Goals:

- Illustrate some problems that Nuu-chah-nulth poses for her account.

1 Verbalizing Lexical Suffixes in Nuu-chah-nulth and Inuktitut


(1) a. suuHa?ics
   suuHaa-’i;c-s
   “salmon-ingest-1SG
   “I am eating salmon.” (4 June 2003)

b. jaamaYizs
   jamas-’iz[\L]-s
   sweet-take-1SG
   “I took something sweet.” (17 May 2004)

c. NajaalYakayi/iS
   Naja:lYak-ayi;/i;S
   book-give-3IND Kim Sandy

- A similar class of suffixes exists in Inuktitut (Sadock, 1980).

(2) a. tuktu-vinir-tur-tunga
    caribou-former-consume-intr.part.1s
    “I’m eating caribou meat.” (Mittimatalik (Johns 2003:12))

---

1 All Nuu-chah-nulth data is from Katie Fraser, who speaks the Ahousaht dialect.
2 Inuktitut abbreviations: intr - intransitive, part - participial mood, indic - indicative mood, mod - modalis case.
b. qukiuti-taar-tunga  
rifle-get-intr.part.1s  
“I got a rifle.” (Mittimatalik (Johns 2003:11))
c. ulu-iruti-junga  
ulu-lack-intr.part.1s  
“I’m out of ulu’s.” (Mittimatalik (Johns 2003:11))

2 Johns’ Observations

- Johns (2003) assumes the verbalizing suffixes are stems, not suffixes, and notes (following Mithun (1997, 1999)) that they have more general meanings than non-incorporating verbs. Both eating and drinking are represented by a single suffix, but they are represented by separate non-incorporating verbs (cf. *naq “drink” and *haʔum “eat” in Nuu-chah-nulth).

(3) **Inuktitut**
   a. tuttu-vini-tu-vunga  
caribou-former-consume-intr.indic.1s  
“T’m eating caribou meat.” (Labrador (Johns 2003:19))
   b. tii-tuq-tunga  
tea-consume-intr.part.1s  
“T’m drinking tea.” (Iqaluit (Johns 2003:19))

(4) **Nuu-chah-nulth**
   a. suuHa/ics  
suuHaa-’i;c-s  
salmon-ingest-1SG  
“I am eating salmon.” (4 June 2003)
   b. tiičičiš Kim  
ti-’i;c-ʔi;š Kim  
tea-ingest-3.IND Kim  
“Kim is having tea.” (23 February 2004)

- Johns observes that verbs which can incorporate must, and no other verbs can. There is no overlap between incorporating and non-incorporating verbs. Wojdak (2003) presents similar evidence for Nuu-chah-nulth.

(5) Labrador Inuttit (Johns 2003:7)
   a. pitsi-nik nigi-vunga  
dried.fish-MOD eat-INTR.INdic.1S  
“I am eating dried fish.”
   b. *pitsi-nigi-vunga  
dried.fish-eat-intr.indic.1s
a. pitsi-tu-vunga  
dried.fish-consume-intrans.indic.1s  
“I’m eating dried fish.”
b. *pitsi-mik tu-vunga  
dried.fish-mod consume-intr.indic.1s

• Johns also notes that incorporating verbs do not include manner in their meanings nor are there change of state suffixes. We don’t find suffixes meaning “paint” or “break.”

• Johns poses three questions:
  1. Why is noun incorporation obligatory when it is possible?
  2. Why is it restricted to a certain set of verbs?
  3. Why is it restricted to these particular verbs and not others?

• Johns’ answer: incorporating verbs are light verbs, and all light verbs must incorporate in Inuktitut.

3 Sublexical Modality

• Koenig and Davis (2001) note that have, receive, lose, lack and need have entirely different entailments, but all deal with possession.

• Semantic structure of verbs contains two separate units:

  Situational Core: contains semantic relations
  Modal Base: contains modal operators which act on the semantic relations in the situational core

(7) Lexical semantics of need (Adapted from Koenig and Davis, 2001, 93)

• For Johns (2003), little v for is the modal base, and its complement is the situational core.

• The incorporated noun occupies the root and lends its semantics as the situational core. Johns assumes all nouns in Inuktitut are existential.
Koenig and Davis posit five modal operators: negative, inchoative, inchoative-negative, and deontic and energetic irrealis. Johns posits three: identity (I), quantification (Q), and negation (~)

Complex argument structure is not possible, since the incorporated noun can only be the complement of vP.

4 Nuu-chah-nulth

Can Nuu-chah-nulth suffixes be reduced to modal operators? There are problems with this approach.

perception: -'inākuːh “see”, -'nā:ħ “look for”, -(y)aʔaːt “find”

Nuu-chah-nulth has a set of perception suffixes which Inuktitut lacks.

How do we get perception from modality? Koenig and Davis posit perception as a type of situational core parallel to possession. It is not clear how Johns would account for these.

consuming/making: -'iːc “eat/drink”, -iːt “make”, -siːk “finish making”

Johns notes that Inuktitut incremental theme verbs are problematic for her analysis. Her suggested combination of modal operators for “eat/drink” is the same as that for “become”. The same problem exists in Nuu-chah-nulth.

The difference between -iːt “make” and -siːk “finish making” is one of aspect, but Koenig and Davis suggest that aspevtual operators might be added to the modal base.
(12) **others:** *-simɛ* “pray for”, *-čhi* “marry”, *-ίu:ta* “host (ceremony)”

- Some suffixes, as in (12) are too specific in their meaning for it to be built from modal operators. *-simɛ* “pray for” entails that the agent performs a ritual.

(13) **possession:** *

(15) a. *ʔaäkiips*
   
(15) b. *ʔaaxiiʔpʔiš*
   
(15) c. *mahtiiʔapʔiš*
   
(15) d. *ʔaaxqimtįʔuʍә*

- *-ayi* “give” creates ditransitive verbs. As Johns notes, ditransitives are not predicted by her analysis: internal arguments of incorporating verbs are the complement of little v, and there can be only one complement.

(14) *nāčaarlýakayiʔiš Kim Sandy*

- *-ayi* “give” creates ditransitive verbs. As Johns notes, ditransitives are not predicted by her analysis: internal arguments of incorporating verbs are the complement of little v, and there can be only one complement.

(15) a. *ʔaaxa-ʔiʔp-s*
   

(15) b. *ʔaaxa-ʔiʔ[p]-ʔiš*
   
(15) c. *mahtiiʔapʔiš*
   
(15) d. *ʔaaxqimtįʔuʍә*

“John bought a house.” (4 June 2003)

“John got paid two dollars.” (17 May 2004)

- Nuu-chah-nulth has both an incorporating and a non-incorporating verb that means “buy.”
Since Johns claims that the reason some verbs incorporate and some do not is based on semantics, she predicts there will be no pairs of incorporating and a non-incorporating verbs with the same semantics.

(16) a. maakûk̓ ̱ iš John mahťi:i
    maakuk -iš John mahťi:i;
    buy-3.ind John house
    “John bought a house.” (23 February 2004)

b. mahťi:iap̓ iš John
    mahťi:-a-p-ış John
    house -buy
    “John bought a house.” (23 February 2004)

5 Concluding Remarks

- The similarity between Nuu-chah-nulth and Inuktitut verbalizing suffixes suggests a similar analysis.
- The problems that Nuu-chah-nulth presents suggest Johns’ analysis is not correct.
- The fact that differences in modal operators can account for many suffixes suggests that they do play some role, but not a central role.
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