

Bibliography

- Baier, N. 2018. Anti-Agreement. *Doctoral thesis*, University of California, Berkeley.
- Bertrand, A. 2019. *Drawing a map to the Ktunaxa clause: evidence from verbal morphology*. In E. Sadler-Brown, O. Tkachman and A. Ozburn (eds.). Vancouver, BC: UBCWPL.
- Dryer, M. 1992. A Comparison of the Obviation Systems of Kutenai and Algonquian. in *Papers of the 23rd Algonquian Conference*, pp. 119-163
- Dryer, M. 1998. Obviation across clause boundaries in Kutenai. in *Studies in Native American Linguistics IX*, 22:2
- Garvin, P. 1951. L'Obviation en Kutenai: Échantillon d'une catégorie grammaticale. in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 47, pp. 166-212
- Underhill, R. 2021. Local persons can be obviative, too: evidence of local person obviation in Ktunaxa. *to appear in proceedings of WSCLA* 25.

So, I'm still not very certain of where the situation pronoun should be exactly, but we could imagine something like this:

IP-internal subject, I agrees with subject:

[CP [IP [XP situation] [IP [DP subject] [I -s/0] [vP [DP t] [vP ...]]]]]

IP-external subject, I agrees with situation:

[CP [DP subject] [IP [XP situation] [IP [DP t] [I -s/0] [vP [DP t] [vP ...]]]]]

For now, let's set aside the question of why extraction would prevent I from agreeing with the subject. When the subject is an overt DP in a non-peripheral position, I should always agree with the subject. I agree that the linear order of DPs doesn't necessarily tell us much in Ktunaxa, but let's assume for the sake of argument that a subject following V is internal to IP. This hypothesis would predict the following:

Hanuti xaʔɬçins naʔuti(*s)	<i>same or different situation</i>
Hanutsi xaʔɬçins naʔuti*(s)	<i>same or different situation</i>

When the subject is an overt DP in a peripheral position, I should agree with the situation:

Naʔuti ma hanut(s)i xaʔɬçins	<i>situation marked on V</i>
Naʔutis ma hanut(s)i xaʔɬçins	<i>situation marked on V</i>

When the subject is an overt DP in a peripheral position relative to its embedded clause, I agrees with the situation, but because the situation must be different from the matrix situation, it looks like subject agreement:

*Maʔi qakiʔni Semos k wiłqa	<i>situation marked on V, cannot be same situation</i>
Maʔi qakiʔni Semos k wiłqaps	<i>situation marked on V, cannot be same situation</i>

This predicts obligatory mismatch in cases like the following (needs testing):

Maʔis qakłapsi Semo k wiłqaps	<i>situation marked on V, cannot be same situation</i>
*Maʔis qakłapsi Semo k wiłqa	<i>situation marked on V, cannot be same situation</i>

When the subject is a null pro, the two structures are phonologically ambiguous. This ends up being a problem for the embedding cases—the sentences (interpretations) marked ungrammatical here are predicted by this theory to be well-formed.

*ʔatiçkiʔis Maʔi qakiksi k ʔiktuqumik <i>pro</i>	<i>pro</i> should = Maʔi, but this is ungrammatical
ʔatiçkiʔis Maʔi qakiksi <i>pro</i> k ʔiktuqumik	<i>same situation, pro</i> = brother

ʔatiçkiʔis Maʔi qakiksi k ʔiktuqunakis *pro*

pro = brother

*ʔatiçkiʔis Maʔi qakiksi *pro* k ʔiktuqunakis *different situation, pro* ≠ brother, but it can

So I guess we would need to say more about these cases to get things fully functional, but I feel like we can scrape by without justifying that in the abstract?

The anti-agreement bit is interesting—idk if it's worth digging too much into, but it does seem like it could be an avenue to explore if we end up keeping this analysis. I left a link in the google doc to a nice survey abt anti-agreement by Nico Baier.