

The complementizer *Guʔ in Athabascan: its reflex in Dogrib*

Leslie Saxon
University of Victoria

This paper outlines the functions of a complementizer in Dogrib that is cognate with Navajo *go*, Western Apache and Jicarilla Apache *go*, Hupa *-xw*, Tsuut'ina *gù*, Dëne Sųłné *-ú*, Slave *gú*, Koyukon *hu*, and related forms in a number of other Athabascan languages. The paper presents an argument that the form of the morpheme in Dogrib as currently spoken actually belongs to this cognate set, and documents its functions. The paper ends with some speculations about the use of the morpheme in Proto-Athabascan and the paths of its semantic change. Examples from a range of Athabascan languages are brought in to support the case.

1 The complementizer *Guʔ in Athabascan

Widespread in all branches of the Athabascan family is a morpheme of somewhat varied function that, among other things, serves to create adverbial expressions from clauses or words of other parts of speech. I here propose the reconstruction of Proto-Athabascan *Guʔ from which the reflexes in the daughter languages descend. I label it as a complementizer because of its role in embedded clauses; the same form also has uses as an adverb formative.

This morpheme has been treated extensively in works on Navajo (Schauber 1979), Slave (Rice 1989), and Western Apache (Potter 1997), where it is contrasted with other complementizers. Its use in these languages is subject to considerable comparative discussion in Rice 1989 and Potter 1997. Part of what I want to do here is add to that growing comparative discussion and, like Jung 2002, provide a focus on a particular language.

* This research is supported by SSHRC grant 410-2003-1514 'Dogrib Textual Studies' and funding from the Office of the Vice-President (Research) and the Dean of Humanities, University of Victoria. My attention was first drawn to the subject matter several years ago through collaborative research with Mary Siemens funded by the Dogrib Divisional Board of Education and I am very grateful to her for this. Mary has provided insight and confirmed some observations in recent discussions. I am appreciative of audience members in Brandon, Victoria, and Arcata, especially Shanley Allen, Rose-Marie Déchaine, Patrick Moore, Dagmar Jung, Henry Davis, Ted Fernald, Victor Golla, Gary Holton, Alik Marinakis, and Mark Riepl. Thanks to Christel Bodenbender, Sharon Hargus, Rosa Mantla, Joseph Martel, Philip Rabesca, Keren Rice, and Mary Koyina Richardson for discussion. All errors are my responsibility.

I begin by showing a number of examples from Navajo, Western Apache, and Slave with the morpheme used as a complementizer.

In the sentence from Navajo, we see an example of "... the temporal/conditional constructions where an initial subordinate clause is under the scope of the complementizer enclitic *-go*" (Willie 1991:132).¹

- (1) **Navajo**
 Mą'ıı hastııı yııııtsąągo dah dııłwod.
coyote man 3O.3S.see-GU 3S.start to run
 'When the coyote saw the man it started to run'
 (Young and Morgan 2000 [1948]:302)

The Western Apache example (2) is similar:

- (2) **Western Apache**
 Adąądą' ní'ıthush go o'ı'ąą nı'.
yesterday 3s.imp.sleep GU 3s.pf.go Past
 'Yesterday he slept all day'
 [Yesterday, while he was sleeping, the sun set.] (Potter 1997:48)

A parallel Slave example is given in (3).

- (3) **Slave**
 Ts'ódanı hehlı gú ɾabá lanıwe.
child 1s.be GU father 3S.pf.die
 'My dad died when I was a child' (Rice 1989:1256)

The examples in (4)-(8) illustrate how this form is used in similar ways in adverbial subordination in Koyukon, Dëne Sųhné, Dakelh,² Tsuut'ina, and Hupa.³ Note the variety of forms that the morpheme takes.

- (4) **Koyukon**
 No'eedeyo hu k'edenaadletl'ees.
3S.return GU 3S.bell ring
 'The bell rang just about the time he came home'
 (Jetté and Jones 2000:262)

¹ In the glosses I identify the morpheme in question as *-GU*. Spellings are taken from the original sources; in many cases I have added the glosses. Athabascan languages typically exhibit the characteristics of head-final languages.

² Morice (1932:196, § 469) identifies two subordinating particles in Dakelh, *hwê* and *hoh*. I am unable to understand fully the distinction that Morice draws between them. Either of them is plausibly a reflex of PA *Guʔ. Morice's *hwê* appears to correspond to *whe* in the Central Carrier Bilingual Dictionary (Carrier Dictionary Committee 1974).

³ Many thanks to Victor Golla for invaluable assistance with the Hupa examples.

- (5) **Dëne Sūliné**
 Ts'enidhër n̄j -ú náthestj k'j.
1sS.wake up Past GU 1sS.dream Emphasis
 'As I woke up it was only a dream' (Cook 1992:468)
- (6) **Dakelh**
 Ntughálh whe kw'uts'uzda yúzgooh.
3S.trip GU chair 3S.grab
 'While tripping he grabs the chair'
 (Carrier Dictionary Committee 1974:179)
- (7) **Tsuut'ina**
 nád̄ic̄icá-gù gh̄is̄í
I-go-home-GU I-saw him
 'When I went home, I saw him' (Cook 1984:92)
- (8) **Hupa**
 Na-ldidaht-x^w maʔa-diloyʔ -neʔ.
back.2sS.run-GU 3OO.ReflO.2sS.tie FutOblig
 'On running back home you must tie yourself to it'
 (Golla and O'Neill eds. 2001:455)

These examples taken together support the claim that the morpheme has a source in Proto-Athabaskan, as it occurs in languages from Alaska eastward to Hudson Bay and southward through languages in British Columbia and Alberta, as well as in the Apachean and Pacific Coast branches of the family.⁴

2 The complementizer *Guʔ in Dogrib: Form

Dogrib has a morpheme that I will argue is cognate with the forms reviewed in other languages above: it has functions expected from comparative studies, although its shape is quite distinctively different from what we have seen. It appears as a suffix and, lacking a consonant, takes the shape of a low-tone copy of the final vowel of the word it is affixed to. We see this in the example below, where the morpheme appears as a suffix to the verb *goaʔj*, 'he saw them'.⁵

⁴ Thanks to Sharon Hargus for pointing out Jeff Leer's reconstruction of this morpheme, *-qu' (~ *-qu-) and for his citation of Koyukon *da'nəx'-xu* 'four places (areas), four directions' showing its use as an adverb formative (Leer to appear). As Sharon points out, if there are glottalized and non-glottalized variants as Leer indicates, the reflexes shown in (1)-(8) and in Dogrib are all compatible with the proto-form(s). I have reconstructed initial *G rather than *q on the basis of the many modern languages with /g/ reflexes and the absence of languages with /q/ or /k/.

⁵ Many of the Dogrib examples in this paper are cited from a translation of the New Testament (Dogrib [Bible] Translation Committee 2003). Mary Siemens was the principal writer on this landmark project. The published data reported in this paper will be supplemented through elicitation at the next stage of the research.

- (9) Paul eyi dɔ goaʔj] ekò [...]
that person 3pO.3S.pf.see-GU then

Nòhtsj ts'ò masi di.
God to thank you 3S.imp.say
 'When Paul saw those people [...] he said thanks to God'
 'At the sight of these men Paul thanked God ...'
 (LS glosses; LS translation; NIV translation)

(Dogrib Translation Committee: Acts 28:15)

The example in (10) shows the identical pattern, with the reflex of *Guʔ affixed to the verb *nàniwo* 'he was thinking'. Mary Siemens (personal communication) observes a preference for the use of the connective *ekò* 'then' in the main clause of temporal expressions like these.⁶

- (10) Peter jtaà nàniwoò ekò Yedàyeh
still 3S.imp.think-GU then spirit

Nezj] yets'ò hadi, ...
good 3.to 3S.imp.say
 'As Peter was still thinking, then the Holy Spirit said to him, ...'
 'While Peter was still thinking [...], the Spirit said to him, ...'
 (LS glosses; LS translation; NIV translation)

(Dogrib Translation Committee: Acts10:19)

We can observe from (3) that the Slave reflex of *Guʔ is *gú*. How does it happen that the same morpheme takes such apparently different forms in Dogrib and its neighbour to the west, Slave?

Émile Petitot, after his time in northwestern Canada in the 1860s and 1870s, published transcriptions of a small number of Dogrib stories, together with word-by-word glosses (1888) and free translations (1886). These transcriptions provide evidence that the morpheme at that time had the shape /gu/. Petitot spelled it <gu>, and there is no reason to believe that its phonemic shape would be otherwise, though as Petitot did not observe or record tone at all, we can't know anything about its tone. Below I reproduce two examples from Petitot 1888. They are shown with my retranscription, and a number of translations.

- | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| (11) | Ejitta | ttsékhé | khittcha | ttsen | déya |
| | Ezhit'à | ts'èke | kich'à | ts'è | dèya |
| | <i>therefore</i> | <i>woman</i> | <i>3p-from</i> | <i>to</i> | <i>3S.pf.leave</i> |
| | la, étsegu, | tchon | kota | xhé, ... | |
| | là, etse gù, | chɔ | goda | xè, ... | |
| | <i>Evid 3S.cry-GU</i> | <i>3S.pregnant</i> | | <i>with</i> | |

⁶ See Scollon 1985 for insightful discussion of the cognate construction in Dëne Sùliné (also known as Chipewyan).

'So the woman went [to] away from them, crying, and also pregnant.'
 'The woman left the camp in great sorrow, for she was pregnant.'
 'Elle s'installa donc loin du pays de ses pères, pleurant et portant dans son sein le fruit de ses amours avec l'Ennemi-Chien qui l'avait séduite' (Petitot 1888:471; LS retranscription; LS glosses based on Petitot 1888; LS translation; translation from GNWT 1976:18, line 28; Petitot 1886:313)

In (11), <gu> is affixed to the verb *etse* 'she is crying' and the word is translated by Petitot as "pleurant" [crying]. In (12) <gu> is affixed to a copular verb with the complement 'ashamed of them'.

- (12) Khipa uya enligu khipon yétiyeptpon kpuli, ...
 Kigha ùya ɛl-gù kigho yediyètq kùli, ...
3p.for ashamed 3S.be-GU 3p.of 3S.love but
 'although she was ashamed of them, but she loved them, ...'
 'She was ashamed of them and yet she loved them at the same time'
 'Honteuse de son fruit, mais cependant amoureuse de sa progéniture, ...'
 (Petitot 1888:471; LS retranscription; LS glosses based on Petitot 1888; LS translation; translation from GNWT 1976:18, line 30; Petitot 1886:313f)

These examples show temporal simultaneity between the subordinate and main clauses, a sense relation also found in the present-day examples given earlier.

By my hypothesis, the form of the Dogrib complementizer has changed as shown in (13).⁷

- (13) gù > (h)ù > ì > marked-tone vowel

The first stage can also be observed in some dialects of Slave and in Dëne Sùliné, the language bordering Dogrib to the east (see (5) and examples to follow). The second stage represents a general process in Dogrib: the nineteenth century /u/ phoneme merged with /i/ at some time. The third stage, investigated by Marinakis 2003a, 2003b, is a general process in suffixes: the only vowel-initial suffix with an independent place of articulation has the low vowel /a/. The other suffixes assimilate to the vowel of the base.

We will examine the stages shown in (13) one at a time starting with the first. The idea that Dogrib gù could lose its initial consonant is supported by examples (14)-(15) from the Assumption dialect of Slave.⁸

⁷ I have retranscribed Petitot's <gu> as gù, with marked tone. I justify this by the fact that Slave and Dëne Sùliné show marked-tone vowels, as does the Dogrib reflex of today. Marked tone is low in Dogrib and high in Slave and Dëne Sùliné, all of these regular developments of vowel constriction in Proto-Athabaskan. Note that accents on vowels in Petitot's work signal contrasts in vowel quality, not tone.

⁸ I do not have an account of the final <h> on the reflex of *Gu? in Assumption Slave.

- (14) Xoniá wozen úh, "Hín, hín!" éhdi úh etse.
suddenly dark GU sob sob 3S.said GU 3S.cried
 '[The younger sister] began crying as darkness came'
 (Dene Wodih Society:103;3)
- (15) "Seyéh, sa k'ésín udedinghelá," éhdi úh, sa
Is.in-law sun towards 2sS.roll self over 3S.said GU sun
 k'ésín edit'e úh xondéhtl'a.
towards 3S.flex GU suddenly.3S.run off
 "'Brother-in-law, roll in the direction of the sun," Wolf cried.
 Wolverine flexed and flipped himself over, then quickly ran off.'
 (Dene Wodih Society:117; 10)

and (16)-(17) from Dëne Sų́líné.⁹

- (16) Nátēi řeyi ghēřj -ú řadi, "Ghwałts'í řekúhú. ..."
prophet that 3S.pf.see GU 3S.say 3S.opt.blow then
 "The prophet having seen that said, "Let it blow now! ..."
 (Li and Scollon:381; 380)
- (17) řetthén dza-tc'éré hų́thagh -ú "Sų́naghj ..."
caribou leg-tendon she-bite GU my-grandson
 'Having caught the caribou's leg tendon in her teeth [she said], "My
 grandson ..."
 (Scollon 1985:126)

In both of these languages the form is vowel-initial.¹⁰ As Dogrib is the third member of this close-knit group, it is plausible to propose a similar change for it. Dogrib /u/ > /i/ can be observed in the following cognate sets, adapted from Ackroyd 1976.

(18)	Slave	Dogrib	Dëne Sų́líné	<i>gloss</i>
	tu	ti	tu	water
	ts'u	ts'i	ts'u	spruce
	ndu	di	nu	island
	t'uh	t'ih	t'uł	string

From these facts I conclude that the Dogrib reflex of *Gu₂ had the form *ì* at one stage. Currently the suffix has a further reduced specification, appearing as a vocalic mora with marked low tone but without a distinct vowel quality. In this, the suffix behaves like a pair of vocalic suffixes documented by Marinakis 2003a, 2003b. These suffixes, cognate with Slave and Dëne Sų́líné -i

⁹ The examples in (16)-(17) come from texts Li transcribed in 1928. The morpheme has the same shape in Dëne Sų́líné as presently spoken.

¹⁰ Li 1946:420 gives the forms -hú and -ú for this morpheme, glossed 'gerundive suffix'. Rice 1989:1245, 1255 observes that Slave gú sometimes reduces to [hú], [ú], or [o].

'nominalizer' and -é 'possessed noun suffix', in Dogrib lack any specification for vowel quality. We see this in (19), comparing Slave and Dogrib.¹¹

(19)	a.	Slave	Dogrib	<i>gloss</i>
		ʔehdzoi	ʔehdzoo	trap
		dahʔai	dahʔaa	fishhook
	b.	-yatié	-yatii	word (possessed form)
		-lǰé	-lǰii	dog (possessed form)

General patterns in Dogrib phonology as well as patterns of sound change shared with Slave and Dëne Sų́liné thus, in my view, provide strong support for the chain of changes laid out in (13). The <gu> of Petitot's (1888) Dogrib texts occurs in present-day Dogrib as a lengthened vowel with marked tone.

3 The complementizer *Guʔ in Dogrib: Functions

3.1 Adverbial functions

Let's consider now the functions of this morpheme in Dogrib. We have so far only seen its use in creating an adverbial clause understood in temporal relation to the main clause (9)-(12). We will start in this section with the other most widely attested function of the reflexes of *Guʔ in Athabaskan languages-- its use as an *adverbial formative*. In (20) are listed five adverbs, each of which is derived with this suffix.

(20)	di	'now'	(di	'this')
	taà	'three times'	(ta	'three')
	nǰǰdeè	'at last; finally'	(nǰǰdee	'last')
	nezǰǰ	'well'	(nezǰ	it is good')
	ǰhǰǰ	'quietly; slowly'		

(DDBE 1996; see also Marinakis 2003a, b)

For the first four items in (20) the word in brackets serves as the base for the suffix; the last item is inherently an adverb and thus also possibly contains the suffix. Both of these patterns are quite common in Dogrib.

This function is observed in all languages in which the morpheme is attested, including all of the other languages illustrating this paper. In (21) and (22) I show examples of adverb formations from Ahtna and Mattole.

(21)	Ahtna		
	Ts'itǰhu	natxasdaat.	(ts'it'one')
	one-GU	1sS.return	
	'I'll come back soon'		(Kari 1990:225)

¹¹ Slave examples are from Rice 1989.

- (22) **Mattole**
 'isi-tcxjng nitcxé'gw 'a-t'i-n (-tcxjng 'to be bad')
coyote bad-GU he acts
 'The coyote behaves badly' (Li 1930:145; 152)

There isn't space here to explore the range of word classes available for suffixing in adverb formation; some languages allow regular derivations with noun bases, numerals are common bases, as are adjectival forms like Dogrib 'last' and stative verbs like 'to be bad/good'. *Gu? in this function therefore is similar to its role as a complementizer in temporal clauses, in that in both cases adverbial expressions are the result.

Further investigation is required to determine the full range of uses for the complementizer in adverbial clauses. Researchers in other languages have observed uses of *Gu? in purpose clauses, causal clauses, conditional clauses, and locational expressions. There is a type of formation in Dogrib in which the clausal relationship is essentially one of *manner*. Consider (23) and (24):

- (23) Tai toò eyits'q nàke dzə̀ə ts'ò
three nights and two days until
 hadì yaizeh.
3S.say thus-GU 3S.scream
 'He screamed, saying that for three nights and two days'
 'For three nights and two days Raven cawed and squawked'
 (LS glosses; LS translation; DDBE free translation)
 (DDBE n.d. [1997a])

- (24) "... 'Dii dɔ weghɔ dɔ ts'ò goahde-le,'
this man 3.about person to 2pS.talk-neg
 hats'edi nàgets'eehʔɔ ha," ...
1pS.say thus-GU 3pO.1pS.warn Fut
 "'We will warn them, saying, 'Don't talk to people about this man' "'
 "'we must warn these men to speak no longer to anyone in this name."
 (LS glosses; LS translation; NIV translation)
 (Dogrib Translation Committee: Acts 4:17)

While earlier examples involve two acts (or states) expressed in the subordinate and main clause, here there is just a single act described in two ways. That act is represented as an act of saying through forms of the verb *hats'edi* 'say thus' marked as subordinate with the complementizer. It is also given another characterization through the main speech act verb, in (23) *yaizeh* 'he screams' and in (24) *nàgets'eehʔɔ ha* 'we will warn them'. (The Slave example (14) illustrates the same pattern.) The verb of saying, then, appears to describe the manner by which the other speech act is performed. This pattern bears a great resemblance to the use of *Gu? as an adverb formative (20)-(22): in that context

too there is just a single act modified by secondary predication.¹² In subsequent research I would like to investigate the range of this pattern beyond speech acts.

3.2 Argumental functions

In many Athabascan languages clauses marked by *GU₇ may function as sentential arguments of higher verbs. In Dogrib *GU₇-clauses serve as the complements to inchoative and causative verbs.¹³ The examples in (25)-(26) show inchoatives and those in (27)-(28) show causatives. The inchoative and causative verbs are underlined in the examples.

- (25) Edàani nàʔets'eeli yek'èehoèzhà tʔ'axq eki
how *1pS.sew* *3S.pf.know* *after* *just*
- dats'qò nàreeliì ajà.
always *3S.sew-GU* *3S.pf.become*
 'After she learned how to sew, she just [got so that she] sewed all the time'
 (LS glosses, LS translation) (Doris Rabesca 'Semq Dàani Dèezhə / How my mother grew up' in NWT Literacy Council 1995:20)
- (26) Yaika xè k'edaà ajà.
3S.jump up with *3sS.walk around-GU* *3S.pf.become*
 'He jumped to his feet and began to walk'
 (LS glosses; NIV translation)
 (Dogrib Translation Committee:Acts 3:8)

The contexts of (25)-(26) make it plain that the inchoative construction marks a change of state from not doing something to the opposite, or in these cases actually, more strongly, a gained capacity to sew or walk.

¹² Part of the functional motivation for this pattern may come from selectional restrictions. If few speech act verbs permit direct or indirect speech as complements, then the propositional content of warnings, etc., is nicely expressed as in (23)-(24). See Willie 1989 on this point.

¹³ There is textual evidence that *GU₇-clauses may also function as complements to the copula, as in (i). This pattern requires further research. Mary Siemens (personal communication) suggests that the use of the copula relates to the nature of the evidence for the event being described.

- (i) ... ɟdèe googhoo ta ts'q ɟk'qòdqò hòt'ò
 back *thicket* *in* *from* *medicine man* *loud*
- ezeè hòt'e, ...
3S.shout-GU *3S.be*
 'Back from in among the thick bushes the medicine man was shouting loud'
 '... the medicine man's shouts echoed through the bush behind them'
 (LS glosses; LS translation; DDBE free translation) (DDBE n.d. [1997b])

- (27) Yatı eyi-le xàra k'èè gogedeè
language other various according to 3pS.imp.speak-GU

agòlà.

3pO.3sS.pf.cause

'He caused them to speak in various other languages'

(LS glosses; LS translation) (Dogrib Translation Committee: Acts 2:4)

- (28) Dajràa eyits'ò ełajwo t'àxqò wechekeè
3S.pf.suffer and 3S.pf.die after 3.follower

gıarjı

3sO.3sS.pf.see-GU

adìdlà.

3S.pf.cause self

'After his suffering and death, he caused his followers to see him'

'After his suffering, he showed himself to these men'

(LS glosses; LS translation; NIV translation)

(Dogrib Translation Committee: Acts 1:3)

The causative verb *ats'ele* seen here is grammatically transitive, taking the causer and the causee as its subject and direct object. The verb expressing the caused event is marked by *Gu?.¹⁴

3.3 Secondary predication

The notion of *secondary predication* allows us to unify the inchoative and causative functions of *Gu? with the adverbial uses. What we see in all instances is an event expressed in the main clause that is to be evaluated in terms of its relation to another predicate, marked by *Gu?.

4 The functions of *Gu? across Athabaskan and across time

In this part of the paper I would like to speculate about how the two functions of *Gu? that are universally found in the languages of the family are related to its other functions. I assume that these two functions, adverbial complementizer for subordinate temporal clauses and adverb suffix, are the most basic and perhaps most ancient uses.

4.1 Developments from the temporal function

As temporal relations are easily reconstructed along dimensions of cause and effect or contingency, so across Athabaskan languages *Gu?-adverbial clauses express a range of different types of adverbial relations, including causal clauses, purpose clauses, and conditionals (29)-(31).

¹⁴ The periphrastic causative constructions in Athabaskan languages merit full study. Note that in (28) the literal translation goes something like 'he caused himself his followers seeing him', as the causative verb is marked as reflexive.

(29) **Causal clause**

Dakelh

Keyit nuyá whe oot'é'danat.
barefoot 3S.walk GU 3S.be jabbed
'Because of going barefooted he now has a splinter'

(Carrier Dictionary Committee 1974:179)

Ella nusthêlyaz khwen petk'a yek'eînlez hwe
then little-wolverine fire against-them urinated-on-it GU

nainîno.

it-extinguished

'[Little Wolverine] then urinated on the fire and thereby put it out'
(Morice2:530)

Navajo

Mary shaaníyáago Jáan bił hózhó.
1sO.3S.pf.come-GU 3.with 3.be happy
'Because Mary came to see me, John is happy'
(Schauber 1979:32)

(30) **Purpose clause**

Tsuut'ina

ṭhík'í xáyíyá-là ̣icxùt-gù
one went-out scrape-GU
'One (of them) went out in order to scrape.'
(Cook 1984:37)

ṃits'ikánidàt-gù ts'idáátsà-rà isdínì
him-to-you-lie-GU girl-it-is you-say
'To tell him a lie, say "it's a girl" to him.'
(Cook 1984:92)

(31) **Conditional clause**

Navajo

Díníyáa = go shídó' dooleet.
2-go-GU I=too will
'If you go, I will go too'
(Willie 1991:133)

Western Apache

Hastin isáá áyíllaa yúgo shí gozhóó doleet.
old man drum 3sS.pf.make ?-GU 1s-to 3S.please Fut
'If the old man made a drum, I'll be happy'
(Potter 1997:118)

These patterns share with temporal clauses the fact that two acts or events are put in relation to each other, with one understood as subordinate to the other.¹⁵

¹⁵ Schauber takes a very broad view of the semantics of Navajo -go, writing:

I therefore propose that, unlike /-í /, /-go / has no semantic content. It is a subordinator creating a logical connection between a dependent proposition and the rest of the sentence. To say that two S's are logically connected is to require

The extension of the use of *GU?-clauses to inchoative and causative constructions clearly relates to both of its more basic functions. Rice (1989) observes for Slave that the inchoative verb permits only adverbial and not nominal complements, such as *yuwe* 'down' in (32).

- (32) Tu yuwe ʔajá.
 water down 3S.pf.become
 'The water went down' (Rice 1989:1223)

It stands to reason that a clausal complement to such a verb might also be marked as an adverbial. In (33)-(35) we see Slave, Tsuut'ina, and Jicarilla Apache examples illustrating the same inchoative and causative construction we see in Dogrib (25)-(28).

- (33) Slave
 ʔit'ó defo gú ʔagodadee. (Hare Slavey)
 leaf 3S.yellow GU 3S.areal.prog.become
 'The leaves are turning yellow' (Rice 1989:1248)

- (34) Tsuut'ina
 k'adà tínáts'ínáh-gù áq'ul'ah
 back one-moves-camp-GU you-make-them
 'Make them move their camps back!' (Cook 1984:117)

- (35) Jicarilla Apache
 hışh̄-q ásh̄jnnla.
 1sS.eat-GU 1sO.2sS.cause
 'You make me eat' (Jung 2002:177)

Although I have not performed independent semantic testing, the inchoative and causative constructions appear to involve two separate events, as the aspectual and tense marking of the two clauses is independent of each other. In (36) from Dogrib, the underlined causative verb is perfective, interpreted as past, and the embedded verb is future:

- (36) Dogrib
 D̄ ɬè gots'q, d̄ hazq̄ xàraa whehtsj h̄t'e
 person one from person all various 3S.pf.make Ar.be
 eyits'q d̄ n̄k'e hazq̄ n̄gedè ha agq̄l̄à.
 and this land all 3pS.live Fut 3pO.3S.pf.cause

some possible-world relationship between them, specifying only that one S is dependent on the other. (Schauber 1979:259)

-go clauses are extremely versatile in Navajo. However, as they are ruled out in certain contexts (see, e.g., Schauber 1979:241), I find this characterization slightly too strong.

'From one person he created all the various people and caused them to [in future] inhabit this whole land'

'From one man he made every nation of men, that they should inhabit the whole earth' (LS glosses; LS translation; NIV translation)
(Dogrib Translation Committee: Acts 17:26)

The fact that inchoative and causative constructions in some languages subcategorize for *Guʔ-clauses supports the idea that *Guʔ marks [secondary] predication rather than merely adverbials. These complements are surely complements and not adjuncts: most commonly adverbials are understood as adjuncts.

In some languages the relationship of the matrix and embedded clauses linked by *Guʔ has been refocussed so that a reading of coordination now also exists. In the Slave example (15) above, the use of úh conveys a strong sense of temporal sequencing rather than a relationship of temporal subordination, and this is reflected in the translation. Midgette 1995 observes that a coordinate reading of -go in Navajo does not necessarily entail a temporal relationship. Please note my emphasis in the quotation below:

[...] this particle can serve either as a temporal connective ("while" or "after," depending on the Mode of the verb form), as a simple connective (equivalent to an atemporal "and"), or as an indication that the verb has the status similar to a participle in English (Young and Morgan 1980, 58-59)." (Midgette 1995:92)

4.2 Developments from the adverb formative function

*Guʔ as a suffix to lexical items creates adverbs, which modify the event of the sentence as secondary predicates. The Dogrib pattern in (23)-(24) involving speech act verbs can be connected with this function, as a form of the verb 'say' modifies the main speech act verb without introducing a second event. This pattern is attested in a number of languages besides Dogrib, including Slave (14), Dëne Sųłiné (37), and Navajo (38).

(37) **Dëne Sųłiné**
[...] n̄ade dzadzj yaíkah h̄eniú ghjz̄t.
last leg.without 3.stick up 3.say-GU 3.call
"The last one is sticking up without a leg", he said, calling out"
(Li and Scollon:79, 78)

(38) **Navajo**
T'áádoo tó baa nich'í ní-go(nóo)
Neg water 3.about 2.be stingy 3.say-GU

John shich'j díłwosh.
Is.to 3.yell
'John was yelling at me, "Don't be stingy with the water"
(Willie 1989:519)

In these examples the reflexes of *Gu? are complementizers taking the verb 'say' and its quotative complement in its scope. While I relate this function of *Gu? semantically to the adverb use in terms of secondary predication, it can also be related to the temporal function: as a number of researchers have noted, two clauses connected by *Gu? can be interpreted as expressing events happening simultaneously. In this pattern two aspects of one event are brought out by separate verbs, with the embedded verb functioning grammatically as a manner adverbial.

Adverbial question words in Athabascan languages are often formed from interrogative verbs (or verb phrases) marked by reflexes of *Gu?. This pattern, widespread in the languages of the family and illustrated in (39)-(41), clearly relates to both of the basic functions of *Gu?.

- (39) **Slave**
 Dádéhdee gú rí ʔawohlee ʔ
how long? GU Q 1sS.make/do
 'How long should I make it?' (Rice 1989:1170)
- (40) **Tsuut'ina**
 xát'áá nìdjà-gù nìghá-àhílá g̃ut̃onánínòʔ-í ʔ
what-for 2sS-did-GU 2s-son-with 3pOO-2sS-moved-back-N
 'Why did you move back to the people with your son?'
 (Cook 1984:109)
- (41) **Western Apache**
 Hagot'úgo hastiin kjh náágole'.
how.3.be-GU old man house 3sS.imp.build
 'By what means/method is the old man building the house?'
 or 'How can it be that the old man is building a house?'
 (Potter 1997:47)

I include these examples in this section rather than the previous one because the secondary predication does not invoke more than a single event.

5 Closing remarks

The complementizer under discussion has an ancient source. In this paper my aim has been to document the morpheme in Dogrib and survey the languages of the Athabascan family to provide a description of some of the functions of the morpheme that have not been the focus of detailed comparative study before. The next step is to link this work with the in-depth studies of Navajo (Schauber 1979), Slave (Rice 1989), and Western Apache (Potter 1997) and their concern with the role of *Gu? as a marker of speaker knowledge or presupposition.

References

- Ackroyd, Lynda. 1976. Proto-Northeastern Athapaskan: Stem-initial consonants and vowels. Ms, University of Toronto.
- Carrier Dictionary Committee. 1974. *Central Carrier Bilingual Dictionary*. Fort St James, BC.
- Cook, E.-D. 1984. *A Sarcee Grammar*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Cook, E.-D. 1992. Polysemy, homophony, and morphemic identity of Chipewyan -ú. *Folia Linguistica* 26: 467-70.
- Dene Wodih Society. 1990. *Wolverine Myths and Legends: Dene Traditions from Northern Alberta*, ed. by Patrick Moore and Angela Wheelock. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dogrib Divisional Board of Education. 1996. *A Dogrib Dictionary*, ed. by Leslie Saxon and Mary Siemens. Rae-Edzo.
- Dogrib Divisional Board of Education. n.d. [1997a] *Dàani Tatsò Weèhdà Dikòdeewò / How Raven Lost His Beak*, told by David Chocolate, ed. by Rosa Mantla and Mary Siemens. Rae-Edzo: Dogrib Divisional Board of Education. [unpaginated]
- Dogrib Divisional Board of Education. n.d. [1997b] *Dàani Hozì Hòlì eyits'ò Dàani Weyiits'atfæ Wegodì Hòlì / The Creation of the Barren Lands and the Couple Inside the Mountains*, told by Vital Thomas, ed. by Rosa Mantla and Mary Siemens. Rae-Edzo: Dogrib Divisional Board of Education. [unpaginated]
- Dogrib Translation Committee. 2003. *Nòhtsì Njht'è, Zezì wegòhtì t'axòò* [translation of the *New Testament*]. Toronto: Canadian Bible Society.
- Golla, Victor and Sean O'Neill. 2001. *The Collected Works of Edward Sapir XIV: Northwest California Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Government of the Northwest Territories. 1976. *The Book of Dene*. Department of Education, Yellowknife, NWT. [Translation of parts of Petitot 1886.]
- Jetté, Jules and Eliza Jones. 2000. *Koyukon Athabaskan Dictionary*, ed. by James Kari. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center.
- Jung, Dagmar. 2002. Clause combining in Apache. *Problems of Polysynthesis*, ed. by Nicholas Evans and Hans-Jürgen Sasse. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 167-183.
- Kari, James. 1990. *Ahtna Athabaskan Dictionary*. Fairbanks: ANLC.
- Leer, Jeff. In press. How stress shapes the stem-suffix complex in Athabaskan. *Athabaskan Prosody*, ed. by Sharon Hargus and Keren Rice. John Benjamins.
- Li Fang-Kuei. 1930. *Mattole, an Athabaskan Language*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Li Fang-Kuei. 1946. Chipewyan. In Harry Hoijer (ed.), *Linguistic Structures of Native America*. New York: Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology. 398-423.
- Li Fang-Kuei and Ron Scollon. 1977. *Chipewyan Texts*. Academica Sinica, Taiwan.
- Marinakakis, Alikì. 2003a. Resisting simple structure: the case of the diminutive suffix in Dogrib. Paper presented at the Workshop on Grammatical

- Structure in the Indigenous Languages of the North/West. University of Victoria, February 2003.
- Marinak, Alik. 2003b. *Dogrib syllable structure*. Master's thesis, University of Victoria. In preparation.
- Midgette, Sally. 1995. *The Navajo Progressive in Discourse*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Morice, Adrian G. 1932. *The Carrier Language*. Collection Internationale de Monographs Linguistiques, Anthropos, vol. 9. Vienna. [2 volumes]
- Northwest Territories Literacy Council. 1995. *Rosa Hoghàseèhtò Eyts'ò Behchokò-Edzò Gots'ò Godì / Learning from Rosa and Other Stories from Rae-Edzo*. Yellowknife.
- Petitot, Émile. 1886. *Traditions indiennes du Canada nord-ouest*. Paris : Maisonneuve et C. Leclerc.
- Petitot, Émile. 1888. *Traditions indiennes du Canada nord-ouest: Textes originaux & traduction littérale*. Alençon: E. Renaut-de Broise.
- Potter, Brian. 1997. Wh/Indefinites and the Structure of the Clause in Western Apache. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Rice, Keren. 1989. *A Grammar of Slave*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schauber, Ellen. 1979. *The Syntax and Semantics of Questions in Navajo*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Scollon, Ronald. 1985. The sequencing of clauses in Chipewyan narrative. *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*, ed. by Johanna Nichols and Anthony C. Woodbury. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 113-131.
- Willie, MaryAnn. 1989. A comparison of indirect speech constructions in two Athabaskan languages. *Proceedings of the Fourth Meeting of the Pacific Linguistics Conference*, ed. by R. Carlson, S. Delancey, S. Gildea, D. Payne, and A. Saxena. Eugene: Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon. 507-520.
- Willie, MaryAnn. 1991. Navajo Pronouns and Obviation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Young, Robert W. and William Morgan. 1980. *The Navajo Language* [first edition]. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Young, Robert W. and William Morgan. 2000 [1948]. The function and signification of certain Navaho particles. *The Athabaskan Languages: Perspectives on a Native American Language Family*, ed. by T. B. Fernald and P. R. Platero. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 288-317.