Introduction: This paper provides a description and a structural account of verbal agreement in Ktunaxa, a language isolate spoken in the Kootenay region of British-Columbia, parts of Alberta, Washington, Montana and Idaho (Ktunaxa Nation, 2016). Ktunaxa is little studied, and only a handful of descriptions of its verbal morphology are available (Garvin, 1948; Mast, 1988; Morgan, 1991). Of these descriptions, none provide a formal account of verbal agreement. In addition, very little is known about Ktunaxa clausal structure. Thus, the goal of this paper is two folds, it aims to understand how verbal agreement is licensed in Ktunaxa, and it explores the functional apparatus of the language.

Theoretical framework: As is common in generative syntax, I assume that verbal agreement, the co-variance between a verb and its arguments with respect to the phi-features they encode, is licensed through functional projections, such that variation in the functional material of the clause triggers variation in agreement patterns (Pollock, 1989; Boeckx, 2006 and references therein).

Description and empirical problem: Ktunaxa verbal morphology involves a subject number suffix (1) and object person and number suffixes (2).

(1) a. Hun   ¢łakiłni
     hun   ¢łakił-ni
     1.SBJ   like-IND
     'I like'

    b. Hun   ¢łakiłnałani
     hun   ¢łakił-nała-ni
     1.SBJ   like-1.PL-IND
     'We like'

(2)   Hun   ¢łakłiskiłni
    hun   ¢łakił-is-kił-ni
    1.SBJ   like-2.OBJ-2.PL-IND
    'We like you$_{pl}$'

Agreement morphemes occur in a fixed sequence given in (3b), where object agreement follows the verbal stem and subject agreement follows object agreement.

(3) Ktunaxa verbal template

    a. Hun   wukatiskił-nała-ni
     hun   wukat-is-kił-nała-ni
     1.SBJ   see-2.OBJ-2.PL.OBJ-1.SBJ.PL-IND
     'We sees you$_{pl}$'

b. V > object person suffix > object number suffix > subject number suffix (> indicative suffix)

It is widely assumed, in generative literature, that subject agreement is licensed in TP (Pollock, 1989), while object agreement is licensed in vP (Chomsky, 2000). Other usual suspects for licensing agreement include AspP and CP. In Ktunaxa, functional material encoding aspectual and tense distinctions occurs before the complementizer *k* which introduces root interrogatives and subordinate clauses (4).

(4) a. Ɂat   ma   kin   ¢̇inaxałani   Ɂakitła Ɂis.
     Ɂat   ma   k-hin   ¢̇inax-ała-ni   Ɂakitła-Ɂis.
     HAB   PAST   COMP-2.SBJ   go-1.PL-IND   house-2.POSS
     'You$_{pl}$ went to your house (regularly)'

    b. [$_{AspP}$ Ɂat [$_{TP}$ ma [$_{CP}$ k [$_{XP}$ hin ¢̇inaxałani Ɂakitła Ɂis]]]].

If agreement was licensed in any of these functional projections, we would expect agreement patterns to be sensitive to variation in these domains. However, this is not the case, agreement

patterns are not sensitive to aspect, tense, nor clause typing, which suggests that agreement in Ktunaxa is licensed lower than C, in functional projections that do not encode neither tense nor aspect.

Analysis: Event nominalizations in Ktunaxa allow for the full argument structure of the verb to be realized (5), suggesting that event nominalizations involve at least a vP structure.

(5) Hun   upxni   k̇waqnu   ɫkamnintik   yaqanuqnunamkis
     Hun   upxni   k̇ waqnu   ɫkamnintik   yaqanuqnunamki-s
     1.SBJ see-IND NMLZ climb   children   ladder-OBV
     'I saw children's climbing of the ladder.'

In these nominalizations, subject agreement is grammatical (6), object agreement is grammatical (7), but both agreement morphemes are in complementary distribution (8).

(6) Hun   upxni   k̇waqnukiɫ
     Hun   upxni   k̇ waqnukiɫ
     1.SBJ see-IND   COMP climb-2.PL
     'I saw your climbing

(7) hun   upxni   k̇hamatik¢iɫnis   paɫki
     hun   upx-ni   k̇-hamatik¢iɫ-nis   paɫki
     1.SBJ   see-IND   NMLZ-give-2.OBJ   woman
     'I saw/witness the giving of you to the man.' (in an adoption context)

(8) *   Maɫian   upxni   k̇hamatik¢iɫnisnaɫa
            Maɫian   upx-ni   k̇-hamatik¢iɫ-nis-naɫa
            Marianne   see-IND   NMLZ-give-2.OBJ-1.PL.SBJ
            Intended: 'Marianne saw our giving of you.'

Conclusion: I conclude that i) the clausal structure of Ktunaxa involves functional projections dedicated to tense and aspect unusually high in the tree, above C, ii) based on nominalizations patterns, agreement is licensed in two functional projections, the highest one being located between vP and CP, and the lowest one, being most likely vP itself, iii) that functional heads licensing agreement simply agree with the closest argument available such that in event nominalizations, both subjects and objects can agree with the same functional projection. This paper contributes to the description and documentation of an underdocumented language.

References

Boeckx, C. (2006). Introduction. In Boeckx, C. (Ed) *Agreement systems* (Vol. 92, 1-12). Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: e framework. In *Step by Step*, R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds), 89-155. Cambridge MA: e MIT Press.

Garvin, Paul. (1948). Kutenai III: Morpheme distributions (prefix, theme, suffix). *International Journal of American Linguistics* 14 (3): 171-187.

Ktunaxa Nation. (2016). Who we are: Ktunaxa nation. Retrieved from http://www.ktunaxa.org/who-we-are/

Mast, Susan J. (1988). *Aspects of Kutenai Morphology*. Master's Thesis, University of Pittsburgh.

Morgan, Lawrence R. (1991). *A Description of the Kutenai Language* (1.2nd ed., unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley.

Pollock, J.-Y. (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry, 20*(3), 365-424.