

# What to do to ‘do-to..’?\*

Florence Woo  
flwoo@ucsc.edu  
University of California, Santa Cruz

## 1 Introduction

- This paper concerns the morpheme  $-č̣iʔ[L]$  in Nuuchahnulth (independent form  $ʔuuk^w iʔ$ ;  $-yuq^w[L]/ʔuuyuq^w$  in Ditidaht), and how it interacts with other aspects of the syntax in the language.

(1)  $naacsaa\lambda a\eta$   $suutiʔ$   
watch-now-1sg. you- $č̣iʔ[L]$   
I have watched you. (NT/NA)

(2)  $ʔaač̣ač̣iʔiʔ$   $kaapap$  John  
who- $č̣iʔ[L]$ -PST-3.Q like John  
‘Who does John like?’ (Davis and Sawai (2001))

(3)  $ʔuuk^w iʔintiʂ$  Bill  $\lambda awa$   $sučʻisi$   
 $ʔuuk^w iʔ$ -PST-3 Bill near tree-DET  
‘That’s the tree Bill was near.’ Rose (1981)

(4)  $č̣uq^w ši\lambda$   $-ibt$   $-ʻa$  John  $ʔuuyuq^w$  Bill  
hit-PRF -PST -DCLR John  $ʔuuyuq^w$  Bill  
‘John hit Bill.’ Ditidaht: Klokeid (1978:8)

- This morpheme is found co-occurring with direct and indirect objects of various types, and is sometimes obligatory.

---

\*Much thanks to Nuuchahnulth speakers Mary Jane Dick, Katherine Fraser, Archie Thompson, Barbara Touchie, Sarah Webster, and Barney Williams, Jr. for their patience in sharing their language with me.  $ʔuušjakṣi\lambda ʔicuuš$   $siič̣iʔ!$  I would also like to thank Sandy Chung for her guidance and advice throughout this project, and Christine Ravinski and Rachel Wojdak for many helpful discussions. The research presented here is supported by a SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship, the Jacobs Research Funds (Whatcom Museum), and the Philips Funds for Native American Research (American Philosophical Society). The examples obtained by fieldwork are marked for the dialect that they are in; examples taken from Sapir and Swadesh (1939) and Sapir and Swadesh (1955) are marked as (NT/NA). All errors remain my own.

- It is found primarily in three environments: adjacent to an object in canonical position ((1), (4)), suffixed onto a fronted element ((2)), and clause-initially to indicate focus ((3)).
- Past analyses:
  - Klokeid (1978), Jacobsen (1993): Case/object marker
  - Rose (1981), Rose and Carlson (1984): ‘do-to..’ – a predicate independent of the main verb but which introduces NP arguments for that verb
  - Davis and Sawai (2001), Steriopolo (2004): a functional element that’s part of the verb projection which licenses certain arguments.
- Because  $-čič[L]/ʔuuk^w ič$  seems to serve a wide range of functions, past analyses tend to treat each function independently.
- Assuming that  $-čič[L]$  and  $ʔuuk^w ič$  are indeed one and the same, I investigate the possibility of a unified characterization of this morpheme.
- Questions to be addressed:
  1. How can we know if it is a verb (predicate-like) or if it is a functional agreement-type morpheme?
  2. What is its distribution? What restricts it?
  3. Can its full range of functions fall out from one single account?

## 2 The data

- $-čič[L]$  lengthens the first vowel of the word, and the  $/č/$  is in the right prosodic domain to turn into  $[k^w]$  when preceded by  $/u/$ .
- It belongs to the class of incorporating verbs morphologically, and surfaces either with the dummy morpheme  $ʔu-$ , forming the citation form  $ʔuuk^w ič$ , or with some other morphological root prefixed on it.
- It has been generally acknowledged that it functions as a predicate that forms a class along with  $-h̄w̄ač/ʔuw̄h̄w̄ač$  (introduces instruments),  $-ch̄in/ʔuch̄in$  (introduces benefactees),  $yi/ʔuyi$  (introduces time),  $-h̄ta/ʔuh̄ta$  (emphatic object) among others.
- Arguments for  $ʔuuk^w ič$  being a verb/predicate:
  1. It may take its own aspect inflection:

- (5)  $ʔuuk^w ičš̄χ$   
 $ʔuuk^w ič$ -PRF  
 ‘He started to refer to it.’

- (6) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił-šič-ʔiš Ben hiis-hiis-a John  
 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił-PRF-3 Ben RED-hit-IT John  
 ‘Ben started beating up John.’ (Ahousaht)

2. It may stand alone as the main predicate of a clause<sup>1</sup>:

- (7) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłma haat̥haak<sup>w</sup>ałʔi  
 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił-3 girls-DET  
 ‘She was dealing with the girls.’ (NT/NA)

- (8) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłma č’ataşuł haak<sup>w</sup>aałuk  
 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił-3 John.Mack girl-POSS  
 ‘He (sang) to John Mack’s daughter.’ (NT/NA)

3. Incorporates like a verb (affixal predicate); while not all incorporating verbs incorporate items from all syntactic categories freely, they minimally allow quantifiers, wh-words, and the negation morpheme *wik* to incorporate into them. Some examples:

- (9) ʔaanačičʔał simt̥simt̥š hawiłsimminh̥ʔi q<sup>w</sup>aıneeʔitq  
 only-čič-now RED-name-SPOR chief-?-PL-DET REL-location-3.REL  
 maamaht̥’i  
 house  
 ‘... calling by name only the chief of each house.’ (NT/NA)

- (10) wiikił hałiil  
 NEG-čič call.for  
 ‘He called no one.’ (NT/NA)

- (11) ʔaałaačičʔał maakšičip λaλuuʔi  
 two-čič-now buy-PRF-APPL others-DET  
 ‘Then he bought from two others.’ (NT/NA)

## 2.1 Objects introduced by -čič[L]

- ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił/-čič[L] is most often found introducing indirect objects of ditransitive predicates.

- (12) waaʔał niix<sup>w</sup>ʔin ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił pałuus  
 say-now Coiling.Sound ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił Pathluus  
 ‘...said Coiling-Sound to Pathluus’ (NT/NA)

- (13) wikayi ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił ʔuk<sup>w</sup>iiqsuʔi  
 NEG-give ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił younger.sibling-DET  
 ‘...did not give any to the younger sister’ (NT/NA)

- (14) ʔiiq̥huk<sup>w</sup>itʔiš John ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił mamałiih̥ʔi ʔen ...  
 tell-PAST-3 John ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił policeman-DET that ...  
 ‘John told the policeman that...’ (Ahousaht)

- (15) ʔuutyaamitʔiʃ ʔumʔiiqsakʔi qawii ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Lucy  
bring-PAST-3 mother-POSS-DET berries ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Lucy  
'(Lucy's) mom brought berries to Lucy.' (Ahousaht)
- (16) ʔaaqičiʔitk nahi ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ ʔuk<sup>w</sup>i  
what-č*iʔ*[L]-PAST-2sg.Q bestow ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ younger.sibling  
'What did you give your younger sibling (as a gift)?' (Ahousaht)
- (17) ʔuyimitsiʃ ʔapačaqʰ ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Rachel  
give-PAST-1sg. bread ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Rachel  
'I gave the bread to Rachel.' (Tla-o-qui-aht)

- However, as noted by many, ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ is also used to introduce 'objects' of transitive clauses. Klokeid (1978) and Jacobsen (1993) both gloss it as an object marker.
- There is speaker variation on which transitive verbs may permit ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ on their objects, or which types of objects may co-occur with ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ.
- ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ occurs most naturally on an object when both arguments of the verb are animate:

- (18) kaapapʔiʃ ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ ʔaa ʔaak<sup>w</sup>aaʔi  
like-3 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ that girl-DET  
'He likes that girl.' (Ahousaht)
- (19) k<sup>w</sup>ik<sup>w</sup>ixasiʔmatakʔiʃ John ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Mary  
RED-kiss-on.cheek-PRF-probably-PST-3 John ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Mary  
'John probably kissed Mary on the cheek.' (Ahousaht)
- (20) čoqʃiʔma Rachel ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Christine  
punch-PRF-3 Rachel ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Christine  
'Rachel punched Christine.' (Ucluelet)
- (21) ʔuuʃsuqʰʔiʃ Christine ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Rachel  
angry-3 Christine ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ Rachel  
'Christine is angry at Rachel.' (Tla-o-qui-aht)

- With other kinds of objects, there is much variation in acceptability. Some speakers do not allow ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ to introduce inanimate objects.
- Speakers who allow ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ on inanimate objects report some sense of contrastive focus on the object. For those speakers, there is virtually no limit on the types of objects. Furthermore, the use of ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ is optional.
- The object may be affected by the event in different degrees, from the patient of 'kill' and 'light on fire'...

- (22) qaʔsaapʔiʃ Ben ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ q<sup>w</sup>ayačiiik  
die-PRF.CAUS-3 Ben ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʃ wolf  
'Ben killed the wolf.' (Ahousaht)

- (23) pałšixłiš Tom ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił łayiipt  
light-PRF-3 Tom ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił leaves  
'Tom lit the leaves on fire.' (Ahousaht)

- ... to mildly-affected objects such as the patient of 'lose' and 'hide' ...

- (24) pawałšixłs ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił č'iima  
lose-PRF-1sg ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił knife  
'I lost the knife.' (Ahousaht)

- (25) haptaapłiš ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił hiishiisač'ak  
hidden-CAUS.PRF-3 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił axe  
'He hid the axe.' (Ahousaht)

- ... to objects that are not affected at all:

- (26) ʔuqhıyuułiš Susie ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił łuucmałi  
related-3 Susie ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił woman-DET  
'Susie is related to the woman.' (Ahousaht)

- (27) tułuksłaał ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił hiyi  
fear-1sg-always ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił snake  
'I'm afraid of snakes.' (Ahousaht)

★ ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił occurs most naturally with indirect objects and animate direct objects.

★ Allowing for the focus usage, ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił occurs with the full range of syntactic and semantic predicates/objects.

- ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił cannot be characterized simply as a marker for patient arguments (or any other specific set of semantic arguments).
- ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił is ungrammatical on the patient argument of unaccusative predicates.

- (28) a. kiłšixłiš naputaayi  
break-PRF-3 bottle  
'The bottle broke.' (Ahousaht)

- b. kiłsaapsiš ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił naputaayi  
break-PRF.CAUS-1sg ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił bottle  
'I broke the bottle.'

- c. \*kiłšixłiš ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił naputaayi  
break-PRF-3 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił bottle  
( 'The bottle broke.' )

- (29) a. qałšixłiš q<sup>w</sup>ayačiiik  
die-PRF-3 wolf  
'The wolf died.' (Ahousaht)

- b. qahsaapʔiš                    ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ q<sup>w</sup>ayačiik  
die-PRF.CAUS-1sg ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ wolf  
'He killed the wolf.'
- c. \*qahšiλʔiš                    ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ q<sup>w</sup>ayačiik  
die-PRF-3 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ wolf  
(‘The wolf died.’)

\* ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ indicates that the predicate is syntactically transitive.

## 2.2 Fronted functional elements

- Davis and Sawai (2001) observe that wh-words in Nuu-chah-nulth, which obligatorily surface at clause-initial position and which obligatorily incorporate into an incorporating verb, require the presence of *-čič[L]* when the verb is not an incorporating verb.
- *-čič[L]* does not appear with subject wh-words.

- (30) a. *As a subject*  
ʔačaqh    λumkšiλ  
who-?-3Q wake-PRF  
'Who woke up?' (Ahousaht)
- b. *As the object of an incorporating verb*  
ʔačañak'uuhith    Mary  
who-see-PAST-3Q Mary  
'Who did Mary see?' (Ahousaht)
- c. **As the object of a non-incorporating verb**  
ʔaačāčičh    λumk-saap  
who-čič-1sg.Q wake-PRF.CAUS  
'Who did I wake up?' (Ahousaht)

- The same pattern is found with the relative marker *yaq* and with quantifiers—if they are related to the object of the sentence, they must surface clause-initially incorporated into *-čič[L]*.

## Relative Clauses

- (31) a. *As a subject*  
k<sup>w</sup>ik<sup>w</sup>ixasiχitʔiš                    John haa    yaʔitq                    waʔičič  
RED-kiss-on.cheek-PAST-3 John DEIC which-3REL sleep-inside  
'John kissed on the cheek the one who is sleeping in there.' (Ahousaht)
- b. *As the object of an incorporating verb*  
kaapapʔiš John yaq<sup>w</sup>ayimitii                    Mary ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ Bill  
like-3    John which-give-PAST-3REL2 Mary 'to'    Bill

‘John likes the one Mary gave to Bill’ (Ahousaht)

c. **As the object of a non-incorporating verb**

k<sup>w</sup>inʔaʔʔiʃ John yaq<sup>w</sup>iʔitqs k<sup>w</sup>ik<sup>w</sup>ixasiʃ  
like-3 John which-čič[L]-PAST-1sg.REL RED-kiss-on.cheek-PRF

‘John likes the one who I kissed on the cheek.’ (Ahousaht)

### Quantifiers

(32) a. *As a subject*

ʔuuʃʔiiʃ hiʔcuu ɣaa ʃaʔiqsʔi  
some-3 hiʔ-in.container DEIC box-DET

‘Some of it is in that box there.’ (Ahousaht)

b. *As the object of an incorporating verb*

ʔuuʃcuʔiʃ ʃaʔiqsʔi  
some-in.container-3 box-DET

‘There’s something in the box’ (Ahousaht)

c. **As the object of a non-incorporating verb**

ʔuʔuuʃiʔitʔiʃ naatsiičič Lucy ɣuucaamiiɣ  
RED-some-čič[L]-PAST-3 see-PRF Lucy women

‘Lucy saw some of the women’ (Ahousaht)

- Independent pronouns are somewhat emphatic in nature. When they do occur, they can either be clause-initial (and bear all the inflectional morphology of the clause), as in (33-a) and (33-c), or stay in-situ, as in (34).

(33) a. *As a subject*

siʔaaqsiʃʔuʔiic  
I-q-1sg Ø-eat

‘I’m eating.’ (Ahousaht)

b. *As the object of an incorporating verb*

ʔuk<sup>w</sup>ačusitʔiʃ John  
self-make.fun-past-3sg.ind John

‘John made fun of himself’ Steriopolo (2004)

c. **As the object of a non-incorporating verb**

ʔuk<sup>w</sup>ačič[L]itʔiʃ čakup ʃiixčus  
self-do.to-PST-3 man laugh-make.fun.of

‘A man made fun of himself.’ Olga Steriopolo, p.c.

(34) ɣaksuuqɣaɣ suutiʔ  
have.pity.on-1sg. you-čič[L]

‘I have pity for you.’ (NT/NA)

- When the pronoun is in-situ, it doesn’t necessarily bear the *-čič* morpheme:

- (35) wik'ałči suwa  
NEG-now-go.along-2sg.IMP you  
'Don't you go along (and help)!' (NT/NA)
- (36) yaaʔakuksiš suwa  
care-DUR-1sg you  
'I take care of you.' (Ahousaht)

★ If wh-questions, relative clauses, and fronted pronouns involve syntactic movement: -čič[L] must occur on moved objects that are not incorporated into the main verb.

### 2.3 'Clefts'

- When *ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* is used for focus, it can be sentence-initial, bearing all clausal inflection (subject agreement, tense, mode, etc).

- (37) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłitsiš Mary λumksaap  
*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił*-PAST-1sg Mary wake-PRF.CAUS  
'It's Mary that I woke up' (Ahousaht)
- (38) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłʔaλah ʔaʔak<sup>w</sup>inčič čeeksin  
*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił*-now-1sg. plead-PRF Jackson  
'I begged Jackson.' (NT/NA)

- Examples from texts don't show the complete picture of word order of sentences with initial *ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił*, since sentences in narratives tend to not realize all arguments overtly.
- Looking at elicited examples, we see the orders [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* S V O], [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* V S O], and most surprisingly, [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* S O V]<sup>2</sup>

- (39) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłma Christine wiška ʔaak<sup>w</sup>ałisʔi  
*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił*-3 Christine scold girl-DIM-DET  
'Christine is scolding that little girl.' [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* S V O], (Ucluelet)
- (40) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłʔiš hiix<sup>w</sup>atʔi Susie Ben  
*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił*-3 angry Susie Ben  
'Susie is angry at Ben.' [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* V S O], (Ahousaht)
- (41) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iłʔaqλs siya miʔaatʔi λuuk<sup>w</sup>ił  
*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił*-FUT-1sg I sockeye smoke  
'I am going to smoke the sockeye.' [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* S O V], (Ahousaht)

- As far as I know, there is no meaning difference among all three variants. They are usually translated as clefts in English ('It is X that...')
- The order [*ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>ił* S O V] is the interesting because while VSO and SVO clauses are found in the language, SOV is unattested (see Jacobsen (1997)).

- Note that in all these cases,  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$  is separated from the object.
- $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$ -clefts also appears with affixal predicates that take clausal complements. They necessarily focus the object of the lower verb, rather than the caused agent.

- (42)  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}\text{ʔap}\text{ʔi}\text{š}$  Susie Tom  $\text{čuu}\text{ł}\text{čuu}\text{ya}$  taakinis  
 $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$ -CAUS-3 Susie Tom RED-wash-IT socks  
 Susie made Tom wash the socks. (Ahousaht)
- (43)  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}\text{ma}\text{ħ}\text{sap}\text{ʔi}\text{š}$  Ken Kay  $\text{ʔu}\text{ʔaa}\text{łuk}$   $\text{t}^{\prime}\text{aatna}\text{ʔisuk}\text{ʔi}$   
 $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$ -want-CAUS-3 Ken Kay care.for children-DIM-POSS-DET  
 ‘Ken wants Kay to take care of his children.’ (Ahousaht)

★  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$  does not necessarily show up right next to the object.

### 3 The analysis

- We saw three main uses of  $-\text{či}\text{ł}[\text{L}]/\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$ :
  1. Introduces an argument of the main predicate
    - Used in transitive clauses
    - Precedes an object in its normal position (post-verbal)
    - Prefers animate objects. Other has some focus flavour to it.
  2. Obligatorily supports a raised object of a non-incorporating verb
    - Wh-words, relative markers, quantifiers, and fronted pronouns
    - Incorporation is necessary
  3. Focus/cleft construction
    - $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$  is sentence-initial, bears all main clause inflection.
    - Focused object is disjoint from it.
- $-\text{či}\text{ł}[\text{L}]$  and  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$  have same distribution.
- Given the seemingly disparate functions of  $-\text{či}\text{ł}[\text{L}]/\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$ , is it possible to one unified analysis of this morpheme?
- How to account for all the possible word orders? How does  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$  fit in the clause structure?
- Outline of a proposal:  $\text{ʔuuk}^w\text{i}\text{ł}$  is a light verb. So bleached in meaning, in fact, that it is used only as ‘last resort’.
- Revised version of Davis and Sawai’s (2001): the head of the Nuu-chah-nulth Focus projection attracts only verbal elements.

- Wh-words, quantifiers, and emphatic pronouns have focus force, but they cannot check the focus feature on their own; if there is no incorporating verb, a  $-čič[L]$  must be there to support them.
- A sentence with contrastive focus on its object also requires a verbal element to check the focus feature— $-čič[L]/ʔuuk^w iʔ$  is inserted to fulfill that purpose.
- In ditransitives, it serves to Case-license the recipient argument (the idea of verbs introducing the extra argument in ditransitives go back to Larson’s (1988) VP-shells.).

### 3.1 Object marker, focus marker

#### Why $ʔuuk^w iʔ$ can’t be an object/case marker

- $ʔuuk^w iʔ$  can be disjoint from the object (as seen in section 2.3; case markers in the traditional sense are adjacent (if not affixed) to the nominal argument).
- $ʔuuk^w iʔ$  takes verbal morphology (aspect markers such as the perfective  $-šič$ ; ‘restrictive suffixes’ such as  $-yaqič$  ‘to be doing inside’).
- Rose and Carlson (1984) point out that  $ʔuuk^w iʔ$  can introduce the patient argument (underlying object) of passive clause:

(44)  $qaḥsaaptint$                        $ʔuuk^w iʔ$   $muwič$   
 die-PRF.CAUS-PST  $ʔuuk^w iʔ$  deer  
 ‘The deer was killed.’ Rose and Carlson (1984)

- If the arguments for passive being a syntactic operation (Emanatian (1986), Kim (2000)) are correct,  $muwič$  is the subject of the sentence above, not the object.

#### Why $ʔuuk^w iʔ$ can’t be a focus marker

- That  $-čič[L]/ʔuuk^w iʔ$  can be a focus marker has been proposed by Sawai (2002). In her analysis, this morpheme is base-generated as the head of the Focus Phrase, and attracts a wh-element to move into it.
- Given recent data, the claim that this morpheme is inherently a focus marker is untenable: it can be used without an overt NP argument:

(45)  $wik’ii$                        $ʔuuk^w iʔ$   $taanaqš$   
 NEG-2.IMP  $ʔuuk^w iʔ$  money-request  
 ‘Don’t ask her for money.’ (Ahousaht)

(46) Context: I’m burning some garbage in my backyard, and you see me pick up a cardboard box that you plan to use later.

$wik’ii$                        $ʔuuk^w iʔ$   
 NEG-2.IMP               $ʔuuk^w iʔ$   
 ‘Don’t (burn it)!’

(47) waaʔaʁ yaq<sup>w</sup>acʔitq tupaati ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ ʔani ...  
 say-now REL-own-3.REL tupati ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ that ...  
 ‘The owner of the topati told him to ...’ (NT/NA)

(48) ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔʔaʁni nanaʔuhʔiih  
 ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ-now-1pl hear-try.to.get  
 ‘We listened for them.’ (NT/NA)

- Null pronouns are not known to carry focus force.
- What if the argument is not null in those cases: *ʔu-* part of *ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* is an overt pronoun and stands in for the object under focus.
- *ʔu* has standardly been glossed as ‘it’ (Sapir and Swadesh (1939), a ‘referential root’ (Rose (1981))
- However, the core usage of *ʔu* strongly suggests that it is not a pronominal:

(49) ʔu-k<sup>w</sup>iiʔ-it-ʔiʃ-ʔaaʔ John čapac  
 ʔu-make-PST-HAB John canoe  
 ‘John used to make canoes.’ (Ahousaht)

(50) k'achaq ʔuk<sup>w</sup>iiʔʃiʔaʁ  
 robe/blanket ʔu-make-PRF-now  
 ‘She began to make a robe’ (NT/NA)

(51) ...ʔani huʔacačaʁʔaaqʁqa ʔuk<sup>w</sup>iiʔwit'asʔatuk maht'ii7is  
 ... COMP return-FUT-3.SUB ʔu-make-plan.to-PSV-POSS house-DIM  
 ‘that he would come back and make a little house for her.’ (NT/NA)

(52) ʔuçuuʔiʃ niisʔakʔi haʔum  
 ʔu-in.container-3 pot-DET food  
 ‘There’s food in the pot.’ (Ahousaht)

- Objects in these sentences are indefinite; *ʔu* does not refer to an established discourse referent, or even a real-life object.<sup>3</sup>
- Pronouns are also incompatible with locative existentials (\**There’s it in the pot.*).
- Furthermore, you can have two of them (as long as one of them is raised)<sup>4</sup>.

(53) ʔaaqičiʔitk naʁii ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ ʔuk<sup>w</sup>i  
 what-č*iʔ*-PST-2sg.Q give ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ younger.sibling  
 ‘What did you give to your younger sibling?’ MJD 06/04

- Focus is not generally assumed to be able to occur twice in a clause (see Rizzi (1997)).
- It’s unlikely that *-č*iʔ*[L]/ʔuuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* is ambiguous between a focus marker and an object marker.

- ★ *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* cannot be inherently an object marker or a focus marker.
- ★ The correlation between it and those functions must be ‘accidental’, falling out from some other grammatical principle.

### 3.2 -*č*iʔ[L] as a light verb

#### How to get around the problem of *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* appearing with transitive verbs?

- *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* can assign Case, but has no thematic roles to assign.
- Just like the light verb *suru* in Japanese, which has Case to assign but needs to get theta roles off its object.

(54) John-wa Mary-ni hanashi-o shita  
 John-TOP Mary-to talk-ACC *suru*-PST  
 “John talked to Mary”

- In the ‘cleft’ focus constructions, the reason why the main verb cannot check the focus feature is because it comes with too much content: the lexical content of the verb itself, as well as all the arguments that go with it.
- *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* allows a minimum of one of the main verb’s thematic arguments to be transferred to it—at least the object is transferred.
- Whereas *suru* requires at least the subject and one other argument to be transferred. (Grimshaw and Mester (1988) analysis this as happening at a lexical level. Whether that can be directly applied to *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* requires further research.)

(55) John-wa murabito-ni [[ookami-ga kuru-to]-no keikoku]-o shita  
 John-TOP villager-to wolf-NOM come-COMP-GEN warn-ACC *suru*  
 “John warned the villagers that the wolf was coming” (only Subj and IO)

(56) John-wa murabito-ni [ookami-ga kuru-to] keikoku-o shita  
 John-TOP villager-to wolf-NOM come-COMP warn-ACC *suru*  
 “John warned the villagers that the wolf was coming” (all arguments)

- *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* can also be used as a ‘substitute’ for a previously-mentioned verb, and inherits all its semantic arguments from it:

(57) a. *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔk* muyaa ʔayipt  
*?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ*-2sg.Q burn leaves  
 ‘Are you burning the leaves?’

(58) a. wik. *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔsiš* ʔʰəiqsmihʔi  
 No. *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ*-1sg. box-PL-DET  
 ‘No. It’s the boxes.’

- English translation misleading: the subject is actually still the first person.
- *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* must have inherited the thematic argument structure from *inuyaa*.
- Cannot be seen as a case of VP ellipsis, unless you allow the object to have raised out of the VP before the VP is elided.

### Why is *?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* more often found on animate objects?

- Perhaps a ‘differential object marking’ (DOM) effect?
- Many languages prefer animate, definite, or specific things to be the subject. When they have to be used as objects, they take some kind of special morphology. (Aissen (2003))

- (59) a. Veo la casa  
 see-1sg. the.FEM house  
 ‘I see the house.’  
 b. Veo a la mujer  
 see-1sg. to the-FEM woman  
 ‘I see the woman.’

Spanish; Aissen (2003:446)

- (60) a. Maria videla stol  
 Maria saw.FEM table-NOM  
 ‘Maria saw the table.’  
 b. Maria videla Ivana  
 Maria saw Ivan-GEN  
 ‘Maria saw Ivan.’

Russian

- DOM realized as weak focus marking in Nuu-chah-nulth?

## 4 To sum up; or, where to go from here

- I’ve provided data illustrating the three main environments where *-č*iʔ*[L]/?uuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* is found—any account that denies the ambiguity of this morpheme must account for the full range of facts.
- It cannot be simply a case marker or a focus marker—its use in focus constructions or in the introduction of certain arguments must fall out from other grammatical principles.
- The most straightforward solution seems to be one that treats this morpheme as a light verb that is neutral in every way, but has multiple functions (Case-licensing arguments, checking focus, etc).
- I’ve provided one hypothesis as to how it can interact with main verbs—transitive ones in particular—in terms of argument-sharing/transferring.
- What is the precise nature of this argument-transferring?

- Its precise position in the syntax remains to be researched—I have preliminary data on word order variations, but I suspect that’s not the complete picture.
- What’s also useful would be to examine the behaviour of *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił* in embedded clauses.
- Rose and Carlson’s (1984) problem: what to do with *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił*-underlying-objects in passives? Potential answer: argument-transfer occurs before passivization; passive doesn’t affect it.
- This, as I see it now, is what we should do to ‘do.to.’.

*čuu!*

## References

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:435–483.
- Davis, Henry, and Naomi Sawai. 2001. Wh-movement as noun incorporation in Nuu-chah-nulth. In *Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Karine Megerdooimian and Leora Anne Bar-el, 123–136. Cascadilla Press.
- Emanatian, Michele. 1986. The Nootka passive revisited. In *In honor of mary haas: From the haas festival conference on native american linguistics*, ed. William Shipley, 265–291. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grimshaw, Jane, and Armin Mester. 1988. Light verbs and theta-marking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:205–232.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Jacobsen, William H. Jr. 1993. Subordination and cosubordination in Nootka: Clause combining in a polysynthetic verb-initial language. In *Advances in role and reference grammar*, ed. Jr. Robert D. Van Valin, volume 82 of *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 235–274. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jacobsen, William H. Jr. 1997. Mary R. Haas’s contributions to Wakashan linguistics. *Anthropological Linguistics* 39:4:569–577.
- Kim, Eun-Sook. 2000. The morphology and syntax of *-?at* in Nuu-chah-nulth. Syntax Generals Paper, University of British Columbia.
- Klokeid, Terry J. 1978. Syntactic and conceptual relations in Nitinat. In *12<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Salishan Languages (1977)*, 1–68. Colville: Colville Federated Tribes.
- Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:335–391.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Kluwer.
- Rose, Suzanne. 1981. Kyuquot grammar. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Victoria.
- Rose, Suzanne M., and Barry F. Carlson. 1984. The Nootka-Nitinaht passive. *Anthropological Linguistics* 26:1–12.
- Sapir, Edward, and Morris Swadesh. 1939. *Nootka texts*. Philadelphia: LSA.
- Sapir, Edward, and Morris Swadesh. 1955. *Native accounts of Nootka ethnography*. Publications of the Indiana Univ. Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, 1. (= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21(4), pt.2).
- Sawai, Naomi. 2002. The syntax of wh-questions in Nuu-Chah-Nulth. Syntax Generals paper, University of British Columbia.
- Steriopolo, Olga. 2004. Applicative morphemes in Nuuchahnulth. Syntax Generals Paper, University of British Columbia.

## Appendix

List of abbreviations used:

|      |             |      |                   |
|------|-------------|------|-------------------|
| APPL | applicative | NEG  | negation          |
| CAUS | causative   | PL   | plural            |
| DCLR | declarative | POSS | possessive marker |
| DEIC | deictic     | PRF  | perfective aspect |
| DET  | determiner  | PST  | past tense        |
| DIM  | diminutive  | RED  | reduplicant       |
| DUR  | durative    | REL  | relative marker   |
| FUT  | future      | IT   | iterative aspect  |

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>However, this alone cannot be used to show that *?wuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* is really the main predicate in those sentences; it is possible that those are examples of VP-ellipsis. Since person inflection always occur suffixed to the first word of a clause domain, the fact that it can occur on *?wuk<sup>w</sup>iʔ* tells little of the latter's syntactic function. Quantifiers, which are unlikely candidates for predicates, can also stand alone as an elliptical answer and bear subject agreement. Consider the answers in (b) below;

- (61) a. hišuk-uk-ḥ t'atiiʔ t'aatñaʔis Emily?  
 all-POSS-3Q sick children Emily  
 'Are all of Emily's children sick?'  
 b. hišuk-ʔiʃ / ʔuušuk-ʔiʃ  
 all-3 / some-3  
 'All of them.' / 'Some of them.'

(Rachel Wojdak, p.c.)

The quantifiers *hišuk* and *?uuš*, which normally require a main predicate and an overt noun to quantify over, are nonetheless perfectly fine on their own in (61-b). Incidentally, *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił* is also commonly found in a question-and-answer environment:

- (62)    a.    *muyaa-ḥ Tom łayiipt*  
               burn-3.Q Tom leaves  
               ‘Is Tom burning leaves?’  
       b.    wik. *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił-?iš X’ahiqs-minḥ-?i*  
               no. *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił-3 box-PL-DET*  
               ‘No, it’s the boxes [that he’s burning].’ (Ahousaht)

There has not been any reported cases of a clause headed by *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił* in the beginning of a discourse—in all the cases I am aware of, the *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił* clause is dependent on some prior predicate, and it does not seem that it can truly be ‘independent’ and ‘non-truncated’.

<sup>2</sup>[*?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił* O V S] is marginally acceptable, but not volunteered by the speakers.

<sup>3</sup>Standard analysis of pronouns treats them as variables that are either interpreted by being equated to an established discourse referent or by being bound by a quantifier. Neither is present in those examples—following Heim (1982) and semantic works of that tradition, I take indefinite NPs to be non-quantificational.

<sup>4</sup>There is some data in Rose (1981) that indicate otherwise—she has data where both theme and recipient are introduced with *?uuk<sup>w</sup>ił*. However, I have not seen such data for the southern dialects.

Florence Woo  
 Department of Linguistics  
 University of California, Santa Cruz  
 California, 95064, USA  
 flwoo@ucsc.edu