<u>Syntactic Ergativity</u> <u>in</u> Coast Tsimshian (Sm'algyax)

Jean Mulder University of Alberta

1. Introduction

In this paper, I examine a range of syntactic constructions in Coast Tsimshian to determine whether they are ergative or accusative. In accessing the typology of a language, it is a relatively straight-forward matter to determine whether it is ergative or accusative in terms of its morphological marking. However, at the syntactic level, making a decision as to whether a construction or process is ergative (S treated in the same way as 0) or accusative (S treated like A) involves considering several different types of syntactic evidence which do not necessarily all give the same result. First, a distinction must be made as to syntactic operations which are universally accusative. That is, in those languages where they occur, they always treat the S like the A. This is true of imperatives, jussive complements, and 'want' and similar verbs. Even here, though, I show that with imperatives, for example, there is an ergative aspect to this construction in Coast Tsimshian.

Next a distinction must be made as to constructions and processes which have a universal basis that is not dependent on S and A, as in an accusative construction, or on S and O, as in an ergative construction. For example, in the case of causatives, the universal basis is dependent upon the A and with reflexives it is dependent on the O.

Then a distinction must be made with syntactic operations which are language-particular as to whether they are accusative or ergative. These include coordination, subordination, relativization and topicalization. In most laguages it seems, these processes also function accusatively. But, it is definitely not the case that all of these processes in all languages work in terms of S and A. Some languages function in terms of S and O for part or all of these processes and it is these languages which can be said to show syntactic ergativity. The degree of syntactic ergativity is then dependent on the number of syntactic operations which treat the S like the O. It is demonstrated in this paper that Coast Tsimshian is syntactically, as well as morphologically, ergative.

The final distinction to be made is syntactic operations which function to place an NP in an S function for a variety of syntactic and discourse purposes. These include passive and antipassive which place an O or A in an S 'slot', respectively, producing an intransitive sentence. It is also shown in this paper, that Coast Tsimshian lacks either of these operations and that functions which these operations typically serve in a language are handled in other ways in Coast Tsimshian.

The syntactic constructions and processes which have been categorized here are discussed in terms of the Coast Tsimshian langauge in the sections that follow. Sections 2-4 cover those operations which are universally accusative, Sections 5-6 - those which are universally neither accusative nor ergative, and Sections 7-10 - those which are language particular as to ergativity and accusativity. Then in Section 11, I consider the lack of a passive or antipassive process in Coast Tsimshian.

2. Imperatives

Imperatives, cross-linguistically, have a 2nd person pronoun as the stated or understood S or A NP who the speaker intends to get to perform

an action. Thus, as Dixon (1979:112) states:

...the fact that S and A have the same possibilities of reference for the imperative constructions of some particular langauge (and the fact that, say, either can be deleted from surface structure) is no evidence at all for the placement of that language on a continuum of syntactic 'ergativity' vs. 'accusativity'. Even the most ergative language will treat S and A NPs of imperatives the same. This follows from the meaning of imperatives (addressee is told to be agent)...

In Coast Tsimshian, there are five types of imperative constructions that are common in discourse and narratives and in each type the S or A is the addressee of the imperative and is a 2nd person. For example, one type is a periphrastic construction which can be translated as <u>It would be</u> <u>good if you...</u>, as in (1):

(1)a. Aam dm k'yeexg-n -t. good FUT escape -2SG-DEM S It would be good if you escaped. (Boas 1911:407)

b. Aam m -dm di -baal-t-ga, k'anayis, dm ganamn -t. good 2SG-FUT also-try -3-DEM friend FUT be good-3 A 0 S It would be good if you tried it too, my friend, it will be fun.

In (la) which is intransitive and in (lb) which is transitive, the S or A is the addressee of the imperative and appears as a dependent pronoun.

In Sm'algyax, in addition to this universal S/A linkage, there is also one respect in which S and O are treated alike. In particular, in the imperative construction which could be termed a 'true' imperative, the S and A must be 2nd person (the universal rule), but when the A is 2nd person, singular it is always deleted whereas the S, like the O, is retained:

- (2)a. Amuxs -n. listen-2SG S Listen.
 - b. Sm -gyit -dax -yagwa aniis -it, damxł. very-right-firmly-hold branch-DEM friend there Hold on to the branch tight, my friend. (A = 2SG)
- (3)a. Yüü duus. (E)⁵ hide cat Hide the cat. (A = 2SG)
 - b. Sm yüü duus. (E) 2PL hide cat Hide the cat.

-sda nah wil sa -ałg -at-da. -CN PAST be make-fire-3 -DEM PREP wood S while he was getting wood. (Boas 1912:186)

(9) Mał -a n gun -sa -ałg -a łams -u. tell-CN lSG CAUS-make-fire-CN son-in-lSG PREP A wood PRED law POSS Tell my son-in-law that I order him to get firewood. (Boas 1912:100)

The jussive complement is a prepositional phrase in (8) and (9) as it is in the first type discussed above. In (8), <u>Gunaxnesmgyad</u> is the 0 of the main clause, <u>nah ła małdida...Gunaxnesmgyad</u> 'he told Gunaxnesmgyad to...' and the A of the jussive complement <u>wila dzabadas Gunaxnesmgyad</u> 'Gunaxnesmgyad do it'. In (9), <u>łamsu</u> 'my son-in-law' is the 0 of the main clause, <u>mała...łamsu</u> 'tell my son-in-law to...' and the 0 of the jussive complement <u>n gunsa'ałga łamsu</u> 'I order my son-in-law to get firewood'. Here <u>ałg</u>-'firewood' is incorporated into the verb.'

In summary, in the first type, the coreferential A or S is not reduced to a dependent pronoun or deleted in jussive complements where it is coreferential with the O, or indirect object, of the main clause. In the second type of jussive complement, deletion does occur and the coreferential NP is an O in the main clause and a S, A or O in the subordinate clause. Thus, in the first type where Coast Tsimshian follows the universal tendency whereby S and A have the same possibilities of reference, it does not allow the deletion of the coreferential element. In the second type, where deletion is allowed, the coreferential NP is an S, A or O and this type is, therefore, neither ergative or accusative.

4. 'Want' and Similar Verbs

In a number of languages, certain verbal forms that are dependent on another verb may lack an overt S, or A, if and only if the S, or A, of the dependent verb is the same as the S of the main verb. For example, in English, the verb want behaves in this way:

(10)a. The baby wants to walk.b. The babysitter wants to watch the movie.

Where the S, or A, of the dependent verb is not the same as that of the main verb, as is possible with <u>want</u>, the S, or A, of the dependent verb must be expressed overtly (in English, as the O of want):

(11)a. The man wants the salesman to leave.

b. The salesman wants the man to buy his product.

As these examples illustrate, this condition treats the S and A of the dependent verb alike, in contrast to the O.

In Coast Tsimshian, there are two types of constructions with 'want' and similar verbs: if the agentive argument of a verb such as <u>hasax</u> 'to want' is coreferential with the S of the complement clause than this clause will occur as the object of <u>hasax</u> 'to want' and the agentive argument is an A. However, if the agentive argument of <u>hasax</u> 'to want' is coreferential with the A of the complement clause or is not coreferential with either the S or A, then the complement clause occurs as a prepositional phrase and the agentive argument is an S. The first situation occurs in (12) and (14), whereas the second occurs in (13) and (15). With respect to deletion, when the agentive argument of <u>hasax</u> 'to want' is correferential with the S or A of the dependent clause, there is no deletion, as in (12). There is no deletion even when the NP in the dependent clause is 3rd person, as in (13). But the S or A in the dependent clause does reduce to a dependent pronoun if it is a lexical NP, as in (14). With respect to a non-coreferential NP in the complement clause, it appears in the prepositional clause rather than as an 0 in the higher clause as in English. This is illustrated in (15) with an S:

- (12) Hasag-u dm di <u>ga</u>lmiilg-u. want -lSG FUT on my play -lSG A part S I want to play.
- (13) Hasax-t-ga dm -t moga -n -t-ga. want -3-CN FUT-3 go -CAUS-3-DEM S PREP A aboard O He wanted to take him aboard. (Boas 1912:126)
- (14) Hasag-a awta dm yeltg -it da lax galts'ap. want -CN porcupine FUT return-3 CN place village PRED S PREP Porcupine wanted to return to the mainland.
- (15) Ada hasag-ayu da dm lu-hat'ak -laatg-n. and want -lSG CN FUT in-lengthwise -move -2SG along middle S I want you to creep in. (Boas 1912:180)

In (12), the A of <u>hasag</u>- 'to want' is a lst singular dependent pronoun, the O is the complement clause, <u>dm di galmiilgu</u> 'I on my part will play', and the A is coreferential with the S, -<u>u</u> 'ISG' in the complement clause. In (13), the S of <u>hasag</u>- is a 3rd person dependent pronoun which is coreferential with the A, -<u>t</u> on <u>dm</u> 'FUT' in the prepositional clause <u>ga dm mogantga</u> 'he will take him aboard'. The A of <u>hasag</u>- 'to want' is a full lexical NP in (14) and is coreferential with the dependent pronoun -<u>t</u> '3' suffixed to <u>yeltg</u>- 'to return' in the object complement <u>dm yeltgit da lax gal-</u> <u>dent</u> pronoun in <u>yeltgit</u> 'he return' is an epenthetic vowel.) The S of <u>hasag</u>- in (15) is a lst person singular dependent pronoun and is not coreferential with the S of the prepositional complement which is a 2nd singular dependent pronoun on the verb <u>laatg</u>- 'to move'. (The -<u>a</u>- before the dependent pronoun in <u>hasagay</u>u'I want' is an epenthetic vowel.)

To summarize, verbs like 'want', in Coast Tsimshian, behave like similar verbs cross-linguistically, in that they take a complement in which the S or A of the dependent verb can be coreferential with the agentive argument of want. In this respect, Sm'algyax follows the universal tendency to group S with A as NPs that can be coreferential with the agentive argument of want. However, unlike a number of languages, this language does not allow deletion of the coreferential NP, but only a reduction to a pronoun if it is a full lexical NP. Similarly, a non-coreferential S or A stays in the complement clause and does not appear in the higher clause as an O, like in English.

However, counter to the universal tendency, Coast Tsimshian also shows some non-accusative tendencies with respect to this construction: if the argument of a verb like <u>hasax</u> 'to want' is coreferential with the S in the or the O is replaced by a reflexive form and the A serves as the antecedent of the reflexivization 'from' the A 'to' the O. In cases where a direction can be determined, it is the O that undergoes reflexivization and this has been taken as evidence for accusative syntax (Anderson 1976: 14-6). However, I feel that the directionality from the A to the O is instead a universal tendency and does not provide evidence as to the syntactic ergativity or accusativity of a language.

In Coast Tsimshian, both types of reflexives are found with the deletion of the O being a further development of the reflexive construction in which the O is present. First, when the Q is present it is an independent pronoun and the proclitic <u>lap</u> 'REFLX' occurs with the verb as in (22) and (23):

- (22) Lap niidz-a łguwoomłg-at 'niit.(E) REFLX see -CN child -CN 3SG PRED PRED PRED The child sees her/himself.
- (23) Lap di-daalg-m dp 'nüüm. (E) REFLX PL-talk -lPL PL lPL ; We are talking to ourselves.

In (22), the A is a lexical NP, $\frac{1}{2}$ child', whereas, in (23), it is a dependent pronoun, -m 'lPL'.

When the 0 is deleted in a reflexive construction, the proclitic <u>gyilk</u> 'REFLX', as well as the proclitic <u>lap</u>, occur with the verb:

- (24) Lap gyilk niis-ga łguwoomłk. (E) REFLX REFLX see - CN child PRED The child sees her/himself.
- (25) Lap gyilk di-daalg-'nm. (E) REFLX REFLX PL-talk -1PL S

We are talking to ourselves.

In (24) and (25), which correspond to (23) and (24), respectively, the O has been deleted and the resulting sentence is intransitive. This is signaled by the change in predicative connective in (24) and the change from an objective to a definite objective pronoun in (25).

With respect to the universal characteristics of reflexives, then, the two types of reflexive constructions found in Coast Tsimshian are similar to the two types found cross-linguistically. Furthermore, Coast Tsimshian follows the universal tendency for the directionality of the reflexive to be from the A to the O, since when the O is present, it is an independent pronoun that is coreferential with the A which is a lexical NP or a dependent pronoun. However, as was noted in the beginning of this section, this should not be taken as evidence of syntactic accusativity since it is a universal tendency of reflexivization.

7. Coordination

Coordination is a syntactic process that relates two clauses which can have an NP in common. In some languages, there are restrictions on the syntactic role the coreferential NP can have in either clause, or there may be syntactic conditions on deletability of the second occurence of this NP. In Coast Tsimshian, coordination of clauses is indicated by <u>ada</u> 'and' and occasionally by <u>a</u> 'PREP'. With this type of clause linkage, there are no restrictions on the syntactic role of the coreferential NP and this NP is only reduced, not deleted, in the second clause. First, there is no change in the coreferential S or A in the second clause when it is a dependent pronoun in the first clause. This is the case regardless of whether both clauses are intransitive as in (26), transitive as in (27), or one is intransitive and the other is transitive as in (28):

- (26) Ha 'wileeks-u ada suuns-u. PAST be old -1SG and be -1SG S blind S I am old and blind.
- (27) Dawla-t sa -spiil gahuu -m noł da gayk then -3 off-pull necklace-CN shell CN chest A ADJ PREP Then he pulled a shell necklace from his chest
 - -t ada-t gun -ooy -t da awa ts'u'uts. 3 and-3 toward-throw-3 CN near bird POSS A O PREP and threw it to the bird.
- (28) Dawla 'naka -t ga-an'on lgulg-m 'yuut ada haaytg-it. then reach out-3 PL-hand young-CN man and stand -3 with hand A ADJ up S He reached for the boy's hands and stood up.

In (26), both clauses are intransitive and the S in each is $-\underline{u}$ 'lSG', whereas, in (27), both clauses are transitive and the coreferential A in each is $-\underline{t}$ '3'. The first clause in (28) is transitive and the A, $-\underline{t}$ '3' is coreferential with the S, $-\underline{it}$ '3' in the second clause. (The $-\underline{i}$ - in the $-\underline{it}$ '3' is an epenthetic vowel.)

If the S or A of the first clause, however, is a lexical NP, then it is reduced to a dependent pronoun in the second clause. Again this is the case regardless of whether the clauses are intransitive as in (29), transitive as in (30), or a combination as in (31):

- (29) Mo'mg-a han<u>a'a</u> ada miilk-t. smile-CN woman and dance-3 PRED S The woman smiled and danced.
- (30) Gyiimkl-as <u>Galganms Hayda lgu mati ada-t ludam -t</u>. wipe -CN kid mt. and-3 comfort-3 PRED goat A O <u>Galganms Hayda wiped the mountain goat kid dry and comforted</u> it.
- Ada wil dzaga -yaa-sga awta -ga, ada-t and then across-go -CN porcupine-DEM and-3 PRED A
 Then porcupine walked across, and
 dzaga -goo n -sm -lax-yuup-t -ga.
 - across-go POSS-real-on -land-3 -DEM to POSS went across to his country.

porcupine was about to die', is coreferential with the 0, -t '3' on the verb <u>ksa'ooy</u> 'to throuw out', of the subordinate clause, <u>dat wil ksa'ooyt</u> <u>da txa'axsga nts'apt</u> 'when he threw him out of his den'.

That the coreferential NP is not deleted but is only reduced if it is a full lexical NP is likewise shown in (33)-(37): The main clause S in (33) is a lexical NP, <u>hana'a</u> 'woman' and is reduced to a dependent pronoun, $-\underline{it}$ '3' on the verb <u>'wiihawtg-</u> 'to cry' in the subordinate clause. In (34)-(37), the S or A of the main clause is a dependent pronoun and the coreferential NP in the subordinate clause is not deleted but also occurs as a dependent pronoun.

To summarize, like coordination, the syntactic process of subordination 'n Coast Tsimshian does not restrict the syntactic role of the coreferential S, A or O and does not allow deletion of the coreferential NP in the subordinate clause. Instead, if the S, A or O is a lexical NP, then it is reduced to a dependent pronoun. However, since the reduction is not restricted to the S and A, or the S and O, it is neither an accusative or an ergative process, respectively, and does not provide evidence as to the categorization of Sm'algyax syntax.

9. Topicalization

Topicalization is a syntactic process that gives prominence to a particular NP within a sentence. The syntactic strategies for giving such prominence can be the same for an A, S or O (i.e., neither ergative or accusative), they can treat the S in the same way as an O (i.e., ergative), or they can treat the S in the same way as an A (i.e., accusative). The different strategies might distinguish between whether an A, S and O can all be topicalized, whether all types of NPs such as full NPs as well as pronominals can be topicalized, and how the different topicalized NPs are marked.

In Coast Tsimshian, the relevant parameters for topicalization are what type of NP is given prominence, whether or not there is a topic marker, and the marking of the connectives and person agreemnt. With regard to the first parameter, full NPs, independent pronouns, and the sentence initial demonstrative pronoun <u>ni'nii</u> can all be topicalized regardless of whether they function as an \overline{A} , \overline{S} or 0.¹ For example, the full NP that is topicalized is an A in (38), an S in (39) and an 0 in (40). In (41), the topicalized S is an independent pronoun and, in (42), the topicalized 0 is the sentence initial demonstrative pronoun ni'nii.

(38) 'Yagay 'wii gyisiyaasg-at in -t deen -tga instead great northwind -3 TOP-3 avenge-CN A A PRED Instead the great northwind avenged the little

> -sga igu alasg-m yetsisk. -CN little weak -CN land PRED ADJ animal weak animal.

(39) Awta uks -haytg-it gi -sga lax małiitg-m kyoox. porcupine toward-stand-3 DEM-CN top green -CN grass S PREP ADJ Porcupine stood at the edge on the green grass.

- (40) Waab -a awaan nah dzab-u. house-CN DET PAST make-1SG NP A That's the house that I built. (Dunn 1979b:342)
- (41) "'Nüüyu dm ksgooga -t," daya-ga awta. ISG FUT be first-3 say -CN porcupine S S PRED "I will go first," said Porcupine.
- (42) Ni'nii-sga k'yin-k'yinam-t gi -sga łgułg-m DEM -CN PL -give -3 DEM-CN young-CN PRO PRED A PREP ADJ That is what he gave to his son.

'yuuta-t -ga. man -3 -DEM POSS (Boas 1912:80)

In (38) the A, 'wii gyisiyaasg- 'great northwind', is in preverbal position, while in (39) and (40), the S, awta 'porcupine', and the O, waab 'house', occupy this position, respectively. In (41) the S, 'nüüyu 'ISG', has been topicalized and in (42) it is the O, ni'nii 'DEM PRO' which has been given prominence.

While there is no distinction between an A, S or O as to what type of NP is given prominence, there is a distinction made with respect to the presence of a topic marker. As is illustrated in (38), when an A is topicalized there is a topic marker \underline{in} 'TOP', whereas with a topicalized S or O, as in (39)-(42), there is no topic marker.

The marking of person agreement and the connectives is also sensitive to whether the topicalized NP is an S, A or an O. First, when an S is topicalized, it occurs in preverbal position and the verb is suffixed with a 3rd person dependent pronoun, $-\underline{t}$ '3', as in (39) and (41). The $-\underline{t}$ can only be interpreted as showing person agreement and not as a connective.

When an A is topicalized, the A occurs in preverbal position and the subjective dependent pronoun, \underline{t} '3', marking person agreement with the A shows some interesting variations which are discussed below. Connectives do not occur with a topicalized A with the exception of one example, (38), where this connective is still present when the A is topicalized. In all of the other examples, the only predicative connective which is present marks the following O:

- (43)a. T 'nüüyu dm -t in naks -ga lguulg -n -t. 3 lSG FUT-3 TOP marry-CN daughter-2SG-DEM A A PRED POSS It is I who will marry your daughter. (Boas 1911:365)
 - b. "'Nüüyu dm -t in naks -ga lguulg -n -t, ISG FUT-3 TOP marry-CN daughter-2SG -DEM A PRED POSS I am the one who will marry your daughter,

7

In (46), the head of the relative clause, <u>t'apxadooltga hana'angt</u> 'two women', is an A in the relative clause, <u>in waay Hatsenas</u> 'who had found Hatsenas' and in (47), the head, <u>nts'mwaabtga</u> 'his lodge', is an S in the relative clause, <u>gu haytgit gisga nasüülga t'aa</u> 'which stood in the middle of the lake'. The head, in (48), is <u>sunaksga</u> 'new wife' which is an O in the relative clause, <u>nakstga</u> 'whom he had married', and the head, in (49), is -a<u>t</u> '3' which is an A in the relative clause, <u>in huwaata txa'nii ligi</u>-<u>waalga</u> 'who were trading all kinds of things' (the -<u>a</u> in -<u>at</u> '3' is an

While there is no distinction between an A, S or O as to what type of NP is relativized, there is a distinction made with respect to a relative marker and whether one must be present. As is illustrated in (46) and (49) when an A is relativized, there is a relative marker in "REL', where-as with a relativized S or O, as in (47) + (48), there is either no relative marker or it is <u>qu</u> 'REL'.

The marking of person agreement and the connectives are also sensitive to whether the relativized NP is an S, O or A in the dependent relative clause. When the head is an S or O in the relative clause, there is either a prepositional connective suffixed to the S or O, as in (47) and (48), or, if the relative marker \underline{qu} is present, the prepositional connective, \underline{da} , occurs after the relative marker. (I have also found one example where both prepositional connectives and the relative marker are present.) In casual speech, the prepositional connective does not occur. In addition, when the head is an S in the relative clause, the verb of that clause is suffixed with a 3rd person dependent pronoun, $-\underline{t}$ '3' as in (47). There is no such marking when the head is an O.

When the head is an A in the relative clause, connectives do not occur as part of relativization. As with topicalization, the dependent pronoun $-\underline{t}$ '3' occurs with several different variations. For example, in (46), the dependent pronoun $-\underline{t}$ '3' is suffixed to the head of the relative clause, $\underline{t'apxadooltga}$ hana'angt 'two women'. In the most formal variation, the $-\underline{t}$ is suffixed to the head of the clause as well as to the relative marker, in. In other cases, the $-\underline{t}$ is suffixed just to the relative marker, in, or just to a tense/aspect marker such as <u>nah</u> 'PAST'. In casual speech the -t occurs optionally.

In summary, relativization, like topicalization, in Sm'algyax, is a process which has ergative, accusative and neither ergative or accusative characteristics. First, since all three arguments, A, S and O, can be relativized and there is no restriction as to the type of NP that can be relativized, this aspect of relativization is neither ergative or accusative. Next, the relative marker is in 'REL' with a head that is an A in the relative clause, whereas the relative marker is gu or β with a head that is an S or O in the relative clause. In this respect, relativization is ergative in Coast Tsimshian. Connectives were found to be part of the relativization process with an S or O but not with an A. In this respect, relativization is also ergative. Finally, it was shown that person agreement marking occurs with a head of a relative clause that is an S or A in the relative clause, but not with an O. This aspect of relativization, then, is accusative.

11. The Lack of a Passive or an Antipassive

In Sm'algyax, there are no syntactic processes which correspond to a passive or an antipassive construction. That is, following Dixon's (1979: 119) definitions, there is no passive process which "places the deep O NP in surface S function, and marks the deep A NP with an oblique case/preposition/etc. (this NP can then be deleted)." Similarly, there is no antipassive process which "places the deep A NP in surface S function, and marks the deep A NP in surface S function, and marks the deep A NP in surface S function, and marks the deep O NP with an oblique case/preposition/etc. (this NP can then be deleted)."

There is a verb-formation process in Coast Tsimshian which involves the semantic incorporation of the O into the verb. Syntactically, the number of arguments on the verb is reduced and the A becomes the S of the resulting intransitive verb. Morphologically, a suffix is added to the verb stem. This process relates lexical items such as:

(50)a.	g <u>a</u> b	g <u>a</u> 'psk	eat eat berries off the tree
b.	beex	beexk	tear tear bark from a cedar tree

Indeed, Dunn (1983:3) terms this an 'antipassive' rule. However, it is not a productive morphological process, but rather a process relating a few lexical items. Because of the very small number of verbs with a corresponding 'antipassive' form and the fact that the complex stem has a more specialized meaning than the simple verb stem, it would seem that the complex verb stems should be lexically derived as is done in Dunn's (1983) analysis.

The lack of a passive or an antipassive construction in Coast Tsimshian is not too suprising when we look at the reasons for the existence and uses of passives and antipassives. For example, one of the functions of a passive, or an antipassive, is to bring the O, or the A, into S function for processes such as coordination, subordination, and relativization. However, in each case, as it was shown in Sections 7, 8 and 10, there are no restrictions on the syntactic role of the relevant NP in these types of clause linkage.

Another function of a passive, or an antipassive, is to allow for a way to avoid having to mention an A, or an O, where either this is unknown or difficult to specify, or conversely, where this is already all too well known to the hearer. This is done in Sm^2 algyax by simply indicating the A or O by a third person dependent pronoun on the verb rather than as a full lexical NP. As the third person dependent pronoun does not specify gender or number it has a very general meaning. The following pairs of examples illustrate this first with an S (51), then an A with an O that is expressed (52), and finally an O with an A that is expressed (53):

(51)a. Yagwa sa -na'axs-as n -dzi'its -n. (E) PRES make-dress -CN POSS-grandmother-2SG PRED POSS Your grandmother is dressmaking.

b. Yagwa sa -na'axs-it.
 PRES make-dress -3
 S
 She is dressmaking.

9

native speaker rather than being from a text or observed in natural discourse.

- 6. Connectives, which are roughly analogous to case markers, are an extensive system of suffixes that are always in word final position and mark words that are syntactically related in specific ways. There are adjectival, adverbial, predicative, possessive, and prepositional connectives. For a full discussion of the connectives and person agreement on the verb see Chapter 2 of Mulder (1987b) and for a detailed argument of the analysis of topicalization presented here see Section 3.2.9 of Mulder (1987b).
- 7. With a non-causative sense, the proclitic <u>gun</u> has a meaning of 'to-wards' and occurs with intransitive and transitive verbs. However, the occurence of <u>gun</u> with this locative sense does not change a one-place predicate into a two-place one with the identification of S and O or a two-place predicate into a three-place one with the identification of the A and the indirect object.
- The proclitic <u>lap</u> also occurs with an emphatic meaning in sentences which are not syntactically reflexive:

Gyiloo baas -n, di lap -naxnoox -a'nu. don't be -2SG on my EMPH-have superna-1SG afraid S part tural power S Don't be afraid, I have supernatural power myself. (Boas 1912:100)

 The proclitic <u>gyilk</u>, like <u>lap</u>, also occurs in sentences which are not reflexive. In this case it has a meaning of 'back':

> Ndo, lu-yeltg-n, hawin na -gyilks-niidz-n. go on in-turn -2SG before ISG-back -look -2SG = return S A at O Go back, lest I look back upon you.

10. It should be noted that this sentence was not directly elicited but is the second line in a repetition story that is part of the primary level reading sereis developed for School District No. 52 (Prince Rupert, B.C). The two sentence frames in the story are:

 Xsmasg-m
 ol
 xsmasg-m
 ol
 gooyu niidz-n?

 brown -CN
 bear
 brown -CN
 bear
 what
 see -2SG

 ADJ
 ADJ
 S

 Brown
 bear,
 brown bear, what do you see?

 Niidz-u
 masg-m
 ts'u'uts, ada di
 -t niis-d
 -u.

 see
 -ISG
 red
 -CN
 bird
 and on
 -3 see
 -TRANS-ISG

 A
 ADJ
 its
 A
 =look at
 0

 part
 I
 see
 and it
 is looking at me.

(The underlined NPs are changed throughout the repetition story).

- 11. Dunn (1978b:342) claims that non-pronominal As can not be topicalized. However, I have found topicalized non-pronominal As occuring freely in texts.
- 12. I have not been able to find enough examples in texts of relative

clauses that contain a tense/aspect marker to determine if the occurrence of the person agreement marker $-\underline{t}$ is also conditioned the the tense/aspect of the sentence and by the semantic content of the A and O relative to each other as it is with topicalization.

Bibliography

Anderson, S.

1976. On the Notion of Subject in Ergative Languages. In C. Li, ed., Subject and Topic. Pp. 1-25. New York: Academic Press.

Boas, F.

1912. Tsimshian Texts, New Series. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, Vol. III. Pp. 76-284. Leyden: E.J. Brill.

Dixon, R. M. W.

1972. The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland. Cambridge: University Press.

1979. Ergativity. Language 55.1:59-138.

Dunn, J. A.

1978. Coast Tsimshian Relztivization. In Working Papers for the 13th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages. Pp. 334-51.

1983. Coast Tsimshian Non-basal Suffixes. Anthropological Linguistics 25:1-18.

Jacobsen, W. H.

1979. Why Does Washo Lack a Passive? In F. Plank, ed., Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations. Pp. 145-60. New York: Academic Press.

Mulder, J. G.

1987a. Morphological Ergativity in Coast Tsimshian. In P. Kroeber, ed., Native American Languages and Grammatical Typology. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

1987b. Ergativity in Coast Tsimshian (Sm'algyax). Ph.D. dissertation. UCLA.