SYNTACTIC AND CONCEPTUAL RELATIONS IN NITINANT

Terry J. Klokeid

Introduction

The language of the Nitinat belongs to the Southern branch of the Wakkan family of Native Canadian languages, and is mutually intelligible with the language of the Pacheenaht. The homelands of the Nitinat centers on Lake Nitinat and the adjacent portion of the West Coast of Vancouver Island. Today, much of Nitinat territory has been absorbed into Pacific Rim National Park; the rest is largely Crown land, in large measure given over to exploitation by logging corporations. Most Nitinat people live at Bella Coola, or Malachan, designated by the Federal Government as Indian Reserve number 12.

Note on Nitinat Transcriptions

I have employed here the orthography which I suggested for Nitinat in Klokeid (1975a).

Examples are written separately, and I have written the language, not strictly phonetically, but somewhat abstractly. If nothing else, this makes for relative transparency in the morphological make-up of words, and so will help the reader who does not know Nitinat. For example, I write the sequence of words 'deer' plus the 'the' (an enclitic) as bowinuc 'the deer'; phonetically, the processes of syncope and glottal coalescence reduce it to something more like bowits'og.

While the above is a relatively straight-forward case, I think, in retrospect, that I have not yet achieved a fully satisfactory level of abstractness for fluctuations between more phonetic and more abstract representations in the present work.

1. Grammatical Relations: case, word order, and encilitization

1.1 Syntactic framework

I assume here, following the work of David M. Perlmutter and Paul M. Postal (forthcoming), that a sentence is most appropriately viewed in terms of a network of relations. Thus, in the English sentence (1a), the network of relations consists in part of the statements of (1b), represented formally in (1c).

1. (a) John made a canoe with an axe.

(b) John is subject(1).

John is agent (i.e. the one carrying out the action).
made is verb.
canoe is patient (i.e. that most affected by the action).
canoe is direct object(2).
axe is instrument (i.e. that used by the agent to effect the action).

(c)

The Nitinat sentence (2a) essentially corresponds to (1a).
and reflects the network of relations (2b), cf. (1b). The formal representation (2c) may be compared with (1c).

2. (a) OkaWl iit t'a ("many") John tÇ'apats "gumaw'ni hisy'k. (b) John is subject (I).
   John is agent.
   OkaWl is verb.
   tÇ'apats is direct object (2).
   hisy'k is instrument.

   AGT 1 PAT 2 INSTRIM
   John tÇ'apats
   hisy'k

The conceptual relations—agent, patient, instrument—describe the role of the nominal (or, better, its referent) in the action or state. Thus conceptual relations directly to the meaning, or semantics, of the sentence. The syntactic relations—subject, direct object—do not interact directly with semantics, but rather have purely syntactic consequences. That is, the syntax, or sentence pattern, makes reference to these syntactic relations. For example, English word order is:

   Subject Verb Direct Object (Other);

Nitinght word order is:

   Verb Subject Direct Object (other).

These linear precedence (LP) relations can be added to the networks (1a), (2a), as in (3):

3. (a)  

   AGT 1 LP 2 PAT
   John
   canoe
   axe

   INSTRIM

   (b)  

   AGT 1 LP 2 PAT
   John
   tÇ'apats
   hisy'k

   INSTRIM

The linear precedence relations shown in (3a, b) allow us to construct the ultimate word orders:

   John made ... canoe ... axe
   OkaWl ... John tÇ'apats ... hisy'k.

   These word order statements are true regardless of the conceptual relation held by subject and direct object. In (4a, b), the nominals are John and canoe/tÇ'apats as before, but their conceptual relations differ drastically from (1, 2). John in (4a, b) cannot be agent, because there is no action carried out: instead, there is an experience, that of seeing, and John is the Experiencer. Similarly, canoe in (4a) and tÇ'apats in (4b) are not patients (they are unaffected); rather, each functions as the stimulus of
the experience described by these sentences.

4. (a) John sees the canoe
   \[ \text{Exp} \quad \text{Stim} \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   1 & 2 \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   (b) Date\$?al ?a (\$?oq) John \$?yoq w tc'apats \$?aq.
   \[ \text{Exp} \quad \text{Stim} \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   1 & 2 \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   Nevertheless, John, as subject, precedes the verb in English and immediately follows it in Nitinaht; canoe and tc'apats, as direct objects, immediately follow the verb in English and the subject in Nitinaht. Hence, the networks for (4a, b) are:

5. (a)
   \[ \text{Exp} \quad \text{Stim} \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   1 & 2 \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   canoe
   
(b)
   \[ \text{Exp} \quad \text{Stim} \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   1 & 2 \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   tc'apats
   
The relations Agent, Experiencer, and Subject (1); Patient, Stimulus, and Direct Object (2) are distinct, but they are nevertheless interrelated. In general:

Agent is Subject (in any language)
Patient is Direct Object (in any language)

Experiencer is Subject (in any language)
Stimulus is Direct Object (in any language)

And, in English:
Subject precedes Verb
Verb precedes Direct Object

While in Nitinaht:
Verb precedes Subject
Subject precedes Direct Object.

Another kind of relation is the anaphoric relation. In (6a, b), two persons are involved in the action, as shown by the subject Bill and the benefactive John (the latter marked by for in English and \$?twa\$?ad in Nitinaht). In contrast, sentences (7a, b) involve only a single person in the action, Bill.

6. (a) Bill made a canoe for John.
   \[ \text{Exp} \quad \text{Stim} \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   1 & 2 \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   (b) Ok\$?I ibt ?a Bill tc'apats \$?twa\$?ad John.

7. (a) Bill made a canoe for himself.
   \[ \text{Exp} \quad \text{Stim} \]
   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   1 & 2 \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   (b) Ok\$?I ibt ?a Bill tc'apats \$?kwtsaq\$?ad.

When two grammatical relations in a single sentence are borne by a single nominal, then a so-called reflexive pronoun, e.g. himself, comes in to take over the lower ranking of the two relations in English; while in Nitinaht, -k(w)- is attached to the preposition marking the lower relation. The English reflexive pronoun himself and the -kw- of Nitinaht thus reflect the anaphoric relation between subject and benefactive in the examples (7a, b).
We have looked briefly at some syntactic relations (e.g. subject, direct object), some conceptual relations (agent, patient, experiencer, stimulus, benefactive, etc.), and the anaphoric relation. This synopsis of Nitinaht syntax examines these relations, and others, in greater detail.

1. 2 Case

The various syntactic relations are marked by prepositions, in both English and Nitinaht. In English, subject (1) and direct object (2) remain prepositionless, while indirect object (3) and, generally, all other nominals take prepositions. In Nitinaht, each nominal is assigned a preposition.

Subject and direct object

A subject takes the preposition ?eyw 'Nominaeive' and a direct object may take the preposition ?eyoqw 'Accusative', as in sentence 8. (The formatives iht 'Past', ?a 'Declarative' are discussed elsewhere.)

V 1 AC 2

'John hit Bill'

1 V 2

Sentence (8) as it stands is a little unusual, in that the nominative preposition is usually deleted. Hence, sentence (9) is a paraphrase of (8) — they both assert that John hit Bill — but sentence (9) is a more usual form.

V 1 2

Moreover, in a short sentence containing only one or two nouns, the preposition assigned to the second (or only) one is typically postposed after that noun, as with the accusative in (10).

V 1 2

So the sentences (8-10) are all grammatical and all assert the same thing, but the form of (10) is the most common in conversation.

While the nominative preposition is always assignable to the subject, some verbs do not permit the assignment of the accusative ?eyoqw to the direct object. Instead, they take a registration prefix ?o-. That is, the prefix ?o- on a verb registers the presence of a prepositionless direct object.

One verb showing this prefix is holwlil 'make, build', exemplified in (11). The direct object in (11) is ba'as 'house'.

11. Olhwil iht ?a John ba'as.  
1 1 2

'John built a house'

1 V 2

(The initial ?o- of the case-marking prepositions ?oqwil, ?oqw'el, etc., is the same morpheme.) Many other verbs do not govern a dependent in the accusative ?eyoqw, but in a different preposition.
11. (a) Haʔokw s ?oʔokwis haʔob.  
V 1 fish  
'I eat fish'  
V 1 v  
For example, with the verbs haʔokw 'eat' and deqitl 'drink' the item consumed takes the preposition ?oʔokwis. The verb may be omitted.  
(b) ?oʔokwis s teʔaʔak.  
1 water  
'I (drink) water'  
V 1 v  
V 1 2 BEN  
'I made a canoe for John.'  
1 V 2 BEN  
V 1 2 IN  
'John made a canoe with an adze.'  
1 V 2 IN  
V 1 2 LC  
'John built a house in Pacheena  
1 V 2 LC  
Many time expressions take the case-marking preposition ?ovi lit. 'when'.  
V 1 2 TM  
'John built a house yesterday'  
1 V 2 TM  
An adjective or quantifier optionally but preferably attaches.
to the front of the preposition, i.e. it incorporates into the
preposition, replacing the registration prefix $\text{?}0$. 

15. ġiwi $\text{?}0$ John $\text{?}\text{atl ba}^\text{?}a^\text{?}s$. 

\begin{verbatim}
   \text{\text{two}} / V 1 \text{two} 2 \\
\end{verbatim}

John built two house(s).

\begin{verbatim}
   V 1 \text{V} 2 \\
\end{verbatim}

Question and relative morphemes obligatorily incorporate.

A noun incorporates only rarely in Nitinaht, and pronouns apparently
never do so. (Thus this language differs significantly from the
related language to the north with respect to incorporation.) See
Chapter Six for more on incorporation.

1.3 Word order

Linear precedence relations in Nitinaht are determined by
syntactic relations.

The verb precedes all its dependents, i.e. Nitinaht is a
'verb-initial' language.

The dependents of a verb come in the following order:

subject direct object others.

The following sentences illustrate these linear precedence
relations.

16. (a) Ta\'ogewit $\text{?}0$ (\?ogw) ha\?'i\'ilqats $\text{?}a^\text{?}q \?yo\text{?}o\text{?}w

\begin{verbatim}
   V \text{NM} 1 \text{AC} \\
\end{verbatim}

The boy hit the woman.

(b) Ta\'ogewit $\text{?}0$ (\?ogw) $\text{x}\text{?}\text{da}^\text{?}a^\text{?}k \text{?a}^\text{?}q \?yo\text{?}o\text{?}w

\begin{verbatim}
   V \text{NM} 1 \text{AC} 2 \\
\end{verbatim}

The woman hit the boy.

(c) Dwew $\text{?}0$ (\?ogw) $\text{x}\text{?}\text{da}^\text{?}a^\text{?}k \text{?a}^\text{?}q \?yo\text{?}o\text{?}w \text{ha}^\text{?}\text{i}\text{?}\text{ittiqats \?aq}. 

\begin{verbatim}
   V \text{NM} 1 \text{AC} 2 \\
\end{verbatim}

The woman watches the boy.

(d) \text{?}\text{ogw} $\text{?}a$ (\?ogw) $\text{?}\text{da}^\text{?}a^\text{?}k \text{?a}^\text{?}q \?yo\text{?}o\text{?}w \text{to}^\text{?}\text{bi} \text{?}a^\text{?}q. 

\begin{verbatim}
   V \text{NM} 1 \text{AC} 2 \\
\end{verbatim}

The boy throws out the garbage.

(e) Babuyak $\text{?}0$ (\?ogw) $\text{x}\text{?}\text{da}^\text{?}a^\text{?}k \text{?a}^\text{?}q \text{?i}^\text{?}a^\text{?}q \text{?b}\text{?}\text{ukiwi} \text{?}a^\text{?}q. 

\begin{verbatim}
   V \text{LC} \\
\end{verbatim}

The woman works in the store.

A noun is preceded by its free dependents (modifiers), (17).
   V       Future 1   AC   ADJ 2   the
   'They will spear the big deer'

   (b) Datocitl ?a yIlqa q87am.
   V       IMPER this 2
   'Look at this man'

Bound dependents of nominals include both enclitics, e.g.
?aq 'The' in (17a) (see 1.4), and incorporated dependents (see chapter 4).

1.4 Enclitization

A number of formatives in previous examples have not been studied closely as yet: Abt 'Past', Ja 'Declarative', a 'I', ?aq
'the', ?E?is 'Future', ?a1 'they-Declarative', ?a 'Imperative'.

There are a couple of respects in which the group of formatives including these stands apart from others.

Firstly, their position in the sentence is distinctive. This is brought out by contrasting the position of the time expression Abt 'Past tense' and ?a1hay ?oyt 'yesterday' in (18). While the latter expression comes in the usual position for time expressions, i.e. following the direct object, the past tense formative Abt comes immediately after the first word in the sentence, the verb.

18. ?NYW ?a John te'apats ?Ahay ?oyt,
   V 1  2   Time
   'John made a canoe yesterday'.

Secondly, the group of formatives including Abt are not independent words, phonetically speaking. They are enclitics, that is, they must be phonetically linked to the preceding formative; thus, the sequence of verb ?NYWl and enclitics Abt ?a in (18) are pronounced as one word: ?NYW?Abt-l?

The definite determiner ?aq 'the' is an enclitic. Thus the sequence of noun te'apats 'canoe' and determiner ?aq in (19) is pronounced as one word: te'apats-saq.

   V 1  2   the
   'John is making the canoe'

The categories which must undergo enclitization include: ?E?is 'Future'; tense (e.g. Abt 'Past') modals (e.g. Ja 'Declarative', ?a 'Imperative'); subject and direct object pronouns (e.g. a 'I', me'); and many others.

Mackernagel's Law

In the examples so far, the enclitics have attached to the governing word: tense and modal to verb, as ... te'ecsitl Abt ?aq (hey the) in the same sentence. 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 (20a, b, c), the verb is ?t?ic?i 'shoot' and the direct object is bowatic 'deer'. In (20b, c), the direct
object governs some further word: the adjective ƙụy in (20a) and the quantifier ọtụl 'two' in (20c). The governing nominal and its dependent form the sequences ƙụy bowa.tc and ọtụl bowa.tc in (20b, c), respectively: the sequence of a nominal and its dependents can be referred to as a Constituent.

20. (a) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John bowa.tc ƙụyoqw.
   V fast decl 1 2 AC
   ‘John shot a deer’
   1 V 2
   (b) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John ụọbowa.tc ƙụyoqw.
      big 2
      ‘John shot a big deer’
      1 2
   (c) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John ọtụl bowa.tc ƙụyoqw.
      two 2
      ‘John shot two deer’

When the determiner enclitic ƙụ ‘the’ is added to the direct objects of (20a, b, c), then we get (21a, b, c), respectively:

21. (a) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John bowa.tc ƙụ ƙụyoqw.
    V 1 2 the AC
    ‘John shot the deer’
    1 V 2
    (b) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John ụọbowa.tc ƙụyoqw.
       big the 2 AC
       ‘John shot the big deer’

In (21a), the determiner ƙụ encliticizes to the governing nominal: bowa.tc ụọ ‘the deer’. But in (21b), the determiner ƙụ encliticizes instead to an adjective dependent of the direct object nominal: ụọbowa.tc ụọ ‘the big deer’. The generalization must be that the determiner encliticizes to the first word of the Constituent, whether it is the governing nominal (21a) or a dependent of it (21b). Sentence (21c) verifies this statement: here the direct object bowa.tc governs the quantifier ọtụl ‘two’ and the determiner ƙụ encliticizes to the first word in the resulting Constituent: ọtụl ƙụ bowa.tc ‘the two deer’.

The case-marking preposition does not form a part of the Constituent relevant to the encliticization of ƙụ, so the determiner never encliticizes to it when it precedes the nominal:

22. (a) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John ƙụyoqw bowa.tc ƙụ.
    AC 2 the
    ‘John shot the deer’
    (b) Ti’itcitil ibt ọ John ƙụyoqw ụọ ƙụ bowa.tc.
       AC big the 2
       ‘John shot the big deer’

Encliticization like this is not unique to Hitcinta. A linguist who described the placing of enclitics in ‘second position’ in Indo-European has had the relevant Principle named after him:
23. Wackernagel’s Principle

Attach enclitics to the first word of the Constituent.

Thus, the enclitics associated with the verb of the sentence attach to the first word of the sentence, in (24), the verb itself. The sentence enclitics exemplified here are: Unknown yi-(i)ci 'maybe, I think that'; Imperative 2i; g 'I'; 2atl 'now, then'; Complementizer 2ag; Complementizer owix (or soy) 'when'; (i)bft 'Past'; Jk 'Usitative'.

24. (a) Oqwa’tap giic John cote’as 2ag.

V 1 2

'Maybe John chopped down the tree'

1 V 2

'John must have chopped down the tree'

1 V 2
(b) Daqcitl 2i tc’a?ak!

V IMPER 2

'Drink water!'

V 2
(c) Nalcitl 2atl s, hay5 2atl 2ag s royi babuyak.

V then 1 V 1

'I went home, when I finished work'

1 V 1 V

25. Pronominal enclitics

Pronouns in Nitinaht can appear as free nominals, but pronominal subjects and direct objects, encliticize to the first word in the sentence. (Under limited circumstances, pronouns encliticize in different ways not described here.) The phonological forms for free and enclitic pronouns show similarities but there are significant differences that cannot be predicted.

(d) Yowl 2atl qo y s da5'owus.

then 1 V

'I used to accompany (him) then'
(e) Mivw bt s ik.

V PAST 1 Usitative

'I used to work hard'

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

26. P'os̱ák 'a. 'He/she is tired'
But there is a third person plural enclitic, ə or ə̱, exemplified in (27).

27. P'os̱ák ə 1. 'They are tired'

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 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 a ic:

28. Kílíciti ibt ə̱ xi a ic. 'I must have broken it'

If we now insert the first person plural, we get the enclitic sequence xi, ə̱, ic; observe that there are two vowels in a row. The second of these regularly drops, giving the phonetic form: ə̱ ə̱ a ic, as in (30).

29. Kílíciti ibt ə̱ ə̱ a ic. 'We must have broken it'

We have seen that the sequence of Declarative plus second person singular is xə a (30a). The form of the second person enclitic with the Inferential sequence is different: xi k ic (30b).

30. (a) Bálíl xi a. 'You're cold'

(b) Bálíl xi k ic. 'You must be cold'

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 a (31).

31. P'os̱ák xi a. 'He/she must be tired'

When the direct object is a pronoun, it too will encliticize. The first person enclitics are always xi (1) and ə̱ (2), regardless of whether they represent the subject or direct object. But the second person singular enclitic for subject is ə̱ and for direct object itə̱. The sentences in (32) contain first person subjects and a second person direct object; while in (33) the subject is second person singular and the direct objects are first person.

32. (a) Ts'óqvecitl ibt a itə̱. 'I hit you'

(b) Ts'óqvecitl ibt ə̱ itə̱. 'We hit you'
33. (a) Ts'eqwclt1 ibt s is. 'You hit me'
    V  1
(b) Ts'eqwclt1 ibt id is. 'You hit us'
    V  2

Further variation in the pronominal enclitics is conditioned by other enclitic categories.

The enclitics associated with the verb attach to the first word of the sentence, even if that word is not the verb. For example, if the direct object of (34a) is made the topic of the sentence, then it precedes the verb, together with its accusative preposition ?oyoqw, and its dependents. Sentence (34b) shows the result: the sentence enclitics attach to the accusative preposition, since it is the first word in the sentence. (The vowel of ?oht 'Past' has assimilated to the preceding labial consonant qw in (34b)).

34. (a) Ts'asTsks ibt ?a John ?oyoqw tc'?kwil ?aq.
    V PAST Decl 1 AC 2 the
    'John chased the dog'
(b) ?oyoqw oht ?a tc'?kwil ?aq ts'asTsks John.
    AC PAST Decl TOPIC/2 the V 1
    '(It was) the dog, (that) John chased'

1.5 Some further examples

The following sentences provide a variety of examples of prepositions and enclitics.

1's and 2's

Nominative and accusative prepositions, as well as subject and direct object enclitics, are found in (35). Some verbs taking the registration prefix ?o- for direct objects are given in (36)

35. (a) Tl'itoctl s cots'aas ?aq ?yoqw.
    V  1 2 AC
    'I'm shooting (at) the tree'
(b) Daceel ?a Bill John ?yoqw.
    V  1 2 AC
    'Bill sees saw John'
(c) ?oyoqw oht s ?yoqw John;
    V  1  AC 2
    'I hunt/am hunting John'

36. (a) Okwaqikw ?a bayil q8?atsqlp ?aq
    V  1
    'The Indians call (it) bayil'
(b) Okowis sa takin.
    V  1 2
    'I am wearing-on-the-head a stocking'

Recipient

With a verb of transfer, such as ?yoq 'give', the recipient nominal is marked with the accusative preposition ?yoqw (37a); it
may be omitted (37b). The item transferred receives no preposition.

   V FUT 1 sugar AC 2
(b) Gy?u ?a?is s tcabas John.
   V FUT 1 2
   'I will give sugar to John'

The recipient may be topicalized with ?Gyqv.

   AC FUT 1 2 V
   'John, I will give sugar to'

Alternatively, ?Otsey'ap 'to(ward)' may be used.

39. Otsey'ap ?a?is ?id tcabas yadaqakkw 'aqad
   to FUT 1 sugar child/our
   'To our child, we'll give sugar'

Only the item transferred and not the recipient may be incorporated into the verb ?ayo as with the question (40a). (See chapter 2 for the significance of this fact.) To question the recipient, it is incorporated as in (40b).

40. (a) Raga-y? ?a?is ik yadaqakkw 'aqad
   what V FUT Q/1 2
   'What will you give to my child?'
   1 V 2
(b) Acli-sey'ap ?a?is ik tcabas?
   who/to FUT you sugar
   'Who will you give sugar to?'

A benefactive or delegative takes the preposition 'Tsa?yad 'for'.

41. (a) Owu ?a?is s pok? ?Tsa?yad yoko'ac
   FUT 1 2 for BEN/my
   'I'll make a basket for my grandchild
   1 V 2 BEN
(b) SS s itay ?Tsa?yad y?
   V 1 2 for DEL
   'I'm holding you for him'
   1 V 2 DEL
(c) Tsa?yad s itay y? s5.
   'For him, I'm holding you'
   V 1 2 the BEN/for PAST you 2/V
   'I saw the man who you were building a house for'
   1 V 2 BEN 1 2

A question of reason ('why?') uses this same preposition.

   BEN/for 1 V 2 the
   'Who are you making the basket for?'
   BEN 1 2
   why 1 V 2
   'Why are you making a basket?'

Instrument

An instrument nominal takes ?Tsa?w'1 'with, using' (43a).
Sometimes the instrument nominal incorporates into the preposition

(43b).

43. (a) Opkway'i ?ap ?Itis 'a yobis ?ɡaw'el hisly'y'.

    FUT Decl 2 with IN

    Opkway'i ?ap ?Itis 'a yobis hisly'y' ?ɡaw'el.
V    FUT Decl 2 IN with

'(He) will fell the cedar with an axe'
V 2  IN

(b) Opkway'i ?ap ?Itis 'a yobis hIly'y'k-gaw'el.


'Don't use cedar limbs, use rope!'

Time

Most time expressions take ?ɔyki 'when' (44).


    V time

'I used to work hard a long time ago.'

(b) Wl'at ?a ts'aqt(3) laq ?ɔyki.

    V 1 Time

'There's no best (operating) at present.'


    V PAS 1 2 TM for REM/ey

'I made a canoe for my friend in the wintertime'

1 V 2 REM


    V PAST. LC in child I

'I was-in-school in Clo-oose, when I was a child'

V LC

Place expressions

Among the place expressions are included:

Location: ?iy'ay 'the (be) at, in' (45)
Destination: ?oowiy 'go to' (46)
Source: ?iy'atagqits 'come from'
?o'otl 'from (a person)' (47)

45. (a) ?iy'ay ikt id to?IISA P?tocEEd.

at PAST 1 V LC

'We were fishing at Port Renfrew (Pacheena)'

1 V LC

(b) Date with a datay'k ?ag ?iy'ay.

V 1 LC in

'I look(ed) in the mirror'

1 V LC


V/Passive 1 to that DEST

'We were invited to that house'

1 V DEST


2/V from SOURCE

'John got a letter from the store'

1 V 2 SOURCE
Comparison

The Standard in an expression of comparison takes the accusative %yoqw (48). The Standard may be a clause (48c).

48. (a) %hitə 'a Tom %yoqw Jack.
   V 1 AC Standard
   'Tom is taller than Jack', lit.
   'Tom is taller than Jack'
   1 V Standard
(b) %hitə 'a Chris %yoqw Roy.
   V 1 AC S
   'Chris is smaller than Roy'
   1 2
(c) %hitə 'a Tom %yoqw qas %aq Jack.
   be-so COMP
   'Tom is taller than Jack is (so)'
While (48a, c) above are paraphrases, (48a) is an expression of comparison but (48b) is not; it is paraphrased by (48c).

49. (a) Og%kətl ə %yoqw qe %kh.
   V 1 AC be-so COMP/l
   'I am-happy (more than) you are (so)'
   1 V
(b) Og%kətl ə %yoqw sou's.
   V 1 AC ə
   'I am-happy (to see what) you (are doing)'

2. Some transitions among syntactic relations

The initial syntactic relation assigned to a nominal can undergo a transition, so that the ultimate syntactic relation is not identical to the initial one. On the hierarchy of syntactic relations:

50. Syntactic hierarchy

   1 (subject)
   2 (direct object)
   3 (indirect object)
   others (including Benefactive, Place, Time, Instrument); it is possible for direct objects (2.1), indirect objects (2.2), and Benefactive to advance.
   Furthermore, it is possible for a nominal in a conjoined expression to take over the syntactic relation of the latter (Comitative Float, 2.4).

   Evidently the syntactic relations in a causative construction undergo a similar transition (Clause Union 2.5).

   Possibly, Hitinaht also sanctions Emphatic Float (2.6) and
Raising (2.7). The possibility of Retreats is discussed in section 2.8. In Chapter 3, the syntax of Possessors is described; both Possessor Ascension and Possessor Union are sanctioned in Nitinaht.

While transitions in Nitinaht are optional in some instances, many of them are obligatory when some nominal bearing a given syntactic relation outranks a nominal with a higher syntactic relation so, on the chain-of-being hierarchy (51).

51. Chain-of-being hierarchy

Speaker and listener
(other)persons
Animals
Inanimates

That is, a transition between syntactic relations is sometimes obligatory when there is a discrepancy in rank between two nominals on the two hierarchies (50) and (51). Manifestations of this conditioning are described below.

2.1 Direct objects

The Patient of an action verb, such as ta'oqwciit 'hit' is initially the direct object; the agent is initially the subject. The case markings prepositions are optional ?oxw 'Nominaive' for subject, and ?yoqw 'accusative' for direct object. Sentences (52 a, b, c) illustrate these syntactic relations overtly.

52. (a) Ta'oqwciit ibt ?a (?oqw) John Bill ?yoqw.

53. (a) Ta'oqwciit t ?a (?oqw) Bill ?oxwct John.
When direct object advances to subject in Nitinaht, the verb takes the Passive suffix -pVt (usually appearing in a phonetically reduced form). Also, the former subject loses that relation and becomes a chômeur (indicated by a circumflex over the number of its former relation; here 1): the 2 takes the case of a 1, i.e. nominative towa, plus the suffix -pVt, deletion of the glottal stop produces topwít.

Networks for (52c), (53c) are displayed below, showing syntactic relations only.

52. (c)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{tseš}\text{ll} \\
1 \rightarrow 2 \\
\text{te'\text{I}t\text{al}} \rightarrow \text{John}
\end{array}
\]

53. (c)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{tseš} \\
2 \rightarrow 1 \\
\text{te'\text{I}t\text{al}} \rightarrow \text{John}
\end{array}
\]

If the initial direct object outranks the initial subject on the chain-of-being hierarchy, then that direct object must advance to subject. For example, first person outranks third person on this hierarchy, and therefore the advancement is obligatory in 54. The initial direct object is manifested here as ultimate subject, in the enclitic a 'I'.

54. (a) Te'ogiti't a John 'opwít.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\text{V/P} \rightarrow \text{I} \\
\text{John hit me', literally, 'I was hit by John'}
\end{array}
\]

55. (a) Cokwàq'adit 'as John.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\text{V/P} \rightarrow \text{I} \\
\text{'John invited you', lit. 'You were invited by John'}
\end{array}
\]

First and second person are both of the highest rank. Thus, whenever the invited subject is third person, and the initial direct object is either first or second person, the direct object must advance. The sentence in 55 illustrates initial second person direct object that has advanced.

56. (a) Ducóq a čtas '\text{y}.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\text{V} \rightarrow \text{2} \\
\text{'I am watching you'}
\end{array}
\]
56. (b) Cokw¹q'ad a itaq.
   V 1 2
   'I'm inviting you'
   1 V 2 'you'
(c) 0?aw a itaq.
   V 1 2
   'I'm waiting for you'
   1 V 2
(d) Ts'oqwcitl ibt a itaq.
   V Past 1 2
   'I hit you'
   1 V 2
(e) Ts'oqwcitl ibt id itaq.
   V 1 2
   'We hit you'
   1 V 2

57. (a) Ts'oqwcitl ?a a is.
   V Past Decl 1
   'You hit me'
   1 V 2
(b) Ts'oqwcitl ?a a ow'itcis.
   V Decl 2 1
   'You (plural) hit me'
   1 V 2
(c) Ts'oqwcitl id ow'itcis.
   V 2 1
   'You (plural) hit us'
   1 V 2
(d) Cokw¹q'ad ak a is.
   V Q 2 1
   'Are you inviting me?'
   1 2

When both subject and direct object are third person, then, in
general, advancement of direct object is optional. This has been
illustrated in (52-53), as well as in (58) and (59) below.

   V 1 2
   'The lightning scared John'
   1 2

   V 1 2
   'The cigarette burned John'
   1 V 2
(b) Botca?ab't ?a John kwic? ?aq oox'lt.
   V/P 1 2
   'John was burned by the cigarette'
   1 V 2

However, sentences in which ultimate subject is inanimate
and ultimate direct object is animate are very rare. It seems
that the chain-of-being hierarchy is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>first and second person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(other) animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Indirect objects

There is some evidence that the recipient nominal John in (37), although ultimate direct object, is initial and indirect object. A question nominal obligatorily incorporates into the verb (for a certain class of verbs, including ?oye). However, it is a general constraint in Nitinaht that only the initial direct object can incorporate in this way. A question word incorporated into ?oye represents the item transferred: therefore, it is the nominal that serves as initial direct object, not the recipient.

For example, the ultimate direct object of (60) is first person, but this is not the incorporated nominal. Rather, the latter is baq- 'what', which must then be the initial direct object.

60. (a) Baq-ay? ?is ik s is?
   V Put Q 1 2
   'What are you going to give to me'

The network of (60) is, therefore, (60b).

60. (b) ![Diagram](Image)

The initial indirect object incorporates into the Dative preposition:

61. Atcis?a be ik q'utsa'qypt?
   who/Dat Past 1 fruit?
   'Who did you give the fruit to?'

In (62a), the initial indirect object advances to ultimate subject. This advancement is presumably in two steps: indirect to direct object, then direct object to subject. Evidence for this is the presence of the Passive morpheme, associated with advancement of direct object. Thus, the network for (62a) must be (62b).

62. (a) Baq-ay? ?is it ik s John?
   what/V Put P Q 1
   'What will John give to me?'

   (b) ![Diagram](Image)

The chain-of-being constraint extends to indirect objects as well as direct objects. That is, if the initial subject is outranked by the initial indirect object, then the latter must advance, via direct object, to subject. Thus the sequence of two advancements, 3 - 2 and 2 - 1, is obligatory in (63).
63. (a) Oy?t q'ats'aq.
V/P 1 fruit
'I was given fruit'
(b) Wik?n-ly?t s.
no-good/V/R
'(They) gave me something no good.
(c) Wikst?p-qy?t ?as.
nothing/V/R
'(They) give you nothing', lit. 'You are given nothing'

2.3 Benefactives

Benefactives are marked with the preposition ?otsazaar 'for'
(64a), but are subject to the chain-of-being hierarchy constraint. Thus, advancement of the initial benefactive to ultimate subject in (64b) is obligatory.

64. (a) Okwil s bab?q ?otsazaar Roger.
V 1 2 for Ben
'I am making the basket for Roger'
(b) Okwilip s bab?q.
V/D/P 1 ?ets.ta
'She is making the basket for me', lit. 'I am being made a basket'

This last sentence manifests the morphology both of Benefactive advancing to direct object and direct object advancing to subject. However, the initial Benefactive can advance to direct object and then bear this as its ultimate relation:

65. (a) Okwil s te'apats ?otsazaar yayqav'aqs.
V 1 2 for Ben
'I made a canoe for my friend'
(b) Okwilip s te'apats yayqav'aqs.
V/D 1 2 2
'I made my friend a canoe'

Thus, the morphological side effect of Ben-2 advancement is the addition of the morpheme -k to the verb.

To question a Benefactive, incorporation into ?otsazaar is required.

66. Xta-otsazaar ik babouk?
who for Q/you V
'Who are you working for'

2.4 Comitatives

Sentences with a plural subject, e.g. (67a), have paraphrases with ultimate singular subjects and a comitative expression, marked by ?otsokwidoks 'together with', as (67b, c).
It is possible that the initial syntactic relations for both (67a) and (67b, c) are identical; these initial relations are manifested directly in the ultimate relations of (67a), where the initial first plural subject is revealed directly by the ultimate subject enclitic id 'we': network represents (67a):

\[ \text{id} \quad \text{itax} \\
1 \quad 2 \\
\text{?øôkwidokw} \]

In (67b, c), a part of the initial subject, that representing first person singular, has assumed ultimate subjecthood. Thus the remainder of the initial subject becomes a chomeur, taking the preposition ?ø?okwidokw 'with'. Network (69) shows the initial and ultimate relations of (67b, c): these two sentences differ in word order because the chomeur phrase ?ø?okwidokw y? with him functions as the topic of (67c), and so precedes the verb. The sentence enclitics s-itax come in second position according to Wackernagel's Principle.

Conjoined nominal expressions are 'broken up' in other ways. For example, reflexivization may affect one of two conjuncts, which then shows up (by the regular reflexivization process as a prefix -k(w)- on the preposition or verb:

\[ \text{\text{?ø?økwidokw-y?}} \text{ s-v} \]

In (67b, c), a part of the initial subject, that representing first person singular, has assumed ultimate subjecthood. Thus the remainder of the initial subject becomes a chomeur, taking the preposition ?ø?okwidokw 'with'. Network (69) shows the initial and ultimate relations of (67b, c): these two sentences differ in word order because the chomeur phrase ?ø?okwidokw y? with him functions as the topic of (67c), and so precedes the verb. The sentence enclitics s-itax come in second position according to Wackernagel's Principle.

\[ \text{id} \quad \text{sow'a} \\
1 \quad 2 \\
\text{s(y'a)} \quad \text{y?} \\
\text{?øôkwidokw} \]

Conjoined nominal expressions are 'broken up' in other ways. For example, reflexivization may affect one of two conjuncts, which then shows up (by the regular reflexivization process as a prefix -k(w)- on the preposition or verb:

\[ \text{?ø?økwidokw-y?} \text{ s-v} \]

If a subject is one that normally encliticizes, e.g. first person plural, and yet contains a non-encliticizable noun, then both the subject enclitic and the noun show up: the subject enclitic
reflects the number and person of the entire subject, while the non-
encriticizes part will retain the conjunction 'iic 'and'. (Since
there is no change in grammatical relations here, the preposition
kodokw can't show up.)

71. kodokw-'I quv id 'ic John.
    2/V used-to l and
    'John and I used to build houses'
    lit. 'we and John ...
    1

An additional use of -kidokw 'with' is shown below.

Walcitl 'atka 'Ed-tcicakw-sas.
    V then l only-with-just
    'I'll go-home then alone'
    1  V

2.5 Causatives

An intransitive verb such as kodokw- 'awake' may appear as
an independent verb, e.g. kodokw-citl 'awake-momentous' in (72a),
or it may incorporate into the verb -(s)a'ap 'cause, make', hence
the causative kodokw-na'ap 'awaken' in (72b). The nominal which
functions of the subject of the intransitive is the (ultimate)
direct object of the corresponding causative.

72. (a) Kodokwitl lbc 'a.  'He woke up'.
    (b) Kodokwa'ap obt s.  'I woke him up'.

The formation of causative expressions by incorporation of
an intransitive verb into -(s)a'ap is fully productive, as the
following examples illustrate.

73. (a) To'iwatcitl 'a.  'He's frightened'.
    skt
(b) Oo'to'iwat/qiw 'ags va'ita.
    1  V/Pass when COMP I asleep
    'I was frightened by somebody when I was asleep'
    1  
(c) Atiqouq fto'iwat- sa'ap?
who/ACC O/l
'Who did you frighten?'

74. (a) Wik s 'Snoqw.
    not l  V
    'I don't ache, hurt'
    1  V
(b) So'ciladitl's Annie, yaq-'aq s 'SnoqwEc.
    nose/grabbed 1  COMP 1 V/Passive
    'I was grabbed on the nose by Annie, (and) I was hurt'

75. (a) Kitcitl lbc ?a 1 lipotay 'aq.
    V  1
    'The bottle broke/shattered'
    1  V
(b) Kitla'ap obt ?a 1 litqats 'aq lipotay 'aq.
    1  2
    'The boy broke the bottle'
    1  V  2
A transitive verb with an incorporated direct object participates in a causative construction in the same way as an intransitive verb.

76. (a) ū-kwíl ?as bə̃nas.
   V 1 2
(b) bə̃nas-Tl ?as.
   2/V 1
   'You are (starting to) build a house'
   V 2
(c) bə̃nas-Tl-sa?ap s ítq.
   1 2
   'I made you (start to) build a house'

It is possible that the causative construction of Nitinaht reflects the transition of Clause Union. If this is the correct analysis, then -sa?ap 'cause' is the superordinate verb of (72b), its initial direct object being kodóke- 'awake'. The initial subject of kodóke- then serves as the ultimate direct object of the superordinate causative verb.

77. (a) u-sa?ap ikt tc'iccitl bə̃nas ?aq.
   who/V Q/1 clean house
   'Who did you make clean the house?'
   1 V
(b) tc'ic-sa?ap s yèdaqek ?aq bə̃nas ?aq.
   clean/V 1 2 house
   'I made the child clean the house'
   1 V 2

This analysis, seemingly, does not make completely accurate predictions about the syntax of causatives in Nitinaht, and one might argue that a rather different syntactic process is involved. I briefly outline a few of the difficulties here and show that they are not insurmountable for the Clause Union analysis.

If the subordinate verb is initially transitive (and its direct object does not incorporate), then its direct object and subject should serve as the ultimate direct and indirect objects, respectively, in the causative sentences. There are two problems here: nominal representing the subordinate subject bears evidence of being (i) the initial direct object, and (ii) the ultimate direct object, of the causative verb -(s)ə̃ap.

(i) In general, only the initial direct object of a verb (or a modifier of the direct object) may incorporate into the verb, and this is regardless of the ultimate syntactic relation of that initial direct object. Yet in the causative construction, the initial subject of the subordinate verb may incorporate, as in 78a (cf. 78b).

78. (a) Atc-a?ap 1k tc'iccitl bə̃nas ?aq.
   who/V Q/1 clean house
   'Who did you make clean the house?'
   1 V
(b) tc'ic-sa?ap s yèdaqek ?aq bə̃nas ?aq.
   clean/V 1 2 house
   'I made the child clean the house'
   1 V 2
However, since a modifier of a dependent nominal may incorporate in place of that nominal, it may also be possible that the subject of a direct object verb incorporate in place of that verb.

Evidently, other dependents of the direct object verb may not incorporate in its place, hence the question (79a) must be formed by double incorporation, something which is in general possible (79b).

79. (a) Ki?kwu?Ra ik qO?as ?aq?
    what/build/V 1 man
    'What did you make the man build?'
    1 V
(b) To'apats-Tl-ap s qO?as ?aq.
    canoe/build/V 1 2
    'I made the man build a canoe'
    1 V 2

(ii) That the initial subject of the subordinate verb shows up as the ultimate direct, not indirect, object (as in 78b), is explainable as an advancement. Thus the network for (78b) is:

80. -sa?ap

One further property of causative constructions in Nitinaht is that the initial dependents of the subordinate verb, aside from subject and direct object, simply transfer to the causative verb with the same syntactic relation. For example, the subordinate benefactive of (80a) has advanced to direct object of the superordinate verb. (This verb takes both -ip showing benefactive becoming direct object; and -?a?T, showing direct object to subject advancement; the sequence contracts to atb.) Cf. (80b). The network for (80a) is (80c).

80. (a) Ki?las-Tl-ap-?at s itay ?aqwit Bob.
    house/build/V 1 2
    'Bob made me build a house for you'
    1st. 'I was made (for) you (to) build a house by Bob.'
    1 V 2
(b) Ki?las-Tl-ap s itay ?Otsayad Bob.
    'I'm making you build a house for Bob'
(c) -sa?ap

\[\text{Diagram:}
\begin{align*}
\text{Bob} & \quad \text{1} & \text{2} & \text{3} \\
\text{S} & \text{1} & \text{2} & \text{3} \\
\text{te'To} & \text{1} & \text{2} & \text{3} \\
\text{yEtsa?ak ba?as} & \text{1} & \text{2} & \text{3}
\end{align*}\]
2.6 Emphasis

Nitinahht has an emphatic expression ʔoʔokw 'by oneself' as in (81).

81. Hitakvisadap s ʔoʔokw.

'I took it off (by) myself'

The word ʔoʔokw consists of the definite prefix ʔo-, the reflexive -k(w)-, and the nominative preposition -ʔ(ə). Possibly, this word forms a part of the initial subject of (81) together with a 'I', and the latter takes over that relation, the emphatic ʔoʔokw then 'floating', the ultimate subject then encliticizes as ə.

However, it has been seen in section 2.9 that even if a pronominal enclitic for the subject is used, there may be a non-encliticized nominal still present as part of the ultimate subject. So, the ultimate subject of (81) could be ʔoʔokw, without my emphatic float.

I lack enough relevant data to decide this question.

2.7 Raising

In sentence (82a), we would expect the first person pronoun to be manifested as the ultimate direct object of họwtakaʔap 'teach, cause to learn', but instead, it is the direct object of ʔap̓ap̓ 'be willing'. Evidently, it has been raised from earlier direct object of họwtakaʔap to ultimate direct object of ʔap̓ap̓.

This is shown in the (simplified) network (82b).

82. (a) Q'ap̓ap̓ ak s is họwtakaʔap DİDI TİDq?

V Q 2 1 teach Nitinaht-lg

'Are you willing to teach me the Nitinaht language?'

(b) q'ap̓ap̓

We can see that ə 'me' is the ultimate direct object of q'ap̓ap̓ from the fact that it encliticizes within the clause governed by q'ap̓ap̓. Furthermore, a nominal raised in this way can further advance to subject of (the passive form) q'ap̓ap̓t:

83. (a) Kab̓ait'p ak q'ap̓ap̓t qs s Ben họwtakaʔap DİDI TİDq?

know Q/yQ V/PASSV COMP 1 1

'Do you know if Ben is willing to teach me Nitinaht?'

COMP 1 V

lit. 'Do you know if I am willing-ed by Effie to

It seems that the advancement of the first person pronoun from direct object to subject cannot be while a dependent of họwtakaʔap 'teach' but rather when raised to, be direct object of q'ap̓ap̓ 'be willing', since it is the latter verb that shows the passive
Morphology: g'apk't.

However, at least two alternative analyses must be considered. (1) Possibly, the ultimate direct object achieves that relation through a Union not through raising. (ii) If there is in fact a Union involved here, then possibly the ultimate direct object passes through a stage of being subordinate subject: by virtue of the Union rule, the passive morphology would not be manifested in the subordinate verb.

For now, I must leave these as open questions.

2.8 Retreats

The Chain-of-Being Hierarchy, described in section 2.1, has been shown to constrain transitions in Htnahit.

Advancements of direct object, indirect object, and benefactive are optional under certain circumstances, but obligatory under certain circumstances where the above Hierarchy is relevant.

I review briefly using the passive (advancement of direct object to subject). While (84), with both initial subject and direct object being third person animates, is grammatical in both the active and passive forms (84a, b), (85), with initial third person subject and first person direct object is ill-formed in the active (85a), but perfectly grammatical in the passive (85b).


     V NOM 1 ACC 2

85. (a) Fmstcil? ?a (?opw) Robin ?yoq? s(ip'a)

     V 1 ACC 2

literally 'Robin pinched me'

(b) Fmstcil'i?it s ?opwIt Robin.

V/PASSV 1 1

literally: 'I was pinched by Robin'

The interaction of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy with sanctioned advancements is more general. For example, while an initial benefactive, optionally to ultimate direct object (86b) or ultimate subject (86c) if it is of equal hierarchical rank compared to the initial subject, the benefactive must so advance (in general) if it outranks the initial subject, as shown in (87).

86. (a) Omwil the ?a (?opw) Mary bab'j? Utsayad John.

V 1 2 for Ben

'Mary made a basket for John'

(b) OqwIt the ?a (?opw) Mary bab'j? Utsayad John.

V/PASSV 1 1

literally: 'Mary was pinched by John'


     V NOM 1 ACC 2

85. (a) Fmstcil? ?a (?opw) Robin ?yoq? s(ip'a)

     V 1 ACC 2

literally 'Robin pinched me'

(b) Fmstcil'i?it s ?opwIt Robin.

V/PASSV 1 1

literally: 'I was pinched by Robin'

The interaction of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy with sanctioned advancements is more general. For example, while an initial benefactive, optionally to ultimate direct object (86b) or ultimate subject (86c) if it is of equal hierarchical rank compared to the initial subject, the benefactive must so advance (in general) if it outranks the initial subject, as shown in (87).

86. (a) Omwil the ?a (?opw) Mary bab'j? Utsayad John.

V 1 2 for Ben

'Mary made a basket for John'

(b) OqwIt the ?a (?opw) Mary bab'j? Utsayad John.

V/PASSV 1 1

literally: 'Mary was pinched by John'

The interaction of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy with sanctioned advancements is more general. For example, while an initial benefactive, optionally to ultimate direct object (86b) or ultimate subject (86c) if it is of equal hierarchical rank compared to the initial subject, the benefactive must so advance (in general) if it outranks the initial subject, as shown in (87).

86. (a) Omwil the ?a (?opw) Mary bab'j? Utsayad John.

V 1 2 for Ben

'Mary made a basket for John'

(b) OqwIt the ?a (?opw) Mary bab'j? Utsayad John.

V/PASSV 1 1

literally: 'Mary was pinched by John'
86. (b) Okwilip ob3 %a (*opy) Mary John bab?6.
   V/B 1 2 2
   "Mary made John a basket"

(c) Okwilib't t %a (*opy) John bab?6 *opyt? Mary.
   V/B/PASSV 1 2 1
   lit. 'John was made a basket by Mary'

The benefactive of (87), the first person singular, has
advanced successively to indirect object, direct object, and subject.
When that benefactive does not undergo all these advancements then
ungrammatical sentences result (e.g. *87a, b); thus only (87c) is
grammatical. These judgements of grammaticality are very strong
and clinchcut; moreover, there is absolutely no variation among
speakers of Nitinaht in these respects. A Nitinaht person has
difficulty in consciously repeating word-for-word sentences like
(*87a, b), much as an English-speaking person would when abruptly
faced with an ill-formed sentence like 'who did they whisper that
John and left together.

87. (b) *Okwilip %a (*opy) Mary s(iy'a) bab?6.
   V/B 1 2 2
   lit. 'Mary is making me a basket'

(c) Okwilib't a bab?6 ?opyt? Mary.
   V/B/PASSV 1 2 1
   lit. 'I am being made a basket for me'

The condition that advancement is obligatory when a direct
object, indirect object, or benefactive outranks the (initial)
subject on the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy accounts for the above
observations.

There are some sentence patterns in Nitinaht which at first
glance seem to violate the condition involving the Chain-of-Being
Hierarchy. For example, in (88), the initial subject and benefactive
are Mary and s(iy'a) 'I, me', respectively. It is obvious that
the initial benefactive outranks the subject on the Chain-of-Being
Hierarchy, and also that any advancement rules have failed to apply.
Our expectation is that (88) will be an ill-formed pattern in Nitinaht,
but it is in fact perfectly grammatical. For example, the typical
reaction of a fluent speaker of Nitinaht to (*87a) is to correct
this sentence to (88).
The crucial feature about (88) is that the benefactive case-marking preposition, normally just štaxad', takes here the affix -vit (reduced by regular processes to štaxad'it).

Since the affix -vit is in general assigned to a chomeur (or to a verb having a chomeur), the above observations lead to the hypothesis that the expression štaxad'it is in (88) is an ultimate chomeur, and so for this reason does not count as a violation of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy condition on ultimate syntactic relations.

At least two mechanisms for effecting the demotion to chomeur have been proposed, cf. Klokeid (1976a) and Postal (1976). A rather different analysis has been explored in Klokeid (1976c).

Not only benefactives, but other dependent nomininals demote to chomeur in the same way, i.e. with the function of eliminating violation of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy condition. Here, I present an example of a denoted direct object (89c).

89. (c) Wik ša yabop tc'Ioqií aq šyiqwi? s.
not Decl V 1 ACC/PASS I
'The dog doesn't recognize me'

3. Possession

At least three semantically distinct kinds of possessions exist: (i)-(iii); in addition, there are less readily classifiable possessors (iv).

(i) Part-whole relation. The whole is the 'possessor'; the part is the 'possessed'. The most common manifestation of the part-whole relation is in the area of body part expressions, e.g. my hands, kokodokwi? aq 'my hand(s); your ear, p'ip'yt? s 'your ear'; t'il'YaYah -it aq llapotay aq 'the cap of the bottle'.

(ii) Kinship. The specified kinship relation is the 'possessed', while the person having that kin is the 'possessor'. For example, my mother, šab'eqs-shy aq 'my mother'; his daughter, hitay'일h-bay s 'his daughter'.

(iii) Ownership and control. The owner is the 'possessor', the item which is owned is the 'possessed'. For example, my axe hisiv'ak-kw aq 'my axe'; your house, ba'as-kw sy 'your house'.

(iv) Miscellaneous. Included here are such expressions as my picture: semantically, they are unlike groups (i-iii), but are morphologically related to possession.

Type (i) has been traditionally called 'inalienable' possession, and type (iii), 'alienable' possession. In the three
sections of this chapter, I deal with types (i, ii, and iii): 3.1 covers ownership and control; 3.2, part-whole relations; and 3.3 kinship. In Nittinaht, the syntax of each is distinct.

3.1 Ownership and control

One way to express ownership or control is as follows. The possessed nominal under the ownership-control relation takes the suffix -okw; the possessor appears, with the complementizer (definite determiner) ?aq?okw, in the allomorph used for subject of a clause. Thus:

   V 1 car /POSS the I
   'John is near my car'

If the possessor is a nominal, then it appears immediately after the possessed nominal (91a), or else preceding it (91b). In the former instance, the possessed suffix -okw is used, but in the latter, the possessor takes the suffix -q. Both forms are used by younger generation of Nittinaht speakers; it seems that the second mode of expression is based on an English way of expressing the ownership relation.

    V 1 car/POSS the man the
    'I am near the man's car, the car of the man'
    1  V

   'I am near John's car'

An alternative way of expressing ownership is possible in Nittinaht: it finds no parallel in English. The initial possessor assumes the syntactic relation of indirect object, and the possessed does not have any overt morphological marking.

Thus (91a) is paraphrased by (92). Here, the possessor has advanced from indirect object to direct object, and so the verb takes the suffix -tcp.

   V 1 2 2
   'I am near the man's car'

   We can see that the possessor has become the ultimate direct object in the sentence pattern of (92), in that the possessor enclitizes in direct object form if it is non-third person, as in (93).

    V 1 2 2
    'I am near your car'

The conversion of initial possessor to indirect object is called Possessor Union.

If Possessor Union fails to apply, as in (94a), then no violation of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy condition is observed. But when Possessor Union does apply, then a potential violation
of that condition arises in circumstances like that exemplified by (94), and so advancement of indirect object to ultimate subject is obligatory, as in (94b).

94. (a) Tlaʔasʔa čqʔas ʔaq ʔiƛləbəs-əkw ʔaq s.
   V 1 car/POSS my
   'The man is near my car'
   1 V

(b) Tləwə-tcəb'? ə ʔiƛləbəs čqʔas ʔaq.
   V/Passv 1 2 1
   'The man is near my car' (literally, 'I am-neared the car by the man'
   1 V 2 1

This form of expression, shared by all generations of Nitinaht speakers, quite clearly does not reflect influence by English, or, say, Chinook Jargon.

Sentences with initial indirect objects may acquire second indirect objects through Possessor Union. In the known examples, it appears that both of these advance to direct object, but that the higher ranking nominal (with respect to the Chain-of-Being) serves as the ultimate direct object.

95. Qəʔ-təcəp s ʔiʔəc pokə čqʔas ʔaq ʔiʔəcəqəw.
   V 1 2 2 man ACC
   'I gave your basket to the man'
   1 2 2

Some additional examples of Possessor Union involving the ownership/control relation follow.

96. (a) Atcaʔt ik s kəw'əl-əkb tələla.
   1 q 1 V 2
   'Who stole my money?'
   1 V 1 2

(b) Wik s t'əqəsqək ʔəfəst əq s Dick šəkwəl-əkb tələla.
   not I believe by COMP 1 1 V 2
   'I don't believe that (it was) Dick (who) stole my money'.
   1 2

(c) Həʔək-əkb ʔəs yələq čqʔas cəcəi.
   V 1 that 1 2
   'That man doesn't-know your name'
   1 V 1 2

(d) Həʔək obt id ʔıʔəc ʔətəsqək.
   V PAST 1 2 2
   'We ate your fish'
   1 V 2 2

No possessor union occurs in (97).

97. (a) Wik ʔət tətəcəʔək ʔəq'əqələk-əkb ʔaq.
   not Imper V 2 DAT POSS
   'Don't pull my glasses!'
   V POSS 2
97. (b) Batct't owi 1d tc'Tkwi'k-ckw ʔaq y'lqa qaʔas'.

V/Passv might 1 ʔ POSS

'That man's dog might bite us'.

POSS 1 V 1

Other ways of expressing ownership: space precludes describing them here.

3.2 Part-Whole relationship

If an initial (intransitive) subject or direct object is a body part, then the possessor of that body part typically assumes the relation of ultimate subject or direct object, respectively. For example, the initial subject of (98a,b) is p'ip'i 'ear(s)'; its possessor, the first person singular has assumed ultimate subjecthood, as we can see from the fact that it exclicizes within the clause according to Wackernagel's principle. The verb here takes the suffix which is underlyingly -ʔTk:

98. (a) Osquoqi't s p'ip'i.

V 1 ear

'Vear(s) hurt', lit. 'I hurt ear'

1 V

(b) Osquoqi't owi s p'ip'i.

V might 1 ear

'Vear(s) might hurt'.

The network for (98a) is (99): the initial possessor ascends, i.e. it assumes the syntactic relation borne by its governor, here, subjecthood. The suffix -ʔTk records the ascension.

99. Osquoqi't

1 0

1 ʔ

p'ip'i

POSS

Possessor ascension is possible with direct objects as well, as in (100): the verb suffix -ʔTk is absent here.

(100) Wiq ? a tc'itl p'ip'i.

not Impc 1 V ʔ

'Don't pull my ear', lit.

V 2

'Don't pull me (on the) ear'

V 2 ʔ

(Possibly, the absence of the suffix -ʔTk here is evidence that Possessor Union, not Possessor Ascension, is at work. However, we would expect to see the morphological side effects that would be ultimately triggered by Possessor Union, and yet these are absent.)

Possessor Ascension is impossible if the possessed nominal is neither direct object nor subject of an intransitive. For example, in (101), the nominal s 'l' is subject of a transitive verb: to express the possessed nominal, an instrumental phrase must be resorted to. (The direct object, though, has undergone Possessor Union — see immediately below, also, for the internal morphological forms of the instrumental expression, see below.)
101. tcoywciti-ip s John quaqwítqatísib ʔeqwaw'ʔl kokodókweít
   V 2 2 with INSTR
   ʔaq s.
   Det POSS
   'I tickled John(s) foot with my hand'
   1 V 2 2 POSS INSTR

Body part expressions also seem to permit Possessor Union. For example, the initial direct object of (101) above must be quaqwítqatísib 'foot', with a possessor John. John is evidently the ultimate direct object of (101), and it must have arrived at that syntactic relation by advancement from indirect object: the suffix -ip on the verb of (101) marks advancement of indirect to direct object. Now, the only way for the possessor of a direct object to become an indirect object is by Possessor Union. Thus the network for (101), ignoring the instrument expression, is (102).

102.

However, instances of Possessor Union with body part expressions is rare.

The internal form of the instrument expression in (101) is interesting, in that the possessed nominal manifests the suffix -ʔʔs, which we have previously seen to be associated with Possessor Ascension, as well as with advancement of direct object to subject. In fact, the typical way to express a part-whole relationship, in a context where Possessor Ascension (as well as, perhaps, Possessor Union) is impossible, is with this form, i.e.: body part + suffix -ʔʔs; encliticized determiner ʔaq/ʔk; encliticized possessor (in the same form as for a subject). Some examples of such expressions in isolation are given in (103).

103. wadTk  'throat'
    wadTkʔt ʔaq s 'my throat'
    wadTkʔt Tk 'your throat'
    ditsʔ 'nose'
    ditsʔʔt ʔaq s 'my nose'
    ditsʔʔt Tk 'your nose'

Yet another mode of expressing the part-whole relation exists in Nitinaht, although it is not used as extensively by contemporary speakers as was evidently the case with earlier generations. The possessor of an initial direct object ascends, and the possessed nominal incorporates into the verb, as a suffix, as in (104).

104. (a) Wik s qaqaʔqov John bobo-dk-ʔp.
    not 1 on purpose 2 V/ʔʔ/cans
    'I didn't burn John's hand on purpose'
    1 V 2 2
    lit. 'I didn't hand-burn John on purpose'
    2/V 2
Incorporation as a suffix is not unique to body parts; several locative expressions typically incorporate in this way, especially in the speech of elder persons; incorporation is less exploited by younger speakers in general, apparently. In any event, incorporation in Nitinaht seems to be somewhat more restricted overall than in the related languages to the north. However, I cannot state the restrictions with any certainty.

3.3 Kinship

A kinship relation can be expressed by placing the possessor nominal in front of the possessed nominal, and suffixing -ak' to the latter (106a); a pronominal possessor will encliticize (106b).

106. (a) Whwiktl xXda?x?ctc xaq gatcibisqis-kw xaq?

where Q little-girl brother

'Where is the little girl's brother?'

(b) Tootcoywats'awitl x a John yadaq-kw xaq s.

V 1 2 POSS

'John tickled my child'

Possessor Union is possible in kinship expressions. In (107) the possessor of the direct object has become the indirect object by Possessor Union; then, because of the Chain-of-Being Hierarchy constraint, it has advanced, via direct object, to ultimate subject.
ultimately subject of (110a) must be *yaya'daqiy* 'children', as shown by the enclitic *?al* 'they'; in (110b), the ultimate subject is instead *?I*.

    V they 1 POSS
    'My children are hiding'
    POSS 1 V
    (b) Apt? - k s yay?daqiy.
    V 1 V
    'My children are hiding'
    POSS 1 V
    lit. 'I hide, children'

The networks for (110a, b) are (111a, b), respectively.

111. (a) Apt?
    V 1
    yay?daqiy-?ak
    POSS
    s
    (b) Apt? - k
    V 1
    yay?daqiy
    POSS
    s

Apparently, kinship expressions also permit Possessor Ascension, as in (109): here, the possessed suffix *-ak* is assigned to the verb.

109. (a) bHar?'-iy-?ak y?daqik?
    V / POSS 0/1 V
    'Is your child coming?'
    1 V
    lit. 'Are you coming child?'

The transition from initial to ultimate syntactic relations must be as I have here described. With an intransitive verb, only the ultimate subject can produce an enclitic form. Hence, the
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