subject. Oswalt makes clear, however, that dependent verbs (subordinate in his analysis) in

[10] Oswalt notes that cognate forms to Central Pomo *=da* are found in three other languages, and these point to a Proto Pomo *-...da...; he also notes that these forms are also nominal enclitics meaning 'in, at, to' and are possibly derived from Proto Pomo *hiʔda 'road, way, door' (1976:26).

Kashaya which take SR suffixes are marked in relation to one and only one main verb, which he terms "focal reference" (1983:277).

Oswalt's original analysis of Kashaya SR is confirmed by Olsson (2010). After going through 24 of the Kashaya narrative texts recorded by Oswalt, Olsson reports that "610, or 94%, of 649 SR-markers found behaved as expected from Oswalt's analysis" and that, ultimately, "[t]he main function of the Kashaya switch-reference system appears to be reference tracking" (2010:38). SR in the Kashaya texts is canonical.

It is in function, rather than form, that Central Pomo SR is reported to differ most markedly from Kashaya and Southern Pomo. Mithun states that these six morphemes in Central Pomo "do not form a switch-reference system after all" and "[t]hey mark same versus different eventhood, rather than same versus different subject" (1993:134). Unelicited dialogic data form some portion of the corpus on which Mithun's Central Pomo study is built, but it is unclear to what degree other genres were sampled and whether the Central Pomo system behaved differently within different genres.

The data on which the reference-tracking analyses for both Kashaya and Southern Pomo are based come from natural, unelicited narrative discourse rather than dialogic data or elicited sentences. In the case of the Kashaya data, both Oswalt and Olsson relied on narrative texts collected by Oswalt.[11] In the case of the Southern Pomo data herein considered, narratives collected by Halpern and Oswalt have been the sole sources. This stands in contrast to Mithun's Central Pomo description, where she notes that a traditional reference-tracking analysis works in elicited sentence, but not in "natural speech" where "the alternations do not correspond to the matches and mismatches of subjects across clauses" (1993:121). Mithun reiterates this natural discourse versus elicited data basis for the analysis of SR systems as "actually distinguish[ing] continuity or discontinuity of events rather than of referents" in her discussion of the broader phenomenon in North America (1999: 270).

[11] Oswalt's analysis was built on data of all genres, but Olsson (2010) used only the narrative texts collected by Oswalt.

The data for both Kashaya and Southern Pomo on which their respective SR analyses are based also come from natural speech data rather than elicited sentences. What can explain the differences between Central Pomo's system and those of its southern congeners? The canonical systems found in natural textual data from Kashaya and Southern Pomo are not due to bad data or poor analysis, so the differences cannot be credited to errors in analysis due to unnatural language use.

I think there are two competing explanations for the reported difference between Central Pomo SR and that of its neighbors to the south, neither of which can be confirmed or denied on the basis of the current status of these languages:

(a) The differences between Central Pomo, on the one hand, and Kashaya and Southern Pomo on the other are an artifact of the data. What Mithun terms "natural speech" is data from shorter speech acts which occur in both monologic and dialogic speech situations. The core data for Kashaya and all the data under consideration for Southern Pomo are monologic narratives, many of which are traditional Coyote tales of some length.

(b) The origins of SR in Pomoan are such that Central Pomo is at an earlier stage of grammaticization in which these morphemes have not yet been reanalyzed by speakers as reference-tracking morphemes.[12]

It is impossible to rule out (a) above without access to a searchable database of Central Pomo texts that might be used to confirm the canonicity of SR in this genre. However, it is possible to explore the likelihood of (b) by looking at the SR systems (or lack thereof) in the other four Pomoan languages: Northern Pomo, Eastern Pomo, Southeastern Pomo, and Northeastern Pomo.

Northern Pomo, the borders of which were contiguous with those for Eastern Pomo and Central Pomo, is also reported to have SR suffixes. However, their function is murkier than for other Pomoan languages. O'Connor (1982:43-44) discusses the

[12] Recall that Central Pomo DIFFERENT markers are enclitics rather than suffixes as in Kashaya and Southern Pomo, but the synchronic phonological alternations in Kashaya and Southern Pomo switch-references allow for the reconstruction of an earlier stage when the DIFFERENT suffixes of these languages were probably enclitics as in Central Pomo. Perhaps the tighter phonological connections in Southern Pomo and Kashaya might be related to grammaticization paths which led to referent tracking.

asymmetry in the SR system of Northern Pomo by providing a list of six SR morphemes which do not pair up into convenient sets of coreference versus disreference. Two of these, *-nt̰e* and *-t̰e*, have adversative meanings and cannot be cognate with any of the Southern Pomo suffixes under discussion (though possibly with the enclitic ||=ʔnat̰i|| and the suffix ||-et̰i|| which are not considered herein).[13] However, the other four appear to be cognate (at least partially) with some of the previously considered SR suffixes of Southern Pomo, Kashaya, and Central Pomo.

O'Connor (1987:36-37) lists these same suffixes; however there is no mention of SR and they are called "adverbial subordinators" only; the suffix *-nt̰e* is missing (it is reanalyzed as *-t̰e* following another morpheme), and the subordinator *-haw* is added, but with no discussion of any SR function. O'Connor (1993: 230-237) provides a substantially reworked inventory of SR morphemes together with a detailed description of their function and possible explanations for the origins of their meanings. Crucially, O'Connor finds that there are no true different subject morphemes. Table 7 lists the four SR suffixes of Northern Pomo and their values as given in O'Connor (1993:230-231)

Table 7: Northern Pomo SR suffixes

-hI-	Action in main clause contiguous with or follows closely upon action in the dependent clause. The action in the suffixed clause may be a prerequisite for the action in the main clause.
-en-	Action in suffixed clause precedes action in following clause, or in proceeding coextensively.
-da	Action in suffixed clause is simultaneous, coextensive.
-kan	Action in main clause is seen as resulting from event in suffixed clause. [Note: This appears to be a combination of /-ka-/ CAUSATIVE and the /-Vn/ suffix above, as noted by O'Connor (1982:45)]

The Northern Pomo suffix *-hI* is cognate with the irrealis *-pʰi* of Southern Pomo and Kashaya, and *-hi* in Central Pomo; however, there is no specific irrealis meaning in the

[13] I have converted O'Connor's orthography to my own.

Northern Pomo affix. The Northern Pomo suffix *-en* is also cognate to the *–Vn* same simultaneous affix of Southern, Kashaya, and Central Pomo; Northern Pomo *-kan* is also built with this suffix (the *-ka-* is the CAUSATIVE). The Northern Pomo suffix *-da* is cognate with Central Pomo *=da*.

Eastern Pomo, which diverged from the nearest ancestor of Northern Pomo, Central Pomo, Southern Pomo, and Kashaya Pomo (Western Pomoan languages) before they diverged from each other, shows fewer cognates with them in its SR system. In McLendon's (1978) account of Eastern Pomo SR, suffixes mark the same subject as different when there is a change in case from agent to patient, rather than on the basis of subjecthood. This claim has cast a long shadow (e.g. her example is included in both van Gijn 2016 and Roberts 2017). As shown in Table 8, only Eastern Pomo *-in*, *-pʰi*, and *-pʰila* are clearly cognate in shape with the SR markers of the four Western Pomoan languages. As in Northern Pomo (but unlike the other three Western Pomoan languages), the Eastern Pomo *-pʰi*, and *-pʰila* suffixes have no obvious irrealis meaning.

Table 8: Eastern Pomo SRs markers (adapted from McLendon 1978)

	SAME	DIFFERENT
Action precedes main verb	*-iy*	*-qan*
Action (1) explains, justifies main verb; (2) is simultaneous with main verb	*-in*	*-sa* (meaning (1) only)
Action is prior to and prerequisite for realization of main verb	*-pʰi*	*-pʰila*
Action of main verb continues over same period or begins with time specified by suffixed dependent verb	*-bàya*	*-iday*

Southeastern Pomo, which split off from Proto Pomo around the same time as Eastern Pomo and has been in direct contact with Eastern Pomo on the shores of Clear Lake for thousands of years has less in common with Eastern Pomo than Eastern Pomo has with Northern Pomo, Central Pomo, Southern Pomo, and Kashaya. Southeastern Pomo is not reported to have a SR system, but Moshinsky (1974:75-77) lists seven morphemes which conjoin clauses and "indicate whether the actions are sequential or simultaneous, bear a

conditional or contingent relationship, and whether the conjoined sentences have the same or different subjects." In fact, only two of these morphemes is reported by Moshinsky to be sensitive to same or different subject, and these are not clearly cognate with any of the Pomoan affixes listed for the other languages. The other Southeastern Pomo morphemes Moshinsky records may be used with "same or different subjects" (1974:76). All seven morphemes are listed in Table 9.

Table 9: Southeastern Pomo SR morphemes

	GLOSS (from Moshinsky 1974: 75-77)	SR FUNCTION
-bt̂onwa	"sequential actions"	none
-fla	"sequential actions"	none
-yukin	"sequential actions"	DS
-qat	"contingent actions" ("actions occur sequentially or simultaneously")	none
=miṭ	"contingent actions" ("actions which are either causally connected or simultaneous")	SS
-day	"simultaneous actions'	none
-fed	"conditional"	none

Two of these, *-fed* and *-fla*, are surely cognate with Southern Pomo ||-pʰi|| and ||-pʰla||, though only *-fed* has a partially cognate meaning, namely, it "conjoins two sentences, the second of which describes an action following and conditional on the first" (Moshinsky 1974:77). The conditionality fits with the meanings of the Southern Pomo cognate, but it is clear that Southeastern Pomo has not developed the sharp irrealis/realis distinction found in Southern Pomo, nor does it show evidence of coreferencing functions.

Northeastern Pomo, the only Pomoan language not spoken in a territory contiguous with another Pomoan language, likely split off from its Pomoan congeners before Kashaya, Central Pomo, and Southern Pomo split among themselves. Though the available data on Northeastern Pomo are limited, there is no evidence of a SR system in the language despite the phonologically conservative nature of the language and its sharing both a border and a seasonal village site with Yuki, which does have SR (see

Walker 2016 for an account of the contact situation between Northeastern Pomo and the non-Pomoan languages surrounding it).

There are, however, possible cognates with SR suffixes in other Pomoan languages. The commonest verbal suffix in Northeastern Pomo is *-Vn*, the default verbal suffix (DVS), which is the suffix of the citation forms of verbs and adjectives (Walker 2016:73). Oswalt records cognates for this morpheme in the other six Pomoan languages; he divides them into two Proto Pomo reconstructions: (1) *-v̂n "Absolutive II" (roughly equivalent to perfective), for which he identifies reflexes in Northern Pomo, Southeastern Pomo, and Northeastern Pomo; and (2) *-v̂n, which he glosses describes as indicating "subordinate action [that] is simultaneous with that of the main verb and has the same [subject]" (1976: 25-26). This latter Proto Pomo reconstruction has reflexes in Southern Pomo, Kashaya, Central Pomo, Northern Pomo, and Eastern Pomo, and Oswalt notes that in Northern Pomo (the only language for which he reconstructs both homophonous morphemes), the suffix "is used no matter what the relative timing of the two actions" and "may be related to…[the] Absolutive II" suffix *-v̂n.[14]

Though neither Oswalt (1976) nor McLendon (1973) propose a Northeastern Pomo reflex of Proto Pomo *-pʰi, there is a possible contender in the unpublished field notes of Abraham Halpern. Among the tiny amount of multi-clausal data for the language, there is a structure that is reminiscent of some non-recapitulative uses of *ha:mini-* in Southern Pomo. Examples (19a-19c) provide three instances of Northeastern Pomo *ni-*, which I believe is a pro-verb or auxiliary of some kind that is cognate with Southern Pomo *ha:mini-*; and each of these is suffixed with the mystery morpheme (or morphemes?) *-khi.*

[14] Note that the Southeastern Pomo reflex of this morpheme, *-n*, has a much more restricted meaning than Oswalt's comparative data suggest. Moshinsky glosses it as "absolutive" and states that it "forms adjectives from certain verbs…as well as state of action nouns" (1974: 78).

Examples of Northeastern Pomo *ni-khi*[15]

(19a) <níkhi wá·ya ʔá· mó'gon> (Halpern, SCOIL)
ní–khi wá:ya ʔá: móhko–n
thus–? far 1SG.NOM go.away–DVS
'thus long way I went'

(19b) <níkhi šó·kata> (Halpern, SCOIL)
ní–khi šó:kʰaṭ–a
thus–? breathe–IMP
'thus breathe!'

(19c) <níkhi túmaya> (Halpern .007.0905)
ní–khi ṭ̂úma–ya
thus–? sit–IMP
'good(?) sit, be still!'

In examples (19a-19c), the morpheme *-khi* stands out for two reasons: (1) it is the only combination of /k/+/h/ in Northeastern Pomo (in other words, it does not equal the /kʰ/ phoneme), and Halpern's spelling seems to indicate the pronunciation ['nikʰ.hi], which suggests that the *-hi* component might be a separate morpheme; (2) *-khi* is suffixed to *ni-*, which can occur with other suffixes and seems to mean 'do' or 'thus', much like other Pomoan pro-verbs, as in *ni-ṭ̂ʰín-ya čʰí:-ya* thus-NEG-IMP AUX-IMP 'don't do that!' (Halpern, SCOIL). Perhaps the *-hi* of *-khi* could be the missing Northeastern Pomo cognate of Proto Pomo *-pʰi.

Two of the three examples above are set in imperative constructions, and out of a total of seven instances of *ni-khi* I have located in Halpern's field notes, five are clearly in

[15] Halpern's <k> is equivalent to /kʰ/ unless it is in coda position, where it generally equals /k/. The transliteration *-kʰhi* would also be appropriate (if phonetically unlikely for Northeastern Pomo).

imperative constructions, one (example (19a) above) is combined with a main verb suffixed with the default verbal suffix, and one sentence is not fully glossed and has no free translation, and its semantics are therefore unrecoverable. It is striking that the only morpheme in Northeastern Pomo that has a phonetic shape that could reasonably descend from Proto Pomo *-pʰi also has a strong association with irrealis constructions as do the reflexes of this morpheme in the majority of the daughter languages.[16] Ultimately, the data are too few to say more than this: it is likely the case that the *-hi* in *-khi* descends from Proto Pomo *-pʰi, and it will treated as the Northeastern Pomo reflex hereafter.

4. Origin of SR in Pomoan

As discussed in the foregoing section, SR (whether canonical or not) is only attested for six of the seven Pomoan languages. Only a small number of morphemes are possibly shared by all seven languages regardless of the status of SR in each language. The first of these, which Oswalt reconstructs as two Proto Pomo morphemes *-v̂n "Absolutive II" and *-v̂n "subordinat[ing]…simultaneous" suffix, is hereafter united in the reconstruction of a single Proto Pomo morpheme, *-Vn. There is no question that all seven daughter languages preserve reflexes of *-Vn. The other suffix that most likely has reflexes in all seven daughter languages is Proto Pomo *-pʰi, which Oswalt reconstructs on the basis of reflexes in five languages: Southern Pomo, Kashaya, Central Pomo, Eastern Pomo, and Northern Pomo (1976: 26). Oswalt lists no Northeastern Pomo reflex and does not include Southeastern Pomo *-fed* as a reflex (though he does discuss it under his reconstruction for *-pʰila).

[16] Northeastern Pomo /f/ is the normal reflex of Proto Pomo *pʰ in the language; however, both Northern Pomo and Central Pomo show restricted instances of Proto Pomo *pʰ surfacing as /h/, as in their reflexes for the *pʰi suffix, and it is therefore possible that Northeastern Pomo had the same change (whether through shared inheritance or convergent innovation).

Moshinsky notes that *-fed* "conjoins two sentences [= clauses], the second of which describes an action following and conditional on the first" (1974: 77). I consider Southeastern Pomo *-fed* to be a reflex of Proto Pomo *-pʰi. The final consonant of *-fed* might have existed in Proto Pomo (Southeastern Pomo often preserves finals otherwise lost in the rest of Pomoan), or it could be additional material added later. And, as discussed in the previous section, it is possible that Northeastern Pomo *-(k)hi* is a reflex of Proto Pomo *-pʰi. Table 10 summarizes the synchronic shapes of the two suffixes likely shared by all seven Pomoan languages which are also part of the SR systems of a majority of Pomoan languages.

Table 10: Reflexes of Proto Pomo *-Vn and *-pʰi

PROTO POMO →	*-Vn	*-pʰi
Southern Pomo	*-in, -an, -on, -un, -n*	*-pʰi*
Kashaya	*-in, -an, -on, -un, -n*	*-pʰi ~ -čʰi ~ -hi*
Central Pomo	*-in*	*-hi*
Northern Pomo	*-en*	*-hI*
Eastern Pomo	*-in*	*-pʰi*
Southeastern Pomo	*-n**	*-fed (?)*
Northeastern Pomo**	*-in, -en, -an, -on, -un, -n*	*-...hi (?)*

*not part of the SR or clause-combining system in Southeastern Pomo
**no SR system attested

To the above suffixes might be added *-ba same sequential, which Oswalt only reconstructs for the nearest common ancestor of Southern Pomo, Kashaya, and Central Pomo (1976:26). Eastern Pomo *-bàya* same subject simultaneous, though it has different temporal ordering semantics, appears to contain a reflex of *-ba, which would push its time depth back to Proto Pomo. It is possible that the Southeastern Pomo *-bt̂onwa* "sequential actions" has *-ba as the origin of the /b/. In Halpern's unpublished field notes, there is also evidence of a possible Northeastern Pomo reflex of *-ba, which is given in (20).

(20) <ʔa· baʔčʾói šímitiʔ> ~ <baʔčʾóiʔba ʔa· šímitka·li> (Halpern, SCOIL)

	ʔa:	*baʔčʾó–y*	*šímiṯ–iʔ*
	1SG.NOM	sing–FUT	listen–FUT?
	*baʔčʾó–y–**ʔba***	*ʔa:*	*šímiṯ–kʰa:li*
	sing–FUT–**?**	1SG.NOM	listen–?

'I will sing so that ye may hear'

In (20), Halpern collected two ways of saying 'I will sing so that ye may hear', the second of which appears to use the mystery morpheme *-ʔba* as some short of clause-combining morpheme. However, if that is the case, that would be all this morpheme might share in common with the *-ba* of Southern Pomo, Kashaya, and Central Pomo. In (20) above, the verb 'sing' takes the future suffix, and in the Pomoan languages which use *-ba* as a same subject sequential SR suffix, it is not possible to affix it to an inflected independent verb and it is not possible to combine a clause marked with *-ba* with an irrealis main verb.

When the origins of the same markers in Pomoan are compared to those of the different markers, a pattern emerges. The different markers (whatever their actual semantics) show signs of more recent grammaticization. And with the exception of the different marker *pʰila, which came to be restricted to irrealis contexts in a subset of languages, the different markers cannot be reconstructed to Proto Pomo in that function. Table 11 summarizes the origins of the different markers across the Pomoan languages. Note that some of these markers have no reported different values in some daughter languages, but where they do have such semantics in at least one Pomoan language, I have listed the reflexes in all congeners.

Table 11: The origins of DIFFERENT morphemes across Pomoan

SOUTHERN POMO	DIFFERENT	ORIGINS	DIFFERENT	ORIGINS	DIFFERENT	ORIGINS

VALUES →	SEQUENTIAL		SIMULTANEOUS		IRREALIS	
Southern	*-:li*	*-w=li -PFV=LOC	*-wen*	*-w-em PFV-?	*-pʰla*	*-pʰi-la -SEQ-?
Kashaya	*-...li*		*-wem*		*-pʰila*	
Central	*=li* *=LOC	*=li	*=da	*hiʔda > *=da 'road' > =LOC	*=hla*	
Northern	*-kan*	*-qa-Vn CAUS-SIM	*-da*		N/A	
Eastern	*-qan*		*-iday*		*-pʰila*	
Southeastern	*-yukin*	unknown[17]	*-day*[18]		*-fla*[19]	

963

964 Though the specific origins of all the different morphemes are not known with
965 certainty, there is enough known to uncover a pattern: different morphemes were
966 grammaticized after same morphemes through the addition of morphemes to the original
967 same morphemes (as in *-qa-Vn and *pʰi-la), the addition of enclitics meaning 'at, to' (as
968 in *=li and *=da), or the creation of dedicated morphemes, which were originally added to
969 inflected independent verbs (as in *-w-em). The different morphemes as clause-
970 combining markers, whatever their synchronic semantics in the daughter languages, are
971 not as ancient as the SAME morphemes.

972

973 5. Conclusion

974 The SR markers (or at least some cognate suffixes) are known for all seven Pomoan
975 languages, though Northeastern Pomo has no known SR system. Northern Pomo has
976 fewer morphemes in its switch reference system and its different suffixes do not conform
977 to a subject-tracking analysis (as noted early on by Oswalt (1976:26) and confirmed by
978 O'Connor (1993)). Kashaya and Southern Pomo have canonical systems which track
979 subjects as being shared or not shared between a dependent verb and a main verb (at least
980 in narrative genre), and Central Pomo is reported to have NCSR that tracks events as
981 more closely or loosely being bound and does not track subject or agent or any other
982 referents. Eastern Pomo does not track subject (at least consistently), and Southeastern

[17] The -…kin part of this suffix might also descend from *-qa-Vn.
[18] No different semantics in Southeastern Pomo.
[19] No different semantics in Southeastern Pomo.

Pomo shows some cognate suffixes that do not participate in a SR system, though the language has at least two innovated morphemes which might be sensitive to tracking subjects across clauses.

These varied systems share many cognate morphemes across the languages, though their semantics are not always shared along with the forms. It is clear, however, that the various systems developed over the millennia through Pomoan-internal mechanisms. Central Pomo and Northern Pomo have high-quality documentation and published analyses (though there is not yet a grammar of Central Pomo), and their reported lack of canonical subject-tracking SR systems cannot be dismissed. Likewise, the consistent subject-tracking seen in Kashaya and Southern Pomo narratives (particularly with the realis suffixes) cannot be dismissed as a sampling error.

In favor of the argument that the reported differences between Southern Pomo and Kashaya, on the one hand, and Central Pomo and Northern Pomo on the other are not merely the result of different genres is the geographical distribution of these differences. Further south and west within Pomoan territory correlates with elaborate SR suffixes and reports of canonical subject-tracking. Further north and east corresponds to less elaborate SR suffixes and consistent reports of NCSR. The furthest east corresponds to little-to-no attested actual SR function in cognate morphemes.

SR, therefore, cannot be reconstructed for Proto Pomo, but something happened early on that led to the grammaticization of clause-combining suffixes which came to mean SAME in a majority of the daughter languages. In these languages, it is likely that the oldest structure involved *-Vn, the only SR suffix with unambiguous reflexes in all seven Pomoan languages, and involved something similar to an English participial construction followed by an inflected verb (e.g. ‘crying, they ran away’). Such constructions often require a shared subject (as they do in English). Because Proto Pomo and most daughter languages lack Indo-European-type person marking on verbs, and all daughter languages allow the omission of overt core arguments, sentences with these participial constructions would have been uttered and understood without any overt indication of their subjects.

I believe *-pʰi originally had a same sequential function with strong 'if-then' semantics. This came to pattern with *-Vn as the major means of combining clauses. In only some daughter languages, the reflexes of *-pʰi came to have strictly irrealis semantics, which necessitated the grammaticization of a new same sequential morpheme, *-ba (which was perhaps some sort of conjunction). In all the daughter languages but Northeastern Pomo, *-pʰi was augmented with *-la, a morpheme of unknown meaning, in order to create the different form, though it is unlikely that subject tracking was a feature at this early stage. After the daughter languages had begun to differentiate more fully, additional different morphemes were innovated through different means and spread through Pomoan-internal contact.

Over time, the languages furthest south came to restructure these clause-combining morphemes as subject-tracking suffixes with strict same subject versus different subject semantics. Thus the NCSR systems described for Central Pomo and Northern Pomo are most likely representative of an earlier stage of the SR grammaticization process within Pomoan, and the more canonical subject-tracking SR found in Kashaya and Southern Pomo is a more recent innovation.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. *The languages of the Amazon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Balodis, Uldis. 2016. Yuki grammar with sketches of Huchnom and Coast Yuki. Berkeley: University of California Press.

de Sousa, Hilário. 2016. Some non-canonical switch reference systems and the fundamental functions of switch reference. In van Gijn, Rik & Hammond, Jeremy (eds.), *Switch reference 2.0*. (Typological studies in language 114), 55-92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in typological perspective. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Aikhenvald, (eds.), *The semantics of clause linking:*

A cross-linguistic typology, 1-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dixon, R. M. W. 2012. *Basic Linguistic Theory Volume 3: Further Grammatical Topics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Foley, William A. 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge University Press
Haiman, John and Munro, Pamela. 1983. Introduction [to switch-reference]. In J. Haiman and P. Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference and universal grammar*, ix-xv.
Halpern, Abraham. Unpublished field notes on Southern Pomo. Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, University of California at Berkeley.
Jacobsen, William Jr. 1967. Switch-reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan. In *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics: Meaning and History in the Languages of the American Southwest*, Dell Hymes & William E. Bittle (eds.), 238-263. The Hague: Mouton.
MacDonald, Lorna 1990. *A grammar of Tauya*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Martin, Jack. 2011. *A grammar of Creek (Muskogee)*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
McKenzie, Andrew. 2012. The role of contextual restriction in reference-tracking. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
McKenzie, Andrew. 2015. A survey of switch-reference in North America. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81(3): 409-448.
McLendon, Sally 1973. *Proto Pomo*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 71.
McLendon, Sally. 1978. Ergativity, case, and transitivity in Eastern Pomo. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44(1): 1-9.
Mithun, Marianne 1993. "Switch reference": Clause combining in Central Pomo. *IJAL*, Vol. 59, No. 2, 119-136.
Mithun, Marianne. 1999. *The languages of native North America*. Cambridge University Press.
Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The emergence of agentive systems in core argument making.

In *The typology of semantic alignment*, ed. Mark Donahue and Søren Wichman, 297-333. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moshinsky, Julius. 1974. *A grammar of Southeastern Pomo*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 72.

Olsson, Bruno. 2010. Subordinate clauses in Kashaya Pomo. Unpublished thesis, Stockholm University.

O'Connor, Mary Catherine. 1982. Asymmetry in the switch-reference system of Northern Pomo. In *1981 Hokan-Penutian Workshop.*

O'Connor, Mary Catherine 1987. Topics in Northern Pomo grammar. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

O'Connor, Mary Catherine. 1993. Disjoint reference and pragmatic inference in anaphora and switch reference in Northern Pomo. *The role of theory in language description*, ed. William A. Foley, 215-242. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Oswalt, Robert 1976. Comparative verb morphology of Pomo. In Hokan Studies, Papers from the First Conference on Hokan Languages, held in San Diego, California, April 23-25, 1970, M. Langdon and S. Silver, eds. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 181: 13-28.

Oswalt, Robert 1978. Retribution for mate-stealing: A Southern Pomo tale. In: Northern California Texts. V. Golla and S. Silver (eds.), *IJAL-NATS*.

Oswalt, Robert 1983. Interclausal reference in Kashaya. In J. Haiman and P. Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference and universal grammar*, 267-290.

Oswalt, Robert. Unpublished fieldnotes on Southern Pomo. Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, University of California at Berkeley.

Roberts, John R. 2017. A typology of switch reference. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic typology*, 538-573. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, Sandra A., Joseph Sung-Yul Park, and Charles N. Li 2006. *A reference*

grammar of Wappo. University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 138.

van Gijn, Rik. 2016. Switch reference: An overview. In *Switch reference 2.0*. van Gijn, Rik and Hammond, Jeremy (eds.), (Typological studies in language 114), 1-54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Walker, Neil Alexander. 2013. A grammar of Southern Pomo: An indigenous language of California. Unpublished dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Walker, Neil Alexander. 2016. Assessing the effects of language contact on Northeastern Pomo. In Andrea Berez-Kroeker, Diane M. Hintz, and Carmen Jany (eds.), *Language contact and change in the Americas: Studies in honor of Marianne Mithun*, 67-90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Walker, Neil Alexander. 2020. *A Grammar of Southern Pomo*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Watkins, Laurel. 1993. The discourse function of Kiowa switch-reference. *Yuman texts*, ed. Margaret Langdon, IJAL-NATS monograph 3:61-67.

Westerlund, Torbjörn. 2019. Switch-reference and insubordination in Ngarla (Ngayarta, Pama-Nyungan), *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 39:2, 174-201.