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In this paper I provide a characterization of discontinuous noun phrases in Karuk (ISO 693-3:kyh), an endangered Northern Californian language isolate within the purported Hokan phylum, based on the examination of a corpus of mostly narrative texts recorded in the first half of the twentieth century. I show that Karuk discontinuous noun phrases differ in several ways from the general expected behavior of discontinuous noun phrases cross-linguistically, most strikingly in the presence of a new type of inverted discontinuous noun phrase, the lack of a correlation between prosodic structure (one intonational phrase versus two) and type of discontinuous noun phrase (simple versus inverted), and, for some cases, a seeming lack of the information-structural motivations for discontinuous noun phrases typically assumed. I then go on to situate the discussion of Karuk discontinuous noun phrases within the literature on non-configurationality, arguing that Karuk discontinuous noun phrases exhibit a new type of subject-object asymmetry that can only be accounted for by generating the noun phrases themselves as arguments, contra the widely assumed PRONOMINAL ARGUMENT HYPOTHESIS represented by Jelinek (1984) and Baker (1991). I finish by proposing a preliminary movement analysis of Karuk discontinuous noun phrases. This paper proceeds through the following sections: 1) Relevant Karuk Grammar; 2) Cross-Linguistic Generalizations on Discontinuous Noun Phrases; 3) Karuk Discontinuous Noun Phrases; 4) A Movement Analysis.\footnote{I use the term "noun phrase" merely descriptively and atheoretically to refer to any type of nominal constituent, including those with quantifiers, determiners and demonstratives. When I speak about the status of various nominal phrases theoretically I will use the appropriate abbreviations (NP, DP, QP).} \footnote{Data in this paper are taken from the Karuk Dictionary and Texts corpus online and written in the modern tribal orthography. This corpus gathers together sentences from both recent elicitation done by members of the UC Berkeley Karuk Study Group and published and unpublished materials from earlier documentation of the language. The majority of texts in the corpus are from the Bright (1957) grammar of the language, which also includes 92 texts, all morphologically tagged in the corpus. The analysis in this paper is based on a subcorpus including 88 examples of discontinuous noun phrases drawn from online editions of the texts in Bright (1957) and a text from each of de Angulo & Freeland (1931) and Harrington (1930). As this is a corpus study, there will be no negative evidence. Example sentences from texts and elicitation will be cited with the name of the speaker, the text identifier used in the corpus followed by a colon and the number of the sentence within that text, and the year of publication or elicitation, e.g. (Vina Smith, VS-01:1, 2010). Abbreviations used in the glossing include: ANC = Ancient Tense; ANT = Anterior Tense; AS.MOT = Associated Motion; DIM = Diminutive; DUR = Durative Aspect; INT = Intensifier; ITER = Iterative; NPST = Near Past Adverb; OBV = Obviative Marker; PER = Perfect Aspect; PL = Plural; PL.ACT = Plural Action; POSS = Possessive (always indicated with person and
1 Relevant Karuk Grammar

Self-evidently relevant to a discussion of non-configurationality is the fact Karuk bears the hallmarks of non-configurationality set forth by Hale (1983): it has relatively free word order, free dropping of arguments, and discontinuous constituents.

(1) a. ... pa-asiktávaan-sas ápakas kun-íshum-tih
   ... the-woman-PL iris 3PL>3-scrape-DUR
   '... the women scraped iris leaves.' [SOV]
   (Maggie Charley, "Indian Food", WB_KL-68:1, 1957)

b. xás pa-pihnˆ ıich the-old.man u-p´ ıimni 3sg
   then 3sg>3-fall.in.love the-3sg.POSS-child
   'And the old man fell in love with his child.' [SVO]
   (Julia Starritt, "Coyote Marries His Own Daughter", WB_KL-16:3, 1957)

c. k´ ari x´ as t-óó psáansip pa-tayfíth tishnamkanvínusunach
   and then PER-3SG>3 carry.off the-brodiaea skunk
   'Then (the type of skunk called) Tishnamkanvínusunach carried off the brodias.' [VOS]

d. pufích-taay kun-iyká-rih itráhyar mu-tünviiv
   deer-many 3PL>3-kill-DUR ten 3SG.POSS-children
   'His ten sons were killing lots of deer.' [OVS]
   (Chester Pepper, "Deer Hunting Medicine", (WB_KL-53:4), 1957)

e. ... naa vúra púra fáat íin nee-shkáxishrihmath-eesh
   1SG.PRON INT not something OBV 3SG>1SG-stop.(someone)-PROSP
   '... Nothing can stop me.' [OSV]
   (Mamie Offield, "Victory Over Fire", WB_KL-45:18, 1957)

The five sentences in (1) showcase five of the six logically possible orderings of arguments and verb, showcasing Karuk’s free word order: SOV, SVO, VOS, OVS, OSV.

(2) xás ta’ítam u-‘ánavath-vunaa-heen
   and then 3SG>3-paint.face-PL-ANT
   'So then he painted their faces.'
   (Julia Starritt, "Coyote Steals Fire", WB_KL-10:33, 1957)

(2) exhibits the dropping of arguments in Karuk, as neither the subject nor the object of the sentence is expressed by any overt noun phrase.

number features, e.g. 3SG.POSS; PRON = Pronoun (always indicated with person and number features); PROSP = Prospective Aspect; PST = Past Tense; RPST = Recent Past Adverb. The subject and object person and number inflection on the verb will be glossed in the following way: Subject>Object. Thus, the prefix kun-, indicating a 3PL subject and 3 object, is glossed as 3PL>3.

3Not any ordering of arguments is possible: Bright (1957) reports that, for transitives with two animate arguments (his ‘interpersonal’ verbs), the subject must precede the object. Furthermore, Mikkelsen (2014) reports that VSO order is unattested in the online corpus of over 5000 sentences.
(3) puyava táay tá kun-’uupva pa-tayííth
      so many PER 3PL>3-dig the-brodiaea

'So they dug a lot of brodiaeas.'

(3) showcases a discontinuous noun phrase, táay ... patayííth 'a lot of brodiaeas,' that is split across the verb of the sentence, tá kun’uupva. I provide a more detailed discussion of discontinuous noun phrases in section 3.

In addition to these features of non-configurationality, Karuk has a complicated set of fourteen syncretic pronominal verbal prefixes which encode both the subject and object of the verb (like kun- '3pl>3'). It is thus a language that seems at first glance to be perfectly suited to support the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis, as will be discussed later in section 4.

Also relevant to the following discussion will be the intonational structure of Karuk clauses. Karuk is a pitch accent language, with each word having at most one high pitch peak syllable that is marked either by an acute accent or a circumflex accent (if the peak occurs partway through a long vowel and then falls in that same vowel.) Bright (1957) describes the two most common multi-word intonational contours in the language as being the Comma Intonation and Period Intonation, named after the punctuation symbol that ends a contour of that type in his transcription (and in the data given in this paper).

Both types have the same basic contour, with each syllable being higher pitched than those preceding it (that have the same relative pitch, i.e. high pitch syllables occurring later in the contour will be higher pitched than high pitch syllables earlier in the contour, but a late low syllable, though higher in pitch than previous low syllables, will not be higher than high pitch syllables), until a peak in the sentence is reached, which is generally the last accented syllable in the contour, but can also be a penultimate circumflex marked syllable. After that peak the two contours differentiate. Syllables following the peak in the Comma Intonation fall to "about the same pitch as the lowest previous one in the contour", while the Period Intonation peak-following syllables fall to a "pitch noticeably lower than anything preceding" (Bright, 1957, pp.15-16). The following diagram from Bright (1957, p. 16) exemplifies these contours:

---

4Bright (1957) describes two other intonational contours: High Intonation, with all syllables higher than normal, associated with excitement on behalf of the speaker and written with an exclamation point, and Falling Intonation, where each syllable is lower than the preceding, associated with sadness on behalf of the speaker and written with a semicolon. These are much less common and will not enter further into discussion in this paper.

5The diagram uses Bright (1957)'s Americanist transcriptions. I will transliterate his transcriptions into the tribal orthography when I need to refer to them in the prose.
The first sentence represented in the diagram above has both an initial comma intonation phrase and a final period intonation phrase. Note that the final two syllables of the comma intonation, -rameesh, have low pitch, but not as low as the pitch of the final syllable of the period intonation, -reesh, which is lower than any preceding syllable. The same is true of the many syllables following the peak in the first syllable of yāamach in the second sentence represented – they are lower than any syllable before (except for the acute accented syllable of the final word tu’ífship, but even that is lower than preceding highs like the first syllable of vára.)

For the purposes of discussing intonation in the context of discontinuous noun phrases, I will assume that a sentence like the first in the above diagram, with both a comma intonation contour and a period intonation contour, contains two intonational phrases, one for each contour, while a sentence with only period intonation constitutes only one intonational phrase.

In the next section I discuss the literature dealing with generalizations about discontinuous noun phrases cross-linguistically, focusing on those aspects which the Karuk situation will offer an interesting counterpoint to.

2 Discontinuous Noun Phrases Cross-Linguistically

Before beginning this section, it is important to be clear about what a discontinuous noun phrase is. I will work with the following definition:

(4) A discontinuous noun phrase is any noun phrase which is constituted of two or more segments of phonetic material that are separated from each other by intervening material that does not belong to the noun phrase.

Fanselow & Féry (2006) describes a distinction between discontinuous noun phrases and extractions from DP, where extractions from DP involved the dislocation of a maximal projection XP leftwards (a PP, say) out of an NP and where discontinuous noun phrases involved the dislocation of what in earlier periods of generative syntax would have been analyzed as N’ (everything in NP except for a determiner or quantifier, for example). As Fanselow & Féry (2006) explains, however, this distinction is hardly relevant for modern syntactic theory, where noun phrase structure has been enriched with a variety of functional projections, thus allowing movements even of everything except a determiner to be licit as movements of a maximal projection. Thus, I will not adopt this distinction, opting for the more general definition given in (4).
The literature on discontinuous noun phrases has identified several generalizable types of discontinuous noun phrases cross-linguistically. In this discussion I rely mostly on Fanselow & Féry (2006), a sizeable typological study of discontinuous noun phrases in 120 languages (ranging from Germanic languages to Algonquin and beyond), but also refer to Féry et al. (2007), which is a detailed exploration of discontinuous noun phrases in Ukrainian, and Cavar & Fanselow (1998), which discusses discontinuous noun phrases in Slavic and Germanic languages. Fanselow & Féry (2006) identifies two types of important differentiation in types of discontinuous noun phrases.

First, there is a distinction between "cohesive" and "non-cohesive" discontinuous noun phrases: cohesive ones are those the discontinuous parts of which fall inside the same intonational phrase, and the non-cohesive are those the discontinuous parts of which fall into separate intonational phrases, with one part of the split noun phrase generally serving as its own intonational phrase. This difference is illustrated below by two German sentences taken (in simplified form) from Fanselow & Féry (2006):

(5) Cohesive discontinuous noun phrase in German

\[ H^* \quad H^*L \quad L_I \]
\[
[\text{Gelbe Bohnen hat Mary wenige gemalt}]_I
\]
\[
\text{yellow beans has Maria few painted}
\]
\[
'\text{Mary painted few yellow beans.' (Fanselow & Féry, 2006, ex. 20, p. 19)}
\]

(6) Non-cohesive discontinuous noun phrase in German

\[ H^*L \quad L^*H \quad H_I \quad H^*L \quad L_I \]
\[
[\text{Gelbe Bohnen} \quad [\text{hat Maria wenige gemalt}]]_I
\]
\[
\text{yellow beans} \quad [\text{has Mary few painted}}
\]
\[
'\text{Mary painted few yellow beans.' (Fanselow & Féry, 2006, ex. 18, p. 17)}
\]

The discontinuous noun phrase in (5) and (6), \textit{gelbe Bohnen} \ldots \textit{wenige} 'few yellow beans' is bolded. The verb and subject of the sentence intervenes between the two parts of the noun phrase. (5) exhibits a cohesive discontinuous noun phrase, in that both parts of the discontinuous noun phrase are within the same intonation phrase, as indicated by the bracketing and the fact that there is only one boundary tone (the \( L_I \)) at the end of the sentence. (6), on the other hand, exhibits a non-cohesive discontinuous noun phrase, in that the two parts of the noun phrase are in different intonational phrases: \textit{gelbe Bohnen} is its own intonational phrase, as indicated by the boundary tone \( H_I \) following it, while \textit{wenige} falls in the intonational phrase of the rest of the sentence.

The next major differentiation is between simple discontinuous noun phrases (also called 'stretched', as in Cavar & Fanselow (1998)) and inverted discontinuous noun phrases. In simple ones, the word order of the pieces of the discontinuous noun phrase are in the same relative order as they would have been in a canonical, unsplit noun phrase. Inverted discontinuous noun phrases exhibit a different word order from that exhibited by unsplit noun phrases. This difference is illustrated by the Croatian sentences in (7) and (8) from Cavar
& Fanselow (1998) below:

(7) Simple discontinuous noun phrase in Croatian

\[
\text{crveno je Ivan auto kupio} \\
\text{red has Ivan car bought}
\]

'Ivan has bought a red car.' (Cavar & Fanselow, 1998, ex. 6a, p. 3)

(8) Inverted discontinuous noun phrase in Croatian

\[
\text{auto je Ivan crveno kupio} \\
\text{car has Ivan red bought}
\]

'Ivan has bought a red car.' (Cavar & Fanselow, 1998, ex. 6a', p. 3)

The discontinuous noun phrase in (7), \text{crveno ... auto}, follows the canonical Croatian word order of Adj N and thus it is a simple discontinuous noun phrase. (8) exhibits the opposite order, \text{auto ... crveno}, N Adj, and is thus an inverted discontinuous noun phrase.

These two types of differentiation, simple vs. inverted and cohesive vs. non-cohesive, are not entirely independent. As reported by Fanselow & Féry (2006) and exemplified for Ukrainian in Féry et al. (2007), there is a general tendency for simple splits to be cohesive, and inverted to be non-cohesive, as seen in the Ukrainian sentences from Féry et al. (2007) below:

(9) Simple cohesive discontinuous noun phrase in Ukrainian

\[
\text{[Cikavu Marija pročtala knyžku]}_f \\
\text{interesting.acc.fem.n-fock Mary has.read book.acc.fem}
\]

'Mary has read an interesting book.' (Féry et al., 2007, ex. 1b, p. 4)

(10) Inverted non-cohesive discontinuous noun phrase in Ukrainian

\[
\text{[Knyžku]}_f \quad \text{[Marija pročtala cikavu]}_f \\
\text{book.acc.fem.top Mary has.read interesting.acc.fem.n-fock}
\]

'Mary has read an interesting book.' (Féry et al., 2007, ex. 1c, p. 5)

(9) is of the simple type because the split parts of the noun phrase, \text{cikavu ... knyžku}, exhibit the canonical Adj N word order, and it is cohesive because they are all within one intonational phrase (indicated by the bracketing). (10) is inverted because the split parts of the noun phrase, \text{knyžku ... cikavu}, exhibit the inverted N Adj order. It is non-cohesive since the first part of the split, \text{knyžku}, is in its own intonational phrase, while the other part of the discontinuous noun phrase is within the intonational phrase of the rest of the sentence.

\footnote{Féry et al. (2007) motivates the bracketing of these sentences with a detailed discussion of Ukrainian prosody and intonation that I will not summarize here. It is enough for the purposes of this paper to assume the bracketing is correct}
It is important to note that it is a tendency (though a strong one, at least) and not a necessity that simple or inverted correlates with cohesive or non-cohesive. Thus, Féry et al. (2007) offers sentences like the following inverted cohesive example:

(11) Inverted cohesive discontinuous noun phrase in Ukrainian

\[ \text{Romaniv vona napysala } p'jat' \]

novel.GEN.PL she has.written five

'She has written five novels.' (Féry et al., 2007, ex. 33b, p. 32)

The fact that there is only one bracketed intonational phrase in (11) shows that it is cohesive, all in one intonational phrase, and the inverted order N Num romaniv ... p'jat' of the discontinuous noun phrase shows that it is inverted. Féry et al. (2007) does not appear to offer any examples of simple splits that are non-cohesive, and the mechanism Fanselow & Féry (2006) briefly describe for handling mismatches of prosodic structure and inversion or lack of it, namely that a deaccenting process can erase an intonational phrase, seems capable only of removing an intonational phrase, making the inversion cases with only one intonational phrase a possible outcome, whereas an intonational phrase would need to be added in some way to get a simple, non-cohesive case.

One may also have noticed that the discontinuous noun phrase is always inverted in German, as seen for the cohesive (5) and non-cohesive (6). German does not allow simple splits except in cases that involve wh-movement (see Cavar & Fanselow (1998, ex. 10, p. 4)), but still retains the cohesive versus non-cohesive distinction, further exhibiting the independence of the two, despite a general correlative tendency.

Yet, there is a tendency, and this has been explained in Fanselow & Féry (2006) and Féry et al. (2007) as an effect of the differing information-structural needs of different types of discontinuous noun phrases and by the fact that most of the languages exhibiting discontinuous noun phrases are intonation languages, meaning intonation is relatively free and used to express pragmatic and information structural meanings (like the pitch accent used to mark informational focus, as described in Kiss (1998)). Because intonation and prosody express information-structural meanings, different information-structural needs will be reflected in prosodic differences. Fanselow & Féry (2006) also claim, as they observed pitch accent languages\(^7\) to either lack discontinuous noun phrases or have only very restricted examples of it, that the lack of freedom of intonation and tone assignment which allows intonation to express pragmatic meaning in intonation languages may be the reason for its lack or restriction in pitch accent languages. This claim will of course become important for my discussion of Karuk, a pitch accent language itself.

Before moving on to discussing the patterns of Karuk discontinuous noun phrases in light of this background, it is important to discuss exactly what the differing information structural needs of the types of discontinuous noun phrases have been claimed to be. As

\(^7\)Pitch accent languages are those like Karuk, with both lexical specification of pitch accents and restricted intonational contours over multiple words and where placement of tones is not as free as in intonation languages.
described in Fanselow & Féry (2006), the general assumption is that discontinuous noun phrases are caused when the two split parts of a discontinuous noun phrase have differing information structure. For example, Féry et al. (2007) explains that, for Ukrainian, cohesive splits arise when one part of a noun phrase needs to be focused but not the other part (see (9), with the preverbal part of the noun phrase, cikavu, glossed as narrow focus n-FOC) while non-cohesive splits involve one part of the constituent being topicalized and the other part being focused (as in (10), with the post-verbal part of the noun phrase, cikavu, being in narrow focus (N-FOC in the gloss), and the preverbal part, knyžku being the topic, (TOP in the gloss). Of course, different languages will have different ways to instantiate topic and focus and so the surface patterns will not be exactly the same as in Ukrainian.

In the following section I provide a characterization of Karuk discontinuous noun phrases in the light of this background material.

3 Karuk Discontinuous Noun Phrases

In this section I show that Karuk exhibits distinctions between cohesive and non-cohesive as well as simple and inverted discontinuous noun phrases (though the latter are of a different type than the inverted cases discussed in the literature), but without the expected tendency for inverted discontinuous to correlate with non-cohesive structures and simple to correlate with cohesive. Following that I discuss the information structural properties (or lack thereof) for the various types of discontinuous noun phrases in Karuk and end by pointing out a striking type of subject-object asymmetry affecting discontinuous noun phrases, namely that subjects of transitive clauses appear to be unable to surface as discontinuous.

Before moving on to those discussions, however, I will make a four-way distinction in discontinuous noun phrases in Karuk based on the grammatical relation between the discontinuous parts of the noun phrase. The point of this is to show the range of noun phrases that can be discontinuous, something that is not generally done in the literature. The following examples showcase these four types: quantification in (12), possession in (13), apposition in (14), and coordination in (15).

(12) Quantification Type
   With táay 'a lot'
   a. ... táay kun-iykar pa-ˈáama.
      ... a.lot 3PL>3-kill the-salmon
      '... they caught a lot of fish' (Lit. They killed a lot of salmon.)
      (Maggie Charley, ”Indian Food”, WB_KL-68:5, 1957)
   
   With koovúra 'all'

---

8It appears that most examples given in the literature are either of the quantificational type (like (5), (6), and (11); see also Russell & Reinholtz (1995) and Reinholtz (1999)'s discussion of discontinuous noun phrases in Swampy Cree, where apparently only quantifiers and determiners can split from the rest of the noun) or of adjectives and nouns (as in (7) and (8)). Adjectives split from nouns are also a type of discontinuous noun phrase found in Karuk, but they are rare and often translated as two clauses rather than one, thus making their status on discontinuous noun phrases unclear, or as an apposition (adjectives can act as independent nouns in Karuk), thus making their status as a separate type unclear. Thus, I leave them out of the discussion here.
b. ... koovúra t-u-tháfip pa-nunu-patúmkir.
... all PER-3SG>3-eat.up the-1PL.POSS-pillow
'... he ate up all our pillows.'
(Chester Pepper, "Coyote’s Journey", WB_KL-03:140, 1957)

With numerals
c. kári xás yítha u-píp pa-’ifápiit ...
and then one 3SG-said the-girl ...
'Then one girl said...'

The quantification type is one of the most common (need percentage) types of discontinuous noun phrase. In the above examples, a quantifier (either táay ‘a lot’, koovúra, or a numeral) is split from the NP it quantifies by the verb; both parts of the discontinuous noun phrase are bolded.

(13) Possession Type

With pronominal possessor
a. ... naa pífaat nanípaah.
... 1SG.PRON nothing 1SG.POSS-boat
'... "I don’t have any boat."' (Lit. My boat is nothing.)

With non-pronominal possessor
b. á’îkneechhan pirishkáarim mu-hróoja.
duck.hawk grizzly.bear 3SG.POSS-wife
'Duck Hawk’s wife was Grizzly Bear’
(Lottie Beck, "Duck Hawk and His Wife", WB_KL-25:1, 1957)

The possession type is less common and generally only occurs with non-verbal predicates. In the examples above (in fact, all examples of the possession type), the possessor (either a pronoun or noun) precedes the non-verbal predicate and the possessum (marked with a possessive prefix that agrees in person and number with the possessor) follows it.

(14) Apposition Type

Pronominal apposition
a. púya uum v-oo-kuph-aanik pihnêefich.
so 3SG.PRON thus-3SG>3-do-ANC coyote
"Coyote did this."
(Afríich, "Coyote Falls Through the Living-House Roof-Hole", JPH_KT-12:29, 1930)

Nominal apposition
b. áxak asiktáan kun-’ín-anik kustáar-as ameekyáaram.
two woman 3PL-live.(dual)-ANC sister-PL ameekyáaram
'Two women, sisters, lived there at Ameekyáaram (Ike’s Falls).'
(Mamie Offield, "Coyote Gives Salmon and Acorns to Mankind", WB_KL-17:1, 1957)
The apposition type is also very common, and is characterized by two noun phrases which have the same referent being split over the verb. There are two sub patterns, the pronominal apposition in (14-a) where a pronoun precedes the verb and a coreferential noun phrase follows it, and the nominal apposition in (14-b) where it is two coreferential nouns that the verb intervenes between.

(15) Coordination Type

\[
\text{pa-’áama kun-’áam-ti káru víra pa-’ékoons}
\]

the-salmon 3PL>3-eat-DUR and INT the-acorns

They ate the salmon and the acorns’

(Maggie Charley, “Indian Food”, WB_KL-68:10, 1957)

The coordination type involves a coordinated noun phrase split across the verb, with one noun pre-verbal and the coordinator k’aru and the other nouns following the verb. Noun phrases that are coordinated differ from apposition in that the various noun phrases constituting the overall phrase are not coreferential.

These final two types, apposition and coordination, are not generally mentioned in discussions of discontinuous noun phrases though I suspect they are relatively common, since they are found even in English, which lacks other types of discontinuous noun phrases. This is shown by the three alternative translations in (16) of the apposition and coordination sentences in Karuk given above:

(16) a. He did this, Coyote.
    b. Two women lived there, sisters, at Ameekyaaram.

I will not discuss these English cases in any more detail, since the focus in this paper is on Karuk. I am not sure why these types are not generally included in discussions of discontinuous noun phrases, though potentially they are considered to be of a fundamentally different type from the other types of discontinuous noun phrase (the post-verbal parts of the noun phrase all have the feeling of being afterthoughts, which is perhaps significant).

Cohesive and Non-Cohesive Discontinuous Noun Phrases in Karuk

Karuk exhibits a distinction between cohesive and non-cohesive discontinuous noun phrases across all of the categories described above except possessives\(^9\) The above examples all show cohesive noun phrases, as evidenced by the lack of commas in the transcription. The following sentences exhibit non-cohesive examples for the quantification, apposition, and coordination types (meaning examples across these types that have a comma intervening between the two parts of the discontinuous noun phrase.)

(17) Non-Cohesive Quantification

\[
\text{a. víra koovúra tá kun-paxeep-áyaachha, pa-mukús-’uup.}
\]

INT all PER 3PL>3-win.from-well the-3PL.POSS-property

---

9As described in section 1, I interpret the presence of a comma intervening somewhere between the two parts of a discontinuous noun phrase to be evidence the two are in separate intonational phrases.
'They won all their property from them.'
(Chester Pepper, "Coyote’s Gambling Song", WB_KL-13, 1957)

(18) Non-Cohesive Apposition

**Pronominal apposition**

a. kári xás uum káru ishímfir, āanaxus.
   and then 3SG.PRON also tough weasel
   'And Weasel was tough, too.'

**Nominal apposition**

b. pa-’ás u-éechip, asa-yâamach.
   the-rock 3SG>3-pick.up rock-pretty
   'He picked up the rock, the pretty rock.'
   (Chester Pepper, "Coyote Eats His Own Excrement", WB_KL-14:17, 1957)

(19) Non-Cohesive Coordination

a. víí kún pa-kéevuikich ú-kříi, káru patapriha-’ifápiit.
   so pcl the-old.woman 3SG-live and pataprihak-girl
   There lived the old woman, and the young woman of pataprihak.
   (Nettie Reuben, "The Boy from Itúkuk", WB_KL-57:8, 1957)

Not all types are equally likely to occur as non-cohesives, however. Out of 31 examples of Apposition discontinuous noun phrases, 15 are non-cohesive and 15 cohesive (one is from Harrington (1930) and thus does not necessarily use punctuation as a way to mark out intonational contours). Out of 28 examples of quantification discontinuous noun phrases, however, only 4 are non-cohesive and 27 are cohesive (one is from de Angulo & Freeland (1931) and thus does not necessarily use punctuation as a way to mark out intonational contours and is thus not counted). There are only 8 examples of coordination discontinuous noun phrases, 2 of which are non-cohesive, and of 10 examples of possession discontinuous phrases, none are non-cohesive. I have little to say at this point about the higher incidence of non-cohesives as appositives, other than to mention that this correlation, if it is cross-linguistically valid, has gone unnoticed in previous work on discontinuous noun phrases which have not included appositive discontinuous noun phrases in their study.

**Simple and Inverted Splits**

In this section I argue that Karuk does exhibit inverted discontinuous noun phrases, but of a different type than those described in Cavar & Fanselow (1998), Fanselow & Féry (2006) and Féry et al. (2007). Only three examples (out of 88 total) exhibit what I call the inverted structure, and all are examples of quantification type discontinuous noun phrases:

(20) Inverted Discontinuous Noun Phrases

a. káan xas këech-as p-éeshpuk cháavura áxak ni-ma.
   there and big-PL the-money finally two 1SG>3-find
   And right there I found two big gold nuggets.
   (Benonie Harris, "How I Found Gold", DAF_KT-05b:10, 1931)
b. **p-eekxaréeyav** yíchakanach **koovúra** kun-pamfipishniháyaachha.
the-god in.one.place all 3PL-come.together.
'The gods all gathered together.'
(Chester Pepper, "Coyote’s Gambling Song", WB_KL-13:2, 1957)

c. **pa-vírusur** íshyaav kusrahkêem káí **koovúra** eeráriiv-ak kúuk tá
the-bear winter december and all den-LOC to PER
kun-pá-vyiihma.
3PL-ITER-go.(pl)
'In the winter, in December (lit. the bad month), the bears all go into dens.'

In each of these sentences above, the discontinuous noun phrase consists of a lexical noun separated from a quantifier, in that order, by an adverb, unlike the inverted order exhibited in other languages, where the split is still across the verb. So, in (20-a), the discontinuous noun phrase këechas péeshpuk ... ázak, with the order Adj N ... Num, is separated by the adverb cháavura 'finally.' In each case but (20-c), the quantifier appears immediately pre-verbally, in the same place that it generally appears in simple splits when the rest of the noun is post-verbal. (20-c) has a postpositional phrase, eeráriivak kúuk, intervening between the quantifier and the verb, but the quantifier is still relatively close to it.

In calling these the inverted structure I assume that the opposite order, of Quantifier N, is the canonical order. Though I do not currently have the quantitative data to support it, my intuition is that that order is the most common, though the inverted order does occur even without material intervening between parts of the noun phrase, as in (21):

(21) káakum **pa-éekoons táay** vúra tá kun-ífik ...
some the-acorns a.lot INT PER 3PL>3-gather ...
'Some people gathered a lot of acorns ...'
(Maggie Charley, "Indian Food", WB_KL-68:11, 1957)

This order seems to be about as rare as the inverted discontinuous noun phrases are, however, and so I assume it represents a marked and thus derived structure. The analysis I will provide for inverted discontinuous noun phrases will apply to these non-split inverted cases as well.

It is crucial to note that the inverted discontinuous noun phrases exhibited above do not correlate with non-cohesiveness, despite such a correlation being a generalization found across other languages. Potentially this difference could be attributed to Karuk’s status as a pitch accent language, though I leave that question up to further research. However, it is perhaps not particularly insightful to compare the Karuk inverted noun phrases with those in other languages that, after all, exhibit a different pattern. At the same time, this type of inverted phrase must also be accounted for as a type of discontinuous noun phrase.

---

10 Inverted noun phrases without material intervening between the parts are actually still counted as discontinuous noun phrases in Fanselow & Féry (2006) and Féry et al. (2007); see, for example, ex. 13 from Fanselow & Féry (2006), that counts an inverted but not split noun phrase as a discontinuous noun phrase in Estonian.
Information Structural Properties of Karuk Discontinuous Noun Phrases

In this section I argue that, for simple splits, there is no clear positive informational structural reason for the postverbal location of a part of the noun phrase and that, for inverted splits, the fronted location of the noun is indicative of topic or focus status (at least for the few examples of that type discovered.)

Concerning Karuk information structure, I assume the order of informational structural categories given in (22), adapted from an order provided by Garrett & Mikkelsen (2015) for Karuk clefts (only replacing the cleft part with a mere V):

(22) Topic – Focus – V or Pred – Post-V

To argue that the postverbal position in simple discontinuous noun phrases is not information-structurally motivated, I show in the following examples that said position can hold a topic (23), a focus (24), and entirely new information (25)\(^\text{11}\):

(23) [The men catch and the women prepare salmon.]

a. The women gathered acorns.

b. pa’áama kun-’ám-ti káru víra pa’éeoons
   the-salmon 3PL>3-eat-DUR and INT the-acorns
   They ate the salmon and the acorns’

c. kákum pa’éeoons táay víra tá kun-’ífik ...
   some the-acorns a.lot INT PER 3PL>3-gather ...
   ‘Some people gathered a lot of acorns …’

d. ...
   and put as many as ten baskets to soak.

e. In three years, then the soaked acorns were good-tasting.
   (Maggie Charley, ”Indian Food”, WB_KL-68:9-12, 1957)

In (23-b), I interpret pa’éeoons, the postverbal conjunct of the discontinuous noun phrase, to be the topic of the sentence, as the surrounding discourse is also providing information about acorns and activities surrounding them; the organizing principle of this section thus appears to be acorns and their use, making it likely that the set of propositions regarding acorns is what is being updated with each new sentence, making acorns the topic following the analysis of sentence topics in Reinhart (1981)\(^\text{12}\).

(24) a. A lot of people were picking acorns in the mountains, in acorn season.

b. Then they all went home.

c. yích-eech víra kíkí mu-hrōoha xákaan.
   one-DIM INT only still 3SG.POSS-wife with.
   ‘Only one man and his wife were still (there)’
   (Mannie Offield, ”The Devil Who Died Laughing”, WB_KL-63:1-3, 1957)

\(^\text{11}\) This is contra the characterization of Karuk post-verbal DPs given in Mikkelsen (2014, p. 4), which claims the ”post-verbal position” is ”restricted to non-new, less salient, non-focused elements.” However, it is possible that the post-verbal position of a discontinuous noun phrase is qualitatively different from independently post-verbal nouns, which Mikkelsen (2014)’s claim may then hold for

\(^\text{12}\) An alternative explanation would be to say that this section is about the women and what they do, but as the entire text is generally about types of Karuk food, I assume that the food is actually the topic.
In (24-c), I interpret the postpredicate *muhrōoha* as being in focus, by the following reasoning: the preverbal part of the noun phrase, *yícheech víra kích*, is marked with *kích*, a marker of exhaustive focus. However, as it is exhaustive focus, the entity for which the proposition is asserted to hold must include both the ‘one man’ and the postpredicate *muhrōoha*, or else there is a contradiction: if only *yícheech* were in focus, it would mean that only the one man lived there, but that his wife also lived there, contradicting the exhaustivity asserted of the one man. The only way out of this contradiction is to assume that the wife is also within the exhaustive focus, making *muhrōoha* a focus despite being in postpredicate position.

(25)  

\[
\text{ittáharavan kun-’íifshipr-eenik tipahēer-as} \\
ten.(animate) \text{3PL-grow.up-ANC brother-PL} \\
\text{‘Ten brothers once grew up.’} \\
\text{(Mamie Offield, ”Wrestling Medicine”, WB_KL-55:1, 1957)}
\]

(25) exhibits the use of a discontinuous noun phrase as the first sentence in a text, thus making the ten brothers entirely new information, despite part of it being postverbal.

In addition to the postverbal or postpredicate position not having any certain information structural motivation, these data show that there are cases where the discontinuous parts of the noun phrase do not appear to have differing information structural requirements. In (24), both parts of the noun phrase are in focus, so the motivation for discontinuous noun phrases generally assumed, that the two parts have differing information structure, does not seem to hold for simple Karuk discontinuous noun phrases.

The question then remains about what exactly is motivating the discontinuous noun phrases. Though I cannot offer a full answer at this time, there are significant correlations between phonological weight (as measured by amount of syllables) and pre- or post-split position in discontinuous noun phrases, such that, on average, the post-split part of the noun phrase contains more syllables. This correlation is significant across all grammatical-relation types of discontinuous noun phrase taken together (p=.003)\(^{13}\), and three of the four types taken individually: quantification (p=.001), apposition (p=.001), and coordination (p=.05)\(^{14}\). Possession was the only type where there was no significant correlation, (p=.456), though the mean for post-split syllable count was slightly higher than for the pre-split syllable count (2.9 vs. 3.6)\(^{15}\). Given these correlations, perhaps it is phonological weight that determines what is sent postverbal in a simple split, even if the postverbal thing is information structurally licensed to be in a preverbal position.

However, I think there is an information structural motivation for the inverted discontinuous noun phrases (or at least the three examples of them I have), in that the fronted part of each of those noun phrases is either a topic or a focus. I repeat two of the inverted noun phrase sentences here, with added context:

---

\(^{13}\) All p-values calculated by the use of a Welch’s two sample t-test through R  
\(^{14}\) The p-value is higher for coordination because of the small number of tokens: 8. The mean value for pre-split syllables for coordination is 3.625, while the mean post-split value is 9  
\(^{15}\) This represents the second way in which the possession type appears to be different, after also lacking non-cohesive examples. Because there is not a very large amount of data to go off of, though, it is difficult to say concretely that they are fundamentally different from the others at this time. Further research will have to explore the matter further.
(26)  a. I found there was gold there.
    b. Then I went after a pick.
    c. The farther down I dug the better luck I had.
    d. Finally I got down to bed-rock.
    e. káan xas kéech-as p-éeshpuk cháavura áxak ni-ma. there and big-PL the-money finally two 1SG>3-find
       'And right there I found two big gold nuggets.'
    f. They were worth eight dollars apiece.
    g. Then there were a lot of smaller ones, so that in the end I had seventy dollars in all. (Benonie Harris, "How I Found Gold", DAF KT-05b:6-10, 1931)

I interpret kéechas péeeshpuk as an information focus (following Kiss (1998)) in (26-e) because it conveys and emphasizes the new information that big gold nuggets were what the narrator found. This cannot be exhaustive or identificational focus, however, owing to the mention of finding smaller gold nuggets in (26-g).

(27)  a. pa-vírusur íshyaav kusrakhkèem kári koovúra eeráriiv-ak kúuk tá the-bear winter december and all den-LOC to PER kun-pá-vyiïhma.
       3PL-ITER-go.(pl)
       'In the winter, in December (lit. the bad month), the bears all go into dens.'
    b. They stay inside all winter.

I interpret paviírusur as the topic of (27-a), given that that sentence, the one following it, and in a sense the whole text are about bears. It is not clear, however, that the quantifier koovúra in (26) and the numeral áxak in (27) are interpreted as not being in focus or part of the topic respectively; thus it is unclear whether these sentences follow the generalization that discontinuous noun phrases are motivated by two parts of a noun phrase having different information structural requirements.

**Subject-Object Asymmetry in Karuk Discontinuous Noun Phrases**

I now discuss a striking asymmetry affecting discontinuous noun phrases in Karuk that does not appear to be mirrored in the discontinuous noun phrases described for other languages. Namely, though the subjects of intransitives and the objects of transitive clauses can be expressed by discontinuous noun phrases, there are no clear examples of the subject of a transitive clause being discontinuous17 Of the 88 examples of discontinuous noun phrases, 80

---

16In calling this focus information focus, I have to contradict Kiss (1998)'s assertion that information focus never requires movement, since I will indeed argue that these inverted discontinuous noun phrases are derived by movement. Kiss (1998) ties information focus to intonation, saying that a pitch accent associates with it, but this can only work for an intonational language with free assignment of pitch accents. In a pitch accent language like Karuk, where pitch accents cannot be freely assigned based on pragmatic considerations, it is perhaps not so surprising that a structural position could be associated with information focus and further supplemented by focus particles like k'ich that add a notion of exhaustivity

17Cavar & Fanselow (1998) does mention a potentially related phenomenon in the acceptability of discontinuous noun phrases in German: some speakers only accept splitting of accusative noun phrases, some for accusatives and nominatives, and some for accusatives, nominatives, and datives. Cavar & Fanselow (1998)
are split arguments. Within that, 55 discontinuous noun phrases are subjects of intransitives (both agentive/unergative as in (12-c) and (14-a) and unaccusative as in (25)) and 23 are the direct objects of transitive verbs. There are only 2 which could potentially be interpreted as the subject of a transitive, but neither is unambiguously so. I provide these two examples below:

(28) káru uum náa vára nee-músahi-ti pa'-ávansa.
and 3SG.PRON 1SG.PRON INT 3SG>1SG-look.like-DUR the-man
'And he looks just like me, the man.'
(Julia Starritt, "Coyote Marries His Own Daughter," WB_KL-16:14, 1957)

In (28), the discontinuous noun phrase is uum ... pa’ávansa, which, based on the translation and an interpretation of the verbal pronominal agreement prefix, should be the subject. However, it should be noted that the prefix na- (here coalescing with the first vowel of the verb imusahi to become neec-) is also used with verbs of personal states like ’to be hungry,’ indicating in those cases a first person subject. Furthermore, the verb of this sentence, imusahi, is somewhat irregular; it is formed from the verb imus ’to look’ and the so-called essive suffix -ahi, which for the purposes of this paper I will assume acts basically like a passive (though it is likely something different), promoting the object to subject. Thus, the discontinuous noun phrase could have started out the derivation of this sentence as an underlying object, thus respecting the generalization that subjects of transitives cannot be discontinuous if one assumes that means underlying or base-generated subjects of transitives. Even if one does not accept that analysis, imusahi is still a complicated verb and does not provide an unproblematic example of a transitive subject being split.

(29) uum vára itíhaan kuma-máh’íit t-óó
3SG.PRON INT always 3INANIM.POSS-morning PER-3SG(>3)
kvát-ar,

itukuk-’afishríhan.
gather.sweathouse.wood-AS.MOT itukuk-young.man
'The young man of Itukuk went gathering sweathouse wood every morning.'
(Nettie Reuben, ”The Boy from Itukuk”, WB_KL-57:3, 1957)

In (29), the discontinuous noun phrase is the subject uum ... itukuk’afishríhan of the verb ikvat, which has two meanings: when it appears with an expressed object, it generally means 'carry X over the shoulder' or 'get X' as in (30) (with the addition of the associated motion suffix -ar, it means 'go get X'):

(30) ... tíi kan-p-ikvat-an pa-naní-paah.
let 1SG.IMP-ITER-carry.on.shoulder-AS.MOT the-1SG.POSS-boat.
'Let me go get my boat!'
(Nettie Reuben, ”The Boy from Itukuk”, WB_KL-57:36, 1957)

hypothesizes this may be due to the fact that both parts of a split noun phrase in German have to be focal, and that subjects are generally worse foci than objects. I leave the question of comparing the German pattern more thoroughly to the Karuk to further research.

18 This leaves ten examples of discontinuous nouns which bear various adverbial or oblique relationships to the verb. I will not discuss these further here.
However, when appearing without an expressed object (or a clear understood pro-dropped object) as in (29), *ikvat* always has the specialized meaning ‘gather sweathouse wood.’ In that meaning, it never occurs in the corpus with the expressed noun *ikmahachraam’dhap* ‘sweathouse wood’ though such would be expected to occur occasionally if it were actually a transitive verb. I thus interpret the specialized meaning of *ikvat* as being an intransitive version of the otherwise transitive verb.

As neither of the two possible subject of transitive discontinuous noun phrases are unambiguously subjects of transitives\(^{19}\) I will continue with my claim that, concerning arguments, only the subjects of intransitives and objects of transitives may be split\(^{20}\).

This asymmetry between transitive subjects and other arguments represents a strong argument against the base-generation of adjuncts approach to representing explicit noun phrases in non-configurational languages, such as is assumed in the PRONOMINAL ARGUMENT HYPOTHESIS for represented in two different strands by Jelinek (1984) and Baker (1991). Under that hypothesis, the actual arguments of verbs are either the pronominal affixes attached to the verbs (Jelinek, 1984) or null pronouns (Baker, 1991). Expressed noun phrases are generated as adjuncts that are co-referenced with the pronominal arguments; this is meant to capture what was assumed to be the unrestricted word order of these arguments and the unrestricted order of discontinuous noun phrases, as well as the lack of various subject-object asymmetries (like the lack of a weak-crossover effect in Mohawk as described in Baker (1991)).

However, further research into discontinuous constituents in non-configurational languages has recognized that these processes are not as unrestricted as previously thought. Thus, Russell & Reinholtz (1995) describes how the order of discontinuous noun phrases in Swampy Cree is not free as expected if both parts of the discontinuous noun phrase are separate adjuncts. Furthermore, they show that preverbal adjunct NPs would c-command postverbal adjunct NPs, resulting in a violation of Principle C. Russell & Reinholtz (1995), however, does not militate this evidence against the basic claim of the PRONOMINAL ARGUMENT HYPOTHESIS, that the NPs are adjuncts; rather they use it only to argue for an analysis that derives discontinuous noun phrases through movement rather than through base-generation. LeSourd (2006) mentions similar evidence for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, arguing that the constrained word order of discontinuous noun phrases in that language (Demonstrative always before the rest of the NP) cannot be predicted by the ?; this and some other facts he uses to argue that the PRONOMINAL ARGUMENT HYPOTHESIS is untenable for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy.

Karuk, as shown in this section, does not have free word order in discontinuous noun phrases: the word order is determined by the type of split, whether simple or inverted, and these two are quite different, with simple splitting over the verb and inverted over pre-

\(^{19}\)Of course, with only 88 examples and no negative evidence, this claim is on somewhat shaky ground. Potentially subjects of transitives are just overtly expressed less often, though I doubt that they are as unlikely in general as they are for discontinuous noun phrases, with only 2 examples out of 88. Further research should address this issue.

\(^{20}\)There are no examples of an indirect object being split, but there are few examples of an indirect object in the corpus anyway. Bright (1957) claims that there is no syntactic difference between direct and indirect objects; potentially they would behave like direct objects and be allowed to be discontinuous, though further research must assess this claim.
verbal adverbs\textsuperscript{21}. Yet, this alone is not enough to argue against the status of expressed NPs as adjuncts, as the fact that Russell & Reinholtz (1995) does not need to adopt such an analysis. However, there seems to me to be no way to preserve an analysis of the noun phrases as adjuncts if the ability for a noun phrase to be discontinuous depends on its argument status as I have argued; there is no principled way I can think of to have the ability for two separate adjunct noun phrases to both be referentially linked to the same pronominal argument restricted to intransitive subjects and transitive objects only. However, in the next section I provide a preliminary movement analysis that can account for this asymmetry.

## 4 A Movement Analysis

Before moving into the specifics of this first pass at a movement analysis of the data, I will first make my assumptions about Karuk phrase structure clear. I follow Mikkelsen (2014) in claiming that Karuk clauses are basically verb-final, with a pre-verbal position of the object being the basic object position. In order to capture the fact that both unergative and unaccusative subjects pattern together with direct objects with regards to the ability to be a discontinuous noun phrase, I will have to adopt the position that Karuk has no structural difference between unergatives and unaccusatives, instead treating all subjects of intransitives as internal arguments\textsuperscript{22}. Though I assume expressed DPs occupy argument positions, argument positions can also be instantiated by null pronouns, accounting for the possibility of pro-drop. For the sake of brevity, I only explicitly discuss quantificational discontinuous noun phrases in this analysis; this is because quantificational noun phrases are the only ones for which both inverted and simple splits have been found. I expect that the core idea of this analysis should be applicable to all types of discontinuous noun phrases thus described, though perhaps excepting possessives due to the differences they exhibited compared to the other types. This analysis will not discuss how to achieve all of the attested word orders of arguments and verbs, leaving aside such a discussion for further research so as to focus only on the question of discontinuous noun phrases.

I account for the transitive subject vs. other argument asymmetry in this analysis through the use of a new functional projection, called here XP for lack of a better name, that sits between VP and vP, the head X of which bears a \(*uD\) feature to attract the DP part of an internal argument QP to the postverbal position. Because the XP is below vP that introduces the subject, the probing of \(*uD\) feature will never find the subject, thus accounting for the subject-object asymmetry that motivates this analysis. This movement does not appear to be for any information structural motivation, as discussed above (which is, in a way, a blessing: information structural concerns are C-related functions (see (Mikkelsen, 2015)) and expected to be handled outside of VP in the domain of CP.) As the only general correlation for that postverbal position was the greater phonological weight of elements in that position,

\textsuperscript{21}I do not deal with Condition C effects, weak crossover effects or any other observed non-asymmetries brought up in the non-configurationality literature in this paper because the corpus does not offer ideal evidence for discussing these topics. It is crucial that research into such topics be done, however, to fully support my analysis, as it contradicts a widely accepted view.

\textsuperscript{22}It is beyond the scope of this paper to argue conclusively in favor of this analysis, though future research should be aimed at supporting it.
perhaps movement to specifier of XP is triggered in some way by phonological heaviness, though I will not build that directly into the model, since more research is needed to fully understand the motivations for dislocating to the postverbal position. The ordering facts for the simple splits come from the fact that X, with its *uD feature, only attracts the DP part of any QP to its specifier, stranding the quantifier in the pre-verbal position.

(31) showcases my analysis of a simple, transitive quantificational discontinuous noun phrase, like that in (12-a). Only features relevant to the analysis are given; assume that the rest behaves as expected, such as v introducing the subject:

(31)

(32) showcases my analysis of a simple intransitive quantificational discontinuous noun phrase, like that in (25). It is the same as the analysis for the transitive sentence, differing only in the fact that the v of the intransitive does not introduce an external argument (i.e. has no uD feature). In order to preserve the ordering derived through movement to XP, I must assume that TP in these intransitives does not attract the postposed NP (perhaps taking the remnant QP or NumP instead).
(33) showcases the structure of an inverted discontinuous noun phrase taken from (20-b). In it, the DP part of the QP bears a Top feature (it could also be a Foc feature), and is thus attracted to the specifier of TopP, the head of which has a *uTop feature. This movement strands the quantifier pre-verbally, in this case in the specifier of TP which the QP had moved to from inside the vP (this movement is not shown for reasons of space; assume there is no XP within the vP, since there is nothing postverbal.):
Note that the analysis of inverted discontinuous noun phrases does not disallow subjects to become inverted splits, as the Top (or Foc) head will c-command any DP in the structure and be able to attract it. This prediction is not yet borne out in the data, but as there are only three examples of inverted splits, I do not think this prediction can be ruled out. Further research will have to assess whether subjects of transitives can participate in inverted splits.

So, what then to make of cases like (23) or (24), where the fronted part of the discontinuous noun phrase is topic or focus but the other part is postverbal? I will not provide a tree for those structures, but I think they can be easily derived by making it so the first part of either of those types of discontinuous noun phrases bears the relevant Top or Foc feature, but with an XP in the vP whose *uD feature needs to be satisfied as well. In such a case, the noun phrase splits so as to satisfy both the *uTop or *uFoc of the TopP or FocP and the *uD feature of the lower XP. This analysis, however, interprets such structures as placing different information structural needs on different parts of the noun phrase, a claim that was not clearly supported by the data. Further research will have to address this issue; an approach based on the Distributed Deletion model of movement advanced in Cavar & Fanselow (1998) and Fanselow & Cavar (2001), where an entire DP or QP (whatever the maximal projection is of the entire noun phrase) moves to various positions but only pieces of it are spelled out at any one place. In such a case, one could say that the entire noun phrase bears the Top or Foc feature, but in order to satisfy the competing needs of the *uTop or *uFoc and the *uD feature of XP partially spells out the noun phrase in each position.

5 Conclusion

In this paper I have provided a characterization of discontinuous noun phrases in Karuk, arguing that several patterns in Karuk discontinuous noun phrases do not match the cross-linguistic patterns described in the literature. After identifying a subject-object asymmetry in the realization of Karuk discontinuous noun phrases, I put forward a preliminary movement analysis that requires the noun phrases to generate in argument position, contra the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis advanced by Jelinek (1984) and Baker (1991). However, this study represents in essence only a pilot study of the phenomenon of discontinuous noun phrases in Karuk. Open questions still remain, such as what the motivation is for the postverbal position in simple discontinuous noun phrases and whether possessive splits have the same structure as the others. Further work should also be completed to expand the corpus of discontinuous noun phrases. Beyond that, research remains to be completed on discontinuous constituents of other types in Karuk.
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