Paradigm Regained: Deixis in Northern Wakashan

SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics Vol. 14 (2006): 267-281

Paradigm Regained: Deixis in Northern Wakashan

Emmon Bach
ebach@linguist.umass.edu

Summary: demonstrative and determiner systems in the Pacific Northwest show areal similarities. The categories include two or three way deictic distinctions, visibility, modality (existent - non existent), and temporal contrasts. There are formal characteristics that are shared as well. This paper gives a survey of the features across some Northern Wakashan languages of the area. Then we will look at two especially interesting categories: `just gone' in Upper North Wakashan, which combines spatial and temporal (or: spatiotemporal) concepts, `visible-invisible', which seems to be basically evidential and modal in some languages. The paper presents for the first time a set of forms that have been recovered in a kind of "linguistic archaeology."

I. Background.[1]

People and the talk they make are located in time and space. Without reference to context we cannot make sense of the meanings of words like ***I, you, here***. The common matrix of human experience is reflected in words like these. And languages commonly encode contextual information in their grammatical systems: demonstrative words like ***this***, ***that***, pronominal systems and inflections, tenses. The common matrix is universal. What gets into the grammar varies quite a lot.

Franz Boas -- one of the heroes of language documentation --, in the Introduction to his Handbook of American Indian Languages (Boas, 1911) famously discussed the system of obligatory distinctions found in `Eskimo' and Kwakw'ala (his Kwakiutl), a Northern Wakashan language of the Pacific Northwest. The passage is worth quoting at length as it introduces most of the themes that we will take up in this paper.

Franz Boas, (1911: pp. 40-41; reprint, pp. 36-37):

> In many cases, the analogy of the personal pronouns and of the demonstrative pronouns is rigid, the demonstrative pronoun having three persons in the same way as the personal pronoun. Thus the Kwakiutl will say, ***the house near me*** (this house), ***the house near thee*** (that house), ***the house near him*** (that house).
>
> But other points of view are added to the principle of division corresponding to the personal pronoun. Thus, the Kwakiutl, and many other American languages, add to the pronominal concepts just discussed that of visibility and invisibility, while the Chinook add the concepts of present and past. Perhaps the most exuberant development

[1] **Acknowledgements.** Thanks to the many members of Kitamaat Village who have helped me understand their language; for help and suggestions on this presentation, thanks to colleagues Darin Howe (U Calgary), Pat Shaw (UBC). I especially want to thank Rose Robinson, who performed the "linguistic archaeology" reported on in this paper. The research reported on here was supported in part by the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Programme Grant MDP0102.

> of the demonstrative idea is found among the Eskimo, where not only the ideas corresponding to the three personal pronouns occur, but also those of position in space in relation to the speaker, -- which are specified in seven directions; as, center, above, below, in front, behind, right, left, -- and expressing points of the compass in relation to the position of the speaker.
>
> It must be borne in mind that the divisions which are mentioned here are all ***necessary*** parts of clear expression in the languages mentioned. For instance, in Kwakiutl it would be inconceivable to use an expression like our ***that house***, which means in English ***the single house away from the speaker***. The Kwakiutl must express this idea in one of the following six forms...

Boas goes on to list the meanings of the six forms expressing the ideas he has just discussed and then some of the various distinctions made in Eskimo. We will take up the Northern Wakashan forms in a while, where an additional distinction comes into the Upper North Wakashan languages Haisla, Heiltsuk, and Ooweky'ala.

For our purposes here, let me extract these special points:

i. **Grammatical distinctions are necessarily expressed.**
ii. **Locations are specified with reference to the speaker, hearer, and other.**
iii. **Demonstrative distinctions are expressed in personal pronouns and clitics/inflections.**
iv. **Besides the locational distinctions, demonstratives may encode temporal notions.**
v. **Visibility vs invisibility may also be encoded in the grammar.**

II. Preliminary Examples

Let’s look first at:

Upper North Wakashan: Haisla, Henaaksiala, Heiltsuk, Ooweky'ala

These languages illustrate all the points just listed.

Haisla

2. **guk^{w}asi** `his/her/their$^{3\text{-}3vis}$ house^{3vis},

This example can be analysed into a free form **guk^{w}** `house' based on a root √**guk$^{w}$-** and two deictic elements: **-a** expressing the location and visibility (=3vis) of the house and **-si** referring to a 3rd person possessor who is also remote and visible (3vis). Obviously there will be 36 different ways of translating `his house' into a language like this. One further distinction is found in the Upper North Wakashan languages which will yield 49 different forms.

Looked at the other way, since Wakashan languages have no gender distinctions and minimal number marking, as the glosses show, a single item can match four different possibilities encoded into English possession (his / her / its / their), and since number marking is largely optional in nouns themselves we will have eight possible translations: ***her house***, ***her houses***, ...

Here's another example from Haisla, this time a plain unpossessed element:

3. **qu gelwʾiǐxu** `that[2-vis] canoe'

The notation `2-vis' refers to the category of something that is visible and near the hearer.

Oowek'ala

Here is a scheme for the affixed third person possessive forms of demonstratives: first the deictic category for the thing possessed (item), then for the possessor. The element –**s** is a connective marking oblique or instrumental (inst) `case' (here for possession) , while the element **–c** indicates the category of "invisibility." (In the combinatorics, this element absorbs the oblique marker **–s**.)

	item-dem	**(inv)**	**inst**		**owner-dem**	**(inv)**
	-ga				**-k**	
ITEM	**-aǐx**	**(-c)**	**-s**		**-ǐxʷ**	**(-c)**
	-a				**-i**	
	-xdi*				**-ki***	

Examples (Hilda Smith†) `her/his pencil':

4. **ɬkadayug(ʷ)ask -ga -s -k** 1 vis 1 vis
   `the pencil that is visible right here belonging to this visible person right here by me'
5. **ɬkadayug(ʷ)ack -ga -c -s -k** 1 inv 1 vis
   `the hidden pencil right here belonging to this visible person right here by me'
6. **ɬkadayug(ʷ)asǐxʷ -ga -s -ǐxʷ** 1 vis 2 vis
   `the visible pencil right here belonging to that visible person right there by you'
7. **[ɬkadayuxdiski] -xdi -s -ki** GONE and GONE!!!!
   `the pencil that was just here that belongs to the person that just left'
   (Constructed! (based on Boas on Heiltsuk (Bella Bella,Boas, 1947:298))

The Upper North Wakashan languages add a category for something that was present recently but is now gone. This category apparently has no visible / invisible distinction, at least as reported by Boas and Rath (1981, but see below on Haisla). 7 time 7 = 49 QED.

III. Form: North Wakashan

Prenominal deictics in Kwakw'ala.

Boas again (1947, pp. 251-2):

> In this case [i.e. when nominals occur in a sentence following pronominal clitics EB] the pronominal subjective, objective, and instrumental undergo phonetic changes. These forms may be designated as prenominal. The phonetic coalescence of the syntactic pronominal elements with the preceding part of the complex persists, but the pronouns are phonetically separated from the following noun. Theoretically the statement "the man struck the boy with the stick" could be expressed in in the form: "struck=he=the-man=him=the-boy=with=the-stick."
>
> These items, which are enclitic on the preceding word but syntactically related to the following word (“pro-enclitics”), have occasioned much comment. They encode subject, object, oblique (Boas's `instrumental') functions and deictic categories of the following nominal as well as a distinction reminiscent of the determinative/nondeterminative distinction in Tsimshianic. For the last distinction Boas uses the terms "vocalic" and "consonantic" -- the latter going with proper names, generics, and some possessed nominals.
>
> Here's a table based on Boas, 1947, p. 252 (Table II) [retranscribed by EB]: Kwakw'ala Demonstrative Suffixes

Demonstrative of	Pronominal	Prenominal Consonantic	Prenominal Vocalic	Postnominal
1 vis	-k	-ga	-gada	-k
1 inv	-gaʔ	"	"	-ga
2 vis	-ux̌	-ux̌	-ux̌da	-ix̌
2 inv	-uʔ	"	"	-ax̌, -aqʼ
3 vis	-iq	-i	-ida	-- / -i
3 inv	-iʔ	"	"	-a / -i

The postnominal forms here are suffixed to nominals in concord with the prenominal elements. Note that the prenominal forms do not distinguish visible from invisible, so that the distinction is carried by full pronominal forms or by the suffixed elements on the nominal (and in some cases there is no overt marking).

The prenominal demonstrative suffixes in this table are preceded by case marking elements: basically **-x̌-** for objects, **-s-** for oblique (instrumental). The pronominal affixes similarly have special case forms, not always transparently analysable (see Table II p. 252). For example, the `near 2 visible' forms for object and instrument, respectively, are **-qʷ** and **–sox̌**, compare the plain (subject) form given above **-ox̌**.

Examples:

8. **duˈx̌ʷʾidasx̌ux̌da** guˈkʷix̌
   `Do you see this house? (2-vis)' (Boas, 1947: p. 253)
9. **laʔəmˈ kʷʾaʾsʾɔˈlax̌a** gənaˈnəm__
   `and now they left sitting on the ground the child' (remote vis vocalic)(ib. pp. 253-4)

In Heiltsuk, Ooweky'ala, and Haisla, there are no prenominal elements of the sort given by Boas for Kwakw'ala. In Haisla we find frequent use of the independent demonstrative forms **qi**, **qu** and so on, acting as optional but frequent first elements in nominal groups.

Example (Haisla, Lincoln and Rath, 1986):

10. **tlʾia qi_wisemax̌i qu_gukʷax̌u**
    `That man[3] buys/bought that house[2']

The authors remark: "Note that /qi_/ and /qu_/ are proclitics in dictation, but that often in conversation they behave like enclitics attached to the word directly preceding."

The third person object clitics in Haisla are:

11. **-ʾix**/-**ʾex̄** 3-1,
    -ʾu 3-2, vis
    [-**ʾuc** 3-2, inv] (conjectured!)
    -ʾi 3-3, vis
    -ʾic 3-3, inv
    -ʾex̄gi gone.

In Henaaksiala, according to Lincoln and Rath (1986), the corresponding first three object clitics have **q** in place of the glottal stop, leading to homophony with the

proclitics mentioned above.[2]In principle, the first three can be combined with **-c** to mark `invisibility' (compare Heiltsuk, Rath, 1981, p. 77). On the notional character of the category see discussion in Section IV below).

For comparison, in Heiltsuk we have (Rath, 1981):

-qk	3-1	vis
-qkc	3-1	inv
-q^{w}	3-2,	vis
-q^{w}c	3-2,	inv
-qi	3-3,	vis
-qic	3-3,	inv

-qki gone.

Heiltsuk Demonstrative Items (Rath, 1981, 87-88; Boas, 1947, 297)

Demonstrative of	**Independent Item**	**Deictic Clitic**
1 vis	**gaq^{w}**	**-gaǰga**
1 inv	**gacq^{w}**	**-gacǰga**
2 vis	**quǰ^{w}**	**-(i)aǰ^{w}**
2 inv	**quǰ^{w}cǰ^{w} [!]**	**-(i)aǰacǰ^{w}**
3 vis	**qiǰ^{w}**	**-(i)aǰi / -i**
3 inv	**qicǰ^{w}**	**-(i)acǰi/ -ac [??]***
gone	**qkiǰ^{w}**	**-iǰg(a)***

*Always preceded by a temporal suffix, e.g. **-xd**.

I think it will ultimately be reasonable to argue that the Kwakw'ala prenominals correspond historically to the pronominal clitics in the Upper Northern Wakashan languages. This idea can be motivated on internal grounds in Kwakw'ala itself.

[2] I can't verify this claim yet completely. There has been a lot of importation of Haisla into Henaaksiala and more work needs to be done with speakers of Henaaksiala besides the principal consultant for Lincoln and Rath, the late Gordon Robertson.

For a start here's a table based on the Kwakw'ala table above, but with Haisla (Kitamaat) forms, as near as I can do it. Items in brackets are projected on the basis of other forms and Heiltsuk forms but have not been verified. (Orthographic note: ***e*** is **ə** throughout in Haisla examples.)

Haisla Demonstrative Items

Demonstrative of	Independent Item	Deictic Clitic
1 vis	**qix**	**-gaǎga**
1 inv	**[qic(e)x]**	**[-gac(e)ǎga]**
2 vis	**qu**	**-aǎu**
2 inv	**[quc]**	**[-acǎu]**
3 vis	**qi**	**-aǎi / -i**
3 inv	**qic**	**-acǎi/ -ac [??]***
gone	**qiki**	**-tiǎga**

*More on this below, Section 4.

The items in the last column are actually composite, consisting of a "primary" and "secondary" deictic (Lincoln and Rath, 1986). When a nominal phrase consisting of an preposed attributive element with instrumental clitic **-s** and a nominal occurs, the primary deictic drops out. Further, when the deictic affixes go on proper names the secondary deictic drops, and we have something reminiscent of Boas's vocalic and consonantic distinction. But there are many details still to be pinned down. Moreover, knowledge of the details of the system seem to be fading. The emerging situation with some speakers is one where the 3 vis forms seem to be taking over, and they are already a kind of default.

(More on this system as it appears in Heiltsuk can be found in the pages of Boas, 1947, mentioned - 296-299-- and in Rath, 1981.)

In very recent work in Kitamaat Village (October, 2005), it has been possible to amplify the remarks made above on Haisla/Henaaksiala. Here is a full set of third person possessed form for the word **k’adayu** `pencil.' It is possible that there are still some alternate forms to be listed.

Third Person Possessive Forms in Haisla

POSSESSED thing near me

example	item	(inv)	inst	owner	(inv)	categories
kʼadayugasix	**-ga**		**-s**	**-ix**		**1 vis 1 vis**
kʼadayugacix	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**		**1 inv 1 vis**
kʼadayugasixc	**-ga**		**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**1 vis 1 inv**
kʼadayugacixc	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**1 inv 1 inv**
kʼadayugasu	**-ga**		**-s**	**-u**		**1 vis 2 vis**
kʼadayugacu	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**		**1 inv 2 vis**
kʼadayugasuc	**-ga**		**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**1 vis 2 inv**
kʼadayugacuc	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**1 inv 2 inv**
kʼadayugasi	**-ga**		**-s**	**-i**		**1 vis 3 vis**
kʼadayugaci	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**		**1 inv 3 vis**
kʼadayugasic	**-ga**		**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**1 vis 3 inv**
kʼadayugacic	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**1 inv 3 inv**
kʼadayugasgi	**-ga**		**-s**	**-ki**		**1 vis gone vis**
kʼadayugacgi	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**		**1 inv gone vis**
kʼadayugasgic	**-ga**		**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**1 vis gone inv**
kʼadayugacgic	**-ga**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**1 inv gone inv**

POSSESSED thing near you

example	item	(inv)	inst	owner	(inv)	categories
kʼadayuaqsix*	**-aq**		**-s**	**-ix**		**2 vis 1 vis**
kʼadayuaqcix	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**		**2 inv 1 vis**
kʼadayuaqsixc	**-aq**		**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**2 vis 1 inv**
kʼadayuaqcixc	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**2 inv 1 inv**
kʼadayuaqsu	**-aq**		**-s**	**-u**		**2 vis 2 vis**
kʼadayuaqcu	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**		**2 inv 2 vis**
kʼadayuaqsuc	**-aq**		**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**2 vis 2 inv**
kʼadayuaqcuc	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**2 inv 2 inv**
kʼadayuaqsi	**-aq**		**-s**	**-i**		**2 vis 3 vis**
kʼadayuaqci	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**		**2 inv 3 vis**
kʼadayuaqsic	**-aq**		**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**2 vis 3 inv**
kʼadayuaqcic	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**2 inv 3 inv**
kʼadayuaqsgi	**-aq**		**-s**	**-ki**		**2 vis gone vis**
kʼadayuaqcgi	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**		**2 inv gone vis**
kʼadayuaqsgic	**-aq**		**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**2 vis gone inv**
kʼadayuaqcgic	**-aq**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**2 inv gone inv**

*Because of the rule of velar spirantization, the **q** in these examples will normally be pronounced as **x̄**.

POSSESSED thing remote

example	item	(inv)	inst	owner	(inv)	categories
ḳ'adayuasix	**-a**		**-s**	**-ix**		**3 vis 1 vis**
ḳ'adayuacix	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**		**3 inv 1 vis**
ḳ'adayuasixc	**-a**		**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**3 vis 1 inv**
ḳ'adayuacixc	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**3 inv 1 inv**
ḳ'adayuasu	**-a**		**-s**	**-u**		**3 vis 2 vis**
ḳ'adayuacu	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**		**3 inv 2 vis**
ḳ'adayuasuc	**-a**		**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**3 vis 2 inv**
ḳ'adayuacuc	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**3 inv 2 inv**
ḳ'adayuasi	**-a**		**-s**	**-i**		**3 vis 3 vis**
ḳ'adayuaci	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**		**3 inv 3 vis**
ḳ'adayuasic	**-a**		**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**3 vis 3 inv**
ḳ'adayuacic	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**3 inv 3 inv**
ḳ'adayuasgi	**-a**		**-s**	**-ki**		**3 vis gone vis**
ḳ'adayuacgi	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**		**3 inv gone vis**
ḳ'adayuasgic	**-a**		**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**3 vis gone inv**
ḳ'adayuacgic	**-a**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**3 inv gone inv**

POSSESSED just gone

example	item	(inv)	inst	owner	(inv)	categories
ḵ'adayutisix	**-ti**		**-s**	**-ix**		**gone vis 1 vis**
ḵ'adayuticix	**-ti-c**		**-s**	**-ix**		**gone inv 1 vis**
ḵ'adayutisixc	**-ti**		**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**gone 1 inv**
ḵ'adayuticixc	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ix**	**-c**	**gone 1 inv**
ḵ'adayutisu	**-ti**		**-s**	**-u**		**gone vis 2 vis**
ḵ'adayuticu	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**		**gone inv 2 vis**
ḵ'adayutisuc	**-ti**		**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**gone vis 2 inv**
ḵ'adayuticuc	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-u**	**-c**	**gone inv 2 inv**
ḵ'adayutisi	**-ti**		**-s**	**-i**		**gone vis 3 vis**
ḵ'adayutici	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**		**gone inv 3 vis**
ḵ'adayutisic	**-ti**		**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**gone vis 3 inv**
ḵ'adayuticic	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-i**	**-c**	**gone inv 3 inv**
ḵ'adayutisgi	**-ti**		**-s**	**-ki**		**gone vis gone vis**
ḵ'adayuticgi	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**		**gone inv gone vis**
ḵ'adayutisgic	**-ti**		**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**gone vis gone inv**
ḵ'adayuticgic	**-ti**	**-c**	**-s**	**-ki**	**-c**	**gone inv gone inv**

It will be noted that this full set of 64 forms includes words showing both "visible" and "invisible" categories for the set of "just gone" meanings. Whether or not these

forms have been "regenerated" or preserved is an intriguing question which I cannot answer. In any case, the data illustrate vividly the value of doing intensive work in the field with knowledgeable speakers of an endangered language.

A formal parallel: Smalgyaxian (Tsimshianic)

I would like to point out a striking formal parallel to the much discussed "en/pro-clisis" that Boas underlined for Kwakw'ala, in the Tsimshianic (or as I prefer, Smalgaxian) languages (my remarks based mainly on Coast Tsimshian). In sentences without and with nominal arguments we see in Kwakw'ala what can be schematized like this:

12. **V-proS-proO-proI**
13. **V-preS N-preO N-preI N**

That is there are enclitic elements that relate not to their phonological hosts, but to a following nominal element, expressing case relations and deictic properties, including a distinction between following nominals on the basis of semantic classes: proper names, genericity, possessed vs non-possessed.

Details aside, this formal patterning is exactly what is found in Coast Tsimshian, usually discussed under the rubric of "connectives" (probably following Boas in his article `Tsimshian' in the Handbook (Boas, 1911: Vol I) devoted to Nisaga'a (Boas's Nass River Tsimshian) and Coast Tsimshian. Two of the three content elements just mentioned occur in the connective system (see Bach, n.d. -- notes posted on my website -- for a view of what is going on here, largely based on Boas's descriptions, which seems to do better than later analyses) including the distinction between `determinative' and `non-determinative' nominals. Determinate nominals are: free form pronominals (always with third person agreement!), proper names, and common nouns that can be used as names (close kin etc.) I don't know to what extent this formal patterning can be claimed to be a part of the areal characteristic. It is interesting that it is only Kwakw'ala that shows the fullest and clearest system of enclitic/proclitic marking, farthest away from Tsimshianic in present-day distribution. Southern Wakashan lacks the elaborate deixis of Northern Wakashan.

III. Space and Time

In their survey of languages in the Northwest volume of the ***Handbook of North American Indians***, Thompson and Kinkade (1990) list a number of typological characteristics of the Pacific Northwest ***Sprachbund*** (ib.: pp. 46-47). Let's look briefly at two of these features in the remainder of this paper, in this section, the following:

14. **Concepts of space and time occur within the same deictic particle...** (ib. column 16, and explanation)

We have noted the seventh category in the deictic system already, tagged as `gone' or `just gone.' In his few notes on Heiltsuk (Bella Bella), Boas wrote:

> In addition to the six forms of Kwakiutl...we find a form characterized by ki which indicates "something that was in view but is no longer in view." In meaning it is related to -xdi which in

> Kwakiutl indicates "passed out of existence," while in Bella Bella it has the same meaning as ki. (Boas, 1947: 296)

(I learned about these forms from the late Mike Shaw on my first trip to Kitamaat Village, many years ago, and also learned a valuable lesson: Listen to what your language expert is telling you and don't jump to conclusions based on your expectations!)

At first blush, it seems that we have here a good instantiation of the situation pointed to in the quote from Thompson and Kinkade. When I indicate the import of forms in the way I have: marking something that was here recently and is now gone, it seems like we have something like a present perfect tense idea. Mike Shaw said they meant something like "was just here" or "just gone." Speakers sometimes call them Past Tense. Notice by the way that Boas's meaning "something that was in view but is no longer in view" would account for why the category does not support a visible-invisible distinction.

At second blush, however, I think we need to rethink our presuppositions a little. Semanticists often appeal to temporal structures in explicating tense systems. And linguists often talk about `metaphorical' extensions of local notions to temporal ones. Such talk invariably gets us into thinking about ontological questions. This is not the place for an extended discussion of questions about `natural language metaphysics' (Bach, 1981, 1986).

IV. Visibility

"The ineluctable modality of the visible"
James Joyce ***Ulysses***

Going back to Thompson and Kinkade's areal characteristics:

13. **Visible-invisible (present-absent, or the like) contrast in the deictic system...** (Thompson and Kinkade, 1990: pp. 46 - 47 Column 17 and explanation)

The category of visibility is reported in a number or languages in the Pacific Northwest area as well as outside the area (including the Algonquian language Blackfoot): for example, Musqueam (Suttles, 2004) and Lillooet (van Eijk, 1997). However, it is not clear that we can identify the category across languages without more detailed study. I will confine myself here to a few remarks about the meaning of "invisible" marking in Northern Wakashan.

(My confession of ignorance here is fueled by similar differences across languages with respect to the categories `definite' and `indefinite.' See Matthewson, 1998, for a thorough examination of the differences in the meaning of socalled definite markers in some Salish languages as opposed to, for example, English.)

Boas (1947 and elsewhere) used the designation "visible" without comment. Lincoln and Rath (1986) and Rath (1981) use the following kind of locution for the invisible category: "invisible or seen with the mind's eye only."

In Haisla, the category of invisible seems to involve notions of existence as well as speaker's knowledge. For example, in opaque contexts as objects of verbs like **n'aka** `seek, look for' invisible remote marking is favoured. Similarly, one consultant

rejected using the visible remote ending in **"Massachusetts"-aǐ** on the grounds that she had never been to Massachusetts, or seen it. Clarifying these distinctions as used in the current language is very much on our agenda. (Compare Suttles' designation for Musqueam of demonstratives for "present and visible" vs "remote or hypothetical.")

A note on orthographies. My examples from North Wakashan are given in a kind of hybrid transcription to make comparisons easier. I have retranscribed Kwakiutl examples from Boas throughout. I use **tl tl' dl lh** for the laterals, postposed **'** for glottalized segments, ***c*** for the affricate **d^{z}.** In Haisla forms ***e em en el*** stand for **ə** and syllabic sonorants (sometime in fact pronounced with a vocalic segment). Where relevant, and in more extended example stress is marked with **'** after the stressed nucleus. The back velars are indicated variously in various orthographies: I use **q ǧ x̌** throughout. Readers of Boas materials should be warned about an unfortunate idiosyncracy: Boas used underdotted **ġ** for the back (uvular) sound, but underdotted **ẋ** for (in some contexts) the front velar spirant!

References

Bach, Emmon. 1981. On Time, Tense, and Aspect: An Essay in English Metaphysics. in Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*, New York: Academic Press, 63-8l.

Bach, Emmon. 1986. Natural Language Metaphysics. In R. Barcan Marcus, G.J.W. Dorn and P. Weingartner, eds. ***Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science VII*** (Amsterdam et al.: North Holland, 1986), pp. 573-595.

Bach, Emmon. n.d. Argument Marking in Riverine Tsimshian. Handout from a colloquium given in several places a few years ago. (See my website: http://www.people.umass.edu/ebach/papers/lingdex.htm)

Boas, Franz, ed. 1911-1922. ***Handbook of American Indian Languages***. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40. 2 vols. Rpt. New York: Humanities Press, 1969. [Introduction reprinted with J.W. Powell, Indian linguistic families of America North of Mexico. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966]

Boas, Franz. 1947. Kwakiutl Grammar with a Glossary of the Suffixes. Edited by Helene Boas Yampolsky with the Collaboration of Zellig S. Harris. ***Transactions of the American Philosophical Society***. N.S. Vol 37, Part 3, pp. 202[?]-377. Reprinted by AMS Press, New York.

Boas, Franz and George Hunt. 1905. ***Kwakiutl Texts***. Leiden: E. J. Brill; New York: G. E. Stechert. (= Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, vol. 3.) (Repr. New York, AMS Press, 1975.)

Jacobson, Steven A. 1995. ***A Practical Grammar of the Central Alaskan Yup'ik Eskimo Language***. With Yup'ik readings written by Anna W. Jacobson. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center and Program, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Lincoln, Neville J. and John C. Rath. 1986. ***Phonology, Dictionary and Listing of Roots and Lexical Derivates of the Haisla Language of Kitlope and Kitimaat***. (2 vols.) Ottawa: National Museum of Man Mercury Series. Canadian Ethnology Service: Paper No. 103.

Matthewson, Lisa. 1998. ***Determiner Systems and Quantificational Strategies: Evidence from Salish***. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Mithun, Marianne. 1999. ***The Languages of Native North America.*** Cambridge University Press.

Montler, Timothy. 1986. ***An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish.*** University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1986 No.4.

Rath, John C. 1981. ***A Practical Heiltsuk-English Dictionary***. With a Grammatical Introduction. (2 vols.) Ottawa: National Museum of Man Mercury Series. Canadian Ethnology Service: Paper No. 75.

Suttles, Wayne. 2004. ***Musqueam Reference Grammar.*** Vancouver / Toronto: UBC Press.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Dale Kinkade. 1990. Languages. In Wayne Suttles, ed. ***Northwest Coast. Handbook of North American Indians***. Vol. 7. Pp. 30-51. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

van Eijk, Jan. 1997. ***The Lillooet Language.*** Vancouver: UBC Press.