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Abstract: This paper gives a short survey of the formation of $wh$-questions in Ktunaxa, concluding that they are formed by direct movement of arguments to a position on the left periphery of the (matrix) clause. Ktunaxa adheres to at least three strong island constraints as defined in Ross (1967), namely the Coordinate Structure Constraint, the Adjunct Island Constraint, and the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint; additionally, $wh$-words cannot be predicates, as nouns require a copula to be interpreted as predicative.
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1 Introduction

The body of work on questions in Ktunaxa (isolate; British Columbia, Montana, Idaho) is sparse. The most thorough descriptive linguistic resources on the language in general are Boas (1927a), Morgan (1991), and Mast (1988), a Master’s thesis examining Ktunaxa morphology as it appears in Boas (1918). The thesis devotes two sections to the broad topic of questions, the first (pp. 90–97) providing an inventory of interrogative/indefinite pronouns, and the second (pp. 108–115) examining participial/interrogative marking.

Previous work has shown several preliminary facts. First, that Ktunaxa interrogative pronouns share their form with indefinites—specifically, Mast (1988) translates $qala$ to ‘who, whose, someone (for humans)’, $ka$/$ka$ to ‘how, where (as for manner or location)’, and $qapsin$ to ‘what, why, something (for non-human nouns, both animate and inanimate)’. Second, these words may be obviative (indicated in Ktunaxa with a suffix -$s$), but cannot be marked for possession or number, and do not show any agreement morphology. Finally, there is a relevant verbal prefix $k$-$ki$-$k$- glossed by Mast as “participle/interrog,” which can mark yes-no questions, as well as serving as “a style marker.” (Mast 1988:109) This paper seeks to add to the literature by exploring the status of movement islands in Ktunaxa using existing Ktunaxa reference materials (Kootenai Culture Committee 1999) and original data collected in discussions between the authors. The first author takes responsibility for the theoretical linguistic material presented in this work, while the second author, a speaker of Ktunaxa, vouches for the consistency and validity of the data.

*We would like to thank Martina Wiltschko for enabling this project to go forward, and Henry Davis for providing direction, and giving thoughtful comments on earlier drafts. All remaining errors are our own.

This work describes how wh-questions are formed in Ktunaxa, concluding that they are instances of direct wh-movement that conform to the limits of three traditional movement islands outlined in Ross (1967). Section 2 gives a general introduction to Ktunaxa sentence structure in several subsections focusing on declarative sentences (Subsection 2.1) and canonical cases of wh-questions (Subsection 2.2). Following this, Subsection 3.1–3.3 illustrate that Ktunaxa abides by the restrictions on movement that were described in Ross (1967). Finally, Section 4 concludes and gives directions for future work on this topic in this language.

2 Survey of Ktunaxa clauses

2.1 Declarative sentences, complementizer k

Default Ktunaxa word order is verb-initial, with some variation permitted in word order for information structural effects (topics and foci can precede the verb, specifically). Verbs also agree with all of their arguments (subject and object for transitive verbs, subject for intransitive verbs), though not for indirect objects of ditransitive verbs (Mast 1988:30).

A few notes on conventions: this squib uses the orthography from the reference dictionary, rather than a closer phonetic transcription. One consequence of this is that what Mast (1988) analyzed as subject-marking prefixes are written as separate words, which has the superficial effect of making Ktunaxa look as though it has SVO word order—however, since these morphemes are bound and do not allow free-standing words to intervene between them and the verb, the generalization that Ktunaxa is verb-initial still holds. Additionally, since the present work focuses on whole-word syntax rather than morphology or morphosyntax, morphologically complex words are provided with simplified glosses.1

The following show some simple declarative sentences: (1a) and (1b) show intransitive verbs with and without a full NP argument, respectively; (2a) and (2b) demonstrate the same, but with transitive verbs.

(1) a. kumnaqalqaʔni mafi
kumnaqalqaʔ-ni mafi
sad.face-IND Mary
‘Mary looks sad.’

b. hu ćakunani
hu ćakuna-ni
1.SG short-IND
‘I’m small/short.’

(2) a. wu·kati martinas erin
wu·kat-i martina-s erin
see-IND Martina-obl Erin
‘Erin saw Martina.’

b. hin ćłakiłni
hin ćłakti-ni
2.SG like.3.SG-IND
‘You like him/her.’

1Glosses used: 1, 2, 3 = first person, second person, third person; cont = Boas and Mast’s “continuative”; cop = copula; comp = complementizer; dem = demonstrative; dual = dual (though this gloss may be somewhat inaccurate, as Ktunaxa can also indicate group of three, group of four, which is unusual in a system with a straightforward dual); ind = indicative; neg = negation; pl = obviative; pl = plural; prog = progressive; sg = singular; sub = subordinator. A question mark indicates that no applicable gloss could be found.
Embedded clauses in Ktunaxa are distinguished by two main factors: the embedded verb lacks the indicative suffix, and it can be preceded by what this work glosses as a complementizer, $k$—note that in (3a) and (3b) the $k$ affixes to the subject morphology, deleting the $h$- that would be pronounced in a declarative version of this utterance. These attributes (demonstrated in (3a) through (3c) below) are shared with $wh$-questions.

(3) a. hu qakiʔni ku ʔumae
    hu qakiʔ-ni k-hu ʔumae
    1.SG say-IND COMP-1.SG laugh
    ‘I said I laughed.’

b. hin qakiʔni kin ʔumae
    hin qakiʔni k-hin ʔumae
    2.SG say-IND COMP-2.SG laugh
    ‘You said you laughed.’

c. qakiʔni ēan kʔumae malis
    qakiʔ-ni ēan k ʔumae
    say-IND John COMP laugh
    ‘John said that Mary laughed.’

This $k$ particle has a wide distribution in the language. Mast (1988:109) provides a brief summary:

First, as Canestrelli (1927:7) notes, it marks participles (verbal forms used as nouns) and interrogatives. In Kutenai Tales it is added to verbs in clauses without interrogative pronouns to indicate yes-no questions; in addition, it is optionally added to verbs which immediately follow interrogative pronouns. It marks subordinate clauses as well as participles. It is used optionally with declarative verbs, perhaps as some sort of style marker.

It can also mark subordinate clauses without distinct overt subjects, as in (4) below.

(4) hin ēlakíni k ēkati̇ kiktuklilkał
    hin ēlaki̇ni k ēkati̇ l̓ iktuq̓ i̇ l̓ qał
    2.SG like-IND COMP look book
    ‘You like to read.’

In light of its specific (though diverse) functions, this paper assumes going forward that $k$ is a complementizer. However, due to the limited scope of this paper, we do not investigate the consequences of this particular classification in more detail, though the topic may be a promising avenue for future research.
2.2 Wh-questions

As noted above, questions in Ktunaxa follow the general template of: [interrogative pronoun (if a wh-question)] + k + [verb without indicative morphology]. Simple examples are given in (5a) through (5c) below. Additionally, these interrogative pronouns may be interpreted as indefinite when in an argument position, as in (5d) below.

(5) a. qaⱡa k haⱡalaqa
    qaⱡa k haⱡalaqa
    who comp sleepy
    ‘Who’s sleepy?’

b. qapsin kin wu·kat
    k-hin wu·kat
    what comp-2sg see
    ‘What do you see?’

c. qaⱡa k wu·kat niʔis qukins
    qaⱡa k wu·kat niʔis qukin-s
    who comp see dem raven-obv
    ‘Who saw the ravens?’

d. hu ġłakiłni qaⱡa ?uk̓qna kiʔsuk
    ġłakił-ni qaⱡa ?uk̓qna k-iʔsuk
    1sg like-ind who because comp?-?good
    ‘I like someone, because they, are so good.’

With respect to interrogative pronouns Ktunaxa differentiates between human arguments, qaⱡa ‘who’, and non-human arguments, qapsin ‘what’. Both interrogative pronouns inflect for obviation with an -s suffix, though only in situations where obviation would be appropriate for the argument in the declarative counterpart of the interrogative sentence (for more on obviation in Ktunaxa, see Dryer 1992). The majority of the data in this paper are qaⱡa questions; though Ktunaxa is sensitive to human/non-human status (particularly in number marking), the behaviours of the two interrogative pronouns seem identical, and the generalizations made for qaⱡa are expected to hold for qapsin as well.

Due to the fact that both interrogative pronouns and embedding verbs such as qakiʔni ‘say-ind’ induce the following phrase to be “k + non-indicative verb,” it could be argued that the interrogative pronouns are themselves predicative. However, nouns in Ktunaxa require an overt copula ?in to serve a predicative function, as shown in (6a), (6b), and (7a) below.

(6) a. *hun nak̓yu
    hun nak̓yu
    1sg fox
    (intended:) ‘I am a fox’

b. hun ?ini naky̓u
    hun ?in-ni naky̓u
    1sg cop-ind fox
    ‘I am a fox.’
(7) a. qaⱡa kiʔin na qaⱡa kiʔin na
   who COMP-COP DEM 'Who is this?'

   b. (?ini) mали
   ?in-ni mали
   COP-IND Mary

   ‘(It’s) Mary.’

   (as reply to 7a)

This copula is also used to form cleft questions such as (8)—clefts are also employed as a way to repair certain island violations, and will appear in following sections in that capacity.

(8) qaⱡa kiʔin kin wukqa
    qaⱡa kiʔin k-hin wukqa
   who COMP-COP COMP-2.SG find

   ‘Who is it you found?’

Long-range wh-movement is permitted across bridge verbs, as in (9a) through (9c) below. The matrix clause morphology is identical to what would be expected from a local wh-move.2

(9) a. qaⱡa kin qaki k ḥaḍalaqa
   qaⱡa k-hin qaki k ḥaḍalaqa
   who COMP-2.SG say COMP sleepy
   ‘Who did you say was sleepy?’

   b. qapsins k a·qaki mали qukins k sakiʔ ḥiks
      qapsin-s k a·qaki mали qukin-s k sakiʔ ḥik-s
      what-OBV COMP ?-say Mary raven-OBV COMP PROG eat-OBV

   ‘What did Mary say the ravens were eating?’

   c. qapsins k qaki mали k sakiʔ ḥiks a·quk̓liʔits
      qapsin-s k qaki mали k sakiʔ ḥik-s a·quk̓liʔit-s
      what-OBV COMP say Mary COMP PROG eat-OBV berry-OBV

   ‘What did Mary say was eating the berries?’

Note that the example (9b) is identified as “emphasizing” the eating event; to ask about more specifically what Mary said the ravens were eating, a question such as (10) below (employing the more general wh-word ka·) is preferred.

(10) ka·s k a·qaki mали qukins k sakiʔ ḥiks
     ka·s k a·qaki mали qukin-s k sakiʔ ḥik-s
     where-OBV COMP ?-say Mary raven-OBV COMP PROG eat-OBV

   ‘What did Mary say the ravens were eating?’

2 Additionally, in example (9b), the progressive k sakiʔ can also be written or said k skikiʔ.
To sum up, Ktunaxa questions are consistently introduced by an overt complementizer \( k \), to whose specifier the wh-word moves, either from the same clause, or cross-clausally given the presence of a bridge verb. When \textit{in situ}, wh-words may be interpreted as indefinite. And lastly, without an overt copula, wh-words (as is the case for Ktunaxa nouns in general) cannot act as predicates.

3 Island constraints

3.1 Coordinate Structure Constraint

As stated in Ross (1967), the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) requires that “[i]n a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct.” The latter half of this constraint, specifically barring the movement of one element from a conjunct, holds in Ktunaxa.\(^3\) The conjunction operator in Ktunaxa is the particle \( \text{¢} \), a dental affricate; it can conjoin verb phrases and noun phrases, as in (11a) and (11b) below. (data from Kootenai Cultural Council, pp. 43)

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \( \text{pul} \text{nawasxu’mik} \text{¢} \text{naqwíŋni} \)  
  \( \text{pul} \text{nawasxu’mik} \text{¢} \text{naqwíŋ-ni} \)  
  Paul sang and dance-IND  
  ‘Paul sang and danced.’
  \item \( \text{piyál} \text{¢} \text{puł} \text{qa} \text{¢kaxi} \)  
  \( \text{piyál} \text{¢} \text{puł} \text{qa} \text{¢kaxi} \)  
  Peter and Paul NEG come  
  ‘Peter and Paul did not come.’
\end{enumerate}

The sentence (12) below is acceptable as an answer to a general question ‘What did I see?’ However, in a context where the speaker knows only part of the proposition in (12), that speaker cannot then ask about one half of the coordinated object phrase; this results in the ungrammaticality shown in (13a) and (13b).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item hin \( \text{wu·kati} \text{ niʔiy qukin} \text{¢} \text{a·quk’liʔit} \)  
  hin \( \text{wu·kat-i} \text{ niʔiy qukin} \text{¢} \text{a·quk’liʔit} \)  
  2.SG see-IND DET raven and berry  
  ‘You saw the ravens and the berries.’
  \item *\( \text{qapsin} \text{ kin} \text{ wu·kat} \text{¢} \text{a·quk’liʔit} \)  
  \( \text{qapsin k-hin} \text{ wu·kat} \text{¢} \text{a·quk’liʔit} \)  
  what COMP-2SG see and berry  
  intended:‘What did you see and berries?’
\end{enumerate}

\(^3\)Or at least, it holds enough to ban the movement of one member of a coordinate NP in subject or object position. Whether Ktunaxa permits Across-the-Board movement of identical objects (as in ‘What does Mary love and John hate?’) is a topic for another time.
b. *qapsin kin wu·kat qukin ɕ?
qapsin k-hin wu·kat qukin ɕ
what comp-2sg see raven and
Lit. ‘What did you see a raven and?’

The sentence in (13b) can become acceptable if the speaker inserts a prosodic break; this then allows the utterance to be interpreted as a question and partial or leading answer, much the same as the English translation.

(14) qapsin kin wu·kat? qukin ɕ...?
‘What did you see? A raven and...?’

The same pattern holds in subject position. The following examples show a plain declarative sentence, and a question appropriate to ask (answerable with the declarative sentence).

(15) a. kakiswisqani paⱫkiy ĕ naʔuti
kaki-swisqa-ni paⱫkiy ĕ naʔuti
dual-stand-ind woman and girl
‘A woman and a girl are standing there.’

b. qaⱫa k sawisqa
qaⱫa k sawisqa
who comp stand
‘Who’s standing there?’

Questioning only one of the elements of the conjunct results in ungrammaticality:

(16) a. *qaⱫa k sawisqa ĕ naʔuti
qaⱫa k sawisqa ĕ naʔuti
who comp stand and girl
Lit. ‘Who and a girl are standing there?’
(intended: ‘Who and a girl are standing there?’ as echo-question.)

b. *qaⱫa k sawisqa naʔuti ĕ
qaⱫa k sawisqa naʔuti ĕ
who comp stand girl and
Lit. ‘Who a girl and are standing there?’
(intended: ‘A girl and who are standing there?’)

Leaving qaⱫa in situ can usually lead to either an indefinite reading or an echo-question reading (see the following sections for examples), but in this particular instance it does not seem to be preferred. Instead, for the declarative form a different word, laʔaklaq ‘another’, is used; for the intended wh-in situ (echo-like) interrogative, cleft questions like (17c) are preferred.
(17) a. */sawisqəʔni paɬkiy ɛ qəla
sawisqəʔ-ni paɬkiy ɛ qəla
stand-IND woman and who

(intended): ‘A woman and someone are standing there.’ OR ‘A woman and who are standing there?’

b. sawisqəʔni paɬkiy ɛ ɬaʔakɬaquəl
sawisqəʔ-ni paɬkiy ɛ ɬaʔakɬaq.
stand-IND woman and another
‘A woman and someone (else) are standing there.’

c. qəla kiʔin k sawisqəpmaɬ naʔutis
qəla kiʔin k sawisqəpmaɬ naʔuti-s
who COMP-COP COMP stand.with? girl-OBV
‘Who is it standing with the girl there?’

3.2 Adjunct islands

Adjuncts also form islands from which extraction is not allowed (Ross 1967). This pattern is shown to hold in Ktunaxa; though it is logically possible to seek information about arguments within an adjunct (such as the ‘because’ phrase in the following examples), a speaker cannot do it simply by applying standard question formation rules, “plugging in” a wh-word at the beginning of the sentence. To wit, given a declarative sentence such as (18a) below, a speaker can ask about the subject of the main clause VP—see (18b)—but not the subject or object of the adjunct—(19a) and (19b), respectively.

(18) a. maɬi ɬumnaqəɬʔqaʔni ʔukɬqa ɛans k ɬəlakiɬs erins
maɬi ɬumnaqəɬʔqaʔ-ni ʔukɬqa ɛan-s k ɬəlakiɬ-s erin-s
Mary sad.face-IND because John-OBV COMP like-OBV Erin-OBV
‘Mary looks sad because John likes Erin.’

b. qəla k ɬumnaqəɬhwi-ɬik ʔukɬqa ɛans k ɬəlakiɬs
qəla k ɬumnaqəɬhwi-ɬik ʔukɬqa ɛan-s k ɬəlakiɬ-s
who COMP sad.heart because John-OBV COMP like-OBV
erins
erin-s
Erin-OBV
‘Who is sad because John likes Erin?’
The precise semantics of the question interpretation of these sentences is beyond the scope of the present work. They do not seem to necessarily be echo-questions. They might be productively analyzed as questions with declarative syntax (QDS), as they “[appear] to be wh-in-situ […] and] may carry interrogative force as a speech act, but from a syntactic perspective [are] declarative clause[s] with a wh-expression in focus” (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2014:1).
3.3 Complex NP constraint

The final island addressed by this squib is the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint (CNPC). Specifically, the CNPC states that “No element contained in a sentence dominated by a noun phrase with a lexical head noun may be moved out of that noun phrase by a transformation” (Ross 1967:127). Ktunaxa abides by the CNPC for noun complement clauses in both subject and object positions. Beginning with subjects (which should be the worst case, due to the separate existence of Subject Islands apart from the CNPC), speakers may take a declarative sentence such as (21a) and reform it as a yes-no question, as in (21b).

(21) a. niʔi k haqalpaŋi?nam k qakił ilwa mali ępqas sił
   niʔi k haqalpaŋi?nam k qakił ilwa mali ępqa-s sił
   DET COMP story COMP say shoot Mary deer-OBV CONT
   suʔkni
   suʔk-ni
good-IND

   ‘The story that says how Mary shot and killed a deer is a good one.’

b. niʔi k haqalpaŋi?nam qakił ilwa mali ępqas, kiʔin
   niʔi k haqalpaŋi?nam qakił ilwa mali ępqa-s kiʔin
   DET COMP story say shoot Mary deer-OBV COMP-COP
   kiʔsuks?
   kiʔ- suk-s
   COMP-good-OBV

   ‘The story that says how Mary shot and killed a deer, is it a good one?’

However, attempting to create a wh-question (by movement) which inquires about either of the arguments of the complex NP results in ungrammaticality, demonstrated in (22a) and (22b) on the following page. Note that leaving the wh-words qaⱡa and qapsin in situ in either example would result in normal indefinite readings for either sentence (i.e. ‘The story of how someone shot and killed a deer is a good one,’ ‘The story of how Mary shot and killed something is a good one.’) These in situ counterparts can also be interpreted as questions–be they echo questions or questions with declarative syntax’ á la Bobaljik & Wurmbrand–and the addressee may reply with a fragment answer mali ‘Mary’ or ępqaš ‘deer (obviative)’, as appropriate.

(22) a. *qaⱡa, k haqalpaŋi?nam k qakił ilwa ępqas isıł
   qaⱡa k haqalpaŋi?nam k qakił ilwa ępqa-s i-sił
   who COMP story COMP say shoot deer-OBV ?-CONT
   suʔkni/suk
   suʔk(-ni)
good(-IND)

   Lit. ‘Who, the story that says t shot and killed a deer is a good one?’
   (Asking about who shot and killed a deer, including information that the story is a good one.)
b. *qapsins, k haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa mali isit qapsin-s k haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa mali i-sit
what-obv comp story comp say shoot Mary ?-cont
su?kni/suk
su?k(-ni)
good(-IND)

Lit. ‘What, the story that says Mary shot and killed $t$ is a good one?’
(Asking about what Mary shot and killed, including information that
the story is a good one.)

When the complex NP is in object position, the same generalization holds. Given a declarative such as (23a) below, speakers may pose it as the yes-no ques-
tion (23b), but cannot use the who-questions in (24a) and (24c) to ask about the
arguments of the complex NP’s embedded clause.

(23) a. hun hulpalni haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa mali ġupqas
hun hulpalni haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa mali ġupqa-s
2.sg hear-ind story comp say shoot Mary deer-obv
‘I heard the story that says how Mary shot and killed a deer.’

b. kin hulpalin haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa mali
k-hin hulpal-in haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa mali
comp-2.sg hear story comp say shoot Mary
ġupqas
ġupqa-s
deer-obv

‘Did you hear the story that says how Mary shot and killed a deer?’

(24) a. *qaša hin hulpalni haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa ġupqas
qaša hin hulpal-ni haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa ġupqa-s
who 2.sg hear-ind story comp say shoot deer-obv
Lit. ‘Who you heard a story that says $t$ shot and killed a deer?’
(I know you heard a story about someone killing a deer–who was that?)

b. qaša kin hulpalin haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa
qaša k-hin hulpalin haqalpani?nam k qaki’ilwa
who comp-2.sg hear story comp say shoot
ġupqas?
ġupqa-s
deer-obv

Who did you hear a story that says they shot and killed a deer?
(I know you heard a story about someone killing a deer–who was that?)
C. *qapsins hin hulpani haqalpani?nam k qakił iwa mali
qapsin-s hin hulpan-ri haqalpani?nam k qakił iwa mali
what-obv 2.sg hear-ind story comp say shoot Mary
Lit. What you heard a story that says how Mary shot and killed it?
(I know you heard a story about Mary killing something—what was it?)

D. qapsins ma kin hulpani haqalpani?nam k qakił
qapsin-s ma k-hin hulpani haqalpani?nam k qakił
what-obv PAST comp-2.sg hear story comp say
iwa malis?
iwa mali-s
shoot Mary-OBV

‘What did you hear a story that says how Mary shot and killed?’
(I know you heard a story about Mary killing something—what was it?)

More acceptable ways to ask the questions attempted above use the wh-in-situ forms given in (25a) and (25b) below. Speakers also have the option of splitting the query across two sentences (e.g. ‘I know you heard a story about someone killing a deer. Who was it?’) or using a cleft, as in (25c).

(25) a. hun hulpani haqalpani?nam k qakił iwa qala ʔupqaś
hun hulpan-ri haqalpani?nam k qakił iwa qala ʔupqa-s
1.sg hear-ind story comp say who deer-obv
‘I heard the story that said how someone/who shot and killed a deer?’
Potential replies: man ?ini mali. ‘It was Mary,’ or mali. ‘Mary.’

b. hun hulpani haqalpani?nam k qakił iwa mali qapsins
hun hulpan-ri haqalpani?nam k qakił iwa mali qapsin-s
1.sg hear-ind story comp say kill Mary what-obv
‘I heard the story of that said how Mary shot and killed something/what?’
Potential replies: man ?ini ʔupqas. ‘It was a deer,’ or ʔupqas ‘deer’.

c. qala kiʔin, niʔi haqalpani?nam k iwa ʔupqaś
qala kiʔin niʔi haqalpani?nam k iwa ʔupqa-s
who comp-cop det story comp shoot deer-obv
‘Who was it in that story who killed a deer?’

4 Conclusions and future directions

This work has given evidence for the existence of direct wh-movement in Ktunaxa, in contrast with its Salish neighbours, which use predicative wh-words in question formation (Kroeber 1999). The major pieces of support for this conclusion are the language’s systematic adherence to the three island constraints listed above (the Coordinate Structure Constraint, Adjunct Island Constraint, and Complex NP Constraint), as well as the fact that nouns and wh-words require a copula in order to act as predicates, and are copula-free in plain (i.e. non-cleft) wh-questions. Furthermore, the pattern of obviation present in questions involving two third-person
arguments (namely that the object is obviated and the subject not, regardless of which is a \textit{wh}-word) is consistent with \textit{wh}-words being generated as arguments rather than as predicates, and triggering obviation fittingly.

An additional consequence of the work presented here is that there is an adjunct-argument asymmetry in Ktunaxa, evinced by the ungrammaticality of movement out of adjuncts, but not out of arguments of bridge verbs. The existence of this asymmetry points to the existence of further structural asymmetries in the clause.

Throughout the earlier sections of this paper, passing reference has been made to areas where this research may be expanded. Specifically, the nature of the \textit{k} particle, the viability of Across-the-Board movement, and the semantic attributes of questions with declarative syntax might all be productive lines of linguistic inquiry. The following are three other questions and issues that arose in the writing of this work that remain unaddressed here, but may be within the scope of future research.

Whether these \textit{wh}-indefinites are determiners or NPs is somewhat of an open question. Mast (1988) cites data from \textit{Kutenai Tales} (Boas 1918) in which the phrase \textit{qaⱡa qaⱡa} ‘some child’ appears; however, the second author’s first impression of sentences using \textit{qala} as an indefinite determiner was that they were ungrammatical. For instance, \textit{qala patkiy wur·kat niʔis qukins} intended to mean ‘some woman saw the ravens’ was judged to be questionable at best. It is therefore a possibility that \textit{qala} and perhaps \textit{qapsin} could be used as indefinite determiners in older dialects of Ktunaxa, but younger speakers use the words only as full NPs. However, we have not explored the topic in more detail and we cannot give a conclusive category for the indefinite pronouns at this time.

As for weak islands, we have some preliminary data on \textit{wh}-islands, given in (26a) and (26b) below, but have not yet discussed the crucial ungrammatical cases. The prediction is that extraction from the embedded phrase headed by a \textit{wh}-word is banned; given the rest of the data in this paper, this prediction seems likely to hold.

\begin{align*}
    \text{(26) a.} & \quad \text{hu qaⱡwini qaⱡa k \textit{wu·kat} mafis} \\
    & \quad \text{hu qaⱡwi-ni qaⱡa k \textit{wu·kat} maf-i-s} \\
    & \quad 1.\text{sg think-ind who comp see Mary-obv} \\
    & \quad \text{`I wonder who saw Mary.'} \\
    \text{b.} & \quad \text{hu qaⱡwini qaⱡas maf is k \textit{wu·kat}} \\
    & \quad \text{hu qaⱡwi-ni qaⱡa-s maf is k \textit{wu·kat}} \\
    & \quad 1.\text{sg think-ind who-obv Mary comp see} \\
    & \quad \text{`I wonder who Mary saw.'}
\end{align*}

Finally, we have not so much as scratched the surface of multiple-\textit{wh} questions. Whether Ktunaxa uses multiple \textit{wh}-fronting (*‘Who what bought?’), or partial (*‘Who bought what?’), or another strategy for inquiring after multiple arguments is a natural next step in its pursuit.
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