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1 Introduction

• This paper concerns the morpheme -či[Ł] in Nuu-chah-nulth (independent form ?uukʷî; -yuqʷ[Ł]/?uuyuqʷ in Ditidaht), and how it interacts with other aspects of the syntax in the language.

(1) ŋaacsaaňah suutî
watch-now-1sg. you-či[Ł]
I have watched you. (NT/NA)

(2) ?aaćčiľith kaapap John
who-či[Ł]-PST-3.Q like John
‘Who does John like?’ (Davis and Sawai (2001))

(3) ?uuḵʷintiš Bill ɬawa suč’isi
?uuḵʷiř-PST-3 Bill near tree-DET
‘That’s the tree Bill was near.’ Rose (1981)

(4) čuqʷsiɬ -ibt -’a John ?uuyuqʷ Bill
hit-PRF -PST -DCLR John ?uuyuqʷ 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.
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• 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:
  – 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 -či[L]/ʔuwkʷd seems to serve a wide range of functions, past analyses tend to treat each function independently.

• Assuming that -či[L] and ʔuwkʷd 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

• -či[L] lengthens the first vowel of the word, and the /č/ is in the right prosodic domain to turn into [kʷ] 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 ʔuwkʷd, 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 -hwat/ʔuwat (introduces instruments), -chin/ʔuchin (introduces benefactees), yi/ʔuyi (introduces time), -hta/ʔuhta (emphatic object) among others.

• Arguments for ʔuwkʷd being a verb/predicate:
  1. It may take its own aspect inflection:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(5) } & \quad \text{ʔuwkʷd-PRF} \\
& \quad \text{ʔuwkʷd-PRF-PRF} \\
& \quad \text{‘He started to refer to it.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

  Rose p. 65
2. It may stand alone as the main predicate of a clause:

(7) ?uukʷíhма ḥaathāaḵʷaχʔi
    ?uukʷíh-3  girls-DET
    ‘She was dealing with the girls.’  (NT/NA)

(8) ?uukʷíhма č'atashuł  ḥaakʷaaχuk
    ?uukʷíh-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) ?aanačǐʔaχ  'iiṁt'iiṃtš  ḥawǐšimnimhʔi  qʷaaneʔitq
    only-čǐ-now RED-name-SPOR chief-?-PL-DET REL-location-3.REL
    maamaht'i
    ‘. . .calling by name only the chief of each house.’  (NT/NA)

(10) wikiy  hàliił
    NEG-čǐ call.for
    ‘He called no one.’  (NT/NA)

(11) ?aaχačǐʔaχ  maakšiχčip  χałuʔi
    two-čǐ-now buy-PRF-APPL others-DET
    ‘Then he bought from two others.’  (NT/NA)

2.1 Objects introduced by -čǐf[L]

- ?uukʷiʔ/-čǐf[L] is most often found introducing indirect objects of ditransitive predicates.

(12) waaʔaχ  niixʷ'īn  ?uukʷiʔ  pahtuuś
    say-now Coiling.Sound  ?uukʷiʔ  Pathluus
    ‘. . .said Coiling-Sound to Pathluus’  (NT/NA)

(13) wikayi  ?uukʷiʔ  yuukʷiʔṣuʔi
    NEG-give  ?uukʷiʔ  younger.sibling-DET
    ‘. . .did not give any to the younger sister’  (NT/NA)

    tell-PAST-3 John  ?uukʷiʔ  policeman-DET that . . .
    ‘John told the policeman that . . .’  (Ahousaht)
(15) ʔutytamitʔiš ʔumʔiqsakʔi qawii ʔuukʷił Lucy bring-PAST-3 mother-POSS-DET berries ʔuukʷił Lucy ‘(Lucy’s) mom brought berries to Lucy.’ (Ahousaht)

(16) ʔaaqiqiʔitk ʔahii ʔuukʷił ʔukʷi what-ʔiʔ[ʔ]PAST-2sg.Q bestow ʔuukʷił younger.sibling ‘What did you give your younger sibling (as a gift)?’ (Ahousaht)

(17) ʔuyimtitşi ʔapaqeqʔ ʔuukʷił Rachel give-PAST-1sg. bread ʔuukʷił Rachel ‘I gave the bread to Rachel.’ (Tla-o-qui-aht)

• However, as noted by many, ʔuukʷił 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 ʔuukʷił on their objects, or which types of objects may co-occur with ʔuukʷił.

• ʔuukʷił occurs most naturally on an object when both arguments of the verb are animate:

(18) kaapapiš ʔuukʷił ʔaa ʔaaqeqʔ that girl-DET like-3 ʔuukʷił ‘He likes that girl.’ (Ahousaht)

(19) ʔwakʷixaqeqʔ ʔuukʷił Mary RED-kiss-on.cheek-PRF-probably-PST-3 John ʔuukʷił Mary ‘John probably kissed Mary on the cheek.’ (Ahousaht)

(20) ʔaaqeqʔ ʔuukʷił Christine punch-PRF-3 Rachel ʔuukʷił Christine ‘Rachel punched Christine.’ (Ucluelet)

(21) ʔuuqeqʔ ʔuukʷił Christine angry-3 Christine ʔuukʷił 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 ʔuukʷił to introduce inanimate objects.

• Speakers who allow ʔuukʷił 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 ʔuukʷił is optional.

• The object may be affected by the event in different degrees, from the patient of ‘kill’ and ‘light on fire’...

(22) qahsaapiš ʔuukʷił qʷayačik die-PRF.CAUS-3 Ben ʔuukʷił wolf ‘Ben killed the wolf.’ (Ahousaht)
(23) paššiʔiš Tom ?uukʷi?id layiip
light-PRF-3 Tom ?uukʷi?id leaves
‘Tom lit the leaves on fire.’ (Ahousaht)

• ...to mildly-affected objects such as the patient of ‘lose’ and ‘hide’...

(24) pawaššiʔs ?uukʷi?id ćiima
lose-PRF-1sg ?uukʷi?id knife
‘I lost the knife.’ (Ahousaht)

(25) haptsaapiʔiš ?uukʷi?id hiishìsač’ak
hidden-CAUS.PRIF-3 ?uukʷi?id axe
‘He hid the axe.’ (Ahousaht)

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

(26) ?uqhyuuʔiš Susie ?uukʷi?id ʔuucmaʔi
related-3 Susie ?uukʷi?id woman-DET
‘Susie is related to the woman.’ (Ahousaht)

(27) t̓uʔuksʔaad ?uukʷi?id hiyì
fear-1sg-always ?uukʷi?id snake
‘I’m afraid of snakes.’ (Ahousaht)

* ?uukʷi?id occurs most naturally with indirect objects and animate direct objects.

* Allowing for the focus usage, ?uukʷi?id occurs with the full range of syntactic and semantic predicates/objects.

• ?uukʷi?id cannot be characterized simply as a marker for patient arguments (or any other specific set of semantic arguments).

• ?uukʷi?id is ungrammatical on the patient argument of unaccusative predicates.

(28) a. kiššiʔiš naputaayi
break-PRF-3 bottle
‘The bottle broke.’ (Ahousaht)

b. kišsaapsiʔ ?uukʷi?id naputaayi
break-PRF.CAUS-1sg ?uukʷi?id bottle
‘I broke the bottle.’ (Ahousaht)

c. *kiššiʔiš ?uukʷi?id naputaayi
break-PRF-3 ?uukʷi?id bottle
(‘The bottle broke.’) (Ahousaht)

(29) a. qahšiʔiš qʷəyačiik
die-PRF-3 wolf
‘The wolf died.’ (Ahousaht)
b. qahšaapʔiš ?uukʷi̱l qʷayačiʔk
die-PRF.CAUS-1sg ?uukʷi̱l wolf
‘He killed the wolf.’
c. *qahšiʔîʔiš ?uukʷi̱l qʷayačiʔk
die-PRF-3 ?uukʷi̱l wolf
(‘The wolf died.’)

* ?uukʷi̱l 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 -čiʔ[L] when the verb is not an incorporating verb.

- -čiʔ[L] does not appear with subject wh-words.

(30) a. As a subject
?[from]caqhq ḥunkšiʔk
who-?/-3Q wake-PRF
‘Who woke up?’  
(Ahousaht)

b. As the object of an incorporating verb
?acaʔak'uuhíth Mary
who-see-PAST-3Q Mary
‘Who did Mary see?’  
(Ahousaht)

c. As the object of a non-incorporating verb
?aaʔačiʔîʔs ḥunk-saap
who-čiʔ-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 -čiʔ[L].

Relative Clauses

(31) a. As a subject
kʷikʷixasiʔíʔtʔiʔs John ḥaa yaʔîtq waʔičiʔl
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
kaapapʔi̱s John yaqʷayimitii Mary ?uukʷi̱l 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**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kʷiʔaʔiʔi} & \quad \text{kʷiʔiʔi} \\
\text{like-3} & \quad \text{like-3} \\
\text{John & John} & \\
\text{yaqʷiʔitqs} & \quad \text{yatʔiʔitqs} \\
\text{RED-kiss-on.cheek-PST-1sg.REL} & \\
\text{‘John likes the one who I kissed on the cheek.’} & \quad \text{(Ahousaht)}
\end{align*}
\]

**Quantifiers**

(32) a. **As a subject**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʔuusʔi} & \quad \text{haa} \\
\text{hit-in.container} & \quad \text{RED-box-PST-1sg.REL} \\
\text{‘Some of it is in that box there.’} & \quad \text{(Ahousaht)}
\end{align*}
\]

b. **As the object of an incorporating verb**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʔuusʔeuʔi} & \quad \text{ʔaʔiʔ} \\
\text{some-in.container-PST-3sg.ind} & \quad \text{box-PST-1sg.REL} \\
\text{‘There’s something in the box’} & \quad \text{(Ahousaht)}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʔuusʔiʔi} & \quad \text{naatsiʔi} \\
\text{RED-some-ˇ ci} & \quad \text{Lucy} \\
\text{ʔiʔiʔi} & \quad \text{Lucy} \\
\text{ BOX} & \quad \text{women} \\
\text{‘Lucy saw some of the women’} & \quad \text{(Ahousaht)}
\end{align*}
\]

- 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**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{siyaaq} & \quad \text{I-q-1sg} \\
\text{ʔiʔi} & \quad \text{John} \\
\text{eat} & \\
\text{‘I’m eating.’} & \quad \text{(Ahousaht)}
\end{align*}
\]

b. **As the object of an incorporating verb**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʔukʷačus} & \quad \text{self-make.fun-past-3sg.ind} \\
\text{ʔiʔi} & \quad \text{John} \\
\text{‘John made fun of himself’} & \quad \text{Steriopolo (2004)}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʔukʷači} & \quad \text{self-do.to-PST-3sg.ind} \\
\text{ʔiʔi} & \quad \text{man} \\
\text{čakup} & \quad \text{laugh-make.fun.of} \\
\text{ʔiʔi} & \quad \text{‘A man made fun of himself.’} & \quad \text{Olga Steriopolo, p.c.}
\end{align*}
\]

(34) ṭaksnuq폭하 have.pity.on-1sg. you-ˇ ci[PST-3sg.ind] \\
‘I have pity for you.’ & \quad \text{(NT/NA)}

- When the pronoun is in-situ, it doesn’t necessarily bear the -ci morpheme:
(35)  wi³k’a³chi su³wa
NEG-now-go.along-2sg.IMP you
‘Don’t you go along (and help)!’ (NT/NA)

(36)  yaa³akusi³ su³wa
care-DUR-1sg you
‘I take care of you.’
(Ahousaht)

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

2.3 ‘Clefts’

- When ?uuk³i³ is used for focus, it can be sentence-initial, bearing all clausal inflection (subject agreement, tense, mode, etc).

(37)  ?uuk³i³tsis³ Mary ¿umksaap
?uuk³i³-PAST-1sg Mary wake-PRF.CAUS
‘It’s Mary that I woke’
(Ahousaht)

(38)  ?uuk³i³³a³xah³ ta³lak³win³ci³ ¿eeksin
?uuk³i³-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 ?uuk³i³, since sentences in narratives tend to not realize all arguments overtly.

- Looking at elicited examples, we see the orders [?uuk³i³ S V O], [?uuk³i³ V S O], and most surprisingly, [?uuk³i³ S O V][2]

(39)  ?uuk³i³ma Christine wi³ka ¿a³ak³a³xis³i
?uuk³i³-3 Christine scold girl-DIM-DET
‘Christine is scolding that little girl.’
[?uuk³i³ S V O], (Ucluelet)

(40)  ?uuk³i³³i³³hii³¿at³h³ Susie Ben
?uuk³i³-3 angry Susie Ben
‘Susie is angry at Ben.’
[?uuk³i³ V S O], (Ahousaht)

(41)  ?uuk³i³³i³¿aq³x³ si³ya mi³aat³i³ ¿uuk³i³
?uuk³i³-FUT-1sg I sockeye smoke
‘I am going to smoke the sockeye.’
[?uuk³i³ 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 [?uuk³i³ 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, ?uu?wí? is separated from the object.

• ?uu?wí?-clefts also appears with affixal predicates that take clausal complements. They necessarily focus the object of the lower verb, rather than the caused agent.

?uu?wí?-CAUS-3 Susie Tom RED-wash-IT socks
Susie made Tom wash the socks. (Ahousaht)

‘Ken wants Kay to take care of his children.’ (Ahousaht)

* ?uu?wí? does not necessarily show up right next to the object.

3 The analysis

• We saw three main uses of -čí[L]/?uu?wí?:

  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. Obligatory supports a raised object of a non-incorporating verb
     – Wh-words, relative markers, quantifiers, and fronted pronouns
     – Incorporation is necessary

  3. Focus/cleft construction
     – ?uu?wí? is sentence-initial, bears all main clause inflection.
     – Focused object is disjoint from it.

• -čí[L] and ?uu?wí? have same distribution.

• Given the seemingly disparate functions of -čí[L]/?uu?wí?, is it possible to one unified analysis of this morpheme?

• How to account for all the possible word orders? How does ?uu?wí? fit in the clause structure?

• Outline of a proposal: ?uu?wí? 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 -či[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—-či[L]/ʔuukʷi^I^ 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 ʔuukʷi^I^ can’t be an object/case marker**

- ʔuukʷi^I^ 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).

- ʔuukʷi^I^ takes verbal morphology (aspect markers such as the perfective -šiƛ; ‘restrictive suffixes’ such as -yaqi^I^ ‘to be doing inside’).

- Rose and Carlson (1984) point out that ʔuukʷi^I^ can introduce the patient argument (underlying object) of passive clause:

  (44) qahsąaptint ʔuukʷi^I^ muwič
die-PRF.CAUS-PST ʔuukʷi^I^ 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 ʔuukʷi^I^ can’t be a focus marker**

- That -či[L]/ʔuukʷi^I^ 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 ʔuukʷi^I^ taanaqš
  NEG-2.IMP ʔuukʷi^I^ 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 ʔuukʷi^I^
  NEG-2.IMP ʔuukʷi^I^
  ‘Don’t (burn it)!’
Null pronouns are not known to carry focus force.

What if the argument is not null in those cases: ?u- part of ?uukʷi̱ is an overt pronoun and stands in for the object under focus.

?u has standardly been glossed as ‘it’ (Sapir and Swadesh (1939), a ‘referential root’ (Rose (1981))

However, the core usage of ?u strongly suggests that it is not a pronominal:

Objects in these sentences are indefinite; ?u does not refer to an established discourse referent, or even a real-life object.³

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)⁴.

Focus is not generally assumed to be able to occur twice in a clause (see Rizzi (1997)).

It’s unlikely that -čil[<L>/?uukʷi̱ is ambiguous between a focus marker and an object marker.
* ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wì \textdagger 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 -čì[\textit{L}] as a light verb

How to get around the problem of ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wì appearing with transitive verbs?

- ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wì can assign Case, but has no thematic roles to assign.
- Just like the light verb \textit{suru} in Japanese, which has Case to assign but needs to get theta roles off its object.

\begin{equation}
\text{John-wa Mary-ni hanashi-o shita} \\
\text{John-TOP Mary-to talk-ACC \textit{suru-PST}} \\
\text{“John talked to Mary”}
\end{equation}

- 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.
- ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wì allows a minimum of one of the main verb’s thematic arguments to be transferred to it—at least the object is transferred.
- Whereas \textit{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 ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wì requires further research.)

\begin{equation}
\text{John-wa murabito-ni [[ookami-ga kuru-to]-no keikoku]-o shita} \\
\text{John-TOP villager-to wolf-NOM come-COMP-GEN warn-ACC \textit{suru}} \\
\text{“John warned the villagers that the wolf was coming” (only Subj and IO)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{John-wa murabito-ni [ookami-ga kuru-to] keikoku-o shita} \\
\text{John-TOP villager-to wolf-NOM come-COMP warn-ACC \textit{suru}} \\
\text{“John warned the villagers that the wolf was coming” (all arguments)}
\end{equation}

- ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wì can also be used as a ‘substitute’ for a previously-mentioned verb, and inherits all its semantic arguments from it:

\begin{equation}
\text{a. ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wìl kuyaa \textatil{layiipt} \textatil{\textit{\textdagger}}}} \\
\text{\textit{\textdagger}}-2sg.Q burn leaves} \\
\text{‘Are you burning the leaves?’}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{a. \textit{wik. ?uu\textsuperscript{k}wìsi}} \textatil{\text{\textdagger}}} \textatil{\text{\textdagger}}} \\
\text{\textit{\textdagger}-1sg. box-PL-DET} \\
\text{‘No. It’s the boxes.’}
\end{equation}
• English translation misleading: the subject is actually still the first person.
• "Puuwii" must have inherited the thematic argument structure from "muyaa".
• 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 "Puuwii" 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.’

(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.’

• 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 "-cid[λ]/Puuwii" 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 ?ukwù in embedded clauses.


• This, as I see it now, is what we should do to ‘do.to.’

čuu!
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**Appendix**

List of abbreviations used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLR</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>iterative aspect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1 However, this alone cannot be used to show that ?uωkʷit 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 ?uωkʷit 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-ŋ t’atiŋ t’aat̲n̲áʔis Emily?
    all-POSS-3Q sick children Emily
    ‘Are all of Emily’s children sick?’

b. hišuk-t’is / ?ušuk-t’is
    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, ?uuš’iḥ is also commonly found in a question-and-answer environment:

(62) a. niuyaa-h Tom ḷayiipt
       burn-3.Q Tom leaves
‘Is Tom burning leaves?’

b. wik. ?uuš’iḥ-ʔiš X’ahiqs-minh-ʔi
   no. ?uuš’iḥ-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 ?uuš’iḥ in the beginning of a discourse—in all the cases I am aware of, the ?uuš’iḥ clause is dependent on some prior predicate, and it does not seem that it can truly be ‘independent’ and ‘non-truncated’.

2[?uuš’iḥ O V S] is marginally acceptable, but not volunteered by the speakers.

3Standard 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.

4There is some data in Rose (1981) that indicate otherwise—she has data where both theme and recipient are introduced with ?uuš’iḥ. However, I have not seen such data for the southern dialects.

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