ABSTRACT

CLAUSAL ARCHITECTURE OF CHUKCHANSI YOKUTS

In this thesis I examine scrambling and clausal structure in Chukchansi Yokuts, following a general hypothesis of XP movement to landing sites in the clausal left periphery (Rizzi 1997). I analyze focus and topic constructions and verb-first word order as phenomena derived from movement to the left periphery, and assess the status of several categories as XPs using movement as a diagnostic. I also examine island and crossover effects related to this movement.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Focus of this Thesis

The focus of this thesis is to account for the apparently unmotivated and pervasive scrambling present in Chukchansi Yokuts by appealing to Rizzi’s (1997) Split-C system, termed “the fine structure of the left periphery.”

Syntactically, Chukchansi exhibits “free” word order, with simple declaratives appearing in every combination of S, V, and O. SVO, SOV, VOS, VSO, OSV, and OVS are all attested. In simple declaratives, particularly intransitives, verb-first order often seems preferred. In elicitations with native speakers, VS and VSO are often given first, but other orders are often given in addition, with no apparent change in meaning. This is particularly vexing for the study of Chukchansi syntax, as it suggests apparently unmotivated movement in violation of the Principle of Last Resort.

I will show that the majority of cases of displacement in Chukchansi can be accounted for via movement to Specifier positions in Focus, Topic, and Finiteness Phrases. To this end I will assume Rizzi’s (1997) proposal in which CP is expanded into Force Phrase, two Topic Phrases situated above and below Focus Phrase, and Finiteness Phrase situated at the far right edge of this periphery, preceding TP. This allows for ample landing sites for the displaced elements which characterize Chukchansi syntax and give the impression of chaotic word order.

1.2 Background on Yokuts

California is a hotspot of linguistic diversity, home to as many as 90 languages belonging to as many as 20 major language families. Among these is the Yokuts family, comprised of up to 40 distinct varieties, each of which has been
spoken by a separate small population of the southern half of the San Joaquin Valley (Kroeber 1907). I use the term “varieties” for the simple reason that “dialect” and “language” are terms which lack rigid definitions, and the difference between one and the other is poorly established. Particularly in the case of the related varieties of Yokuts, it is not at all clear to what degree they may have once been mutually intelligible. Kroeber (1907) claims a great deal of intelligibility and structural uniformity, while others such as Whistler & Golla (1986) dispute at least the degree to which this is true.

At the time of Kroeber’s (1907) study the Yokuts Indians inhabited the San Joaquin Valley from the Fresno and Chowchilla Rivers in the north to the Tehachapi mountains in the south, and lived both on the valley floor and the nearby Sierra Nevada foothills (see Figure 1). Kroeber’s (1907) analysis places Chukchansi in the Northern Yokuts branch along with Kechayi, Dumna, and Chauchila, while the use of the imperative suffix -ga1 and negative particle ‘ohom’ place it in the Valley group, despite the distribution of Chukchansi speakers in the foothills. Whistler & Golla (1986), however, place Chukchansi in the Hill branch of Valley Yokuts, based on phonological and morphological innovations, rather than Kroeber’s (1907) lexical classification (see Figure 2).

---

1 Throughout this thesis I will be using the orthography developed by CSU Fresno linguistics department, currently in use by the Chukchansi language revitalization project. This orthography differs from that of Kroeber (1907), Newman (1944), Collord (1968), and Gamble (1994). All data from these sources has been transliterated into the new standard orthography.
Figure 1. Dialect areas of Yokuts distributed throughout California (Whistler & Golla 1986)
Figure 2. Family tree of Yokuts varieties (adapted from Whistler and Golla 1986)
1.3 Chukchansi Morphology

Chukchansi is an agglutinative language with a relatively rich verbal morphology, which manifests exclusively as suffixation to verb stems. Category in Yokuts is relatively flexible, as many noun roots can appear suffixed with verbal morphemes, and any verb can be rendered nominal with any number of nominalizing morphemes, which can then take case. These strategies are used to express many ideas which would require prepositional phrases or clausal adjunction in other languages.

(1) 'ama-’ wiy-mi tana-a’a-n
   he-SUB say-CONS go-PRES-FAC
   ‘…and after saying this, she goes’
   (Gamble 1994, p. 69)

(2) T’ew da’ na’ tish-e’ mun’a-w, mech’
   whenever FOC I come.out-FAC outside-LOC very
   chooya-ch’.
   be.lonely-AGENT.SUB
   ‘Whenever I go outside, I get very lonely.’
   (Collord 1968, p. 86)

(3) hew’ne’-ich’ na’ ta’ish-ta’ ch’eehan
   do.thus-AGENT.SUB I see-PERF smoke.OBJ
   ‘As I turned my head like this, I saw smoke.’
   (Collord 1968, p. 90)

Verb stems can take many types of morphemes, including ones that convey tense, mood, aspect, and voice. These include three types of past tense, progressive and durative aspects, imperative mood, passive voice, and other types such as reflexive-reciprocative, benefactive, and a form that co-occurs with the
modal *na’ash*, meaning something like ‘might’ or ‘can’. Stems can also take a variety of morphemes which render verbal roots nominal and can express a variety of meanings. These include the consequent, precedent, indirective, and resultative (Collord 1968, pp. 42, 46).

(4) **yalik-mi**  **na’**  **leel-et**
    stand-CONS  I  read-PST
    ‘I stood up and read.’

(5) **xat-taw**  **na’**  **’amin ta-’an**  **haay-e’**
    eat-PREC  I  his  that-OBJ  laugh-FAC
    ‘I always laugh when he eats.’

(6) **galbiy-it**  **ta-’**  **tan-tin**
    Be.difficult-PST  that-SUB  go-IND
    ‘It is hard to go there.’ (lit. ‘is difficult for going’)

(Collord 1968, pp. 43-44)

Despite this rich system of verbal agglutination, Chukchansi is non-incorporating. Each word has only a single lexical root, of either a verbal or nominal origin (though they often change category through suffixation). Chukchansi also lacks any kind of verbal agreement in terms of inflection. Arguments of a verb are not specified verb-internally, and must appear in the sentence, either as nouns or pronominals, except for the third person singular subject, in which a null subject may be used.

Chukchansi draws on an eight-case system, with a nominative-accusative alignment (“subjective” and “objective,” in Collord’s (1968) terminology). In addition to these two cases, Chukchansi also makes use of a possessive (genitive), instrumental, locative, ablative, possessed, and associative case. Of these, some are less productive than others, with the ablative in particular conspicuously absent.
from current speakers’ repertoires. Chukchansi lacks a marked dative, and so relies on double-object constructions, verbal morphology, and other cases to express arguments such as beneficiary, recipient, goal, etc. (marking the verb with a benefactive, for example, or pairing verbs of motion with nouns marked in the locative case). Weigel (2005, p. 11) refers to the Yokuts family as making use of “Primary Object” and “Secondary Object,” what Collord (1968, pp. 59, 61) calls “objective” and “instrumental,” though to my knowledge there have not been any elicited cases of instrumental used to mark oblique arguments in modern Chukchansi. Case marking is often optional, if the results are contextually unambiguous. This is also true of adjective-noun agreement, in which either the adjective or noun (both typically marked with the same case marker) may lack the requisite case marking.

Yawelmani shares much of Chukchansi’s case system, though it lacks both instrumental and possessed case, and has an indirect object case which Chukchansi lacks (Newman 1944). Under Weigel’s (2005) analysis, this indirect object case would be functionally similar to Chukchansi’s instrumental. Tachi, like Yawelmani, lacks possessed case and uses dative rather than instrumental (Britsch 1980). Newman asserts that common to all varieties of Yokuts are the subjective, objective, possessive, indirect objective, and locative (Newman 1944, p. 195).

In addition to a rich pool of verbal morphemes and a case system, Chukchansi also has a few particles which seem to function as discourse markers, and can be used to express doubt, to mark an utterance as a question, or, as I hope to demonstrate, to focus important information.
1.4 Language Consultants

Currently, only two native speakers of Chukchansi Yokuts are known, but both have claimed that “a few more [Chukchansi speakers] exist” (Mello 2012, p. 4). These two speakers, sisters Holly and Jane Wyatt, have served as language consultants for this study.

The sisters acquired Chukchansi as a first language while living with their Chukchansi-speaking grandmother (Nancy Wyatt, one of the consultants for Collord’s (1968) survey) during their early childhood. Both spoke Chukchansi exclusively until enrolling in elementary school at age 5 or 6, at which point they acquired English (Martin 2011). English is now their dominant language, both when speaking to others and when speaking to one another.

Much of the Chukchansi data in this study comes from elicitations with Holly and Jane Wyatt, collected by myself and others at Fresno State’s linguistics department as part of an ongoing documentation and revitalization project. The consultants provided both Chukchansi translations of English phrases and sentences during elicitation sessions, as well as grammaticality judgments of fabricated and previously elicited Chukchansi sentences.

1.5 Literature Review

The primary sources of data in this study include an overview by Kroeber (1907), a description of the Yokuts languages by Newman (1944), a dissertation by Collord (1968), and collected Yokuts stories by Gamble (1994).

Much of the literature on the Yokuts languages has focused on phonology and morphology, paying special attention to the phonology and semantics of verbal morphology. The studies of Kroeber (1907), Newman (1944), and Collord (1968) are broad but detailed descriptions of the nuanced morphophonemic
systems of Chukchansi, with only brief mentions allotted for the use of particles and even briefer mention of word order and clausal structure.

Kroeber (1907, p. 183) categorizes Yokuts languages as being structurally simple, stating “for an American language it shows little verbal subordination.” Collord (1968, pp. 107-108) notes that a typical Chukchansi sentence consists of a single clause, though he cites three conjunctive particles which he considers to be subordinating: hi’nah, which introduces a conditional clause, t’ew, ‘whenever’, which introduces a conditional-temporal clause, and t’eeyaw, ‘before’, which is used both temporally as well as spatially to mean ‘ahead/in front of’. Rather than consist of tensed verb forms, however, these subordinate clauses consist of gerundials, or nominalized verb forms (Collord 1968, p. 86).

(7)  hi’nah lool-ot,  xat-ni  nim  washi

If leave-PST eat-PASS.GER my after.a.while

‘If he left it, I’m going to eat it.”

Sentences without multiple tensed verbs are generally interpreted not as containing subordinate or embedded clauses, but complete clauses conjoined to one another. This is the general view of Yokuts (Kroeber 1907, p. 183, Collord 1968, pp. 82, 86) that subordination and embedding of clauses containing tensed verbs is rare, but that conjunction of whole clauses is common. “Since a clause may have only one [finite verb], the sentence which has more than one [finite verb] has that many clauses, at least” (Collord 1968, p. 86). Gamble (1978, p. 123) states of Wikchamni that a matrix clause consists of a tensed verb, while a subordinate clause consists of a gerundial or nominal verb.

As for word order, “the order of words in the Yaudanchi [a variety of Yokuts] sentence is rather shifting. A usual order is quite perceptible, but this is often departed from. As regards the three chief parts of the sentence, the verb most
frequently comes first, the subject next, and the object last” (Kroeber 1907, p. 233). Collord (1968, p. 79) makes a similar observation of Chukchansi: “There is little restriction on the order of words in the clause. The relationships between major classes is marked by the system of suffixation. Hence, except for conjunctions, interrogatives and particles, the words may be in almost any order.” Collord notes three common word orders: VSO, SOV, and OSV. Gamble (1978, p. 121) corroborates with this observation in Wikchamni, noting that the most common word orders are VSO and SOV, and further asserts that subject-object inversion can serve as a topicalization strategy. However, Britsch remarks plainly that the word order of Tachi is SVO (Britsch 1980, p. 4).

Harmon (2012) compiles a list of elicited word orders in Chukchansi, giving the full range of possible orders of the elements S, V, and O (6 distinct orders, or 3!). Her listed orders are VSO, VOS, SVO, SOV, OSV, and OVS, with cited examples of each.

(8) Nancy’ ta’ish-hil naanin
    Nancy-sub see-aor us
    ‘Nancy saw us.’ (SVO)

(9) Na’ min p’ay’-a ta’ish-hil
    I your.sg child-obj see-aor
    ‘I saw your child.’ (SOV)

(10) Ta’ish-hil Nancy’ nan
    see-aor Nancy-sub me.obj
    ‘Nancy saw me.’ (VSO)

(11) Ta’ish-ta’ mam Nancy’
    see-past you.sg.obj Nancy-sub
    ‘Nancy saw you.’ (VOS)
(12) Naanin Nancy’ ta’ish-hil
   us.OBJ Nancy-SUB see-AOR
   ‘Nancy saw us.’ (OSV)
(13) min p’ay’-a ta’ish-hil na’
    your.SG child-OBJ see-AOR I
    ‘I saw your child.’ (OVS)

Harmon notes that demonstratives seem to function more like adjuncts in that they exhibit equal freedom of movement. There are restrictions, however. She also notes that adjuncts cannot be moved out of their phrase, that clauses cannot be interleaved, and that an adjunct cannot intervene between a verb and its complement. The latter is illustrated with the preposition hitwash, ‘with’, and it is unclear if this fact is true of adjuncts generally or true of this preposition specifically.

(14) *Mok’eela-’ gosneeno-ta’ hitwash nan xataash-i
    Girl-SUB cook-PERF with me food-OBJ
    ‘She cooked food with me.’

Chukchansi appears to have at least a tendency, if not a requirement, for verb-initial word orders. Collord (1968, p. 79) makes the observation that “the orders Vf S and S Vf are about equally common...,” and goes on to list a series of Chukchansi sentences, a majority of which are in verb-initial order. Britsch (1980, p. 20), in her description of Tachi, notes: “when a noun functions as the subject of the verb... it precedes the verb, but a pronoun follows the verb ... This occurs in the majority of sentences in isolation.” This suggests the possibility that Tachi allows verb-initial order, and that non-pronominal NPs can appear preposed. In Harmon’s (2012) description of Chukchansi syntax, she mentions that in many
intransitive sentences verb-initial order is often elicited first, though subject-initial is also acceptable.

In Tachi, Britsch observes that certain particles that did not typically occur in initial position might appear initially, apparently as a means of focus. She states that

Often the consultant placed the locative particle in initial position when she considered location to be of primary importance in the sentence... It is not yet clear whether this reflects a common pattern for the placement of new and old information in the sentence. (Britsch 1980, p. 16)

Although the typical sentence order in Tachi consists of a pronoun following the verb, “the consultant occasionally accepted sentences in which the pronoun appeared initially, but this may have been due to the immediate influence of English on her speech.” (Britsch 1980, p. 20)

Collord cites several examples of Chukchansi particles in his (1968) dissertation:

At least six dozen lexemes are free, unsuffixed units. These words bring to the clause or sentence modifications of an adverbial nature (time, place, aspect) for the most part, and some are particles, conjunctions and interjections affecting the whole clause. Among the particles a few are post-positive. These are usually, but not always, the second word in the clause. One of these, [da’], is the second word in hundreds of utterances. It possibly gives a mild emphasis to the preceding word which is very often a pronoun but may be a verb or adverb. (Collord 1968, pp. 103-104)

This particle, da’ appears frequently in conjunction with wh-elements, and occasionally on its own. For every appearance, it goes unglossed, which is true in Collord’s dissertation, as well as Gamble’s collection of Yokuts texts. Collord
fully admits that the meaning of this particle is unknown, while offering a guess that it correlates with emphasis of some kind.

Newman (1944) points out a similar particle, *dab* (also in Gamble 1994) in Yawelmani. He describes it as a “conjunctive particle” with “the function of coordinating or subordinating predications of parts of a predication,” meaning “next, on the other hand” (Newman 1944, p. 237).

To explain these disparate facts of Chukchansi, I will be appealing to Rizzi’s (1997) expansion of the left periphery. In this scheme, CP is split into several different projections, some of which can iterate multiple times. The highest projection (replacing CP) is Force Phrase (ForceP), followed by Topic Phrase, Focus Phrase, another potential Topic Phrase, and Finiteness Phrase, which serves as a landing site for verb heads (see Figure 3). This hierarchy follows the form:

...Force...(Topic)...(Focus)...Fin…TP

![Figure 3. Tree structure of the Split-CP system (Rizzi 1997)](image-url)
TopicP and FocusP are optional, and may remain empty. Further, given data from Italian, it becomes clear that Topic has two projections on either side of Focus, and can iterate further at those two points in the hierarchy.

ForceP > TopicP* > FocusP > TopicP* > FinP

where TopicP* represents a potential nesting of multiple Topics.

(15)-(18) demonstrate the possibility of multiple topics, concurrent topic and focus, and the impossibility of multiple foci.

(15) *A GIANNI IL LIBRO daro (non a Piero, l’articolo)

TO GIANNI THE BOOK give.FUT.1SG

‘To Gianni the book I’ll give (not to Pierre, the article)’

(17) A Gianni, che cosa gli hai detto?

to Gianni, what to.3SG have.2SG tell.PAST

‘To Gianni, what did you tell him?’

(18) *A GIANNI che cosa hai detto (non a Piero)?

to GIANNI, what have.2SG tell.PAST

‘TO GIANNI what did you tell (not to Piero)?’

(Rizzi 1997, pp. 290-291)

Rizzi (1997) notes that in languages such as English and Italian, elements that are left-dislocated often show a marked focus or topic feature, and devises a landing site of FocusP and TopicP in the left periphery. Each has a functional head that projects a category in the X-Bar schema. The Focus head selects a focalized element as its specifier and the presupposition as its complement (see Figure 4),
and the Topic head selects the topicalized element as its specifier and comment as its complement (see Figure 5).

Rizzi (1997) concedes that these functional heads are phonetically null in Italian, but may be expressed in other languages, such as with the particle we in Gungbe (Aboh 2008). He notes also that wh-elements can co-occur with topicalized elements but not with focalized elements, as wh-elements carry a feature of focus themselves, and focus does not iterate more than once in a phrase. (Rizzi 1997)

Under the Minimalist framework in which Rizzi operates, movement is considered to be “last resort,” “and must be motivated by the satisfaction of some
criterion” (Rizzi 1997, p. 282). He goes on to surmise that “under such a restrictive theory we expect that no kind of (syntactic) movement to the left periphery may involve free, optional adjunction to IP” (Rizzi 1997, p. 300). Thus, some motivation is necessary to account for any presumed syntactic movement.

For this reason, I will assume movement in Chukchansi, though seemingly unmotivated with completely optional phrasal order, to be motivated by semantic or pragmatic features such as Focus or Topic, which must be moved to relevant projections in the left periphery for feature-checking.

At this stage, little is known of the role and nature of Focus and Topic constructions in Chukchansi, due in part to a relative dearth of conversational data and difficulties in obtaining Focus and Topic paradigms. Though these phenomena are poorly understood, for the purpose of this analysis I will assume their existence to account for XP movement, for which a motivation is required to comply with the Last Resort Condition. Research in these areas of Chukchansi is nascent, and further research is sorely needed.
CHAPTER 2: SCRAMBLING

In this chapter I will examine word order in Chukchansi, and particularly the apparent freedom of ordering that is possible. I will first give an account of Chukchansi’s canonical verb-first word order. I will then examine the scrambling apparent in Chukchansi, and I will show that it is at the XP level and that it is in fact the leftward movement of XPs to landing sites in the left periphery. I will outline a series of expectations that derive from these general observations, and investigate how these expectations are met in the data.

I will also examine clausal boundaries and island effects and crossover effects, and discuss how these facts support the analysis of the syntactic nature of Chukchansi scrambling.

2.1 Verb Fronting

Verb-initial order is a viable and common word order in Chukchansi. This is true of both transitive and intransitive sentences.

(1) Hewee-t-it ta-’ noono-
walk-PST that-SUB man-SUB
‘That man walked.’

(2) Ta’ash-al Nancy-’ nan
see-PST Nancy-SUB me.OBJ
‘Nancy saw me.’

I am assuming verb-initial order to be canonical in Chukchansi (as opposed to the subject-initial order proposed by Britsch (1980) for Tachi) for several reasons. A strong plurality, if not majority, of elicited Chukchansi sentences are given first in verb-initial order, suggesting it as a default order. A plurality is also given in subject-initial order, but this may be due to possible contamination from
subject-initial languages such as Spanish and English. This explanation cannot also hold for preferred verb-initial order, which requires its own explanation. Another reason to assume verb-initial as canonical is particular to this investigation. It is simpler to assume canonical verb-initial order than it would be to explain head-to-head verb movement to the left periphery from some kind of semantic motivation. Given the Principle of Last Resort, all movement requires motivation, but base-generated word orders do not.

There have been several proposals made to account for verb-first order in a variety of languages. The VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis argues that subjects are not base-generated in [Spec,TP] position, but that they are base-generated within the VP and are moved to [Spec,TP] before Spell-Out (Koopman and Sportiche 1991). In this scheme, verb-first order could be derived by simply not moving the subject to a Specifier position above the VP, and so the subject NP remains within VP while V moves to T to the left of the subject (Koopman and Sportiche 1991).

In addition, arguments have been made that appeal to movement of the verb to positions in the left periphery, which have found support in Rizzi’s (1997) proposal to expand the left periphery with numerous functional projections with Specifier landing sites for preposed elements (see Figure 6).

![Figure 6. Tree structure of the Split-CP system (Rizzi 1997)](image-url)
In Robert’s (2004) analysis of V-movement in Celtic languages and V2 properties in German, he introduced the “filled-fin” requirement, a property of these languages which requires the [Head,FinP] position to be filled with a verbal element.

In Breton, the verb undergoes head movement and adjoins to FinP while the particle *a* occupies [Head,FinP]:

(3) a. \( \text{lenn} \quad a \quad \text{ra} \quad \text{Anna} \quad \text{al} \quad \text{levr} \)

Read-INF PRT does Anna the book

‘Anna reads the book.’

Rendered with brackets:

(3) b. \( \text{FinP[Fin[V[lenn] \quad \text{Fin[a]] \quad AgrSP[ra \quad TP[Anna \quad t_{lenn} \quad \text{al} \quad \text{levr}]]]} \)

This reflects canonical word order of Chukchansi declaratives:

(4) a. \( \text{Ta’sh-it} \quad \text{na’} \quad \text{nim} \quad \text{nek’et}. \)

see-PST I.SUB my aunt- Ø

‘I saw my aunt.’

Rendered with brackets:

(4) b. \( \text{FinP[Fin[V[tashit] \quad \text{Fin[Ø]] \quad TP[na’ \quad t_{tashit} \quad \text{nim} \quad \text{nek’et}]]]} \)

One notable difference between the Breton example and Chukchansi is the lack of a particle heading FinP in Chukchansi. The absence of such a particle does not preclude the existence of the category, following Rizzi’s (1997) analysis of Italian focus constructions with constituents moved to [Spec,FocusP] in the absence of any kind of focus marker heading the FocusP projection, and of T to Fin movement in Italian without any Fin head.
2.2 XP Fronting

Sentences in Chukchansi can appear in any permutation of S, V, and O. What follows are six simple transitive sentences consisting of a subject, object, and verb in each permissible order.

(5) *Nancy’ ta’ish-hil naanin*
    Nancy-SUB see-AOR us
    ‘Nancy saw us.’ (SVO)

(6) *Na’ min p’ay’a ta’ish-hil*
    I your.SG child-OBJ see-AOR
    ‘I saw your child.’ (SOV)

(7) *Ta’ish-hil Nancy’ nan*
    see-AOR Nancy-SUB me.OBJ
    ‘Nancy saw me.’ (VSO)

(8) *Ta’ish-ta’ mam Nancy’*
    see-PAST you.SG.OBJ Nancy-SUB
    ‘Nancy saw you.’ (VOS)

(9) *Naanin Nancy’ ta’ish-hil*
    us.OBJ Nancy-SUB see-AOR
    ‘Nancy saw us.’ (OSV)

(10) *min p’ay’a ta’ish-hil na’*
    your.SG child-OBJ see-AOR I
    ‘I saw your child.’ (OVS)

Following Rizzi’s (1997) proposal, these orders are generated via movement of elements to specifier positions of functional categories in the left periphery, such as Topic and Focus. In the above examples, subject NP, object NP,
verb (VP minus complement), and VP (full VP containing both verb and complement) are each fronted, sometimes more than one at a time. If we assume the subject resides in [Spec,TP], we can assume that elements to its left have been moved to Specifier positions in the left periphery, since there are no landing sites between the left periphery and TP.

Because of the filled-fin requirement (Roberts 2004), the verb in canonical order resides in FinP. Given this fact, any constituent that appears to the left of the verb must have been moved to a landing site somewhere in the left periphery above that of FinP (e.g. FocusP).

(11) *Gaama-’an  ‘amin ju’ba’ di’sh-it.*  
    bed-OBJ  his    some  make-PST  
    ‘Some made their beds.’

(12) *Gamiisha-’an  ‘aman  beewin-‘an’.*  
    shirt-OBJ  they    sew-FACT  
    ‘They are sewing a shirt.’

In these cases of object fronting, both object and subject have been left-dislocated to nested topic positions to the left of the verb in FinP.

(13) *Galbiy-it  da’  tan-tin.*  
    be.difficult-PST  FOC  go-IND  
    ‘It is hard to go there.’

(14) *Gosneeno-xon’  xataash-i  hawitmi  da’  ma’*  
    cook-DUR  food-OBJ  how     FOC  you.SG.SUB  
    Nancy-’  benet-ta’.  
    Nancy-SUB  ask-PERF  
    ‘Nancy asked how you cooked the food.’
(13) looks like a typical verb-first Chukchansi sentence, with a verb in FinP and a nominal (the indirective gerundial *tantin*) following. But the interceding focus particle suggests that the verb in this case has in fact been fronted and is in [Spec,FocusP]. (14) contains a wh-element in focus position, with the entire VP fronted to its left, occupying a leftmost [Spec,TopP], with the subject *ma’* left in situ.

(14) b. \[\text{TopP}\{[\text{VP}[[\text{V} \text{gosneenoxon'}]\text{NP}[xataashi]]]_\text{Top}[\emptyset]]\text{FocP}[[\text{hawitmi}]_\text{Foc}[\text{da’}]]\text{NP[ma’]}\right\} \text{[Nancy’ benetta’]}

Nominals can also be fronted, as in (15), in which the indirective gerundial *beeletin* precedes the tensed verb *galbiyit*. *Beeletin* must be residing in [Spec,TopP] since it is immediately to the left of the verb, and the other elements (i.e. the subject and object) appear in their base-generated positions.

(15) *Beele-tin* *galbiy-it* *gaadu’* *baana-’an*.

*feed-IND* *be.difficult-PST* *cat-SUB* *bread-OBJ*

‘It’s difficult to feed a cat bread.’

Quantifiers can also be fronted, as *hidya’* here appears in focus position, while the subject *na’an* and the adverbial *gew* reside in lower topic projections, with the verb coming last in its FinP position.

(16) *Hidya-’* *da’* *na’an* *gew* *xoo-to’*.

*all-SUB* *FOC* *we* *there* *stay-PST*

‘We all stayed over there where we were.’

Perhaps unsurprisingly, adjuncts can also be freely moved. In (16) and (17), the adverbials *t’ew* and *hiyim’* are in [Spec,FocusP], with the subject *na’* occupying the lower topic projection, and the verb in FinP. Both are also followed by a second clause. (18) also features a focused adverbial, but the focused constituent also includes the particle of uncertainty, *uk*. This is followed by a
nominal, the verb *pana-* marked with possessed case, in a lower topic position, followed by the imperative verb.

(17) *T’ew da’ na’ tish-e’ mun’a-w, mech’*

whenever FOC I come.out-FAC outside-LOC very

*chooya-ch’.*

be.lonely-AGENT.SUB

‘Whenever I go outside, I get very lonely.’

(18) *Hiyim’ da’ na’ gayes-it, hoyl-it.*

already FOC I become.good-PST heal-PST

‘Right away I felt good and got well.’

(19) *mi’in pajxi-w ‘uk da’ pana-m*

then bad-LOC uncertain FOC arrive-POSS

*wooxush-ga*

make.noise-IMP

‘Whenever you come to a bad place, make a noise.”

Except for the specific case of verb movement (fulfilling the filled-fin requirement by moving to FinP), all the elements moved to the left periphery are XPs. Movement of XPs to the left periphery is permitted and pervasive. Movement of *X*’s, however, is rare and often judged ungrammatical.

This is evidenced by the fact that while the verb obligatorily fills FinP, it cannot appear any higher in the left periphery without its complements. As an *X*, the verb may move out of its phrase to fill FinP, but it may not do so to fill any other Specifier position, since movement of this type is restricted to XPs due to the Structure Preservation Principle. So a verb may move to FinP while leaving behind its object, but it may not move any further to the left (e.g. topic or focus projections) without its object accompanying it.
(20) *Ta’ish-ta da’ na’ shikwin cheexa-‘an.
see-PERF FOC I white dog-OBJ
‘I saw a white dog.’
(20) has moved the verb (minus its complement) to a focused position, [Spec,FocusP]. This is judged ungrammatical by speakers.

(21) Ta’ish-ta’ na’ da’ shikwin cheexa-‘an.
see-PERF I FOC white dog-OBJ
‘I saw a white dog.’
In (21), the verb is preposed before even the focused element na’ which resides in [Spec,FocusP]. Since it cannot share the focus position with the subject, the verbal head here must be residing in [Spec,TopP], which is ungrammatical since it does not constitute an XP on its own.

2.3 Preposition-like Adverbials
XP-level movement can serve as a useful diagnostic to assess the status of a small number of Chukchansi words of uncertain category. These words – ’och’i’, ’adil’, ’adlen, and hitwash, meaning ‘near/nearby’, ‘down’, ‘under’, and ‘with/together’, respectively - often appear adposition-like in their use and meaning.

(22) Xo-’ nim gew ’adil’
house-SUB my there down
‘My house is down there.’

(23) Wadola-’ holosh-ta’ ’och’i’ pa’ash-a.
Wadola-SUB sit-PERF near valley-OBJ
‘Wadola sat near the meadow.’
The category and function of these terms is not well-agreed upon in the literature.

Collord (1968) lists many of what he calls adverbials, grouping them into categories such as temporal, local, and aspectual adverbials. Among the local adverbials he lists hitwash, though the others mentioned previously are absent from his description. Newman (1944) likewise makes lists of particles, organized into groups corresponding to use such as modal, temporal, and predicational. These lists contain dozens of words which have functions similar to the three in question here, though these are conspicuously absent from his lists as well.

Note, though, that hitwash, adlen, and 'och'i' can license accusative case, and so appear to take NP complements.

(24) *Xaya-t na’ chokolade-’en ’adlen gayeeda-’an.*

put-PST I chocolate-OBJ under cookie-OBJ

‘I put the chocolate under the cookie.’

(25) *Hitwash Mary-’in da’ John hewet-ta’*

together Mary-OBJ FOC John.SUB walk-PERF

‘John walked with Mary.’

(26) *Mokela-’ ship-wish-ich’ heweeet-it ’och’i’*

girl-SUB write-REF-AGENT.SUB walk-PST near

*noch’o-’on limk-’in shilsh-in.*

boy-OBJ black-GEN hair-GEN

‘The girl with the tattoo walked near the boy with black hair.’

Compare (27) and (28). In (27), ’och’i’ appears immediately preceding its apparent complement nan. In (28), ’och’i’ has been fronted to a position preceding xo’om’ in a case of Left-Branch Extraction. In a converse but similar
process, sentence (29) has fronted the NP complement of the adpositional element to the front of the sentence, and is separated from its phrase by an interceding NP (in this case a goat).

(27) \( Ta-' yokuch-' xo'-om' 'och'i' nan xat-it \)
    That-SUB person-SUB house-POSS near me eat-PST

    'aabul-a.

    apple-OBJ

    ‘My neighbor ate an apple.’

(28) \( Ta-' yokuch-' 'och'i' xo'-om' nan xat-it \)
    That-SUB person-SUB near house-POSS me eat-PST

    'aabul-a.

    apple-OBJ

    ‘My neighbor ate an apple.’

(29) \( Lameesa-'an jiiwu-' 'adlen xat-it. \)
    table-OBJ goat-SUB under eat-PST

    ‘The goat ate under the table.’

These facts seem to buttress Collord and Newman’s assessment of these adposition-like elements as adverbial particles. Using Chukchansi’s XP-fronting as a diagnostic suggests that these particles are in fact XPs themselves, and are much more like adverbial adjuncts than adpositions which take NP complements.

2.4 Demonstratives

Fukui (1995) argues that Japanese lacks the category D, citing facts about Japanese demonstratives and possessives, namely that their multiple possible iterations suggest them to be lexical rather than functional heads. This iteration, which is possible and normal in Japanese, is impossible in English because the
function D head closes the category projection, preventing multiple iteration and freedom of movement.

(30) kyonen-no Yamada-sensei-no so-no koogi
    last.year-GEN yamada-teacher-GEN that-GEN lecture
    *‘that last year’s Professor Yamada’s lecture’

This is perfectly mirrored in Chukchansi, with demonstratives and possessive pronouns appearing in multiple iterations and with freedom of movement.

(31) 'Ama’ cheexa-’ ohom’ bot’omi.
    he dog-SUB not cute
    ‘The dog is not cute.’

(32) 'Ama’ ta-’ cheexa-’ ohom’ bot’omi.
    he that-SUB dog-SUB not cute
    ‘That dog is not cute.’

(33) 'Amin hi’ cheexa-’ ohom’ bot’omi.
    his this.SUB dog-SUB not cute
    ‘This dog of hers is not cute.’

    From this, we can suppose that Chukchansi demonstratives, rather than head DP, reside in AP, and so can enjoy the same freedom of movement as other XPs.

(34) Ta-’ da’ cheexa-’ hoxt-om’.
    that-SUB FOC dog-SUB bark-POSS
    ‘That’s the dog that barked.’

(35) 'Amin da’ maamil-’ mich gayis numoogun da’ ohom’.
    his FOC berry-SUB very good our.EXCL FOC not
‘His berries are better than our berries.’ (lit: ‘His berries are good; OURS are not.’)

(36) *no’om’ da’ numoogun hashwin-ta’ tomooxisha-w
    mother-SUB FOC our.DU.EXCL die-PERF winter-LOC

‘Our mother died in the winter.’

In (34) the demonstrative *ta* has been moved to the left of the particle *da’*, which heads the focus projection. This position, the specifier of Focus Phrase, is a position which attracts elements marked with an uninterpretable focus feature. In this case it is the demonstrative *ta* which has been assigned the focus feature, and this necessitates its movement to [Spec,FocP].

(35) likewise moves the possessive pronominal *’amin* to the [Spec,FocP] position, as well as the possessive pronominal *numoogun*, a fact which suggests that this construction is in fact two clauses in succession without a hierarchical clausal arrangement. (36) is the converse of (35), in that the NP *no’om’* has been fronted to a focus position, and its possessive pronominal has been left behind.

2.5 Clausal Boundaries

Movement of XPs in Chukchansi seems unrestricted in terms of distance and order, limited only by the availability of landing sites in the left periphery. The data suggest additionally that this movement is clause-bounded, with the interleaving of clauses judged entirely ungrammatical.

(37) *Hawitmi Nancy-’ benet-ta’ da’ ma’ gosneeno-xo-n’
    why Nancy-SUB ask-PERF FOC you cook-DUR-FAC

    xataash-i.
    food-OBJ

‘Nancy asked why you cooked the food.’
(38) *Hawitmi da’ ma’ Nancy-’ benet-ta’ gosneeno-xo-n’
   why FOC you Nancy-SUB ask-PERF cook-DUR-FAC
   xataash-i.
   food-OBJ
   ‘Nancy asked why you cooked the food.’

(39) *Nancy-’ hawitmi da’ ma’ benet-ta’ gosneeno-xo-n’
   Nancy-SUB why FOC you ask-PERF cook-DUR-FAC
   xataash-i.
   food-OBJ
   ‘Nancy asked why you cooked the food.’

(37-39) are the result of movement of elements beyond clausal boundaries, with XPs from the lower clause moved into or above the higher clause. This sentence was originally elicited in a variety of possible orders, all of which maintained the two clauses separately. ‘Nancy asked’ can appear before the clause ‘how you cooked the food’:

(40) Nancy-’ benet-ta’ hawitmi da’ ma’ gosneeno-xo-n’
   Nancy-SUB ask-PERF how FOC you cook-DUR-FAC
   xataash-i.
   food-OBJ
   ‘Nancy asked why you cooked the food.’

The order of the clauses can be reversed:

(41) Gosneeno-xo-n’ xataash-i hawitmi da’ ma’ Nancy-’
   cook-DUR-FAC food-OBJ how FOC you Nancy-SUB
   benet-ta’.
   ask-PERF
   ‘Nancy asked why you cooked the food.’
This stands in stark contrast to the strict ungrammaticality of the same two clauses, with elements interleaved, as in (37-39). Likewise, (42) is judged ungrammatical, since the adverbial has been stranded outside its clause, with a clause intervening between it and its head.

(42) *Noono-’ hewet-ta’ mok’eela-’ wil-ta goosinmi
    man-SUB walk-PERF lady-SUB say-PERF slowly
    ‘She said that he walked slowly.’

Aside from this clausal boundary restriction, movement is also subject to island effects, notably adjunct islands. (43-46) show various ways in which the wh-element can be extracted from the adjunct ‘because Mary ate [what]’. The ungrammaticality of these cases suggests that movement in Chukchansi is sensitive to the Adjunct Condition, which prohibits movement out of adjuncts.

(43) *Ha’an John tan-ta’ halaada’ Mary xat-ta’?
    what-OBJ John leave-PERF because Mary eat-PERF
    ‘What did John leave because Mary ate?’

(44) *Xat-ta’ ha’an John tan-ta’ halaada’ Mary?
    eat-PERF what-OBJ John leave-PERF because Mary
    ‘What did John leave because Mary ate?’

(45) *Mary xat-ta’ ha’an John tan-ta’ halaada’?
    Mary eat-PERF what-OBJ John leave-PERF because
    ‘What did John leave because Mary ate?’

(46) *Mary xat-ta’ ha’an halaada’ John tan-ta’?
    Mary eat-PERF what-OBJ because John leave-PERF
    ‘What did John leave because Mary ate?’
(47) is a case in which the wh-element has been extracted from a relative construction, in Chukchansi rendered with a nominal, and moved to the leftmost edge of the sentence. This is judged ungrammatical, due to the Adjunct Condition.

(47) *Ha’an John ta’ish-ta’ noono’on xataa-ch’-i?
what-OBJ John see-PERF man-OBJ eat-AGENT-OBJ

‘What did John see a man who ate?’

All of these facts strongly suggest a fundamentally syntactic origin for the scrambling present in Chukchansi. The status of preposed elements as XPs, canonical verb-first order, sensitivity to clausal boundaries, and adherence to the Adjunct Condition are all syntactic considerations, and as such fall into line with expectations born from the hypothesis that variation in word order in Chukchansi is a function of movement of syntactic constituents to landing sites in the left periphery.

2.6 Crossover Effects

Another strong diagnostic tool for the assessment of Chukchansi scrambling as syntactic in nature is that of crossover phenomena. Crossover effects prevent an interpretation of sentences such as (48) and (49) in which the wh-element and pronominal corefer. This is a general restriction on binding that applies to A-bar movement.

(48) a. Who_i claimed Jack kissed her_i?
b. *Who_i did she_i claim Jack kissed?

(49) a. Who_i first recognized that God created him_i?
b. *Who_i did he_i first recognize that God created?

(Postal 1971, p. 250)
A similar pattern is observed in Chukchansi, in which certain elements cannot corefer.

(50) *Hili’si’in i bobbil-a da’ t’ul-ut amin_i shipa-ch’?*

Which-OBJ paper-OBJ FOC burn-PST his write-AGENT.SUB

‘Which_i paper did its_i writer burn?’

(51) *Hili’si-’in i utu-’un da’ las-it amin_i wo’yi-ch’?*

Which-OBJ tree-OBJ FOC chop-PST his plant-AGENT.SUB

‘Which_i tree did its_i planter chop?’

(52) *Hili’si-’in i biiba-’an da’ ag-it amin_i ba’mo’-ich’?*

Which-OBJ pipe-OBJ FOC smell-PST his smoke-AGENT.SUB

‘Which_i pipe did its_i smoker smell?’

(53) *Hili’si-’in i noono-’on da’ ach’-it amin_i cheexa-’?*

Which-OBJ man-OBJ FOC bite-PST his dog-SUB

‘Which man did his dog bite?’

(54) *Wat-a_i da’ shum-ut amin_i no’om’?

Who-OBJ FOC kiss-PST his mother

‘Who_i did his mother kiss?’

(55) ??Wat-a_i da’ seyes-et amin_i nopop?

Who-OBJ FOC embarrass-PST his father

‘Who_i did his_i father embarrass?’

(56) ??Wat-a_i da’ ach’-it amin_i cheexa-’?

Who-OBJ FOC bite-PST his dog-SUB

‘Who_i did his_i dog bite?’

In all of these examples, the intuition in Chukchansi is much the same as it is in English, that fronted elements do not corefer with elements to their right that
the fronted elements C-Command, that they have ‘crossed over’. While the majority give a clear picture of impossible or undesirable coreference, there are a few examples in which coreference is the norm.

(57) *Hili’si-*’in<sub>i</sub> pa’ay-a<sub>i</sub> da’ shum-ut amin<sub>i</sub> no’om’?

Which-OBJ child-OBJ FOC kiss-PST his mother

‘Which<sub>i</sub> child did its mother kiss?’

(58) *Hili’si-*’in<sub>i</sub> boch’on-a da’ seyes-et amin<sub>i</sub> nopop?

Which-OBJ son-OBJ FOC embarrass-PST his father

‘Which<sub>i</sub> son did his<sub>i</sub> father embarrass?’

These cases appear to be typically rendered as coreferential, despite the crossover. However, there is a substantial difference between (57-58) and (50-56). Compare (58) above and (55), reproduced below:

(55) ??Wat-a<sub>i</sub> da’ seyes-et amin<sub>i</sub> nopop?

Who-OBJ FOC embarrass-PST his father

‘Who<sub>i</sub> did his<sub>i</sub> father embarrass?’

While (61) uses *wata*, ‘whom’, (64) makes use of the much more specific *hili’si’in boch’ona*, ‘which son’. The latter is discourse-linked and so implies the existence of related entities which alleviates the ambiguity induced by the crossover effect.

Despite this, the pattern holds strong with seven out of ten cases of crossover judged ungrammatical for the targeted coreferential meaning. This suggests both that leftward movement in Chukchansi is syntactic, and that specifically it is A-bar movement, which is an observation that perfectly supports the hypothesis of movement to specifier positions in the left periphery.
CHAPTER 3: FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS

In this chapter, I will outline the distribution and function of the mysterious particle *da’*. Previously unexplained in the literature, I will show that it contains an element of focus and serves as Foc°. First, I will examine the particle’s distribution and show that it not only attracts elements containing uninterpretable focus features to its specifier position, but that it requires a specifier.

I will also examine the range of elements that can appear in its specifier position, with special attention to wh-elements, known to contain a feature of focus. I will then look to correspondences with English focus constructions to further reinforce the interpretation of the particle as a focus marker.

Finally, I will examine scrambling in the context of these focus constructions, using the focus projection as an anchor to gauge movement to other landing sites in the left periphery, notably upper and lower Topic phrases.

3.1 The Focus Particle

The left periphery in Chukchansi is marked by the extensive use of a mysterious particle, for which no explanation could be given by previous researchers. This particle *da’* appears often in the left periphery of Chukchansi questions, and occasionally in declaratives. In the latter context, Collord (1968) intuited it to have an intensifying effect, though he fully admitted that its meaning was unknown. It appears many times in Collord’s (1968) data, unglossed.

A similar particle, *dab* or *tap*, appears in Yawelmani, and is described by Newman (1944) as a “conjunctive particle” with “the function of coordinating or subordinating predications of parts of a predication.” Newman (1944) glosses it as ‘next’ or ‘on the other hand’. In Gamble’s (1994) collected Yokuts texts, the Yawelmani *dab* is often glossed as ‘but’, but also goes unglossed at times.
Another similar particle, \( ta \), appears in apparently the same position as \( dab \) and also appears unglossed.

In Yawelmani, these particles inhabit a position at the left edge of the clause, before the verb but typically after a conjunction. In addition, it appears several times immediately following a pronoun, as Collord (1968) observed of the Chukchansi particle \( da' \). He notes further that “among the particles a few are post-positive. These are usually, but not always, the second word in the clause.” (Collord 1968)

Given that the particle most often appears pre-verbally, it must have a home somewhere in the left periphery above FinP (the site of the verb, via the filled-fin requirement). This leaves ForceP, TopP, and FocP as possible sites for \( da' \). The particle, as Collord (1968) notes, exhibits post-positivity, never appearing sentence-initially. In fact, sentences beginning with \( da' \) are judged ungrammatical:

\[(1) \quad *Da' \quad Nancy-\' \quad xat-it \quad ha-\'an?\]
\[\text{FOC} \quad \text{Nancy-SUB} \quad \text{eat-PST} \quad \text{what-OBJ} \]
\[\text{‘What did Nancy eat?’}\]

\[(2) \quad *Da' \quad ma-\' \quad wan-it \quad xataash-i \quad wat-a?\]
\[\text{FOC} \quad \text{you.SG.SUB} \quad \text{give-PST} \quad \text{food-OBJ} \quad \text{who-OBJ} \]
\[\text{‘Who did you give the food to?’}\]

(1) and (2) are wh-questions with wh-element in situ (a perfectly allowable construction in Chukchansi). However, both are rendered ungrammatical by the sentence-initial appearance of \( da' \). Compare to (3) and (4) below, which differ from (1) above only in the appearance and placement of the particle:

\[(3) \quad Nancy-\' \quad xat-it \quad ha-\'an?\]
\[\text{Nancy-SUB} \quad \text{eat-PST} \quad \text{what-OBJ} \]
\[\text{‘What did Nancy eat?’}\]
(4) Nancy-’ xat-it ha-’an da’?

Nancy-SUB eat-PST what-OBJ FOC

‘What did Nancy eat?’

As can be seen in (4), the particle da’ can occur immediately following a wh-element. In fact, this is its most common distribution, appearing in the majority of wh-questions immediately following the wh-element.

(5) Wat-a da’ Nancy-’ ta’ish-ta’?

who-OBJ FOC Nancy-SUB see-PERF

‘Who did Nancy see?’

(6) Hawshin da’ maamil-’ shawig-tin?

how-many FOC berry-SUB buy-IND

‘How much do blackberries cost?’ (lit. ‘How many blackberries for buying?’)

In addition to following wh-elements, da’ also appears after subject and object NPs.

(7) No’om da’ numoogun hashwin-ta’ tomooxisha-w

mother FOC our.DU.EXCL die-PERF winter-LOC

‘Our mother died in the winter.’

(8) gayeeda’-an da’ na’ na’ash xat-al

cookie-OBJ FOC I can eat-PO

‘I can eat cookies.’

It can follow full VPs, but not V◦s. This follows from the observation that da’ resides in the left periphery, in some position open to movement of XPs, but not X◦s.
(9)  *Galbiy-it da’ tan-tin.*  
    be.difficult-PST FOC go-IND  
    ‘It is hard to go there.’

(10)  *Ta’ish-ta da’ na’ shik’win cheexa’-an.*  
    see-PERF FOC I white dog-OBJ  
    ‘I saw a white dog.’

It can also follow any variety of other XPs, such as gerundials, adverbial adjuncts, and demonstratives. This follows from observations made in the previous chapter about the movement of XPs to positions in the left periphery. These and previous examples of fronting to [Spec,FocP] perfectly conform to patterns seen in the focus constructions of other languages, notably Gungbe and Kwa (Aboh 2004 and Aboh 2008).

Gungbe:

(11)  *Hwèví wè ùn nò sà?*  
    fish FOC 1SG HAB sell  
    ‘I sell FISH.’  
    (Aboh 2008, p. 3)

Kwa:

(12)  *wè Séná xiá wéma ló*  
    FOC Sena read-PERF book Spf[+def]  
    ‘SENA read the specific book.’  
    (Aboh 2004, p. 238)

This distribution suggests that *da’* heads a functional projection in the left periphery, with a specifier position that is filled by preposed XPs. In fact, it appears to require a specifier, which explains its observed post-positivity. In the
words of Aboh (2004): the “left adjacent position to [the focus particle] must be realized at PF.”

3.2 Wh-Questions

The strong association of da’ with fronted wh-elements suggests that it contains an element of focus, and so heads FocP. Wh-elements are “viewed as a type of focus construction” (Fortin 2009), and this is reflected by the fact that in many languages wh-elements co-occur with well-documented focus particles. Indonesian, Malay, and Gungbe all pattern exactly as Chukchansi, with wh-elements followed by a focus particle (Fortin 2009, Zavitnevich-Beaulac 2005, Aboh 2008).

Bahasa Indonesian:

(13) Siapa yang men-sintai Sally?

who FOC TRANS-loves Sally

‘Who loves Sally?’

(Fortin 2009)

Gungbe:

(14) Été wè à nɔ̀ sà?

what FOC 2.SG HAB sell

‘What do you habitually sell?’

(Aboh 2008, p. 3)

Chukchansi:

(15) Hawal’ma’ da’ ma’ ta’ish-ta’ Nancy-‘in?

when FOC you.SG see-PERF Nancy-OBJ

‘When did you see Nancy?’
Wh-elements are assumed to contain a feature of focus which attracts them to the specifier position of FocP (Aboh 2004). Since $da'$ heads the Focus projection, it appears directly to the right of the wh-element. As previously mentioned, a huge number of wh-questions appear with the particle $da'$ immediately following the wh-element. While the focus particle cannot appear alone, wh-elements are free to occur without the particle. It appears to be completely optional, analogous to the English complementizer that.

(16) *Wat $da' widn-it?*
    who FOC fall-PST
    ‘Who fell?’

(17) *Wat widn-it?*
    who fall-PST
    ‘Who fell?’

3.3 Focused XPs

Besides appearing with wh-elements, the focus particle $da'$ also appears in conjunction with plenty of other XPs, as mentioned above. These include subject and object NPs, pronominals, full VPs, gerundials, demonstratives, the negative marker, quantifiers, and adverbials. These cases bolster the interpretation of $da'$ as focus marker, as there are strong correspondences between these cases and English focus constructions. (18)-(20) are English cleft constructions, translated into Chukchansi as typical focus constructions with an XP fronted to [Spec,FocP], immediately to the left of $da'$.

(18) *Ta $da' cheexa-’ hoxit-hil toy’no-w.*
that FOC dog-SUB bark-AOR last.night-LOC
    ‘That’s the dog that barked last night.’
These sentences perfectly mirror the focalizing effect of their English counterparts, fronting the demonstrative associated with the subject (18) and object (19, 20) to the specifier position of FocP.

(19) Ta da’ noono-’ na’ wan-ta’ ‘am somleela-’an.
that FOC man-SUB I give-PERF him hat-OBJ
‘That's the man I gave his hat to.’

(20) Ta da’ noono-’ nim noxox wan-ta’ nim somleela-’an.
that FOC man-SUB my uncle give-PERF my hat-OBJ
‘That's the man my uncle gave my hat to.’

These examples in particular stand out as strong evidence both that focus is rendered in Chukchansi by moving elements to the left periphery and in particular that they are moved to the specifier position of FocP, a projection headed by da’, the marker of focus.

3.4 Focus and Scrambling

The presence of a focus marker occupying [Head,FocP] gives us an anchor point which we can use to analyze the movement of elements to other landing sites in the left periphery. With FinP obligatorily filled with the verb head and
[Spec,FocP] filled with a focused XP (followed by the focus particle \textit{da’}), only ForceP and the upper and lower Topic projections are available as landing sites for additional fronted XPs.

ForceP is generally considered the landing site of elements such as complementizers (which appear lacking in Chukchansi) and sentential adverbs. This leaves the iterated Topic projections as landing sites for elements which do not have clausal scope, such as fronted (but not focused) NPs, demonstratives, negative markers, and adverbials.

(22)-(24) contain XPs in the lower topic position, to the right of FocP. With a focused element residing in [Spec,FocP] (evidenced by the appearance of an XP preceding \textit{da’}) and the verb obligatorily filling FinP, any elements between the focus particle and the verb have only a single viable landing site: [Spec,TopP].

(22) \textit{Ha-’an \ da’ na’ na’ash chish-al?}
\text{what-OBJ \ FOC \ I \ can \ cut-PO}
\textquote{‘What should I cut?’}

(23) \textit{Hidya-’ da’ na’an gew xoo-to’}.
\text{all-SUB \ FOC \ we.EXCL \ there \ stay-PERF}
\textquote{‘We ALL stayed over there where we were.’}

(24) \textit{Hili’si-’in da’ na’ maamik’-wa xap’e’?}
\text{which-OBJ \ FOC \ I \ you.DU-? \ spank-FAC}
\textquote{‘Which one of you two shall I spank?’}

In (22), the wh-element \textit{ha’an} resides in [Spec,FocP] while the subject pronominal \textit{na’} resides on [Spec,TopP], with the verb \textit{chishal} in FinP. (23) has focused the quantifier \textit{hidya’}, and both the subject \textit{na’an} and the locative \textit{gew} have been fronted to iterated Topic positions. (24) patterns like (23), but with a portion
of the object focused, and the other portion of the object as well as the subject in iterated Topic positions.

(25) \textit{Maamil-’ hawshin da’ shawig-tin?}

\begin{tabular}{lll}
& berry-SUB & how-many FOC buy-IND \\
\end{tabular}

‘How much do blackberries cost?’ (lit. ‘How many berries for buying?’)

(26) \textit{Nancy-’ wat-a da’ ta’ish-ta’?}

\begin{tabular}{lll}
& Nancy-SUB & who-OBJ FOC see-PERF \\
\end{tabular}

‘Who did Nancy see?’

(25) and (26) are much like (22-24), but rather than appearing in lower Topic positions, XPs have instead been fronted to the left of the focused element, to upper Topic positions. In both cases, the focused element is a wh-element, with the subject appearing to its left.

(27) \textit{Nancy-’ xat-it ha-’an da’?}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
& Nancy-SUB & eat-PST what-OBJ FOC \\
\end{tabular}

‘What did Nancy eat?’

(28) \textit{Xat-it Nancy-’ ha-’an da’?}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
& eat-PST & Nancy-SUB what-OBJ FOC \\
\end{tabular}

‘What did Nancy eat?’

(27) and (28) differ from the previous examples in that the verb has been topicalized. In what appears to be a case of remnant movement, the object of the VP (\textit{ha’an}) has first been focused and moved to [Spec,FocP], and the VP (including the trace of the former object) has been moved to an upper Topic position.

(28) is also a clear case of remnant movement as proposed by Den Besten and Webelhuth (1987), in which an element is moved out of its phrase, and the phrase containing the trace (the remnant) is fronted past the element it once
contained. In this case, the VP complement *ha’an* has moved to a Focus position, and the remainder of the VP (including the Vº *xatit* and the trace of *ha’an*) has moved to the left of Focus to an upper Topic position.

This directly parallels German verb fronting:

(29) *Gelesen hat das Buch keiner.*

read has the book no.one

‘No one has read the book.’

Just like (28), in (29) the VP complement (*das Buch*) has been moved out of its phrase, and the VP containing its trace has moved to its left to a topic position (Müller 1998).
CHAPTER 4: PROBLEMATIC CASES

While a great majority of the Chukchansi data can be explained by movement of XPs to landing sites in the left periphery, there are cases which do not very easily fit this pattern and require additional investigation. In this chapter I will examine cases of V movement, which violate the specific prediction that only XPs undergo left dislocation. I will analyze these as potential cases of remnant movement, in which an element is moved out of an XP followed by the movement of that XP containing the trace of the moved element. I will also examine cases of negative fronting, and propose that the negative marker in Chukchansi is in fact an XP.

4.1 Remnant Movement

The following wh-question appeared in the previous chapter on focus constructions, analyzed as remnant movement:

(1) \textit{Xat-it Nancy-' ha-'an da’?}

\textit{eat-PST Nancy-SUB what-OBJ FOC}

‘What did Nancy eat?’

The only analysis of this construction available via the XP-fronting hypothesis is that the XP \textit{ha’an} was moved first to a Focus position, and the VP (consisting of the verb \textit{xatit} and the trace of \textit{ha’an}) moved afterwards to an upper topic position above the trace, an analysis which mirrors the analysis of German verb fronting by Den Besten & Webelhuth (1990).

(2) \textit{\ [{VP t_2 Gelesen }]_1 \ {hat [IP keiner [NP das Buch ]_2 t_1 ]}

\textit{read has no.one\textsubscript{nom} the book\textsubscript{acc}}

‘No one has read the book.’

(Müller 1998, p. 6)
Further examples of this phenomenon have been found in Chukchansi, such as (3) below.

(3) a. *Hoye-ta’ xataash-i Nancy-’ nan.*
    send-PERF food-OBJ Nancy-SUB me
    ‘Nancy sent me food.’

(3) is a double object construction in which both objects are marked in the objective case. It is presumed that both objects receive case VP-internally and reside in the VP as complements. Since both are marked with the same case, Chukchansi often resolves the ambiguity with a fixed argument order. This is clearly not a necessity, however, as even these cases can be scrambled. While the VP appears fronted with its direct object as per the expectations of the hypothesis, the indirect object has been stranded, which seems to counter expectations. Assuming that both objects are contained within VP prior to Spell-Out, this raises a problem.

A possible explanation for such a sentence could be that the indirect object *nan* moves first to the lower of the two Topic projections offered by Rizzi (1997). Subsequently, the VP which formerly contained the indirect object moves to the higher TopicP. The subject either moves to FocusP as an unmarked focused element or to a nested TopicP (presumably the lower), resulting in the above construction. Below is (3) rendered with brackets:

(3) b. TOP1 [VP2 [hoyeta’ xataashi t1]] FOC [Nancy’] TOP2 [nan1] ... t2

This parallels the German example provided by Müller (1998), in which the verb is fronted minus its object:

(4) a. *Gelesen hat das Buch keiner.*
    read-INF has the book no.one
    ‘No one has read the book.’
Rendered with (minimal) brackets:

(4) b.  \( \text{VP}_2[\text{t}_1 \text{ Gelesen}] \) hat [das Buch, \( \text{[keiner]} \) \( \text{t}_2 \)

Utilizing the same type of split-CP analysis as Chukchansi, the auxiliary in German resides in [Head,FinP], the object \textit{das Buch} is fronted to a lower Topic position, and the VP containing the trace of the object is moved to an upper Topic or Focus position.

This analysis introduces a new problem, however, as every element in (2) is now residing in either a Topic or a Focus position. Note below that every element is fronted to the left of FinP, which does not even appear. The only filled positions are the Focus and upper and lower Topic positions.

(3) b.  \( \text{TOP}_1 [\text{VP}_2 [\text{hoyeta’ xataashi } \text{t}_1]] \) \( \text{FOC [Nancy’]} \) \( \text{TOP}_2 [\text{nan}_1] \ldots \text{t}_2 \)

If this is an accurate analysis, we have a sentence with a focus but no ground, with topics but no comments. This should strike us as peculiar and potentially untenable, but possibly unavoidable given the totality of the scrambling.

While it is clear that certain elements are being fronted with a definite semantic motivation, it may be the case that other instantiations of movement are either not semantically motivated (which violates the Principle of Last Resort), or are moved by non-syntactic means (i.e. Prosodic Movement).

Axel (2007) makes a case for the former in an analysis of Old High German, stating that there "exists a type of XP-movement to the left periphery in earlier OHG that is semantically/pragmatically vacuous.” He asserts that this “Stylistic Fronting” lacks both a semantic and pragmatic trigger, and so the field can be filled by elements that cannot normally be topics, including indefinites such as “no one,” sentence adverbs, and expletive subjects.
As for prosodic movement, more work is needed to determine the prosodic status of the full range of fronted constituents in Chukchansi (for a discussion of Prosodic Movement, see Agbayani & Golston (2010)).

4.2 Negation

Another area of concern in the data is the appearance of the negative marker ‘ohom’ in the left periphery. It occurs in a variety of positions in the Chukchansi sentence, with only a single apparent restriction: it must occur before the verb. It can occur in any number of positions in front of the verb:

(5) ‘ohom’ may’ na’ash hawt’-al
    not we.INCL can do-PO
    ‘We couldn’t do anything about it.’

(6) Na’ da’ ‘ohom’ taxin-ta’.
    I FOC not come-PERF
    ‘I didn’t come over to the house.’

If the negative particle follows the verb, it is judged ungrammatical:

(7) *Nancy hewet-hil ‘ohom’
    Nancy walk-AOR not
    ‘Nancy did not walk.’

This suggests a requirement that the negative particle be in a position granting it scope over the VP. That this is expressed in the surface structure of the sentence reinforces the syntactic, rather than prosodic, nature of the scrambling (see Agbayani & Golston 2010 for an analysis of prosodic scrambling).

Aside from simply appearing before the verb, the negative particle may also appear in Topic and Focus position.
In both (8) and (9), ‘ohom’ appears in [Spec,FocP], immediately preceding the focus particle da’. Since movement of Xo's to the left periphery is assumed to be ungrammatical, this suggests a characterization of the negative particle as an XP, much like the previous adverbial elements and demonstratives.

Zeijlstra (2004) outlines several tests to determine the status of negative particles as syntactic phrases. Among these is topicalization in V2 languages, such as Swedish and Dutch. In these languages, the only available landing site for topicalization is (according to Zeijlstra) [Spec,CP], a site which only permits XPs. In Swedish, topicalization of the negative particle is possible, suggesting that it is an XP rather than an Xo (Zeijlstra 2004).

(10)  *Inte var det Selma*
    Neg was it Selma
    ‘It was NOT Selma.’

(Zeijlstra 2004)

This perfectly mirrors the Chukchansi data, which in addition to topicalizing the negative particle can also focus it, as in (8) and (9). If the negative particle can be topicalized in Chukchansi, we expect to find it above a focused element, or between a focused element and the verb (which appears in FinP).
(11) \[ Na' \quad da' \quad 'ohom' \quad taxin-ta'. \]

I  FOC  not  come-PERF

‘I didn’t come over to the house.’

In (11), we find the negative particle ‘ohom’ appearing directly between the focus particle da’ and the tensed verb taxinta’. The only position available in the left periphery between these two positions (FocusP and FinP) is the lower TopicP. This falls perfectly in line with the expectations of the negative particle as an XP having the same freedom of movement to the left periphery as any other XP, including demonstratives, adverbials, and NPs.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The goal of this thesis has been to explore the nature of scrambling in Chukchansi Yokuts and find underlying order to the seeming chaos that free word order presents. As has been shown, the variability of order in Chukchansi in particular, and Yokuts more generally, is extensive and often confounding, and presents a serious problem to the study of syntax of these languages. Following Rizzi (1997), I have assumed an articulated left periphery consisting of projections of functional categories which attract dislocated elements with particular featural properties such as [+focus].

The syntactic nature of the scrambling is bolstered by the existence of ungrammatical data in which elements have been moved out of adjuncts in violation of the Adjunct Condition, as well as Crossover effects, indicating movement to A-bar position. This movement appears restricted to the XP level rather than the head level (except for the Filled-Fin requirement). In fact, while head movement is generally restricted, XP movement appears almost wholly unrestricted, given available landing sites.

Using the restriction of head movement as a diagnostic, we can assign XP status to many elements in Chukchansi which exhibit complete freedom of movement and freedom of co-occurrence, including demonstratives, adjectives, quantifiers, and possibly even the negative marker, all of which appear in Focus and Topic positions.

For a variety of reasons, I have taken verb-first order as the canonical order of Chukchansi. Following Roberts (2004) analysis of Celtic verb-first languages with a “Filled-Fin requirement,” which requires a verb head to adjoin to the head of FinP, the tensed verb in Chukchansi is assumed to reside in [Head,FinP]. This
provides one anchor point we can use to analyze the movement of XPs to the left periphery.

Because movement in the Minimalist Program is considered Last Resort, I have assumed semantic triggers for the movement of XPs which take the form of Topic and Focus features requiring an element to move to the appropriate functional category before Spell-Out. This interpretation is reflected well in the data, with wh-questions overwhelmingly associated with a particle of focus, which also co-occurs with clear cases of semantically focused elements.

While the semantic motivation in focus constructions is apparent, the case for topicalization is much less clear. Using the focus projection as an anchor point, we can assign other fronted XPs the potential status of Topic. XPs appearing to the left of Focus must inhabit either the specifier of Force or Topic, and XPs appearing between Focus and Fin must inhabit the specifier of Rizzi’s (1997) lower Topic projection.

While the hypothesis accounts for a good majority of the data, there are some cases which appear problematic. Among these is the status of the negative marker. Typically regarded as a head, the negative marker in Chukchansi exhibits full freedom of movement to the left periphery, including to Focus position, its only restriction being that it have scope over the verb. If the negative is analyzed as a head, the hypothesis can offer no account of its movement. However, if we utilize movement, particularly movement to Focus position, as a diagnostic tool to assess its status, we can regard it as an XP in its own right. It would then be capable of fronting and focus, a trait observed in Swedish by Zeijlstra (2004).

Also useful as a diagnostic to assess the XP status of elements is Left Branch Extraction. Elements such as demonstratives, possessive pronominals, and hili’si, ‘which’, all frequently appear in the left periphery, separated from their
presumed complements. In addition to leftward movement, they also exhibit freedom of multiple iteration, an impossible trait for heads of functional categories such as DP.

Also troubling are cases of partial XP fronting, in which, for example, the VP is fronted without its complement. These cases appear to undermine the generalization about XP movement, and can be rescued only by interpreting them as cases of remnant movement, as suggested by Den Besten & Webelhuth (1990) to explain verb fronting in German.

A fourth troubling fact is that several cases in the data appear to consist entirely of preposed elements. That is, there are sentences in which every element has been moved to a landing site in the left periphery. This is problematic given the Principle of Last Resort, since it implies a semantic motivation for every preposed element. This means that there are cases which exhibit Focus and lack Ground, or exhibit Topic and lack any Comment. While it can be claimed that semantically vacuous fronting is possible, as Axel (2007) claims of Old High German, having a “prefield” of moved elements still implies a background of unmoved elements. This case is far from settled, and will undoubtedly require much more research into the semantics and pragmatics of Yokuts.

Despite these concerns, the hypothesis that specifier positions of functional projections in Rizzi’s (1997) expanded left periphery attract left-dislocated XPs offers a large amount of explanatory power to account for Chukchansi’s apparently chaotic word order.
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