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Salishan, Chimakuan, and Wakashan languages show a remarkable degree of structural similarity, apparently the result of millennia of language contact and grammatical diffusion. Within this Central Northwest group of languages, the Salishan Bella Coola (Nuxalk) stands out in that it appears to have undergone a series of additional changes away from typically Salishan features towards structures and grammatical patterns more characteristic of the nearby Northern Wakashan languages. The types of changes in Bella Coola that have taken place under Wakashan influence are of particular interest because of the ways in which these have led both to increasing grammatical similarities between Bella Coola and its neighbours and to the emergence of innovative grammatical systems. In this last respect, Bella Coola is of particular interest for models of language contact in that it shows how grammatical convergence can lead, paradoxically, to linguistic diversity.

1 Grammatical approximation in Bella Coola and North Wakashan

The Pacific Northwest of North America is home to one of the most geographically extensive Sprachbunds in the world, stretching from the north of California to southern Alaska and extending at its widest point as far east as the Rocky Mountains of Alberta and Montana. Within this area is found a diverse set of languages belonging to a wide range of families and phyla which resemble each other in typological terms to a remarkable degree. A particularly cohesive set of languages within the larger Northwest Coast language area is the Central Northwest group of languages (see Map 1), made up of the Salishan, Chimakuan, and Wakashan families. The typological similarities among the languages of these three families are so striking that they have been used as an argument for a common genetic origin; the evidence for this putative Mosan phylum, however, is far from convincing (see, for example, Beck 1997) and it seems far more likely that the typological similarities within the Central Northwest group are instead the result of millennia of language contact. Unfortunately, while extensive trade, intermarriage, and bilingualism in the region seem likely, we can only speculate about the extent and the nature of the contact between the various language groups in prehistoric times. In order to fully understand the dynamics of language contact and linguistic diffusion in the area, it is necessary to find examples of substantial grammatical approximation within the Central Northwest language area which have taken place at a manageable time-depth and which might allow us to build a model of language interaction that reflects one type of contact situation found in the NWC Sprachbund as a whole.

One such case is that of Bella Coola (Nuxalk), the most northerly of the coastal Salish languages, which shows substantial grammatical approximation to the nearby North Wakashan languages Haisla, Heiltsuk, Oowekyala, and K'ak'ala. In its modern range, Bella Coola is completely cut off from its relatives, being bounded on three sides by Haisla, Heiltsuk, and Oowekyala, and to the east by two languages of the Athapaskan family, Carrier and Chilcotin. In the “traditional” scenario (e.g. Thompson and Kinkade 1990), the Bella Coola occupied the northern end of a coastal Salishan continuum and became separated from the remainder of the Salishan languages early on by intruding Wakashan peoples moving eastward from the north of Vancouver Island. A more novel hypothesis is put forward by Lane (1990), who reports that the Chilcotin believe the Bella Coola to be the original inhabitants of at least the western portion of the present-day Chilcotin range, in the headwaters of the rivers whose mouths and fjords constitute the
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modern Bella Coola territory. This suggests that the Bella Coola might have arrived at their present location from the Inland Plateau, having broken off earlier from the main Salishan group in the Fraser Valley and initially moved inland. Kinkade (1991a) offers some evidence for this hypothesis based on patterns of lexical cognates, particularly for flora and fauna, found within the Salishan languages themselves and from patterns of lexical borrowing from Wakashan into Bella Coola. These loans are reported by Jacobsen (1979a, citing Newman 1974 and Nater 1974) to be primarily of the direction Wakashan > Bella Coola and to largely concern maritime items.

Whether or not the Bella Coola came to their present location overland or as an extension of a Salish continuum along the coast, the fact remains that their separation from congener languages is ancient and predates the separation of the main body of Salish into its Central (Coastal) and Interior branches, which Kinkade (1991a) puts conservatively somewhere between 3000 and 1500 years B.P. It also seems to be the case, judging by the nature and direction of the lexical borrowings, that the Bella Coola adapted themselves culturally to their Wakashan neighbors, although it remains to be seen whether this is a case of an Interior or Plateau people adapting to an established maritime culture or a case of a people adapted to the exploitation of the protected Inner Coast area coming under the influence of a culture suited to life on the open ocean. Whatever the case, according to McIlwraith (1948:19), the Bella Coola held the Wakashan in some esteem and admired their superior knowledge of ceremonial lore and rituals (see also Newman 1974). The Bella Coola had especially close relations with the Heiltsuk and the Oowekeeno (speakers of Oowekyala) and believe many of their rites to have originated with the Wakashan peoples, particularly the Heiltsuk; McIlwraith reports intimate contact, including trade and intermarriage, between the two groups:

At Q'wain, the nearest [Heiltsuk] settlement, so many of the people spoke Bella Coola that it was practically bilingual. There had been so many intermarriages for generations that the people were not considered foreigners; in fact, Boas includes it among the Bella Coola villages. [McIlwraith 1948:19]

The situation reported at Q'wain, located downriver from the main Bella Coola settlements, resembles a pattern reported by Jacobs (1937) for the Washington-Oregon coast whereby inland cultures were drawn seaward along river valleys by the prospect of trade and inter-marriage with richer maritime communities. In the initial phases of this downriver migration, the inland culture had strong motivation for being fluently bilingual, which became the ordinary pattern in communities on the boundaries between the two language groups as these areas were occupied by people moving in from upriver. Frequently, where the inland culture was numerically superior, the settlements on the border zones shifted entirely to the language of the newcomers, and the next villages downriver became the bilingual interface settlements. In a number of cases, this process resulted in the complete supplantation of the downriver language. While it seems unlikely that the Heiltsuk as a whole were in any danger of being supplanted by the Bella Coola, Jacobs' model of language contact does seem to be consistent with what we know about conditions at Q'wain, which may well have been the result of increasing numbers of Bella Coola moving into the area seeking prestigious marriages and trade advantages and, in the initial stages, adapting themselves linguistically to the Heiltsuk. On the whole, Bakker & Grant (1996: 1145) note that while there was some bilateral bilingualism, it was more common for the Bella Coola to learn Heiltsuk than the other way around. The relative unidirectionality of the lexical borrowing reported by Newman (1974) and Nater (1974), like the Bella Coola perception of the neighboring cultures as prestigious, seems consistent with this type of contact situation, which fosters extensive bilingualism and frequent cultural and economic exchange, key factors in the spread of linguistic patterns.²

Linguistically, the net result of the intimate contact between the Bella Coola and their Wakashan neighbours has been a process whereby Bella Coola has undergone a series of changes away from typically Salishan features towards structures and grammatical patterns more typical of the nearby Wakashan

---

1 An identifiable difference in culture-complexes associated with the two types of habitat—maritime vs. inner coast—extends back at least to the first century AD, although it is impossible to identify either of these complexes with a specific language group (Holbin 1990).

2 In addition to being largely unidirectional, the lexical borrowing in Bella Coola was also extensive. According to Nater (1984), "some 30% of the Bella Coola roots and stems with etymological counterparts in other Amerindian tongues are of Wakashan origin" (p. xvii).
languages. Even in the absence of written records of the original Bella Coola language, the grammatical shifts which have taken place may be detectable by comparing the modern form of Bella Coola with other Salish languages: at least in those cases where the shift has set Bella Coola apart from other members of the family, it may be possible to use such comparisons to enumerate the extent and the types of changes that have taken place under Wakashan influence. This comparison may then allow us to infer the processes which have led to the divergent features observed in Bella Coola and, in turn, to exemplify those at work in the NWC Sprachbund as a whole. In some cases, particularly in the order of nominal actants in the matrix clause, the outcome of linguistic contact has been the grammatical convergence of Bella Coola with Northern Wakashan, whereas in other cases—most notably in the area of person-marking—the result has been the creation of a uniquely Bella Coola grammatical pattern. In this respect, the Bella Coola situation is of particular interest for models of language contact and grammatical diffusion in that it shows how the process of language convergence can lead, somewhat paradoxically, to linguistic diversity.

1.1 Actant order

The unmarked word order for the matrix clause in Central Northwest languages tends to be VSO. Naturally, the rigidity with which a predominant word-order is followed varies from language to language and within the Salishan family some variation is observed, most commonly in the direction of VOS. At least occasional VSO/VOS alternation is reported for Shuswap (Kuipers 1974:77), Squamish (Kuipers 1967:169), Halkomelem (Hukari et al. 1977), and Lillooet (Roberts 1994)—in fact, in Lillooet there is some debate as to what the unmarked word-order really is, with van Eijk (1995) claiming VOS and Davis (1996) reporting the predominance of VSO and the emergence in at least one dialect (possibly under English influence) of SVO. Of all the Salishan languages, Bella Coola most rigidly holds to the VSO word-order and uses it as an interpretive device to identify subject and object—the leftmost of two NPs being the subject (Davis and Saunders 1997:31). Similarly, in Halkomelem, a strict subject-object-oblique order of NP actants is also observed, and in clauses with both third-person NP subjects and objects, the constituent-order in Halkomelem appears to be rigid and to carry interpretive weight (Rath 1981:85). The same is true for Kwakala (Boas 1969:529; Levine 1977) and this may hold of Northern Wakashan in general. On the other hand, rather than using word order to mark the syntactic roles of third-person subjects and objects, Salishan languages tend to use a process of topical NP-deletion in transitive clauses, leaving at most a single non-oblique actant whose syntactic role is then determined by the type of morphology carried on the verb (Kinkade 1990).

Many Salish languages allow not only for SO/OS alternations, but also allow variation in the relative order of direct and indirect (oblique) complements of verbs. In Lushootseed, for instance, oblique NPs, particularly agents of passives, quite freely precede direct objects, as in (1).²

\begin{verbatim}
Lushootseed (S)

(1) ?uʔusi+s+əb ti cičiʔx ti sʔulax’ʷ
PNT+divc+APPL+MD PR D fish:hawk D salmon
‘the fish hawk dove after a salmon’
(lit. ‘the salmon was dove after by the fish-hawk’)
\end{verbatim}

²In Lushootseed (Hess 1993; Beck 1996a, to appear b) and possibly in Okanagan (Mattina 1996:31), this deletion process has been grammaticalized to the point that syntactic subjects are obligatorily removed from transitive clauses; the identity of elided subjects is recoverable from their identification with the discourse topic (Kinkade 1990). Kinkade (1983:32) suggests that Lushootseed and Okanagan are conservative in this respect and that two-NP clauses have come into Salish under English influence. For Ksyuquot (Southern Wakashan) Rose (1981:38) notes that transitive verbs with a single NP are ambiguous as to whether the NP represents the subject or object. This is rarely the case in a contextualized Salish sentence.

³The abbreviations used here are: = = sentence-second clitic; 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; ADD = additive; APPL = applicative; AUX = auxiliary; C-C = contrastive-conjunctive; CAUS = causative; CONT = continuous; D = deictic; DIM = diminutive; DIR = directive; DP = derivational prefix; DUB = dubitative; EROG = ergative; EVID = evidential; EXP = expectative; f = feminine; FIN = finite; HAB = habitual; INCH = inchoative; IND = indicative; INT = interrogative; IRR = irealis; MD = middle; MOM = momentaneous; NP = nominalizer; NWC = Northwest Coast; OBJ = (direct) object; OBL = oblique object; P = plural; PASS = passive; PERF = perfective; PNT = punctual; PO = possessive; PR = preposition; PROX = proximal; QT = quotative; RDP = reduplication; REFL = reflexive; S = singular; SUBJ = subject; STAT = stative; TNS = tense; TO = topical or old information; TR = transitivizer; TRM = transmutative; VSO = Verb-Subject-Object. Wherever possible, examples have been standardized in an Americanist IPA, in some cases departing from the orthography in the original sources.
In Lushootseed, indirect or oblique complements are contained within prepositional phrases; in the Interior language Thompson, oblique complements are introduced by a special deictic, te, as in (2):

\[
\text{Thompson (S)} \quad \text{shaded+eye+PASS} \quad \text{D}_{\text{obl}} \quad \text{uncontrolled:clouding} \quad \text{D}_{\text{direct}} \quad \text{sun}
\]

'a cloud covered the sun'  
(lit. 'the sun was covered by a cloud')

According to Thompson et al. (1996), the normal order in this language is for oblique complements to follow direct complements, the reverse order being considered slightly emphatic. Such variation, however, does not seem to be permitted in the Northern Wakashan languages Heiltsuk and K'wa', nor is it attested in Bella Coola. In both Bella Coola and Heiltsuk, oblique actants are contained within prepositional phrases which appear clause-finally, as in (3):

\[
\text{Bella Coola (S)} \quad \text{hit}+3S:3S \quad \text{D}+\text{man}+\text{D} \quad \text{D}+\text{thief}+\text{D} \quad \text{PR}+\text{D}+\text{stick}+\text{D}
\]

'\text{the man struck the thief with a stick}'

(Davis & Saunders 1997:31)

\[
\text{Heiltsuk (W)} \quad \text{watch} \quad \text{man}+\text{D}+\text{D}_1 \quad \text{dog}+\text{D}+\text{D}_2 \quad \text{PR} \quad \text{binoculars}+\text{D}_1+\text{D}_2
\]

'\text{the man watches the dog with the binoculars}'

(based on Rath 1981:85)

In this sense, Bella Coola is less like other Salish languages than it is like Northern Wakashan in that the order of actants in the matrix clause appears to be fixed, subject preceding direct object and direct object preceding obliques.

1.2 Predicate modifiers and auxiliaries

Another interesting feature of word-order in Bella Coola is the virtual abandonment of two important Central Northwest areal features—namely, the use of the sentence-initial adverbial particle and the sentence-second clitic. Both of these innovations are tied to an overall shift in the Bella Coola strategy of predicate-modification away from the dual system of pre-predicate particle and predicate enclitics typical of Central Northwest languages in general towards a more restricted system making use only of sentence-second enclitics, a strategy that seems overall to be the preferred one in Wakashan. This grammatical change in Bella Coola is a clear example of what Heath (1978) referred to as indirect diffusion, given that it involves the adoption of a grammatical pattern of one language by another without the actual transmission of a substantial number of actual morphemes (a handful of possible cognates are discussed in Nater 1987).

In Salishan languages other than Bella Coola, pre-predicate adverbs are a common method of modifying sentence predicates, and many Salish languages possess a substantial closed-class of lexical items expressing a range of meanings similar to those shown for the Lushootseed elements in table 1. For Shuswap, Kuipers (1974:73–74) lists about twenty adverbs with similar meanings, while the 2,800 Saanich word list in Montler (1991:53–54) contains about a dozen words with glosses similar to the adverbials listed in table 1. According to Vogt (1940:73–75), there are a "great number" of adverbial particles in Kalispel, although he lists only eighteen of these. In Lillooet, van Eijk (1997:231) lists around the same number of pre-predicate elements under the heading of 'auxiliaries', although it is not clear that they differ substantially from the Lushootseed or the Shuswap elements in either semantic range or syntactic
properties. Kuipers (1967:165) claims that there are only eight adverbial particles in Squamish, but then goes on to explain that most adverbial meanings are carried by intransitive verbs, which may indicate that Squamish has developed a system of (sentence-initial) verbal or verb-like auxiliaries with a predicate-modifying function.

Table 1. Lushootseed adverbial particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baₖʷ</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coₜ₁</td>
<td>previously, in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cukʷ/cugʷ</td>
<td>only, uniquely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dayʲ</td>
<td>only, uniquely, completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʷahawʷ</td>
<td>it seems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haʔkʷ/hagʷ</td>
<td>ago, long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haʔ</td>
<td>well, good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ha)laʔab</td>
<td>really, a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cickʷ/cay</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ckʷaqid</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daʔxʷ/daw</td>
<td>just now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʷ’aʔxʷ</td>
<td>eventually, soon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hess 1993:114–15)

When adverbial particles appear in a clause they attract person and other enclitic morphology. In the Lushootseed sentence in (4a), for instance, the presence of ckʷaqid ‘always’ triggers the fronting of the clitic =sixʷ (expressing contempt on the part of the speaker), while in (4b) the adverb dayʷ ‘completely’ attracts both =sixʷ and =awa, which expresses surprise:

(4a) Lushootseed (S)  
ckʷaqid=sixʷ  xʷ-ul  ṭiʔ?aʔ  qaʔqeqʷ  
always=CONTEMPT  just  PNT+eat  D  raven  
‘Raven is always just stuffing his face’

(4b) dayʷ+axʷ=awa=sixʷ  ṭiʔ?aʔ  qaʔqeqˢ  
completely+now=SURPRISE=CONTEMPT  PNT+bad+TRM  D  raven  
‘Raven really stuck his foot in it this time’

(Hess 1993:116)

While Hess (1993) does not enumerate the full range of enclitic “predicate particles” in Lushootseed, he characterizes them as expressing speaker attitudes and various grammatical categories. Montler (1986:200–222) lists fifteen such elements for Saanich, and van Eijk (1997:199–206) gives about the same number for Lillooet; in both these languages, the semantic range of post-predicate morphemes differs from that of pre-predicate adverbials and auxiliaries in that the enclitics tend to have either grammatical meanings dealing with “modal-aspectual notions” (van Eijk 1997:199), to express “the speaker’s subjective relationship to the propositional content of the sentence” (Montler 1986:200), or to do both. In all three of these languages, enclitics include evidentials, the interrogative (yes-no question) marker, and no more than one or two whose meanings approximate those of English lexical adverbs or the Lushootseed particles listed in table 1. In Squamish, Kuipers (1967) lists only a single predicate suffix with an adverbial meaning (-xʷ ‘still, yet’) and, other than intransitive pronouns, Thompson et al. (1996:631) list...
only seven predicate enclitics in Thompson Salish, none of which have adverbal meanings. Enclitic or suffixal morphemes with adverbal meanings are not mentioned at all in the grammars of Shuswap (Kuipers 1974) or Kalispel (Vogt 1940), nor are any adverbs listed as affixes (as opposed to having lexical entries) in the Upper Chehalis dictionary (Kinkade 1991b).

In contrast to the rather restricted numbers of enclitics found in Salishan languages, in Wakashan predicate enclitics seem to be the preferred strategy for adverbial modification. In these languages enclitics are a little harder to differentiate from verbal affixes in that they frequently appear directly affixed to verb-stem as if they were ordinary suffixes and show little phonological differentiation from them. Traditionally, Wakashan studies distinguish two types of post-predicate morpheme called variously "formativ" vs. "incremental" (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:236), "stem" vs. "word" suffixes (Boas 1969:448), or "Category A" vs. "Category B" suffixes (Rath 1981:67). The most obvious difference between the two classes of morpheme is their behavior in the presence of sentence-initial adverbs or auxiliaries. Here, formative or stem suffixes remain associated with the main predicate of the clause, whereas incremental or word suffixes show clitic-like behavior and migrate—along with person-marking morphology—to sentence-second position. In the Nootka examples in Jacobsen (1993) and Nakayama (1996), for instance, the momentaneous and durative aspect-suffixes appear in morphological slots closely associated with the verb stem and resist movement to sentence-second position, whereas person-markers appear as enclitics on pre-predicate particles, as in (5):

\[
\text{Nootka (W)} \\
1\alpha h=\text{?at}=0 \text{ ciq}+\text{?i}+\text{?a} \lambda \text{ haa}\text{wi}\lambda+\text{?is}+\text{?i} \\
\text{then}=\text{FIN}=3s \text{ speak}+\text{MOM}+\text{FIN} \text{ young:man}+\text{DIM}+\text{D} \\
\text{then the little young man spoke up'}
\]

(Jacobsen 1993:243)

A similar pattern is found in Makah,

\[
\text{Makah (W)} \\
\text{?aabeyu}=0=s \text{ ba}+\text{ci}+\text{?it} \\
\text{yesterday}=\text{IND}=1s \text{ bite}+\text{MOM}+\text{PASS} \text{ dog}+\text{D} \\
\text{yesterday the dog bit me'}
\]

(Jacobsen 1979c:132)

Unlike Salishan languages, where predicate enclitics seem typically to number in the teens, enclitics in Wakashan constitute a large and varied class of morphemes. In K'vakwala, for instance, Boas (1969:451–52) offers a list of fifty-two "word-suffixes," divided into three classes—thirty-nine adverbial (e.g. =cslaak 'V' 'apparently', =wiisla 'very', =ca 'indeed', =l 'QUOTATIVE'), five adjectival (e.g. =o0 'small'), =qa 'woman'), and eight miscellaneous (e.g. =stana 'to die of', =sqamft 'mask'). In Heiltsuk, Rath lists thirty-three "Category B suffixes," including those in table 2. Each of these Heiltsuk affixes has a number of allomorphs and, often, more than one gloss; I have given only the most complex form and the most relevant meaning for each morpheme (a practice I follow for other Heiltsuk paradigms given below). While not all of the meanings expressed here are adverbial, many bear close comparison to the meanings of the Lushootseed adverbial particles shown in table 1. The use of pre-predicate adverbs in Wakashan, on the other hand, seems to be somewhat less robust than in Salish languages. Among the southern Wakashan languages, Jacobsen (1979c:131) lists only four Makah adverbial particles—hua\text{\textit{x}i} 'still', yuq'aa 'yet', ?aabeyu 'yesterday,' and ?a\text{\textit{c}i}ya\text{\textit{a}} 'two days'—although there is no indication of how many more there might be. For Kyuquot, Rose (1981:54) lists nine pre-predicate "qualifiers" which attract enclitic morphology, and the brief Nitinaht texts in Sapir (1924), Haas and Swadesh (1932), and Touchie (1977) contain few, if any, examples of pre-predicate particles. In the Northern Wakashan, K'vakwala, according to Boas, "The only independent adverbs that do not take verbal forms [i.e. verbal stem-suffixes—DB] ... are \text{\textit{laaq}} ALMOST, and the numeral adverbs with the suffix -\text{"pk\text{\text{\textit{en}}}"} (1969: 550). The text at the end of Boas (1969) contains no good candidates for pre-predicate particles other than an element \text{\textit{laa}}?\text{\textit{aee}} 'then

---

5 As noted by an anonymous reviewer, there is another class of morphemes in Thompson with adverbal meanings such as 'still' and 'also'; these rarely appear in front of the verb.
it is said’ (analyzed as ‘go+QTV’), which begins virtually every sentence in the text; Levine analyzes what is almost certainly the same element, *laʔam-*, glossed as ‘go+word+TOP’, as an auxiliary which “identifies a new or changed state of affairs from what went on previously” (1977:105).6

Table 2. Heiltsuk predicate enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=kwaem</td>
<td>perhaps, possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=aaila</td>
<td>PERFECTIVE; thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kwaat</td>
<td>long ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kwaat</td>
<td>reason, cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kwi</td>
<td>simply, merely, just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=la</td>
<td>of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=aai</td>
<td>(RECENT) PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=æk</td>
<td>sort of, more or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=aaila</td>
<td>PERFECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=xent</td>
<td>apparently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rath 1981:70-73)

In the Oowekyala texts in Hilton and Rath (1982) and the Heiltsuk texts in Boas (1928) there is also occasional use of an introductory narrative element, *walaʔle* ‘then’, although by and large the counterpart to the K’akʷala *láaʔlaee* is the particle *kʰi* ‘then’ which appears to be an interjection and does not trigger sentence-second fronting of clitics. Rath (1981) offers the following list of Heiltsuk elements which occur in pre-predicate position without the use of an overt subordinator (the adjunct-marker =s):

Table 3. Heiltsuk pre-predicate morphemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ailmiri</td>
<td>still, yet still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akʰ</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qʰát</td>
<td>stop, finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qʰoyála</td>
<td>regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iuxwa</td>
<td>almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haelsla</td>
<td>on the verge of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ks</td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kus</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mensít</td>
<td>try, attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riuxʰa</td>
<td>if, when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qʰenriʰ</td>
<td>often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa</td>
<td>connective mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wakʰ</td>
<td>supposedly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rath 1981:102)

Of these fifteen, four have an obvious subordinating or coordinating function (k- ‘and’, la ‘LOCATIVE’, nixoʰ ‘if, when’, wa ‘CONNECTIVE MOOD’) and two (*ks ‘NEGATIVE IMPERATIVE’ and kus ‘NEGATIVE’) are negative grammatical morphemes which, as noted by Boas (1940), are clause-initial in most if not all of the Central Northwest and neighboring languages. At least three of the remaining morphemes (*qʰat ‘stop,

6 On this note, Bella Cool narrative text is peppered with clauses introduced by the verb *ay ‘do’ followed by a nominalized clause denoting an event, as in

Bella Coola (S)

(i) *Ąay+naw x+iči* s+ʔal+iči+nit s+knix+nit
do+3P when NP+STAT+FOCAL+3P NP+eat+3P:3P
‘they roasted them then and ate them’

(Davis and Saunders 1980:62, line 39)

This seems reminiscent of the K’akʷala use of the auxiliary *la- to connect narrative texts, described in more detail in Black (1994).
finish', haélsá 'on the verge of', and mensít 'try, attempt') appear from their lexical entries in Rath's dictionary to be verbal auxiliaries, leaving six good candidates for pre-predicate adverbial particles.7

Whereas Wakashan and most Salishan languages make some use of both pre-predicate adverbs and enclitics to modify sentence predicates, Bella Coola has abandoned the pre-predicate particle as a means of predicate modification altogether in favor of post-predicate clitics, as in (7):

**Bella Coola (S)**

(7) q'als+am+σ=k?it=alu=tu=ci=k
hemlock:needles+INCH+3S=QTV=C-C=almost=now=PERF=C-C

'and now [it is said] he really almost became hemlock needles'

(Nater 1984:131)

Like Wakashan predicate enclitics, these morphemes include a wide range of evidential, adverbial, and other meanings, although like Salish enclitics they cluster at the end of the verb, following the person morphology. The glosses given for these morphemes vary from author to author, but their semantic range includes both a number of grammatical categories and various adverbial meanings that are expressed by pre-verbal elements in a number of other Salishan languages. A sample of Bella Coola enclitics, taken largely from Nater (1984), is given in table 4:

**Table 4. Bella Coola predicate enclitics**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=ma</td>
<td>maybe, possibly</td>
<td>=ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=mas</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>=k&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=tu</td>
<td>really, indeed</td>
<td>=alu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=tuu</td>
<td>just, exactly, even</td>
<td>=?it ... =k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ck(i)</td>
<td>it would seem</td>
<td>=ks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=c(n)</td>
<td>now, already</td>
<td>=kuks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=c(kw)</td>
<td>if only</td>
<td>=luks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=su</td>
<td>surprise!</td>
<td>=?ičk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=lu</td>
<td>still, yet</td>
<td>=?itk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kuw</td>
<td>quotative</td>
<td>=?isu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=atu</td>
<td>unrealized</td>
<td>=?i̱tu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these bear semantic/functional comparison to the Lushootseed adverbial particles in table 1—cf. =ma 'maybe, possibly' and x'wa?ola? 'maybe, perhaps', =mas 'always' and ck'agid 'always', =tu 'really, indeed' and put 'very much, indeed', =tuu 'just, exactly, even' and x'al 'just that, nothing else', =cki 'it would seem and g'ahaw?o 'it seems', =kuw 'suddenly, unexpectedly' and tuw" 'contrary to

7 Rath (1981) also makes reference to a larger set of pre-predicate elements that do require the subordinating-suffix and states that these refer to "mental and physical qualities, including, colors, shapes, professions, habits" (p. 102). It is difficult to see, however, how words of this sort can be used as adverbial modifiers of predicates with ordinary verbal meanings. What Rath may have in mind are attributive modifiers of nominal predicates, as in (i):

**Heliltsuk (W)**

(i) cākahkanem=menca= wïs’em
dark:skinned=DUB=1P:INCLUSIVE=ADJUNCT man

'we may [be] dark-skinned men'

(lit. 'we [are] probably dark-skinned man')

(Rath 1981:143)

Such elements seem best considered to be adjectives modifying nominal predicates rather than pre-verbal adverbs. There are, however, other elements which require =s that seem to have adverbial uses, although Rath does not give a list of these.

8The contrastive-conjunctive here is a discontinuous morpheme, consisting of the clitics =?it and =k.
expectation'. In total, Nater lists thirty-three predicate enclitics, a number more comparable to those found in Heiltsuk and Kwakwala than to those typical of Salish.

An important consequence of the abandonment of the pre-predicate adverbial in Bella Coola has been the virtual loss of the clitic vs. suffix distinction which is so salient in other Central Northwest languages: given that predicate-modifiers are no longer particles and that Bella Coola has no true auxiliaries, this means that there are no longer any pre-predicate landing sites for clitics. Sentence-second position is, in fact, the one immediately following the matrix verb. The single environment in which clitics can still be identified as such is in the presence of the negative ?aX", the only adverbial element in the language that is eligible to occupy sentence-initial position:

Bella Coola (S)
(8a) ?aX" ?it+nuAalk+mx+aylayx+s ti+?imlk+tayx
NEG speak+Bella: Coola+populace+LC+3S D+man+D
'this man doesn't speak Bella Coola'

(8b) ?it+nuAalk+mx+aylayx+e=a ti+?imlk+tayx
speak+Bella: Coola+populace+LC+3S=INT D+man+D
'does this man speak Bella Coola?'

(8c) ?aX"=a ?it+nuAalk+mx+aylayx+s ti+?imlk+tayx
NEG=INT speak+Bella: Coola+populace+LC+3S D+man+D
'doesn't this man speak Bella Coola?'

(Davis and Saunders 1997:170–73)

Sentence (8a) shows the negative particle in its customary (and areally typical) position at the beginning of the sentence; note that the third-person singular suffix -s in this example appears on the negated verb ?itnuAalk+mx 'speak Bella Coola', rather than cliticized to ?aX". (8b) is a yes/no question containing the interrogative clitic, =a, which in this case immediately follows the sentence-initial main verb. In (8c), the interrogative clitic maintains its sentence-second position and follows the negative ?aX" in the same way that it would follow an adverbial particle in, for example, Shuswap (Kuipers 1974:81), Thompson (Thompson et al. 1996:631), or Lushootseed (Hess 1993:116).

Like the interrogative in (8c), evidential markers in Bella Coola can also be shown to be enclitics in the presence of the negative particle:

Bella Coola (S)
(9) ?aX"=k"=l=u=k ayk+m+i+s ta+s+cx"+lx+ulmx+tX
NEG=QTV=C=C=EXP=C=C be:long:time+MD+DIM+3S D+NP+dark+INCH+earth+D

s+tuin+m+s=k"=l=u=x ta+nannk+tX
NP+appear+MD+3S=QTV=EXP=PERF D+animal+D

'it wasn't very long after it got dark that the animal showed up before expected'

(Davis and Saunders 1980:8, line 33)

Once again, the person-marker—the third-person intransitive suffix -s—has lost the clitic-like properties typical of person-markers in other Central Northwest languages and is attached to the matrix predicate, the negated verb ?ayk' 'be long time', rather than to the sentence-initial ?aX". However, ?aX" does play host to a string of evidentials—k' 'QUOTATIVE', =lu 'EXPECTATIVE', and =i ... =k 'CONTRASTIVE-CONJUNCTIVE'—which normally follow the matrix predicate when this appears at the beginning of the sentence.

An interesting fact about the use of the negative particle is that it does not allow the form of the third-person singular intransitive subject (Davis and Saunders 1997:170). As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, this is suggestive of subordination. It may be that historically the negative construction was biclausal, as it is in Halkomelem (Galloway 1993:185), Thompson (Kroeber 1997), and Sechelt (Beaumont 1985:75); in these languages the negative particle takes a pronominal enclitic and the negated verb is marked by conjunctive subject morphology, as it would if it were contained in a subordinate clause. Bella Coola, however, has lost the conjunctive paradigm and subordination of the negated verb would require nominalization of the embedded clause (Beck, to appear a).

The absence of the nominalizing prefix s— in examples like (8a) indicates that, synchronically at least, the negative particle is acting as an adverbial rather than as a superordinate predicate.
sentence (cf. the position of the evidentials =k", =lu, and the aspectual clitic =c·"PERFECTIVE" in the embedded clause stuunmskçuč tαnαnmmktx ‘that the animal showed up as expected, so they say’).

Given the existence of sentence-initial adverbs in Wakashan, it is not clear that the loss of the pre-predicate particle (and the consequent loss of landing sites for sentence-second clitics) is the direct result of Bella Coola convergence with its Northern Wakashan neighbors; however, it is suggestive that of the two options for predicate-modification attested in the Salishan family, Bella Coola has opted for the strategy more strongly attested in the Wakashan languages—the use of predicate enclitics. One possible explanation for this is that the loss of pre-predicate particles is related to the Bella Coola adopting a rigid VSO word-order, a development which seems more certainly to be linked to the dynamics of language contact. Judging by the prevalent object-subject order of pronominals in Bella Coola and the rest of the Salishan family (see Section 1.4 below), VSO may not have been the predominant word-order in Proto-Salish, and certainly the widespread SO/OS variability reported for most Salishan languages suggests that the interpretive weight of SO order in Bella Coola is an innovation. The move towards a rigid, Wakashan-inspired VSO template may well have been the result of a process analogous to that observed by Gumperz and Wilson (1971)—the adaptation of a contact-induced syntactic template and an overall simplification of word-order patterns in the matrix clause. As noted by Gumperz and Wilson, the net effect of language convergence in Kupwar was a simplification of "surface structure in relation to underlying categories and relationships" (p. 270). While simplification in Kupwar seems to have been mutual in that all three languages concerned seem to have converged on the simpler, more easily intertranslatable structure, Coteanu (1957) notes that in the case of a number of Romanian dialects contact with morphologically complex Slavic languages has, in fact, resulted in the unilateral simplification of Romanian morphology. This seems to be somewhat closer to the case of Bella Coola, which has jettisoned a syntactic pattern likely found both in Wakashan and in Proto-Salish in favor of a simpler overall syntactic template involving only one (V-initial) rather than two (V-initial and ADV-clitic V) patterns for the unmarked matrix clause.

Thus, while the pre-predicate adverb probably existed in Bella Coola at one point, it may have been lost as part of a move towards a simpler, more rigid Wakashanized syntactic pattern for the matrix clause, although alternatively its loss could simply represent a separate instance of Northern Wakashan influence on Bella Coola grammar. In either case, a shift of this type would likely have been favored by the marked discourse properties of adverbs, which are less frequent than unmodified predicates. This is especially true in contact situations where one of the two parties has less than perfect command of the other's language and so would provide, or have access to, a more restricted range of structures to use as a basis for calques or models for syntactic templates. Alternatively, given the rather restricted number and frequency of sentence-initial adverbs in Northern Wakashan (there are fewer of these elements singled out in the grammars of Wakashan languages and they seem to appear less frequently in the Wakashan texts I have access to than they do in many Salish texts), it may be that the shift to a purely post-predicate system of verbal modification represents an overcompensation on the part of Bella Coola speakers emulating Northern Wakashan linguistic patterns. Whatever its ultimate source, however, the loss of the pre-predicate adverbial particle and auxiliaries and the adoption of rigid VSO word-order in Bella Coola has resulted in a pattern where the unmarked matrix clause in this language resembles the most common type of matrix clause of the adjacent Wakashan languages. At the same time, these two innovations have created a grammatical system which is uniquely Bella Coolan, setting this language apart from its relatives and neighbors in the Central Northwest language area.

1.3 Nominal deixis

Another obvious way in which Bella Coola combines native Salishan traits with features borrowed from Wakashan is in its pattern of nominal deixis. Deictic systems marking NPs for spatial location with respect to the speech act are an important and well-known property of both Wakashan and Salishan grammars, but in spite of a large number of common semantic features, the deictic morphosyntax of the NP in the two families is highly distinct. In Salishan languages, deictic elements (often referred to as determiners) are particles or clitics that appear immediately preceding an NP or other phrasal element which takes a nominal role in a sentence, as in (10):
Nominal deixics—underlined in these examples—precede NPs and their modifiers as in (10a), serve to introduce non-nominal elements used as nouns (10b), and can function as heads of relative clauses, creating syntactic nominals from finite clauses as in (10c).

While Salish deixics resemble, at least superficially, determiners in Indo-European languages, Wakashan nominal deixis presents a completely different picture, making use of suffixation or encliticization:

Makah (W)

(11a) daasa=s huktuub+iq
see=IND:1S bird+D
'I see the bird'

(Nominal deictics—underlined in these examples—precede NPs and their modifiers as in (10a), serve to introduce non-nominal elements used as nouns (10b), and can function as heads of relative clauses, creating syntactic nominals from finite clauses as in (10c).)

While Salish deixics resemble, at least superficially, determiners in Indo-European languages, Wakashan nominal deixis presents a completely different picture, making use of suffixation or encliticization:

Makah (W)

(11a) daasa=s huktuub+iq
see=IND:1S bird+D
'I see the bird'

(Nominal deictics—underlined in these examples—precede NPs and their modifiers as in (10a), serve to introduce non-nominal elements used as nouns (10b), and can function as heads of relative clauses, creating syntactic nominals from finite clauses as in (10c).)

Little information is available on the Makah suffix -iq or the Nootka -?ii beyond the fact that it appears on nouns and predicates (including finite clauses) in argument position and is glossed as 'the/a' (Jacobsen 1979c; Rose 1981:43-45). The Heiltsuk deictic system is more complex and consists of two sets of suffixes, the primary deictics (D1), which distinguish various types of spatial distinctions, and the secondary deictics (D2) which show agreement for a reduced set of the distinctions marked by the primary deictics (Rath 1981:78). In both Salish (including Bella Coola) and Wakashan, the presence of nominal deixis is often the only way to identify an element—particularly a non-nominal element—as an actant rather than a predicate or a modifier.

In Bella Coola, NPs bear both a proclitic and an enclitic, as in the examples in (12):
In (12a), the NP actants of the verb are marked with a circumclitic, in this case the masculine (non-feminine) and feminine proximal non-demonstratives (a full paradigm of these clitics is given in table 15 below). In (12b), the NP is marked with the masculine proximal demonstrative, which encompasses the entire NP—noun and modifier. This type of circumcliticization seems to be unique to Bella Coola, although Kwakwala demonstrative subject NPs appear bracketed between a deictic subject-marker attached to the verb stem and a demonstrative deictic suffix, giving a D-NP-D sequence reminiscent of the Bella Coola deictic circumclitic pattern, as in (13):

(13) Kwakwala (W)

Wulāas ow+ D3:MIDDLE:SUBJ
come=TOP+D3:MIDDLE:SUBJ "Wulāaso has come"

(Boas 1969:537)

Similarly, object NPs bear a deictic suffix and are preceded by a demonstrative morpheme which attaches phonologically to the preceding element in the sentence. We will return to this pattern in the context of the Kwakwala system of person-marking, discussed in more detail in 1.4 below. Another feature of deixis in the Bella Coola noun phrase that is also noteworthy is the iteration of the deictic proclitic in (12b). In Heiltsuk, adjectives in an NP are also marked by one of the two deictic suffixes, the primary deictic (D₁ in (11c) above), while the secondary suffix (D₂) appears (optionally) affixed to the noun, as in (14):

(14) Heiltsuk (W)

wisem+xi
man+D₂ 'that diligent man'

(Rath 1981:87)

A two-part deictic system is also found in Lillooet, which has a deictic enclitic, -a (homophonous with the Kwakwala third person post-nominal demonstrative suffix) which follows the first full word in the NP:

Lillooet (S)

(15) ti ŷzūm+a cixw
D big+D house 'the big house'

(van Eijk 1997:197)

10Bella Coola also has a set of "secondary" deictic enclitics, based on -ʔilay 'slight or increased distance', which gives forms like:

Bella Coola (S)

(i) ci+xrav+čitay+cs
D+woman+D₂+D 'the woman over there (quite close)'

(Nater 1984:44)

Note the NP+D+D pattern, which parallels that seen in the Heiltsuk example in (11b) above.

11 It should be noted that, in the Nootkan dialect Kyuquot, Rose (1981:40-43) reports a set of NP-initial deictic particles and a definite article, ha 'the, that', which she classifies together as determiners; these may co-occur with the deictic suffix -iq illustrated in (11b). In the absence of textual data and more detailed discussion, however, it is difficult to determine how they figure into the present discussion. It is interesting that such elements pass without mention in other sources on Nootka (e.g. Sapir & Swadesh 1939), although whether this is due to oversight, textual infrequency, or can be attributed to dialect differences (Kyuquot being at the northern extreme of the Nootkan continuum whereas the more-studied varieties lie at the southern end) will have to remain an open question. The last possibility is suggestive of influence (either diffusional or as a conservative influence causing the retention of an older familial pattern lost at the southern end of the continuum) from the adjacent Northern Wakashan Kwakwala.
In semantic terms, the Bella Coola deictic system resembles the Northern Wakashan systems, particularly in its complexity. Northern Wakashan systems of nominal deixis are highly developed and can encode up to seven different spatial categories (Anderson and Keenan 1985); on the other hand, Salishan systems, which are still relatively complex compared to Indo-European, tend to be much simpler, although by and large they grow more complex as they approach the core Central Northwest area. In the Southern Interior, for instance, Kalispel has only two degrees of distance (proximal and distal) along with an unmarked category which has a purely syntactic function (Vogt 1940:68–69). In the Northern Interior, Shuswap has a referential–non-referential category which combines with a case-like function marking oblique actants:

Table 5. Shuswap nominal deictic clitics

| referential | non-ref.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>visible</td>
<td>invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblique</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gardiner 1996:175)

Note the visible-invisible distinction shown here, which is a category singled out by Sherzer (1976:231) and Thompson and Kinkade (1990) as an areal feature of the Northwest Coast.

A more typical Salishan deictic system in terms of its complexity is that found in Upper Chehalis, which expresses three spatial degrees and a referential category of 'indefinite':

Table 6. Upper Chehalis nominal deictics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-fem</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>?it</td>
<td>tact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>tic, cic</td>
<td>?ic</td>
<td>tac, cac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kinkade 1964:258)

The Upper Chehalis system is notable in two respects. The first is the loss (as in Kalispel) of the visible-invisible distinction. This category is absent in at least three of the four Tsamosan Salish languages (Thompson and Kinkade 1990), the possible exception being Quinault. The second noteworthy feature is the appearance of the feminine–non-feminine distinction; this is typical of coastal (as opposed to Coast) Salish languages running from Bella Coola in the north down to Tillamook in the south and is also a feature of Chinook and Chimakuan (Thompson and Kinkade 1990), but is not found in Wakashan.

A slightly more complicated system is Lushootseed, which has three spatial degrees and preserves both the gender and the visible-invisible distinction, although the latter has been conflated with a more general category that also marks hypotheticality and distance:

Table 7. Lushootseed nominal deictic clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distal</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>remote-hypothetical</th>
<th>unique</th>
<th>non-contrastive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-fem</td>
<td>tiʔiʔ</td>
<td>tiʔaʔ</td>
<td>kʷi</td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>ciʔiʔ</td>
<td>ciʔaʔ</td>
<td>kʷsi</td>
<td>ci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hess 1993:97)
Lushootseed also appears to have expanded the referential category in some form, although the precise semantics of the *ti* and *ta* deictics await more detailed investigation. Division between the referential and non-referential categories of deixis has apparently become even more fundamental to the deictic system of Lillooet, which makes a primary contrast between a single non-referential category and a more highly differentiated system of referential classes, as in table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential</th>
<th>Non-referential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td><em>ti</em>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td><em>i</em>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td><em>k&quot;i</em>-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Matthewson and Reinholtz (1996:219), the non-referential determiner *k"u* encodes "non-assertion of existence." There are two other interesting features of the deictic system here, both of which may be signs of influence from the nearby Northern Wakashan languages. The first is the appearance of the category 'ABSENT'. Although closely related to the visible-invisible distinction we have seen already in some other systems, 'ABSENT'—used for something that was once in the presence of the speaker but is now gone—is also a distinctive feature of the Heiltsuk deictic system (see table 10 below), which sets it off from at least one other Northern Wakashan language, K"akala (Anderson and Keenan 1985).

The second interesting feature of the Lillooet deictic system is the appearance of the enclitic, a single morpheme which seems to encode referentiality. In Bella Coola, there is a full range of deictic enclitics that encode spatial, demonstrative–non-demonstrative and gender distinctions. In total, Bella Coola nominal deixis distinguishes three spatial categories, each sub-divided into demonstrative and non-demonstrative classes, as in table 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demon</td>
<td>Non-dem</td>
<td>Demon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fem</td>
<td><em>ti</em>-hayx</td>
<td><em>ti</em>-tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem</td>
<td><em>ci</em>-cayx</td>
<td><em>ci</em>-cx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td><em>wa</em>-?ac</td>
<td><em>wa</em>-c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bella Coola paradigm shown here is not only remarkable for its complexity, but also for encoding an additional degree of plurality, an obligatory category which is unusual not only for Salishan languages but for languages of the area in general.12

While the plural inflection found in Bella Coola deixis is not typically Wakashan, the number of spatial categories is. According to Anderson and Keenan (1985), K"akala distinguishes six spatial degrees—proximal, middle, and distal, each subdivided into visible and invisible. Heiltsuk has all of these

12Thompson and Kinkade (1990) report that, aside from Bella Coola, in the area running roughly between the Alaska panhandle and the Washington-Oregon border, the Tsimshian languages are the only ones to consistently mark plurality. According to Matthewson and Reinholtz (1996), however, Sechelt also has a plural–non-plural deictic distinction and there seems to be at least the option of marking collective plurality in Lillooet (see table 8 above). Some Salishan languages (and Quileute) also have the option of marking ordinary plurality in deictics through the use of reduplication.
plus the seventh category, ‘ABSENT’, used for something once present but currently removed from the
speaker. The complete Heiltsuk system is given in table 10:

Table 10. Heiltsuk nominal deictic suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>visible</td>
<td>invisible</td>
<td>visible</td>
<td>invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary</td>
<td>-k'&quot;a</td>
<td>-k'ac(^h)</td>
<td>-ia(^x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>-(\check{\text{x}})ka</td>
<td>-(\check{\text{x}})w</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rath 1981:77)

Given that the opposition demonstrative vs. non-demonstrative is semantically quite closely related to
visible vs. invisible (visible things being most amenable to being pointed to and, hence, referred to
demonstratively as ‘this’ or ‘that’), the Heiltsuk deictic paradigm seems almost identical to the Bella
Coola one, aside from the absence of the plural and gender categories (the latter typical of coastal Salish).
In addition, the Heiltsuk system appears to capture all three of the spatial degrees encoded in the various
Salishan systems illustrated above, while its fourth non-spatial category—‘ABSENT’—may correspond in
some sense to the non-referential–indefinite–hypothetical category present in most of the other systems. 13
This may well mean that Wakashan (or Central Northwest areal) influence on the Salishan deictic systems
extends back into the realm of Proto-Salish, although it is equally possible that the various Salishan lan­
guages have borrowed only certain aspects of the complex nominal deictic system of their Wakashan
neighbors, those languages closest to the Central Coast area showing the greatest influence.

Another interesting feature of the Bella Coola system of nominal deixis is the frequent use—in envi­
ronments where other Salishan languages might be expected to use a null subject—of one of the deictic
enclitics as an anaphoric subject-pronominal, as in (16):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Bella Coola (S)} \\
(16a) & \text{ks+is=k"a=\(\check{c}\) } \text{\(\check{\text{t}}\)ay} \text{ } \text{ta+mila+s+t\(\check{x}\)} \text{ } \text{pull+3S:3S=QTV=PERF} \text{ } \text{D} \text{ } \text{D+cane+3PO=D} \\
& \text{‘this one pulled his cane out’} \\
& \text{(Davis and Saunders 1980:35, line 74)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(16b) & \text{?ax"snix+it=k" } \text{\(\check{\text{t}}\)axw} \text{ } \text{ti+numu+\(\check{x}\)m+uc+m} \text{ } \text{hear+3S:3P=QTV} \text{ } \text{D} \text{ } \text{D+AGT+carry+mouth+MD} \\
& \text{‘they heard someone making a noise with his mouth’} \\
& \text{(Davis and Saunders 1980:146, line 185)}
\end{align*}
\]

Fully comparable text frequencies for constructions of this type are difficult to determine because of the
wide range of conditioning discourse factors involved (e.g. topicality of subject, presence of other third
person event-participants, need to distinguish event-participants by location, gender, etc.); however, in the
texts in Davis and Saunders (1984), the number of sentences with deictic third-person subjects is around
33%, as compared to 42% of sentences which have zero subjects and 25% which have overt NP subjects
(sentences with non-third person or impersonal subjects were excluded from the count). In the 288 lines of
the fifth Lushootseed text in Hess (1998), on the other hand, there are two instances of deictic subjects and
about a dozen examples of deictics used as obliques, while in the 128 lines in the Saanich text in Montler
(1986) there are nine examples of the purely anaphoric (as opposed to determinative) use of \(\text{ca}W\text{tf}\), which
is glossed as ‘he’ (although it is not listed as a part of the demonstrative system discussed on page 224).
The 352 line Halkomelem text in Hukari et al. (1977), although slightly harder to analyze, contains
twenty-four instances of deictics used as actants; the eleven line Lillooet text in van Eijk (1997) contains
no demonstrative subjects and only two NP subjects. While some of these texts are too short to be reliable

---

13 Non-referentiality or indefiniteness in Bella Coola is conveyed by the omission of the deictic enclitic (Nater 1984:41).
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samples, they do show the consistent preference for zero subjects noted by Kinkade (1990), and this seems to contrast with the Bella Coola practice of using deictic enclitics as anaphoric subject-markers.

It is also worth noting here that even though the use of deictics (or cognate forms) as third-person pronouns seems to be a common trait of all three Central Northwest language families, many Salish languages with complex nominal deictic paradigms make use of a reduced inventory of these pronouns. Thus, of the five degrees of deixis found in Lushootseed, only tiʔkoʔ ‘this’ and tiʔiʔ ‘that’ surface as independent pronouns; in Saanich, only those deictics expressing one of the three spatial degrees (proximal, middle, distal) can be used pronominally (Montler 1986:224). In Bella Coola, however, Nater (1984:42) implies that the entire set of deictic enclitics can be used anaphorically, and in texts and various examples in the literature I have found instances of twelve of the eighteen deictic enclitics attested in independent usage, and the absence of these six elements may represent an accidental gap in the data. Interestingly, the Northern Interior Salish languages Shuswap (Kuipers 1974) and Lillooet (van Eijk 1997) also make use of a complex paradigm of demonstrative pronouns, although in both cases the demonstrative paradigm exceeds the pre-nominal deictic paradigm in complexity (that is, in the number and types of distinctions made). Lillooet in particular seems to have developed a system that closely resembles the nominal deictic categories of Bella Coola and the nearby Northern Wakashan languages, as in table 11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. Lillooet demonstrative pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on van Eijk 1997:168)

A relatively large range of deictic pronouns seems to be a northern Central Northwest areal phenomenon, although to a greater or lesser extent this is typical of all the languages of the area, as is the close correspondence of nominal deictic and pronominal deictic categories. The fact that this correspondence is almost exact in Bella Coola is most probably attributable to influence from Northern Wakashan (whose person-markers encode the full range of distinctions found in their deictic systems—see tables 15 and 16).

1.4 Person-marking.

Another area in which Bella Coola has become distinct from both Wakashan and other Salishan languages is in the area of person-marking, and—like the system of nominal deixis—the person-marking system is a synthesis of features inherited from Salish and borrowed from Wakashan. In the Salishan family as a whole, the marking of subjects and objects is complex, the most notable trait being the subject-pronominal clitics. In intransitive matrix clauses, Coast and Interior languages use clitics to mark first- and second-person plural and singular subjects, and the absence of a clitic pronoun indicates a third-person (singular or plural) subject. In most languages, these clitics follow the sentence-second pattern illustrated in the examples in (1) above, although in Squamish and the Southern Interior subject clitics regularly precede the verb even in the absence of adverbs and auxiliaries (Kroeber 1991:19).14 The same clitics are used for first- and second-person subjects of transitive clauses in Lillooet and Coast Salish languages, as illustrated in the Lummi data in (17):

Lummi (S)  
(17a)  
\[ \text{C}\text{i+t=san} \]  
\[ \text{know+TR=1s} \]  
‘I know it’

14The situation in the Tsamosan languages and Tillamook is somewhat distinct, subject-person marking being tied to the aspectual system in Tsamosan (or in Upper Chehalis, at any rate—Kroeber 1991:15) and being exclusively affixal in Tillamook main clauses (Egesdal and Thompson 1998).
Transitive clauses with a third-person subject take a suffix, -s, as in (17c). This suffix is morphologically bound to the verb, does not undergo sentence-second fronting, and can cooccur with overt NPs, as in (18):

(18) **Lummi (S)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xčiči+t+s</th>
<th>ca</th>
<th>swayʔqoʔ</th>
<th>ca</th>
<th>swiʔqoʔʔ</th>
<th>know+TR+3</th>
<th>D man</th>
<th>D boy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'the man knows the boy'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jelinek and Demers 1983:168)

In Interior languages other than Lillooet, subject-suffixes are used for all persons in transitive clauses (Kroeber 1991:15), as per the Thompson examples in (19):

(19a) **Thompson (S)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sak+t+téne</th>
<th>hit: with: stick+TR+1S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'I hit him/her/it with a stick'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19b) | sak+t+téx̂ | hit: with: stick+TR+2S |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'you hit him/her/it with a stick'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19c) | sak+t+éš | hit: with: stick+TR+3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'he/she/they hit him/her/it with a stick'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19d) | sak+t+tém | hit: with: stick+TR+1P |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'we hit him/her/it with a stick'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19e) | sak+t+tép | hit: with: stick+TR+2P |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'you guys hit him/her/it with a stick'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Thompson et al.:622)

Once again, these subject suffixes are bound elements rather than clitics and do not migrate to sentence-second position when the clause is introduced by pre-predicate particles. In the Southern Interior, first- and second-person subjects and objects are both prefixes in the continuative aspect (Newman 1980).

Aside from the Southern Interior transitive-continuative paradigm, pronominal direct objects in Salishan languages are uniformly expressed by suffixes bound to the transitive verb stem, although—like third-person intransitive subjects—third-person objects are represented by a paradigmatic zero (that is, the absence of an object suffix signals a third-person object). In all Salishan languages in which the subject pronouns can follow the verb or in which they are suffixes, the required order of person-markers is object-subject. Object suffixes are illustrated in (20):

(20a) **Lushootseed (S)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tuxʷ+n̓aʔxʷ=čəd</th>
<th>tu+yahub+tu+bicid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just+now=1S</td>
<td>IRR+tell:story+CAUS+2S:OBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'now I will just tell you a story'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hess 1993:175, line 2)
In (20a), the Coast Salish language Lushootseed uses a clitic—shown fronted to sentence-second position in the presence of an adverb—to mark the subject and a suffix to mark the object of a transitive sentence. In (20b), the Interior language Shuswap realizes both the first-person transitive object and the second-person subject with suffixes.

Shuswap likely represents the Proto-Salish pattern (Newman 1979a, 1980), which resembled modern Interior Salish in marking intransitive subjects with clitics and transitive subjects with suffixes. Newman’s reconstructions of the Proto-Salish person-markers are given in table 12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1S</th>
<th>2S</th>
<th>3S/P</th>
<th>1P</th>
<th>2P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intransitive subject</td>
<td>*kan</td>
<td>*køx</td>
<td>*ø</td>
<td>*køl</td>
<td>køp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive subject</td>
<td>*-an</td>
<td>*-ax</td>
<td>*-as</td>
<td>*-at</td>
<td>*-ap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive object</td>
<td>*-c</td>
<td>*-ci</td>
<td>*ø</td>
<td>*-al</td>
<td>*-ulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive</td>
<td>*n-</td>
<td>*?æn-</td>
<td>*-s</td>
<td>*-it</td>
<td><em>-mp/</em>-alap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, all of the Proto-Salish affixal person-paradigms listed in table 12 above consist of suffixes, with the exception of the possessive, which has first- and second-person singular prefixes. This is a pattern that persists in most of the modern daughter languages, which typically have a possessive paradigm like that of Lushootseed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>(čæl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ad-</td>
<td>-lap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Lillooet and Kalispel depart from this pattern in that the former uses a suffix in the second person singular (van Eijk 1997:144) while the latter has a first-person plural possessive prefix (Vogt 1940:24).

Unlike its sister languages, Bella Coola marks possession exclusively with suffixes, making use of the same set of markers not only for nominal possession, but for the subject of intransitive clauses as well. Thus, we have the pattern shown in (21):

Bella Coola (S)

(21a) ti+mna+c+tx
D+child+1S+D
’my child’

15 In addition to the paradigms presented here, Davis (1998) proposes an additional subject paradigm for what are usually termed in Salishan studies “conjunctive clauses”, a particular type of subordinate clause (functionally heterogeneous over the family as a whole) marked by a special series of person-markers. The only relevant point that we need to make about these clauses is that while most Salishan languages (excluding Upper Chehalis and the Southern Interior languages) have them (Kroeber 1991), Bella Coola (like Wakashan) doesn’t.
Example (21a) illustrates the ordinary possessive use of the first-person intransitive suffix -c, while (21b) and (21c) show the use of the same affix as an intransitive subject marker. The distinction between the possessive use of the affix in (21a) and the subject-marking use in (21b) is made only by the presence of deixis, which indicates that mna 'child' is used referentially rather than as a syntactic predicate. Overt possessors may cooccur with the third-person suffixes -s and -aw, as do intransitive third-person subjects:

\[
\begin{align*}
(22a) & \quad \text{Bella Coola (S)} \\
       & \quad \text{ti+yalkuut+s} \quad \text{ti+immllkii+tx} \\
       & \quad \text{D+ball+3s} \quad \text{D+boy+D} \\
       & \quad \text{‘the boy’s ball’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(22b) & \quad \text{ti+yalkuut+aw} \quad \text{wa+immllkii+c} \\
       & \quad \text{D+ball+3p} \quad \text{D+boy+D} \\
       & \quad \text{‘the boys’ ball’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(22c) & \quad \text{puX+s} \quad \text{ti+mna+s} \quad \text{sliX‘lik”} \\
       & \quad \text{come+3s} \quad \text{D+child+3s} \quad \text{SliX‘lik”} \\
       & \quad \text{‘SliX‘lik”’s son came’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(22d) & \quad \text{puX+aw=k”=c} \quad \text{wa+Xmsta+yuks} \\
       & \quad \text{come+3P=QT=PERF} \quad \text{D+person+PLURAL} \\
       & \quad \text{‘the people came’}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the third-person singular intransitive suffix illustrated in (22c) is frequently realized as $\emptyset$ when used as a subject-marker. This form is not allowed in the marking of possessives and is generally restricted to matrix clauses, where it alternates with -s on the basis of style and register (Nater 1984:36–37). The full paradigm of Bella Coola intransitive suffixes is given in table 14:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
& \text{Bella Coola intransitive person suffixes} \\
\hline
\text{singular} & \text{plural} \\
1 & -c & -it \\
2 & -nu & -nap \\
3 & -s/\emptyset & -aw \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

According to Newman (1979), each of these morphemes is derived from a different Proto-Salish paradigm—for instance, the first-person -c comes from Proto-Salish *-c ‘1S:OBJ’, second-person -nu from an independent pronominal *nawi, and so on. These last two innovations eliminated all prefixes from the possessive paradigm. Of the morphemes in table 14, only the second-person plural seems likely to be related to the Proto-Salish subject clitics they replaced as subject-markers in intransitive clauses.
Person-marking in Wakashan in some ways resembles the general Salish pattern in that Wakashan languages also make use of sentence-second pronominal clitics, although these are used in both transitive and intransitive clauses. The order of pronominal actants, however, is subject-object rather than object-subject, as in Makah and Nootka:

\[(23a) \text{Makah (W)} \]
\[\text{huu'xili}=0=\text{sii}=\text{cu}x \text{daac} \]
\[\text{still}=\text{IND}=1S=2S \text{see} \]
\['I can still see you' \]

\[\text{(Jacobsen 1979c:132)}\]

\[(23b) \text{Nootka (W)} \]
\[\text{haa}n?=\text{aq}=\text{ni}\text{s si}h\text{a}t \text{invite}=\text{FUT}=1P \text{ 2P} \]
\['we will invite you all' \]

\[\text{(Nakayama 1996:266)}\]

Another similarity between the Southern Wakashan and Salishan subject-clitic paradigms is that third-persons are paradigmatic zeros, a pattern Haas (1969b) reconstructs as being Proto-Nootkan. Paradigmatic zero subjects, however, do not seem to be a characteristic of Northern Wakashan, which has adopted the practice of using deictic or demonstrative enclitics as pronominals. In Kwa, deictic elements may appear on their own and also (obligatorily) accompany full NPs, which follow a rigid subject-object-oblique order:

\[(24a) \text{Kwa (W)} \]
\[\text{kaax}=\text{ka} \text{come}=\text{DpROX:INV:SUBJ} \]
\['this one comes' \]

\[\text{(Boas 1969:535)}\]

\[(24b) \text{neex}=\text{la}=\text{ee} \text{say}=\text{QTV+DpDISTAL:SUBJ} \text{Tseetsekin+DpDISTAL:VIS} \text{ible} \]
\['Tseetsekin said' \]

\[\text{(Boas 1969:537)}\]

\[(24c) \text{yos}=\text{eeta} \text{eat:with:spoon+DpDISTAL:SUBJ} \text{leelq}\text{ala}=\text{h}+\text{aya}+\text{xa} \text{tribe+DpDISTAL:INV:SUBJ}+\text{DpDISTAL:OBJ} \text{dog:salmon+DpDISTAL:VIS} \text{ible} \]
\['the tribes ate the dog salmon with spoons' \]

\[\text{(Boas 1969:538)}\]

In the first example here, a deictic person-clitic appears alone, acting as an anaphoric subject pronoun, while in (24b) a prenominal deictic cooccurs with an overt third-person subject, which also bears a deictic suffix. As shown in (24c), deictics are also used with direct objects, although in this case they appear on the preceding noun (if there is one) rather than affixed to the verb as we would expect were they inflectional agreement markers per se. According to Boas (1969), this produces a pattern where the sentence "THE MAN STRUCK THE BOY WITH THE STICK" [is] expressed by STRUCK—HE—THE MAN—HIM—THE BOY—WITH-IT—THE STICK. The separation between the pronoun and the following noun is justified only by the phonetic character of the sentence. [Boas 1969: 528]

Syntactically, however, the deictics which are phonologically enclitics seem to form a constituent with the following NP, leading to the mismatch between syntactic and phonological structure noted by Anderson

\[\text{16The second-person plural in this example may be an independent form rather than a clitic. Haas (1969b) lists the 2p independent} \]
\[\text{stem in Nootka as si}h\text{h} \text{"} and Jacobsen (1993:254) gives an example containing the unanalyzed form si}h\text{h} \text{"} \text{glossed as '2P+OBJ'.} \]
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(1992) wherein initial elements of NPs are incorporated phonologically to preceding words. Pre-nominal deictic elements in this language thus seem more amenable to a syntactic treatment as part of the NP, which they mark for person (1, 2, 3) and case (subjective, objective, or oblique); post-nominal elements distinguish visibility and the three primary spatial categories (proximal, middle, and distal). As illustrated in data set (24), third-person deictics take different forms depending on whether they stand alone in the clause (i.e. if they are, in Boas’ terms, “pronominal”) or whether they are part of an NP. This gives us the following paradigm of Kwakwala deictic elements:

Table 15. Kwakwala third-person-deictic markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>visible</td>
<td>invisible</td>
<td>visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>=kh</td>
<td>=ka</td>
<td>=oox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>-q^ekh</td>
<td>-xka</td>
<td>-q^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>-seek^h</td>
<td>-skd</td>
<td>-soox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>-kata</td>
<td>-ooxta</td>
<td>-eeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>-xkata</td>
<td>-xooxta</td>
<td>-x^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>-skata</td>
<td>-sooxta</td>
<td>-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-nominal</td>
<td>-k^h</td>
<td>-ka</td>
<td>-ee /a^j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on Boas 1969:532)

Aside from its case-marking function, the Kwakwala deictic system seems highly congruent, both structurally and functionally, with the Bella Coola system of deictic circumclitics (see 1.1 above).

Like other deictic elements, possessives in Kwakwala also come in circumclitic pairs, the pre-nominal element again being phonologically incorporated to the preceding word, as shown in (25):

(25) 
laa+i+kin
go+FUT+D^PROX:VISIB
k’eesoo+xt+ek^h
crest+become:non:existant+D^PROX:VISIB
‘this my crest will go’

(Boas 1969:538)

Syntactically (25) would be parsed as [láa] [kin k’éesooxt ek] ‘will go [my former-crest of mine]’; the pre-nominal element is inflected for person, proximity and visibility, and genitive case (hence, it is the same regardless of whether the possessed element is subject, object, or oblique actant in a clause). While the Bella Coola system of possessive-marking may not be identical to the Kwakwala system in that Bella Coola does not have a special set of pre-nominal possessive clitics, possessed NPs in Bella Coola are preceded by a deictic clitic and followed by a possessive suffix (see the examples in (21) and (22) above) in a Kwakwala-like pattern made more consistent—both internally and with respect to the other person-marking paradigms—by Bella Coola’s shift to purely suffixal possessive morphology.

A pattern of person-marking similar to the Kwakwala system is found in two other Northern Wakashan languages, Haisla (Bach 1996) and Heiltsuk (Rath 1981), both of which also cliticize deictic person-markers to the verb stem following all other morphology. Just as in Kwakwala, the order of elements is rigidly VSOO (bliique); however, in Heiltsuk overt NPs seem to replace deictic pronominals, as in (26):

Heiltsuk (W)
(26a) 
tatoo"la+i+qi+si
‘he/she/they watches him/her/it/Them with it’

17 The pre-nominal person-markers show alternations based on whether or not the following noun is a proper name, indefinite, or if it is possessed by a person other than the subject of the sentence. There are a wide variety of other morphonological complications as well; the interested reader is referred to Boas (1969:527-35).
(26b) tátuq'ila wiśm+a+xi+qi+si
watch man+D₁+D₂+3DISTAL:VISIBLE+3DISTAL:VISIBLE:OBL
'the man watches him/her/it/them with it'

(26c) tátuq'ila wiśm+a+xi wac+iā+xi+si
watch man+D₁+D₂ dog+D₁+D₂ DISTAL:VISIBLE:OBL
'the man watches the dog with it'

(Rath 1981:94–95)

(26d) tátuq'ila wiśm+a+xi wac+iā+xi his túc'āyū+a+xi
watch man+D₁+D₂ dog+D₁+D₂ PR binoculars+D₁+D₂
'the man watches the dog with the binoculars'

(based on Rath 1981:85)

As is areally typical, subject-markers are fronted to follow pre-predicate particles or auxiliaries. In these cases, third-person NP subjects can cooccur with the deictic enclitic and follow the main predicate:

(27) Heiltsuk (W)
wál=1=s well=3DISTAL:VISIBLE:SUBJ=ADJUNCT tátuq'ila wiśm+a+xi
watch man+D₁+D₂
'the man watches the dog well'

(Rath 1981:101)

In sentences such as these, with subject person-markers and an overt NP subject, there is agreement between the deictic class of the subject-clitic and the class of the primary deictic (D₁) attached to the subject NP. Rath does not make it clear where the object pronominal would appear in a sentence such as (27) if it were represented by a deictic person-marker instead of an NP. In K'aK'ala, however, the subject-marker follows the adverbial particle or auxiliary and the object-marker follows the main verb, as in (28):

(28) K'aK'ala (W)
kāax=m=enuxʷ λ'eeel+ooλʰ
come=TOP=1:EXC invite+2:OBJ
'we came to invite you'

(Boas 1969:536)

In the first example the intransitive verb kāax ‘come’ functions as an auxiliary and plays host to the enclitic topical-marker =m and the first-person exclusive subject-clitic =enuxʷ. The direct object suffix -ooλʰ appears after the main verb, λ'eeel ‘invite’, creating the AUX+SUBJ V+OBJ pattern identified by Boas (1940) as a feature of the Central Northwest language area.

Just as in K'aK'ala, Heiltsuk third-person pronounals are inflected for person, three cases (subject, object, and oblique), and the full range of distinctions found in the nominal deictic paradigm, as shown in table 16 (cf. table 10 above):

Table 16. Heiltsuk third-person person-markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>invisible</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>invisible</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>invisible</th>
<th>absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>=kʰh</td>
<td>=kʰc</td>
<td>=uqʷ</td>
<td>=uşʷ</td>
<td>=i</td>
<td>=i</td>
<td>=kʰi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>-qkʰ</td>
<td>-qkʰc</td>
<td>-qʰ</td>
<td>-qʰc</td>
<td>-q</td>
<td>-q</td>
<td>-qʰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblique</td>
<td>-sx</td>
<td>-sxcʰ</td>
<td>-sqʰ</td>
<td>-sχʰ</td>
<td>-si</td>
<td>-si</td>
<td>-ski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent</td>
<td>kাঔʰ</td>
<td>kάqʰqʷ</td>
<td>qάqʰ</td>
<td>qάχʰqʰqʰ</td>
<td>qqʰ</td>
<td>q[qʰqʰ]</td>
<td>qkʰqʰ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rath 1981:77–78)
The last row of elements here, the independent forms, represent unbound versions of the deictics which, apparently, act as full NPs (subject or object) in the clause (cf. the Bella Coola use of deictic enclitics as subject pronominals discussed in Section 1.3).

Just as Bella Coola differs from both general Salishan and Wakashan in the person-marking of intransitive clauses, this language has developed a unique system portmanteau object-subject suffixes to mark the person and number of actants in transitive clauses, as in (29):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Bella Coola (S)} & \\
(29a) & \text{kl}+\text{is} & \text{ti}+\text{immillki}+\text{tx} & \text{ti}+\text{tqia}+\text{tx} \\
& \text{drop}+3\text{s:3s} & \text{D+boy}+\text{D} & \text{D+knife}+\text{D} \\
& & \text{'the boy dropped the knife'} & \\
(29b) & \text{sp}+\text{tis} & \text{ti}+\text{immillki}+\text{tx} & \text{wa}+\text{wa}+\text{uk}+\text{sc} \\
& \text{hit}+3\text{p:3s} & \text{D+boy}+\text{D} & \text{D+dog+PLURAL+D} \\
& & \text{'the boy is hitting the dogs'} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Davis and Saunders 1997:24)

In total, there are eight person-paradigms listed for Bella Coola by Davis and Saunders (1980:253–54)—the intransitive-possessive, the active-transitive, the causative-transitive, the passive, the causative-passive, the imperative, the causative-imperative, and the intransitive-imperative. Of these, the causative-active, the causative-passive, and the causative-imperative are pretty clearly analyzable as combinations of the non-causative person-markers with the causative suffix \(-tu\), and so might not require treatment as separate paradigms. The complete set of active-transitive person-markers is given in Table 17:

Table 17. Bella Coola active transitive person-markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>object</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>2s</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Davis and Saunders 1980:252)

Most of these morphemes historically followed object-subject order and, in this sense, Bella Coola very clearly follows the general Salishan pattern of having an object-suffix followed by a subject morpheme. The exceptions to this are the 1:SUBJ-2:OBJ (marked with an asterisk) and the 3:SUBJ-2:OBJ suffixes (marked with a cross), this latter set being derived from passive markers (Nater 1984:38). In the first persons and the third-person singular, the subject portion of the suffix comes from the Bella Coola intransitive subject paradigm given in table 14 above, as do the object portions of the 2:OBI series. The subject portions of the 2:SUBJ series are clearly related to the Proto-Salish 2S/O transitive subject suffixes, while the origins of the third-person plural subject series is uncertain. First-person objects seem clearly to be

18Forrest (1994) has used the irregularities of the Bella Coola second-person transitive person-markers to argue for the existence of a system of inverse person-marking in an earlier stage of the language. Whether this could be squared with what we know about Proto-Salish is unclear, although it is possible that something like this might have been the origin of the person-marking hierarchies discussed in, for example, Jelinek and Demers (1983). It is also worth noting that Nootka second-person subject markers can be analyzed historically as having a component *-?itor or *-t (Haas 1969), the former having a passive-like function in the modern language (Nakayama 1996).
reflexes of the Proto-Salish object forms reconstructed in Newman (1979b). The origins of the 3:OBJ portions of the active transitive paradigm (-il-ti) are mysterious, although Heiltsuk does have a distal:visible subject clitic =i (Rath 1981:77).

The most significant point to be made about the Bella Coola person-markers from an areal-typological perspective, however, is the fact that the both transitive and intransitive paradigms represent a distinctive pattern of subject-verb agreement which has no exact counterpart in the other Central Northwest languages. Trask (1993) defines agreement as a phenomenon in which “the appearance of one item in a sentence in a particular form requires a second item which is grammatically linked with it to appear in another form” (p. 12). The appearance of third-person (singular or plural) subject-marking on verbs in Bella Coola clauses with overt NPs or deictic pronouns conforms to this definition very nicely, given that these markers are inflectional suffixes bound to the predicate stem and obligatorily agree in person and number with any overt subject or object appearing in the clause. The closest thing to this type of agreement in the Salish family is the transitive subject marker (-s in the Lummi examples in (17), -es in Thompson (1990); however, these agree with NP subjects in person only and not in number, and in most Salishan languages there is a strong tendency to avoid overt NP subjects with this suffix (Kinkade 1983, 1990), making it seem rather the inverse of agreement. Intransitive subject-clitic paradigms in Salishan languages also seem not to be agreement in the traditional sense in that these have a 0 third-person which one might be hesitant to claim cooccurs with overt NP subjects. Bella Coola intransitive person-markers, on the other hand, cooccur freely with overt NPs or deictic enclitics with whom they agree in person and number (as, for example, in (22d) above), the latter being unattested as an inflectional category in the third person in any other Central Northwest language. Similarly, there is no Salishan language other than Bella Coola which shows (non-zero) agreement of any kind with third-person objects (cf. the Bella Coola sentences in (29)).

The absence of verbal agreement markers for third-person objects is also true of Southern Wakashan languages, where neither third-person subject nor objects are overtly marked on the verb. The Northern branch of the Wakashan family, on the other hand, does seem to make more use of what superficially looks like subject agreement, particularly in Kwak’ala, where third-person subject NPs cooccur with deictic elements affixed to the verb. As noted above, however, the agreement-like features of the Kwak’ala person-marking system may, in fact, be more an accident of phonology than a feature of the syntax. Rather than constituting agreement per se, the enclitic deictic markers apparently cross-referencing NPs on verbs are morphosyntactically part of the NPs themselves. In Heiltsuk, the pre nominal deictics are absent altogether and pronominal personmorphology is replaced by overt NPs. The closest thing to agreement in this language is the agreement between a person-clitic appearing on a fronted adverbial element and the deictic category marked on the NP in examples such as (27) above. Even this, however, seems a far cry from the four intransitive subject and four transitive object-subject agreement paradigms found in Bella Coola matrix clause. The agreement-like properties of the Bella Coola system are enhanced by this language’s proclivity, noted in Section 1.3 above, for using its deictic enclitics as third-person pronouns (emulating the North Wakashan use of third-person deictic pronouns in the absence of overt NPs), creating a uniquely Bella Coolan system of person-marking and showing once again that processes of grammatical convergence can and do result in the creation of linguistic diversity.

19 Lillooet appears to be exceptional in this regard in that it has the third-person plural subject suffix -wit in the intransitive paradigm (van Eijk 1997:145) which appears to co-occur with an overt third-person subject (van Eijk 1997:194), although it is not clear if this morpheme is obligatory (and hence inflectional agreement) or alternates with a 0 person pronominal (as indicated in Davis 1998:15, table (23a)). The cognate morpheme in Squamish, -wil, also seems to be agreement-like in that it appears with overt third-person plural NPs (and, again, may be optional, as indicated in Davis 1998:19, table (33a)); however, -wil also appears in transitive clauses following the third-person transitive subject suffix -as and apparently has ambiguous scope, potentially pluralizing either the transitive subject, the intransitive object, or both (Kuipers 1967:87). This suggests that -wil is related to the general pluralizing morphemes found in many Salishan languages (e.g. Lushootseed hōl°G, Bella Coola -yuks, Thompson -iyx) which serve to indicate the plurality of syntactic actors or possessors but which are optional and not part of the person-marking paradigms per se. It could be that in Lillooet this marker has become (or is becoming) grammaticalized as an inflectional marker of plural subject agreement.
Convergence and diversity

One of the most interesting results of the investigation into the place of Bella Coola in the NWC Sprachbund is the discovery that, while Bella Coola displays a number of grammatical traits that place it squarely on a continuum between the Salish and the Wakashan groups, it has also developed a major and fundamental syntactic pattern—paradigmatic non-zero subject and object agreement in matrix clauses—which represents an innovation not only for Salish but for the Central Northwest languages as a whole. This sort of contact-induced innovation answers an important question with respect to the NWC language area itself and with respect to the phenomenon of the Sprachbund in general: given the findings of Nichols (1992:250) that languages in residual zones tend to converge towards a common typological profile, and given the evidence presented by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) that virtually any facet of language is potentially transmissible, why is it that the languages in a Sprachbund—in spite of centuries, or even millennia, of intensive contact and extensive borrowing—still make use of distinct and often distinctive grammatical systems?

While there are undoubtedly sociological barriers to total grammatical convergence in many situations, theoretically it seems possible—perhaps even probable—that the tendency towards grammatical approximation could result in the convergence of the various languages of a residual zone to a single grammar or set of grammatical patterns, particularly since the process seems to be a cumulative, self-sustaining one. If, as Thomason and Kaufman (1988:72) observe, typological similarity is a facilitator of grammatical borrowing in light to moderate contact situations, then as grammatical convergences accumulate, typological similarities increase, and the stage is set for further and faster borrowings. The end result should be a common morphosyntax across the set of languages, distinguished in each case mainly by the use of native words and morphemes. This is, in fact, the situation reported for Kupwar by Gumperz and Wilson (1971). The Kupwar situation, however, represents a special case of localized, intimate daily contact between speakers bound together into a single society. Similarly, cases reported by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:223-28) such as that of Ma'a, where one of the contact languages adopts the grammatical forms of the other but retains some or all of its own native vocabulary, involve circumstances of political or economic domination, language shift, or both—circumstances which are, by definition, not typical of a residual zone.

What sets a residual zone or Sprachbund apart from cases like that of Ma'a is that in a residual zone the languages involved exist independently enough of one another that they have a developmental pattern and a historical dynamic of their own. Borrowing, of course, can be extensive and cumulative over time, but as borrowed elements are incorporated into the grammar of the recipient language they are nativized and contribute to the intrinsic development of that language. The incorporation of a new grammatical element can thus have one of two opposite effects: the element can be incorporated in such a way as to increase the recipient language's resemblance to the donor language, or it can be nativized in such a way as to create a new, divergent grammatical pattern. In Bella Coola, we have examples of both types of nativization. In its system of nominal deixis and its rigid adherence to a VSOO(blique) order of actants, for example, Bella Coola has moved towards patterns found in the neighboring Wakashan languages, and in this case grammatical borrowing has clearly resulted in greater similarity. On the other hand, the Bella Coola development of inflectional object-subject agreement markers and the loss of the pre-predicate particle, sentence-second clitic pattern illustrates the opposite principle—that of nativized development of grammatical borrowings leading to grammatical divergence.

Trying to unravel the developmental path of the Bella Coola grammatical innovations is necessarily a highly speculative undertaking; however, several of the changes that have taken place in Bella Coola do seem to be plausibly inter-related when looked at from a systemic, rather than a strictly individual, point of view. Given the prevalence of pre-predicate particles and sentence-second clitics in the Salishan family (and the relics of the latter still found in Bella Coola), it seems likely that both of these patterns existed in Bella Coola at the time of its initial (or the initiation of its intensive) contact with Northern Wakashan. As a result of this contact, Bella Coola appears to have adapted the rigid Wakashan VSOO syntactic template—a pattern that is likely to have been at least incipient in Proto-Salish grammar, given its prevalence

---

20 Quileute also appears to lack a pattern of agreement in the traditional sense and makes use of deictic person-markers which, as in Heiltsuk, seem to disappear in the presence of overt NPs (Powell and Woodruff 1976: 497-506).
in the modern languages of the family. Along with this change seems to have come another grammatical shift away from the mixed (adverbial particle and enclitic) Central Northwest system of predicate modification to the exclusive use of predicate enclitics. This may have taken place because the former pattern was weaker in the Northern Wakashan languages with which Bella Coola had the most intimate contact, or perhaps because Bella Coola speakers simply allowed the new, rigid predicate-initial template to obscure the older more flexible one. Whatever the trigger, this change—again, a change building on a pattern already present in Bella Coola grammar—would have been reinforced by the principle of intertranslatability, as Bella Coola’s increasing reliance on adverbial enclitics brought it more in line with the preferential use of such elements in Northern Wakashan. Ultimately, the loss of pre-predicate particles eliminated those environments where intransitive subjects in Proto-Salish were realized as pre-verbal, sentence-second clitics, creating a situation where subjects of both transitive and intransitive clauses were marked consistently with post-predicate morphemes. The outcome of this was the eventual incorporation of both subject and object pronominals to the verb-stem, a process reinforced by the historical loss or reduction of vocalic material (potentially linked to Heiltsuk-Oowekyala contact) noted by Nater (1984:xvii).

The end result would have been the creation of sentences with pronominal actants bound to the verb stem inside an often extensive string of other morphemes (see, for instance, the sentence in (7) above). Such elements might frequently have been felt not to be salient enough in and of themselves to carry out their communicative function as anaphors or reference-tracking devices in discourse, thereby encouraging their iteration either by pronominal deictics (a Salish practice intensified in Bella Coola under Wakashan influence) or by full NPs. Under this analysis, Bella Coola person-markers can be seen to have undergone a historical transition from pronominal clitic to pronominal suffix to inflectional agreement marker co-occurring regularly with overt, coreferential NPs—a standard, well-documented cline of grammaticalization whereby independent pronouns come to be reanalyzed as inflectional affixes (Givón 1979; Hopper and Traugott 1993).

Within the context of the larger NWC Sprachbund, the case of Bella Coola is an especially important one because of the example it offers of the various effects of language contact that can arise as a result of contrasting patterns of historical development and interaction. What is significant about Bella Coola is the fact that where the Salishan family, as a part of the Central Northwest areal grouping of languages, appears to have been on a path of mutual grammatical convergence with Wakashan, perhaps for millennia, Bella Coola has gone farther down this path, and veered further towards the Wakashan pattern, than any of its congener languages. That this is due to Bella Coola’s particular historical and geographic circumstances is, in hindsight, obvious—but this fact is, in and of itself, of enormous importance for linguistic models of language contact and language change, particularly in residual zones. Given the millennia of contact not only in the Central Northwest area itself but in the NWC Sprachbund as a whole, both the amount of grammatical convergence and the amount of diversity are remarkable. Yet, by and large, our models of language contact in residual zones seem to have focused on borrowings and convergences, and might seem to predict a greater degree of homogeneity than what we actually do see. What Bella Coola teaches us is that each language exists, as it were, in its own micro-climate or ecological niche, and its pattern of convergences, borrowings, and innovations are uniquely conditioned by the nature and intensity of an individual language’s contact with its relatives and neighbors, and by the number and particular set of neighboring groups it comes into contact with. Thus, within the larger Sprachbund area, we find eddies or pockets of local variation amidst the larger current of typological convergences that unify the area in terms of a subset of the most widely distributed—and hence, by inference, the most readily transmissible—features. In the case of Central Northwest and some of the neighboring languages, we see the latter type of feature in the predominant (VSO) word-order, whereas a number of other traits such as the marking of plurality and gender or the visible-invisible deictic distinction are less consistently distributed over the same area, and so are apparently more amenable to microcosmic conditions on their (retention or) spread. Such observations open the door to further studies of patterns of convergence and diversity aimed in particular at the dynamics of language contact in residual zones. Coupled with statistical studies of feature transmission and stability such as that of Nichols (1992), these should pave the way for the development of a better understanding of the conditions governing the spread of linguistic traits and the areal-historical development of human language.
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Map 1: The Central Northwest Language Area

The Salishan, Chimakuan, and Wakashan families constitute the Central Northeast group. Tsimshian and Kutenai (not shown) share a number of the most salient characteristics of this group, including VSO word order.