

Evidence for question formation by direct *wh*-movement in Ktunaxa*

E.K. McClay and Violet Birdstone
University of British Columbia

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.

Keywords: Ktunaxa, *wh*-questions, syntax, field work

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 *qata* 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. | kumnaqatqa?ni maŋi
kumnaqatqa?-ni maŋi
sad.face-IND Mary
'Mary looks sad.' | b. | hu ɕakunani
hu ɕakuna-ni
1.SG short-IND
'I'm small/short.' |
| (2) a. | wu·kati martinas erin
wu·kat-i martina-s erin
see-IND Martina-OBV Erin
'Erin saw Martina.' | b. | hin ɕtakilni
hin ɕtakil-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 ʔumaç
 hu qakiʔ-ni k-hu ʔumaç
 1.SG say-IND COMP-1.SG laugh
 ‘I said I laughed.’
- b. hin qakiʔni kin ʔumaç
 hin qakiʔni k-hin ʔumaç
 2.SG say-IND COMP-2.SG laugh
 ‘You said you laughed.’
- c. qakiʔni çan kʔumaç matis
 qakiʔ-ni çan k ʔumaç
 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 çłakitni k ç'i·katit k'iktuklitkat
 hin çłakit-ni k ç'i·katit k' iktuqłitqat
 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. qaḷa k haḡaḷaqa
 qaḷa k haḡaḷaqa
 who COMP sleepy
 ‘Who’s sleepy?’
- b. qapsin kin wu·kat
 qapsin k-hin wu·kat
 what COMP-2SG see
 ‘What do you see?’
- c. qaḷa k wu·kat niʔis qukins
 qaḷa k wu·kat niʔis qukin-s
 who COMP see DEM raven-OBV
 ‘Who saw the ravens?’
- d. hu ḡḷakitni qaḷa ʔukqna kiʔsuk
 hu ḡḷakit-ni qaḷa ʔukqna k-iʔsuk
 1SG like-IND who because COMP-?-good
 ‘I like someone_i because they_i are so good.’

With respect to interrogative pronouns Ktunaxa differentiates between human arguments, *qaḷa* ‘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 *qaḷa* 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 *qaḷa* 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 *ʔin* to serve a predicative function, as shown in (6a), (6b), and (7a) below.

- (6) a. *hun naḡyu
 hun naḡyu
 1.SG fox
 (intended:) ‘I am a fox’
- b. hun ʔini naḡyu
 hun ʔin-ni naḡyu
 1.SG COP-IND fox
 ‘I am a fox.’

- (7) a. qaḷa kiʔin na
 qaḷa ki-ʔin na
 who COMP-COP DEM
 ‘Who is this?’
- b. (ʔini) maḥi
 ʔin-ni maḥi
 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) qaḷa kiʔin kin wukqa
 qaḷa ki-ʔin 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. qaḷa kin qaki k haḷaḷaqa
 qaḷa k-hin qaki k haḷaḷaqa
 who COMP-2.SG say COMP sleepy
 ‘Who did you say was sleepy?’
- b. qapsins k a-qaki maḥi qukins k sakit ʔiks
 qapsin-s k a--qaki maḥi qukin-s k sakit ʔik-s
 what-OBV COMP ?-say Mary raven-OBV COMP PROG eat-OBV
 ‘What did Mary say the ravens were eating?’
- c. qapsins k qaki maḥi k sakit ʔiks a-qukḥiʔits
 qapsin-s k qaki maḥi k sakit ʔik-s a-qukḥiʔit-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 maḥi qukins k sakit ʔiks
 ka·s k a--qaki maḥi qukin-s k sakit ʔik-s
 where-OBV COMP ?-say Mary raven-OBV COMP PROG eat-OBV
 ‘What did Mary say the ravens were eating?’

²Additionally, in example (9b), the progressive *k sakit* can also be written or said *k skikit*.

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 *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 banning the movement of one element from a conjunct, holds in Ktunaxa.³ The conjunction operator in Ktunaxa is the particle ϕ , a dental affricate; it can conjoin verb phrases and noun phrases, as in (11a) and (11b) below. (data from Kootenai Cultural Council, pp. 43)

- (11) a. puł nawasxu'mik ϕ naqwiłni
 puł nawasxu'mik ϕ naqwił-ni
 Paul sang and dance-IND
 ‘Paul sang and danced.’
- b. piyał ϕ puł qa ϕ kaxi
 piyał ϕ puł qa ϕ kaxi
 Peter and Paul NEG come
 ‘Peter and Paul did not come.’

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).

- (12) hin wu-kati ni?iy qukin ϕ ?a-qukłi?it
 hin wu-kat-i ni?iy qukin ϕ ?a-qukłi?it
 2.SG see-IND DET raven and berry
 ‘You saw the ravens and the berries.’
- (13) a. *qapsin kin wu-kat ϕ ?a-qukłi?it
 qapsin k-hin wu-kat ϕ ?a-qukłi?it
 what COMP-2SG see and berry
 intended: ‘What did you see and berries?’

³Or 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 paŋkiy ɕ naʔuti
 kaki-swisqa-ni paŋkiy ɕ naʔuti
 DUAL-stand-IND woman and girl
 ‘A woman and a girl are standing there.’
- b. qaʔa k sawisqa
 qaʔa k sawisqa
 who COMP stand
 ‘Who’s standing there?’

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

- (16) a. *qaʔa k sawisqa ɕ naʔuti
 qaʔa k sawisqa ɕ 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. *qaʔa k sawisqa naʔuti ɕ
 qaʔa k sawisqa naʔuti ɕ
 who COMP stand girl and
 Lit. ‘Who a girl and are standing there?’
 (intended: ‘A girl and *who* are standing there?’)

Leaving *qaʔa 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, *taʔaktaq* ‘another’, is used; for the intended *wh-in situ* (echo-like) interrogative, cleft questions like (17c) are preferred.

- (17) a. ^{*/?} sawisqaʔni pałkiy ɕ qała
 sawisqaʔ-ni pałkiy ɕ qała
 stand-IND woman and who
 (intended): ‘A woman and someone are standing there.’ OR ‘A woman and *who* are standing there?’
- b. sawisqaʔni pałkiy ɕ łaʔakłaq
 sawisqaʔ-ni pałkiy ɕ łaʔakłaq.
 stand-IND woman and another
 ‘A woman and someone (else) are standing there.’
- c. qała kiʔin k sawisqapmał naʔutis
 qała ki-ʔin k sawisqapmał 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. małi kumnaqałqaʔni ʔukqna ɕans k ɕłakits erins
 małi kumnaqałqaʔ-ni ʔukqna ɕan-s k ɕłakit-s erin-s
 Mary sad.face-IND because John-OBV COMP like-OBV Erin-OBV
 ‘Mary looks sad because John likes Erin.’
- b. qała k kumnaqałwi-tik ʔukqna ɕans k ɕłakits
 qała k kumnaqałwi-tik ʔukqna ɕan-s k ɕłakit-s
 who COMP sad.heart because John-OBV COMP like-OBV
 erins
 erin-s
 Erin-OBV
 ‘Who is sad because John likes Erin?’

- (19) a. *qatas k kumnaqatwi·tiks (mati) ʔukqna k ɕtakits
 qata-s k kumnaqatwi·tik-s (mati) ʔukqna k ɕtakit-s
 who-OBV COMP sad.heart-OBV (Mary) because COMP like-OBV
 ɕans
 ɕan-s
 John-OBV
 intended: ‘Who is Mary sad because (t) likes John?’
 (asking about who likes John, including information that Mary is sad.)
- b. *qatas k kumnaqatwi·tiks (mati) ʔukqna ɕans k
 qata-s k kumnaqatwi·tik-s (mati) ʔukqna ɕan-s k
 who-OBV COMP sad.heart-OBV (Mary) because John-OBV COMP
 ɕtakits
 ɕtakit-s
 like-OBV
 intended: ‘Who is Mary sad because John likes (t)?’
 (asking about who John likes, including information that Mary is sad.)

Leaving the *wh*-word *in situ* results in an indefinite reading, but can also be interpreted as a question. For instance, (20a) and (20b) are ambiguous between the two translations given; whether there are prosodic differences between the two forms is uncertain for now, but initial discussion did not result in intense prosodic variation of the sort observable in English echo-questions.

- (20) a. mati kumnaqatqaʔni ʔukqna ɕans k ɕtakits qatas.
 mati kumnaqatqaʔ-ni ʔukqna ɕan-s k ɕtakit-s qata-s
 Mary sad.face-IND because John-OBV COMP like-OBV who-OBV
 ‘Mary is sad because John likes someone./who?’
 (Potential reply: *ɕan ɕtakitni erins*. ‘John likes Erin,’ or simply *erins*. ‘Erin.’)
- b. mati kumnaqatqaʔni ʔukqna qatas k ɕtakits ɕans
 mati kumnaqatqaʔni ʔukqna qata-s k ɕtakit-s ɕan-s
 Mary sad.face-IND because who-OBV COMP like-OBV John-OBV
 ‘Mary looks sad because someone/who likes John./?’
 (Potential reply: *erin ɕtakitni ɕans*. ‘Erin likes John,’ or simply *erins*. ‘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 haqaʔpaʔniʔnam k qakit itwa mali ɕupqas siʔ
 niʔi k haqaʔpaʔniʔnam k qakit itwa mali ɕupqa-s siʔ
 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 haqaʔpaʔniʔnam qakit itwa mali ɕupqas, kiʔin
 niʔi k haqaʔpaʔniʔnam qakit itwa mali ɕupqa-s ki-ʔin
 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 *qaʔa* 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’ à la Bobaljik & Wurmbrand—and the addressee may reply with a fragment answer *mati* ‘Mary’ or *ɕupqas* ‘deer (obviative)’, as appropriate.

- (22) a. *qaʔa, k haqaʔpaʔniʔnam k qakit itwa ɕupqas isiʔ
 qaʔa k haqaʔpaʔniʔnam k qakit itwa ɕupqa-s i-siʔ
 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 haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa maṭi isiṭ
 qapsin-s k haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa maṭi i-siṭ
 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 question (23b), but cannot use the *wh*-questions in (24a) and (24c) to ask about the arguments of the complex NP’s embedded clause.

- (23) a. hun huṭpaṭni haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa maṭi ḥupqas
 hun huṭpaṭni haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa maṭi ḥupqa-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 huṭpaṭin haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa maṭi
 k-hin huṭpaṭ-in haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa maṭi
 COMP-2.SG hear story COMP say shoot Mary
 ḥupqas
 ḥupqa-s
 deer-OBV
 ‘Did you hear the story that says how Mary shot and killed a deer?’
- (24) a. *qaṭa hin huṭpaṭni haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa ḥupqas
 qaṭa hin huṭpaṭ-ni haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa ḥupqa-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. qaṭa kin huṭpaṭin haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa
 qaṭa k-hin huṭpaṭin haqaṭpaṭni?nam k qakiṭ iṭwa
 who COMP-2.SG hear story COMP say shoot
 ḥupqas?
 ḥupqa-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 hułpałni haqałpałni?nam k qakił itwa mati
 qapsin-s hin hułpał-ni haqałpałni?nam k qakił itwa mati
 what-OBV 2.SG hear-IND story COMP say shoot Mary
 Lit. What you heard a story that says how Mary shot and killed *t*?
 (I know you heard a story about Mary killing something—what was it?)
- d. qapsins ma kin hułpałin haqałpałni?nam k qakił
 qapsin-s ma k-hin hułpałin haqałpałni?nam k qakił
 what-OBV PAST COMP-2.SG hear story COMP say
 itwa matis?
 itwa mati-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 hułpałni haqałpałni?nam k qakił itwa qala čupqas
 hun hułpał-ni haqałpałni?nam k qakił itwa qala čupqa-s
 1.SG hear-IND story COMP say kill who deer-OBV
 ‘I heard the story that said how someone/who shot and killed a deer?’
 Potential replies: *man ?ini mati*. ‘It was Mary,’ or *mati*. ‘Mary.’
- b. hun hułpałni haqałpałni?nam k qakił itwa mati qapsins
 hun hułpał-ni haqałpałni?nam k qakił itwa mati 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 čupqas*. ‘It was a deer,’ or *čupqas* ‘deer’.
- c. qala ki?in, ni?i haqałpałni?nam k itwa čupqas
 qala ki-?in ni?i haqałpałni?nam k itwa čupqa-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 (Kroeger 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 *wh*-word) is consistent with *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 *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 *wh*-indefinites are determiners or NPs is somewhat of an open question. Mast (1988) cites data from *Kutenai Tales* (Boas 1918) in which the phrase *qata tkamu* ‘some child’ appears; however, the second author’s first impression of sentences using *qata* as an indefinite determiner was that they were ungrammatical. For instance, *qata patkiy wu-kati ni?is qukins* intended to mean ‘some woman saw the ravens’ was judged to be questionable at best. It is therefore a possibility that *qata* and perhaps *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 *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 *wh*-word is banned; given the rest of the data in this paper, this prediction seems likely to hold.

- (26) a. hu qatwini qata k wu-kat mahis
 hu qatwi-ni qata k wu-kat mahi-s
 1.SG think-IND who COMP see Mary-OBV
 ‘I wonder who saw Mary.’
- b. hu qatwini qatas mahi k wu-kat
 hu qatwi-ni qata-s mahi k wu-kat
 1.SG think-IND who-OBV Mary COMP see
 ‘I wonder who Mary saw.’

Finally, we have not so much as scratched the surface of multiple-*wh* questions. Whether Ktunaxa uses multiple *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.

References

- Boas, F. (1918). *Kutenai Tales*. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 59. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Boas, F. (1927a). Additional Notes on the Kutenai Language. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 4.85–104.
- Bobaljik, J. & S. Wurmbrand. (2014; To appear). “Questions with Declarative Syntax tell us what about selection?” In: *50 Years Later: Reflections on Chomsky’s Aspects*, ed. by A. J. Gallego and D. Ott. MITWPL. (accessed through <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002266>)
- Dryer, M. S. (1992). “A Comparison of the Obviation Systems of Kutenai and Algonquian.” In *Papers of the Twenty-Third Algonquian Conference*, ed. by W. Cowan. Ottawa: Carleton University, pp. 119–163.
- Kootenai Culture Committee. (1999). *Ksanka ’A·klukaqum: Kootenai Dictionary*. Elmo, Montana: Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Kootenai Culture Committee.
- Kroeber, P. D. (1999). *The Salish language family: Reconstructing syntax*. U of Nebraska Press.
- Mast, S. J. (1988). “Aspects of Kutenai Morphology.” MA thesis. University of Pittsburgh, 1988.
- Morgan, L. R. (1991). *A Description of the Kutenai Language*.
- Ross, J. R. (1967). “Constraints on Variables in Syntax.” PhD dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1967.