Borrowed rhetorical constructions as starting points for grammaticalization

Marianne Mithun

Viewing constructions as a locus of grammatical change can often help us understand seemingly inexplicable synchronic structures. Here we consider a grammatical pattern that appears at first highly unmotivated, a typological peculiarity. It involves the marking of syntactic relations not on predicates (heads of clauses), nor on arguments (dependents), but on words that need bear no syntactic relation to either. Even more surprisingly, this odd pattern crops up in neighboring languages that are not genetically related. We thus have two puzzles: Why does such a structure exist in the first place, and how could it be borrowed? Answers emerge once we identify the construction from which the modern grammatical pattern is apparently descended, a common discourse pattern which apparently evolved into a conventionalized rhetorical strategy before crystallizing into the morphological structure we see today. These developments illustrate the importance of considering whole constructions as potential units of change, complete with their prosody and discourse uses. Furthermore, a dynamic view of constructions as entities that evolve over time can further our understanding of the kinds of grammatical change that may be triggered by language contact. A structure that is shared by neighboring languages need not have been borrowed in its current form; it may have developed in both the source and target languages from an earlier borrowed construction. Such processes are illustrated here with material from two language families indigenous to the Northwest Coast of North America: Wakashan and Tsimshianic.

1. The structure

In discussions of the marking of syntactic relations, a distinction has been drawn between syntactic heads and dependents (Nichols 1986). At the clause level, the head is defined as the predicate, and the dependents as other constituents such as subjects or objects.

In head-marked clause structures, grammatical relations are marked on the predicate (the head), often with pronominal affixes. An example of a prototypical head-marking structure can be seen in the Mohawk sentence in (1). The roles
of the woman and the boy are identified solely on the predicate by a pronominal prefix -honwa- 'she/him'. There is no indication of syntactic function on the noun for 'boy'.

(1) **Mohawk (Iroquoian, Quebec):** Mae Niironhia:y a Montour, speaker p.c.

HEAD

S-a-honwa-a-s-e

rep

the

ne raka: = a.

DEPENDENT

rep

she followed him back

the m.sg-child=dim

'The woman followed the boy back.'

In dependent-marked clause structures, syntactic relations are marked on arguments (the dependents). In the Mongolian clause in (2), relations are indicated by case markers on the nouns for 'basket' (comitative), 'pear' (accusative), and 'bicycle' (dative/locative).

(2) **Khalkha Mongolian: Erdenebaatar Erdene-Ochir, speaker p.c.**

DEPENDENT

Tegeed ter xuused ter neg sags-tai liir-iig n'

then that child that one basket-com pear-acc poss

DEPENDENT

duqui-no-a a-c-aad

bicycle-loc-rfl.poss load-seq

'Then that child loaded the pears on the basket onto his bicycle and ...'

An intriguing pattern of marking occurs in some languages indigenous to the Northwest Coast of North America. The examples below are from a dialect of Kwak’wala, a language of the Wakashan family spoken on northern Vancouver Island and the adjacent British Columbia mainland. The language is documented in Boas (1911a, 1947), Boas and Hunt (1902–5) (where it is called Kwakiutl, after the term for one group of its speakers), Anderson (1984, 1992, 2005), and elsewhere. The sentence in (3) suggests a typical head-marking pattern, with the predicate 'be deep' carrying a nominative case marker for the role of the subject 'hole'.

(3) **Kwak’wala: Boas cited in Anderson (2005: 90)**

HEAD

wangola=ida

be.deep=common.nominative hole

xʷ op’a

'The hole was deep.'

The sentence in (4) appears at first to continue the head-marking pattern: the head (the predicate 'eat raw') carries a nominative marker indicating the role of the dependent (the subject 'Indians'). The location of the accusative marker for the object 'gooseberry' is surprising, however, it is attached to the subject 'Indians'.

(4) **Kwak’wala: Boas cited in Anderson (1992: 34)**

HEAD

k’əxk’’wxə-ləgə=ida

DEPENDENT

bak’’sna=ə

DEPENDENT

ten.mw also=common.nominitive

Indian=common.accusative

gooseberry

ent.ow also=common.nominitive

'The Indians also eat raw gooseberries.'

The sentence in (5) is again surprising. The oblique marker =s, which identifies the role of the instrument 'stick', is attached to the object noun 'dog'.


HEAD

yolk”mas=ida

cause.hurt=common.nominative

DEPENDENT

bog” anxious=xa

man=common.accusative

DEPENDENT

’wats=sa

dog=common.oblique

stick

'He hurts the dog with the stick.'

These case markers are enclitic determiners, of the type described in Klavans (1985). They are bound phonologically to whatever word precedes them, regardless of its syntactic function, but they are in construction syntactically with the nominal phrase that follows. There thus seems to be a mismatch between their phonological and syntactic properties: they lean left phonologically, but right syntactically. There is no question about the word boundaries in these sentences. As Anderson notes (2005: 15), word-internal phonological processes of open-esis operate between the enclitics and their preceding hosts, but not between the enclitics and the following nominals. Furthermore, stress in Kwak’wala is initial, appearing on the first full vowel of words. Enclitics never carry stress. In fact nominals never appear at the beginning of utterances in topic or focus constructions, because there would be no preceding word to host their determiners.

This placement of case markers is a bit surprising: we tend to expect that grammatical markers will generally be attached to elements they pertain to. Even more surprising is the fact that a similar pattern can be seen in the languages of the Tsimshianic family, spoken immediately to the north of the Wakashan...
languages. No genetic relationship has ever been seriously proposed between the Wakashan and Tsimshianic families.

The Tsimshianic family consists of two language groups: Maritime and Interior. The examples below are from Tsimshian (also called Tsimshian Proper or Coast Tsimshian), a variety of Maritime Tsimshian. Here, too, clause structure appears at first to be head-marking, with syntactic relations marked on the predicate. In (6), the predicate ‘blow’ (the head of the clause) is marked for the role of the absolutive ‘northwind’.


\[
\text{HEAD} \quad \text{DEPENDENT} \\
Da \quad \text{gwaant} \quad \text{ga} \quad \text{‘wii yisiyaask}
\]

\[
\text{then blow=COMMON.ABSENT.ABSOLUTIVE} \quad \text{great northwind}
\]

‘Then a great northwind [ABSOLUTIVE] blew.’

In (7), the predicate ‘kill’ (the head) is marked for the role of the ergative ‘wolf’.


\[
\text{HEAD} \quad \text{DEPENDENT} \\
Dm \quad \text{zaakda} \quad \text{sga} \quad \text{gibaw} \quad \text{sga}
\]

\[
\text{FUT} \quad \text{kill=COMMON.ABSENT.ERGATIVE} \quad \text{wolf=COMMON.ABSENT.ABSOLUTIVE}
\]

\[
\text{DEPENDENT} \\
haas \quad \text{sga}
\]

dog=DEM

‘The wolf [ERGATIVE] will kill the dog [ABSOLUTIVE].’

But example (7) also provides a surprise. The role of the absolutive ‘dog’ is marked not on the predicate but on the ergative noun ‘wolf’, another dependent. Like their counterparts in Kwak’ala, these case markers are enclitic determiners. They are bound phonologically to whatever word precedes them, regardless of its syntactic function, but they are in construction syntactically with the nominal that follows.

The enclitics are not pronouns. They appear only when a lexical noun phrase follows. The language does contain pronominal clitics and affixes, but they have different shapes.


\[
\text{Galksa-xwoosgit \quad gisga \quad aks}
galksa-xwoosg-it \quad gi=sga \quad aks
\]

\[
\text{through-dive-SG} \quad \text{DEM=OBlique} \quad \text{water}
\]

‘He dove into the water.’

The phonological bond between the Tsimshian enclitics (called connectives in the literature on Tsimshianic languages) and their hosts is strong. Dunn reports:

In hesitating and pausing, speakers always tie the connective to the preceding word, that is, they always pause after a connective. They never continue a sentence (after a pause) by starting with a connective; they may repeat the last word before the pause but never just the connective. (Dunn 1979a: 131–132)

Stebbins (2003a: 405–406) notes that word-internal processes of lenition operate over combinations of enclitics and their preceding phonological hosts, but not the enclitics and following lexical nominals.

Our first challenge is to account for the existence of a structure that differs so radically from those of most other languages and seems at odds with usual expectations of iconicity. Our second is to account for its simultaneous presence in genetically unrelated languages spoken in the same geographical area. Usually, explanations for parallelism seem unpromising. The probability of chance resemblance is extremely low, given the relative rarity of the pattern. The similarity cannot be a common genetic inheritance, since the languages are not related. The most obvious explanation should be language contact, since the languages are spoken in the same geographical region, once known as a strong linguistic area. Yet patterns of head and dependent marking have been hypothesized to be highly resistant to areal influence (Nichols 1992: 181). Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine how such an abstract morphological structure, so deeply integrated into the core of the grammar, could be transferred. Finally, the categories marked by the morphological structure are not even equivalent: the Kwak’ala system shows a nominative/accusative pattern, and the Tsimshian system shows an ergative/absolutive pattern.

2. The source construction

On the surface, this locus of marking seems unmotivated. But if we enlarge our perspective from the written representation of words to speech complete with prosody, and from the confines of the clause to larger stretches of discourse, we can see how a construction might come into existence that could evolve into the morphological pattern we see today.

Chafe has pointed out that “Conversational language appears subject to a constraint that limits an intonation unit to the expression of no more than one new idea” (1994: 119). Speakers do not generally introduce multiple separate elements of new information within a single, prosodically unbroken stream
of speech. Such prosodic organization of information characterizes spontaneous speech in all types of languages. We will illustrate it here with material from another member of the Wakashan family, Nuuchahnulth (also called Nootka). The Wakashan family consists of two major branches. Kwakw'ala, seen above, is a member of the northern branch. Nuuchahnulth, seen below, is a member of the southern branch. The Nuuchahnulth material cited here is in the Ahousaht dialect, from the speech of-George Louie, recorded, transcribed, and analyzed by Nakayama (2003a, 2003b). Nakayama has produced a rich record of Ahousaht speech and has made available copies of his audio recordings.

An example of the prosodic packaging of information in speech can be seen in (9), part of an account of an early encounter between local people and the crew of an English schooner called the Kingfisher. The passage is divided into prosodic sentences, defined by a final terminal prosodic contour. (Terminal contours rise in pitch in this language.) Nakayama's free translation of each sentence is given first. The translations are followed by the original corresponding Ahousaht material, arranged so that each line represents a separate intonation unit or prosodic phrase. As can be seen, each prosodic phrase introduces just one substantial new piece of information, one new idea. In (9a), the first line presents the action, the second introduces the couple, and the third adds their origin. In (9b), having sea otter hides is packaged as a single idea: the verb 'have' does not contribute substantial information of its own.

(9) Ahousaht: Nakayama (2003a: 395.31–397.37), George Louie, speaker

a. 'Then a couple that came from outside the village went out to meet them [to trade].'

čiiu hinaččičə.
ču: hina-ččičə
now then there.MOMENTANEOUS-go.out.to.meet
now then go out to meet

hıcncup,
hıcncup
couple

b. 'They had sea otter hides.'

ʔanaak kʷʷakʷə.a.k.
ʔu-na:k kʷʷja.kʷə.a.k
it-having sea.otter
having sea.otter

c. 'My grandmother didn't tell me [what they had for trade].'

wiiksəʔı:s ʔiχhυ k yaqųkʷi·tiíis
wik-saʔi::i:s ʔiχhųk yaqųkʷ-it-i:s
not-just-INDICATIVE.3 tell-DUR who-POSS-PAST-INDEFINITE.ISG
not to me narrating who was mine

naniqṣu
nani:qu
grandparent
grandparent

d. 'She only mentioned that there was a couple on the ship.'

ʔanuwa kəʔuŋəʔə hićnuysṭa,
ʔanu-wa: kəʔuŋəʔə hićnuysṭa
only-say mention-MOMENTANEOUS couple-people.on.board
only said mentioned a couple on board

hićnuysṭa,
hićnuysṭa
couple

e. '[When the Captain saw the couple,] he suddenly acted strangely.'

nay'i:k atwaʔis kʷʷisχii·ʔa.t.
na:y'ik-ː atwaʔi:s kʷʷisχii·ː at
at.once-SHIFT-QUOTATIVE.3 different-DURATIVE-SHIFT
at once different

f. 'As they [white men] took them [the couple] on board the ship, they took the husband and the wife to different places.'

hīnasaspiłətal,
hin-ə:sp-ħ-ː-at-ʔa:tl,
there.MOMENTANEOUS-on.board-MOMENTANEOUS.CAUSATIVE-SIMULTANEOUS-SHIFT-PL
as they were taken on board,
The sentence in (12) was the opening of a narrative. The demonstrative ‘this’ refers cataphorically to the whole event that is about to be described.

(12) Ahousaht: Nakayama (2003a: 386.1), George Louie, speaker

‘This happened a long, long time ago.’

\[\text{qii} \, \text{at}, \]
\[\text{qi} \cdot \text{a} \, \text{t},\]
\[\text{for.a.long.time-FINITE}\]

happened long ago

\[\text{qii} \, \text{an} \, \text{at}, \]
\[\text{qi} \cdot \text{t} \, \text{an} \, \text{a} \, \text{t},\]
\[\text{for.a.long.time-slightly-FINITE}\]

given long ago

\[\text{qii} \, \text{iyu} \, \text{ckw} \, \text{i} \, \text{t}, \]
\[\text{qii} \, \text{is}\]
\[\text{rah}\]
\[\text{time-done-RELATIVE.3 happen.thus this}\]
\[\text{qii}\]
\[\text{is}\]
\[\text{rah}\]
\[\text{happen.thus this}\]

[‘They sailed into the bay of Maaquisiis. ...’]

Ahousaht demonstratives can occur on their own, as in the examples above, or with other referring expressions. The demonstrative ‘this’ in (13) is associated prosodically and referentially with the following word ‘hole’.

(13) Ahousaht: Nakayama (2003a: 372.178.50), George Louie, speaker

‘He only went in and out through this hole.’

\[\text{?ana} \, \text{is}\]
\[\text{ra}\]
\[\text{kiih}\]
\[\text{hiini} \, \text{aas} \, \text{at}\]
\[\text{only-DIMINUTIVE this hole there.MOMENTANEOUS-GO.OUT-ITERATIVE}\]
\[\text{ra}\]
\[\text{a} \, \text{is}\]
\[\text{ra}\]
\[\text{kiih}\]
\[\text{hiini} \, \text{aas} \, \text{at}\]
\[\text{only this hole goes.out repeatedy}\]

In spontaneous speech in many languages, demonstratives are sometimes followed by a pause for lexical selection or retrieval, as speakers decide how to designate a referent. In some languages, demonstratives have even become conventionalized hesitation forms, as in Japanese (Akiyo Maruyama, p.c.). In a number
of languages however, including many spoken in North America, demonstratives are more often exploited for another purpose. Special constructions built on demonstratives allow speakers to manage the flow of information, particularly in more formal speech such as oratory and narrative. To avoid introducing too many distinct ideas under a single intonation contour, demonstratives can be used cataphorically, as place holders within the phrase to stand in for larger referring expressions. The demonstrative provides a signal to the listener that further specification of the referent is to come.

Such a construction occurs in Ahousaht Nuchahnulth. The first line in (14) ends in a demonstrative which points to the place identified in the following line: the chief’s house.

(14) Ahousaht: Nakayama (2003a: 378.192), George Louie, speaker

[‘All the way down to Neah Bay there are our relatives. We are all related, thanks to whatever happened to the young man. And thanks to women who got married and left for these places—or the chiefs who have these daughters.’]

‘When a daughter gets her husband, she leaves the chief’s place.’

čapxnaačiƛ
čapʰ-na-šiƛ
man-having-MOMENTANEOUS
got husband
haw’ili,
haw’ili-ʔi
chief-DEFINITE

ʔucačiƛ
ʔu-ca-čiƛ
it-go.to-MOMENTANEOUS
went to

hist’iƛ
hist-‘iƛ
there

ʔah,
ʔa-h
this

ʔu-ʔa-
ʔu-a-
there

taken from there

taken from there

Similiar patterns can be seen with other demonstratives referring to locations.

(15) Ahousaht: Nakayama (2003a: 433.154)

‘He ran over there to the foot of the mountain.’
kamatqsiƛ,
kamatqʰ-ʔiƛ
running-MOMENTANEOUS
run

hiihiiʔasʔi.
hiihii-ʔasʔi
there-in.front-on.ground-DEFINITE

the foot of the mountain

These multi-phrase demonstrative structures constitute a kind of construction in the technical sense. Goldberg has defined the term ‘construction’ as below.

A distinct construction is defined to exist if one or more of its properties are not strictly predictable from knowledge of other constructions existing in the grammar ... Phrasal patterns are considered constructions if something about their form or meaning is not strictly predictable from the properties of their component parts or from other constructions. (Goldberg 1995: 4)

The demonstrative construction seen in Ahousaht and elsewhere typically consists of an initial element (usually a predicate) plus a word from a small paradigmatic set (the demonstratives) in one intonation unit, followed by a referring expression in the next. This construction is distinguished from ordinary nominal expressions containing demonstratives (like ‘this hole’ above) by both form and function. Formally, the demonstrative construction has a distinctive prosodic contour, which spans two intonation units separated by a break between the demonstrative and the referring expression. Functionally, it allows speakers to manipulate the flow of information so that substantial new ideas are introduced in separate intonation units.

The existence of such constructions on the Northwest Coast and within the Wakashan family itself suggests a likely source for the enclitic structures seen in Kwakwala. Unfortunately, there is no written documentation of earlier stages of any of these languages (as for most languages in the world), so we cannot rely on philology for attestation of individual steps in the development of the modern enclitics. We do, however, know about certain recurring processes of language change.

We know that it is common for demonstratives to develop into articles over time. The link between stressed demonstratives and unstressed definite articles in German has long been noticed, as has that between English demonstratives and the definite article, and Latin demonstratives and definite articles in modern Romance languages. In a landmark work, Greenberg (1978) outlined a process by which demonstratives can evolve into obligatory definite articles that simply
label referents as identifiable (Stage I), then be extended to label all specific referents (Stage II), and finally result in general noun markers, perhaps retaining gender distinctions (Stage III). Diesel (1999: 8) provides a list of works detailing the development of demonstratives into articles in European languages. Semantic distinctions encoded in the modern Kwakw’ala enclitic system suggest that the enclitics did indeed originate as demonstratives. Boas himself noted that “the pronominal forms ... have demonstrative significance” (1911a: 529). They distinguish not only three degrees of distance, but also common from proper nominals: one set is used before common nominals, and another before proper names and indefinites. Demonstratives in many languages show distinct patterning in just these two contexts, often not even occurring in the second at all.

We also know that repeated prosodic association of linguistic material can set the stage for phonological fusion over time. Heavy use of patterns like the demonstrative construction illustrated above, in which a demonstrative is pronounced in the same intonation unit as a preceding predicate but separated prosodically from a following larger referring expression, could lead to just the kinds of enclitic structures now characteristic of Kwakw’ala. The original demonstrative would fuse with the material preceding it rather than with the following nominal.

It should be noted that the exact process of development outlined here is not the only one that could lead to such enclitic structures. Bybee (2002) has suggested, for example, that English auxiliary enclitics such as the future -l (I’ll go) the perfects -v and -d (I’ve gone, I’d gone) and the conditional -d (I’d go) have fused phonologically with the preceding word (typically a subject), rather than with the following word (typically the rest of the verb phrase), purely because of frequency. In these English structures the host word is most often drawn from a very small set of words (the subject pronouns), while the following word could be any lexical verb and more. The Kwakw’ala enclitics do not appear to have developed by this route, because their phonological hosts are drawn from the full inventories of predicates and discourse markers. In some other languages, the development of enclitics of this type is purely phonologically based. Booij (1996) discusses Dutch vowel-initial determiners that syllabify with the preceding word, though they depend syntactically on the following noun. Reid (2001) describes Bontok determiners that encliticize to any vowel-final preceding word. Again the Kwakw’ala situation is slightly different: the enclitics fuse phonologically with the preceding word whatever the phonological shapes of each element.

3. The transfer

An understanding of the process by which the enclitic structure could develop opens the door to an explanation of how it could be transferred across genetic lines. The Northwest Coast is a well-known linguistic area, comprising a large number of genetically unrelated language families (Thompson and Kinkade 1990; Beck 2000, 2002). The area, shaded in Figure 1 below, stretches from southeastern Alaska southward through British Columbia, Washington State, and into Oregon.

![Figure 1. The Northwest Coast Linguistic Area of North America](suttles1990iii)

Languages in the Northwest Coast area show the effects of longstanding multilingualism. They share numerous structural features, among them basic predicate-initial order. This order is conducive to the development of the cataphoric demonstrative construction seen above in Ahousaht. The Wakashan and Tsimshianic languages are spoken in adjacent territories in the center of the area, shown in closer detail in Figure 2. In all of the languages at the center, speakers lay out the skeleton of the clause in an initial predicate, often containing pronominal reference to core arguments. The predicate typically introduces a substantial new idea. For this reason, heavy lexical nominals are often not included in the same prosodic phrase. If the multi-phrasal demonstrative construction did not already exist independently in the various families, it could easily be transferred from one language to another by bilinguals. The sequential and prosodic arrangement of a predicate and demonstrative in one prosodic phrase, followed by a pause and a larger referring expression in a second, would be easy to copy in the target language by exploiting material already present in that language, namely initial holophrastic predicates and demonstratives.

If the demonstrative construction was already available to bilinguals as a rhetorical option in both of their languages, a propensity to favor the option
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ers of Arabic, Romance languages, and Asian languages bring rhetorical structures from their mother tongues into written English. Examining the English of Mandarin and Japanese speakers, Rutherford observes that "the transferable typologies – topic-prominence and pragmatic word order – are discourse phenomena, whereas the untransferable S, V, and O configurations are a syntactic phenomenon. I take these observations as evidence that it is therefore discourse and not syntax that gives gross overall shape to interlanguage" (1983: 368) Bartelt documents the transfer of rhetorical structures from Apache into English. He finds that "rhetorical redundancy exists in Apachean languages as a stylistic discourse feature for the expression of emphasis ... Redundancy in English interlanguages of Apachean speakers is a result of transfer of a similar rhetorical technique in Apachean languages" (1983: 298–299)

Mithun (1992) describes certain discourse patterns in Central Pomo, a language of the Pomoan family indigenous to Northern California, that are found throughout the area and beyond. One consists of a simple clause that lays out a basic message in one prosodic phrase, followed by one or more prosodic phrases, each of which provides further elaboration. Such structures are used in formal oratory, but they also appear in conversation, as in (16).


Má: el ‘élsi:yaw’k’h.e.

ma: el ‘élsi:-ya-w’=’k’h.e

land he sell-DEFOCUS-PRF=FUTURE

‘The land would be sold.’

Danóma: ‘el =do: ‘élsi:yaw’k’h.e.

danó=ma: ‘el =do: ‘élsi:-ya-w’=’k’h.e

mountain=land the COPULA=QUOTATIVE sell-DEFOCUS-PRF=FUTURE

They said the mountain land would be sold.’

Interestingly, the same pattern can be seen in the English of Central Pomo speakers. The passage in (17) is also from conversation.


They gave them cattle.

The government gave them cattle.

Nice breed of cattle.

A second discourse pattern common in Central Pomo and other languages throughout the Americas involves couplet constructions. Pairs of prosodically
and semantically parallel lines are used to make points of importance. The second line in the pair typically provides the same information as the first but in a slightly different way, as with a shift in word order or syntactic structure, the substitution of synonyms, etc. These couplet structures are characteristic of formal oratory, but they also appear in conversation, as in the second and third lines below.

\[ \text{jáwál yhé:paz} \quad 'el dá:ó:w} \quad \delta^h ó:w
\text{jáwál yhé-paz} \quad 'el dá:ó:w} \quad \delta^h ó:w
\text{work dō-MULT.EVENT-IMPREF.} \quad \text{the want-RFL-IMPRF.PF-PRF be.absent-PRF}
\text{They don't want to work}
\text{pē:su ñów } \quad \text{'in;}
\text{pē:su ñó-w } \quad \text{'in;}
\text{money be.absent-PRF be=as}
because there is no money;
\text{manítayyammaw kʰe} \quad \text{ñin}
\text{maná-ta-ća-m-a-w=m} \quad \text{ñin}
\text{pay-MULT.EVENT-SML-MULT.EVENT-MULT.AGT-DEFOCUS-PRF=FUT be.absent-IMPRF be=as}
because they are not going to be paid.'

A similar couplet structure appears frequently in the English of these Central Pomo speakers.

\text{When the payoff came,}
\text{he got some of it too;}
\text{they paid him too.}

Such parallels call to mind what Ross terms ‘metatyp’, processes in which speakers of neighboring languages begin to reorganize their ‘ways of saying things’, which can ultimately result in the restructuring of syntax (Ross 2001: 146).

It certainly seems more plausible that an abstract discourse structure, a demonstrative construction like that illustrated in Abousaht above, was transferred through contact than that speakers pulled a fully developed inflectional system, complete with specific enclitic markers, from one language into the other, particularly when the languages are unrelated genetically.

4. The markers

The alert reader may have noticed some tantalizing similarities in shape between some of the Kwak’wala and Tsimshian markers. Common Kwak’wala enclitics are =\text{id}a and =\text{ga}.

(20) Kwak’wala enclitics: Boas and Hunt (1905: 8.13–14)
\text{dá:x ida’:s a’yasó: lá=xa}
took.also=INSTRUMENTAL hand DEM=COMMON.ACCUSATIVE
took hold of the
\text{pá:q’a hë gwe:xs saó:k’w t’e:sema.}
flat that like board stone
board-like stone with his hand.’

Common Tsimshian enclitics are =\text{da} and =\text{ga}.

(21) Tsimshian enclitics: Mulder (1994: 34)
a. \text{Snga ‘woomxg-a=da}
very be.in.pain-EPENTHETIC=COMMON.PRESENT.ABSOLUTE
\text{ta’ni} \quad \text{txamoo-r=ga.}
all body-3.POSS=DISTAL
‘His whole body was really in pain.’

b. \text{T’aa=ga}
\text{sm’ooygit=ga.}
be.sg=COMMON.ABSOLUTE.chief=DISTAL
‘There was a chief.’

A closer look reveals that the two pairs of markers represent quite different distinctions. The Kwak’wala enclitics =\text{id}a and =\text{ga} distinguish nominative and accusative case (for common, distal referring expressions). The Tsimshian =\text{da} and =\text{ga} elements do not mark case; they distinguish present from absent referents.

The Tsimshian connective system is described in Boas (1911b), Dunn (1979a, 1979b, 1991), Mulder (1987, 1988, 1994), Stebbins (2003a, 2003b), and elsewhere. The examples seen so far are from what Mulder identifies as the oratory
register, characterized by a more elaborate enclitic system than that used in everyday speech. Enclitics in the oratory register specify three kinds of distinctions: they distinguish common and proper nouns; present, absent, or unspecified referents; and ergative and absolutive case. Table 1 shows the patterns found in independent clauses (indicatives). The patterns found in dependent clauses (subjunctives), which are actually very common, are slightly different. (Boas notes that forms for present and unspecified ergative proper nouns, which correspond to blank cells in Table 1, did not occur in his corpus.)

![Table 1: Tsimshian Indicative Connectives: Oratory Register](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMON NOUNS</th>
<th>PROPER NOUNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>=ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>sda</td>
<td>sga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact this =da/=ga distinction cannot be reconstructed for Proto-Tsimshian. These elements do not appear in the Interior enclitic system, where all common nouns are preceded by the enclitic =l. They do not even occur in the Maritime everyday register, where presence and absence of degrees of distance are not distinguished. (Everyday speech does show a common ergative enclitic =da used in certain aspects.) What can be reconstructed is the general common enclitic *=l, which persists in irrealis contexts in Maritime Tsimshian.

The distribution of the =da/=ga and =da/=ga markers suggests that they may have been transferred through contact as well, but this transfer was apparently distinct from the development of the enclitic patterns. Among the numerous features shared by languages in this region are elaborate deictic systems (Thompson and Kinkade 1990: 46–47). A visible/invisible or present/absent distinction is made in the deictic systems of languages over a large area on the Northwest Coast, including all of the North Wakashan languages (Haisla, Heiltsuk, Kwakw'ala), both subgroups of the Tsimshian family (Maritime, Interior), and the isolate Haida to the north, as well as the neighboring Salishan languages to the east and south (Bella Coola, Comox, Sechelt, Squamish, Halkomelem, Nooksack, Northern Straits, Clallam, Lushootseed, Twana, and Tillamook) and the Chimakuan languages (Chemakum, Quileute). The North Wakashan languages (Heiltsuk, Haisla, and Kwakw'ala) and Tsimshian all distinguish proximal, middle, and distal categories as well. It is not unlikely that the da and ga elements originated as demonstratives which were borrowed widely throughout the area to add spatial distinctions to the existing deictic systems.

Borrowed rhetorical constructions as starting points for grammaticalization

Elements with these shapes still function as demonstratives in the modern North Wakashan and Tsimshian languages. In this capacity they are not obligatory, unlike the enclitics. The Kwak'wala uvular =ga is probably not comparable to the Tsimshian velar =ga. Both languages maintain a distinction between uvulars and velars that goes back to their respective parents. A distal demonstrative =ga can be seen at the end of the Kwak'wala sentence in (22). It marks referents or events as distant in space and/or time.

(22) Kwak'wala demonstrative: Boas cited in Anderson (1984: 36)

\[hik\ 'ala=\text{gada}\]

make that noise=proximal.invisible.common.nominitive

\[x\text{wa}=\text{la}'.\text{g}a'-\text{a}\]

disappear-past=distal.demonstrative

'The ones (near me, invisible) who had disappeared made that noise.'

Modern Tsimshianic languages also still show phrase-final or clause-final clitics =da and =ga which indicate physical or psychological proximity and distance respectively (Tarpent 1998). The distal demonstrative =ga was seen at the end of both Tsimshian sentences in (21) above. Both =da and =ga can be seen in the Southern Tsimshian examples in (23) below.

(23) Southern Tsimshian deictics: Tarpent (1998)

a.  **Hlaa ix ts'u k'uy daa'w'ihs la: i'x ts'u: q'ay tâ: wî=ș=t now again trying still leave=conn=proper**

Scotttya'a

Scottty=la'

NAME=PROXIMAL.DEMONSTRATIVE

'Scottty [who is living in the house] has gone out again

**dim si'ixtihoontsît.**

tm si'ix=shô:ntkws-t

FUTURE try.to.get.fish-3
to try to fish.'

b.  **O, hlaa ni i lip waalpra'a.**

ô: la: ti: lip wâ:lpra=t=ka'

yes now INSENTANT self house-c=DISTAL.DEMONSTRATIVE

'Yes, they do have their own house now (over there).'
5. The contrasting case patterns

The enclitic case systems in Kwak’wala and Tsimshian do not express the same case patterns. Evidence of the development of the different systems can still be seen within the modern languages.

5.1. Kwak’wala case

Among the Wakashan languages, only Kwak’wala distinguishes core case for lexical nominals. The other North Wakashan languages show enclitics only before obliques. Boas notes, “[In Heiltsuk], nominal subject and object are defined by their position, the subject preceding the object” (1947: 298). No markers precede ‘the man’ or ‘the dog’ in (24). Only the oblique ‘binoculars’ is marked by an enclitic.

(24) Heiltsuk: Rath (1981: 1.85)
Dáduqvá  wismá-xi  wác’iá-xi  hi=s  dígdvía-xyi.
watch  man-DEM  dog-DEM  DEM=OBLIQUE  binocular-DEM
The man watched a dog with [OBLIQUE] binoculars.

In the Haisla sentence in (25), the core arguments ‘the king’ and ‘the bear’ are similarly unmarked for case.

Keta-th  hímas-axi  sak-axi.
shoot-FUTURE  king-DEFINITE.ABSENT  grizzly-DEFINITE.ABSENT
The king is going to shoot the grizzly bear.

The enclitic structure does not exist at all in the South Wakashan branch of the family. In the Nuuchahnulth sentence in (26), there is no marker of the syntactic function of the fog bag’ or ‘the wolf tribe’.

(26) Ahousaht Nuuchahnulth: Nakayama (2003b: 142), Caroline Little, speaker
sukwíiču  ŋucq’uštíi  q’úyuc’ikštuqumí,
sukwíiču  ŋucq’uštíi  q’úyuc’ikštuqumí,
take  fog-inside-DEFINITE  wolf-groups
take  the fog bag  wolf tribe
‘The wolf tribe took the fog bag
pu’n’ísəl’ə́!
pu-n’i-’səl’-ə́!
run.in.group-downslope-on.beach-PLURAL
and ran down the beach.’

The enclitic structure does not appear in the other South Wakashan languages, Nitinah and Makah, either. It can therefore not be reconstructed for Proto-Wakashan or even Proto-North Wakashan. It appears to be a comparatively recent development within Kwak’wala itself.

The forms of the Kwak’wala case markers are suggestive of their sources. The subject marker =da (perhaps with segmentable deictic element i according to Anderson (1992)) looks very much like the proximal deictic element da seen throughout the area. The Kwak’wala object markers, which all contain a uvalerelement =, look very much like distal demonstratives in all of the North Wakashan languages. Though Heiltsuk and Haisla to the north do not have grammatical object marking with lexical nominals, they do contain elaborate sets of demonstratives comparable to those in Kwak’wala, many based on uvalures.

(27) Heiltsuk: Rath (1981: 88)
wisem  ‘man’
qaúw=wisem=da=xí  ‘that man’ (‘over there, near neither you nor me’)

(28) Haisla: Bach (forthco)
genem  ‘woman’
genem=axí  ‘that woman’

It appears that the Kwak’wala subject marker developed from a proximal demonstrative (‘this’), and the object marker from a distal demonstrative (‘that’).
5.2. Tsimshianic case

The Tsimshianic enclitic systems show ergative-absolutive patterning. The development of this pattern can be traced to relatively recent changes within the family as well.

We know that one common route by which ergative systems can develop is through increased use of passivization (Chung 1976). When, for one reason or another, passives come to be used more frequently than actives, they may come to be interpreted as pragmatically unmarked, basic transitive constructions. Evidence of this phenomenon can be seen elsewhere in the Northwest Coast linguistic area (Mithun 2007). In the South Wakashan languages, the Chimakuan languages immediately to the south of them, and the neighboring Salishan languages immediately to the east, a tendency to cast first and second persons as subjects (points of departure of the clause) has crystallized into a grammatical requirement. Events in which a third person acts on a first or second person ('John annoyed me') can be expressed only with a passive construction ('I was annoyed (by John)'). The third person agent is often not mentioned at all ('I was annoyed'), but it may be mentioned in an oblique lexical nominal ('by John'), particularly if it is a specific, known, topewisorc participant.

If original passives with oblique agents are reinterpreted as basic transitives, the grammatical markers they contain are reinterpreted as well. The original oblique marker (such as 'by') can be reinterpreted as an ergative marker, identifying transitive agents. The original unmarked passive subject, a semantic patient, is reinterpreted as an unmarked absolutive (matching the subjects of intransitive clauses which remain unchanged). Original passive morphology associated with the verb ('was —ed') may simply be interpreted as meaningless, or it may be reinterpreted as a mark of transitivity.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{STAGE I} & \text{was} & \text{by John.} \\
\text{SUBJECT} & \text{PASSIVE} & \text{OBLIQUE} \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
\text{STAGE II} & \text{ABSOLUTIVE} & \text{TRANSITIVE} & \text{ERGATIVE}
\end{array}
\]

Two kinds of evidence suggest that just such a reanalysis took place in Tsimshianic. The modern ergative marker =s matches the oblique marker =s.

(29) Gitksan ergative =s: Hunt (1993: 19)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{hitmooyitg} \text{a} \\
\text{t} \text{t} \text{John} \\
\text{t} \text{Kathy} \text{John} \\
\text{apparently Kathy helped John.}
\end{array}
\]

Interestingly, in Interior Tsimshian, this ergative marking appears only with proper nominals. Identified by a marker t, proper nominals include personal names, independent personal pronouns, and demonstrative pronouns referring to people. These are exactly the kinds of agents that are more likely to be mentioned in passive constructions than less central less individuated or unidentified ones. The marker =s was generalized to all ergatives in the Maritime formal register, but it still matches the oblique =s there.

Furthermore, all transitive verbs in Interior Tsimshian carry a suffix -a, which intransitives lack. (The schwa, which can surface as -o or -i is preceded by an epenthetic glide y after vowels and is automatically lost before resonants.)

(30) Gitksan oblique =s: Rigsby (1986: 364)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Guk} \text{ari} \\
yixyugui'm \\
\text{ga} \text{ai} \\
\text{qa} \text{-q'ali} \\
yax-yukw-x' \text{m} \\
\text{qa} \text{=s} \\
\text{RDP-upstream} \\
\text{RDP-follow-I.PL} \\
\text{PREP=PROPER.OLIQUE} \\
\text{Joe} \\
\text{As we were going upstream to Joe's, [...]}
\end{array}
\]

This suffix is not a transiitzizer. It occurs in all transitive verbs, even when the roots are already transitive in meaning, like 'see' above and 'make' below.


a. Intransitive

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{bag} \text{nii'y} \\
\text{pax} \text{ni':y} \\
\text{run} \text{1SG.ABS} \\
\text{'I ran'}
\end{array}
\]

b. Transitive

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ga} \text{q'y} \\
\text{ka} \text{'-q'-y'} \\
\text{ni:n} \\
\text{see-TRANSITIVE-1SG.ERG} \\
\text{2SG.ABS} \\
\text{'I saw you'}
\end{array}
\]

This suffix is not a transiitzizer. It occurs in all transitive verbs, even when the roots are already transitive in meaning, like 'see' above and 'make' below.


\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Jabjit} \\
\text{cap} \text{-a-t} \\
\text{make-TRANSITIVE-3SG} \\
\text{She made it'}
\end{array}
\]

It appears even when a derivational transitivizer is present.
(33) Gitksan: Rigsby (1986: 344)  
_Didaa‘ whilj._  
ta: ‘wl=÷t  
TRANSITIVE-LEAVE-TRANSITIVE-3SG  
‘He took her away.’

The very different case patterns inherent in the Kwak’ala and Tsimshianic enclitic systems, each of which can be seen to have developed relatively recently within their families, provide further support for the hypothesis that it was the abstract demonstrative construction that was borrowed, along with a propensity for its use, rather than a fully developed enclitic system.

6. Differential entrenchment

Additional evidence that it was the rhetorical strategy that was borrowed comes from a comparison of the relative entrenchment of the modern enclitic patterns in the Wakashan and Tsimshianic families. As we saw in the previous section, within the Wakashan family, enclitics appear only in languages of the northern branch and only to a limited extent in those. The structure is most extensive in Kwak’ala, where enclitics precede all lexical nominals: subjects, objects, and obliques. In Heiltsuk and Haisla, enclitics appear only before obliques. The South Wakashan languages do not show the enclitic structure at all.

By contrast, the enclitic structure is well entrenched in Tsimshianic, appearing in all members of the family. Still, the systems are not identical. As noted earlier, the Tsimshianic languages fall into two groups: Maritime and Interior. Maritime Tsimshian consists of Tsimshian (also called Coast Tsimshian or Tsimshian Proper) and Southern Tsimshian (spoken at Klemtu). The two are mutually intelligible. Interior Tsimshian (or Nass-Gitksan) consists of Nisg̱a’a, also called Nass) and Gitksan. Nisg̱a’a and Gitksan are also mutually intelligible, but as Rigsby (1989) points out, their speakers consider themselves distinct politically and culturally and refer to their speech as separate languages. Grammatical descriptions of Tsimshian are in Boas (1911b), Dunn (1979b, 1991, 1995), Mulder (1987, 1988, 1994) and Stebbins (2003a, 2003b). Southern Tsimshian is described in Dunn (1979b, 1991, 1995) and Tarpent (1998). Grammatical descriptions of Nisg̱a’a are in Boas (1911a) and Tarpent (1987, 1989, 1991) and of Gitksan in Rigsby (1986) and Hunt (1993).

Maritime Tsimshian contains two enclitic systems: an elaborate one used in oratory and a simpler one used in everyday speech. Enclitics in this system distinguish ergative and absolutive case, common and proper nominals, and present, absent, or deictically unspecified referents. The enclitic system used in everyday speech is simpler. It shows the distinction between common and proper nouns, but not the deictic distinctions among present, absent, and unspecified referents. (The systems used in indicative and subjunctive clauses differ as well.)

The Interior enclitic system, like that of the Maritime everyday register, shows the common/proper distinction but no deictic distinctions. The enclitic =h/ [l] precedes common nominals in any core function.

(34) Gitksan common nouns: Rigsby (1986: 256, 261)

a. _Saa baxh [l] gat=gt._  
    sa: pax=÷l  
    off ran=COMMON man=DISTAL  
    ‘The man ran off.’

    lamo: ‘÷=l  
    lk ‘÷=÷l  
    luq-sm  
    help-TRANSITIVE=COMMON small-child=COMMON old-ATTR  
    ‘witagti  
    ‘wi:−kat=÷l  
    big-man=DISTAL  
    ‘The child helped the old man.’

The enclitics that precede proper nominals distinguish syntactic function. Proper nominals are preceded by an additional marker t. Absolutive case (as on ‘John’ and ‘Mary’ below) is unmarked.


a. _bax t John._  
    pax t John  
    run PROPER John  
    ‘John ran.’

b. _Hlimooyih hlgutk ‘ihl ‘whl t Mary._  
    lamo: ‘÷=÷t  
    lk ‘÷=÷l  
    Mary  
    help-TRANSITIVE=COMMON small-child PROPER Mary  
    ‘The child helped Mary.’

Ergative proper nominals are distinguished by the enclitic =s.

a. Sdtišs

\[
\text{stil-ω=-s} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{John} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{Peter}
\]

accompany-TRANSITIVE=PROPER.ERG PROPER John PROPER Peter

'John [ERGATIVE] accompanied Peter.'

b. Needit

gups

\[
\text{ne:-ti=-t} \quad \text{kaw-p=ω} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{Peter=½}
\]

not-CONTRASTIVE=3 eat=PROPER.ERG PROPER Peter=COMMON

susit.
susiti:
potato

'Peter [ERGATIVE] didn’t eat the potatoes.'

(Tarpent (1989) shows that the singular proper marker \( i \) is lost following this \( =s \) through phonological processes of consonant cluster reduction. The plural counterpart \( ti \) remains in place in the same context.)

The enclitics are not limited to marking core arguments. They appear before obliques and possessors. (Tarpent (p.c.) notes that instruments are more often identified in separate clauses in spontaneous speech.)

(37) Gitksan oblique: Rigsby (1986: 425)

Galxši nahlewii ahł t’uuts’xw.
galxša kaw-xw=ω =t’uuc’-xw

through stab-PASSIVE-TRANSITIVE=3 with=COMMON knife

'She stabbed him right through with a knife.'

(38) Gitksan possessor: Rigsby (1986: 396)

\[\text{anəa-ikw\text{¬}ux\text{¬}xw=½ c’uuc’} \]

container-child=COMMON bird

'bird’s nest'

They also link clauses to initial focused elements.

(39) Gitksan focus constructions: Hunt (1993: 21, 24)

a. t Peterhl si’mooitxwii’m.
t Peter=½ sim’o:kit-xw’-m’

PROPER Peter=COMMON chief-PASSIVE-1PL

'Peter is our chief.'

b. t Peterhl ga’as

t Peter=½ ka’ω=ω

PROPER Peter=COMMON see-TRANSITIVE=PROPER.ERG PROPER

John

John

John

'John saw Peter.'

They link relative clauses to their heads.

(40) Gitksan relative clause: Rigsby (1986: 404)

Dim nu’whl gathl bahagi

tim nu’w=½ kaw=½ pax-ual=ko

FUTURE die=COMMON man=COMMON run-SUBJECT.RELATIVE=DISTAL

'The man who ran will die.'

They even link clauses to certain initial tense and aspect markers. Presumably structures like the progressive below originated as complex sentences consisting of an initial motion predicate (the ancestor of the modern progressive marker) followed by a sentential complement.

(41) Gitksan aspect: Rigsby (1986: 275)

\[\text{yukwhl} \quad \text{maadim.} \]

\[\text{yukw=½ ma:tom} \]

PROGRESSIVE=COMMON falling.snow

'It is snowing.'

It is clear why Boas termed the enclitics ‘connectives’ rather than simply case markers; they mark general syntactic dependency.

The Wakashan and Tsimshianic languages thus differ from each other and among themselves in the degrees to which enclitic patterns have penetrated their grammars. This variation provides further evidence that what was transferred was not a single, fully-developed inflectional morphological system, but rather a rhetorical construction that served as a starting point for the development of the various inflectional systems in the modern languages.

7. The nature of the contact

In the best of all possible worlds, we would have detailed information concerning the nature of social relations and interaction among the various Wakashan
and Tsimshianic speaking peoples over the past millennia. Such information is of course lacking, as it is for most languages of the world. We do know of extensive multilingualism in recent times. We know that Southern Tsimshian has lost speakers to Heiltsuk, and that the last speaker of Southern Tsimshian also speaks both Heiltsuk and Coast Tsimshian (Tsimshian Proper). As early as 1916, Sapir hypothesized that certain morphological similarities such as reduplicative patterns and distributives "seem to be indicative of a much earlier contact of the Tsimshian with the Kwakiutl and Salish than with the Haida and Tlingit. Such contact need, of course, not have been in precisely the same territory as now occupied by the tribes, nor need their geographical relation have been quite the same" (1951: 450). Indeed, if their locations have remained largely unchanged, the fact that the two languages with the most fully developed enclitic systems (Kwak'ala and Maritime Tsimshian) are not spoken in contiguous areas adds further evidence that it was not the fully-formed enclitic systems themselves that were borrowed, but rather the rhetorical strategies that were their precursors.

The ethnographic accounts that do exist indicate that intense contact continued into recent times. We have descriptions of contacts between all of the adjacent communities. All mention intermarriage. Community locations at contact, shown earlier in Figure 2, are repeated below.

Describing marriage practices of the Tsimshian, Halpin and Seguin mention intermarriage with their neighbors to the south, the North Wakashan Haisla and Heiltsuk.

All marriages were supposed to be between social equals; the children of parents of unequal rank inherited rank no higher than that of the lower-ranked parent. The social distinction between the smiksiket 'real people' (singular smik ó:ket 'chief'), that is, the chiefly families, and the liq'akiket 'other people', that is those who had names of lesser rank, was maintained through intermarriage with other chiefly families, including those from Tsimshian-speaking as well as other language groups (Tlingit, Haida, Haisla, and Heiltsuk). (Halpin and Seguin 1990: 275–276)

Describing the Haisla, Hamori-Torok mentions intermarriage with the Tsimshian.

Culturally the Haisla were close to the Tsimshian, especially in technology and social organization. They were the only Wakashan-speaking people with a fully-developed matrilineal clan system. On the other hand, like other Northern Wakashans, they had a well-developed set of secret societies. Their clan system was almost certainly Tsimshian in origin, just as the Tsimshian secret societies were probably largely Haisla in origin. (Hamori-Torok 1990: 306)

Hilton reports that the groups to the south of the Haisla, the Heiltsuk Haihais and Bella Bella, married their Haisla and Tsimshian neighbors.

The Haihais gained access to resources through intermarriage and trade with the Kitasoo Tsimshian [Southern Tsimshian now at Kelmtu] and Haisla... For the Haihais and Bella Bella, the crest groups were the counterpart of the exogamous matrilineal clans of the tribes to the north. Their names were similar, and their existence no doubt made intermarriage more acceptable to the northerners. (Hilton 1990: 314, 317)

In her description of the Kwakiutl (Kwak'ala speakers), the southernmost of the North Wakashans, Codere mentions intermarriage with all of their neighbors to the north.
The most dependable of such relations [friendly relations] existed with the Haisla, Haihais, Bella Bella, Oowekeeno, and Nootkans. Communication with the Haisla and Bella Bella was mostly of a social and ceremonial character and included intermarriage. (Codere 1990: 360)

Such marriages would certainly have produced bilinguals capable of replicating rhetorical constructions from one language in another.

Up into recent times there was contact of another kind that could be pertinent for the transfer of the demonstrative construction that concerns us here. There is evidence of substantial borrowing of ceremonies from the North Wakashans by the Tsimshians.

The secret society dances were apparently borrowed [by the Tsimshian] from the Haisla and Heiltsuk-speaking people just before contact with Europeans; they were most fully expressed among the Southern Tsimshian, who obtained them directly from the Heiltsuk speakers, and had only partially been received by the other divisions. Most of the names for the dancers are Northern Wakashan in origin. (Halpin and Seguin 1990: 279)

These traditions were passed to the Interior Tsimshian groups, the Nishga and Gitksan, along with the ceremonial language that was an integral part of them.

Many Nishga and Gitksan people once spoke Coast Tsimshian [in addition to their own languages], which was more prestigious, especially for ceremonial purposes. (Halpin and Seguin 1990: 267)

Heiltsuk ceremonies were apparently passed southward to the Kwakiutl as well.

The other Northern Wakashan peoples, especially the Bella Bella and Oowekeeno, seem to have been the sources for many ceremonial concepts. The Kwakiutl themselves recognize these groups as the source of many of their privileges and in fact customarily insert words and phrases from the northern languages into their dance songs. The influence of the Kwakiutl and the other Northern Wakashans has been far-reaching in the ceremonial life of the coast. The Winter ceremony performances of the Haida, Tingit, and Tsimshian have been strongly influenced if not derived from the dances of the Haisla and Bella Bella, a diffusion most clearly demonstrated by the northern use of Wakashan terms for figures that resemble those in Bella Bella and Kwakiutl ceremonial systems. (Holm 1990: 385-386)

It thus appears that many ceremonial traditions originated with the North Wakashan Heiltsuk, who passed them northward to Haisla and Tsimshian speakers, and southward to Kwak’wala speakers. Tarpent (2000) points out that influence from Heiltsuk and Haisla on Tsimshian can be seen in lexical borrowing but not the reverse. Among the North Wakashan terms borrowed into Tsimshian she cites names of secret societies, chiefly names, and legendary names. The transfer of ceremonies, along with the associated oratory, would also be an obvious vehicle for the transfer of rhetorical constructions, especially of the type seen here, and particularly in the context of substantial bilingualism. It is perhaps significant that Maritime Tsimshian, spoken closest to the North Wakashans, contains an additional more elaborate enclitic system used for formal oratory. Of course in the absence of detailed written records from pre-contact times, it is not possible to know just how ancient such contact is, nor how the timing of the transfer of ceremonies might correlate with the transfer of demonstratives or of the conventionalized demonstrative construction.

8. Conclusion

The rise and development of a multi-phrasal construction, complete with its prosodic structure and discourse uses, provides an explanation of an apparent structural anomaly in some languages of the Northwest Coast of North America. Two languages, genetically unrelated but spoken within a well-known linguistic area, show neither classical head-marking nor classical dependent marking. Their seemingly arbitrary marking pattern makes sense, however, once we uncover a rhetorical construction from which it could have developed. An understanding of the series of processes involved in the evolution of the construction over time also helps us to explain the simultaneous presence of this unusual structure in the two languages. The enclitic structure itself was probably not borrowed after all. It was apparently the precursor to its development that was borrowed, the multi-phrasal demonstrative construction.

Many languages indigenous to the Northwest Coast of North America, as elsewhere, contain a special rhetorical construction that is exploited for manipulating the flow of information. The construction consists of one prosodic phrase containing a predicate and a demonstrative, followed by a pause and a second prosodic phrase containing a larger, co-referential referring expression. The predicate in the first phrase presents the skeleton of the clause. The demonstrative provides a signal that an argument will be identified in further detail in the following prosodic phrase. It would be a simple matter for bilingual speakers to carry such a construction from one language to another, exploiting comparable grammatical units (initial holophrastic predicates and demonstratives) already present in the target language. It would also be a simple matter for bilinguals to carry heavy exploitation of the construction from one language to the other.

We know that longstanding conditions of intermarriage and bilingualism were present on the Northwest Coast to set the stage for such transfer. There is
also ample evidence of the transfer of ceremonies among these groups, along with the associated oratory. The transfer of ceremonial speeches would be an excellent vehicle for the transfer of certain stylistic constructions used particularly often in them, and for an increase in their use. The use of such constructions might even come to be admired as characteristic of superior speech. In this case, we have substantial evidence that the parallelism in linguistic structure came about through the borrowing of a rhetorical construction rather than any fully developed inflectional enclitic structure. The modern languages differ in the extent to which the enclitic structures have developed, both through the families and through the individual languages. Within the Wakashan family in the center of the area, the probable point of origin of the ceremonies, the Haisla and Heiltsuk enclitics are used only before obliques. To the south, in Kwak'wala, enclitics mark subjects, objects, and obliques. To the north, in the Tsimshianic family, enclitics mark not only all arguments, but also serve as general markers of syntactic dependency. The enclitic systems also differ in the nature of the categories they mark. The Kwak'wala enclitics distinguish subjects and objects, while the Tsimshianic enclitics distinguish ergatives and absolutes. All of these details become explicable once we focus on the demonstrative construction as the object transferred and the source of development of the modern systems.

Notes

* I am grateful to Jean Mulder, Bruce Rigsby, and Marie-Lucie Tarpent, all of whom have had extensive experience working with Tsimshianic languages, for their help. The time they spent in reading earlier drafts of this work and their generosity in sharing their expertise are very much appreciated. Their comments have proven invaluable. Geert Booij has also contributed helpful comments.
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