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1. Introduction

This paper is an extract from an overall grammar of Nitinaht that I am presently preparing.¹

A number of concepts are assumed, in particular the notion of grammatical relation. For example, in sentence (1) below, the verb ts'qwcitl 'hit' governs the two nominals John and Bill. The dependent noun John bears the grammatical relation of subject, and the dependent noun Bill that of direct object. To indicate these relations, I use the Roman numerals I and II, respectively while the letter V stands for verb. (The remaining formatives in this sentence are the enclitics ibt Past Tense; ?a, Declarative; and the preposition ?oyoqw, Accusative. They will be discussed in greater detail below.)

(1) Ts'qwcitl ibt ?a John Bill ?oyoqw.

V    I   II
'John hit Bill'

2. Case, Word Order, and Registration

Many aspects of Nitinaht syntax are statable with respect to grammatical relations.² Each dependent nominal is assigned a preposition: the choice of preposition is determined by grammatical relation. Thus, a subject is assigned the preposition ?oxw and a direct object the preposition ?oyoqw (with a qualification, set out below), as in sentence (2). I gloss these prepositions as follows: ?oxw 'nominative', abbreviated NOM; ?oyoqw 'accusative', abbreviated ACC.
(2) Ts’oqwcitl ?a Ḥoxw John Ḥoyoqw Bill.

V NOM I ACC II

Sentence (2) is a paraphrase of (1): they both assert that John hit Bill. Sentence (2) as it stands is a little unusual, in that the nominative preposition is usually deleted, as in (3):

(3) Ts’oqwcitl ibt ?a John Ḥoyoqw Bill.

Moreover, in a short sentence containing only one or two dependent nouns, the preposition assigned to the second one (or the only one) is typically postposed to that noun, as in the original sentence (1). So the sentences (1-3) are all grammatical and assert the same thing, but the form of the sentence as in (1) is the most common in conversation.

While the nominative preposition Ḥoxw is always assigned to the subject, some verbs do not permit the assignment of the accusative Ḥoyoqw to the direct object. Instead, they take a registration prefix Ḥo-. One verb showing this prefix is ṭōkwīl 'make, build', exemplified by (4). The direct object in (4) is ba?as 'house'.

(4) ṭōkwīl ibt ?a John ba?as.

V I II

'John built a house'.

Expressions of time, place, instrument, and so on, are also assigned prepositions. I will not describe these in detail here, but only give a few examples. The preposition for 'time at' is Ḥoy (possibly Ḥoyi), and so is assigned to the time expression Ḥābay 'yesterday' in (5). The nominal expressing location in (6), Pātōlda 'Pacheena (Port Renfrew)', is assigned the locative preposition Ḥiyaw. In (7), the instrumental expression Ḥo’tāwaw’ak
'adze' is assigned the instrumental preposition ?ōxwaw'āl. (The direct object of (7) is tc'apats 'canoe'.

   V    I   II  Time
   'John built a house yesterday'

(6) ?ōkwīl ibt ?a John ba'as ?iyax Pātcīda.
   V    I   II  Location
   'John built a house in Pacheena'

(7) ?ōkwīl ibt ?a John tc'apats ?ōxwaw'āl tc'axay'ak.
   V    I   II  Instrument
   'John made a canoe with an adze'

Word order in Nitinaht is fairly consistent, if stated with respect to grammatical relations. In sentence initial position comes the governing verb, then (ignoring for a moment enclitics like ibt, ?a) the subject, then the direct object if there is one, and then, finally, any other dependents like time, location, or instrument. This word order can be summarized succinctly:

   V  I   II  Other dependents.

(Many additional statements about word order are of course necessary. For example, a Topic nominal precedes the verb, regardless of what its (central) grammatical relation might be: I, II, or whatever.)

3. **Encliticization**

So far, we have paid no attention to the Past Tense formative ibt and the Declarative ?a. There are a couple of respects in which this group of formatives stand apart from others.

Firstly, their position in the sentence is distinctive. This is brought out by contrasting the position of the time expressions ibt 'Past Tense' and
"abay o'y 'yesterday' in (8). While the latter expression comes in the usual place for time dependents, i.e. at the end of the sentence, the past tense formative ibt comes immediately after the first word in the sentence, the verb.

(8) ?ōkw̃l ibt ?a John tc'apats ?abay o'y.

V Past Decl.I II Time

'John made a canoe yesterday'

Secondly, the formatives ibt, ?a are not independent words, phonetically speaking. They are enclitics, that is, they must be phonetically linked to the preceding formative: thus in (8), the sequence ?ōkw̃l ibt ?a is pronounced as one word.

Certain categories of formatives, including Tense (e.g. ibt Past Tense), and Modals (e.g. ?a Declarative), must undergo encliticization.

4. Pronouns

Pronouns in Nitinaht can appear as free nominals, but under certain circumstances they encliticize. The phonological forms for free and enclitic pronouns show similarities, but there are significant differences that cannot be predicted.

The free forms of the pronouns are illustrated in the sentences below. The governing predicate here is ?īto'ib '(be) old'. These sentences are expressions of comparison. In each instance I have chosen some pronoun to represent the Standard for comparison; the preposition assigned to the Standard is the Accusative ?ỹoqw. The person categories are indicated by Arabic numbers 1, 2, 3; doubling indicates plural, e.g. 22 is second person plural.
   V I Standard (1)
   'John is older than me'

   V I Standard (11)
   'John is older than us'

   V I Standard (2)
   'John is older than you'

d. ?Itc'ib ?a John ?øyoqw sow'atc.
   V I Standard (22)
   'John is older than you (plural)'

There are no third person pronouns, but demonstratives, such as yä
'that one, he, she', can be used as in (10).

   V I Standard (3)
   'John is older than him/her'

If a pronoun functions as the subject, then it must encliticize, as
in (11). The Declarative element ?a is deleted in front of a first person
enclitic: This is shown by the symbol for zero, ø, in (11 a, b). The
governing predicate in (11) is p'osāk '(be) tired'.

(11) a. P'osāk ø s.  'I'm tired'
   V I(1)

   b. P'osāk ø id.  'we're tired'
   V II(11)
c. P'osāk ?a s. 'you are tired'
   V I(2)

d. P'osāk a sov' itc. 'you (plural) are tired'
   V I(22)

Just as there is no free third person pronoun, so is there no overt third person enclitic, in the singular:

(12) P'osāk ?a. 'he/she is tired'

But there is a third person plural enclitic, a? or l, exemplified in (13).

(13) P'osāk ?a l. 'they are tired'
   V I(33)

There is some variation in the encliticization of subject pronouns that should be pointed out. The examples collected here are primarily for illustrative purposes. Full paradigms of pronominal enclitics are displayed in a later section.

Pronominal enclitics follow tense and modal enclitics, but some elements follow the pronominal ones. For example, first and second person pronominal enclitics are inserted in the middle of the enclitic sequence xi - ic, which represents the Inferential category, meaning roughly 'it must be the case that'. This yields, with first person singular, the enclitic sequence xi s ic:

(14) Kitlciul ibt xi s ic. 'I must have broken it'
   V I(1)

If we now insert the first person plural, we get the enclitic sequence
\[\xi, \ id, \ ic: \text{observe that there are two vowels in a row. The second of these regularly drops, giving the phonetic form: } \xi \ d \ ic, \text{ as in (15).}\]

(15) Kitlcitl ibt \(\xi \ d \ ic.\) \quad 'we must have broken it'

We have seen that the sequence of Declarative plus second person singular is \(\u026a \ s\) (15 a). The form of the second person enclitic with the Inferential sequence is different: \(\xi \ k \ ic\) (15 b).

(15) a. Balāl \(\u026a \ s.\) \quad 'you're cold'

V I(2)

b. Balāl \(\xi \ k \ ic.\) \quad 'you must be cold'

V I(2)

When the subject is third person singular, i.e. the category for which there is no overt pronominal enclitic, then the Inferential elements \(\xi, \ ic\) come together, the second vowel dropping out: \(\xi \ c\) (16).

(16) P'osāk \(\xi \ c.\) \quad 'he/she must be tired'

V

When the direct object is a pronoun, it too will encliticize. The first person enclitics are always \(s\) (1) and \(id\) (11), regardless of whether they represent the subject or direct object. But the second person singular enclitic for subject is \(is\) and for direct object \(itsx\). The sentences in (17) contain first person subjects and a second person direct object; while in (18) the subject is second person singular and the direct objects are first person.

(17) a. Ts'owwcitl ibt \(s \ itsx.\) \quad 'I hit you'

V 1 II/2

b. Ts'owwcitl ibt id \(itsx.\) \quad 'we hit you'

V 11 II/2
Further variation in the pronominal enclitics is conditioned by other enclitic categories, as evidenced by the paradigms in a later section.

4.1. Noun phrase enclitic

Certain categories of formatives that are dependents of nominals are enclitics. For example, the definite determiner ?aq/qtk 'the' is an enclitic. Each of the direct object nominals in (19) has a determiner ?aq enclitically to it.

   V I   II
   'John built the house' (cf. 4)

   V I   II
   'John made the canoe with an adze' (cf. 7)

I will refer to the general class of enclitics including the Declarative ?a and the Determiner ?aq as the Specifiers.

4.2. Wackernagel's Law

In the examples so far the enclitics have attached to the governing word, whether a verb or noun. But the general statement for the positioning of enclitics has to be somewhat different. The true generalization emerges clearly when we study nominals with modifiers. In the three sentences (20 a, b, c), the verb is tl'itcitl 'shoot' and the direct object bowatc 'deer'.

(18) a. Ts'qwcitl ibt s is. 'you hit me'
   V 1 I/2

b. Ts'qwcitl ibt id is 'you hit us'
   V 11 I/2
In (20 b, c), the direct object nominal governs (or: 'is modified by') some further formative: the adjective ?i?x 'big' in (20 b) and the quantifier ?atl 'two' in (20c). The governing nominal and its dependent form a constituent in each instance, thus we have the constituents ?i?x bowatc 'big deer' and ?atl bowatc 'two deer' in (20 b, c), respectively. (A constituent consisting of a nominal and its dependents is a Noun Phrase.)

(20) a. Tl’itcitl ibt ?a John bowatc ?oyoqw.
   V I II
   'John shot a deer'

   V I II
   'John shot a big deer'

   V I II
   'John shot two deer'

Now let's see what happens when we add the Determiner enclitic ?aq to the direct objects of (20 a, b, c): we get (21 a, b, c), respectively:

   V I II
   'John shot the deer'

   V I II
   'John shot the big deer'

   V I II
   'John shot the two deer'
In (21 a), the Determiner \(?aq\) encliticizes to the governing nominal as we expect: \(bowatc\ ?aq\ 'the deer'. But in (21 b), the Determiner \(?aq\) encliticizes not to the governing nominal, but to the adjective dependent on it, \(?aq\ ?aq\ bowatc\ 'the big deer'. The generalization must be that the Determiner encliticizes to the first word of the constituent, whether it is the governing nominal (21 a) or a dependent (21 b). Sentence (21 c) verifies this statement: here the direct object \(bowatc\) govern the quantifier \(?atl\ 'two', and the Determiner \(?aq\) encliticizes to the first word in the resulting Noun Phrase: \(?atl\ ?aq\ bowatc\ 'the two deer'.

The case-marking Preposition assigned to a nominal does not form a part of the Noun phrase, so the Determiner never encliticizes to it when it precedes the nominal:

(22) Tl'iticitl ibt ?a John ?\(\bar{\text{y}}\)oqw bowatc ?aq.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
& V & I & II \\
\text{'John shot the deer'}
\end{array}
\]

The rule for encliticization can be viewed in two ways which are equivalent:

(a) Attach enclitics to the first word in the constituent.
(b) Put enclitics in second position in the constituent.

This encliticization rule is not unique to Nitinaht, and in fact has been called Wackernagel's Law after the linguist who described its operation in Indo-European.

Wackernagel's Law applies to all enclitics. Thus, the enclitics associated with the governing verb \(tl'icitl\) in (22) above, namely Past Tense \(ibt\) and Declarative \(?a\), attach to the first word of the sentence, which happens to be \(tl'icitl\). If some other word comes in first position, then those
enclitics attach to it instead of to the verb. For example, if the direct object in (22) is made the topic of the sentence, then it precedes the verb, together with its associated Preposition and Determiner. Sentence (23) shows the result: observe that the sentence enclitics attach to the Accusative Preposition, since it happens to be the first word in the sentence. (The vowel in Past Tense \textit{obt} is determined by the preceding vowel.)

(23) \textit{?Oyoqw obt ?a bowatc ?aqt tl'itcitl John.}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Topic/II} \quad \textbf{V} \quad \textbf{I}
\end{center}

'The deer, John shot it'

5. \textbf{Enclitic Categories}

This section summarizes the various categories expressed by enclitics.

5.1. \textbf{Mood (Specifiers and Modals)}

5.1.1 \textbf{Known: Unknown}

A major distinction in both clauses and noun phrases is that of Known versus Unknown. This is illustrated by the contrast between a clause with the Declarative (Known) \textit{?a} as Specifier, and one with the Unknown \textit{?i} - \textit{?a}, as in (24) - (26).

(24) a. Daqcitl \textit{?a John.} \quad 'John drank it'

\begin{center}
\textbf{V} \quad \textbf{I}
\end{center}

b. Daqcitl \textit{?i c John.} \quad 'John must have drank it'

'I think that John drank it'

'Perhaps John drank it'

(25) a. \textit{?Oxw ?a s natlkcitl yA.} \quad 'You were the one who kicked him'

\begin{center}
\textbf{NOM} \quad \textbf{I/2} \quad \textbf{V} \quad \textbf{II/3}
\end{center}
The difference between the Known and Unknown categories is a meaningful one. Sometimes, the choice is forced, however. For example, the selection of the Known Subordinating Complementizer \(?aq/q\tilde{k}\) is required in (27 a); the use of the corresponding Unknown Complementizer, \(ow\is\), as in (27 b), results in a semantically ill-formed sentence, which I have indicated with the asterisk. The superordinate verb here is \(kab'at'p\) 'know'; the dependent verb is \(-kwaqal\) 'be called (a name)'. In (27) the speaker asserts that he knows the name of the person, and so the complementizer must be the Known one \(?aq/q\tilde{k}\) (27 a). To choose the Unknown one \(ow\is\) here would have the speaker asserting that he knows something that is marked as Unknown, clearly a contradiction.

(27) a. \(kab'at'p\ s yaq\is\) \(?aq\) \(y\bar{\alpha}\). 'I know what he is called', i.e
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I/1 & I/3 'I know his name'
\end{array}
\]

\[b. *kab'at'p s yaq\is\) \(ow\is\) \(y\bar{\alpha}\).
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I/1 & V & I/3
\end{array}
\]

Substituting for \(kab'at'p\) the verb \(hay\bar{\alpha}\) \(qak\) 'not know', 'be ignorant of', results in a reversal of well-formedness judgements:

(28) a. \(*hay\bar{\alpha}qak s yaq\is\) \(?aq\) \(y\bar{\alpha}\).
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I/1 & V & I/3
\end{array}
\]
b. Hayä?ak s yaqkwaqal owis yä. 'I don't know what he is called'

V I/1 V I/3

To assert that one does not know something marked as Known, as in (28), is deemed contradictory and illformed. The semantically well-formed sentence (28 b), has the speaker asserting his ignorance about something marked as Unknown. Sentences (29 a, b) illustrate the fact that the Known: Unknown distinction is one of speaker orientation, as is implied by the English glosses for, say, (24 b, 25 b, 26 b). Thus in (29 a), the speaker knows the name of the person in question, while in (29 b), he does not. (ak is an interrogative Specifier, glossed Q.)

(29) a. Kab'at'p ak yaqkwaqal ?aq yä? 'Do you know what he is called?'
   V Q/I/2 V I [speaker knows]

b. Kab'at'p ak yaqkwaqal owis yä/ 'Do you know what he is called?'
   V Q/I/2 V [speaker doesn't know]

This is further supported by (30): the last of these three is illformed on the presupposition that the speaker must know his own name.

(30) a. Kab'at'p ?a John yaqkwaqal ?aq s. 'John knows what I am called'
   V I V I/1

b. Hayä?ak ?a John yaqkwaqal ?aq s. 'John doesn't know what I am called'
   V I V I/1


V I V

Adding wik 'not' immediately in front of the verb creates a negative assertion. Sentence (31 a) is grammatical, and (31 b) ungrammatical, since the superordinate verb howstakoiitl 'learn' presupposes the proposition of the dependent verb. Here, then, with the dependent verb wä 'say, tell', it is
presupposed that something was indeed said. (The specifier qīk is an alternate form of ḥaq.)

(31) a. Wik s hoxwtakcitl wā qīk s is.

\[ \text{NEG 1 } V \quad V \quad 1 \text{ I/2} \]
'I didn't learn what you told me'

b. *Wik s hoxwtakcitl wā wisk s is.

\[ \text{NEG 1 } V \quad V \quad 1 \text{ I/2} \]

Not all verbs impose presuppositions on their dependents like hoxwtakcitl does. Since daʔa 'hear' controls no such presupposition, both (32 a, b) are grammatical.

(32) a. Wik s daʔa wā qīk s is.

\[ \text{NEG 1 } V \quad V \quad 1 \text{ I/2} \]
'I didn't hear what you told me'

b. Wik s daʔa wā wisk s is.

\[ \text{NEG 1 } V \quad 1 \text{ I/2} \]
'I didn't hear you talking to me'

'I didn't hear what you said to me, if you said anything'

In narrations, such as in the text by Batłsqawa (Peter) and Jasper Peters (published by Haas, and Swadesh, 1933), there is a zero Declarative in place of ḥa. Both the sentences (33 a, b) have verb ḥowiy 'go' and subject laʔoʔokw 'young man' (with a dependent quantifier ts'awāʔak 'one'), but whereas (33 a) has the declarative ḥa, sentence (33 b) has no overt specifier, symbolized here by \(\emptyset\). Apart from the stylistic difference, the sentences are paraphrases.

'One young man went somewhere'

b. ?Owiy ø ts'awak laxo?okw. (Haas and Swadesh, 1933:195, 203)

cf. also the paraphrases (34 a, b), with verb tladā'il 'stay home'. ?Atl 'now, then' is an enclitic.

(34) a. Tladā'il ?atl ?a ts'awak.

V I

'One stayed home now'

b. Tladā'il ?atl ø ts'awak. (Haas and Swadesh 1933:195, 203)

V I

5.1.2. Realis

A distinction which is similar to the one described in 5.1.1, and which may or may not prove to be the same, is made in subordinate clauses by the pair of complementizing morphemes qa?a, quiy. The distinction made by these two is the one that has been called realis versus irrealis (O'Grady 1964:74-5). The realis qa?a marks a situation that has actually been instantiated; the irrealis quiy one that has not necessarily been as the following pairs of sentences demonstrate. The superordinate verbs are ?ōqwal 'think', t'aquāk 'believe', caaxa 'run away, escape'; the dependent verbs are waloitl 'go home' and ts'ōqwoitl 'hit, punch'.

(35) a. ?ōqwal s waloitl qa?a John.

V I/1 V I

'I thought that John went home'

b. ?ōqwal s waloitl quiy John.

V I/1 V I

'I thought that John would go home'
(36) a. T'aqwak s walcitl qa?a John.

V I/1 V I
'I believe John went home'

b. T'aqwak s walcitl qwiy John.

V I/1 V I
'I believe John will go home'


V I V I
'John is running away [because] Bob punched him'

b. Caxa qa John tsoq wcitl qwiy Bob.

V I V I
'John is running away [because] Bob might punch him'

The complementizer qatxa occurs in similar sentences. (The dependent predicate in (38) is ta?il 'be sick'.)


V V I
'Pat thinks she's sick'

b. ?Oqwal qa ta?il qatxa Pat.

V V I
'Pat thinks she's sick'.

5.1.3 Quotative

Another contrasting set of modals consists of the Quotatives, in the main clause ow, in dependent clause, xi. The Quotatives indicate that somebody other than the speaker is responsible for the statement.
   V I
   'The man knows it'

b. Kab'at'p ow q∅ʔas ?aq.
   V I
   'The man knows it, it is said'
   'The man says he knows it'

c. W∅?a q∅ʔas ?aq kab'at'p xi.
   V I V
   'The man said that he knows it'

The new predicates in (40) are waʔitcq'aqatl 'be sleepy' and waʔitcitl 'go to sleep'. (40 b, d) contain the Future enclitic ? Tk.

   V I
   'The man is sleepy'

   V I (because) V
   'The man is going to sleep because he is sleepy'

c. Waʔitcq'aqatl ow q∅ʔas ?aq.
   V I
   'The man says he is sleepy'
   'The man is sleepy, it is said'

   V I (because) V
   'The man says he's going to sleep because he's sleepy'
   'The man is going to sleep because he is sleepy, it is said'
The specifier $i$ appears in a dependent clause when the suprordinate clause contains a Quotative $ow$ or $x\acute{i}$. The Specifier $i$ appears to be replacing the Specifier $?aq$ in this context; contrast (41 a) and (b).

(41) a. Kab'at'p $ow$ Pat $yaqkwaq$ cal $i$.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I & V \\
\end{array}
\]

'Pat said she knows what he is called'


\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I & V \\
\end{array}
\]

'Pat knows what he is called'

Both the specifiers $i$ and the Unknown $owis$ can appear in this context:

(42) a. $wi$ $?a$ Pat kab'at'p $x\acute{i}$ $yaqkwaqal$ $i$.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I & V \\
\end{array}
\]

'Pat said she knows what he is called'

b. $wi$ $?a$ Pat hay$?ak$ $x\acute{i}$ $yaqkwaqal$ $owis$.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & I & V & V \\
\end{array}
\]

'Pat said she doesn't know what he is called'

5.1.4. Dependent Clauses

There is one category intersecting all the ones described in the previous three subsections, but which has only been mentioned in passing. While the Known (Declarative) $?a$, the Unknown $x\acute{i}$ - $ic$, and the Quotative $ow$ are all associated with the main verb and so all appear in the main clause, the others -- Realis $qa?a$, Irrealis $q\acute{w}ly$, Quotative $x\acute{i}$, and the Specifiers $qat\acute{a}$ and $i$ -- all are associated with dependent verbs, and so appear in dependent clauses (variously called: subordinate, embedded). Hence the
latter are complementizers. (The Known Determiner $aq/qi:k$ and the Unknown Determiner $owis$ function as definite determiners associated with dependent nominal, but can also appear with dependent verbs, e.g. (41 b, 42 b), and so are also complementizers.) A dependent clause of purpose contains the complementizer $\text{?i}:s$ or $\text{?i}x$ 'in order that, so that'.

(43) a. $\text{Q'ap}:\text{ak ak ts'ob}:\text{Il ?iyax ?a}x\text{kap }\text{wa}?\text{icap }\text{?i}:s$?

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{V} & \text{V} & \text{LOC} & \text{V} & \text{1} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Are you willing to clean up here, so that I can sleep?'

b. $\text{?O}:\text{y? }\text{i s tc'a}:\text{ak, daqcitl }\text{?i}:s$.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{V} & \text{1} & \text{II, C} & \text{V} & \text{1} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Give me water, so I can drink'

The text published by Haas and Swadesh (1939) contains an example of the Purposive $\text{?i}:s$:

(44) $\text{Badokw }\text{?ik }\text{i s, h}:\text{taqstitl. }\text{?i}:s$ $\text{s is}$.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{V} & \text{1} & \text{V} & \text{1 I/2} \\
\end{array}
\]
5.1.5. **Interrogative**

Another division of the modal elements reflects basic sentence types: declarative; interrogative; imperative. The previous sections have dealt with declaratives, i.e. sentences which assert. Interrogative sentences are those which overtly ask a question. One of the two kinds of interrogatives are yes/no questions, i.e. those which are used to elicit an answer equivalent to 'yes' or 'no'. Where a declarative sentence contains the modal ?a, yes/no interrogative has qak/ā (the latter only for third person subject). (The first consonant of qak drops after another consonant, as in sentence (45 b) below.) In each of the two sets of examples below, the (a) sentence is declarative, (b) is yes/no interrogative, and (c), (d) are possible answers; a positive response is preceded by hti 'yes', whereas a negative response contains the negative word wik 'no, not'. (Observe that Wackernagel's Law is sensitive to the presence of wik, but does not take account of hti.) I have glossed the interrogative enclitic as Q.

(45) a. Balāl ?atl ?a s.  'you are cold'
   V  I/2
b. Balāl ?atl ak?  'are you cold?'
   V   Q
c. Hti, balāl s.  'yes, I'm cold'
   yes V   I/1
d. Wik s balāl.  'no, I'm not cold'
   NEG I/1 V

(46) a. Ts'oqwctl ?a Paul Dick ?ōyoqw.  'Paul punched Dick'
   V   I   II
b. Ts’oqwcitl ḷ Paul Dick ?ōyoqw?  'Did Paul punch Dick?'

V I II
c. HT?i, ts’oqwcitl ?a.  'Yes, he punched him'
yes V
d. Wik ?a ts’oqwcitl.  'No, he didn’t punch him'
NEG V

It is appropriate to digress slightly and consider abbreviated responses
to yes/no questions. Whereas positive answers can be simply ḷ?i 'yes', a
negative answer must consist of wik 'no, not' plus the full set of encliticized
formative.

For example, abbreviated answers to (45 b) are (47 a, b) below. I
repeat (45 b) here for convenience: Balāl ?atl ?a s? 'Are you cold/'

V I/2

(47) a. HT?i.  'Yes'
yes
b. Wik s.  'No'
NEG I/1

The second kind of interrogative is the content question. This is a
sentence in which some nominal, regardless of its (central) grammatical relation,
is the portion of the sentence used to pose a question. Interrogative nominals
in Nitinaht include ?atc- 'who?', baq- 'what?'. The modal sequence xi - ic
is possible in a content question, but a more direct question employs the
distinctive modal qik/i (the latter only with third person subject). Sentence
(48 a) below is an ordinary declarative, with governing verb ?o?aw 'wait for'
and subject bablād' 'white person' (with demonstrative yilqa 'that'); the
direct object is third person and not overt. (48 b) is a corresponding interrogative: the interrogative formative atc 'who(m)-checkbox' which is the direct object, is obligatorily incorporated, replacing the registration prefix o of the verb: atc-aw.

(48) a. oaw a ytlqa bablad~.
   V I
   'That white man is waiting for him/her/someone'

b. atc?aw T ytlqa bablad~?
   Q/II-V I
   'Who is that white man waiting for?'

c. atc?aw xi c ytlqa bablad~?
   Q/II-V I
   'Who is that white man waiting for?'

The sentences (49) below present additional exemplification:

(49) a. obsts' a yayaqaw'at aq s.
   V I POSS/1
   'My friend is talking about it/something'

b. bqualificationeats' T yayaqaw'at aq s?
   Q/II-V I POSS/1
   'What is my friend talking about?'

c. bqualificationeats' xi c yayaqaw'at aq s?
   Q/II-V I POSS/1
   'What is my friend talking about?'

(50) a. otsaxad as ytlqa q?as.
   'You benefitted that man'
b. ?Áts-tsáxad ik.
   'Who did you benefit?'

c. ?Áts-tsáxad xi k ic?
   'Who did you benefit?'

5.1.6. Imperative

A further sentence type is the imperative, which expresses a command. The imperativeSpecifier in a simple sentence is ?i, as in (51 a, b, c):

(51) a. Hatssay ?i. 'Come here'
   V

b. Daqcitl ?i ?aḵay' tc'a'ak. 'Drink this water
   V II

c. Waţ ?i yayaqaw'at Iêk ?ısyoqw. 'Speak to your friend'
   V II POSS/2

A negative imperative simply adds wik 'not'.

    NEG V II V II
   'Don't use a single bladed axe, hisiy'ak, use a double bladed one, hihisiyap'al'

In reported imperatives, such as (53 a, b, c) - (54 a, b, c) below, the complementizer qwiy replaces the imperative ?i.

(53) a. ?ı̂kwl?i tc'apats. 'make a canoe'
    V II

    V I II V II
   'David told Bob to make a canoe'
c. \(\text{it\ }s\ \text{David}\ \text{kwTl\ qwiy}\ \text{s\ tc'apats.}\)

\[\text{V/Passive I/1 I,C}\quad\text{I/1 II}\]

'I was told by David to make a canoe'\(^6\)

(54) a. \(\text{K\text{-}fiksTl}\ ?i.\ 'make coffee'\]

\[\text{II/V}\]

b. \(\text{W\ a\ David}\ ?\text{yoqw\ Bob\ k\text{-}fiksTl\ qwiy.}\)

\[\text{V}\quad\text{I}\quad\text{II II/V}\]

'David told Bob to make coffee'

c. \(\text{W\ it\ s\ David\ k\text{-}fiksTl\ qwiy.}\)

\[\text{V/Pass I/1 I,C}\quad\text{II/V}\]

'I was told by David to make coffee'

Sapir and Swadesh (1939:242-3) list three additional imperatives, with
glosses, for the Tseshahat language. Nitinaht has cognates for two of these:
corresponding to their 'come' imperative is the enclitic sequence \(\?i-ka\) or
\(\?i-k'a\) (55); and to their 'go' imperative the enclitic \(\text{toi}\) (56). Their
fourth is glossed 'simple imperative, future', for which Nitinaht seems to
lack a distinctive formative. However, the Future morpheme can be used
together with the Imperative \(\?i\).

(55) a. \(\text{W\?itc}\ ?\text{atl}\ ?i.\ 'Go to sleep'\]

\[\text{V}\]

b. \(\text{W\?itc}\ ?\text{atl\ ?i\ ka.}\ 'Go to sleep'\]

(56) a. \(\text{Walcitl}\ ?\text{atl\ ?i.}\ 'Go home'\]

\[\text{V}\]

b. \(\text{Walcitl}\ ?\text{atl\ toi.}\ 'Go home'\]
In a negative imperative in ?i-ka, the verb regularly takes ?ix- or ?ixa, which may be the same formative as the Purposive (see 5.1.4). In the sentences below the verb is sokwitl 'take (hold of)', governing the direct object ?icitslp 'chewing gum'. Sentence (57 a) is an ordinary (negative) imperative in ?i, while (b) contains the sequence ?i-ka.

   \[\text{NEG} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{II}\]
   'Don't take the chewing gum'

   \[\text{NEG} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{II}\]
   'Don't take the chewing gum'

There is a verb ?akcitchl 'please' which can be used in an imperative, as in the one below with dependent verb ?o?okwidokw 'ask'.

   \[\text{V} \quad \text{II/1} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{V}\]
   'Please don't ask me, go ask your mother'

An imperative corresponding to the 'let's' construction of English contains an enclitic sequence ?a?itsq; elsewhere itsq 'II/2' is the second person direct object enclitic, but here it functions essentially as first person inclusive subject, 'I/12'. In the declarative (59 a) below, the subject is id, first person plural (inclusive or exclusive), and there is a tense enclitic ?a?isa 'Future'. In (59 b), the enclitic sequence is ?a?itsq 'let's'.

(59) a. Owiy ?'?is id citl'asaq.
   V Goal
   'We're going to go to town'

b. Owiy ?'?itsx citl'asaq.
   V Goal
   'Let's go to town'

In the language of the Makah (Qwidictca?at?), the closest relative
of Nitinaht, a distinction exists between dual and plural just in these
plural' (W. H. Jacobsen, personal communication). But Nitinaht lacks this
distinction, so (60 a) below is indifferently dual or plural and (60 b) is
ill-formed.

(60) a. Yatccitl ?'?itsx.
   'Let's go for a walk'
   V

b. *Yatccitl ?'?ow'itsx.

5.1.6. Usitative

Aspectual differences are in general reflected in the morphology of
the predicate, not by any enclitic category, as in the distinction among the
three forms of the verb daqā (durative), daqcitl (momentaneous), daqcitl
(inceptive) 'drink'. (Cf. Sapir and Swadesh 1939:240-1)

(61) a. Daqā s.     'I'm drinking'
   V 1

b. Daqcitl s.    'I'm taking a drink'
   V 1

c. Daqcitl s.    'I'm starting to drink'
   V 1
However, habitual action may be expressed by the enclitic *ik* 'usitative'.

(62) Daqā s ik. 'I habitually drink', 'I always drink'

V  l

For habitual action in the past, there are two options. Firstly, the Past Tense *ibt* and Usitative *ik* enclitics may be combined. Alternatively, for the sequence Past Tense *ibt* plus Known Declarative *qa/φ* plus Usitative *ik*, the enclitic *qwiy* 'past usitative' may be substituted. 7

(63) a. Daqā bt s ik. 'I used to drink habitually'

V  l

b. Daqā qwiy s. 'I used to drink habitually'

V  l

(64) a. Hixwā bt s ik. 'I used to work hard, all the time'

V  l

b. Hixwā qwiy s. 'I used to work hard all the time'

V  l

5.1.7. Desiderative

Wish or hope on the part of the speaker is expressed by the enclitic sequence *qwiy-ik*. There appears to be an irrealis quality as the example below shows, (65 a) is an ordinary declarative, (b) the desiderative. *Tcabol* 'be able to' is the main governing verb; while *tl’itoqwāk* is the dependent verb with direct object *tāla* 'money'.

(65) a. Tcabol s tl’itoqwāk tāla. 'I am able to save money'

V  l  V  II

b. Tcabol qwiy s ik tl’itoqwāk tāla (yaq ?aq s dōbay’ kapxwāk),

V  l  V  II 1 Time V

'I wish I could save money (but I'm always short)'
It is possible to substitute the sequence ?eq - xi - ic 'desiderative' for qwiy-ik 'desiderative'. (It is possible that ?eq is not actually an enclitic.) The verb in (66) below is bitlcitl 'rain'.

(66) a. Bitlcitl qwiy ik. 'I hope it's going to rain'
   V
b. Bitlcitl ?eq xi c. 'I hope it's going to rain'

5.1.8. Wonder

The modal element wa 'I wonder if/whether' can be used with various Specifiers (including ?a/∅ Declarative, qwiy) wa follows pronominal enclitics.

(67) Hidakats'itl qwiy s wa babʔč. 'I wonder if I'll sell my basket'
   V  l II

The meaning of wa overlays somewhat with that of the Unknown Declarative sequence xi - ic. For the same meaning as wa, the enclitic ic can be used by itself.

5.1.9. Just

The enclitic sa, as 'just, merely' follows pronominal enclitics. It requires the lengthening of the first vowel of the word to which it encliticizes, a property common to lexical items, and derrivational and inflectional offices, but not otherwise found with an enclitic.

(68) Wik qwiy hitaqčtl yayaqw'at ?aq s, walcitl ?atl s, ?əttdcidokw s as.
5.1.10. **Tense**

A sentence lacking overt tense is neutral with respect to time reference (although usually non-future), but the presence of a time expression can change this, e.g. lax ?oyi 'now, today', hu?ay ?oyi 'a long time ago', ?abay ?oyi 'tomorrow, yesterday'.

(69) a. Halātcitl s itsx. 'I paid you', 'I pay you', 'I'll pay you'

   V 1 II/2

b. Halātcitl s itsx lax ?oyi. 'I'll pay you now/soon'

   V 1 II/2 Time

c. Halātcitl s itsx ho?ay ?oyi. 'I paid you a long time ago'.

   V 1 II/2 Time

d. Halātcitl s itsx ?abay ?oyi. 'I'll pay you tomorrow'

   V 1 II/2 Time

The overt past tense is bt or t. Tense enclitics immediately precede Specifiers.

(70) a. Halātcitl ibt id itsx. 'We paid you'

   V 11 II/2


   Why Q/I/2 NEG V/Passive I, C

   'Why weren't you helped by the boy?'

The overt future is ?tk.

(71) a. Halātcitl ?ik id itsx (?abay ?oyi). 'We will pay you (tomorrow)'

   V 11 II/2 Time

b. Daqcitl ?tk ?a s tc'a?ak. 'You will drink water'

   V I/2 II
The formative ?a?is, which precedes tense in the enclitic sequence, indicates intention or prediction: 8

(72) a. Halátcitl ?a?is s itsx. 'I'm going to pay you'

V I II/2


The enclitic sequence ?a?is plus Past bt/t expresses unfulfilled intention or prediction. (The sequence ?a?is plus Future ?k is ill-formed.)

(73) a. Halátcitl ?a?is ibt s itsx (yaq ?aq s wik).

V 1 II/2 1 NEG

'I was going to pay you (but I didn't)'


V NEG

'It was going to rain (but it didn't)'

5.1.11. **Sequential**

A very commonly used element is the Sequential ?atl with roughly the meaning 'now, then, next'. Haas and Swadesh (1933:202) remark that the Sequential formative is 'very frequent but almost colorless'. The Sequential ?atl precedes the tense elements in the enclitic sequence.


V 1 II/2 Time

'I paid you then (yesterday)'


V 1 II/2 Time

'I'll pay you then (tomorrow)'

c. Halâtcîtîl ʔatl s itsx (laχ ʔoyî).

V 1 II/2 Time
'I'll pay you now (soon)'

5.1.12. Conditionals

The various kinds of conditional sentences are distinguished by a combination of tense and modal elements, as in the following examples. In the clause of result, the crucial tense and modal elements are:

(i) Generic: qwîy or bt - ʔa - ʔiʔ (Past) e.g. (75)
ʔatl - -ʔa - ʔiʔ (Non Past) e.g. (76)

(ii) Realis: ʔa (Near Future) e.g. (77)
ʔitl - ʔa (Distant Future) e.g. (78)

(iii) Irrealis: owîsa e.g. (79)

(iv) Counterfactual: ʔîtl - ʔbt - ʔa e.g. (79)
or: ʔik - ʔbt - ʔa e.g. (80)

Apart from in generics, a clause of condition begin with the preposition ʔoyî, but it is optionally deleted. The clause of condition always contains the Specifier qwîy and in a counterfactual, Past Tense bt/t.

(75) a. Babuyak qwîy s bakwil ʔaq ʔiyâx, hixwâ qwîy s.

V LOC V 1

b. Babuyak qwîy s bakwil ʔaq ʔiyâx, hixwâ bt s ik.

'When I worked in the store, I always used to work hard'
(babuyak 'work'; hixwâ 'work hard')

(76) Babuyak qwîy s bakwil ʔaq ʔiyâx, hixwâ ʔatl s ik.

V 1 LOC V 1

'When I work in the store, I always work hard'

(77) a. (?Oyi) halâtcîtîl qwîy s is, hoχwâtakaʔap s itsx.

If V 1 I/2 V 1 II/2
'If you pay me, I'll instruct/teach you'

b. (?Oyi) wik qwiy b̃tlcitl, wuwʔetx ?a.
   If   NEG   V   V
   'If it doesn't begin to rain, there's danger (of a fire)'

(78) (?Oyi) wik qwiy sokw tlaw̃xa dad̃tc̱eksawob ?aq, '?oy̌
   If   NEG   I/2   V   Goal   V
   ?Itl s itsx b̌l.
   l II/2 II, C
   'If you don't go near the window, I'll give you a ball'

(79) (?Oyi) hatss̆y' qwiy yIlqa q̌as, batcitl owisa tc'tkwãlokk ?aq s.
   If   V   I   V   I   POSS/1
   'If that man came near, my dog would bite (him)'

(80) (?Oyi) wik it qwiy sokw tlaw̃x a dad̃tc̱eksawob ?aq, '?oy̌
   If   NEG   I/2   V   Goal   V
   ?Itl ibt s itsx b̌l.
   l II/2 II, C
   'If you hadn't gone near the window, I would have given you a ball'

(81) (?Oyi) kab'at'p it qwiy s, hitaqaya ?Ik ibt s ?mbay '?oyi.
   If   V   l   V   l   Time
   'If I had known (it), then I would have come yesterday'

6. Surface Structure Constraints

The Enclitics must be arranged in the following sequence; the abbreviations are explained below.

SEQ  INF  FUT  PAST  SPEC  1  2  3  MOD  REP
It is not required that all positions be filled overtly in any given enclitic sequence: only the Specifier (SPEC) category is obligatory. Moreover many individual combinations of enclitics that are consistent with the above chart are never generated by the syntax.

SEQ:  Sequential \( ?atl \)

INF:  Inferential \( \pi t \)

or Intentional/Immediate Future \( ?\alpha is \)

FUT:  Future Tense \( ?\beta l, \beta k \)

PAST: Past Tense \( bt, t \)

SPEC: (Specifier, i.e. Modal, Determiner)

Known (Declarative) \( ?a \) (\( \emptyset \) before first person)

Unknown \( \varkappa \) (requires further modal \( ic \))

Known complementizer (Definite determiner) \( ?aq, \pi k, \pi \)

Unknown complementizer \( owis \)

Re\( \tilde{a} \)nis complementizer or Conjoining Known Specifier \( qa?a \)

Irrealis Complementizer or Past Usitative \( qwiy \)

Quotative \( ow \)

Quotative Complementizer \( \varkappa \)

Quotative known complementizer (Quotative Determiner) \( i \)

Yes/No Interrogative \( qak, \tilde{a} \)

Content Interrogative \( qik, \tilde{i} \)

Imperative \( ?t \)

Purposive Complementizer \( ?ix \)

1 (First person):

Singular \( s \)

Plural \( id \)

Conjoined \( (a)y \)
2: (Second Person)

Singular Subject *is, k, sokw*

Singular Direct Object *itsx*

Plural Subject *ow'is, ow'iteis* (with first person subject);
  *sow', sow'ite* (otherwise)

Plural Direct Object *ow'itsx, ow'itcitsx*

3: (Third Person)

Singular (unmarked)

Plural *al, l*

**MOD:** (Modals, not included in SPEC)

Unknown *ie* (with SPEC *xi*)

Come-Imperative *ik'a, ika* (with imperative SPEC *?i*)

Go-Imperative *tci* (with imperative SPEC *?i*)

Usitative *ik*

Wonder *wa, ic*

**REP:** Repetative *tla*

'Just', 'Merely' *sa*
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I am working within the framework of Relational Grammar being developed by David M. Perlmutter and Paul M. Postal. For present purposes, the distinctions between initial, canonical, and classic grammatical relations can be ignored. A wider range of data, including Passive and Causative Clause Union, show that case assignment makes reference to both initial and classic G.R.'s.

For an unspecified direct object, hit-/hida- is prefixed instead. Incorporation of the direct object or of a dependent of the latter (e.g. quantifier) results in the displacement of the registration prefix, e.g. incorporating ba?as results in (i); cf. (4).

(i) BE?as-?I ibt ?a John.

Encliticization has other phonological consequences. For example, the rule which merges a consonant and a following glottal stop, and which normally applies internal to a word only, applies across an enclitic boundary. Hence, in the example cited in the text, ? and ? merge. The phonetic form of the entire sequence is ʔokw?libt'a.

The enclitic (a)l is sometimes optionally omitted, sometimes preferably...
and sometimes obligatorily, as I will outline elsewhere.

The vowel of (a)l is omitted after an element ending in a vowel. Hence the sequence: Declarative ?a plus 33 -- al is phonetically ?a l, as shown in the orthography.

6 The gloss for David in (53 c), namely I,C, indicates that this nominal is the initial subject (I) of the verb wa 'say', but in the passive ceases to bear that relation and (automatically) becomes a chomeur (C) when replaced by the derived subject s 'I, me'.

7 The enclitic sequence qwiy plus s (1) is regularly reduced to qo s phonetically. I do not show this in the orthography.

8 Phonetically, examples (a, b) are reduced by regular rules to:

(i) Halactl'esitsx. and
(ii) Bitle?esa (respectively)
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