

Chapter 27

VOICE and ROLE: Kutenai

1. *Introduction*

In this chapter, we examine Kutenai, a language that is restricted to expressing one PROPOSITIONAL ROLE. The language has a larger inventory of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES, but only one can appear in any given utterance. The non-ROLE EVENT-PARTICIPANT relationships will show the morphosyntax and the semantics of a MARGINAL PARTICIPANT.

2. *Kutenai*¹

Morgan (1991.2-3)

Kutenai is spoken in Eastern British Columbia in Canada, and in Northwestern Montana, and Northern Idaho in the United States. The total number of Kutenai people has increased dramatically in recent years, but the number of Kutenai speakers has declined steadily since about 1950. While the total number of Kutenai people may be well over a thousand, the number of fluent speakers of the language at the present time [1991] is almost certainly less than three hundred

Kutenai has a potential historical connection both with the Salishan languages and with the Algonquian family of languages. Morgan (1980 and 1991.494-499) argues for a genetic relationship between Salishan and Kutenai, citing:

... some 129 probable cognate sets which yield a set of sound correspondences which can most easily be explained with the hypothesis that there was once a protolanguage, called Proto-Kootenay-Salishan ... (1980.1)

¹ *Kutenai*, Morgan (1991.1) writes:

The name 'Kutenai', as a word in the English language, has been spelled some forty different ways since the word first appeared in print in 1820 ... The spelling 'Kootenai' is used in Montana and Idaho for geographical and tribal designations, the spelling 'Kootenay' is used in British Columbia, where a large part of the province, a major national park, geographical features, a native organization, and many commercial enterprises bear the name, while the third current spelling 'Kutenai' has been used in scholarly works, and, most recently, Kutenai people on both sides of the international border have begun to use this last spelling as an international spelling of the name

Dryer (1991a.184) notes that Kutenai is “generally viewed as a language, isolate”, but elsewhere (1992.153, 155) suggests a relation with Algonquian:

Kutenai possesses an obviative system that bears striking resemblances to the obviation system of Algonquian languages, both at the syntactic level and at the discourse level ... the resemblance seems unlikely to be accidental ... a number of considerations suggest that contact is the more likely explanation for the similarity.

The primary data on Kutenai in the last century come from four sources: Boas (1918 & 1926), Garvin (1947, 1948a, 1948b, 1948c, 1951a, 1951b, 1953, 1954 & 1958), Morgan (1991), and Dryer (1991a, 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1996 & 1997a).²

2.1 *Kutenai Syntax: Word Order & FOCUS*

Dryer (1991a.186) describes Kutenai as “allow[ing] some freedom of [word] order” but its “most common order in direct clauses in VOS.” Morgan concurs. Kutenai word order is “relatively free” (1991.394), and “the most neutral order, in discourse pragmatic terms, is ...VOS” (1991.395).³ The text in Appendix I is consistent with this assessment. A fraction over 97% of the utterances are Verb-initial. Morgan (1991.387) amplifies on Verb-initial or-

V _T O _S	V _T O	V _T S	O _V _T	V _T	V _I S	S _V _I	V _I
5	28	2	1	37	25	3	39

Figure 1: *Word Orders in a Kutenai Text.*

der: “Adverbial particles and derived adverbs occur as constituents of verbal phrases and always precede verbal stems.”

² I find nothing published on Kutenai in the last 15 years. Morgan’s 1991 dissertation was never filed with UMI, and there appears to be a single extant public copy in the library of the University of California at Berkeley. Although Garvin’s 1947 *Kutenai Grammar* is listed in the UMI database, it seems to exist in the USA now only in one copy at Indiana University. And it is currently (March 22, 2011) checked out. Dryer (1997a.51) notes that “The majority of [Garvin 1947] was published with little or no change in a series of articles in IJAL [Garvin 1948a, 1948b, 1948c & 1951a].”

Zúñiga 2006 contains a chapter, based on these same resources, that seeks to place Kutenai in the context of a discussion of “inverse”.

³ In what must be a typo, “VOS” is expanded as “Verbal Phrase - Subject Nominal Phrase - Object Nominal Phrase”.

The heavily Verb-initial numbers suggest that Kutenai will employ sentence-initial position for FOCUS (cf. Chapter 10). None of those who have collected primary data on Kutenai has — as far as I can determine — discussed FOCUS as such. None has described how a *wh*-question is to be answered, and *wh*-questions themselves are mentioned only in passing.⁴ In this regard, Morgan (1991:394) observes that “Phrases representing important or newsworthy new information in a discourse occur in initial position in a clause ... Phrases representing more established information appear later in a clause.” The one OV utterance in the text of Appendix I is sentence (48):

- (47) $t_1n\text{-}a\acute{x}\acute{a}m\text{-}ne\cdot$ $a_a'kut.\dot{\iota}a\text{-}\acute{\iota}s\text{-}e\cdot s$ $ne_i\text{-}s$
 [going.into-go-IND tent-POSS-OBV that-OBV
 $nas\acute{o}_u k^ue\cdot n\text{-}s$ ne_i $n\acute{u}tst\acute{a}ha\dot{\iota}$.
 chief-OBV the youth]
 ‘The youth entered the chief’s tent.’

- (48) $t\dot{\iota}namu.\text{-}\acute{\iota}s\text{-}e\cdot s$
 [old.woman-POSS-OBV]

⁴ There is one passage in Garvin 1954 that comes tantalizingly close to providing an example of a *wh*-question and its answer. I have not altered Garvin’s transcriptions, segmentations, and glosses, and I have used his numbering:

- (29) $qapsin$ tax $k\text{-}in\text{-}s\dot{\iota}a\cdot tiy\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}?\dot{\iota}k$
 [What then have-you-been-eating]
 ‘What is it that you have been eating’

The answer to (29), in (33):

- (33) $ne\cdot$ $\#ci\dot{\iota}miyit$ $hu\text{-}n\text{-}?\dot{\iota}k\text{-}ne\cdot$ $\dot{\iota}awuya\dot{\iota}$ $ne\cdot$ $k\text{-}u\text{-}\dot{\iota}a\text{-}wam$
 [The when-it-was-night I-ate huckleberries the I-coming-back]
 ‘Last night I ate huckleberries on my way back’

is postponed by (30), (31), and (32), so that (33) finally loses the sense of being an answer to (29). It merely confirms the intervening three utterances:

- (30) $\#qapsqaqa?\text{-}n\cdot$ $in\text{-}?\dot{\iota}k\text{-}ne\cdot$ $\dot{\iota}awuya\dot{\iota}$
 [It-seems you-have-been-eating huckleberries]
 ‘It looks like you have been eating huckleberries.’
- (31) $\#sq\dot{a}\cdot\dot{\iota}q?a\dot{\iota}qaqa?\text{-}ne\cdot$ $?a\cdot q?una?\text{-}ne\cdot s$
 [Are-all-over-there your-teeth]
 ‘It’s all over your teeth.’
- (32) $\#qaqa?\text{-}ne\cdot$
 [That-is-so]
 ‘That’s right.’

n'-uk!uɬ-q!akpakit-ɣó_u-ne·.
 PRED-be.one-kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
 'At once he killed the chief's wives.'

The three SV_I utterances are (79), (109a), and (137a). They are essentially the same utterance, differing only in the lexical choice of the last word:

- (79) *ne_i-s aɬ-tɬnamú'-e·s*
 [the-OBV PL-old.woman-POSS
 n'-uk!uɬ-in·qapták-s-e· wɬma·ɬ-s.
 PRED-be.one-become-OBV.SUBJ-IND rattlesnake-OBV]
 'His wives at once became rattlesnakes,'

Garvin's (1954) record of a conversation among three Kutenai speakers has several examples that seem amenable to interpretation as FOCUS (320):⁶

- (75) *sa'n k-#-amkuq'uqo·ɬ 'at #-sɬà·twismakn-iɬi-k*
 [but being-black indeed are-walking-around-there]
 'But the colored people are walking around there.'

Sa'n 'but' accompanies other examples of FOCUS in (124), (149) and (224):

- (124) *sa'n qo· #-'it'wumɬa'as sa'n*
 [but there where-it-is-twelve but
 #-cmak'iɬɬu'-ne· qapsin k-#-'itkin-mu-ɬ
 there-was-nothing-at-all something being-done-with]
 'But over at twelve nothing could be done about it.'

- (149) *sa'n se·munana #-qaqaɬ'-uk'iɬanuqk-ne·*
 [but little-Simon is-the-only-one-who-is-bald]
 'But Little Simon is the only one who is bald.'

- (224) *sa'n ka·min 'at'un-n-'aqaɬɬitk-'am-ci't-e·*
 [but myself indeed I-make-it-nothing-any-more]
 'As for me, I just don't care any more.'

⁵ In his first publication on Kutenai (1991a:192 et passim), Dryer employs the abbreviation OBV.SUBJ for the verbal suffix *-s*. I have generalized that label in this chapter.

⁶ I have, by and large, retained Garvin's segmentation and glosses.

The alternative content that *sa'n* introduces could easily be FOCUS. But not all occurrences of *sa'n* elicit non-Verbal FOCUS. In (273), it seems that it is the EVENT that is FOCUSED, and FOCUS appears without *sa'n* in (129):

- (273) *sa'n* *#-'uac-ne·* *ni'-s* *k-#-qanałqayaqana*
 [but they-are-laughing the walking-past]
 'But those people walking by are laughing.'

- (129) *ka·miłnana* *#-sł-q'apił'isin* *qapsin-s*
 [Little-Camille must-have-owned-all something]
 'Campbell must own everything.'

2.2 Kutenai Syntax: Propositional Organization

First and second person PARTICIPANTS are indicated by proclitics, prefixes or suffixes (Dryer 1991a.187):

- (1) (a) *hu* *çxa-ni*
 [1ST.PERSON talk-IND]
 'I talked'
- (b) *hu* *çxa-nała'-ni*
 [1ST.PERSON talk-PLURAL-IND]
 'We talked'
- (2) (a) *hin* *çxa-ni*
 [2ND.PERSON talk-IND]
 'You talked'
- (b) *hin* *çxa-kił-ni*
 [2ND.PERSON talk-PLURAL-IND]
 'You (pl) talked'

The same persons as PATIENTS are suffixes (Dryer 1991a.188-189):

- (3) (a) *hu* *wu·kat-is-ni*
 [1ST.PERSON see-2ND.PERSON-IND]
 'I saw you (sg.)'

- (b) hu wu·kat-is-kiʔ-ni
[1ST.PERSON see-2ND.PERSON-2ND.PERSON.PL-IND]
'I saw you (pl.)'
- (c) hu wu·kat-awas-ni
[1ST.PERSON see-1ST.PERSON.PL/2ND.PERSON-IND]
'We saw you (sg. or pl.)'
- (4) (b) hin wu·kat-ap-ni
[2ND.PERSON see-1ST.PERSON-IND]
'You (sg.) saw me'
- (b) hin wu·kat-ap-kiʔ-ni
[2ND.PERSON see-1ST.PERSON-2ND.PERSON.PL-IND]
'You (pl.) saw me'
- (c) hin wu·kat-awas-ni
[2ND.PERSON see-1ST.PERSON.PL-IND]
'You (sg. or pl.) saw us'

Third-person PARTICIPANTS in a Kutenai utterance may be expressed by a Noun or by elision (Dryer 1991a.187, 188).

- (5) (a) hu wu·kat-i
[1ST.PERSON see-IND]
'I saw him/her/them'
- (b) hu wu·kat-aʔa'-i
[1ST.PERSON see-1ST.PERSON.PL-IND]
'We saw him/her/them'
- (c) wu·kat-ap-ni
[see-1ST.PERSON-IND]
'He/She/They saw me'
- (d) wu·kat-awas-ni
[see-1ST.PERSON.PL-IND]
'He/She/They saw us'

- (6) (a) hin wu·kat-i
 [2ND.PERSON see-IND]
 ‘You saw him/her/them’
- (b) hin wu·kat-kił-ni
 [2ND.PERSON see-2ND.PERSON.PL-IND]
 ‘You (pl.) saw him/her/them’
- (c) wu·kat-is-ni
 [see-2ND.PERSON-IND]
 ‘He/She/They saw you (pl.)’
- (d) wu·kat-is-kił-ni
 [see-2ND.PERSON-2ND.PERSON.PL-IND]
 ‘He/She/They saw you (pl.)’

When a Noun expresses (or not) the Third Person, the contrast with Intransitives is (Dryer 1996.6-7):

- (7) (a) ɕxa-ni ni’ nasu’kin
 [talk-IND the chief]
 ‘The chief talked’
- (b) ɕxa-ni
 [talk-IND]
 ‘He/She/They talked’

and with Transitives, it is (Dryer 1992.121)

- (8) wu·kat-i pałkiy-s titqat’
 [see-IND woman-OBV man]
 ‘The man saw the woman’

and from Appendix I:

- (25) n’-uk!uł’-ıłwá-ne· łúpkus.
 [PRED- be.one-shoot-IND buffalo.cow-OBV]
 ‘He killed a cow.’

- (62) tsuk^uát-e· átsu-s.
 [take-IND dish-OBV]
 ‘She took a dish.’

Examples of Transitive Verbs in which the PATIENT is elided, but not the AGENT are rare⁷ (Dryer 1991a.190):

- (9) wu·kat-i małi
 [see-IND Mary]
 ‘Mary saw it’

In (7) - (9) and (25) & (62) , Nouns which appear to be either A or S have no mark on them while Nouns that appear to function as PATIENTS have a suffix -s. The zero mark is now commonly (Dryer 1992.119, 1996.13 & 1997.33 and Morgan 1991.385) labeled the Proximate form.⁸ The -s, without dissension, is called the Obviative (Boas 1926.93ff., Garvin 1948c.178, 1951b & 1958, and Dryer 1996.13ff.). An additional contrast between the two — besides their shapes and their apparent uses in (7) - (9), (25) & (62) — is this (Dryer 1994.71, 1996.14 & 1997.33): “...there can be no more than one

⁷ Dryer (1991a.190) adds about (9) that

... it is acceptable on a reading ‘Mary saw it ... [(9)] is judged out of context to be unacceptable on a reading ‘Mary saw him’

And again (Dryer 1997a.39):

There is in general a preference in any situation in which one nominal involves an overt noun and the other pronominal for the pronominal one to be the one chosen as proximate.

We will return to this asymmetry below.

⁸ Boas (1926.95 et passim) and Garvin (1958.1 et passim) used the label ‘Absolute’. Dryer’s (1996.13) reason for the terminological substitution is the following:

Because of the striking grammatical and pragmatic parallelism between these two classes and two classes in Algonquian languages ..., I will employ the terms used by Algonquianists, *proximate* and *obviative*

Garvin (1951b.212), however, concludes:

L’obviation en Kutenai constitue donc un cas tout à fait différent de l’obviation, ou quatrième personne, en Algonquin.

proximate per sentence”⁹ Obviatives, however, have no such limitation (Garvin 1954.326):

- (222) *ni-s* *qasna-nmiyit-s* *ni’-s* *qak-e* *c*
 [the-OBV -day-OBV the-OBV say-IND and
 ʔa-kqa-c-s *kanùkqo-k’ʔaniki-s* *ka-nmiyit-s* *paʔ*
 UNREAL-run-INV freight.train-OBV -day-OBV really
 snàʔʔaqa-c-s-e *ni’-s* *nakùqʔo-k’ʔaniki-s*
 wasn’t.running.yet-INV-IND the-OBV freight.train-OBV]
 ‘The next day, he said, the freights would run again, but the next day
 the freight still wasn’t running.’

Although the *-s* that appears on *paʔkiy-s* in (8), *ʔúpku-s* in (25), and *átsu-s* in (62) seems at first blush to be a marker of PATIENTS, the Obviative has a range of other uses (as suggested by [222]):

As Recipients —

- (10) ... *c* *k-’upxa-ce-t* *ni-’s* *paʔke-s*
 [... and SUBJ.MARKER-see-CAUSATIVE the-OBV woman-OBV
 ni-’s *ʔika-punana-s*
 the-OBV jacket-OBV]
 ‘... and as he showed the woman the jacket’ (Garvin 1958.16)

As Instruments —

- (11) *n’-aku-mu-ʔ-is-ni* *ʕukutiyaʔ-s*
 [PRED-stab-INSTRUMENT-PASS-OBV.SUBJ-IND spear-OBV]
 ‘It got stabbed with a spear’ (Morgan 1991.401)

As Locatives —

- (92) *kanmiyit*
 [when.it.was.the.next.day
 qa·kiʔ-ʔa-upxa-me·k
 REMOTE.PAST-REPETITIVE-see-REFLEXIVIZER-REFLEXIVE

⁹ The restriction of one-Proximate-per-clause must be qualified in some ways. Cf. especially section 2.3.2.3.

wusiya·t-s

sweathouse-OBV]

‘The next day he sobered up in a sweathouse’ (Garvin 1954.320)

- (184) *ta-wa·t’uqo·kax-e· kanùqko·k’aniki-s*
 [REVERSIVE-come.back-IND freight.train-OBV]
 ‘He came back on a freight train.’ (Garvin 1954.324)

- (12) *’a·kwo·k·i’it-s ’at qàki·t-k·tunis-ne· ka-titu*
 [mountain-OBV indeed was-hunting-IND my-father]
 ‘My father was hunting in the hills’ (Garvin 1958.10)

- (13) *c’ina·t-wuknax-ne· tãq’cqamna-s ni-’s tawat’inak-s*
 [start.hunt-IND game-OBV the-OBV beyond.Rockies.OBV]
 ‘... he started hunting game beyond the Rockies’ (Garvin 1958.16)

As Temporals —

- (24) *kka-nmíyt-s wú·t·na·m-s mıṭxa-ne· ṭúkp̣u-s*
 [following-day-OBV early-OBV shoot-IND buffalo.cow-OBV
ne_i nu·t’á-qana. Appendix I
 that old.man-husband]
 ‘Early the next day the old man shot a buffalo cow.’

- (151) *ṭ-awick’apa·ṭe·xa ná·s*
 [OPTATIVE-listen now-OBV]
 ‘He should be listening now’ (Garvin 1954.322-323)

- (238) *hu-n’upx-ne· kaq’anxo· ni’-s k-ci·ṭmiyt-s*
 [I-see-IND policeman the-OBV being-night-OBV]
 ‘I saw a policeman last night.’ (Garvin 1954.326-327)

As Comitatives —

- (14) *Skín·ku·ts qsa-máṭ-ne· ne_i-s pálkei-s*
 [coyote go-COMITATIVE-IND the-OBV woman-OBV
n’-in-s-e· ṭṭamú’-e-s
 PRED-be-OBV.SUBJ-IND wife-POSS]
 ‘Coyote went with that woman, his wife’ (Boas 1918.38)

As Coordinates —

- (15) Qa·náḡ-e· *únłá·kt-s*¹⁰ kóʉko.
 [go-IND Chicken Hawk-OBV Toad]
 ‘Chicken Hawk and Toad went along’ (Boas 1918.42)

As Predicate Nominals —

- (105) n’-unqápte·k *k.łáwłá-’s*. Appendix I
 [PRED-become grizzly.bear-OBV]
 ‘He became a grizzly bear.’

Quite expectedly, Garvin (1958.8) observes:

It is impossible to elicit usable translations of isolated forms — the usual response is that it ‘means the same’ as the corresponding absolute form, but ‘is used a little differently’; it is furthermore quite difficult to elicit obviative forms separately, although they regularly appear in context.

In the usages above, there appears to be no alternative to using the mark of the Obviative, and hence, no contrasts to illuminate directly its meaning. The

¹⁰ Boas (1918.325) has *únłá·k* as the entry for ‘chicken hawk’, a form that appears elsewhere in the text from which (15) is taken. The Obviative stem has an unexplained *t*.

The use of PERIPHERAL semantics in the expression of coordination is not so unusual. Alabama (Muskogean) employs the PERIPHERAL suffix *-n* in this way (Davis & Hardy 1987b.94):

- (i) Hełá-k roy-ka-n ibaa-talwa-hchi
 [Heather-K Roy-FOREIGN-N -sing-ACTIVE]
 ‘Heather sings with Roy’

The suffix *-n* has multiple uses as does the Kutenai *-s*, including marking Patients, Locations and Times:

- (ii) Piano-y-o-n pasil-li-ti
 [piano-TOPIC-O-N wipe-I-PROXIMAL]
 ‘I dusted the piano’ (Davis & Hardy 1987b.92)
- (iii) Yusti-fa-n wiika-li-hchi
 [Houston-LOCATIVE-N live-I-ACTIVE]
 ‘I live in Houston’ (Davis & Hardy 1987b.93)
- (iv) Hinaaka-ya-n omp-ok-o
 [today-TOPIC-N eat- ACCOMPLISH]
 Eat right now!’ (Davis & Hardy 1987b.93)

use of the Obviative in expressions of Possession, however, does provide a contrast and therefore some indication of its semantics:¹¹

- (3) tsuk^uát-e· swín-ís-e·s.
 [take-IND daughter-POSS-OBV
 ‘He took his (not his own) daughter.’ Appendix I

- (47) t_in-aḡám-ne· a_a’kut.ḡa-ís-e·s ne_i-s
 [going.into-go-IND tent-POSS-OBV that-OBV
 nasó_ikue·n-s ne_i nūtstáhaḡ.
 chief-OBV that youth]
 ‘The youth entered the chief’s tent.’ Appendix I

In (3) and (47) the object possessed does not belong to the AGENT. It is another’s, and the presence of the Obviative marks that remoteness in contrast with these:

- (50) qa-kí-ḡ-ne· tutú’-e·s núnko tun-aḡám-e·n.
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND father-POSS you going.into-go-IMP]
 ‘He said to his (own) father: “Go in.”’ Appendix I
- (52) Qa-kí-ḡ-ne· má-e·s ké-ḡu aḡḡsmáki-ník!.
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND mother-POSS INTERR-110 ?-people]

¹¹ Dryer (1997a.36) has a somewhat different interpretation of examples such as these. For example, in the following [The glosses are Dryer’s]:

- (i) n’-uquxaki-ni yiḡkimi-ʔis
 [PRED-put.into-IND pot-3POSS]
 ‘He_i [prox] put him_j [obv] into his_j [prox] bucket [obv]’
- (ii) swaʔ n’-umitḡkin-i yiḡkimi-ʔis-is
 [panther PRED-break-IND bucket-3POSS-OBV]
 ‘Panther_i [prox] broke his_j [obv] bucket [obv]’

In (i), the pot belongs to the AGENT, and in (ii), the bucket is not the Panther’s, yet Dryer (1997a.36) provides a single grammatical gloss ‘bucket [obv]’ for the distinct *yiḡkimi-ʔis* and *yiḡkimi-ʔis-is*. The explanation is:

Possessed nouns are not inflected for their own obviation, but are inflected for the obviation of the possessor. Thus, in ... [(i)], the possessed noun bears the third person possessive suffix -ʔis, while in ... [(ii)], the possessed noun bears both the third person possessive suffix and the obviative suffix.

Cf. also Dryer 1996.41.

(135) tsuk^uát-e· á_a‘k!-e·s
[take-IND arrow-POSS]
‘(The youth) took his (own) arrow’

Appendix I

(16) qaki'-ni ma-i k-ɬxaɬ hawasxu'mik
[say-IND Mary SUBORD-FUTURE sing]
'Mary_i said that she_i would sing'

(17) qaki'-ni ma-i k-ɬaquana-s misaɬ-s
[say-IND Mary SUBORD-leave-OBV.SUBJ Mike-OBV]
'Mary_i said that Mike_i left'

Obviation serves to differentiate subject from object ...; primary object from secondary object ...; and primary subject from secondary subject¹³ Summarizing these three relations, we can say that obviation refers to the relation between a more immediate and a more remote unit, that is a relation of MARGINALITY ...

12 The association of a semantics of *remoteness* or *distance* with a change in AGENT appears to be a fairly common one. For example, Muskogean languages, especially Alabama, make this connection. Cf. Davis & Hardy 1987b & 1988. It is commonly discussed under the heading *switch-reference*.

¹³ Cf. section 2.3.2.

Obviation. Kutenai does not have the morphosyntax of pre- or postpositions.¹⁴ Unlike a language such as Bella Coola, which has a choice of four prepositions to mark content MARGINAL or PERIPHERAL in the PROPOSITION, Kutenai employs the single inflection of Obviative. The Absolute/Proximate then carries the semantics of the NUCLEUS, as do the PARTICIPANTS of a Bella Coola PROPOSITION when not marked by a Preposition.¹⁵

The story in Kutenai is not ended.

2.3 *Kutenai TOPIC*

To understand VOICE and ROLE in Kutenai — and much of Kutenai morphosyntax in general — we must understand the manner in which Kutenai organizes TOPIC. The text in Appendix I will serve as the basis for the discussion.

There will be two aspects to TOPIC in Kutenai. The first turns on the semantics of those PARTICIPANTS that are acceptable as Kutenai TOPICS. Not all are. This is the focus of section 2.3.2. The second aspect to Kutenai TOPIC is the semantics of the TOPIC function itself to which those qualified PARTICIPANTS aspire. This is the subject of section 2.3.3. Section 2.3.1 is a general introduction to TOPIC in Kutenai.

2.3.1 *The Use of Nouns & Elision*

We may begin by discovering what Kutenai TOPIC is not. Consider Figure 2. The general cast of the numbers suggests that TOPIC might be formulated as in Bella Coola, Mam, Tzotzil, and Chuj. That is, the term in the utterance that is the Intransitive S or the Transitive A is the normal carrier of TOPIC, and the presence of TOPIC is recognized by the choice of a Noun (for a changed TOPIC) and elision (for a continuing TOPIC). In this text, Intransitive elision is

¹⁴ Compare Morgan (1991.413): “Kutenai lacks adpositions ...”

¹⁵ Garvin’s expression of the opposition is this (Garvin 1958.32):

Thus, we may say that the category of obviation has the MARK OF MARGINALITY, and that the obviative is its MARKED MEMBER, the absolute is its UNMARKED MEMBER. The presence of the obviative indicates the presence of a marginal referent (though the obviative suffix need not be included in the unit signaling this referent ...), whereas the absolute is neutral as to marginality (and serves to represent the category in the position of neutralization ...).

In deference to Garvin’s work, in this chapter, I shall use MARGINALITY in further discussion of the semantics of Obviation, with the understanding that the semantic phenomenon in Kutenai is the same as that in Bella Coola and other languages and that the contrast is one based in VOICE.

used 31 times where the S continues from the preceding utterance, as opposed to 5 times, where there is a change in the term that fills that function: 86% of the occurrences. When the N_S does not continue from the preceding utterance, an Intransitive Noun occurs 76% of the time (n=22). When a Transitive A is elided, 67% of the occurrences (n=45) continue the term that is either the A or the S in the preceding utterance. And finally, a Transitive Noun appears only

	N _A	Ø _A	N _S	Ø _S
The A or S continues from the preceding utterance	2	45	7	31
The A or S does not continue from the preceding utterance	6	22	22	5

Figure 2: *Nouns & Elision as (Non-) Continuing A and S.*

in 10.6% of all Transitive utterances (n=2+6). Such numbers suggest a pattern, but certainly not the usage that we found in Bella Coola, where *all* utterances adhered to the use of a Noun or elision to track changed or continuing TOPIC.¹⁶

Were we to assume the TOPIC pattern of Kutenai to be that of Bella Coola, then we find deviations in two directions: (i) a Noun_A or Noun_S that is the same as (not different from) the preceding A or S, and (ii) an elided A or S that is not the same as (not continuous with) the preceding A or S. Let us consider (i) first. We shall first inspect the 7 examples in which N_S continues a preceding A or S: (9), (31), (57), (83), (85), (111), (116).

As a precursor to the discussion, let us recall from Chapter 21, that Mam seemed to structure its narrative *About Pedro* into episodes, seven in that case, in which (except for the first episode) five of the six episodes begin with the principal character Pedro starting to travel, and in VI, it is the boss that goes.¹⁷ In the Kutenai story *How the Youth Killed the Chiefs*, there may be twelve

¹⁶ Instances in which the usage was not observed *all* had explanations that were themselves consistent with the sense of TOPIC. Cf. Chapter 15.

¹⁷ There was also an episodic organization to the Tzotzil text *How Rabbit Tricked Coyote* in Chapter 22.

episodes:

- I. A man, who happens to be a chief, arrives where an old man lives with his daughter in a tent. The chief takes the daughter. The old man has another child, a son, whom the chief kills. A woman living in the tent has a daughter, whom the chief takes. (1) - (8)
- II. The chief settled there hunting game. The chief went hunting and killed a buffalo cow. He packed it onto his travois and brought it back. He refused to give any of the food to his parents-in-law. The old woman was hungry, but the chief did not feed her. The father-in-law had still another child, a son, unknown to the chief. The son directs his father to not be afraid of the chief and to kill a buffalo cow. The father does this. The chief sees what the father has done. (9) - (30)
- III. The chief, thinking to kill the old man, goes out with his bow and arrow. The chief confronts the old man and claims the kill and starts to kill him. The chief fails to see the youth, who intervenes and kills the chief. The youth tells his father to take the meat home. (31) - (45)
- IV. The youth arrives home and enters the chief's tent. He kills the chief's wives (the daughters the chief had taken in episode I). He threw them outside and tells his father to go in, that this is the father's tent now. The youth asks his mother where there are people. He is told of a town down river, where there is a chief like the one the youth has killed. He, also, does not give away food. (46) - (56)
- V. The youth starts out. He arrives and enters an old woman's tent. He announces that he is hungry. The woman takes a dish, puts something into it, and hands it to the youth. Apparently it was not food. The youth repeats that he is hungry. The woman counters that she and the others are also hungry. There is much food in the chief's tent, but no one goes there. The youth declares that he will. (57) - (69)
- VI. The youth arises and goes to the chief's tent. The chief is asleep. The youth awakens him. The chief becomes a rattlesnake. The youth kills him with his bow and arrow. The chief's wives then become rattlesnakes. They, too, are killed. (70) - (80)

- VII. The youth goes outside the tent and addresses the people telling them to take the chief's meat. He then asks whether there are other people. Again, he is told of a town down river. He says that he will go there. He is told that the chief is bad. (81) - (84)
- VIII. The youth starts and goes to that town. There is an old woman in a tent, which the youth enters. He says that he is hungry, and the woman says that she is, too. She takes a dish, puts something into it, and gives it to the youth. Again, it is not food. He is told that there is no food, but there is one tent with food, into which no one goes. (87) - (97)
- IX. The youth starts and goes to that tent, where the chief is asleep. The chief awakes, gets out of bed, and becomes a grizzly bear. The youth kills him. The chief's wives become grizzly bears, and the youth kills them as well. He throws them outside. (98) - (110)
- X. The youth goes outside the tent. He addresses the people telling them to take the meat. Again, he asks where there are other people, to be told of another town down river. (111) - (115)
- XI. The youth starts out. Arriving at the town, he enters a woman's tent. He tells her that he is hungry. The scenario of the previous episodes is repeated, ending with his being told of the tent into which no one goes. (116) - (124)
- XII. The youth says that he will go. When he enters the tent to which no one goes, the chief becomes a buffalo bull. After the chief is killed, his wives become buffalo cows. The youth kills them, throws them outside. The narrative concludes with the youth telling the people, for the last time, to come and take the meat. (125) - (139)

With the exception of the first one, the episodes are demarked by the initiation of motion, a setting out, e.g., by Verbs of departure, either *-áx-* 'go' or *-axám-* 'go'.

- II. (9) qao-sa^h-qá_a-ne^h ne_i nasó_ukue^hn
 [there-there-stay-IND the chief
 n-aq_anít^h-e^hk.
 PRED-drive.game-REFLEXIVE]

‘The chief lived there, driving game.’

- III. (31) *ts!u-áx-e·* *ne_i* *nasó_ukue·n.*
 [start.away.from.speaker-go-IND that chief]
 ‘The chief started.’
- IV. (46) *ʔa-ʔax-áx-e·*
 [again-complete-go-IND]
 ‘He arrived at home.’
- V. (57) *ts!u-áx-e·* *ne_i* *ntstáhaʔ.*
 [start.away.from.speaker-go-I the youth]
 ‘The youth started.’
- VI. (70) *n’-owók_une·* *ne_i* *ntstáhaʔ.*
 [PRED-arise-IND the youth]
 ‘The youth arose’
- (71) *qao-xáx-e·*
 [there-reach-IND]
 ‘He went there.’
- VII. (81) *ʔa-an-axá.m-ne·*
 [again-out.of-go-IND]
 ‘He went out again.’
- VIII. (87) *ts!u-áx-e·*
 [start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘He started.’
- IX. (98) *qa-ké_i-ne·* *ne_i* *ntstáhaʔ*
 [thus-say-IND the youth]
hu-ts!u-áx-e·
 1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘The youth said: “I’ll go”.’
- X. (111) *ʔa-an-axám-ne·* *ne_i* *ntstáhaʔ.*
 [again-out.of-go-IND the youth]
 ‘The youth went out again.’

- XI. (116) *ts!un-áx-e·* *ne_i* *ntstáhał.*
 [start.away.from.speaker-go-IND the youth]
 ‘The youth started.’

- XII. (125) *qa-ké_i-ne·* *ne_i* *ntstáhał*
 [thus-say-IND the youth
hu-ts!un-áx-e·.
 1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘The youth said: “I’ll go”.’

With the exception of Episode II, the remaining ten episode-initial utterances contain one of the initiating Verbs. And five of the seven apparent exceptions to the expectation that a Noun_A or Noun_S appears only when not continuous with a preceding A or S are on the above list of episode initiating utterances: (9), (31), (57), (85), (111), and (116). A sixth exception — (85) — is in the transition between episodes:¹⁸

- (82) *qa-ké_i-ne·* *Ø_i* *q!ápe·* *qok^ua-yaxá-keł* *a_a‘kúła·k.*
 [thus-say-IND he all come-get-PL meat]
 ‘He said: “Come in, all of you, and get meat”.’

- (83) *Qa-ké_i-ne·* *ntstáhał_i* *kí-łu* *aqłsmák_i.ntk!*
 [thus-say-IND youth INTERR-110 ?-people
łáák!łá·k.
 others]
 ‘The youth said: “Are there no other people?”’

- (84) *qa-ki-ł-ł-ne·* *Ø_i* *ne_i* *k!una-nmítuk*
 [thus-say-TRANS-PASS-IND he that down-river
s-a_ak.łu-nám-ne·.
 there.is-town-IND.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘He was told: “There is a town down the river”.’

- (85) *qa-ké_i-ne·* *ne_i* *ntstáhał_i*
 [thus-say-IND the youth
hu-ł-ts!un-áx-e·.
 1ST.PERSON-POTENTIAL-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]

¹⁸ It would seem an arbitrary requirement that endings and beginnings of episodes be abrupt, but they should be recognizable.

(86) qa-ki-t-tʰ-ne· Ø_i sahán·-e· nasó_ukue·n.
[thus-say-TRANS-PASS-IND he bad-IND chief]
'He was told: "The chief is bad".'

(87) ts!un-áx-e· Ø_i .
[start.away.from.speaker-go-IND he]
'He started.'

I have no explanation for the usages in (17) and (37), in which a Transitive Noun_A appears to be continuous with a preceding A or S.¹⁹ Numerically, there is a total of 37 Nouns functioning as Noun_A or Noun_S (Figure 2). Accepting our explanation of the seven apparently aberrant Intransitive Noun_S above, 95% follow a pattern in which a Noun_A or Noun_S signals a change from the preceding A or S (n = 6 + 22 + 7 ‘exceptions’).

	N _O	Ø _O
The O continues from the preceding utterance	2	39
The O does not continue from the preceding utterance	31	3

Figure 3: *Nouns & Elision as (Non-) Continuing O.*

¹⁹ Any usage that goes without being incorporated into the larger pattern is a nuisance. There could be hiding in there the information that shows the present understanding to be entirely mistaken ... or perhaps, the path to a more satisfactory understanding.

consistent when the Verb is Transitive and a PATIENT is present. Cf. Figure 3. A Noun_O names a PATIENT 94% of the times when it is not in the preceding utterance, and elision is used 93% of the time when the PATIENT continues from the preceding utterance..

Figures 2 & 3 suggest two things. First, if the pattern of use of a Noun versus use of elision is indeed tracking TOPICS, then there must be some second implementation of TOPIC that is interacting with this one to produce the perturbation we see in Figures 2 & 3. Choice of a Noun versus use of elision applies about equally to what appears to be an AGENT and to what is a PATIENT. AGENTS and PATIENTS end by not being distinguished in this regard. Second, against the background of the nearly completely consistent usage of Nouns_A, Nouns_S, Nouns_O, Ø_S, and Ø_O, the use of Ø_A seems nearly chaotic. Almost 33% of the Ø_A's (n=22) do *not* appear in the preceding utterance, and therein lies the real key to Kutenai TOPIC.

2.3.2 *The character of Kutenai TOPIC*

The passage consisting of sentences (88) through (98) from Appendix I provides a telling place to begin the discussion:

- (88) ʔax-áx-e· Ø_i
 [complete-go-IND he.PROX
 s-a_k.ʔu-nam-ís_i-ne·.
 there.is-town-IND.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘He arrived at the town.’
- (89) sam-t.ʔá_a-s-e· tʔnámuj-’s.
 [-tent-OBV.SUBJ-IND old.woman-OBV]
 ‘There was an old woman living in a tent.’
- (90) tun-a_{xám}-ne· Ø_i
 [going.into-go-IND he.PROX]
 ‘He entered.’
- (91) qa-kí-ʔ-ne· Ø_j Ø_i
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND her.OBV he.PROX
 hu-n-uwás_i-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 ‘He said to her: “I am hungry”.’

- (92) qa-k.-t-áps-e· \emptyset_i \emptyset_j
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV
 hu-n-uwas'-na-tá_a-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-PL-IND]
 'He was told: "We are hungry".'
- (93) tsuk^uát.-s-e· átsu_k-s_k \emptyset_j
 [take-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV she.OBV]
 'She took a dish.'
- (94) (a) n'-oqo_u-xa-kín-s-e· \emptyset_k
 [PRED-in-put-action.done.with.the.hand-OBV.SUBJ-IND it.OBV
 \emptyset_j
 she.OBV]
 'She put something into it.'
- (b) namat-ikts-áps-e· \emptyset_i \emptyset_j
 give-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV]
 'She gave it to him.'
- (95) qa-kí-t-ne· \emptyset_j \emptyset_i
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND her.OBV he.PROX
 ho-qua-kéi-ne· hu-n-uwás_j-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-thus-say-IND 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 'He said to her: "I said I am hungry".'
- (96) qa-k.-t-áps-e· \emptyset_i \emptyset_j tó_u-ne·
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV no-IND
 ku.-ik_j-náta.
 SUBORDINATE-food-PL]
 'He was told: "There is no food".'
- (97) qa-k.-t-áps-e· \emptyset_i \emptyset_j ne_i
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV that
 han-t.ta-nám-ke· yuna-qá_a-ne· k!-tk-e-t
 DEM-tent-INDEF.SUBJ-NOM much-be-IND PART-eat-PASS
 at qa-tin-a_xam-nám-ne·.
 but NEG-going.into-go-INDEF.SUBJ-IND]
 'He was told: "There is much food in that tent, but nobody goes in

there”.’

- (98) qa-ké_i-ne· ne_i mtstáha_t_i
 [thus-say-IND the youth
 hu-ts!in-áx-e·.
 1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘The youth said: “I’ll go”.’

By the calculation above, this passage falls into Episode VIII. In Episode VII, the sole PARTICIPANT is the youth ... who is, presumably, the TOPIC. When Episode VIII begins, the youth is still the TOPIC. Setting aside *átsu·* in (93) — and perhaps (94) — there are only two actors in this passage: the youth and an old woman. Sentence (88) continues the sequence discussed just above in which (85) falls at the juncture between Episodes VII and VIII. *ne_i mtstáha_t* is named in (85), and the same person occurs elided in (86) and (87) ... and in (88), which begins the passage here. Sentence (88) is formed as we would ex-

	AGENT		PATIENT	
	Continuous	Not Continuous	Continuous	Not Continuous
(91)	Ø _Y			Ø _W
(92)		Ø _W		Ø _Y
(93)	Ø _W			N _{DISH}
(94a)	Ø _W		Ø _{DISH}	
(94b)	Ø _W			Ø _Y
(95)		Ø _Y		Ø _W
(96)		Ø _W		Ø _Y
(97)	Ø _W		Ø _Y	

Figure 4: *Elision in a Passage of Kutenai Text.*

pect. Sentence (89) contains a contrasting actor, and *ti~~n~~ámu* ‘old woman’ is cited as a Nouns, again as we would expect. But now things go awry. From (91) through (97), the morphosyntax, which in Episode VII seemed reliably to now to mark TOPIC as the NUCLEAR PARTICIPANT, fails us. Except for the introduction of the dish in (93), *every* term is elided until we arrive at (98), the boundary with Episode IX, where the youth is again named with a Noun. There *is* no pattern in Figure 4. Only when we add more morphosyntax to the mixture, as in Figure 5, do matters come clear. The Youth persists as the Proximate PARTICIPANT throughout, and the woman is the Obviative PARTICIPANT, even when the youth is absent, e.g., (93) & (94a). The affixes *-aps-* and *-s-* tell us that the AGENT is *not* the TOPIC and that the youth, who was the TOPIC in Episode VII and in the beginning of this Episode, continues in that capacity.²⁰

		AGENT		PATIENT	
		Continuous	Not Continuous	Continuous	Not Continuous
(91)		Ø _Y			Ø _W
(92)	<i>-aps-</i>		Ø _W		Ø _Y
(93)	<i>-s-</i>	Ø _W			N _{DISH}
(94a)	<i>-s-</i>	Ø _W		Ø _{DISH}	
(94b)	<i>-aps-</i>	Ø _W			Ø _Y
(95)			Ø _Y		Ø _W
(96)	<i>-aps-</i>		Ø _W		Ø _Y
(97)	<i>-aps-</i>	Ø _W		Ø _Y	

Figure 5: *Elision and -aps-/-s- in a Passage of Kutenai Text.*

²⁰ There is variation in the literature with regard to the grammatical gloss of *-s-*. I have generally used Dryer’s ‘Obviative Subject’.

It may appear at first glance that *-s-* is used when the EVENT is Intransitive, and *-aps-*, when it is Transitive. But matters are slightly more involved. Compare these, also from Appendix I:

- (121) (a) tsuk^uát.*-s-e* átsu-s Ø
 [take-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV she.OBV]
 ‘She took a dish’
- (121) (b) n’-oqou_u.xá-’nt-s-e átsu-s Ø.
 [PRED-in-put-action.hand-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV she.OBV]
 ‘and put something into the dish.’
- (122) n-amat-ikts-*áps-e* Ø Ø.
 [PRED-give-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV]
 ‘She gave it to him.’
- (126) qa-k.-t-*áps-e* Ø ne_r-s
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND him.PROX the-OBV
 tɬnámú-’s ma_ats ts!ín-an’.
 old.woman-OBV don’t start.away.from.speaker-IMP]
 ‘He was told by the old woman: “Don’t go there”.’

All four of these utterances seem to be Transitive, but they differ in that (121a) & (121b) have *-s-*, while (122) & (126) have *-aps-*. The contrast that correlates with and explains the difference is that (121a) & (121b) do not have a Proximate PARTICIPANT to assume the mantle of TOPIC when *-s-* asserts that the AGENTS in (121a) & (121b) are not it. *Átsu-s* in (121) is grammatically Obviative and semantically MARGINAL. There is no TOPIC in (121a) & (121b). In that regard, such sentences stand as ASIDES (or MARGINALS per Garvin). Sentences (122) & (126) both have an elided, and Proximate, PARTICIPANT ‘him’, i.e., the Youth, that assumes the semantics of TOPIC when the woman relinquishes it. Notice that when not elided as it is in (122) the erstwhile AGENT is semantically MARGINAL as in (126):²¹

²¹ There is more morphology here than just *-s-* and *-aps-*. There is an *-aps-is-*, which appears to combine the two:

- (i) cxał-yi-siłʔasqawsałxu-*naps-is-ke* (Garvin 1948c.177)
 [FUTURE-NOMINALIZER-X-INVERSE-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘How far apart they will be.’

-
- (ii) cɬakɬ-*aps-is-ne* (Garvin 1948c.182)
 [love-INVERSE-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
 'He is loved by them.'
- (iii) Wu·kat-i titqat²s k-itkʉn-*aps-is*
 [see-IND man-OBV SUBORDINATOR-sting-INVERSE-OBV.SUBJ
 yuwat²s
 bee-OBV]
 'He saw a man getting stung by a bee'
 'He saw a man who was stung by a bee.' (Morgan 1991.448)
- (iv) Maɬi maʔ-is wu·kat-*aps-is-ni* xaɬiʔ-is-is
 [Mary mother-POSS see-INVERSE-OBV.SUBJ-IND son-POSS-OBV
 misáɬ-s
 Mike-OBV]
 'Mary's mother was seen by Mike's son' (Morgan 1991.436)
 [or 'Mike's_{OBV} son_{OBV} saw Mary's_{PROX} mother_{PROX}.']
- (v) Maʔ-is Misáɬ wu·kat-*aps-is-ni* Maɬi-s
 [mother-POSS Mike see-INVERSE-OBV.SUBJ-IND Mary-OBV]
 'Mary_{OBV} saw Mike's_{PROX} mother_{PROX}.' (Dryer 1991a.196, Morgan 1991.436)
- (vi) Maɬi maʔ-is wu·kat-s-i Misáɬ-s
 [Mary mother-POSS see-OBV.SUBJ-IND Mike-OBV]
 'Mary's_{PROX} mother_{PROX} saw Mike_{OBV}.' (Dryer 1991a.196)

Because of the Possession in (vi), *Maɬi maʔ-is* cannot be a Proximate TOPIC (cf. 2.3.2.4.1 below), and the *-s-* expresses this. Because there is no *-aps-*, any other PARTICIPANT will be an Obviative PATIENT, hence, the Obviative *Misáɬ-s*. There is no TOPIC named in (vi). In contrast with (vi), the *-aps-* in (v) declares the presence of some Proximate TOPIC. Formally, the only candidate for that function is *maʔ-is Misáɬ*. (We will return to this example in 2.3.2.4.2.) The *-s-* then marks *Maɬi-s* as the non-TOPIC AGENT. The question is why not say

- (vii) Maʔ-is Misáɬ wu·kat-*aps-i* Maɬi-s
 [mother-POSS Mike see-INVERSE-IND Mary-OBV]
 'Mary_{OBV} saw Mike's_{PROX} mother_{PROX}.'

on the model of (Dryer 1991a.198):

- (viii) paɬkiy n-ʔitx-*naps-i* xaʔɬɕin-s
 [woman PRED-bite-INVERSE-IND dog-OBV]
 'A dog_{OBV} bit a woman_{PROX}'

Boas (1926.98-99) suggests that "When the noun to which the passive in *-aps* refers has a third person possessive, the *-aps* form appears in the obviative *-apsis*" This speaks to sentences like (iv) & (v), but not to (i) - (iii).

About (v), Morgan (1991.435) writes:

The English sentence 'Mary saw Mike's mother' was the prompt for example ... [(v)], although it was not the first response. The first response was one with a verbal form /wu·kat-s.i/, which is one where a higher ranking subsidiary third person acts on a lower ranking subsidiary third person [i.e., an utterance like (vi),

- s- The AGENT is not TOPIC. If not elided, it will be Obviative. There is no Proximate PARTICIPANT.
- aps- The AGENT is not TOPIC. There is some other PARTICIPANT present, which if not elided, will be Proximate. It is the TOPIC.²²

In the passage (91) - (97), this pattern allows the youth to pass as TOPIC from (91), where he is the AGENT and also the TOPIC, into (92), where the elided AGENT is the MARGINAL *tnámu*-’s from (89). In (93), (94a), and (94b), *tnámu*-’s continues as the MARGINAL, and non-TOPIC, PARTICIPANT. There is no TOPIC referenced in these two utterances, but the TOPIC — the youth — has nevertheless continued in that capacity to return in (94b) and (95), where he reappears as the TOPIC expressed notably by Proximal elision, not by a Noun. In (96) and (97), he again relinquishes his position as AGENT to the MARGINAL elided *tnámu*-’s, but he remains the TOPIC. Even though the youth is completely absent from (93) and (94a) — and the non-AGENT in (94b) — he has persisted as TOPIC. He reemerges in (98) in that capacity to be overtly NAMED as such at the beginning of the following episode.

In Chapter 23, we outlined a possible typology of TOPIC, identifying — in

PWD]. Immediately after this response, the sentence with /wu·kat-ap-s-is,ni/ was offered

This interaction with the speaker suggests that *wukat-s-i* and *wu·kat-aps-is-ni* are (near) equivalents, but (v) & (vi) above suggest that they are not. There was probably some indecision on how to say things. I would still want to know why the speaker did not offer (vii) and what the reaction to it would be.

²² Dryer (1991a.185):

The function of this suffix can be characterized, at least in the majority of its uses, as that of indicating that the proximate participant is the notional object and that the obviative nominal is the notional subject

Stating that TOPIC has a preference for certain classes of lexical items, independent of context — (cf. Morgan’s discussion of bees in section 2.3.2.2 below) — impinges upon the description of *-aps-* (Morgan 1991.425):

The Boasian ‘definite passive’ [i.e., constructions with *-aps-*] involves only third person forms where on a hierarchy of discourse salience a lower ranking third person acts on a higher ranking third person.

In the 13 occurrences of *-aps-* in the text of Appendix I, the pairs are: youth_{PROX} & his mother_{OBV} (53 & 54), youth_{PROX} & old woman_{OBV} (61), old woman_{PROX} & youth_{OBV} (65), youth_{PROX} & old woman_{OBV} (69), youth_{PROX} & old woman_{OBV} (92, 94b, 96 & 97), youth_{PROX} & old woman_{OBV} (120, 122, 124 & 126). Sentences (61) and (65) clearly indicate that more than isolated, contextless lexical content is at play here.

terms of the metaphor employed — a difference between a Prospective TOPIC and a Retrospective TOPIC. The Prospective TOPIC was present in Chuj's preverbal TOPIC, but such TOPIC seems never to occur without an accompanying Retrospective TOPIC, also present in Chuj. A Retrospective TOPIC was the sort we found in Bella Coola and Mam ... and in Yaitepec Chatino. With this difference. The Retrospective TOPIC in Bella Coola and Mam was EMERGENT, that is, as each utterance was pronounced, the morphosyntax identified whether the TOPIC announced in that utterance was the same as the one of the preceding utterance or was altered. Only *after the fact*, did the listener know the extent to which the TOPIC(S) was/were global, i.e., how persistent and, hence, important they were to the text. That conclusion was cumulative and constructed by the experience of the narrative. It emerged. In the alternative composition of Retrospective TOPIC in Yaitepec Chatino, the TOPIC was ABIDING. Deerskin John existed throughout as a global TOPIC, and he was identified as ABIDING TOPIC by the use of pronominal ellipsis. Those PARTICIPANTS that were not TOPICS were identified as such by the Pronoun *ne7*. In a language which construes TOPIC as ABIDING, the individual who is TOPIC may be absent from the narrative for stretches and return as TOPIC with the appropriate morphosyntax, and the narrative may have more than one ABIDING TOPIC. The interaction between Deerskin John's wife and his mother illustrated the use of \emptyset and *ne7*, and ABIDING TOPIC, in the absence of Deerskin John.

Kutenai TOPIC is configured in the manner of the ABIDING TOPIC in Yaitepec Chatino. Consider Figure 6. All the story's characters who appear as AGENTS are listed there. There is the Youth, whose father is the OldMan. The

	OldMan	Man/Chief	Woman ₁	Youth	Woman ₂	Chief ₂	Women ₃	Woman ₄	Chief ₃	Women ₅	Woman ₆	Chief ₄	Women ₇
TOPIC	9	24	3	70	4	3			3			2	
TOPIC Maintained 1				12	1								
TOPIC Denied	1		2	1			1	7		1	6		1

Figure 6: TOPICS in *The Youth Who killed the Chiefs*.²³

²³ The **Old Man's** 9 are: 1, 4, 20, 21, 24, 25, 34, 45, and 46. His 1 is 21. The **Man/Chief's** 24 are: 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, and 38. **Woman₁'s** 3 are: 6, 7, and 18. Her 1 is 19, and her 2 are 53 & 54. The **Youth's** 70 are: 21, 22, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 68, 70, 71, 72a, 73, 76,

Man/Chief is the individual who arrives, takes the daughters, and kills the son. Woman₁ is the Youth's mother. Woman₂ is at the first downriver stop that the Youth makes. Chief₂ is at the second stop as are Women₃. They are Chief₂'s wives. Woman₄ is at the third village as is Chief₃. Women₅ are Chief₃'s wives. Woman₆ is at the fourth village as is Chief₄, and his wives are Women₇. They are listed from left to right in Figure 6 in the order in which they appear in the narrative.²⁴

Several things are remarkable in Figure 6. First, the Youth dominates as TOPIC. With the exception of (65), he is *always* TOPIC and he appears as such in 82 of the 139 utterances. Wherever his EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE function would replace him as the one AGENT ROLE TOPIC, i.e., express him as an Obviative, the condition is rectified with *-aps-*, that says the AGENT is not TOPIC, a non-AGENT PARTICIPANT is. The one Proximate EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE (whether a PATIENT or RECIPIENT [as in (94b)]) is TOPIC. This happens twelve times, and the Youth is very nearly the *only* PARTICIPANT to benefit from this.²⁵ At the other extreme, there is a group five collections of woman who are *never* admitted as TOPICS. Where they would be the Intransitive AGENT, the Verb appears with *-s-*, and they are MARGINAL. When women would appear as the Transitive AGENT, where the PATIENT is the Youth, the women are *always* MARGINAL and *always* denied access to TOPIC.²⁶ The men, especially the Youth and the Chiefs, are *never* dismissed in this way.

These imbalances suggest that PARTICIPANTS that are ABIDING TOPICS

77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 95, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109b, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 123, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135a, 135b, 136, 137b, 138, and 139. His 12 are: 53, 54, 61, 69, 92, 94b, 96, 97, 120, 122, 124, and 126. **Woman₂'s** 4 are 62, 63, 64, and 66. Her 1 is 65 **Chief₂'s** 3 are 72, 74 and 75. **Women₃'s** 1 is 79. **Woman₄'s** 7 are 89, 92, 93, 94a, 94b, 96, and 97. **Chief₃'s** 3 are 102, 104, and 105. **Woman₅'s** 1 is 109. **Woman₆'s** 6 are 120, 121a, 121b, 122, 124, 126. **Chief₄'s** 2 are 133 and 134. **Women₇'s** 1 is 137.

²⁴ In Figure 6, TOPIC intends a PARTICIPANT that is the AGENT and is expressed with Proximate grammar. TOPIC Maintained intends those PARTICIPANTS that are not AGENTS, but which are nevertheless expressed as Proximates. TOPIC Denied are those PARTICIPANTS that are AGENTS, but which are expressed as Obviatives.

One sentence, (113), in which 'meat' is the Passive subject is omitted. It will be discussed below in section 2.3.3 The total number of utterances represented in Figure 6 is now 139.

²⁵ The Youth's father — or father & mother together — in (19) is an apparent beneficiary of *-aps-*, but this has another explanation. Cf. the section on Possession below and the discussion of the textual passage (18) - (22) at the beginning of Appendix I. The other place The Youth is not TOPIC is (65), in which Woman₂ is.

²⁶ With the exception of (61) and (69). Cf. section 2.3.2.2.

have a semantic component of gravitas, personality, or prominence attributed to them and that the PARTICIPANT that is that TOPIC must have a semantics of that ratifies the choice.²⁷ In the following sections, we identify some of the semantic properties of PARTICIPANTS that function as a Kutenai ABIDING TOPIC.

2.3.2.1 *Kutenai TOPIC and elision*

Assuming that grammatical elision is used when the PARTICIPANT it identifies is Proximate in the discourse suggests that a Noun will name a PARTICIPANT that is less proximate. We saw above in Figures 2 & 3 that such was generally the case. When both elision and a Noun co-occur as potential TOPIC and non-TOPIC, there is an interaction between elision & Noun and Proximate TOPIC & Obviative non-TOPIC (Dryer 1991a.190):

- (18) (a) ??wu·kat-i Ø maʔi
 [see-IND him/her/it/them.OBV Mary.PROX]
 ‘Mary_{PROX} saw him_{OBV}’
- (b) ??wu·kat-aps-i Ø maʔi
 [see-INVERSE-IND him/her/it/them.OBV Mary.PROX]
 ‘He_{OBV} saw Mary_{PROX}’
- (c) wu·kat-i maʔi-s Ø
 [see-IND Mary.OBV him/her/it/them.PROX]
 ‘He_{PROX} saw Mary_{OBV}’

In that context, the semantics of elision has such an affinity for TOPIC that the semantics of NAMING via a Noun — by comparison²⁸ — has difficulty being

²⁷ Dryer (1991a.198) quotes one of his consultants calling it “importance”.

²⁸ Where both are elided as in (94a) and (94b), elision has no problem in expressing an Obviative:

- (94) (a) n’-oqo_{il}·xa-kʔn-s-e· Ø_k
 [PRED-in-put-action.done.with.the.hand-OBV.subj-ind it.obv]
 Ø_j
 she.obv]
 ‘She put something into it.’
- (b) namat-ikts-áps-e· Ø_i Ø_j
 [give-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV]
 ‘She gave it to him.’

accepted as TOPIC even though it has the grammar of Proximate. This is independent of whether the Obviative ellipsis would be PATIENT (18a) or AGENT (17b) (Dryer 1991a.190):

As pointed out to me by Lawrence Morgan, ... [(18a)] is acceptable on a reading ‘Mary saw it’. [(18a)] ... is judged out of context to be unacceptable on a reading ‘Mary saw him’, though I am aware of a few text examples that are analogous to ... [(18a)].

Sentence (18b) has a similar difficulty. Dryer (1991a.190):

Lawrence Morgan has pointed out to me that ... [(18b)] is probably acceptable on a reading ‘It saw Mary’, where the notional subject is nonhuman animate, but this needs to be checked.

The gist of this is that the semantics of elision has such a strong affinity to the semantics of Proximate TOPIC, that when juxtaposed with an overt, i.e. Noun, candidate for Proximate TOPIC — which declares the elision to be an Obviative non-TOPIC — the semantic combination — (a) in Figure 7 — is heavily discounted, and the alignment of (b) succeeds. This affinity is another instance of Behagel’s First Law²⁹. The pattern of (18) adds one more component to the semantics of the Kutenai ABIDING TOPIC, the semantic prominence of a PARTICIPANT marked by elision.

- (a) Elision_{OBVIATIVE.NON-TOPIC} with Noun_{PROXIMATE.TOPIC}
- (b) Elision_{PROXIMATE.TOPIC} with Noun_{OBVIATIVE.NON-TOPIC}

Figure 7: *Behagel’s First Law: The Affinity of Elision for PROXIMATE TOPIC.*

The association between the semantics of elision and the semantics of TOPIC extends to those utterances with *-aps-*, where the TOPIC is something other than the AGENT. Notice that in Figure 6, the twelve utterances ([53], [54], [65], [69], [92], [94b], [96], [97], [120], [122], [124], and [126]) in which the Youth is maintained as TOPIC by *-aps-*, every one of the TOPICS is

²⁹ The Law first discussed in Chapter 9, section 4 is this:

Das oberste Gesetz ist dieses, da daß gelästig eng Zusammengehöree auch eng zusammengestellt wird.

³¹ Notice that the zero expression of these Indefinites (Elision?) is outweighed by the semantics of ‘indefinite’.

human animate PARTICIPANTS seem to be preferred TOPICS when a non-human animate is present. Dryer (1991a.190 & 1992.125) initially expresses this as an absolute based on lexical semantic classes:

... the choice of proximate and obviative is also sensitive to the humanness of the participants: it is not possible for the proximate to be nonhuman and the obviative human, **regardless of properties of the two participants in the immediate discourse context** [Emph. mine, PWD].

... semantic animacy plays a role distinct from discourse factors in determining the choice of proximate versus obviative. Thus, given two arguments, one animate and the other inanimate, the inanimate argument is always obviative. Furthermore, if two arguments are both animate, but one is human and the other nonhuman animate, the nonhuman argument must be obviative, **regardless of the discourse context** [Emph. mine, PWD]

Elsewhere, Dryer (1991a.198) softens the prohibition of non-human Proximates with human Obviatives:

Given the English sentence ‘A dog bit a woman’ out of context to translate into Kutenai, my consultant responded with the inverse sentence in ... [(i)]:

- (i) paʔkiy n-ʔifx-naps-i xaʔʔɪn-s
 [woman PRED-bite-INVERSE-IND dog-OBV]
 ‘A dog [obv] bit a woman [prox]’

She described the direct version in ... [(ii)]:

- (ii) ʔʔxaʔʔɪn n-ʔifx-ni paʔkiy-s
 [dog PRED-bite-IND woman-OBV]
 ‘A dog [prox] bit a woman [obv]’

as ‘sounding like English’ and has commented on similar examples as sounding odd because ‘people are more important than animals’.

Morgan (1991.431) expresses a similar opinion:

One feature of what can loosely be called the obviative system in Kutenai is that primary third persons outrank subsidiary third persons on a hierarchy ... This is something which is manifested in an overt way when an entity such as a bee does something to a person. The person, although the object of the verbal stem and semantically, a patient is more important in discourse pragmatic terms than the bee and the person deserves to be a primary third person, while the bee would naturally be a subsidiary third person in a discourse ... One says things such as

‘the man got stung by the bee’. One can also say ‘the bee stung the man’, although it would be discourse pragmatically a highly marked way to say it.³²

In the appropriate context, however, such sentences are entirely natural. Consider the following four sentences which introduce *The Coyote and the Woman* (Boas 1918.18):

- (1) Qa·n·áx·e· skín·ku·ts_i
[-go-IND Coyote.PROX]
‘Coyote went along.’
- (2) switsłeít.s·e·
[-IND]
‘There was a hill.’
- (3) yo_u·xáx·e· Ø_i
[top-go-IND he.PROX]
‘He got on top.’
- (4) n’-úp_x_a·ne· pá·tke_j-s Ø_i
[PRED-see-IND woman-OBV he.PROX]
‘He saw a woman.’

By the calculation of Dryer and Morgan, (4) should be:

- (4'') n’-úp_x_a·naps·e· pá·tke_j-Ø Ø_i
[PRED-see-INVERSE-IND woman-PROX he.OBV]
‘He saw a woman.’

Sentence (4) contains a Proximate elided reference to *coyote*, and an Obviative *pá·tke_j-s* ‘woman’,³³ but all that is required to support such a combination is motivation for seeing the Coyote as having the import needed to support an ABIDING TOPIC.³⁴

³² Should the movie *The Bee Story* ever be dubbed into Kutenai, one could easily imagine Jerry Seinfeld employing many utterances with grammatically Proximate bees.

³³ Notice that the hypothetical (4'') would produce a combination of Elision_{OBVIATIVE.NONTOPIC} + Noun_{PROXIMATE.TOPIC} that was strongly disapproved in Figure 7 above.

³⁴ In this narrative, the woman and the coyote end as marriage partners.

(62) tsuk^uát-e· átsu-s Ø_i
[take-IND dish-OBV she.PROX]
'She took a dish.'

(63) n'-oqo-xá-'nt-e· Ø_i
[PRED-in-put-action.hand-IND she.PROX]
'She put something into it.'

(64) n-amat-íkts-e· Ø_j Ø_i
[PRED-give-IND.OBJ-IND him.OBV she.PROX]
'She gave it to him.'

(93) tsukʰát.-s-e· átsu_k-s_k Ø_i.
 [take-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV she.OBV]
 ‘She took a dish.’

(94) (a) nʼ-oqo_u-xa-kín-s-e· Ø_k
 [PRED-in-put-action.done.with.the.hand-OBV.SUBJ-IND it.OBV]
 Ø_i
 she.OBV]
 ‘She put something into it.’

(b) n-amat-ikts-áps-e· Ø_j Ø_i

(i) k.-ʔáxam ya.uk^u₁ka.m₁ qa-wukatká₄ne- Ø₁ skín.ku.ts (Boas 1918.110)
[SUB-arrive Ya.uk^u₁ka.m NEG-see-IND him coyote]
‘When Ya.uk^u₁ka.m_{PROX} arrived, Coyote_{PROX} did not see him_{OBV}.’

(ii) ʔ-u-ʔáʔ-ne- skín.ku.ts ne₁-s ʔkám.u-s se₁ʔ’uʔá-s-e- (Boas 1918.112)
[PRED-hear-IND coyote the-OBV baby-OBV cry-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
‘Then Coyote_{PROX} heard the child_{OBV} crying.’

(iii) ya.uk¹é.ka.m kùn'me.ták.t-e ntstáhaʔ wunekĩt.-s-e ...
'Ya.uk¹é.ka.m was a full grown man.'
(Boas 1918.102)

[PRED-give-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV]
 ‘She gave it to him.’

The Youth who Killed the Chiefs contains four occurrences that are essentially repetitions of the same events. Sentences (61) - (64) are from Episode V, which tells of the Youth’s visit to the first down river village, and sentences (93) - (94b) are from Episode VII, that relates the Youth’s visit to the third village. In the first, the woman rises to the level of TOPIC, and in the second, she does not. Why? That is the way the speaker saw it, and Kutenai permitted him to say it that way. There *is* no way to predict his choice, because prediction is not a component of the constitution of TOPIC. The difficulty with the combinations that Dryer and Morgan discuss — and with (4) — appears clearly to be not a matter of contextless lexical classes, but a matter of the speaker’s judgment/decision, measuring the PARTICIPANT against its position as designated ABIDING TOPIC.³⁵

2.3.2.4 *Kutenai TOPIC and possession*

The partial semantic composition of Kutenai TOPIC from some purport like the “importance” cited by Dryer is supported — in a complement fashion — by the semantics of Possession. Possession by a third person is indicated by the suffix *-is* on the thing possessed.³⁶

2.3.2.4.1 *Possessed as AGENT*

The relevant observation about Possession and possessed things is that possessed PARTICIPANTS can themselves *never* be TOPIC (Dryer 1997a.34, 36, 1991a.196 & 1996.23):³⁷

- (19) qa.ʔ ʔakmuxu-s waʔunak-ʔis niʔ watak
 [PTCL fall.out-OBV.SUBJ tongue-POSS the frog]
 ‘The Frog’_{sPROX} tongue_{PROX} would come out’

³⁵ Cf. section 2.3.3.

³⁶ Boas (1926.102): “-ʔe:s 3rd person possessive.” Garvin (1948c.172): “-ʔi:s-, third person owner.” Morgan (1991.436 et passim) has numerous examples of “-ʔis” glossed ‘3POS’, as does Dryer (1991.195 et passim).

³⁷ Recall from Chapter 15, that Bella Coola had a similar disinclination to admit possessed things to the status of TOPIC, even though TOPIC in Bella Coola was of the EMERGENT sort and not the ABIDING kind of Kutenai.

Cf., however, section 2.3.2.4.2 below for a small wrinkle to this.

- (20) n-aqap-s-i *tiłnamu-ʼis* ʼinłak
 [PRED-exist-OBV.SUBJ-IND wife-POSS chicken.hawk]
 ‘Chicken Hawk had a wife’
 [Lit: ‘Chicken Hawk’_{SPROX} wife_{PROX} existed’]
- (21) máłi *ma-ʼis* wu·kat-s-i misał-s
 [Mary mother-POSS see-OBV.SUBJ-IND Mike-OBV]
 ‘Mary’_{SPROX} mother_{PROX} saw Mike’
- (22) wu·kat-ap-is-ni *ma-ʼis*
 [see-1ST.PERSON-OBV.SUBJ-IND mother-POSS]
 ‘His_{PROX} mother_{PROX} saw me’

Sentences (19) - (22) would be normal Kutenai sentences except for the Possession. The Intransitive AGENT is expressed as a Proximate in (19) and (20) just as it is in (21) and (22), where, respectively, the third person Transitive PATIENT is coded with an Obviative, and the first person PATIENT, by the appropriate verbal suffix. The only addition to what we have encountered so far is that the verbal suffix *-s-* consistently communicates the disqualification of the possessed AGENT as TOPIC.³⁸

These additional examples show the operation of possessed PARTICIPANTS:

- (23) *ma-ʼe-s* qak.-ł-aps-e· (Boas 1926.98)
 [mother-POSS say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND]
 ‘He was told by his (own) mother’

³⁸ Or *-aps-*. Cf. (22) below.

We can now understand the one occurrence noted in Figure 6, where a character other than the Youth is maintained as TOPIC with *-aps-*. In (19) from Appendix I,

- (19) qa-hts-áps-e· Ø nawaspáł-ʼe·s ne·
 [NEG-give.food-INVERSE-IND them son.in.law-POSS that
 nułʼá-qana.
 old.man-husband]
 ‘The old man’s son-in-law did not give them_{PROX} anything to eat.’

‘the old man’s son-in-law’ is an alternative designation for the Chief who has returned with food from a successful hunt. Because the Chief is named by means of a possessed relationship (someone’s son-in-law), he is too remote to be TOPIC, and the one to whom he did not give food is the Proximate TOPIC ... not necessarily because TOPIC is deserved, but because the Possession forces it. (Because elision is indeterminate with respect to number, the gloss could also be ‘The old man’s son-in-law did not give them [i.e., the mother-in-law and the father-in-law] anything to eat.’)

[or 'His_{PROX} own mother_{PROX} told him_{PROX}']

In (23), the Possessed *ma'-e-s* 'his mother' is marked by *-aps-* as non-TOPIC (as the Possessed can never be), and the same suffix simultaneously points to an alternative TOPIC. In this instance it is the Possessor of *mother*.³⁹

From the perspective of propositional organization, things possessed and their Possessor compose a complex semantic unit with respect to their function as a TOPIC ROLE or as an Obviative PARTICIPANT. Possessed items

	NUCLEAR TOPIC	NUCLEAR non-TOPIC	MARGINAL non-TOPIC
Examples:	(7) & (8)	(19), (20), (21) & (22) (33a) & (35b)	(13) & (79) _{APPENDIX}

Figure 8: *The Semantics of a Kutenai PROPOSITION.*

have a distinct place in a Kutenai PROPOSITION in that they can be non-TOPICS without being MARGINAL (and marked Obviative).⁴⁰ Cf. Figure 8.

2.3.2.4.2 *Possessed as non-AGENT*

Where it is appropriate, a possessed Noun will appear overtly marked as Obviative, and the entire complex is so marked (Dryer 1991a.195):

(24)	<i>misáɬ</i>	<i>wu·kat-i</i>	<i>xatɬin-ʼis-is</i>	<i>maɬí-s</i>
	[Mike	see-IND	dog-POSS-OBV	Mary-OBV]

³⁹ It would be interesting to know whether an utterance such as:

(i) *ma'-e-s qak.-ɬ-aps-e máɬi*
'Mary_i was told by her_i mother'

is possible. And also a hypothetical:

(ii) *ma'-e-s qakiʔ-aps-e máɬi*
mother-POSS say-INVERSE-IND Mary]
'Mary's mother spoke'

The *-aps-* would assert that the Possessed AGENT *ma'-e-s* is not TOPIC, but that there is an alternative TOPIC, namely, the Possessor of *mother*. Something akin to Possessor Raising.

⁴⁰ This suggests a scale or cline of voice, that we will see repeated below in section 2.3.2.5.

‘Mike_{PROX} saw Mary’s_{OBV} dog_{OBV}’

‘Mary’s dog’ as a whole is the grammatical Object and therefore marked by the Obviative *-s*. If (24) is expressed with a pronominal Possessor, then the Possessor is elided while the possessed Object retains its mark of Obviation (Dryer 1991a.194):⁴¹

- (25) misáł wu·kat-i *xatčín-ʔis-is*
 [Mike see-IND dog-POSS-OBV]
 ‘Mike_{PROX} saw her_{OBV} dog_{OBV}’

If the Proximate AGENT is the Possessor of an item that is the verbal Object, then, because the Possessor + Possessed are a semantic unit, the verbal Object is Proximate as its Proximate Possessor is (Dryer 1991a.194):⁴²

- (26) małí wu·kat-i *xatčín-ʔis*

⁴¹ Dryer (1997a.36) has an additional example of this contrast:

- (i) ṇ-uquxaki-ni yičkimi-ʔis
 [PRED-put.into-IND pot-POSS]
 ‘He_i.PROX put him_j.OBV into his_i.PROX bucket.PROX’
- (ii) swaʔ ṇ-umitčkin-i yičkimi-ʔis-is
 [panther PRED-break-IND bucket-POSS-OBV]
 ‘Panther_i.PROX broke his_j.OBV bucket.OBV’

⁴² Dryer (1991a.194) expresses this a bit differently:

The possessed noun in possessive constructions is always obviative, although this is obscured by the fact that the possessed noun does not bear the obviative suffix

Morgan (1991.438-439) agrees with Dryer in that in (i) and (ii), *ʔa·k-t-tʃaʔ-ʔis* and *ʔa·k-t-tʃaʔ-ʔis-is* are both equally glossed as Obviative:

- (i) Wu·kat-i ʔa·kitʃaʔ-ʔis
 [see-IND house-POSS]
 ‘He_{PROX} saw his_{OWN} house_{OBV}.’
- (ii) Wu·kat-i ʔa·k-t-tʃaʔ-ʔis-is
 [see-IND house-POSS-OBV]
 ‘He_{PROX} saw his_{OBV} house_{OBV}.’

The use of _{OWN} in (i) avoids answering the question of whether the Possessor is _{PROX} or _{OBV}.

Dryer’s and Morgan’s conclusion seems to ignore the clear minimal contrast between (24) & (25) and between (i) & (ii). The attitude taken here is that if a form is marked Proximate, then it is. If it is marked Obviative, then it is. If not, then not.

[Mary see-IND dog-POSS]
 'Mary_{i.PROX} saw her_{i.PROX} dog_{PROX}'

In this way, we know that in (3) from Appendix I,

- (3) tsuk^uát-e· swín-ís-e·s.
 [take-IND daughter-POSS-OBV
 'He_{i.PROX} took his_{j.OBV} daughter_{OBV}.'

He_i is the man from sentence (2) in Appendix I who takes the daughter of the *old man_j* in sentence (1), and not his own daughter. In (44), the Youth is speaking to his own father, not someone else's:

- (44) qa-kí-ł-ne· títú-e·s Ø táxa-s tsuk^uát-e·n'
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND father-POSS he then-OBV take-IMP
 a_a'kúł-a·k kún-ł-a-ts!úr-am.
 meat 2ND.PERSON-back-start.a.motion-IND.SUBJ]
 'He_{i.PROX} said to his_{i.PROX} father_{PROX}: "Now take the meat and go back home."'

Sentence (27) adds an example in which the Possessed is an Instrument:

- (27) qanł-ałt-mo-na'ps-e· Ø_i Ø_j
 [strike-INSTRUMENT-INVERSE-IND him he
 a_a'ko·qut!ei.-ís-e·s_j
 intestines-POSS-OBV]
 'He_{i.PROX} (the one) was struck by him_{j.OBV} (the other) with his_{j.OBV} (the other's) intestines.' (Boas 1926.98)
 [or 'He_{j.OBV} struck him_{i.PROX} with his_{j.OBV} intestines']

As Instrument, *intestines* is appropriately marked as Obviative *so long as* the Instrument is not the possession of the grammatically Proximate TOPIC. If that is the case, then the Instrument is likewise Proximate as in (28) (Garvin 1958.16):

- (28) sł-a·łkł-inq'uy-mu-ne· Ø_i qapsin-s
 [continue.play-INSTRUMENT-IND he something-OBV
 'a·kuqsał-a-'is_i
 nose-POSS]

As we have seen, non-AGENTS may be identified as TOPICS by *-aps-* and the grammar of Proximate. Non-AGENT Possessed terms seem to occur with *-aps-* as do the non-Possessed. We saw an example of this in footnote 21:

- Boas (1926.98) has another example:

- Boas (1926.98-99) has commented on these examples:

Possessed non-AGENT PARTICIPANTS may serve as TOPIC only if the *-aps-* that identifies them as such is accompanied by *-is-* ~ *-s-*. In footnote 21, we wondered why would we not say (31) in place of (29):

- on the model of (Dryer 1991a.198):

- ⁴³ Sentence (28) suggests that this extends to SAP Possessives.

The semantic and grammatical behavior of Possessives does two things. First, it adds to the delicacy of a Kutenai PROPOSITION separating non-TOPIC from semantic Obviatees, i.e., MARGINALITY.⁴⁵ In this one instance, at least,

⁴⁵ As noted, from Dryer's perspective, this is not so. Even though *máti ma-ʔis* in (20) has no overt Obviative *-s*, it is nevertheless Obviative (Dryer 1991a.196):

TOPIC and a NUCLEAR PARTICIPANT are not isomorphic. Cf. Figure 8.

Secondly, Possession amplifies the semantics of an ABIDING TOPIC. The conflict between the semantic ‘dependence’ of the Possessed and the semantics of an ABIDING TOPIC adds the complement independence (“importance”) of *non*-Possession to the semantics that composes a Kutenai TOPIC.

2.3.2.5 Kutenai TOPIC and first and second persons⁴⁶

Since section 2.2, our discussion of Kutenai has ignored the use of a first or second person. We will look first at the SAP as it functions as AGENT.

2.3.2.5.1 SAP as AGENT

SAP presence alters the morphosyntactic appearance of a sentence (Dryer 1991a.201, 1992.137):

- (33) (a) hu wu·kat-i xa’~~t~~çin
 [1ST.PERSON see-IND dog]
 ‘I saw the/a dog_{PROX}’
- (b) hu wu·kat-mi~~t~~-i xa’~~t~~çin-s
 [1ST.PERSON see-MIL-IND dog-OBV]
 ‘I saw the/a dog_{OBV}’

The Noun *xa’~~t~~çin* in (33a) has a Proximate inflection, not the expected Obviative one. In (33b), the Noun *xa’~~t~~çin* has the explicit Obviative inflection that we have come to expect of a PATIENT, but to gain this shape, there must be a verbal suffix *-mi~~t~~-* added.⁴⁷ We have seen a pattern parallel to

In ... [(20)], the subject is possessed by a third person participant and thus is obviative, triggering obviative subject marking on the verb.

Asserting (Dryer 1997a.36):

... that in noun phrases involving a noun possessed by a third person, the possessed noun must be obviative.

clearly ignores the minimal contrast between *xa~~t~~çin-ʔis-is* and *xa~~t~~çin-ʔis* in (24) and (25).

⁴⁶ Since first and second persons behave similarly, the examples here will be all first person ones. I will use the common abbreviation SAP for ‘speech act participant’, i.e., first or second person.

⁴⁷ This pattern is limited to the interaction between AGENT and PATIENT. When an Instrument

(33a) & (33b) just above in the grammatical behavior of Possession (repeated here):

- (34) (a) *małí* *wu·kat-i* *xałçin-ʼis*
 [Mary see-IND dog-POSS]
 ‘Mary_{PROX} saw her_{PROX} dog_{PROX}’
- (b) *misáł* *wu·kat-i* *xałçin-ʼis-is*
 [Mike see-IND dog-POSS-OBV]
 ‘Mike_{PROX} saw her_{OBV} dog_{OBV}’

The parallelism is this: (33a) & (34a) have a PATIENT *dog_{PROX}* while (33b) & (34b) have a PATIENT *dog_{OBV}*. A First Person AGENT TOPIC and a Third Person Possessor AGENT TOPIC appear with a Proximate PATIENT in (33a) & (34a), respectively, and with a Obviative Possessed PATIENT in (33b) & (34b), respectively. If it appears with an Obviative PATIENT, the First Person AGENT TOPIC requires *-mił-* and in (34b), the Possessor AGENT TOPIC is no longer the owner of the PATIENT. Given the parallelism, one would expect the remoteness, MARGINALITY, occasioned by the AGENT’s non-possession of the PATIENT in (34b) to be repeated in (33b). The ‘dog’ should be somehow remote — more MARGINAL — in (33b), but not in (33a). In (33b), the semantic MARGINALITY is reflected not by the Obviative *-s*, but by the necessary occurrence of *-mił-*.⁴⁸ The only remark on (33b) is this (Dryer 1991a.201):

When asked whether ... [(33b)] was grammatical, my consultant responded affirmatively, saying one might use it in a story if one were saying that one saw a dog, but ‘he’ didn’t, the implication being that one could use ... [(33b)] is a discourse context in which one was talking about someone else not mentioned in

is involved, *-mił-* is not required (Morgan (1991.443):

- (i) *hiy* *hu* *çu·ku-mu-ni* *ʃuʔu-s*
 [yes 1ST.PERSON pierce-by.point-INSTR-IND awl-OBV]
 ‘Yes, I pierced it with an awl.’

⁴⁸ Garvin (1958.7) concludes that the *-s*- Obviative and *-mił-* are marking the same content:

Suffixes 1131 [*mił*] and 1132 [*-s*] are thus alternants of the same morpheme, the obviative suffix.

Boas (1926.97) also recognizes the affinity between *-s-* and *-mił-*, labelling the latter ‘obviative’.

this particular sentence.⁴⁹

The MARGINALITY signalled by *-mił-* in (33) is repeated in (35) (Dryer 1991a.201):

- (35) (a) *hu wu·kat-i xałçin-ʼis misáł
 [1ST.PERSON see-IND dog-POSS Mike]
 ‘I saw Mike’_{SPROX dogPROX}
- (b) hu wu·kat-mił-ni xałçin-ʼis misáł
 [1ST.PERSON see-MIL-IND dog-POSS Mike]
 ‘I saw Mike’_{SPROX dogPROX}

Now the contrast is not between a Proximate and an Obviative PATIENT as in (33), but in how SAPs recognize Possessed PATIENTS. If the AGENT were Third Person as in (24), then the PATIENT in (35) would be Obviative, *xałçin-ʼis-is misáł-s*. This is not possible with SAPs, and the alternative to the ‘marginality’ of grammatical Obviation is again the ‘marginality’ of the suffix *-mił-*. The suffix *-mił-* would appear to be an affix of VOICE and one that recognizes the reduction of the VOICE value of a PATIENT.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Recall the old *She-wants-to-marry-a-man-with-a-big-bank-account* example. (Bach 1968.106)

⁵⁰ *Mił* recalls the use of *-amk-* in Bella Coola (Chapter 2, section 6.1):

- (i) (a) tx-is ti-ʼimmllkī-tx ti-čłsx^w-tx
 [cut-he/it -boy- -knife-]
 ‘The boy cut the rope’
- (b) tx-amk-is ti-ʼimmllkī-tx ti-čłsx^w-tx
 [cut-AMK-he/it -boy- -rope-]
 ‘The boy cut the rope along with other things’
- (ii) (a) lis-is ti-nusʼūłχ-tx ti-χmsta-tx
 [push-he/him -thief- -person-]
 ‘The thief pushed the person’
- (b) lis-amk-is ti-nusʼūłχ-tx ti-χmsta-tx
 [push-AMK-he/him -thief- -person-]
 ‘The thief pushed the person aside’
- (iii) (a) ʼistux-is ti-łχanm-tx ti-nan-tx
 [skin-he/it -hunter- -grizzly bear-]
 ‘The hunter skinned the grizzly bear’

There are no Obviative forms of SAPs, and *-mił-* has a wide range of uses, all of which seem to involve SAPs and a diminished degree of VOICE. This wider usage of *-mił-* is much less clear than what we have just seen in (33) and (35). In some uses, *-mił-* appears where the degree of ASSERTION is decreased, i.e., in ‘when’, ‘if’ clauses:

- (36) hu-tnaxa-*mił* połł 'isniłàmat-ikc-ap-ne·
 [1ST.PERSON-go.in-MIL Paul give-IND.OBJ-1ST.PERSON-IND]
 ‘When I went to see Paul he gave me some himself.’ (Garvin 1954.318)
- (37) ... qake-’-ne· xm-o-’-n-’aqan’ik-*mił* (Garvin 1954.318)
 [... say-IND INDEFINITIZER-1ST.PERSON-PRED-eat-MIL
 ’e-’é· ławuyałł
 huckleberries]
 ‘... he asked me if I wanted to eat some er, er, huckleberries.’

but there are other uses that are more opaque:

- (38) tnaxa’m-*mił*-kił (Garvin 1958.8)
 [come-MIL-IMP.PL]
 ‘Come in’

versus:

- (39) hamat-kic-kił qapsin-s (Garvin 1958.12)
 [give-IND.OBJ-IMP.PL something-OBV]
 ‘Give him something’

Dryer (1991a.201) says about *mił*, “A complete account of this suffix requires further study.” Fifteen years later, Zúñiga (2006.142) concurs: “Seldom is something as clear in descriptive studies as the need for further research in order to clarify the function(s) of Kutenai *-mił*.”

-
- (b) ’istux-amk-is ti-łXanm-tx ti-nan-tx
 [skin-AMK-he/it -hunter- -grizzly bear-]
 ‘The hunter went somewhere else to skin the grizzly bear’

Although in sharply distinct semantic and grammatical matrices, both Kutenai *-mił-* and Bella Coola *-amk-* may be accomplishing similar ends in the management of VOICE.

2.3.2.5.2 *SAP as non-AGENT*

When an SAP is used as a PATIENT, the result is similar to a Third Person pronominal form. The difference is that a Third Person is completely elided while the SAP is identified as distinct from the Third Person by means of a verbal suffix that specifies the person and number of the SAP:

- (40) taxas n'-itki-ne· qsàmunał-*ap*-ne· (Garvin 1953.308)
 [then PRED-do-IND help-1ST.PERSON-IND]
 'Then he did it, helped me.'
- (41) (a) ... 'at n̄-ukʔniłmityax-*nap*-ne· (Garvin 1954.327)
 [... indeed PRED-suddenly.bite-1ST.PERSON-IND]
 '... they bit me.'
- (b) q!akpakit-ḡó_u-ne· Appendix I, (5)
 [kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
 'He killed him.'
- (42) (a) hu-ts-àmats-kts-*ist*-ne· (Boas 1926.96)
 [1ST.PERSON-FUTURE-give-IND.OBJ-2ND.PERSON-IND
 ká-swin
 my-daughter]
 'I'll give you my daughter'
- (b) n-amat-íłts-e· Appendix I, (64)
 [PRED-give-IND.OBJ-IND]
 'She gave it to him.'

Sentences (36) and (43):

- (43) ... hu-nułpał-ne· ka-ma kaqankłp-an
 [1ST.PERSON-hear-IND 1ST.PERSON-mother call-1ST.PERSON]
 'I heard my mother calling me.' (Garvin 1953.310)

suggest that the AGENT need not be elided with an SAP PATIENT. It may be a Noun. Morgan (1991.437) has an example in which the nominal AGENT is Obviative and the PATIENT is an SAP:

- (44) qa-łwiy-ni xma k-ík-nap-is

[be.thus-heart-IND should SUBORDINATOR-eat-1ST.PERSON-OBV
 'i·ka'-s
 ogre-OBV]
 'He thinks that I should get eaten by an ogre.'

There is no suggestion that an SAP in an utterance like (40) would appear with the OBV.SUBJ -s- nor with the INVERSE -aps-. It is an unanswered question whether a PATIENT SAP has sufficient VOICE value to function as a TOPIC (as if it appeared with -aps-) or not.

2.3.2.6 *Kutenai TOPIC and ROLE*

We might expect that the interaction between TOPIC and the variety of EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLES would add to our understanding of ABIDING TOPIC, but that seems not to be the case. There does seem to be an asymmetry in the ROLES as they combine with an ABIDING TOPIC, but the criterion appears to be the character of the PARTICIPANT filling that ROLE and not the ROLE itself.

Outside the domain of SAP AGENTS and Possessing AGENTS, a clause permits but one EVENT-PARTICIPANT ROLE at a time. That one third person PARTICIPANT may be an AGENT — (45b), a PATIENT — (46b), a RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY — (47b)⁵¹, or a COMITATIVE — (48b):

(45) (a) *sant-t.ʔá_a-s-e·* *tʔnámu-'s.*
 [-tent-OBV.SUBJ-IND old.woman-OBV]
 'There was an old woman_{OBV} living in a tent.' Appendix I, (89)

(b) *qan-t.ʔá_a-ne· ne_i* *tʔnámu*
 [-tent-IND that.one old.woman]
 'The woman_{PROX} lived in the tent.' Appendix I, (6)

(46) (a) *qa-kí-ʔ-ne·* *Ø* *Ø*
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND her.OBV he.PROX]

⁵¹ Morgan (1991:312) identifies -ikts- as "the Benefactive Goal Suffix".

Boas (1926:95) says, "The indirect object of verbs with third person subject is in the obviative," and he provides this example:

(i) *N²-oqo-ʔ^ua-kín·-e·* *náhe·k-s*
 [IND-into.from.the.top-put-action.with.hand-IND basket-OBV]
 'He put it into the basket'

- ‘He said to her_{OBV}’ Appendix I, (95)
- (b) *qa-k.-ł-áps-e·* Ø Ø
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV
 ‘She told him_{PROX}’ Appendix I, (96)
- (47) (a) *n-amat-łkts-e·* Ø Ø
 [PRED-give-IND.OBJ-IND him.OBV she.PROX]
 ‘She gave it to him_{OBV}.’ Appendix I, (64)
- (b) *n-amat-ikts-áps-e·* Ø Ø
 [PRED-give-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND him.PROX she.OBV]
 ‘She gave it to him_{PROX}.’ Appendix I, (94b)
- (48) (a) *Skún·ku·ts qsa-mát-ne· nei-s pálkei-s*
 [coyote go-COMITATIVE-IND the-OBV woman-OBV
n’-in-s-e· tłamú’-e·s
 PRED-be-OBV.SUBJ-IND wife-POSS]
 ‘Coyote went with that woman_{OBV}, his wife’ (Boas 1918.38)
- (b) *#-’in-ne·*
 [3PERS-PRED-IND
*xma-k-#-qo--qawxam-nał-ił*⁵²

⁵² The suffix *-ił* “expresses the passive with indefinite actor” (Boas 1926.98). There is no expressible AGENT in these utterances, and the one PARTICIPANT ROLE may be the PATIENT as in (i):

- (i) *Tsuk^uat-ł-ne· skún·ku·ts.*
 [take-PASSIVE-IND coyote]
 ‘Coyote was taken’ (Boas 1918.39)

the RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY as in (ii) and (iii):

- (ii) *n-itkin-ikts-il-ni*
 [PRED-make.with.hand-IND.OBJ-PASS-IND]
 ‘illi factum est’ (Canestrelli 1926.35)
- (iii) *namat-łkts-łł-ne· á_akuqłá’nt!-e·s skún·ku·ts.*
 [give-IND.OBJ-PASS-IND clothing-POSS coyote]
 ‘Coyote was given his clothing’ (Boas 1918.9)

or the COMITATIVE as in (48b). This Passive in *-ił* seems transparent with respect to VOICE in that it permits its one PARTICIPANT to be either Proximate or Obviative (Dryer 1996.16, 26):

INDEFINITIZER-SUBJ-3PERS-there.go-COMITATIVE-PASSIVE

ka·miłnana c ...

Campbell.DIM and]

‘Someone should take Campbell_{PROX} out and ...’ (Garvin 1951.322)

[I.e., ‘Campbell_{PROX} should be gone out with and ...’]

- (c) *n-ha-kɪs-wɪsqap-mát-ne·* Ø
 [PRED- -DUAL-stand-COMITATIVE-IND they.two_{PROX}]
 ‘Two_{PROX} stand together’ (Boas 1926.89)

Four Kutenai EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations — Agent, Patient, Recipient/Beneficiary & Comitative — are attested in a Proximate form and, thereby, to be PROPOSITIONAL ROLES acting simultaneously as ABIDING TOPICS. Three Kutenai EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations — Instrument, Location & Temporal — seem never to appear with Proximate grammar.⁵³ Hence, there

- (iv) wu·kat-ił-ni
 [see-PASSIVE-IND]
 ‘He/she/it/they_{PROX} was/were seen’

- (v) wu·kat-ił-is-ni
 [see-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘He/she/it/they_{OBV} was/were seen’

In (iv), the elided PARTICIPANT would be Proximate, and in (v), Obviative.

⁵³ Unless crossed by the semantics of Possession. Sentence (i) is repeated from (28) above (Garvin 1958.16):

- (i) sɬa·tɬkɬinɣuy-mu-ne· Ø_i qapsin-s
 [continue.play-INSTRUMENT-IND he._{PROX} something-OBV
 ʔa·kuqsaɬa-ʔis_i
 nose-POSS]
 ‘He_{L,PROX} kept playing a game_{OBV} with his_{L,PROX} trunk_{PROX}.’

The Instrument ‘nose’ is Proximately marked as it is the Possession of an equally Proximate ‘he’. It is apparently the semantic primacy of the possessing Animate, Human ABIDING TOPIC that allows an Instrument access to Proximate grammar, i.e., ʔa·kuqsaɬa-ʔis_{PROX} and not ʔa·kuqsaɬa-ʔis-e_{OBV}. This suggests that without the suffix -ʔis, (i) would not be acceptable.

The freedom that the Kutenai Passive has with respect to VOICE (noted in the previous note) in turn suggests that -ił might occur with the Instrumental -mu- since the Instrument is never Proximate and -ił does not require it. Such a combination seems to be attested (Garvin 1958.12, 30):

- (ii) ... #-miskin-mu-ł Ø manita-s
 [... 3PERS-mix-INST-PASSIVE it_{PROX} ochre-OBV]

seems to be nothing like (49b) paired with (49a):

- (49) (a) qan-ʔaʔ-timú-n·e·.
 [along.there-strike-INSTRUMENT-IND]
 ‘and struck him with it.’ Appendix I (135)
- (b) *qan-ʔaʔ-timú-naps-e·.
 [along.there-strike-INSTRUMENT-INVERSE-IND]

Other relations marked by the Obviative, e.g., Temporals and Locatives (cf. 2.2 above) seem never to be expressed with the Proximate.

All seven EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations have Obviative expressions, and it could be the nature of the specific relation of the Agent, Patient, Recipient/Beneficiary & Comitative that allows access to ABIDING TOPIC, while the Instrument, Temporal & Location exclude it. But it is more likely, I think, that it is the semantics of the PARTICIPANTS that are filling those relations, and not the relations themselves, which allows expression as Proximate TOPIC or not. That is, PARTICIPANTS that are usual Instruments, Temporals, and Locations are just not the sort of entities that qualify as TOPIC.

2.3.2.7 *The Properties of PARTICIPANTS that are Kutenai ABIDING TOPICS*

In sections 2.3.2.1 - 2.3.2.6, we have seen the semantics of a Kutenai ABIDING TOPIC as it is revealed through its interaction with elision, indefinite, importance, possession, SAP, and ROLE. Figure 9 collects these properties and associates them visually.

While the semantics represented in Figure 9 are not themselves constitutive of a Kutenai ABIDING TOPIC, they are reflections of it. They do not, of course, “define” TOPIC in Kutenai, for two reasons. First, there are certainly additional semantics at play, most notably the semantic TOPIC function to which these ABIDING TOPICS are put. Second, because TOPIC is

‘when it_{PROX} was mixed with ochre_{OBV}’

- (iii) #-ʔukʔmux-ne·mu-ʔ-is-ne· tʔawu-ʔis ʔa·k-ʔis
 [3PERS-roast-INST-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ-IND bow-POSS arrow-POSS]
 ‘was-used-for-a-split his-bow [and] his-arrow’
 [I.e., ‘His bow and arrow were used to roast (it) with’]

[Boas 1918.351 has -ʔuk!mo- ‘to roast’ and ʔuk!moʔáme·k ‘he roasted it’.] In (iii), the verbal suffix -is- marks the one PARTICIPANT, ‘his bow and arrow’, as an Obviative non-TOPIC. The suffixation on tʔawu-ʔis and ʔa·k-ʔis marks them as the possessions of a Proximal TOPIC, ‘his’ as in (i). An Instrument can then be the one PARTICIPANT of a Passive so long as it is a non-TOPIC Obviative.

meaningful, a speaker can choose to recognize the understanding of TOPIC contained in Figure 9 by violating it⁵⁴; but a “violation” exists only because the pattern of Figure 9 exists.

ABIDING TOPIC	Not an ABIDING TOPIC
The precision of elision	The imprecision of indefinites
Importance, however recognized	Possessed, i.e. not important
SAP	

Figure 9: *Some Components of the Semantics of a Kutenai ABIDING TOPIC.*

2.3.3 *The Function of PARTICIPANTS that are ABIDING TOPICS*

We have now discussed the first half of TOPIC in Kutenai, i.e., the nature of those PARTICIPANTS that are Kutenai ABIDING TOPICS. The remaining task is to characterize the semantics which those qualified PARTICIPANTS are acting out. We saw above in section 2.3.2.3 that two otherwise very analogous passages from the text contrasted in that an old woman was the TOPIC in the first, and in the second, an old woman was not.⁵⁵ That is, the semantics of the function of an ABIDING TOPIC are independent from the PARTICIPANT that acts as one. A possible approach to the problem would be to attempt to predict when the grammar of an ABIDING TOPIC will occur and when it will not. The motivation supporting this position is the assumption that if one can make such a prediction, then the terms of that predictive statement must somehow embody TOPIC.

If prediction fails (and it does), then we are forced to confront squarely the task of describing TOPIC in Kutenai. There is no way for us to see it directly, and we must construct our understanding of it from what can be directly observed and to do so in such a way that the assemblage accommodates the

⁵⁴ But the “violation” is TOPIC as well. See, for example, the discussion of (113) in section 2.3.3.

⁵⁵ Appendix II is a discussion of the futility of such a goal.

separate observations in as natural a way as possible. There can be no right and wrong, no definitions, just an emerging grasp of what a speaker of Kutenai must have known about his/her language that made it sensible to form content in one way or another.

We begin with the fact that when a SPEECH ACT PARTICIPANT is involved in the content being expressed, that PARTICIPANT is unfailingly the TOPIC. This demand creates an opposition between You & I and the Others. It is only when We are not PARTICIPANTS in the content that some Other can step forward to assume the semantics of TOPIC that We have abandoned. We may understand this contrast in the following way. The content of a narrative or a conversation is not flat and without contour. It has a topography, peaks about which the remaining content is arrayed. When a SAP is part of the content, then it will always be that peak, and the view is from their perspective. When a SAP is absent from the content, then a non-SAP may assume that function. This implies two things. First, since there is but one We, there will be a single perspective per utterance, and when we are replaced, there will be one TOPIC. Using the notion of ‘perspective’ is consonant with the one TOPIC that Kutenai permits in a clause.⁵⁶

Second, since the SAPs are the epitome of perspective — they are the best and the default perspective — then their surrogates should reflect those properties. The ‘importance’ we have found in those PARTICIPANTS that are TOPICS is an empathetic projection of Us onto some Other. This projection cannot be literal. That is, ‘human’, ‘animate’, etc. may be the easiest implementation of the projection since that is what We are. But ‘importance’ has other embodiments. Recall from the text this utterance:

⁵⁶ It is important to keep in mind that the restriction to one TOPIC is not a necessary one. E.g., Lisu (Chapter 18) permits multiple TOPICS. In (i), there are five:

- (i) [nime nya]_{TOP} [ngwa nya]_{TOP} [nwu hi]_{TOP} [basyia ása]_{TOP}
 [today TOPIC I TOPIC you house beside Asa
 [læ yí nápu]_{TOP} bælətsha fwu ɣə-ŋ
 to he ear slap send give-DEC]
 ‘This morning beside your house I gave Asa **a slap** on his ear’

“Where an NP is the focus an optional deletion of the topic marker *nya* can apply to topics” (Hope 1974.13). Where there are many TOPIC elements, as in (35), “the deletion is not applied to the first few ‘to the left’” (Hope 1974.13); and the PARTICIPANTS that are not followed by *nya*, but which remain TOPICS, nevertheless, are each marked “by a slight fall in pitch”. Kutenai’s one follows from the way in which Kutenai as reacted to the demand of TOPIC.

- (113) qok^{ua}-yaḡá-ṭ-ne· a_a'kúṭa·k.
 [come-get-PASS-IND meat]
 'They took the meat.'
 [Lit. 'The meat was come for and gotten']

Grammatically, in (113), a_a'kúṭa·k 'meat' is the Proximate TOPIC. The Passive -ṭ- has accomplished two things. It has made it possible for a PATIENT to function as TOPIC, and second, since the Passive excludes any AGENT, it has separated a_a'kúṭa·k from other content. It is set forth by itself, isolated with its 'importance' reinforced. How can this be? The explanation is this. The narrative *The Youth Who Killed the Chiefs* is a story of famine and greed (of the chiefs).⁵⁷ After feeding his parents, The Youth travels through three villages ([57] - [82], [87] - [113], [116] - [139]). In each, he finds the same condition. The people are starving, and the chiefs have the food. In the context of universal famine, when a_a'kúṭa·k 'meat' is finally provided to the people, it is understandably 'important'. It is a big deal, and in (113), a_a'kúṭa·k 'meat' — at that moment — is the orienting point for other content. It is the ABIDING TOPIC.

Whereas some languages satisfy the orienting force of TOPIC by linking each utterance to the preceding, e.g., Bella Coola, others embody the orientation in by identifying privileged landmarks that serve to orient the content, e.g., Yaitepec Chatino. It is not necessary that a language rely exclusively on one or the other implementations of TOPIC. Chuj (Chapter 23) and Warao (Chapters 19 & 20) have more than one way to accomplish TOPIC, and Kutenai also appears to have more than one way: the STRING TOPIC of Figures 2 & 3, and the ABIDING TOPIC.⁵⁸

3. *Conclusion*

The behavior of SAPs shows a parallelism with that of Possession. In each case, both the PATIENT of an SAP AGENT and the Possessed PATIENT of a Possessing AGENT fail to show the grammar and the semantics of MARGINALITY. In each case, MARGINALITY of the PATIENT can be induced. When the AGENT is an SAP, the use of -miṭ- permits a MARGINAL PATIENT appropriately marked with the Obviative -s- — (31b), and where the PATIENT is itself a MARGINAL Possessed item, that MARGINALITY is recognized by the

⁵⁷ In (17), the first chief refuses to give food to his in-laws, and in (39) he tries to kill his father-in-law, who has managed to kill a buffalo. The other chiefs similarly hoard food.

⁵⁸ See Chapter 24 for a discussion and comparison of TOPIC in these various languages.

obligatory appearance of *-mit-* — (33b). A Possessing AGENT loses its dominance over a Possessed PATIENT when some other is the Possessor.

These parallelisms suggest that there is a semantic dominance by the SAP AGENT and the Possessing AGENT over their respective PATIENTS and Possessed PATIENTS. The semantics of this dominance must be founded in the semantics of VOICE, in the way that the intense VOICE semantics of one PROPOSITIONAL ROLE —say an AGENT in Bella Coola — can dominate the weaker VOICE semantics of another — say the PATIENT. Recall Figure 8 from above.

Excepting the corner of the language where AGENTS are SAPs or Possessors, there is but a single PROPOSITIONAL ROLE in a Kutenai PROPOSITION.

Appendix I

There are two published sources for Kutenai texts: Boas 1918 & 1926 and Garvin 1953 & 1954). Dryer (1992.156, 1994.94-95) cites additional texts, but these are unpublished, and except for a short excerpt (Dryer 1992.156-161), they are inaccessible. The text in Appendix I is from Franz Boas's (1918) *Kutenai Tales*, pages 28-33. There are seventy-seven texts in the collection. Forty-five of the texts are presented with interlinear glosses. "The Youth Who Killed the Chiefs", reproduced below, is the longest of that group. Boas (1918.28) notes that according to the person who told the story, it is a Blackfoot tale.

I have retained Boas's free translation of the text, but I have altered somewhat his word-by-word glosses using his Kutenai-English (313-352) and English-Kutenai (352-387) vocabularies. Boas arranges the text segmented into sentences punctuated with a period. I have kept that grouping and converted it into numbered sentences. The free English translations do not always correspond precisely with the Kutenai. For example, Kutenai sentence (4) is rendered with two English utterances. Keeping the Kutenai segmentation primary, I have not attempted to make the two congruent. The words in Boas's interlinear glosses are not segmented, and, where I cannot find that someone has performed the morphological analysis, the segmentation is mine. The grammatical morphemes are based on Boas 1926, Garvin 1948c & 1951, Dryer 1991a & 1994, and Morgan 1991.

Boas's transcription of the text almost certainly contains some subphonemic detail, and some of his notations are different from current practice. I have not altered his transcriptions; ! marks a glottal ejective.

The text, by Boas's transcription, contains 139 utterances. Five of those are quotations from the character's speech which not incorporated into an utterance containing *k*. ~ *ki* ~ *kɿ* ~ *ké_i* 'say': (23), (36), (51), (55), and (67). These five are set aside and do not figure in any percentages. There are now 134 utterances. Six utterances — (72), (94), (109), (121), (135) & (137) — are configured by Boas as single utterances although they are clearly composed of two independent morphosyntactic clauses in Kutenai. I have bifurcated each into an (a) and a (b) and added six to the total number of clauses. Thus, there are 140 utterances relevant to any counts.

The first ten utterances of the text seem confused/confusing in Boas's translation:

- (1) 'An old man who had a daughter lived in a tent.'
- (2) 'A man arrived.'
- (3) 'He kept his daughter.'
- (4) 'She had another child. It was a male.'
- (5) 'He killed him.'
- (6) 'The woman lived in the tent.'
- (7) 'She had another child. It was a girl.'
- (8) 'He kept her.'
- (9) 'The chief lived there, driving game.'
- (10) 'He skinned a buffalo cow.'

An alternative — still consistent with the morphosyntax — is the following:

- (1) 'An old man_i who had a daughter_j lived in a tent.'
- (2) 'A man_k arrived.'
- (3) 'He_k took his_i daughter_j.'⁵⁹
- (4) 'He_i had another child_i. It was a male_i.'
- (5) 'He_k killed him_i.'
- (6) 'The/A woman_m lived in a tent.'
- (7) 'She_m also had a child_n. It was a girl_n.'
- (8) 'He_k took her_n.'
- (9) 'The chief_k stayed there, driving game.'
- (10) 'He_k skinned a buffalo cow.'

Sentences (18) - (22) are similarly difficult in Boas's translation:

- (18) 'The old woman was hungry.'
- (19) 'The old man's son-in-law did not give him anything to eat.'
- (20) 'She had another child, a male.'
- (21) 'She said: 'Do not tell the chief that I have given birth.'
- (22) 'She said to her father: "Early tomorrow shoot a buffalo cow."'

A possible alternative is this:

- (18) 'The old woman_i was hungry.'
- (19) 'The old man's_j son-in-law_k [the chief] did not give her_i/him_j, i.e., them_{i/j}, anything to eat.'

⁵⁹ Cf. the note below on the grammar and possible glosses of (3).

- (20) 'He_j had another child_i, a male.'
 (21) 'He_j said: 'Do not tell the chief_k that I_j have (another) child_i.'
 (22) 'He_j said to his_i father_j: "Early tomorrow shoot a buffalo cow."'

In (21), *qap* apparently does not literally mean 'give birth'. The discussion in the note to (21) below suggests that the sense of *qap* is something like 'to be in some way/like that'. In (21), *qap* then refers back to *ʔa-ha-qáʔt-e* in (20), i.e., 'have another child'.

The Youth Who Killed the Chiefs

- (1)⁶⁰ Qan⁶¹-t.ʔá_a-ne· nuʔ'á-q_ana na-qáʔte· páʔke_i-s.
 [-tent⁶²-IND⁶³ old.man-husband one⁶⁴-child woman-OBV]
 'An old man_i who had a daughter_j lived in a tent.'
- (2) wáx-e·⁶⁵ túqa·t!.
 [arrive-IND man]
 'A man_k arrived.'

⁶⁰ Sentences (1) through (10) are presented with the alternative glosses discussed above.

⁶¹ Boas (1926.100) segments *qan* into *qa* 'absent invisible' and *n* 'standing'.

⁶² Boas (1918.336) "*t.ʔa* tent, house".

⁶³ The suffix *-ne·* is not found in the vocabularies in Boas 1918, but Boas (1926.87 et passim) and Garvin (1948c.172, 177) give it the gloss 'indicative', hence the IND here. It has a variant *-e·* (Garvin 1948c.177). Dryer (1992.124, 1994.66 et passim) has the shape *-ni* and the variant *-i*.

⁶⁴ Cf. Boas 1926.100.

⁶⁵ About *wáxe·*, Boas (1926.87) writes "-w- COMPLETION OF MOTION TOWARDS SPEAKER: *wáxe·*, HE ARRIVED HERE." On page 92, *-axe·* is "composed of *-a-x-e·*". The *-x-* is "COMPLETION OF MOTION AWAY FROM SPEAKER" and 'arriving there' (Boas 1926.87). I leave *wáx* unsegmented and glose *-e·* as IND.

- (3) tsuk^uát-e⁶⁶ swın-ís-e·s.⁶⁷
 [take-IND daughter-POSS-OBV
 ‘He_k took his_i daughter_j.’]
- (4) ʔa-ha-qáʔt-e· n’-ın-s-e·⁶⁸ títqat!-s.
 [also-have⁶⁹-child-IND PRED⁷⁰-be-OBV.SUBJ⁷¹-IND male-OBV]

⁶⁶ Boas (1918.339) has “tsuk^u(áte·) to take.” Boas (1926.102) has tsuk^uat(e·), suggesting -e-IND.

⁶⁷ Dryer (1992.127) has -ʔis-is as third person possessor plus Obviative. Boas (1918.28) adds a note to his gloss of (3):

Evidently he had married the girl, and he was in the habit of preserving the lives of his daughters, but killing his sons.

This grammatical sequence -ʔis-is indicates that the OBVIATIVE possessor of the daughter is not the same PROXIMATE individual who took her. Sentence (3) cannot mean ‘He_i kept his_i daughter’. Contrast (3) and (59) with (44) and (135a):

- (3) tsuk^uát-e· swın-ís-e·s.
 [take-IND daughter-POSS-OBV]
 ‘He_i took his_j daughter.’]
- (59) ʔın-aḡám-ne· a_a’kít.ʔa.-ís-e·s títnámu-’s.
 [going-into-go-IND tent-POSS-OBV old.woman-OBV]
 ‘He entered an old woman’s tent.’]
- (44) qa-kí-ʔ-ne· títú-e·s táḡa-s tsuk^uát-e·n’
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND father-POSS then-OBV take-IMP
 a_a’kúʔa·k kun-ʔa-ts!ún·-am.
 meat 2ND.PERSON-back-start.a.motion-IND.SUBJ]
 ‘He_i said to his_i father: “Now take the meat and go back home.”’]
- (135) (a) tsuk^uát-e· á_a’k!-e·s
 [take-IND arrow-POSS]
 ‘He_i took his_i arrow’]

It is clear in (59) that the tent is not the possession of the youth, who enters it. It is equally clear in (44) that the youth is addressing his own father, not someone else’s. The semantic distinction in (59) and (44) is maintained by -ís-e·s for the former and -e·s for the latter. In (135a), -e·s signals ‘his own’, not ‘his (someone else’s)’. Thus, (3) must mean ‘He took someone else’s daughter’.

⁶⁸ Dryer (1994.95) segments *nʔinsi* as *n-ʔin-s-i* ‘PR-be-OBVSUBJ-IND’. Boas (1926.89) has the contrasting form *n-ʔın-e·* ‘It is he’.

⁶⁹ Morgan 1991.230.

⁷⁰ Boas (1918.340) notes an “*n*’- prefix of indicative forms of all verbs beginning with a vowel” and an “*n*- prefix of indicative forms of all verbs beginning with an *h*”. Dryer

‘He_i had another child_i. It was a male_i.’

- (5) q!akpakit-ḡó_u-ne·.
[kill.by.striking⁷²-by.striking⁷³-IND]
‘He_k killed him_i.’
- (6) qan-t.ḡá_a-ne· ne_i tṭnám_u
[-tent-IND that.one⁷⁴ old.woman]
‘A/The woman_m lived in a tent.’
- (7) ḡa-ha-qáḡt-e· n’-ṭn-s-e·
[also-have-child-IND PRED-be-OBV.SUBJ-IND
na.ute-nána-s
girl-younger.sister.of.girl⁷⁵-OBV]
‘She_m had another child_n. It was a girl_n.’

(1994.95) describes

a prefix *n-* glossed PRED for ‘predicate marker’, a prefix marking declarative main verbs. It contrasts with the prefix *k-* glossed SUBOR for ‘subordinate’, the latter occurring on subordinate verbs and in questions. The predicate marker *n-* is only realized before stems beginning with *h* and *ʔ*, and only in the absence of certain verbal proclitics; it is otherwise not realized.

Since IND is being used to gloss *-ne· ~ -e·*, I will use Dryer’s grammatical label PRED. Garvin (1948b.173 et passim) identifies the prefix *k-* as the “interrogative; subject marker”. In Garvin’s numerical system of organizing affixes, *k-* is 101, and that is how it is represented in his grammatical glosses. In the examples taken from Garvin, I substitute SUBJ.MARKER as the gloss.

⁷¹ Dryer (1992.127):

... verbs in Kutenai with obviative subjects always bear a suffix *-(i)s* (identical to the suffix used on nouns to indicate their obviative status).

⁷² Boas (1918.367) has *q!akpa(kit)* ‘kill by striking’.

⁷³ Boas (1926.85): “-ḡo- action done with the body, by pounding or pressure; also an unintentional action.” Morgan (1991.240) has “-xu ‘by body’”.

⁷⁴ Morgan (1991.244) has “niʔ ‘the’, or untranslated” and (398) “The standard translation of /niʔ/ is ‘the’.” In (9), Boas glosses the form as ‘the’.

⁷⁵ This is Boas’s gloss. *-nana* is more likely a diminutive marker. Cf. examples (129) and (149) above, cited from Garvin 1954.

- (8) tsuk^uát-e·.
[take-IND]
'He_k kept her_n.'
- (9) qao-sã-qá_a.ne· ne_i nasó_uk^{ue}.n
[there-there-stay⁷⁶-IND the chief
n-aq_anít-e·k.
PRED-drive.game⁷⁷-REFLEXIVE⁷⁸]
'The chief_k lived there, driving game.'
- (10) n'-umitsé_t-te· ʔúpku·-s.
[PRED-skin⁷⁹-TRANS⁸⁰ buffalo.cow-OBV]
'He_k skinned a buffalo cow.'
- (11) ʔa-ts!ín-áḫ-e·.
[again-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
'He started to go back.'
- (12) tsuk^uát-e· a_a'q!_ukamaʔ-'ís-e·s.
[take-IND travois-POSS-OBV]
'He took a travois.'
- (13) ts!ín-áḫ-e·.
[start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
'He started off.'
- (14) n'-oqo-ḫá-'nt-e· a_a'kúʔ'a·k-s.
[PRED-in⁸¹-put-action.hand⁸²-IND meat-OBV]

⁷⁶ Boas (1918.337) has "sao-, saw- pr. there (Demonstrative)," "-saq- to lie," "saq-(q_a)- to lie down," and finally "sa-usaqá_qne· he staid there."

⁷⁷ Boas (1918.331): -haq_anít.

⁷⁸ Boas 1926.91, Garvin 1948c.172, and Morgan 1991.321.

⁷⁹ Cf. Boas 1926.95.

⁸⁰ Boas (1926.91) has -te·, transitive. Morgan (1991.290) identifies -t as "the T-Valence Increasing Suffix".

⁸¹ JBoas (1926.87) has "-oqo- INTO FROM THE TOP, also inside without regard to direction."

‘He put the meat into it.’

- (15) $\text{ʔa-ts!in-áx-e}.$
 [again-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘He started to go back.’
- (16) $\text{ʔa-ʔax-áx-e}.$
 [again-complete-go-IND]
 ‘He came back.’
- (17) $\text{qa-hís-e} \quad \text{nawaspáʔ-e's} \quad \text{ne}_i \quad \text{nasó}_u\text{kue'n}.$
 [NEG-give.food-IND father.in.law-POSS that chief]
 ‘That chief did not give any meat to his parents-in-law.’
- (18)⁸³ $\text{n-uwás}_i\text{-ne} \quad \text{ne}_i \quad \text{tʔnám}u.$
 [PRED-hungry-IND that old.woman]
 ‘The old woman_i was hungry.’
- (19) $\text{qa-hís-áps-e} \quad \text{nawaspáʔ-e's} \quad \text{ne}.$
 [NEG-give.food-INVERSE-IND son.in.law-POSS that
 $\text{nuʔ'á-q}_a\text{na}.$
 old.man-husband]
 ‘The old man’s_j son-in-law_k [the chief] did not give her_i/him_j, i.e.,
 them_{i/j} anything to eat.’
- (20) $\text{ʔa-ha-qáʔt-e} \quad \text{tʔtqa't!-s}.$
 [again-have-child-IND male-OBV]
 ‘He_j had another child₁, a male.’

Cf. also Morgan 1991.229.

⁸² Boas (1926.85) has “- *’nt-* action done with the hand, also an intentional action; plural.”

⁸³ Sentences (18) through (22) are presented with the glosses suggested above.

- (21) qa-k.-t-áps-e· ma_ats tsxa-ná·t-e·n'
 [thus-say-TRANS⁸⁴-INVERSE-IND don't⁸⁵ talk-?86-IMP⁸⁷
 nasó_ukue·n ne_i-s ko-ha-qáp-mi·t.
 chief that-OBV I-have-be⁸⁸-1PERSON.OBV⁸⁹]
 'He_j said to him_j: "Do not tell the chief that I have another child".'
- (22) qa-kí-t-ne· titú-e·s kanmíyit wó·t·na·m
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND father-POSS tomorrow early⁹⁰
 hun-ts-mít_a-ne· tókpu·.
 2PERS-FUTURE-shoot-IND buffalo.cow]
 'He_i said to his_i father_j: "Early tomorrow shoot a buffalo cow".'

⁸⁴ Boas (196.27) analyses a form *kín-tqakí·t·ki·t* as

k-in-t-qa-ki-t-ki·t
 participial-you-potential-thus-say-transitive-ye
 'you may tell him ...'

and elsewhere (104) cites "-t transitive as in -k/1/t to say to." Boas, elsewhere (1926.98):

The form *-aps* expresses a passive verb with definite actor, while *-it* expresses the passive with indefinite actor. *Qakí·t·ne·* means HE WAS TOLD; *qak·tápse·*, HE WAS TOLD BY HIM.

Dryer (1991a.191) has a form *qaki-t-ni* that is glossed as 'say-TRANS-INDIC'.

⁸⁵ "Negative Imperative, Prohibitive, Negative Future, usually can be glossed 'Don't'" (Morgan 1991.228).

⁸⁶ Boas (1926.97) has a form *-nat* 'on account of'.

⁸⁷ Boas (1926.87) has "-e·n' [imperative]". Garvin (1948c.172 & 1958.5) has "(-ēn ~ -n) ~-m singular imperative."

⁸⁸ Boas (1926.87) has a root *qap* 'to be in a condition' and (91) *-qa[p]* 'to be'. Finally, (1926.102): "the completive stem *-qa·* to be, has a secondary, probably older form *-qap* which is used in the obviative and in compounds." In a note to Canestrelli 1926, Boas (29) comments on *qaptek* as follows:

This is not an independent verb, but the reflexive of *-qa·ne·* a verb expressing most frequently a condition, a quality. Before certain endings and in composition the stem of this verb appears as *-qap·*. We also have *k!o·k!uqápe·*. THE ONLY ONE LEFT.

⁸⁹ Boas (1926.97 & 104) has an 'obviative, first person' suffix *-mi·t*. Garvin (1958.5) lists "*-mi·t*-, obviative for first and second person."

⁹⁰ Boas (1918.360) has *wí·t·na·m* 'early'.

- (23) *ma_ats hun-ts!-ont!-t-ne· nasó_ukue·n.*
 [dont' 2PERSON-FUTURE-be.afraid-TRANS-IND chief]
 "Don't be afraid of the chief."
- (24) *kka-nmíyt-t-s wó!na·m-s mıṭxa-ne· ı́ukpu-s*
 [coming⁹¹-day⁹²-OBV early-OBV shoot-IND buffalo.cow-OBV
ne_i nu!á-q_ana.
 that old.man-husband]
 'Early the next day the old man shot a buffalo cow.'
- (25) *n'-uk!ı́t'-ı́wá-ne· ı́upku-s.*
 [PRED- be.one⁹³-shoot-IND buffalo.cow-OBV]
 'He killed a cow.'
- (26) *wó!na·m-s n'-an-aɣam-ne·.*
 [early-OBV PRED-out.of-go⁹⁴-IND]
 '(The chief) went out early.'
- (27) *n'-ıp̣xa-ne· sak-nu·q!mé_i-s-e· ne_i-s*
 [PRED-see-IND -skin⁹⁵-OBV.SUBJ⁹⁶-IND⁹⁷ that-OBV
nu!á-q_ana-s.
 old.man-husband-OBV]
 'He saw the old man skinning.'
- (28) *ı́a·-tın-aɣám-ne·.*

⁹¹ This is uncertain. Cp. Boas 1918.342: "k- pr. coming, motion towards speaker".

⁹² Boas 1918.359

⁹³ "These stems [of which 'uk!u 'be one' is one] are sometimes joined directly to the following stem, sometimes they require a connective -t- ... With the connective -t- [e.g.] ... n' o'k!ı́t!ın·e· THERE WAS ONE ..." (Boas 1926.90-91).

⁹⁴ Boas (1918.363) has "to go out -anaɣa'm-."

⁹⁵ Boas (1918.372) has -hunuq!me-.

⁹⁶ Dryer (1992 and elsewhere) has the practice of glossing -(n)aps- as 'inverse', and -s- as 'obv.subj'. I maintain that notation here.

⁹⁷ Boas (1926.103) has 'OBV.IND'.

[again⁹⁸-into.away.from.speaker⁹⁹-go¹⁰⁰-IND]
 ‘He went in again.’

- (29) tsuk^uát-e· t!á-wu’-s.
 [take-IND knock-bow¹⁰¹-OBV]
 ‘He took a bow’.
- (30) qa-łwíy-ne· hu-ł-’up-ił ne_i
 [thus-mind/heart-IND 1ST.PERSON-POTENTIAL¹⁰²-die-TRANS¹⁰³ that
 nuł’á-qana.
 old.man-husband]
 ‘He thought: “I will kill that old man”.’
- (31) ts!n-áḫ-e· ne_i nasó_ukue·n.
 [start.away.from.speaker-go-IND that chief]
 ‘The chief started.’
- (32) łax-áḫ-e·
 [complete-go-IND]
 ‘He arrived.’

⁹⁸ ła- with a short a is ‘again’; łá- is ‘back, in turn’ (Boas 1918.350).

⁹⁹ In Boas 1918.336, *tu-* is ‘going to’. Boas (1926.87) analyses this form further: *t-!n-a-ḫam-ne*. *t-* is ‘into from the side’. Boas (1926.101) has a form *łatnaḫa’mne* analyzed as:

łá-t-n-a-ḫa’*mne*
 back/again-into-away.from.speaker- -

Notice that the first *ḫ* is repeated as *x*.

¹⁰⁰ The form *aḫam* may be *aḫ-am* and *-am-* an ‘indefinite subject’ (Boas 1926.97):

The obviative is also used when the subject of the verb of motion is indefinite, and has the form *-am*. Derivatives of *-axe*, to go are the principal verbs treated in this way.

Notice that Boas writes the form *-axe*, not with *ḫ*.

¹⁰¹ Boas (1918.337) glosses this as ‘gun’.

¹⁰² Boas (1926.97, 101): “*ł-* potential ... optative”. Garvin (1958.4) has “optative, unreal”.

¹⁰³ Cf. (21) above.

- (33) qa-kí-t-ne· ké-ti nínko ʔútku·
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND INTERR¹⁰⁴-be you¹⁰⁵ buffalo.cow
 kin-s-t-ʔtwa.
 2ND.PERSON-?-POTENTIAL-shoot]
 ‘He said to him: “Did you kill a cow?”’
- (34) qa-ké-t-ne· ne_i nuʔʔá-qana he· nʔ-ú-t-e·
 [thus-say-IND that old.man-husband yes PRED-be-IND
 kámin.
 I]
 ‘The old man said: “Yes, it is mine”.’
- (35) qa-ké-t-ne· ne_i nasó_ukue·n wáha qa.-ú-t-e·
 [thus-say-IND that chief no NEG-be-IND
 nínko.
 yours]
 ‘The chief said: “No; it is not yours,” ...
- (36) nʔ-ú-t-e· kámin.
 [PRED-be-IND I]
 “‘It is mine”.’
- (37) tsukuát-e· t!a-wúʔ-e·s nasó_ukue·n.
 [take-IND knock-bow-POSS chief]
 ‘The chief took his bow.’
- (38) qa.-úp_xa-ne· ntstáhaʔ-s sao-saqáp-s-e.¹⁰⁶
 [NEG-see-IND youth-OBV there-stay-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘He did not see the youth who was there.’

¹⁰⁴ Garvin (1958.4): “-k- ~ -ki- ~ -kēʔ-, interrogative; subject marker.”

¹⁰⁵ Morgan (1991.247) has

ninku Second and Third Person Independent Pronoun Base ...
 Alone it is the independent pronoun
 ninku you, your, yourself

¹⁰⁶ This form contrasts with *sao-saqá-ne·* ‘He stays here’ (Boas 1926.90).

- (39) qa-łwíy-ne· kt-ts-úpi-ł ne·-s
 [NEG-mind-IND PARTICIPLE¹⁰⁷-FUTURE-kill that-OBV
 nuł'á-qana-s.
 old-husband-OBV]
 'He thought he would kill the old man.'
- (40) n'-owók_a-ne· ne_i ntstáhał.
 [PRED-arise¹⁰⁸-IND that youth]
 'The youth arose.'
- (41) tsuk^uát-e· t!a-wú-e-s.
 [take-IND knock-bow-POSS]
- (42) mtḡ_a-ne· nasók^{ue}-n-s.
 [shoot-IND chief-OBV]
 'He shot the chief.'
- (43) n'-ip-ł-ł-ne·
 [PRED-dead-TRANS-IND]
 'He killed him.'
- (44) qa-kí-ł-ne· ttú-e-s táxa-s tsuk^uát-e·n'
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND father-POSS then-OBV take-IMP
 a_a'kúłak kún-ł-a-ts!úr-am.
 meat 2ND.PERSON-back-start.a.motion¹⁰⁹-IND.SUBJ]
 'He said to his father: "Now take the meat and go back home."'
- (45) tsuk^uát-e·.
 [take-IND]
 'He took it.'
- (46) ł-a-łax-áx-e·.
 [again-complete-go-IND]
 'He arrived at home.'

¹⁰⁷ Cf. "*k(i)* ... participle" (Boas 1926.90 et passim).

¹⁰⁸ Boas (1928.326) has "*-uwok_u*- to arise".

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Boas 1926.87.

- (47) $t_1n\text{-}a\acute{x}\acute{a}m\text{-}ne\cdot$ $a_a\text{'}kit.\acute{t}a\text{-}\acute{t}s\text{-}e\cdot s$ $ne_i\text{-}s$
 [going.into-go-IND tent¹¹⁰-POSS-OBV that-OBV]
 $nas\acute{o}_uk^ue\cdot n\text{-}s$ ne_i $ntst\acute{a}ha\acute{t}$.
 chief-OBV that youth]
 'The youth entered the chief's tent.'
- (48) $t\acute{t}namu.\text{-}\acute{t}s\text{-}e\cdot s$
 [old.woman-POSS-OBV
 $n'\text{-}uk\text{!}u\acute{t}\text{-}q\text{!}akpakit\text{-}\acute{x}\acute{o}_u\text{-}ne\cdot$.
 PRED-be.one-kill.by.striking-by-striking-IND]
 'At once he killed the chief's wives.'
- (49) $n'\text{-}an\text{-}aqan\text{-}m\acute{t}\text{-}e\cdot$.
 [PRED-out.of/away.from.speaker-COLLECTIVE¹¹¹-throw-IND]
 'He threw them outside.'
- (50) $qa\text{-}k\acute{t}\text{-}\acute{t}\text{-}ne\cdot$ $t\acute{t}u'\text{-}e\cdot s$ $n\acute{u}nko$ $tun\text{-}a\acute{x}\acute{a}m\text{-}e\cdot n$.
 [thus-say-TRANS father-POSS you going.into-go-IMP]
 'He said to his father: "Go in."'
- (51) $ta\acute{x}a\acute{t}'\text{-}\acute{u}\cdot\text{-}e\cdot$ $a_a\text{'}kit.\acute{t}\acute{a}'\text{-}ne\cdot s$.
 [FUTURE-be-IND tent-your¹¹²]
 "'It will be your tent.'"
- (52) $Qa\text{-}k\acute{t}\text{-}\acute{t}\text{-}ne\cdot$ $m\acute{a}\text{-}e\cdot s$ $k\acute{e}\text{-}\acute{t}u$ $aq\acute{t}sm\acute{a}ki\text{-}n\acute{u}k\text{!}$.
 [thus-say-TRANS mother-POSS INTERR-110 ?-people¹¹³]
 'He said to his mother: "Are there no people?"'
- (53) $qa\text{-}k.\text{-}\acute{t}\text{-}aps\text{-}e\cdot$ ne_i $k\text{!}una\text{-}nm\acute{t}uk$
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND the down-river
 $s\text{-}a_k.\acute{t}u\text{-}n\acute{a}m\text{-}ne\cdot$.

¹¹⁰ " a_a 'k prefix of a noun ... a_a 'kit. $\acute{t}\acute{a}$ nam tent " (Boas 1918.314).

¹¹¹ Boas (1926.88) has a 'collective' affix $-qan\text{-}$.

¹¹² Garvin (1948c.181) has $?a\text{'}kit\acute{t}\text{'}\text{-}ne\cdot s$ 'your house'. This is the PROXIMAL form. The OBVIATIVE is $?a\text{'}kit\acute{t}\text{'}\text{-}nis\text{-}mi\acute{t}$ (Garvin 1948c.178-179).

¹¹³ Boas 1926.85, 100.

(54) qa-k.-t-aps-e· ya_a-qa-qá_a-ke·
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND where.there.is¹¹⁵-thus-be¹¹⁶-
 na· á_a‘ke qa-qá_a-ne· nasó_uk^{ue}n.
 this.one also thus-be-IND chief]
 ‘He was told: “The chief there is like this one was.”’

(56) qa-ké_i-ne_i ne_i nitstáhał
[thus-say-IND the youth
hu-ts!un-áḫ-e.
1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
‘The youth said: “I will start.”’

(58) ʔa·x-áx-e·.
[complete-go-IND]
'He arrived there.'

(59) t₁-a-xám-ne· a_a'kut.ʔa.-ís-e·s tɪʔnámu-'s.
[going.into-go-IND tent-POSS-OBV old.woman-OBV]
'He entered an old woman's tent.'

¹¹⁷ “-ka suff. some one (indefinite object)” (Boas 1918.342).

- (60) *qa-kí-ł-ne·* *hu-n-uwás_i-ne·*.
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 ‘He said to her: “I am hungry.”’
- (61) *qa-k.-ł-áps-e·* *hu-n-uwas’-nałá_a-ne·*.
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-PL-IND]
 ‘He was told: “We are hungry.”’
- (62) *tsuk^uát-e·* *átsu-s*.
 [take-IND dish-OBV]
 ‘She took a dish.’
- (63) *n’-oqo-ḡá-’nt-e·*.
 [PRED-in-put-action.hand-IND]
 ‘She put something into it.’
- (64) *n-amat-łkts-e·*.
 [PRED-give¹¹⁸-IND.OBJ¹¹⁹-IND]
 ‘She gave it to him.’
- (65) *qa-k.-ł-áps-e·* *ho-qua-ké_i-ne·*
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND 1ST.PERSON-thus¹²⁰-say-IND
 hu-n-uwás_i-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 ‘She was told: “I said I am hungry.”’
- (66) *qa-ké_i-ne·* *ne_i* *tłłnámu*
 [thus-say-IND the old.woman
 hu-n-uwas’-nałá_a-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-PL-IND]
 ‘The old woman said: “We are hungry”.’
- (67) *nasó_ukue·n* *a_a’kút.łá-e·s* *yuna-qá_a-ne·* *k!-ik-eł*

¹¹⁸ *hamat* ‘to give’ (Boas 1918.330).

¹¹⁹ “-*kts* [ind. obj.]” (Boas 1926.96). Cf. also Garvin 1948c.172 and Morgan 1991.316.

¹²⁰ “*qa-* thus (*q^ua* after *u* ...)” (Boas 1926.103).

[chief tent-POSS much-be-IND PART¹²¹-eat-PASS
 at qa_a-t_in-a_xam-nám-ne.
 but NEG-going.into-go-INDEF.SUBJ¹²²-IND]
 “‘There is much food in the chief’s tent, but nobody goes in there’.”

- (68) qa-ké_i-ne_e ne_i ntstáhał
 [thus-say-IND the youth
 hu-ts!_in-á_x-e.
 1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘The youth said: “I’ll go there”.’
- (69) qa-k.-ł-áps-e_e ne_i-s t_iłnámu’-s
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND the-OBV old.woman-OBV
 ma_ats ts!_in-an’.
 don’t start.away.from.speaker-IMP]
 ‘He was told by the old woman: “Don’t go”.’
- (70) n’-owók_u-ne_e ne_i ntstáhał.
 [PRED-arise-IND the youth]
 ‘The youth arose’
- (71) qao-ḡáḡ-e_e.
 [there-reach¹²³-IND]
 ‘He went there.’
- (72) (a) tun-a_xám-ne_e á_akıt.ł-a-ís-e_s nasó_ukue_e-n-s
 [going.into-go-IND tent-POSS-OBV chief-OBV]
 ‘He entered the chief’s tent.’
- (72) (b) sak.-łé_its-e_e
 [-sleep¹²⁴-IND]
 ‘(The chief) was asleep.’

121 “*k*!- participle before vowels ...*k*- before consonants” (Boas 1926.100).

122 “*-nam* indefinite (like German *man*, French *on* ...)” (Boas 1926.104).

123 Boas 1918.349.

124 “-łe_its to sleep, only in compounds” (Boas 1926.101).

- (73) qa-kí-ł-ne·
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND
 hu-sł-łk-aḡám-ne·
 1ST.PERSON-CONTINUATIVE-coming.into¹²⁵-go-IND
 á_akłt.łá-'ne·s.
 tent-your]
 '(The youth) said to him: "I have entered your tent".'
- (74) n'-uk_uno-ḡám-ne·.
 [PRED-rise¹²⁶-go-IND]
 '(The chief) got up from his bed.'
- (75) n'-uṇápte·k włłma·ł.
 [PRED-become rattlesnake]
 'He became a rattlesnake.'
- (76) tsuk^uát-e· á_a'k!-e·s.
 [take-IND arrow-POSS]
 '(The youth) took his arrow.'
- (77) qan-łáł-te·.
 [along.there-strike-IND]
 'He struck him.'
- (78) q!akpakit-ḡó_u-ne·.
 [kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
 'He knocked him down.'
- (79) ne_i-s ał-tłłnamú'-e·s
 [the-OBV PL¹²⁷-old.woman-POSS
 n'-uk!łł-in·qapták-s-e· włłma·ł-s.
 PRED-be.one-become¹²⁸-OBV.SUBJ-IND rattlesnake-OBV]
 'His wives at once became rattlesnakes,'

¹²⁵ "uk- pr. coming into" (Boas 1918.336).

¹²⁶ "-uknu- to rise" (Boas 1918.327).

¹²⁷ Garvin 1948c.171.

¹²⁸ Boas (1918.325) has "-uṇápte·k to become".

- (80) n'-uk!u!t-q!akpakit-xó_u-ne.
[PRED-be.one-kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
'and he knocked them down.'
- (81) ʔa-an-aḡá.m-ne.
[again-out.of-go-IND]
'He went out again.'
- (82) qa-ké_i-ne. q!ápe qok^ua-yaxá-ke_iʔ a_a'kúʔa.k.
[thus-say-IND all come-get¹²⁹-PL meat]
'He said: "Come in, all of you, and get meat".'
- (83) Qa-ké_i-ne. nttstáhaʔ kí-ʔu aqʔsmák_i.ntk!
[thus-say-IND youth INTERR-no ?-people
ʔaák!ʔa.k.
others]
'The youth said: "Are there no other people?"'
- (84) qa-ki-ʔ-ʔ-ne. ne_i k!una-nmítuk
[thus-say-TRANS-PASS-IND that down-river
s-a_ak.ʔu-nám-ne.
there.is-town-IND.SUBJ-IND]
'He was told: "There is a town down the river".'
- (85) qa-ké_i-ne. ne_i nttstáhaʔ
[thus-say-IND the youth
hu-ʔ-ts!ʔn-áḡ-e.
1ST.PERSON-POTENTIAL-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
'The youth said: "I will start".'
- (86) qa-ki-ʔ-ʔ-ne. sahán-e nasó_uk^{ue}.n.
[thus-say-TRANS-PASS-IND bad-IND chief]
'He was told: "The chief is bad".'
- (87) ts!ʔn-áḡ-e.
[start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
'He started.'

¹²⁹ Boas (1928.328) has "-yax- to come into contact, to reach, to get" but then also "-qunyaxa- to touch", which suggests the segmentation here, i.e. -yaxá-.

- (88) $\dot{\text{t}}\text{ax}-\acute{\text{a}}\text{x}-\text{e}^{\cdot}$ $\text{s}-\text{a}_\text{a}\text{k}.\dot{\text{t}}\text{u}-\text{nam}-\acute{\text{t}}\text{s}_\text{r}-\text{ne}^{\cdot}$.
 [complete-go-IND there.is-town-IND.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ¹³⁰-IND]
 ‘He arrived at the town.’
- (89) $\text{sant}-\text{t}.\dot{\text{t}}\acute{\text{a}}_\text{a}-\text{s}-\text{e}^{\cdot}$ $\text{t}\dot{\text{t}}\text{n}\acute{\text{a}}\text{mu}-\text{'s}$.
 [-tent-OBV.SUBJ-IND old.woman-OBV]
 ‘There was an old woman living in a tent.’
- (90) $\text{tun}-\text{ax}\acute{\text{a}}\text{m}-\text{ne}^{\cdot}$.
 [going.into-go-IND]
 ‘He entered.’
- (91) $\text{qa}-\text{k}\acute{\text{t}}-\dot{\text{t}}-\text{ne}^{\cdot}$ $\text{hu}-\text{n}-\text{uw}\acute{\text{a}}\text{s}_\text{r}-\text{ne}^{\cdot}$.
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 ‘He said to her: “I am hungry”.’
- (92) $\text{qa}-\text{k}.-\dot{\text{t}}-\acute{\text{a}}\text{pse}^{\cdot}$ $\text{hu}-\text{n}-\text{uwas}'-\text{na}\dot{\text{t}}\acute{\text{a}}_\text{a}-\text{ne}^{\cdot}$.
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-PL-IND]
 ‘He was told: “We are hungry”.’
- (93) $\text{tsuk}^{\text{u}}\acute{\text{a}}\text{t}.-\text{s}-\text{e}^{\cdot}$ $\acute{\text{a}}\text{tsu}-\text{s}$.
 [take-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV]
 ‘She took a dish.’
- (94) (a) $\text{n}'-\text{oqo}_{\text{ur}}\text{x}\text{a}-\text{k}\acute{\text{t}}\text{n}-\text{s}-\text{e}^{\cdot}$
 [PRED-in-put-action.done.with.the.hand¹³¹-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘She put something into it.’
- (b) $\text{n}-\text{amat}-\text{ikts}-\acute{\text{a}}\text{ps}-\text{e}^{\cdot}$.
 [PRED-give-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND]
 ‘She gave it to him.’¹³²

¹³⁰ This is probably Obviative. Garvin (1948c.180) has an example *mitxa\acute{t}it-nam-is-ne'* ‘Somebody fired a shot (obv.)’

¹³¹ Boas 1926.85.

¹³² Although there are two utterances in the English translation, in his transcription, Boas treats (94) as one Kutenai utterance. Sentences (62) and (63) parallel (94). There are two English utterances in the gloss, but unlike (94), Boas has transcribed (62) and (63) as two Kutenai utterances. Because the finite verbs of both portions of (94) appear to partake in the pattern of topic, I have compromised by grouping both into (94), but in the tally of utterances

- (95) qa-kí-ł-ne· ho-qa-kéi-ne·
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND 1ST.PERSON-thus-say-IND
 hu-n-uwás-ı-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 ‘He said to her: “I said I am hungry”.’
- (96) qa-k.-ł-áps-e· łó_u-ne·
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND no-IND
 ku.-ik_i-náła.
 SUBORDINATE¹³³-food-PL]
 ‘He was told: “There is no food”.’
- (97) qa-k.-ł-áps-e· ne_i
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND that
 han-t.ła-nám-ke· yuna-qá_a-ne· k!-łk-e-ł
 DEM¹³⁴-tent-INDEF.SUBJ-NOM¹³⁵ much-be-IND PART-eat-PASS
 at qa-tun-aḡam-nám-ne·.
 but NEG-going.into-go-INDEF.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘He was told: “There is much food in that tent, but nobody goes in there”.’
- (98) qa-ké-ı-ne· ne_i ntstáhał
 [thus-say-IND the youth
 hu-ts!ın-áḡ-e·.
 1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘The youth said: “I’ll go”.’

and in the percentages, (94) will count as two independent clauses.

¹³³ Morgan 1991.227.

¹³⁴ Boas (1926.92):

The elements which precede the complex so far described present considerable difficulties because some of the stems cannot be readily be isolated and possess a very weak meaning only. This is true particularly of the forms *ha-*, *han-*, *hak-*, *hał-*, which I believe may be classed with the demonstratives ...

¹³⁵ Garvin 1948c.172 et passim. *Ke-* is commonly glossed ‘where’, but also ‘why’ (176), ‘the reason’ (176), ‘the one’ (177), ‘the way’ (174, 178), gerund ‘-ing’ (173, 185), and ‘that’s what’ (175).

- (99) n'-an-aḡám-ne·.
[PRED-out.of-go-IND]
'He went out.'
- (100) qao-ḡáḡ-e·.
[there-reach-IND]
'He got there.'
- (101) tun-aḡám-ne·.
[going.into-go-IND]
'He entered.'
- (102) sak.-ḡéḡs-e· nasó_ukue·n.
[-sleep-IND chief]
'and the chief was asleep.'
- (103) qa-kí-ḡ-ne· o·k_uno-ḡám-en'·.
[thus-say-TRANS-IND rise-go-IMP]
'He said to him: Get up''.'
- (104) n'-okun-ḡám-ne· ne_i nasó_ukue·n.
[PRED-rise-go-IND the chief]
'The chief got up from his bed.'
- (105) n'-unqápte·k k.ḡáwḡa-'s.
[PRED-become grizzly.bear-OBV]
'He became a grizzly bear.'
- (106) tsuk^{uat}-e· á_a'k!-e·s ne_i ntstáhaḡ.
[take-IND arrow-POSS the youth]
'The youth took his arrow.'
- (107) qan-ḡáḡt-e·.
[along.there-strike-IND]
'and struck him.'
- (108) q!akpakit-ḡó_u-ne·.
[kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
'He knocked him down.'

- (109) (a) ne_i -s $a\dot{t}t\dot{t}namu$.-ís-e-s
 [the-OBV PL-old.woman-POSS-OBV
 n -ók! $\dot{u}t$ -’ $\dot{u}nqapták$ -s-e k .-áwáa-’s
 PRED-be.one-become-OBV.SUBJ-IND grizzly.bear-OBV
 ‘At once (the chief’s) wives became grizzly bears.’
- (b) n -ók! $\dot{u}t$ -q! $\dot{a}kpakit$ -xó \dot{u} -ne.
 PRED-be.one-kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
 ‘He knocked them down.’¹³⁶
- (110) n ’-an-aqan-mít-e.
 [PRED-out.of/away.from.speaker-COLLECTIVE-throw-IND]
 ‘He threw them outside.’
- (111) $\dot{t}a$ -an-a $\dot{x}ám$ -ne ne_i $\dot{u}ntstáha\dot{t}$.
 [again-out.of-go-IND the youth]
 ‘The youth went out again.’
- (112) qa -ké \dot{r} -ne qok^ua -ya $\dot{x}á$ -ke \dot{t} a_a ’kú $\dot{t}a$ ·k.
 [thus-say-IND come-get-PL meat]
 ‘He said: “Take the meat”.’
- (113) qok^ua -ya $\dot{x}á$ - \dot{t} -ne a_a ’kú $\dot{t}a$ ·k.
 [come-get-PASS-IND meat]
 ‘They took the meat.’
- (114) Qa -ké \dot{r} -ne ne_i $\dot{u}ntstáha\dot{t}$ $kí$ - $\dot{t}u$ $aq\dot{t}smák_i$ · $\dot{u}nk$!
 [thus-say-IND the youth INTERR- $\dot{u}no$?-people
 $\dot{t}aák$! $\dot{t}a$ ·k.
 others]
 ‘The youth said: “Are there no other people?”’
- (115) qa -ki- \dot{t} - \dot{t} -ne ne_i $k!$ un-anmítuk
 [thus-say-TRANS-PASS-IND that down-river
 s - a_a k. $\dot{t}u$ -nám-ne.

¹³⁶ Sentence (108) parallels (93) in its relation to (62) and (63). Here, there is again one Kutenai utterance in the transcription and two in the English Gloss. Sentences (78) and (79) bear the same relation to (108) as (62) and (63) do to (93). I have repeated the compromise of (93).

there.is-town-IND.SUBJ-IND]
'He was told: "There is a town down the river".'

- (116) ts!in-áx-e· ne_i ntstáhaʔ.
[start.away.from.speaker-go-IND the youth]
‘The youth started.’
- (117) ʔax-áx-e· s-a_ak.ʔu-nam-ís-ne·.
[complete-go-IND there.is-town-IND.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ-IND]
‘He arrived at the town.’
- (118) tin-a_xám-ne· a_a‘kít.ʔa.-ís-e·s tʔnámú-’s.
[going.into-tent-POSS-OBV old.woman-OBV]
‘He entered the tent of an old woman.’
- (119) qa-kí-ʔ-ne· hu-n-uwás-_i-ne·.
[thus-say-TRANS-IND 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
‘He said to her: “I am hungry”.’
- (120) qa-k.-ʔ-áps-e· ʔó_u-ne· ku-ík-náʔa.
[thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND no-IND 1ST.PERSON-food-PL]
‘He was told: “We have no food”.’
- (121) (a) tsuk^uát.-s-e· átsu-s
[take-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV]
‘She took a dish’
- (b) n’-oqou_u.xá-’nt-s-e átsu-s.
[PRED-in-put-action.hand-OBV.SUBJ-IND dish-OBV]
‘and put something into the dish.’¹³⁷
- (122) n-amat-ikts-áps-e·.
[PRED-give¹³⁸-IND.OBJ-INVERSE-IND]

¹³⁷ Notice the contrast between (120) and (93) and (108). Boas transcribes (120) as one Kutenai utterance as he did (93) and (108), but (120) differs in that there is one English utterance as a gloss, whereas (93) and (108) each have two English glosses. Contrast (120) with the similar (61) and (62), which are two Kutenai utterances paired with two English utterances as gloss. In (120), I have followed the practice used in (93) and (108)

¹³⁸ “*hamat* to give” (Boas 1918.330).

‘She gave it to him.’

- (123) qa-kí-ł-ne· ho-qua-ké_i-ne·
 [thus-say-TRANS-IND 1ST.PERSON-thus-say-IND
 hu-n-uwás_i-ne·.
 1ST.PERSON-PRED-hungry-IND]
 ‘He spoke to her, he said: “I am hungry”.’

- (124) qa-k.-ł-áps-e· ne_i han-tt.ła-n·ám-ke·
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND that DEM-tent-INDEF.SUBJ-NOM
 yuna-qá_a-ne· k!-łk-e-ł at
 much-be-IND PART-eat-PASS but
 qa-tın-aḡam-nám-ne·.
 NEG-going.into-go-INDEF.SUBJ-IND]
 ‘He was told there is much food in that tent, but nobody goes in there.’

- (125) qa-ké_i-ne· ne_i ntstáhał
 [thus-say-IND the youth
 hu-ts!ın-áḡ-e·.
 1ST.PERSON-start.away.from.speaker-go-IND]
 ‘The youth said: “I’ll go”.’

- (126) qa-k.-ł-áps-e· ne_i-s ttłnám_u-’s
 [thus-say-TRANS-INVERSE-IND the-OBV old.woman-OBV
 ma_ats ts!ın-an’.
 don’t start.away.from.speaker-IMP]
 ‘He was told by the old woman: “Don’t go there”.’

- (127) n’-owók_u-ne·.
 [PRED-rise-IND]
 ‘He arose.’

- (128) n’-an-aḡám-ne·.
 [PRED-out.of-go-IND]
 ‘He went out.’

- (129) qao-ḡáḡ-e·.
 [there-reach-IND]

‘He went there.’

- (130) tun-aḡám-ne.
[going.into-go-IND]
‘He entered.’
- (131) n’-tsak_unú-n·e.
[PRED-sit.down-IND]
‘He sat down.’
- (132) qa-kí-ṭ-ne· okno-ḡám-en’.
[thus-say-TRANS-IND rise-go-IMP]
‘He said to the chief: ‘Arise’.’
- (133) n’-okno-ḡám-ne· ne_i nasó_uk^{ue}·n.
[PRED-rise-go-IND the chief]
‘The chief got up from his bed.’
- (134) n’-unqáptse·k nṽṭseik-s.
[PRED-become buffalo.bull-OBV]
‘He became a buffalo bull.’
- (135) (a) tsuk^uát-e· á_a‘k!-e·s
[take-IND arrow-POSS]
‘(The youth) took his arrow’
- (b) qan-ṭaṭ-timú-n·e·.
along.there¹³⁹-strike-INSTRUMENT¹⁴⁰-IND]
‘and struck him with it.’¹⁴¹
- (136) q!akpakit-ḡó_u-ne·.
[kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
‘He knocked him down.’

¹³⁹ Boas (1918.346) has “qan- pr. along there” and “qanṭaṭte· he struck it.”

¹⁴⁰ Morgan (1991.315) cites a form *-tmu* and says “This is a compound suffix composed of the T-Valence Increasing Suffix /-t/ and the Instrumental Suffix /-mu/.”

¹⁴¹ Cp. (120).

- (137) (a) *ne_i-s ałtułnamu.-ís-e·s*
 [the-OBV old.woman-POSS-OBV
 n'-ok!ııł'-unqapták-s-e· *łúkpu-s*
 PRED-be.one-become-OBV.SUBJ-IND buffalo.cow-OBV]
 ‘(The chief’s) wives at once became buffalo cows.’
- (b) *n'-ok!ııł-q!akpakit-ıó_u-ne·.*
 [PRED-be.one-kill.by.striking-by.striking-IND]
 ‘He knocked them down.’¹⁴²
- (138) *n'-an-aqan-mıt-e·*
 [PRED-out.of/away.from.speaker-COLLECTIVE-throw-IND]
 ‘He threw them outside.’
- (139) *qa-kéı-ne· qo·ka-wıs-yaxá-keıł* *a_a'kúł-a·k.*
 [thus-say-IND come-1ST&2ND.PERSON.OBJ¹⁴³-get-PL meat]
 ‘He said: “Come and take the meat”.’

¹⁴² Cf. the comments to (108).

¹⁴³ I suspect that this is a variant of *-awa:s-* “first person plural object; plural for first person plus second person object” (Garvin 1948c.180).

Appendix II

Grammatical Proximate versus Obviative

1. Introduction

In this appendix, we will look once more at the relation between TOPIC and non-TOPIC, i.e., grammatical Proximate and Obviative. The interplay of the two will, hopefully, strengthen the description of ABIDING TOPIC given above.

Dryer (1992a.140) correctly, I think, assesses the problem in grasping the grammar of Proximate and Obviative:

Each time a clause is produced, the speaker must decide whether to continue the previous proximate sequence or begin a new one, and a complete characterization of an obviation system requires that we correctly characterize the basis on which his decision is made.

That “basis”, however, is most frequently interpreted to mean “prediction” (Dryer 1992a.141):

... The critical question can be stated as follows: how can we predict for a given clause whether or not a proximate shift will occur?

I believe that the answer to Dryer’s question is that we cannot predict it, nor should we want to. If we *were* able to, then the morphosyntax would be meaningless. Recall the relation between predictability and the linguistic meta-prefix *allo-*, i.e., insignificant vs. significant.¹⁴⁴ In the remainder of this Appendix, we will consider the usefulness of prediction in the description of Kutenai (as opposed to just trying to understand what TOPIC is).

2. Co-occurrence of Proximate and Obviative

The grammatical context relevant to the prediction of Proximate and Obviative is taken to be the succession of clauses. Their occurrence is in separate clauses,¹⁴⁵ which are taken to stand in a relation of “subordination”,

¹⁴⁴ Dwight Bolinger’s 1972 article, “Accent is Predictable (If You’re a Mind-Reader),” is relevant here.

¹⁴⁵ Hence, each clause is permitted its grammatical allotment of one Proximate and multiple

with the “main clause” preceding. The following statements about such grammatical complexity have been the norm:¹⁴⁶

“The obviative subject suffix also occurs in subordinate clauses in which the subject is an obviative third person distinct from the proximate third person subject in the main clause ...” (Dryer 1991a.193)

“,,, a third person subject of the subordinate clause distinct from the subject of the main clause involves the obviative subject suffix on the verb ... I do not intend to imply that the choice of proximate shifts is directly determined by characteristics of the preceding text. Rather, it is far more likely that these proximate shifts are determined by fairly abstract properties in the speaker’s cognitive representation underlying the text and the distribution of such things as attention and point of view by the speaker” (Dryer 1992a.138, 143)

“Although I assume that ultimately such choices are to be captured in pragmatic and/or cognitive terms, I will show how it is possible, to a large extent, to predict the choice of direct versus inverse ... the question remains what determines the choice of proximate vs. obviative at any point in a discourse” (Dryer 1994.66, 85)

“... nous pouvons constater ici que l’obviation sert à marquer la difference entre sujet primaire et sujet secondaire, et ... nous pouvons ajouter que le fait de subordination ne joue pas de rôle dans la relation obviationnelle” (Garvin 1951b.199)

“When the object of a verb in the third person is a clause which has for its subject a pronoun or noun different from the subject of the principal clause, and for its predicate an intransitive verb, both subject and predicate of the subordinate clause are in the obviative ... When the subject of the principal clause is a third person and the subordinate clause has the same subject, the absolute form is used” (Boas 1926.96)

These formulations of the distribution of the Proximate (Absolute) and the Obviative relative to one another seem to be informed by the same bias and to give a common impression, i.e., that there is a “rule” for their use, and that rule can be expressed as Dryer, Garvin, and Boas have done: If ... then. If a Proximate comes first and the following Subject is different, then the Obviative is used. If a Proximate comes first and the following Subject is the same, then a Proximate is used. Assuming that we can recognize when the

Obviatives.

¹⁴⁶ I have not been able to find that Morgan (1991) has commented on this issue.

successive clauses are more closely allied than by parataxis, these statements suggest that we should find the predicted:¹⁴⁷

- | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|
| (i) | Proximate Subject _i | ... | Proximate Subject _i |
| (ii) | Proximate Subject _i | ... | Obviative Subject _j |

But if we also discovered:

- | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|
| (iii) | Proximate Subject _i | ... | Proximate Subject _j |
| (iv) | Obviative Subject _i | ... | Obviative Subject _i |
| (v) | Obviative Subject _i | ... | Proximate Subject _j |
| (vi) | Obviative Subject _i | ... | Obviative Subject _j |

the existence of (iii) - (vi) would weaken the force of an if-then rule in the description of the use of Proximate and Obviative and suggest the need for an alternative. As stated above in this chapter, ABIDING TOPICS are expressed by the grammar of Proximate and non-TOPICS, by the grammar of Obviative. Add to this that a TOPIC PARTICIPANT may occur first before a non-TOPIC, or it may follow the non-TOPIC, and also that a given TOPIC may persist, or not ... then all the sequences of (i) - (vi) should appear.

These are examples of (iii) - (vi):

- (iii) (Garvin 1951b.201)¹⁴⁸

Taxa-s	#-sił-qał-'upxa	<i>ne·</i>	'aqłsmaknik' _{PROX}
[then-OBV	3PERS-DURATIVE--know	the	Indian
[Alors	quand-le-sut-ainsi	le	Indien
	k-#-cxał-'isqat'łi'ił-s		c
	SUBJ.MARKER-3PERS-FUTURE-	-OBV	and
	qu'il-ferait-froid		et
	k-#-cxał-wiłko·-s		
	SUBJ.MARKER-3PERS-FUTURE-	-OBV	
	qu'il-y-aurait-beaucoup-de-niege		

¹⁴⁷ The subscripts track same and different.

¹⁴⁸ "It est à noter, d'ailleurs, due la difference entre les deux sujets formals (*ne·'aqłsmaknik?*, *ne·suyape*) n'est pas indiquée par l'obviation" (Garvin 1951b.251). Cf. Garvin 1958.24 for the same example presented in English.

‘Alors lorsque ce fut ainsi que l’Indien sut s’il ferait froid ou s’il y aurait de la neige, l’homme blanc sortit maudissant et rentra chez lui’

- Taxa-s ʔat qakik-s-i “sak sak sak” Ø_{OBV}
[then-OBV IMPERF say-OBV.SUBJ-IND they
 taxa-s ʔat kʔupx-naps Ø_{PROX} Ø_{OBV}
 then-OBV IMPERF SUBORD¹⁵⁰-see-INVERSE him they]
‘Then they_i [obv] say ‘sak sak sak’ when they_i [obv] see him_i’

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| taxa-s | n-upxa-s-i | | | <i>ni'-s</i> | <i>nupika-s</i> _{OBV} |
| [then-OBV | INDIC-know-OBV.SUBJ-IND | | | the-OBV | nupika-OBV |
| paɬ | qa | ʔin-i | Ø _{PROX} | wisiyaɬ-s | |
| EVID | not | be-IND | he | sweat.house-OBV] | |
| 'Then the nupika _i [obv] knew that he _j [prox] was not in the sweat-house' | | | | | |

¹⁵⁰ Garvin and Dryer treat verb-initial *k-* differently. Garvin (1948b.171) labels it “interrogative; subject marker”. Dryer (1992.134) writes, “Kutenai does have two verb forms, one that is generally used in main clauses and one [i.e., with *k-*] that is generally used in subordinate clauses, but the supposedly subordinate clause verb form is often used in clauses that do not seem to be subordinate” I retain the gloss of each without alteration.

(Boas 1926.99)

ttue.-s_{OBV} qakík-s-e· ma k!upx_a-náps
 [father-POSS say-OBV.SUBJ-IND and¹⁵¹ strike-INVERSE
 ∅_{PROX} ∅_{OBV}
 him he]
 ‘His father_i [obv] said that he_j (his son) [prox] had been struck by
 him_i (the father) [obv]’

(vi) Dryer (1997a.43)¹⁵²

N²upxa-s-i ∅_{OBV} çin ‘i-s_{OBV}
 [INDIC-see-OBV.SUBJ-IND they only that-OBV
 ki-’in-s siť-is
 SUBORD-be-OBV blanket-3POSS]
 ‘They_i [obv] saw that this_j [obv] was his_j[prox] only blanket_k [obv]’

The last two configurations of (vii) and (viii) seem not to occur in Kutenai:

- | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|
| (vii) | Proximate Subject _i | ... | Obviative Subject _i |
| (viii) | Obviative Subject _i | ... | Proximate Subject _i |

The reason is probably that their semantics would be contradictory. The combinations (vii) and (viii) would signal that a single PARTICIPANT was simultaneously — in the same sentence — the ABIDING TOPIC and not the ABIDING TOPIC.

The pattern of (i) - (vi) now appears to be fairly simple: If a PARTICIPANT is an ABIDING TOPIC, express it as such, and if it is not an ABIDING TOPIC, then say it that way. Finally, know what you want to say & say what you mean ... that is all there is to it.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ Boas (1926.102) calls *ma* “a weak disjunctive” and glosses it ‘nevertheless’.

¹⁵² Dryer cites this example from Boas 1918.264.

¹⁵³ “Underlying determining factors” (1992a.143) continue to be part of Dryer’s understanding Kutenai TOPIC. In this, reliance on “inverse” is replaced by reliance on understanding ABIDING TOPIC. Except for this, Dryer’s description of Kutenai and the one presented here are not so dissimilar.

[Completed: May 28, 2011]
[Version: December 24, 2020]

