

## ENCLITICIZATION IN NITINAHT

Terry J. Klokeid

The University of Calgary

1. Introduction

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

A number of concepts are assumed, in particular the notion of grammatical relation. For example, in sentence (1) below, the verb *ts'oq<sup>w</sup>citl* '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 *?ōyoqw*, Accusative. They will be discussed in greater detail below.)

(1) Ts'oqwcitl ibt ?a John Bill ?ōyoqw.

V

I

II

'John hit Bill'

2. Case, Word Order, and Registration

Many aspects of Nitinaht syntax are statable with respect to grammatical relations.<sup>2</sup> Each dependent nominal is assigned a preposition: the choice of preposition is determined by grammatical relation. Thus, a subject is assigned the preposition *?oqw* and a direct object the preposition *?ōyoqw* (with a qualification, set out below), as in sentence (2). I gloss these prepositions as follows: *?oqw* 'nominative', abbreviated NOM; *?ōyoqw* 'accusative', abbreviated ACC.

(2) Ts'oqwcitl ?a ?oxw John ?ōyoqw 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 i<sup>n</sup> (3):

(3) Ts'oqwcitl ibt ?a John ?ōyoqw 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 ?oxw is always assigned to the subject, some verbs do not permit the assignment of the accusative ?ōyoqw to the direct object. Instead, they take a registration prefix ?o-.<sup>3</sup> One verb showing this prefix is ?ōkwīl 'make, build', exemplified by (4). The direct object in (4) is ba?as 'house'.

(4) ?ōkwīl 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 ?oy (possibly ?oyi), and so is assigned to the time expression ?ābay 'yesterday' in (5). The nominal expressing location in (6), Pātcīda 'Pacheena (Port Renfrew)', is assigned the locative preposition ?iyax. In (7), the instrumental expression tc'axay'ak

'adze' is assigned the instrumental preposition  $\text{?}\bar{o}xwaw'\bar{a}l$ . (The direct object of (7) is  $tc'apats$  'canoe').

(5)  $\text{?}\bar{O}kw\bar{I}l\ ibt\ \text{?}a\ John\ ba'as\ \text{?}\bar{a}bay\ \text{?}oy$ .

V                      I      II      Time

'John built a house yesterday'

(6)  $\text{?}\bar{O}kw\bar{I}l\ ibt\ \text{?}a\ John\ ba'as\ \text{?}iyax\ P\bar{a}tc\bar{I}da$ .

V                      I      II              Location

'John built a house in Pacheena'

(7)  $\text{?}\bar{O}kw\bar{I}l\ ibt\ \text{?}a\ John\ tc'apats\ \text{?}\bar{o}xwaw'\bar{a}l\ tc'axay'ak$ .

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*,  $\text{?}a$ ) 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  $\text{?}a$ . 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

ʔābay ʔoy '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) ʔōkwīl ibt ʔa John tc'apats ʔābay ʔoy.

V Past Decl. I II Time

'John made a canoe yesterday'

Secondly, the formatives *ibt*, ʔa 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 ʔōkwīl ibt ʔa is pronounced as one word.<sup>4</sup>

Certain categories of formatives, including Tense (e.g. *ibt* Past Tense), and Modals (e.g. ʔa 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 ʔītc'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 ʔōyoqw. The person categories are indicated by Arabic numbers 1, 2, 3; doubling indicates plural, e.g. 22 is second person plural.

(9) a. ?Ītc'ib ?a John ?ōyoqw siy'a.

V I Standard (1)

'John is older than me'

b. ?Ītc'ib ?a John ?ōyoqw dow'a.

V I Standard (11)

'John is older than us'

c. ?Ītc'ib ?a John ?ōyoqw sow'a.

V I Standard (2)

'John is older than you'

d. ?Ītc'ib ?a John ?ōyoqw sow'atc.

V I Standard (22)

'John is older than you (plural)'

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

(10) ?Ītc'ib ?a John ?ōyoqw yā.

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,  $\emptyset$ , in (11 a, b). The governing predicate in (11) is *p'osāk* '(be) tired'.

(11) a. P'osāk  $\emptyset$  s. 'I'm tired'

V I(1)

b. P'osāk  $\emptyset$  id. 'we're tired'

V II(11)

c. P'osāk ʔa s. 'you're tired'

V I(2)

d. P'osāk a sow'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 ʔa. 'he/she is tired'

But there is a third person plural enclitic, *al* or *l*, exemplified in (13).<sup>5</sup>

(13) P'osāk ʔa 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) Kitlcitl 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*: observe that there are two vowels in a row. The second of these regularly drops, giving the phonetic form: *xi d ic*, as in (15).

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

V I(11)

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

(15) a. Balāl *?a s*. 'you're cold'

V I(2)

b. Balāl *xi k ic*. '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*. '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'oqwcitl ibt *s itsx*. 'I hit you'

V 1 II/2

b. Ts'oqwcitl ibt *id itsx*. 'we hit you'

V 11 II/2

(18) a. Ts'oqwcitl ibt s is. 'you hit me'

V 1 I/2

b. Ts'oqwcitl ibt id is 'you hit us'

V 11 I/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 *ʔaq/qʔk* 'the' is an enclitic. Each of the direct object nominals in (19) has a determiner *ʔaq* encliticized to it.

(19) a. *ʔOkwɪl* ibt *ʔa* John baʔas *ʔaq*.

V I II

'John built the house' (cf. 4)

b. *ʔOkwɪl* ibt *ʔa* John tc'apats *ʔaq* *ʔoxwaw'al* tc'axay'ak.

V I II I nstr

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

I will refer to the general class of enclitics including the Declarative *ʔa* and the Determiner *ʔaq* 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'itcɪtl* 'shoot' and the direct object *bowate* 'deer'.

In (20 b, c), the direct object nominal governs (or: 'is modified by') some further formative: the adjective *ʔix* 'big' in (20 b) and the quantifier *ʔatl* 'two' in (20c). The governing nominal and its dependent form a constituent in each instance, thus we have the constituents *ʔix bowatc* 'big deer' and *ʔatl 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 ʔa John bowatc ʔɔyoqw.

V I II

'John shot a deer'

b. Tl'itcitl ibt ʔa John ʔix bowatc ʔɔyoqw.

V I II

'John shot a big deer'

c. Tl'itcitl ibt ʔa John ʔatl bowatc ʔɔyoqw.

V I II

'John shot two deer'

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

(21) a. Tl'itcitl ibt ʔa John bowatc ʔaq ʔɔyoqw.

V I II

'John shot the deer'

b. Tl'itcitl ibt ʔa John ʔix ʔaq bowatc ʔɔyoqw.

V I II

'John shot the big deer'

c. Tl'itcitl ibt ʔa John ʔatl ʔaq bowatc ʔɔyoqw.

V I II

'John shot the two deer'

In (21 a), the Determiner *ʔaq* encliticizes to the governing nominal as we expect: *bowatc ʔaq* 'the deer'. But in (21 b), the Determiner *ʔaq* encliticizes not to the governing nominal, but to the adjective dependent on it, *ʔɛx ʔaq 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 *ʔatl* 'two', and the Determiner *ʔaq* encliticizes to the first word in the resulting Noun Phrase: *ʔatl ʔaq 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'itcitl ibt ʔa John ʔɔyoqw bowatc ʔaq.*

V                      I                      II

'John shot the deer'

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 *ʔa*, attach to the first word of the sentence, which happens to be *tl'itcitl*. 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 *obt* is determined by the preceding vowel.)

(23) ?Qyoq̄w obt ?a bowatc ?aq tl'itcitl John.

Topic/II            V            I

'The deer, John shot it'

## 5. Enclitic Categories

This section summarizes the various categories expressed by enclitics.

### 5.1. Mood (Specifiers and Modals)

#### 5.1.1 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) ?a as Specifier, and one with the Unknown *xi* - *ic*, as in (24 ) - (26 ).

(24) a. Daqcitl ?a John.

'John drank it'

V            I

b. Daqcitl xi c John.

'John must have drunk it'

'I think that John drank it'

'Perhaps John drank it'

(25) a. ?Oxw ?a s natlkcitl yā. 'You were the one who kicked him'

NOM            I/2 V            II/3

- b. ?Oxw xi k ic natlkcitl yā. 'I think you were the one who kicked him'  
 NOM I/2 V II/3 'I guess you were the one who kicked him'  
 'You must be the one who kicked him' etc.
- (26) a. Bitlā ?ā?is ?a. 'It's going to rain'  
 V FUT 'It looks like it's about to rain'
- b. Bitlā ?ā?is xi c. 'I think it's going to rain'  
 V FUT 'It must be going to rain'  
 'I guess it looks like rain', etc.

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/qīk is required in (27 a); the use of the corresponding Unknown Complementizer, *owis*, 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/qīk (27 a). To choose the Unknown one *owis* here would have the speaker asserting that he knows something that is marked as Unknown, clearly a contradiction.

- (27) a. Kab'at'p s yaqkwaqal ?aq yā. 'I know what he is called', i.e.  
 V I/1 I/3 'I know his name'
- b. \*Kab'at'p s yaqkwaqal owis yā.  
 V I/1 V I/3

Substituting for *kab'at'p* the verb *hayā?ak* 'not know', 'be ignorant of', results in a reversal of well-formedness judgements:

- (28) a. \*Hayā?ak s yaqkwaqal ?aq yā.  
 V I/1 V I/3

- b. Hayā'ak s yaqkwaqal owis yā. '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 yā? 'Do you know what he is called?'  
 V Q/I/2 V I [speaker knows]  
 b. Kab'at'p ak yaqkwaqal owis yā/ '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. Hayā'ak 'a John yaqkwaqal 'aq s. 'John doesn't know what I am called'  
 V I V I/1  
 c. \*Hayā'ak 'a John yaqkwaqal owis s.  
 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 *hoxtakeitl* 'learn' presupposes the proposition of the dependent verb. Here, then, with the dependent verb *wā* 'say, tell', it is

presupposed that something was indeed said. (The specifier *qĩk* is an alternate form of *ʔaq*.)

(31) a. Wik s ho<sup>.</sup>xwtakcitl wā qĩk s is.

NEG 1 V V 1 I/2

'I didn't learn what you told me'

b. \*Wik s ho<sup>.</sup>xwtakcitl wā wisk s is.

NEG 1 V V 1 I/2

Not all verbs impose presuppositions on their dependents like <sup>w</sup>ho<sup>.</sup>x<sup>^</sup>takcitl does. Since *daʔā* 'hear' controls no such presupposition, both (32 a, b) are grammatical.

(32) a. Wik s daʔ<sub>a</sub> wā qĩk s is.

NEG 1 V V 1 I/2

'I didn't hear what you told me'

b. Wik s daʔā wā wisk s is.

NEG 1 V 1 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 Batlĩsqawa (Peter) and Jasper Peters (published by Haas, and Swadesh, 1933), there is a zero Declarative in place of *ʔa*. Both the sentences (33 a, b) have verb *ʔowiy* 'go' and subject *laxoʔokw* 'young man' (with a dependent quantifier *ts'awāʔak* 'one'), but whereas (33 a) has the declarative *ʔa*, sentence (33 b) has no overt specifier, symbolized here by  $\emptyset$ . Apart from the stylistic difference, the sentences are paraphrases.

(33) a. ?Owi y ?a ts'awā?ak laxo?okw.

'One young man went somewhere'

b. ?Owi y ∅ ts'awā?ak 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'awā?ak.

V

I

'One stayed home now'

b. Tladā'il ?atl ∅ ts'awā?ak. (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*, *qwi y*. 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* *qwi y* one that has not necessarily been as the following pairs of sentences demonstrate. The superordinate verbs are ?ōqwal 'think', t'aqwāk 'believe', caxā 'run away, escape'; the dependent verbs are *walcitl* 'go home' and *ts'oqwcitl* 'hit, punch'.

(35) a. ?ōqwal s walcitl qa?a John.

V I/1 V

I

'I thought that John went home'

b. ?ōqwal s walcitl qwi y John.

V I/1 V

I

'I thought that John would go home'

(36) a. T'aqwāk s walciṭl qa'a John.

V I/1 V I

'I believe John went home'

b. T'aqwāk s walciṭl qwiṭ John.

V I/1 V I

'I believe John will go home'

(37) a. Caxā 'a John ts'oqwcitl qa'a Bob.

V I V I

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

b. Caxā 'a John tsoqwcitl qwiṭ Bob.

V I V I

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

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

(38) a. 'Ōqwal 'a ta'il qa'a Pat.

V V I

'Pat thinks she's sick'

b. 'Ōqwal 'a ta'il qatṣa 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.

(39) a. Kab'at'p ?a qō'as ?aq.

V I

'The man knows it'

b. Kab'at'p ow qō'as ?aq.

V I

'The man knows it, it is said'

'The man says he knows it'

c. Wā ?a qō'as ?aq kab'at'p xi.

V I V

'The man said that he knows it'

The new predicates in (40) are *wa'itcq'aqatl* 'be sleepy' and *wa'itcitol* 'go to sleep'. (40 b, d) contain the Future enclitic <sup>d</sup>?ik.

(40) a. Wa'itcq'aqatl ?a qō'as ?aq.

V I

'The man is sleepy'

b. Wa'itcitol ?ik ?a qō'as ?aq ?odōtl wa'itcq'aqatl qa'a.

V I (because) V

'The man is going to sleep because he is sleepy'

c. Wa'itcq'aqatl ow qō'as ?aq.

V I

'The man says he is sleepy'

'The man is sleepy, it is said'

d. Wa'itcitol ?ik ?a qō'as ?aq ?odōtl wa'itcq'aqatl xi.

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 <sup>e</sup>suprordinate clause contains a Quotative *ow* or *xi*. 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.

V I V

'Pat said she knows what he is called'

b. Kab'at'p ?a Pat yaqkwaqal ?aq.

V I V

'Pat knows what he is called'

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

(42) a. Wā ?a Pat kab'at'p xi yaqkwaqal i.

V I V

'Pat said she knows what he is called'

b. Wā ?a Pat hayā'ak xi yaqkwaqal owis.

V I V V

'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 *xi* - *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 *qwi'y*, Quotative *xi*, and the Specifiers *qatxa* 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 *ʔaq/qīk* 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 *ʔix* or *ʔix* 'in order that, so that'.

(43) a. Q'apāk ak ts'obīl ʔiyax ʔaxkay' > waʔitcap īx sʔ

V V LOC V 1

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

b. ʔoyē ʔi s tc'aʔak, daqcitl ʔix s.

V 1 II, C V 1

'Give me water, so I can drink'

The text published by Haas and Swadesh (1939) contains an example of the Purposive *ʔix*:

(44) Bādokw ʔIk ʔi s, hītaqstitl. ʔix s is.

V 1 V 1 I/2

### 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 *ʔa*, 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 *hɪʔi* '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 *hɪʔi*.) I have glossed the interrogative enclitic as Q.

(45) a. Balāl ʔatl ʔa s. 'you are cold'

V I/2

b. Balāl ʔatl ak? 'are you cold?'

V Q

c. Hɪʔi, 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'oqwcitl ʔa Paul Dick ʔōyoqw. 'Paul punched Dick'

V I II

b. Ts'oqwcitl ā Paul Dick ?ōyoqw? 'Did Paul punch Dick?'

V I II

c. Hī'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 *hī'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. Hī'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 *xī - 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 *bablad* 'white person' (with demonstrative *yīlqa* 'that'); the

direct object is third person and not overt. (48 b) is a corresponding interrogative: the interrogative formative *ʔatc* 'who(m)?' which is the direct object, is obligatorily incorporated, replacing the registration prefix *ʔo* of the verb: *ʔāt̃c-ʔaw*.

(48) a. *ʔOʔaw ʔa yīlqa babladʔ*.

V I

'That white man is waiting for him/her/someone'

b. *ʔAtcʔaw ī yīlqa babladʔ?*

Q/II-V I

'Who is that white man waiting for?'

c. *ʔAtcʔaw ʔi c yīlqa babladʔ?*

Q/II-V I

'Who is that white man waiting for?'

The sentences (49) below present additional exemplification:

(49) a. *ʔObātsʔ ʔa yayaqawʔat aq s*.

V I POSS/1

'My friend is talking about it/something'

b. *Bāqabātsʔ ī yayaqawʔat aq s?*

Q/II-V I POSS/1

'What is my friend talking about?'

c. *Bāqabātsʔ ʔi c yayaqawʔat aq s?*

Q/II-V I POSS/1

'What is my friend talking about?'

(50) a. *ʔōtsaxad ʔas yīlqa qōʔas*.

'You benefitted that man'

b. ?Āts-tsaxad ik.

'Who did you benefit?'

c. ?Āts-tsaxad xi k ic?

'Who did you benefit?'

#### 5.1.6. Imperative

A further sentence type is the imperative, which expresses a command.

The imperative Specifier in a simple sentence is ?i, as in (51 a, b, c):

(51) a. Hatssay ?i.

'Come here'

V

b. Daqcitl ?i ?axkay' tc'a?ak.

'Drink this water

V

II

c. Wā ?i yayaqaw'at Ik ?ōyoqw.

'Speak to your friend'

V

II

POSS/2

A negative imperative simply adds *wik* 'not'.

(52) Wik ?i ?ōxwaw'al hisiy'ak ?ōxwaw'al ?i hihisiyap'al.

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 *qwi* replaces the imperative ?i.

(53) a. ?ōkwil ?i tc'apats.

'make a canoe'

V

II

b. Wā ?a David ?ōyoqw Bob ?ōkwil qwi tc'apats.

V

I

II

V

II

'David told Bob to make a canoe'

c. Wāʔit s David ʔōkwīl qwi y s tc'apats.

V/Passive I/1 I,C I/1 II

'I was told by David to make a canoe'<sup>6</sup>

(54) a. Kāfiqsīl ʔi. 'make coffee'

II/V

b. Wā ʔa David ʔōyoqw Bob kāfiqsīl qwi y.

V I II II/V

'David told Bob to make coffee'

c. Wāʔit s David kāfiqsīl qwi y.

V/Pass I/1 I,C II/V

'I was told by David to make coffee'

Sapir and Swadesh (1939:242-3) list three additional imperatives, with glosses, for the Tseshah language. Nitinaht has cognates for two of these: corresponding to their 'come' imperative is the enclitic sequence ʔi-ka or ʔi-k'a (55); and to their 'go' imperative the enclitic tci (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 ʔi.

(55) a. Waʔitc ʔatl ʔi. 'Go to sleep'

V

b. Waʔitc ʔatl ʔi ka. 'Go to sleep'

(56) a. Walcitl ʔatl ʔi. 'Go home'

V

b. Walcitl ʔatl tci. '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 *?icitsip* 'chewing gum'. Sentence (57 a) is an ordinary (negative) imperative in *?i*, while (b) contains the sequence *?i-ka*.

(57) a. Wik *?i sokwitl ?icitsip ?aq.*

NEG            V            II

'Don't take the chewing gum'

b. Wik *?i ka sokwitl ?ix ?icitsip ?aq.*

NEG            V            II

'Don't take the chewing gum'

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

(58) *Lakcitl ?i s wik ?o?okwidokw, ?o?okwidokw tci ?ab?ē.*

V            II/1            V            V

'Please don't ask me, go ask your mother'

An imperative corresponding to the 'let's' construction of English contains an enclitic sequence *?ā?itsx*; elsewhere *itsx* '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 *?ā?is* 'Future'. In (59 b), the enclitic sequence is *?ā?itsx* 'let's'.

(59) a. ʔOwiʔ ʔāʔis id citl'āsaq.

V                      Goal

'We're going to go to town'

b. ʔOwiʔ ʔāʔitsx citl'āsaq.

V                      Goal

'Let's go to town'

In the language of the Makah (Qwidictcaʔatx), the closest relative of Nitinaht, a distinction exists between dual and plural just in these inclusive forms: cf. Makah [ʔēʔtsoxw] 'let's/dual', [ʔēʔowʔtsoxw] 'let's/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. Yātccitl ʔāʔitsx.                      'Let's go for a walk'

V

b. \*Yātccitl ʔāʔowʔitsx.

#### 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), *dāqcitl* (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. Dāqcitl 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 1

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 *ʔa/∅* plus Usitative *ik*, the enclitic *qwi* 'past usitative' may be substituted.<sup>7</sup>

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

V 1

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

V 1

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

V 1

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

V 1

#### 5.1.7. Desiderative

Wish or hope on the part of the speaker is expressed by the enclitic sequence *qwi-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 1 V II

b. Tcabol qwi s ik tl'itoqwāk tāla (yaq ʔaq s dōbay' kapxwāk).

V 1 V II 1 Time V

'I wish I could save money (but I'm always short)'

It is possible to substitute the sequence  $\text{?ēq} - \text{xi} - \text{ic}$  'desiderative' for *qwi-y-ik* 'desiderative'. (It is possible that  $\text{?ēq}$  is not actually an enclitic.) The verb in (66) below is *bitlcitl* 'rain'.

(66) a. Bitlcitl qwi-y ik. 'I hope it's going to rain'

V

b. Bitlcitl  $\text{?ēq}$  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  $\text{?a}/\emptyset$  Declarative, *qwi-y*) *wa* follows pronominal enclitics.

(67) Hīdakats'itl qwi-y s wa bab?ō. 'I wonder if I'll sell my basket'

V

1

II

The meaning of *wa* overlays somewhat with that of the Unknown Declarative sequence  $\text{xi} - \text{ic}$ . 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 derivational and inflectional offices, but not otherwise found with an enclitic.

(68) Wik qwi-y hitaqētl yayaqw'at  $\text{?aq}$  s, walcitl  $\text{?atl}$  s,  $\text{?ādtcidokw}$  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. *laxʔoyi* 'now, today', *huʔayʔoyi* 'a long time ago', *ʔābayʔoyi* '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 laxʔoyi. 'I'll pay you now/soon'

V 1 II/2 Time

c. Halātcitl s itsx hoʔayʔoyi. 'I paid you a long time ago'.

V 1 II/2 Time

d. Halātcitl s itsx ʔābayʔoyi. '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

b. Bāqīdaxʔit it ik wikʔit hupʔēʔit baʔitlqats ʔaqʔ

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

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

The overt future is *ʔik*.

(71) a. Halātcitl ʔik id itsx (ʔābayʔoyi). 'We will pay you (tomorrow)'

V 11 II/2 Time

b. Daqcitl ʔIk ʔa s tcʔaʔak. 'You will drink water'

V I/2 II

The formative *ʔāʔis*, which precedes tense in the enclitic sequence, indicates intention or prediction:<sup>8</sup>

(72) a. Halātcitl ʔāʔis s itsx. 'I'm going to pay you'

V I II/2

b. Bitlā ʔāʔis ʔa.

The enclitic sequence *ʔāʔis* plus Past *bt/t* expresses unfulfilled intention or prediction. (The sequence *ʔāʔis* plus Future *ʔik* is ill-formed.)

(73) a. Halātcitl ʔāʔis ibt s itsx (yaq ʔaq s wik).

V 1 II/2 1 NEG

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

b. Bitlā ʔāʔis ibt ʔa (yaq ʔaq wik).

V NEG

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

#### 5.1.11. Sequential

A very commonly used element is the Sequential *ʔatl* 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 *ʔatl* precedes the tense elements in the enclitic sequence.

(74) a. Halātcitl ʔatl ibt s itsx (ʔābay ʔoyi).

V 1 11/2 Time

'I paid you then (yesterday)'

b. Halātcitl ʔatl ʔik s itsx (ʔābay ʔoyi).

V 1 II/2 Time

'I'll pay you then (tomorrow)'

c. Halātcitl ʔatl s itsx (lax ʔoyi).

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: *qwi y* or *bt* - ʔa - *ik* (Past) e.g. (75)

ʔatl - -ʔa - *ik* (Non Past) e.g. (76)

(ii) Realis: ʔa (Near Future) e.g. (77)

ʔitl - ʔa (Distant Future) e.g. (78)

(iii) Irrealis: *owisa* e.g. (79)

(iv) Counterfactual: ʔt̄l - *ibt*-ʔa e.g. (79)

or: ʔik - *ibt* -ʔa e.g. (80)

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

(75) a. Babuyak qwi y s bakwil ʔaq ʔiyax, hixwā qwi y s.

V LOC V 1

b. Babuyak qwi y s bakwil ʔaq ʔiyax, hixwā bt s ik.

'When I worked in the store, I always used to work hard'

(*babuyak* 'work'; *hixwā* 'work hard')

(76) Babuyak qwi y s bakwil ʔaq ʔiyax, hixwā ʔatl s ik.

V 1 LOC V 1

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

(77) a. (ʔoyi) halātcitl qwi y s is, hoxtaksaʔap s itsx.

If V 1 I/2 V 1 II/2

'If you pay me, I'll instruct/teach you'

b. (?Oyi) wik qwi y b̄itlcitl, wuwʔēt̄x ʔa.

If NEG V V

'If it doesn't begin to rain, there's danger (of a fire)'

(78) (?Oyi) wik qwi y sokw tlawāx̄a dadātcēksawob ʔaq, ʔoyē

If NEG I/2 V Goal V

ʔitl s its̄x b̄ol.

1 II/2 II, C

'If you don't go near the window, I'll give you a ball'

(79) (?Oyi) hatssāy' qwi y yilqa qōʔas, batcitol owisa tc'ikwālok ʔaq s.

If V I V I POSS/1

'If that man came near, my dog would bite (him)'

(80) (?Oyi) wik it qwi y sokw tlawāx̄ a dadātcēksawob ʔaq, ʔoyē

If NEG I/2 V Goal V

ʔitl ibt s its̄x b̄ol.

1 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 qwi y s, hitaqaya ʔik ibt s ʔābay ʔoyi.

If V 1 V 1 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 *ʔatl*

INF: Inferential *pɪ̃t*

or Intentional/Immediate Future *ʔāʔis*

FUT: Future Tense *ʔɪ̃tl, ɪ̃k*

PAST: Past Tense *bt, t*

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

Known (Declarative) *ʔa* (∅ before first person)

Unknown *xi* (requires further modal *ic*)

Known complementizer (Definite determiner) *ʔaq, qɪ̃k, x*

Unknown complementizer *owis*

Realis complementizer or Conjoining Known Specifier *qaʔa*

Irrealis Complementizer or Past Usitative *qwĩy*

Quotative *ow*

Quotative Complementizer *xi*

Quotative known complementizer (Quotative Determiner) *i*

Yes/No Interrogative *qak, ā*

Content Interrogative *qik, ĩ*

Imperative *ʔt*

Purposive Complementizer *ʔix*

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'itcis* (with first person subject);*sow'*, *sow'itc* (otherwise)Plural Direct Object *ow'itsx*, *ow'itcitsx*

## 3: (Third Person)

Singular (unmarked)

Plural *al*, *l*

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

Unknown *ic* (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*

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to the many Nitinahts and other West Coast Native people who have taught me something of their languages over the last ten years. A full acknowledgement of their assistance and hospitality is contained in the larger work in progress.

Several institutions have extended financial support for my work. The present project is being carried out under a National Museum of Man contract.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 *baʔas* results in (i); cf. (4).

(i) Bāʔas-īl ibt ʔa John.

II V I

<sup>4</sup>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, *t* and ʔ merge. The phonetic form of the entire sequence is ʔōkwīlibtʔa.

<sup>5</sup>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.

<sup>6</sup>The gloss for *David* in (53 c), namely I,C, indicates that this nominal is the initial subject (I) of the verb wā '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'.

<sup>7</sup>The enclitic sequence qwi plus s (l) is regularly reduced to qō s phonetically. I do not show this in the orthography.

<sup>8</sup>Phonetically, examples <sup>12</sup>(~~xyz~~ a, b) are reduced by regular rules to:

(i) Halāctl'ēsitsx. and

(ii) Bitlē?ēsa (respectively)

#### REFERENCES

- Mary Haas (Swadesh) and Morris Swadesh (1933), A Visit to the Other World, A Nitinat Text, *IJAL* 7.195-205.
- Geoffrey O'Grady (1964), *Nyangumata Grammar*. University of Sydney.
- Edward Sapir and Morris Swadesh (1939), *Nootka Texts*. Linguistic Society of America.