

# RHETORICAL NOMINALIZATION IN BARBAREÑO CHUMASH

MARIANNE MITHUN

*University of California, Santa Barbara*

Much work on grammatical change has focused on the evolution of larger structures into smaller ones: the solidification of discourse patterns into sentence-level syntactic structures, the reduction of complex sentences into simple sentences, and the erosion of independent words into affixes. But grammar can also evolve in the opposite direction. Here one development of this type is examined: the extension of a prefix from a derivational morpheme originally used to create new words, to a marker of sentence-level syntactic relations among clauses, and finally to a marker of discourse-level pragmatic relations among sentences. The process is illustrated with material from Barbareño Chumash, a member of the Chumashan language family spoken along the central California Coast.

## 1. BARBAREÑO

The last speaker of Barbareño, Mary Yee, died in 1965, but there is extensive written documentation of the language, recorded largely by John Peabody Harrington from around 1913 until his death in 1961. Harrington worked primarily with speakers Juan de Jesus Justo, Juliana Ignacio, Luisa Ignacio, Mrs. Ignacio's daughter Lucrecia Garcia, and especially Mrs. Garcia's daughter Mary Yee. Madison Beeler also worked with Mary Yee between 1954 and the early 1960's. Major grammatical descriptions are in Beeler 1970, 1976; Ono 1996; and Wash 2001. A fuller bibliography of work on the language can be found in Mithun 1999. Material cited here comes from texts dictated by Mary Yee to Harrington, reproduced on reel 59 of microfilm copies of Harrington's notes prepared by the Smithsonian Institution (Mills and Brickfield, eds. 1986). These Harrington texts (JPH) have been compiled into a parsed database by Suzanne Wash (SW). Most of the morphological analyses included here coincide with those in the database, though a few of the original glosses have been altered slightly.

## 2. BASIC STRUCTURE.

Barbareño generally shows rich verb morphology and somewhat simpler noun morphology. Verbs lay out the skeleton of the clause, with minimally a verb stem, a pronominal prefix referring to the subject, and a pronominal suffix referring to the object if there is one. Additional prefixes and suffixes may be present as well.

### (1) Basic verb structure

a. *skutiywunwaš*

s-kutiy-wun-waš

3.SUBJECT-see-3.PL.OBJECT-PAST

'he saw them'

b. *pqili'itaquswun*

p-qili-itaq-us-wun

2.SUBJECT-HABITUAL-hear-DATIVE.APPLICATIVE-3.PL.OBJECT

'you hear them'

Basic clause structure is predicate-initial. Lexical nominals and other dependent constituents are marked with a proclitic *hi=* that simply shows syntactic dependency.

- (2) Clauses: basically predicate-initial, with *hi=* marked dependents

*skutiywunwaš*  
s-kuti-wun-waš  
3.SUBJECT-see-3.PL.OBJECT-PAST  
'He saw

*hiłinʔinyuʔ*  
hi=l=ʔin-ʔinyuʔ  
DEPENDENT=ARTICLE=RDP-Indian  
Indian women

*hiłeneneq*  
hi=l=ʔen-eneq  
DEPENDENT=ARTICLE=RDP-woman

*hiheʔnewala.*  
hi=heʔ=newala  
DEPENDENT=PROXIMAL=Nevada  
in Nevada.'

JPH 59.507 SW 92

Focused or topicalized constituents may appear before the nuclear clause. The clause is often then preceded by one of several proclitics, such as *ʔi=* in (3).

- (3) Cleft with *ʔi=* marked clause

*hełwaqwaqáq*  
heʔ=l=waq-waqáq-ʔ  
PROXIMATE=ARTICLE-RDP-frog.species-PLURALIZER  
'The frogs

*ʔipaka ʔiʔaš<sup>h</sup>unač*  
ʔi=pa-ka=l=iy-ʔaš<sup>h</sup>unač  
CLEFT=EVIDENTIAL=then=ARTICLE=PL.SUBJECT-order.IMPRF  
must be the ones who rule the water.'

*hiheʔoʔ*  
hi=he=l=ʔoʔ  
DEP=PROX=ART=water  
JPH 59.0128 SW 11

Simple sentences may be nominalized to form dependent clauses. As in many languages, one way to nominalize a clause is with an article. The use of the article *l=* as a nominalizer can be seen in (4) and (5). (4) shows a sentential complement 'that they did not know', and (5) shows a nominalized clause serving as a modifier '(those) which are hot'.

- (4) Clause nominalized with the article *l=*

*ʔiyʔaleʔaqšwalawaš*  
iy-ʔal-e-aqšwalaw-waš  
PL.SUBJECT-NEGATIVE-NM-like-PAST  
'They did not like what they did not know.'

*hiliyekutixwalyik.*  
hi=l=iy-e-kutixwalyik  
DEPENDENT=ARTICLE-PL-NEGATIVE-know  
JPH 59.8 SW 10

- (5) Clause nominalized with the article *l=*

*siysináywun*  
 s-iy-sináy-wun  
 3.SUBJECT-PL-put.into-3.PL.OBJECT  
 they put them in  
 ‘They put

<i>hiho<sup>l</sup>yinčí</i>	<i>s<sup>l</sup>iš<sup>l</sup>iš<sup>l</sup>o<sup>w</sup></i>	<i>hiho<sup>l</sup>štuhtú<sup>l</sup>iwaš</i>
hi=ho <sup>l</sup> = <u>l</u> =yinčí	s- <sup>l</sup> iš- <sup>l</sup> išow- <sup>l</sup>	hi=ho <sup>l</sup> =s-tu <sup>l</sup> -tu <sup>l</sup> - <sup>l</sup> -iwaš
DEP=DISTAL= <u>ARTICLE</u> -be.hot	3-RDP-coal-PL	DEP=DISTAL=3-RDP-shell-PAST
<u>those that</u> are hot	coals	its former shells
the mussel shells into the <u>hot</u> coals. ‘		JPH 59.583 SW 49

### 3. THE NOMINALIZER *ʔal-*

Barbareño also contains a nominalizing prefix *ʔal-* that is applied to verbs to create new nouns. Added to the verb ‘to be hot’, for example, it derives the noun for ‘sun’: ‘the one that is hot’.

- (6) Derived nouns

<i>ishaw</i>	‘to be hot’	<i>ʔal-ishaw</i>	‘sun, day’
<i>apay</i>	‘to be on top, up, over’	<i>ʔal-apay</i>	‘sky, heaven, ceiling’
<i>olk’oy</i>	‘to go around’	<i>ʔal-olk’oy</i>	‘porpoise’

The reduplicated form *ʔal-ʔal-* > *ʔalal-* derives agentive nouns, terms for one who performs the action described by the verb. Added to the verb ‘sing’, for example, it creates a noun meaning ‘singer’. The nouns in (7) were derived from imperfective verb forms denoting habitual activities, so they contain the imperfective suffix *-š*.

- (7) Reduplicated Nominalizer *ʔalal-* in agentive nouns

<i>expeč</i>	‘to sing’	<i>ʔalal-expeč</i>	‘singer’
<i>axiyep</i>	‘to cure’	<i>ʔalal-alaxiyepš</i>	‘curer, doctor’
<i>uš’e</i>	‘to dig’	<i>ʔalal-uš’eš</i>	‘badger’

### 4. APPOSITIVE MODIFIERS

In Barbareño, a noun may be modified by placing another noun adjacent to it. Such a construction was seen in example (2), where *hilin<sup>l</sup>inyu<sup>l</sup>* ‘Indians’ was combined with *hilene<sup>l</sup>neq* ‘women’ to yield *hilin<sup>l</sup>inyu<sup>l</sup> hilene<sup>l</sup>neq* ‘Indian women’. Another example is *hičtin<sup>l</sup> hilkasqo<sup>l</sup>iwaš* ‘pet dog’ in the first line in (8). The modifying noun serves as an appositive, adding supplementary information about the referent. Nominalized verbs can function in the same way, as in the second line of example (8): *hilku hilalaqšan* ‘a person, one that died’ = ‘a dead person’.

(8) Appositive modifiers

<i>hičtín</i>	<i>hilkasqoʔiwaš</i>
hi=čtín	hi=l=ka=s-qoʔ-waš
DEPENDENT=dog	DEPENDENT-ARTICLE=that=3-pet-PAST
a dog	his former pet
‘A <u>pet dog</u>	

<i>hilku</i>	<i>hílaqšan</i>	<i>ʔisamsiniwe</i>
hi=l=ku	hi=l= <u>ʔal</u> -aqšan	ʔi=s-am-siniwe
DEP=ARTICLE=person	DEP=ART=NOMINALIZER-die	CLEFT=3-INDEFINITE.SUBJECT-kill
a person	one that died	they killed (it)
belonging to a <u>dead person</u> was killed.’		JPH 59:670

The functions of such constructions are much like those of relative clauses, in which a clause adds supplementary information: ‘a person who died’.

5. NOMINALIZER *ʔal*- ON INDEPENDENT SENTENCES

An examination of connected speech in Barbareño shows that the nominalizer *ʔal*- occurs considerably more often than might be expected of a nominalizer. It is used not just to form new nouns like ‘sun’, and appositive nominals like ‘the one who died’. It often appears with what otherwise appear to be full, independent sentences. Example (9), seen earlier in (4), contains the sentential complement ‘what they did not know’, nominalized with the article *l*-. But in addition, the whole sentence ‘They did not like what they did not know’ is nominalized with the prefix *ʔal*-.

(9) Nominalization of independent sentence

[The Indians were much given to following the customs of their ancestors.  
They were very superstitious and they didn’t want to change anything.]

<i>ʔiyʔaleʔaqšwalawaš</i>	<i>hílyekutixwalyik</i>
iy- <u>ʔal</u> -e-aqšwalaw-waš	hi=l=iy-e-kutixwalyik
PL.SUBJECT-NEGATIVE-NOMINALIZER-like-PAST	DEPENDENT=ARTICLE-PL-NEG-know
<u>their not liking</u>	what they did not know
‘ <u>They did not like</u> what they did not know.’	JPH 59.8 SW 10

The use of independent nominalized sentences is not random. In connected speech such sentences are used to convey background or supplemental information, explanation, evaluation, consequences, etc. Some idea of their function can be gained by examining the passages in (10). The nominalized sentences are indented. In the Barbareño original, just the Nominalizer *ʔal*- is underlined. In the English counterpart, the whole nominalized sentence is underlined for ease of comparison with non-nominalized sentences.

(10) Nominalized sentences in context

- a. *ʔimékikínú hilalaqwaywaš hiswašikum* JPH 59:287 SW 34  
*hikaskuy*  
*hiš<sup>h</sup>ow hikasapiʔaqmil.*  
*hikas<sup>h</sup>egenus hihusitiminwaš kes<sup>h</sup>uʔuškal.*  
*xaymi ʔimaliwaš kaʔaluxwalhíywaš hiliya hilinʔinyu?*  
*keʔalšipišwaš.*  
*ʔalčaminwaš hisʔalel hilʔispanyol ke čtaniw hillatin.*

In spite of the lewlew being there,  
Jaime was able to reach over  
and take the pespibata and take a quick drink of it.  
And it took away his fear and made him strong.  
Jaime was the bravest of all Indians  
and he was educated.  
He knew how to read Spanish and a little Latin.

- b. *setaniṁe pakawaš hilinyu hilaktimisawaš.* JPH 59.47 SW 178  
*hikahoʔlpali ʔimeka š<sup>h</sup>olkoyšpi hilkiki hilxinči.*  
*pa ʔalkutixwalyikwunwaš hisč<sup>h</sup>o hiheʔlinʔinyu?*

There had not even been one Indian who had come to mass.  
And so the padre immediately suspected something was wrong.  
Surely he knew some good Indians.

- c. *hiṁeka siysumišup hihoʔsiyyahya? hihoʔlíníyú?* JPH 59.47 SW 178  
*hiṁeka kantiṁe hisnañ hihoʔlpali.*  
*hoʔlpali ʔiʔalqutixwalyikwaš hihoʔlwoť hulinyu.*

*And soon the Indians lowered their arrows.*  
*And then the padre went on.*  
*The padre knew the Indian leader.*

- d. *psipyototon hihoʔlo? kasutikim,* JPH 59.180 SW 10  
*ču ṁemali sipyototon hiṁekapsupintap<sup>h</sup>i hoʔlwuluwul.*  
*hihaku ʔalsaʔpaka hipalsaʔawin.*  
*ʔaleč<sup>h</sup>o hisameqwelin hilkaltu hiheʔlwuluwul.*

You first get the water to boiling.  
And when it boils you throw the crawfish in.  
Maybe you'll boil just one crawfish.  
It is no good to make soup out of crawfish.

- e. *howo moloq hi?akim o?stik hikayi čapala samqilikep. JPH 59.650 SW 45*  
*sqili?hiy hisiyaxwil hi?kepi?*  
*kwsiwawil hi?lmoloqiwaš hisiyaxwi? ka?liykepi?*  
*?akimpi huhowo ?alameqwelwaš hihelšičalayaš hikawliyu.*

For a very long time they used to bathe at the foot of Chapala Street.  
 Their bathing suits were always long.  
 And sometimes their bathing suit was an old dress.  
At that time Cabrillo Boulevard had not been built yet.

- f. *nasiyexpeč hihelču? ?i?alsa?tuhuy. JPH 59:205 SW 21*  
*iy?alaqšwalaw.*  
*kipi kasiyexpeč.*  
*pa iy?alčamín hi?alsa?aktinuna hiluwumu.*  
*siyexpeč hinoño? hinaštuhtuhuy.*

When the huitacoche birds sing, it is going to rain.  
They do like rain.  
 They sing and sing.  
They know that it is going to bring food.  
 They sing a lot when it is raining.

- g. *helwintiy? inoño? ?alč<sup>h</sup>o ?i?axiyep. JPH 59.517 SW 44*  
*?alsantik hil?alteple?*

The ash tree is a very good remedy.  
It cures a consumptive.

- h. *hulmoloqiwaš hilku ?inoño moloq hisiyqili?uniwineč. JPH 59.354 SW 57*  
*malaqa nawentis<sup>h</sup>up hileneq ?imoqe masix kehaku skumu histantaniw.*  
*holxoninas ?imectaniw hikalolxonin hiho?stantaniw.*  
*ke siyuš?išmoč hisiyhopoy,*  
*siyqonqon kesiymiş, kesiytoxš.*  
*?aleqiliwilwaš hiliye?uniwineč hileneneq*  
*ke ?aleqiliwilwaš hiliye?uniwineč hišyhiy.*

The old-time people used to get married very early.  
 A girl would have three or four babies by the time she was twenty years old.  
 The mother was little older than the children  
 and they would play together, play games together,  
 laugh, cry and fight together.  
There were no old-maids.  
and there were no bachelors.

In narrative, nominalized sentences are used for information that is off the event line, as in the first three passages: (10)a ‘Jaime was able to reach over and take the pespibata and take a quick drink of it. And it took away his fear and made him strong. (Jaime was the bravest of all Indians and he was educated. He knew how to read Spanish and a little Latin.)’.

A similar phenomenon appears in procedural texts, as in (10)d: ‘You first get the water to boiling. And when it boils you throw the crawfish in. (Maybe you’ll boil just one crawfish. It is no good to make soup out of crawfish.)’ Comments about the number of crawfish and their suitability for soup are not part of the sequence of steps in the recipe.

The use of nominalized sentences for background information can be seen in (10)e: ‘For a very long time they used to bathe at the foot of Chapala Street. Their bathing suits were always long. And sometimes their bathing suit was an old dress. (At that time Cabrillo Boulevard had not been built yet.)’

Explanation can be seen in (10)e and (10)f: ‘They sing and sing. They know that it is going to bring food. and The ash tree is a very good remedy. It cures a consumptive.’ Again in (10)h the speaker stands back to evaluate the consequences of her descriptions.

These uses are of course related and overlapping. The speaker steps out of the narrative or other account to offer side comments, background description, explanation, evaluation, or other supplementary commentary. The nominalization of independent clauses provides an important rhetorical device for adding texture to discourse, separating the main event line or sequential points in a discussion from side commentary.

## 6. CONCLUSION

What began in Barbareño Chumash as a morphological device for creating new words was extended first to a syntactic device for creating complex sentences and then to a discourse device for creating coherent texts. The nominalizer *?al-* was originally applied to verbs to create new nouns. It was subsequently applied to clauses as well, to form dependent clauses to provide description and supplementary information in larger sentences. It was ultimately applied to independent sentences that contribute background or supplementary information, explanation, or evaluation in discourse. The lexical, syntactic, and discourse functions now coexist in the modern language<sup>1</sup>. We see here not only a development that runs in a direction

<sup>1</sup>The nominalizing prefix *?al-* has developed in other directions as well. One of these is also common cross-linguistically, the marking of stative aspect. Suzanne Wash points out (personal communication) a paradigm recorded by Harrington.

<i>aktik'</i>	‘to come to get, come after, venir a llevar’ (Spanish)	
<i>k-aktik'</i>	‘I came for it’	
<i>k-?al-aktik'</i>	‘I <u>have</u> come for it’	
<i>k-?al-aktik'-wun</i>	‘I <u>have</u> come for them’	JPH 59.137 SW 197

In this use Wash glosses the prefix *?al-* as a Stative marker. An example of the last verb above in context is below.

<i>kalaktik'wun</i>	<i>huk'al?aliyu?</i>
<i>k-?al-aktik'-wun</i>	<i>hu=k--?al-?aliyu-?</i>
1.SUBJECT-STATIVE-come.for-3.PL.OBJECT	REMOTE-1.SUBJECT-RDP-brick-PLURALIZER
‘I have come after my bricks.’	

Because of the multifunctionality of this prefix, it may not always be possible to identify its precise function in a given context.

opposite to that most discussed in the literature on grammatical change, but also the emergence of a powerful, pervasive rhetorical device for shaping discourse.

Such extension of syntactic constructions to discourse purposes is actually not uncommon cross-linguistically, though it may go unnoticed when a language is known primarily through translations of English sentences, or when investigation is restricted to literary materials. The development of the use of dependent syntactic constructions for discourse purposes is especially well documented for Japanese (Iwasaki 1993, 2000). The use of dependent modal inflections in independent sentences has long been observed in languages of the Algonquian family (Starks 1994 and others). Similar developments in Navajo and Central Alaskan Yup'ik, along with their consequences for change elsewhere in the grammar, are described in Mithun 2002. Evans (to appear) provides an ambitious cross-linguistic survey of uses of formally subordinate clauses as independent sentences.

Much remains to be discovered about the mechanisms involved in the extension of syntactic structure to discourse structure. In his discussions of the history of Japanese, Iwasaki proposes that syntactically dependent relative clause structures were extended to use as independent sentences supplying background information in narrative because they lacked illocutionary force of their own. 'In narrative prose, "suppressed assertion" is employed to indicate the dependent, background nature of a sentence in relation to foreground conclusive sentences in textual structure.' (2000:237-8). Evans proposes a less direct route for the constructions he found. He identifies three kinds of functions they may have: (a) interpersonal coercion, such as commands, (b) modal framing, that is particular deontic and evidential meanings, and (c) marking of certain discourse contexts such as negation, contrast, and reiteration. He traces all three kinds of constructions to the disappearance of original matrix clauses to which they were subordinate, with (a) predicates of desire or enablement, (b) predicates of reporting, asserting, etc., and (c) markers of cleft constructions. It is likely that the extension of originally syntactically dependent constructions to use as independent sentences can come about through a variety of routes. For Barbareño Chumash, there is little evidence, at least at present, of complex sentence constructions that would have given rise to the modern independent nominalized sentences, along the lines proposed by Evans. Nominalization does not appear to be systematic in any of these kinds of contexts. In any case, it is clear that we have much to learn about the processes that can lead to such developments, as well as their consequences for other grammatical changes. A first step to unraveling these puzzles, and to appreciating the kinds of rhetorical devices available to speakers, is to document the spontaneous use of such grammar in context.

#### REFERENCES

- BEELER, MADISON. 1970ms. Topics in Barbareno Chumash grammar.  
BEELER, MADISON. 1976. Barbareno Chumash grammar: a farrago. *Hokan studies*, ed. by Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver, 251-69. The Hague: Mouton  
EVANS, NICHOLAS. to appear. Insubordination and its uses. *Finiteness*, ed. by Frans Plank and Irinia Nikolaeva. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
IWASAKI, SHOICHI. 1993. Functional transfer in the history of the Japanese language. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 2.20-32.

- IWASAKI, SHOICHI. 2000. Suppressed assertion and the functions of the final-attributive in prose and poetry of Heian Japanese. Textual parameters in older languages, ed. by S. Herring, P. van Reenen, and L. Schøsler, 237-272. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MILLS, ELAINE and ANN BRICKFIELD, eds. 1986. The papers of John Peabody Harrington in the Smithsonian Institution 1907-1957. Vol 3. Native American History, Language and Culture of S. CA/Basin. Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 1999. The languages of Native North America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 2002. From downstairs to upstairs: a quiet evolution from dependent to independent clause structures and its implications. Oxford-Kobe Seminar on Language Change and Historical Linguistics. Kobe, Japan.
- ONO, TSUYOSHI. 1996. Information flow and grammatical structure in Barbareño Chumash. University of California, Santa Barbara, dissertation.
- STARKS, DONNA. 1994. Planned vs unplanned discourse: oral narrative vs conversation in Woods Cree. *Canadian journal of Linguistics* 30.297-320.
- WASH, SUZANNE. 2001. Adverbial clauses in Barbareño Chumash. University of California, Santa Barbara, dissertation.