

# Degrees of word order freedom in Karuk\*

Line Mikkelsen

UC Berkeley, Syntax Circle, September 27, 2013

## 1 Introduction

Existing descriptions of Karuk word order are brief and emphasize the freedom of position that nominal arguments enjoy (de Angulo and Freeland 1931:194–5, Bright 1957:140–1, Macaulay 2000:479–80):

- (1) “Most of the business of the language goes on within the verb. The nouns that represent the actors in the sentence are interspersed between the verbs without syntactic cases or fixed order to show their relations. Elements in the verb refer to them, but they themselves are not ticketed. Even their number, singular, dual, plural, is expressed for them by the verb. As though we were to say for “The trees stand there ...”, “There they-stand, tree ...” Or for “I will take the children”, “I-will-take-them, the-child”. (de Angulo and Freeland 1931:194–5)

**This talk:** examine wider range of verbal arguments and suggest that they partition into two classes as regards their word order freedom:

- (2) CLASS I = DP arguments (S, O) and locative applied objects: word order is grammatically free, but pragmatically restricted
- (3) CLASS II = manner complements, CP complements, quotes: word order is grammatically fixed

Analytic question: can this difference in word order freedom be linked analytically to particular aspects of verbal morphology (Jelinek 1984, Baker 1996, Adger et al. 2009)?

## Language background

- Setting
  - spoken along the middle course of the Klamath river in northwestern California
  - isolate within Hokan group
  - neighbours: Yurok (Algic), Shasta (also Hokan), Tolowa (Athabaskan), Hupa (Athabaskan)
  - severely endangered; first-language speakers all elderly; language teaching, documentation, revitalization in communities

---

\*I am grateful to the Karuk elders Lucille Albers, Sonny Davis, Julian Lang, Bud Smith, Vina Smith, and Charlie Thom for working with the UC Berkeley Karuk study group and sharing their language with us. The corpus data for this presentation was made available online as part of the Karuk Dictionary and Texts Project (<http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~karuk/index.php>), a collaboration between the Karuk Tribe and at Survey of California and Other Indian Languages at UC Berkeley. I am grateful to Susan Gehr and Andrew Garrett for spearheading this effort and to the Karuk community members and UC Berkeley students who contributed recordings and processed texts for the data base, including Tamara Alexander, Nico Baier, Kayla Carpenter, Anna Currey, Erin Donnelley-Kuhns, Kouros Falati, Matt Faytak, Morgan Jacobs, Erik Maier, Karie Moorman, Olga Pipko, Melanie Redeye, Clare Sandy, Jeff Spingeld, Tammy Stark, Whitney White and 13 other students in Linguistics 170, Spring 2012. Finally, I acknowledge financial support from NSF, award #1065620 Karuk [kyh] and Yurok [yur] syntax and text documentation

- Relevant linguistic features:

- polysynthetic, no noun incorporation, but highly developed set of directional suffixes (Macaulay, 2005)
- agglutinative; predominantly suffixing
- S and O cross-referenced on V by portmanteau prefix (though see Macaulay 1992)

(4) Karuk agreement prefixes, positive indicative series (Macaulay 1992:184)

	3SG (V <sub>intrans</sub> )	3PL	2SG	2PL	1SG	1PL
1SG	<i>ni-</i>	<i>ni-</i>	<i>nu'</i>	<i>kiik'</i>	X	X
2SG	<i>i-</i>	<i>i-</i>	X	X	<i>ná-</i>	<i>kín'</i>
3SG	<i>u-</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>i/-ap</i>	<i>kiik'/-ap</i>	<i>ná-</i>	<i>kín'</i>
1PL	<i>nu'</i>	<i>nu'</i>	<i>nu'</i>	<i>kiik'/-ap</i>	X	X
2PL	<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	X	X	<i>kaná-</i>	<i>kín'</i>
3PL	<i>kun'</i>	<i>kín'</i>	<i>i/-ap</i>	<i>kiik'/-ap</i>	<i>kaná-</i>	<i>kín'</i>

- Transitive agreement with 3rd person objects is systematically identical to intransitive agreement (with the exception of 3PL>3PL). I nonetheless differentiate the glosses by transitivity.<sup>1</sup>

- (5)
- tá **nu**-mah.  
PERF 1SG>2SG-see  
*I see you.*
  - tá **ni**-mah.  
PERF 1SG>3-see  
*I see it.*
  - tá **ni**-kyívish.  
PERF 1SG-fall.down  
*I fell down.*

## Methodology and limitations

- Primarily corpus-based; >5000 sentence online searchable text corpus
  - bulk of textual material is from Bright (1957) (WB-KL-01 through WB-KL-92), based on fieldwork in the late 1940'ies.
  - some earlier texts from Harrington (1931) (JPH-KT) and Kroeber (ALK field notebook 14, 1903)
- some recent targeted elicitation and grammaticality judgments (identified by speaker and date)
- mostly contrasting preverbal vs. postverbal position
- indirect objects and non-locative applied objects not yet examined
- documentation of pragmatic restrictions limited to effect of overt focus-marking on word order

<sup>1</sup>All examples are given in the orthography adopted by the Karuk tribe. I use the following abbreviations in the glosses: ANC = ancient tense, ANT = anterior tense, BEN = benefactive, C = complementizer, DIM = diminutive, DUR = durative, FUT = future, INT = intensive, IRR = irrealis, ITER = iterative, LOC = locative, NEG = negation, OBV = obviative, PERF = perfect, PL = plural, PL.ACT = plural action, SG = singular. In some cases the derivational morphemes of a verb stem are not glossed individually.

## 2 Class I: grammatically free, pragmatically restricted

Karuk displays Hale's (1983) three hallmarks of a non-configurational language:

- (6) Class I arguments may be
- a. **freely ordered**
  - b. freely dropped
  - c. freely split

While grammatically free, the order of Class I arguments seems to be restricted by pragmatic status, such that rheme (new) precedes theme (old) (cf. Tomlin and Rhodes 1979 on Ojibwa and papers in Payne 1992)

- (7)
- a. focused DPs (new/contrastive/identificational) appear preverbally
  - b. post-verbal position restricted to non-new, less salient, non-focussed elements
  - c. preverbal position as default (cf. Harbour et al. 2012 on Kiowa)

### 2.1 DP arguments

#### Intransitive clauses

- (8) xás pa-kah'árah-sas kun-ivyíhuk.  
then the-Shasta.Indian-PL 3PL-come.PL  
*And the upriver people came.* [SV]  
Julia Starritt "Coyote Steals Fire" (WB-KL-10:2)
- (9) t-u-piváxra pa-'íshaha.  
PERF-3SG-dry.up the-water  
*The water had dried up.* [VS]  
Nettie Reuben "Coyote's Journey" (WB-KL-01:62)

#### Transitive clauses with one overt DP argument

- (10) kári xás pa-mú-vaas u-p-ishnáka-rishuk.  
then then the-3SG-blanket 3SG>3-ITER-put.aside-out  
*And he undid his blanket.* [OV]  
Nettie Reuben "Coyote's Journey" (WB-KL-01:56)
- (11) xás kúuk u-páath-ma pa-mú-vaas.  
then to.there 3SG>3-throw-toward the-3SG-blanket  
*And he threw his blanket at it.* [VO]  
Nettie Reuben "Coyote's Journey" (WB-KL-01:60)
- (12) naa ník ni-p-shan-siipree-vish.  
1SG a.little 1s>3-ITER-carry-up-FUT  
*I'll carry them away.* [SV]  
Source: Mamie Offield "Duck Hawk and His Wife" (WB-KL-27:27)
- (13) ... tá kun-tápkuup pa-'arara-'íin.  
PERF 3PL>3SG-like the-human-OBV  
*... the people liked him.* [VS]  
Source: Daisy Jones "The Snake People" (WB-KL-60:22)

## Transitive clauses with two overt DP arguments

- (14) púyava kári pa-’áraar pa-’urípi u-p-ithyúru-ripaa  
 you.see then the-human the-net 3SG>3SG-ITER-pull-out  
*Then the Indian pulled the net out of the water.* [SOV]  
 Source: Julia Starritt “Salmon Fishing” (WB-KL-69:16)
- (15) xás pa-pihñiich u-píimni pa-mú-’aramah  
 then the-old.man 3SG>3-fall.in.love the-3SG-child  
*And the old man fell in love with his child.* [SVO]  
 Source: Julia Starritt “Coyote Marries His Own Daughter” (WB-KL-16:3)
- (16) ta’ítam kun-ífik-aheen pa-xuntápan pa-’asiktávaan-sa  
 so 3PL>3SG-pick.up-ANT the-acorn the-woman-PL  
*Then the women gathered the acorns.* [VOS]  
 Source: Mamie Offield “Coyote Gives Salmon and Acorns tp Mankind” (WB-KL-17:34)
- (17) pufích-taay kun-iykára-tih, itráhyar mu-túnviiv  
 deer-much 3PL>3SG-beat-DUR ten 3SG-children  
*His ten sons were killing lots of deer.* [OVS]  
 Source: Chester Pepper “Deer Hunting Medicine” (WB-KL-53:4)
- (18) ... chavúra p-eethívthaaneen u-p-áxyar pa-’áraar  
 finally the-land 3SG>3-ITER-fill the-human  
*... finally the people filled up the earth.* [OVS]  
 Source: Mamie Offield “A Trip to the Land of the Dead” (WB-KL-58:56)
- (19) ... naa vúra púra fâat iin nee-shkákáishrihmath-eesh  
 1SG. INT nothing OBV 3SG>1SG-stop.from.doing-FUT  
*(And Fire said,) “Nothing can stop me.”* [OSV]  
 Source: Mamie Offield “Victory Over Fire” (WB-KL-45:18)

- (8)–(19) confirm grammatically free order of S and O
- verb-final and verb medial order appear to be more common (consistent with Bright (1957:141)).
- No examples in corpus of VSO (cf. Adger et al. (2009) on Kiowa), but VOS is also rare.
- Bright (1957:134): with transpersonal verbs (roughly, verbs that can take animate subject and animate object) S must precede O. (17) and (19) are potential counterexamples to this.

## 2.2 A preverbal focus position

Karuk has three focus particles: *kích* ‘only’, *káru* ‘also’, *kúna* ‘in addition’. These particles are right-adjoined to the focused element:

- (20) naa kích  
 1.SG only  
*only me*
- (21) naa káru  
 1.SG also  
*me too*
- (22) fâat kúna?  
 what in.addition  
*what else?*

Such overtly focus-marked constituents invariably precede the verb:

- (23) xás [pa-’únuhich kich] t-u-páth-ih.  
 then the-kidney only PERF-3SG>3-throw-BEN  
*Then he threw only the kidney to him.*  
 Source: Mrs. Bennett, “Screech Owl and Coyote” (ALK-14-35)
- (24) [uumkun káru] kun-pakúriihva.  
 3PL also 3PL>3SG-sing.songs  
*They (the Does) were singing too.* (After saying that Coyote was singing when he met the Does)  
 Source: Mamie Offield “Coyote Trades Songs and Goes to the Sky” (WB-KL-09:4)
- (25) [akráa káru] kun-’áam-tih.  
 eel also 3PL>3SG-eat-DUR  
*They ate eels too.* (After saying that they ate deer, salmon and acorns.)  
 Source: Maggie Charley, “Indian Food” (WB-KL-68:18)
- (26) [pa-mu-hrôoha kúna] ú-kfuukiraa  
 the-3SG-wife in.addition 3SG>3-grab  
*He grabbed his wife in turn.* (After grabbing his child.)  
 Source: Lottie Beck, “The Greedy Father” (WB-KL-23)

Postverbal placement judged ungrammatical (27); preverbal placement invariably volunteered (28):

- (27) \*tá nu-’ákih [uxnáhich kich]  
 PERF 1SG>2SG-feed strawberries only  
 Intended: *All I gave you were strawberries.* (Vina Smith, 16/06/2013)
- (28) [uxnáhich kich] tá nu-’ákih.  
 strawberries only PERF 1SG>2SG-feed  
*All I gave you were strawberries.* (Vina Smith, 16/06/2013)

⇒ there is a preverbal focus position. DPs accompanied by a focus particle must occur in that preverbal position.

### 2.3 Locative applied arguments

Karuk has a rich set of directional suffixes (close to 40). Macaulay (2005) argues that the bulk of these (around 30) function as applicative morphemes that introduce a locative applied object which may, but need not, be realized by an independent locative expression:<sup>2</sup>

- (29) páah-ak ú-skaak-ramnih ...  
 boat-LOC 3SG-jump-into.container  
*He jumped into a boat ...*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “Coyote’s Journey” (WB-KL-05:101)
- (30) xás aas ú-yvaay-ramnih.  
 then water 3SG>3SG)-pour-into.container  
*And he poured water in (a basket).*  
 Source: Julia Starritt “Coyote Steals Fire” (WB-KL-10:35)
- (31) xás áas ú-skaa-kurih.  
 then water 3SG-jump-into.water  
*So he jumped into water.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “Coyote’s Journey” (WB-KL-05:30)

<sup>2</sup>It is not clear to me whether the verb agrees with locative applicatives, since 3SG object agreement is invisible; see table in (4).

The applied object may precede or follow the verb:

- (32) kári xás **impá-ak** ú-skaak-**sur** pa-ʼasiktávaan.  
 then then trail-LOC 3SG-jump-off the-woman  
*And the woman jumped off of the path.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “The Devil Discovered” (WB-KL-62:8)
- (33) pa-ʼasiktávaan u-t-**ráamnih-ti** **pa-ʼásip-ak**.  
 the-woman 3SG-look-into.container-DUR the-bowl-LOC  
*The woman is looking in the bowl.*  
 Source: Julia Starritt, “Responses to Pictures” (WB-KL-92:83)
- (34) chími **páah-ak** vá-**ramnih!**  
 soon boat-LOC go-into.container  
*“Get in the boat.”*  
 Source: Chester Pepper, “Coyote’s Journey” (WB-KL-03:150)
- (35) chími vá-**rip-i** **páah-ak!**  
 soon go-out-IMP boat-LOC  
*Get out of the boat!*  
 Source: Chester Pepper, “Coyote’s Journey” (WB-KL-03:169)

When overtly focus-marked, applied objects precede the verb:<sup>3</sup>

- (36) [**húuk kích**] paath-**m-i!**  
 to.somewhere only throw-toward-IMP  
*Just throw it (away) someplace!*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “How Deer Meat Was Lost and Regained” (WB-KL-33:64)
- (37) [**hōoy kích**] t-óo p-thívruuh-**ruprav**.  
 where only PERF-3SG ITER-float-out.through  
*(She wondered) where they had floated out.*  
 Source: Nettie Reuben, “The Pool in Big Rock” (WB-KL-59:7)

Tentative conclusion: Applied objects pattern with S and O in being able to occur before or after the verb. All are required to occur pre-verbally if focus marked.

### 3 Class II: Grammatically fixed order

At least three kinds of non-DP dependents exhibit a grammatically fixed order relative to the verb:<sup>4</sup>

1. manner complements precede V
2. complement clauses follow V
3. quotes follow V

#### 3.1 Manner complements

Certain verbs seem to obligatorily occur with a adverbial dependent expressing manner or quality, including *ipmahóonkoon*, ‘feel’, *kuupha* ‘do, act’, and possibly *imusaha* ‘look (like)’.

- (38) xás vúra **kâarim** t-óo pmahóonkoon.  
 then INT bad PERF-3SG feel  
*Then he felt bad.*  
 Source: Julia Starritt, “Coyote’s Journey” (WB-KL-04:20)

<sup>3</sup>In (37), *tóo* is the result of the perfect marker *tá* coalescing with the 3SG agreement prefix *u-*.

<sup>4</sup>Or nearly fixed in the case of quotes.

- (39) ... **kâarim** i-kuph-eesh.  
           bad       2SG-do-FUT  
           ... *you'll do badly.*  
           Source: Julia Starritt, “Coyote Marries His Own Daughter” (WB-KL-16:18)
- (40) **vaa** u-kúphaa-nik á 'iknêechhan.  
           thus 3SG-do-ANC   falcon  
           *Duck Hawk did this.*  
           Source: Chester Pepper, “Duck Hawk and His Wife” (WB-KL-26:1)
- (41) pa-'ishkêesh **yáv** u-músahi-tih  
           the-river       good 3SG-look-DUR  
           *The river looks good.*  
           Source: Charlie Thom, Sr., (CT-01:8)

Such complements invariably precede the verb and are judged ungrammatical in post-verbal position:

- (42) Naa **vúra yav** ni-pmahóonkoonati.  
           1SG INT   good 1SG-feel-DUR  
           *I feel good.*  
           Vina Smith, 09/07/13
- (43) \*Naa ni-pmahóonkoonati (**vúra**) **yav**.  
           1SG 1SG-feel-DUR           INT   good  
           Vina Smith, 09/07/13

- Could this be a matter of prosodic lightness?
  - also heavier manner expressions must occur preverbally (*kâarim* ‘bad(ly)’ *yâamach* ‘pretty’)
  - monosyllabic DP objects can occur post-verbally:

- (44) káru vaa kumá'ii koovúra kuma-keemishatunvêechas kun-'áay-ti       **aah**.  
           also that because.of all       3SG-little.wild.animals       3PL>3SG-fear-DUR fire  
           *And that's why all the little wild animals are afraid of fire.*  
           Source: Mamie Offield, “Victory Over Fire” (WB-KL-45:22)

⇒ The restriction to preverbal position is grammatical in nature, not prosodic.

### 3.2 Complement clauses

While there appear to be no clausal subjects in Karuk, finite complement clauses are found with verbs of perception, attitude, cognition, and communication,<sup>5</sup> as well as aspectual verbs:

---

<sup>5</sup>These verbs more typically occur with direct speech complements, but they are also attested with subordinate complement clauses.

- (45)
- |                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| aachíchha      | ‘be glad’         |
| áapunma        | ‘to know’         |
| imus-          | ‘to look at’      |
| ikrúunti       | ‘to wait for’     |
| ikyâavarihva   | ‘to try’          |
| ipêer          | ‘to tell’         |
| ipshinváarihva | ‘to forget’       |
| káriha         | ‘to be ready’     |
| kôoha          | ‘to stop’         |
| mah            | ‘to see, to find’ |
| pasúpiichva    | ‘to reveal’       |
| piip           | ‘to say’          |
| pikrôok        | ‘to remember’     |
| pikyaar        | ‘to finish’       |
| táapkup        | ‘to like’         |
| thitiv         | ‘to hear’         |
| ûurih          | ‘to be unwilling’ |

Complement clauses are introduced by the proclitic *pa=*, which Bright (1957:121–2) analyzes as a nominalizer; here I treat it as a complementizer (C).<sup>6</sup>

Complement clauses invariably follow the verb in texts:

- (46) tá kun-’áapunma **p-oo-kitaxríharahi-tih**.  
 PERF 3PL>3SG-know C-3SG-be.unfaithful-DUR  
 They found out that he was being unfaithful.  
 Source: Nettie Reuben, “The Adulterers Discovered” (WB-KL-39:24)
- (47) kéevniikich vúra uum u-tapkúupu-ti **p-óo-thtii-tih**.  
 old.woman INT 3.SG 3SG>3-like-DUR C-3SG-gamble-DUR  
*An old woman liked to gamble.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “The Perils of Weasel” (WB-KL-19:1)
- (48) naa íp ni-pasúpiichv-at [**pa-sôomvaan** **t-i-’ípasuk**].  
 1SG PAST 1SG>3-reveal-PAST C-woman.who.offers.self.in.marriage PERF-2SG>3-bring.person.back  
*I revealed that you were bringing home a new wife.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “Duck Hawk and His Wife” (WB-KL-27:23)

and in elicited forms:

- (49) naa vúra ni-tapkúupi-ti **pa-ni-’uufíthvu-tih**.  
 1SG INT 1SG>3-like-DUR C-1SG-swim-DUR  
*I like to swim.* (Vina Smith 09/07/2013)
- (50) ni-krúunti [**iim p-ee-mnísh-eesh**].  
 1SG>3-wait.for 2SG C-2SG>3-cook-FUT  
*I am waiting for you to cook.* (Vina Smith, 09/08/2013)

When presented with a preverbal complement clause in elicitation, the consultant rejected it as “no good” (compare (51) with (49)):

- (51) \*naa vúra **pa-ni-’uufíthvu-tih** ni-tapkúupi-ti.  
 1SG INT C-1SG-swim-DUR 1SG>3-like-DUR  
 Intended: *I like to swim.* (Vina Smith 09/07/2013)

<sup>6</sup>This proclitic is segmentally identical to the definite determiner; Bright (1957) distinguishes the two based on the morphological processes they trigger.

or reinterpreted the subordinate clause as an adverbial clause and adjusted its form. Compare (52) with (50):

- (52) [iim p-ee-mnísh-eesh] ni-krûuntih-eesh.  
 2SG C-2SG>3-cook-FUT 1SG>3-wait.for-FUT  
*If you are going to cook, I will wait.*

**Note** Adverbial clauses use the same proclitic subordinator as complement clauses (*pa=*), but unlike complement clauses adverbial clauses may precede or follow verb, as is typical for languages with an initial subordinator (Diessel, 2001).

- Some of the verbs in (45) also allow DP objects and, unlike complement clauses, the DP object may follow or precede the verb:

- (53) purafâat vúra ná-'aapunmu-tih-ara.  
 nothing INT 1SG>3-know-DUR-NEG  
*I don't know anything.*  
 Source: Charlie Thom, Sr., (CT-01)

- (54) xás káan askitávaan u-tápkup.  
 then there woman 3SG>3-like  
*He liked a woman there.*  
 Source: Lottie Beck, "Duck Hawk and His Wife" (WB-KL-25)

- (55) xás pihnêefich t-u-tápkup pa-'asiktávaan-sa.  
 then coyote PERF-3SG>3-like the-woman-PL  
*And Coyote took a liking to the women.*  
 Source: Chester Pepper, "Coyote's Journey" (WB-KL-03)

- (56) pa'asiktávaan nu-krûuntih.  
 the-woman 1PL>3-wait.for  
*We are waiting for the woman.* (Vina Smith, 09/08/2013)

⇒ So it is not that these particular verbs require their internal argument, irrespective of category, to follow them; rather CP complements must follow the verb, whereas DP object may precede or follow the verb, as is generally true of DP arguments.

- That in turn sets up an interesting question regarding focus marking:
  - focus-marked phrases occur pre-verbally,
  - complement clauses occur post-verbally
  - can one focus-mark a complement clause and if so, what is the word order?

- (57) iinâak vaa kích u-thítim-ti p-oo-pakuriihvu-ti "yôotva t-u-'iiv'íiv íkamish t-u-'iiv'íiv".  
 indoors thus only 3SG>3-hear-DUR C-3SG>3-sing.songs-DUR hurray! PERF-3SG-die son.in.law PERF-3SG-die  
*Inside he just heard her singing, "Hurray, he's dead, son-in-law is dead!"*  
 Source: Lottie Beck, "The Perils of Weasel" (WB-KL-18)

- (58) uum vúra hitíhaan vaa kích u-kupi-tih, ú-kvaa-tih.  
 3SG INT always thus only 3SG-do-DUR 3SG-carry.on.shoulder-DUR  
*He did only this all the time, he gathered sweathouse wood.*  
 Source: Chester Pepper, "Medicine for the Return of Wives" (WB-KL-52)

- (59) yukún naa ík káru vaa ni-kuph-eesh p-oo-kúphaa-nik p-eeknúumin veekxaréeyav.  
 you.see 1SG must also thus 1SG-do-FUT C-3SG-do-ANC the-Burrill.Peak.spirit  
*You see, I must also do that way, as Burrill Peak Spirit did.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, "Shinny Game Medicine" (WB-KL-54)

### 3.3 Quotations

Like complement clauses quotations follow the verb of saying, typically *piip* ‘say’ or *ipêer* ‘tell’:<sup>7</sup>

- (60) kári xás pa-’asiktávaan u-piip “chími kan-thimníup-i”  
 then then-the-woman 3sg.(3)-say soon 1sg.(-3sg./pl.)(imper.)-roast.with.coals-IMPER  
*And the woman said, “Let me roast it!”*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “The Devil Who Died Laughing” (WB-KL-63), line 6.
- (61) xás pa-pihníich ú-peen-vunaa pa-yeeripáxvuh-sas “chími kiik-p-iru-vôonishuk-i!”  
 then the-old.man 3SG-say.to-PL the-adolescent.girl-PL soon 2PL-ITER-PL-crawl.out-IMP  
*And the old man told the girls, “Crawl out again!”*  
 Source: Julia Starritt, “The Hair in the Soup” (WB-KL-21)

Again, DP objects and manner complements to the same verbs may precede these verbs, suggesting that it is the category of the dependent, not the verb itself, that matters:

- (62) vúra kúnish **hûut** téé piip.  
 INT sort.of how PERF-2SG say  
*You sort of said something.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “Duck Hawk and His Wife” (WB-KL-27)
- (63) pûu, **púra fâat** vúra n-eeπί-tih-ara.  
 no nothing INT 1SG-say-DUR-NEG  
*No, I didn’t say anything.*  
 Source: Mamie Offield, “Duck Hawk and His Wife” (WB-KL-27)
- (64) **púra fâat** vúra kin-ípeen-tih-at  
 nothing INT 3>1PL-say.to-DUR-PAST  
*They (the government) didn’t say anything to us.*  
 Source: Emily Donahue, “Preparing Basket Materials” (WB-KL-85)
- (65) **fatamakêesh kích** ára ú-peer-eesh.  
 anything only person 3SG-tell-FUT  
*She’ll tell a person just anything.*  
 Source: Nettie Reuben, “Blue Jay As Doctor” (WB-KL-29)

Interaction with focus marking:

- (66) xás **vaa kích** kun-ipí-tih “pu-kín-taapxuv-eesh-ara”  
 then thus only 3PL-say-DUR NEG-1PL-capsize-FUT-NEG  
*And they said only that, “We won’t capsize.”*  
 Source: Nettie Reuben, “The Boy from Itúkuk” (WB-KL-57)
- (67) **vaa kích** u-pí-ti pa-kéevniikich “yôotva t-u-’iv pa-nani-’íkam”  
 thus only 3SG-say-DUR the-old.woman.DIM hurray PERF-3SG-die the-1SG-son.in.law  
*The old woman was just saying, “Hurray, he’s dead, my son-in-law.”*  
 Source: Lottie Beck, “The Perils of Weasel” (WB-KL-18)
- (68) víri **vaa kích** u-pí-ti p-oo-’íih-tih “shakatíyu’inaa híyoo”  
 so thus only 3SG-say-DUR C-3SG-dance-DUR shakatíyu’inaa híyoo  
*He said only this as he danced, “shakatíyu’inaa hyoo.”*  
 Source: Nettie Reuben, “Lizard and Grizzly Bear” (WB-KL-34)

<sup>7</sup>Unlike the situation with complement clauses, there are there are examples of quotations that are split across the verb or fully preceed the verb of saying. Of 378 corpus examples of *piip* ‘to say’ with a quotative complement, 1 has the quote preceding *piip* and 2 have the quote split (examples reproduced in appendix). Of 110 examples of *ipêer* ‘to tell’ with a quotative complement, 1 has the quote split and 1 has the quote preverbally. These might have independent explanations or they show that postverbal position is not grammatically determined, but highly dominant in the narrative genres represented in the corpus.

## 4 Summary

1. In Karuk different types of verbal arguments exhibit different degrees of word order freedom:

- Class I (S, O and locative applied O) are grammatically free(er)

- Class II are grammatically fixed:

manner complements > V > quotes/CP complements

2. Karuk has a separate requirement that overtly focus-marked elements must precede the verb:

[XP FOC] > V

- For S, O and locative applied O, this fixes their position to one of several possible ones.
- for quotes and possibly CP complements, this triggers cataphora:

[*vaa<sub>i</sub>* FOC] > V > quote<sub>*i*</sub>/CP<sub>*i*</sub>

## 5 Open Issues

1. Can the difference in word order freedom be linked to the syntactic category of the argument?

- Are Class I arguments nominal (locative *-ak* notwithstanding)?
- Are Class II arguments non-nominal (“nominalizing” *pa=* notwithstanding)?

2. Can it be linked to agreement (Jelinek, 1984) or “Morphological Visibility” (Baker, 1996)?

- difficult to determine whether locatives and CP control object agreement
- Karuk lacks noun incorporation, so is not polysynthetic in Baker’s sense.

3. Should the sentence-final position of complement clauses and quotes even receive a language-specific explanation, since it is a property found in a wide variety of other-wise verb-final languages, including Farsi, German, and Hindi. It is also true of Mohawk (Baker 1996:115)

4. Is Karuk (simply) a weakly verb-final language?

### Appendix: Quotations spanning or preceding verb of saying

- (69) “víri akáray” tá kun-piip.  
so who PERF 3pl-say  
“Then who is it?” they said.  
Source: Julia Starritt, “Coyote Goes to a War Dance” (WB-KL-06)
- (70) “vaa uum” kun-ipí-ti “pitaxyárih.”  
that 3SG 3PL-say-DUR swearing  
That, they said, was “swearing.”  
Source: Julia Starrit “Swearing” (WB-KL-0:3)
- (71) xás “koovúra pa-parishríhva-an-sa” u-píip “óok kii-vyíhuk-i.”  
then all the-twine-Agentive-PL 3SG-say here 2PL-come-IMP  
And he said, “All twiners, come here!”  
Source: Julia Starritt, “Coyote Goes to the Sky” (WB-KL-08)

## References

- Adger, D., D. Harbour, and L. J. Watkins (2009). *Mirrors and Microparameters: Phrase Structure Beyond Free Word Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, M. C. (1996). *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bright, W. (1957). *The Karok Language*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: UC Press.
- de Angulo, J. and L. S. Freeland (1931). Karok texts. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 6(3/4), 194–226.
- Diessel, H. (2001). The ordering distribution of main and adverbial clauses: A typological study. *Language* 77(3), 433–455.
- Hale, K. (1983). Walpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1(1), 5–47.
- Harbour, D., L. J. Watkins, and D. Adger (2012). Information structure, discourse structure, and noun phrase position in Kiowa. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78(1), 97–126.
- Harrington, J. P. (1931). Karuk texts. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 6(2), 121–161.
- Jelinek, E. (1984). Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(1), 39–76.
- Macaulay, M. (1992). Inverse marking in Karuk: the function of the suffix *-ap*. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 58(2), 182–201.
- Macaulay, M. (2000). Obviative marking in ergative contexts: The case of Karuk *'iin*. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 66(4), 464–498.
- Macaulay, M. (2005). On the Karuk directional suffixes. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 85–101. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Payne, D. L. (Ed.) (1992). *Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*. Number 22 in Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tomlin, R. and R. Rhodes (1979). An introduction to information distribution in Ojibwa. In P. Clyne (Ed.), *Papers from the Fifteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, pp. 307–321. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.