1 Introduction

- According to the Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky, 1995), movement chains consist of identical copies of a syntactic object.
  - In English, generally only the highest movement copy is pronounced, while all lower copies are deleted, (1).\(^1\)
  - What do you think \([\text{CP} \text{<what> Mary bought <what>]}\) ?
  - It has also been shown that copy spell-out may be regulated by well-formedness conditions at PF (e.g. Landau, 2006; Kandybowicz, 2008; van Urk, 2018).\(^2\)
    - For instance, such conditions block lower copy deletion in Hebrew V(P)-topicalization, resulting in verb doubling (Landau, 2006), (2).
    - Whereas the higher copy of the verb is spelled out due to intonational requirements on topics, the lower copy is also pronounced to support tense morphology in T\(^0\).

(2) Hebrew: Verb doubling in VP-fronting

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} \quad & \text{le’hasbir et ha-kišalon}, \text{ hu lo hisbir} \\
\text{INF.} & \text{explain ACC the-failure he not PST.explain} \\
\text{‘As for explaining the failure, he didn’t explain.’} & \quad (\text{Landau, 2006})
\end{align*}
\]

(1) In (1), I have omitted intermediate movement through the vP-edge.

\(^1\) Bennett et al. (to appear) also demonstrate that a similar interaction applies to deletion operations beyond copy deletion, e.g. ellipsis. In Irish, subject pronouns, which incorporate into the verb, may survive ellipsis of post-verbal material.


This talk presents a novel case study of this type of interaction, from noun incorporation in Inuktitut.

- In Inuktitut, objects that surface as incorporated into the verb complex nonetheless behave as though they are syntactically active.
  - May be cross-referenced by φ-agreement, participate in (dependent) case calculations, and, crucially, may undergo A-/Á-movement, (3).

(3) Passivization of incorporated object

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ujami-liuq-ta-u-jut} & \quad \text{Suusa-mut} \\
\text{necklace-make-PASS.PART-be-3P.S Susan-ALLAT} & \quad \text{‘The necklaces were made for Susan.’}
\end{align*}
\]

- In (3), the nominal undergoes A-movement to subject position.
  - Merger with the verb forces pronunciation of the base copy, while the higher copy is deleted for reasons of Economy.
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\(^1\) Bennett et al. (to appear) also demonstrate that a similar interaction applies to deletion operations beyond copy deletion, e.g. ellipsis. In Irish, subject pronouns, which incorporate into the verb, may survive ellipsis of post-verbal material.
2 Overview of Inuktitut morphosyntax

- The Inuit languages (Eskimo-Aleut) are a dialect continuum spanning the North American Arctic and Greenland. **Inuktitut** is the dialect group spoken primarily in Nunavut, Canada.³

- Inuktitut displays an **ergative-absolutive case patterning**, as well as **φ-agreement** with **ERG** and **ABS** arguments.⁴

\[ (4) \]

**Ergative case patterning**

a. Taiviti-\underline{up} surak-\underline{tanga} igalaaq


‘David broke the window.’

b. Miali \underline{ani}-qqau-\underline{juaq}

Miali.ABS leave-REC.PST-3.S

‘Miali left.’

- The language is polysynthetic and strictly adheres to the Mirror Principle, with a rigid ordering of morphemes within the word (but flexible sentence-level word order).

  - Verb complexes are invariably composed of an **INITIAL ROOT**, followed by optional suffixes, and ending with **φ-morphology**, (5a-b).

  - **Rule of thumb**: Rightwards in a word → up a syntactic tree. Thus, it is often assumed that the Inuit languages are right-headed, (5c).

\[ (5) \]

**Anatomy of Inuktitut complex verb**

a. √**ROOT**-(suffixes)-AGR

b. niri-juma-lauq-tara


‘I did not want to eat it.’

c.

\[ \text{TP} \]

\[ \text{Agro} \]

\[ \text{Agro} \]

\[ \text{Agro} \]

\[ \text{Agro} \]

\[ \text{TP} \]

\[ \text{ModP} \]

\[ \text{Mod} \]

\[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{...} \]

3Unless cited, the data included in this talk were elicited in Iqaluit, Nunavut, in August 2016, July 2017, and September 2017, as well as over Skype between October 2017-July 2018, and represent the North Baffin, South Baffin, and Kivalliq varieties of Inuktitut.

4In Yuan (2018), I argue that the grammatical status of the object-referencing portion of this φ-morphology is a matter of microvariation across Inuit; in Inuktitut, it is object clitic doubling rather than true φ-agreement. However, this distinction will be set aside here as it does not affect the present analysis.

- In noun incorporation constructions, the leftmost morpheme in the verb complex is the object, adjacent to the verb **underlined** throughout. (6).

\[ (6) \]

**Verb complex with noun incorporation**

Ulak \underline{ujami}-\underline{lin}-qqau-\underline{juq}

Ulak.ABS necklace-make-REC.PST-3.S

‘Ulak made a necklace/necklaces.’

**Below, I detail two additional properties of Inuktitut noun incorporation that will bear on our discussion of chain pronunciation:**

- Noun incorporation is obligatory with a small set of verbs, and follows from more general processes operative in complex word-formation (Johns, 2007, 2009).

- Incorporated objects are not structurally reduced, but display the same range of syntactic and interpretive properties as independent (non-incorporated) objects.

→ Together, these motivate a **postsyntactic** analysis of noun incorporation (Bok-Bennema and Groos, 1988; Phillips, 2016).

3 Noun incorporation as postsyntactic Merger

- Cross-linguistically, noun incorporation tends to be optional and permitted with a variety of verbs (Mithun, 1984; Baker et al., 2005, a.o.), e.g. Mohawk in (7):

\[ (7) \]

**Mohawk: ‘Classical’ noun incorporation**

a. Wa’-k-hninu’-’ ne ka-nakt-a’

FACT-1S-buy-PUNC NE NS-bed-NSF

‘I bought the/a bed.’

b. Wa’-ke-nakt-a-hninu’

FACT-1S-bed-JOIN-buy-PUNC

‘I bought the/a bed.’ (Baker, 1996)

³That the object is indeed incorporated is indicated by the occurrence of certain phonological processes, which take place between morphemes within a word but not across separate words. Here, the final C of ujamik ‘necklace’ is deleted.
3. In contrast, in the Inuit languages, noun incorporation is **obligatory** with a small set of verbs, and otherwise impossible with all other verbs, (8).

(8) **Inuktitut: Obligatory noun incorporation**

a. sivalaar-tuq-tunga cookie-consume-1S.S
   ‘I am eating a cookie.’

b. sivalaar-mik niri-junga cookie-MOD eat-1S.S
   ‘I am eating a cookie.’

`cf. *sivalaar-mik tuq-tunga`

• Following Johns (2007, 2009), incorporating verbs are **light verbs** ($\nu$’s; functional elements), while non-incorporating verbs are **lexical verbs** (i.e. roots). 6

3.1 **Properties of noun incorporation in Inuktitut**

• In most literature on noun incorporation (both in Inuit and cross-linguistically), incorporated objects are taken to be structurally reduced, e.g. N0 or NP (Sadock, 1980; Baker, 1985; Baker et al., 2005; Compton and Pittman, 2010; Barrie and Mathieu, 2016, a.o.).

• However, this does not hold for Inuktitut, in which incorporated objects display the **same syntactic and semantic properties** as their non-incorporated/standalone counterparts.

`▷ Based on this, I argue that incorporated objects in Inuktitut are full DPs.`

1. **Incorporated objects are phrasal**, (9):

(9) **Incorporation of phrasal nominals**

[a. tuktu-miniq niqi-ruma-jara
   David.ABS cookie-consume-want-3S.S
   ‘David wants to eat the cookies.’](Compton, 2013)

b. Taiviti-sivalaar-tu-ruma-jug
   David.ABS cookie-consume-want-3S.S/3P.O
   ‘David wants to eat these cookies.’

`▷ Moreover, in (11b), the subject is not ABS but E RG.`

   – If so, then incorporated objects may also remain syntactically visible to sentence-level case calculations.

2. **Unambiguously DP-sized nominals may be incorporated**, (10):

(10) **Incorporation of pronouns and possessive DPs**

a. Guuti uvanga-lauq-tuq
   God.ABS 1S-make-PST-3S.S
   ‘God made me.’

b. Kiuru [angaju-ngi]-u-quju-juq
   Carol.ABS elder-POSS.3P-be-see-3S.S
   ‘Carol resembles her elder relatives.’

3. **Incorporated objects may participate in case/\(\phi\)-agreement processes**:

   Whereas noun incorporation is typically characterized as detransitivizing, in Inuktitut such constructions alternate between intransitive and transitive.

   ▷ In (11b), both S and O \(\phi\)-agreement are present, suggesting that incorporated objects may be cross-referenced by \(\phi\)-morphology.7

(11) **Incorporated nouns may be targeted by object agreement**

a. Taiviti sivalaar-tu-ruma-jug
   David.ABS cookie-consume-want-3S.S
   ‘David wants to eat the cookies.’

b. Taiviti-up sivalaar-tu-ruma-jangit
   David-ERG cookie-consume-want-3S.S/3P.O
   ‘David wants to eat these cookies.’

   ▷ Moreover, in Inuktitut, incorporation of the object bleeds dependent case on subject, as in Chukchi, (i) (Baker and Bobaljik, 2018). (i)


   – If so, then incorporated objects may also remain syntactically visible to sentence-level case calculations.

---

7The ability for incorporated objects to be cross-referenced by \(\phi\)-agreement has otherwise only been reported briefly by Johns (2009) for Inuktitut, and do not necessarily extend to other varieties such as Kalaallisut (Jerry Sadock, p.c.). Note also that the target of \(\phi\)-agreement is indeed the incorporated object, not an independent null pronoun in (11b) (in the sense of Rosen 1989 and Chung and Ladusaw 2004). In (i), we see that Inuktitut does not permit hyponymous doubling of incorporated nominals, thus ruling out such an alternative.

8The Inuktitut data thus diverge from the more cross-linguistically common profile of noun incorporation, in which incorporation of the object bleeds dependent E RG case assignment to the subject, as in Chukchi, (i) (Baker and Bobaljik, 2018).

(i) a. tuktu-miniq niqi-ruma-jara
   caribou-former.ABS food-consume-want-1S.S/3S.O
   Intended: ‘I want to (food-)eat this caribou meat.’

b. Taiviti-up sivalaar-tu-ruma-jangit
   David-ERG cookie-consume-want-3S.S/3P.O
   ‘David wants to eat these cookies.’

---

6As Johns notes, incorporating verbs as a class are semantically underspecified, with few s-selectional requirements. Beyond -tuq ‘consume,’ other such verbs include -u ‘be,’ -quq ‘have,’ -liri ‘do/work on,’ etc.
4. Incorporated objects may take wide scope: Seen above, but even more clearly shown in (12).

(12) **Incorporated objects may take narrow or wide scope**

a. **Context**: Ulak has a seafood allergy.
   Ulak *iqalu-*runna-ngit-tuq
   Ulak.ABS fish-eat-MODAL-NEG-3S.S
   ‘Ulak can’t/won’t eat (any) fish.’

b. **Context**: Because there is Arctic char around, Ulak won’t touch salmon.
   Ula-up *iqalu-*runna-ngit-tanga
   Ulak-ERG fish-consume-MODAL-NEG-3S.S/3S.O
   ‘Ulak won’t eat a particular fish.’

▷ Crucially, this interpretive pattern is an extensively documented property of Inuit ABS objects (Bittner, 1994; Bittner and Hale, 1996a; Manga, 1996; Sadow, 2003; Wharram, 2003; Yuan, 2018):

(13) **Kalaallisut: ABS objects take wide scope (Bittner, 1994)**

a. suli Juuna *atuakka-mik ataatsi-mik* tigu-si-sima-ngi-laq
   still Juuna.ABS book-MOD one-MOD get-AP-PERF-NEG-3S.S
   ‘Juuna hasn’t received (even) one book yet.’

b. suli Juuna-p *atuagaq ataasiq* tigu-sima-ngi-laak
   still Juuna-ERG book.ABS one.ABS get-PERF-NEG-3S.S/3S.O
   ‘There is one (particular) book Juuna hasn’t received yet.’

→ In these transitive incorporation examples, the incorporated object behaves like an ABS object because it is an ABS object.

3.2 Taking stock

• We have now seen that noun incorporation takes place to satisfy **requirements of the verb**, not requirements of the nominal (Fortescue, 1984; Johns, 2007; Cook and Johns, 2009).

▷ Looking beyond v₀’s, other functional elements along the clausal spine are expounded as suffixes as well

• **Proposal**: Complex words in Inuktitut are created by a postsyntactic operation of Merger (e.g. Marantz, 1984; Bobaljik, 1994; Embick and Noyer, 2001; Harley, 2013), iteratively applying between adjacent syntactic nodes along the clausal spine.\(^{10}\)

4 Movement and Merger of incorporated objects

• If incorporated nouns may participate in syntactic phenomena such as case competition and φ-agreement, we also predict the possibility of syntactic movement.

▷ **This section**: This is borne out, and displays the interaction between Merger and chain pronunciation discussed in §1.

▷ Though they surface inside the verb complex, the occurrence of phrasal (A-/Ā-) movement is nonetheless detectable from syntactic and semantic diagnostics.

• **Proposal**: Merger between v₀ and DP forces pronunciation of that DP, satisfying the Stray Affix Filter. Higher movement copies are deleted in accordance with Economy conditions on pronunciation.

\(^{10}\)That noun incorporation is postsyntactic in Inuktitut is evidenced by the data in §4, but see also Yuan (2018) for additional arguments.
4.1 A-movement

- A-movement in noun incorporation contexts is illustrated with **passivization**.

  ▷ **Salient properties in Inuktitut**: Passive verbal morphology, subject φ-agreement, creation of new antecedents for binding, (15).

(15) **Passives involve A-movement to subject position**

  a. angajuqa-tua-mma sua-qqaau-jaanga
     parent-only-POSS.1S/3P.ERG scold-REC.PST-3S.S/1S.O
     ‘Only my parents scolded me…’

  b. [asi-kka] suak-ta-u-qqaau-nngit-tuit
     other-POSS.1S/3P.ABS scold-PASS.PART-be-REC.PST-NEG-3P.S
     angajuqa-mi-nut
     parent-POSS.REFL-ALLAT
     ‘The others, were not scolded by their; parents.’

- **Passivization of incorporated objects**: Passivized incorporated objects behave just like their non-incorporated counterparts.

  ▷ Incorporated nominals understood as plural are cross-referenced by plural subject φ-agreement (thus ruling out default agreement as an analysis), (16).

(16) **Incorporated nominals with subject φ-agreement**

  a. Ulak [ujami-liu-qqaau-juq]
     Ulak.ABS necklace-make-REC.PST-3S.S
     ‘Ulak made a necklace/necklaces.’

  b. [ujami-liu-ta-juj] Susuq-mut
     necklace-make-PASS.PART-be-3P.S Susan-ALLAT
     ‘The necklaces are being made for Susan.’

  ▷ Passivization of an incorporated nominal moreover permits it to bind lower anaphora, (17).

(17) **Passivized incorporated nominals as antecedents for binding**

  aasiva-liq-ta-juq nulii-mi-nut
  spider-consume-PASS.PART-be-3S.S mate-POSS.REFL-ALLAT
  ‘The spider, is being eaten by its; mate.’

4.2 Ā-movement

- The same pattern is borne out in relative clauses (Ā-movement).

  ▷ As shown in (19), the surface position of a relativized argument may be determined by the **incorporating properties** of the matrix and embedded verbs.\(^{12}\)

(19) **Three patterns of copy spell-out, dependent on incorporation**

  a. [Hi] tu-ruma-junga [RC ibbit niuvi-lauq-targa]-nit
     tea-consume-want-1S.S 2S.ERG buy-PST-3S.S/3S.O-MOD
     ‘I want to drink the tea that you bought.’

  b. imi-ruma-junga [RC ibbit [Hi] taa-ri-lauq-targa]-nit
     drink-want-1S.S 2S.ERG tea-get-TR-PST-3S.S/3S.O-MOD
     ‘I want to drink the tea that you got.’

  c. [Hi] tu-ruma-junga [RC ibbit [Hi] taa-ri-lauq-targa]-nit
     tea-consume-want-1S.S 2S.ERG tea-get-TR-PST-3S.S/3S.O-MOD
     ‘I want to drink the tea that you got.’

- **Proposal**: The constructions in (19) are **structurally identical**, differing only in whether Merger applies between the verb and its object.

  ▷ See the **Appendix** for evidence, based on quantificational scope (cf. Basilico, 1996; Shimoyama, 1999; Hastings, 2004; Bogal-Allbritten et al., 2016).

\(^{12}\)Note that this can only be seen with relativization of direct objects, since only these arguments may undergo noun incorporation.
• Derivation:
  ▶ A-movement to Spec-CP in the syntax;\(^\text{13}\)
  ▶ Postsyntactic Merger of \(\nu^0\) and object DP;
  ▶ Deletion of higher movement copy in Spec-CP (possible spell-out of matrix copy depending on the matrix verb).

(20) A-movement in Inuktitut NI

• Obligatory incorporation beyond Inuktitut
  • While the Inuktitut data shown here are cross-linguistically unusual, they are not unique—as we might expect, if this interaction between syntactic movement and Merger reflects general well-formedness conditions at PF.\(^\text{14}\)

(21) Nuu-chah-nulth: Obligatory noun incorporation
  a. \(\text{maht}'a-\text{aap-mit-}\text{iiš} \text{ čakup}\)
  house-buy-PST-3.IND man
  ‘A man bought a house.’
  cf. *\(\text{aap-mit-}\text{iiš} \text{ maht}'i\) čakup
  b. maakuk-mit-\text{iiš} čakup \(\text{maht}'i\)  
  buy-PST-3.IND man house
  ‘A man bought a house.’
  cf. *\(\text{maht}'a-\text{maakuk-mit-}\text{iiš čakup}\) \(^\text{(Wojdak, 2008)}\)

• Interestingly, Nuu-chah-nulth also permits incorporated nominals to be passivized:

(22) Nuu-chah-nulth: Incorporated nominals can be passivized
  a. \(\text{k'w} \text{aq-}\text{iic-} \text{iiš} \text{k'waa} \text{uuuc}\)
  s.h.eggs-consume-3.IND grandchild
  ‘Grandchild is eating spawned herring eggs.’
  b. \(\text{k'w} \text{aq-}\text{iic-ck} \text{w} \text{ii-} \text{at-} \text{iiš} \text{uuš-qh-}\text{at}\)
  s.h.eggs-consume-EVID-PASS-3.IND some-do.by-PASS
  ‘Spawned herring eggs must have been eaten by someone.’ \(^\text{(Wojdak, 2008)}\)

• … and relativized:\(^\text{15}\)

(23) Nuu-chah-nulth: Object relative pronouns undergo incorporation
  a. \(\text{k'iih-um-} \text{iiš} \text{[šuwis [yaq-ččl-mit-i]} \text{ makuk čakup-} \text{iiš]} \}
  red-RD-3.SG.IND shoes REL-AUX-PST-3.SG.IRL buy man-DET
  ‘The shoes the man bought are red.’
  b. \(\text{k'w} \text{in?al-mit-} \text{iiš} \text{John [luččin [yaq-\text{aap-mit-}iitk]} \]
  like-PST-3.IND John dress REL-buy-PST-2.SG.IRL
  ‘John liked the dress you bought.’ \(^\text{(Wojdak, 2008)}\)

\(^\text{13}\)Note that the fact that the relativized argument surfaces within the embedded clause motivates a raising or matching analysis of RCs (Bhatt, 2002; Huley and Sauerland, 2006; Deal, 2016), as opposed to the null operator analysis.

\(^\text{14}\)While the exact implementation differs, Wojdak (2008) also pursues a postsyntactic analysis of Nuu-chah-nulth complex word formation, in a similar spirit to the one proposed here, and briefly notes the similarity between Nuu-chah-nulth and Inuit (based on Kalaallisut).

\(^\text{15}\)A difference, though, is that relativization in Nuu-chah-nulth involves the usage of a relative pronoun. The fact that the incorporated nominal is a relative pronoun, not a full nominal, presumably reflects a cross-linguistic difference in the formation of relative clauses, though I leave the exploration of this idea for future work. Note also that the (non-incorporated) relative pronoun in (23b) bears second-position enclitics such as tense and Q-morphology.
That Nuu-chah-nulth displays a similar incorporation pattern to Inuktitut is unsurprising, given that the two share a similar morphological profile.

- Both languages are polysynthetic and have a class of affixal verbs that morphologically attach to their complements.

**Further explorations?** Although Wojdak (2008) does not provide concrete evidence for A-/A-movement, we might expect such evidence to exist in the language.

### 6 Conclusion

- Previous literature has argued that the pronunciation of movement chains may, in part, be regulated by PF well-formedness conditions (e.g. Landau, 2006).

- I showed that noun incorporation in Inuktitut provides new evidence for this phenomenon:

 ▷ Objects that are incorporated into the verb nonetheless behave as though they have undergone phrasal (A-/A-) movement.

- I argued that syntactic movement truly has taken place—however, this is followed by the postsyntactic application of Merger between the verb and its object.

 ▷ Elements that have undergone Merger must be pronounced in accordance with the Stray Affix Filter (Lasnik, 1981), while copies of such elements may be deleted.

- **More broadly:** Novel morphosyntactic support for **covert movement as lower copy spell-out**, both in A- and Á-contexts (e.g. Bobaljik, 2002; Potsdam and Polinsky, 2012; Bošković, 2002; Reintges et al., 2006).

### References


A  Evidence for Ā-movement in Inuktitut relativization

- The three copy spell-out patterns in Inuktitut relative clauses are repeated in (24):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(24) Three patterns of copy spell-out, dependent on incorporation} \\
\text{a. } & \text{tii-} \text{tu-ruma-junga [RC ibbit niuvi-lauq-tanga]-nit} \\
& \text{tea-consume-want-1S.S 2S.ERG buy-PST-3S.S/3S.O-MOD} \\
& \text{‘I want to drink the tea that you bought.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{imi-ruma-junga [RC ibbit tii-} \text{taa-ri-lauq-tanga]-nit} \\
& \text{drink-want-1S.S 2S.ERG get-TR-PST-3S.S/3S.O-MOD} \\
& \text{‘I want to drink the tea that you got.’} \\
\text{c. } & \text{tii-} \text{tu-ruma-junga [RC ibbit tii-} \text{taa-ri-lauq-tanga]-nit} \\
& \text{tea-consume-want-1S.S 2S.ERG get-TR-PST-3S.S/3S.O-MOD} \\
& \text{‘I want to drink the tea that you got.’}
\end{align*}
\]

- Though the relativized argument surfaces within the relative clause in (24b-c), these sentences are syntactically head-external, i.e. they are not canonically internally-headed relative clauses.

- In languages that have both head-internal and head-external RCs, IHRCs contrast semantically with their EHRC counterparts (Basilico, 1996; Shimoyama, 1999; Hastings, 2004; Bogal-Allbritten et al., 2016). Illustrated with Japanese:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(25) Japanese: Different interpretations of EHRCs/IHRCs with ‘most’} \\
\text{a. } & \text{Taro-wa [ [ Yoko-ga reezooko-ni irete-oita] kukkii-o hotondo} \\
& \text{Taro-TOP Yoko-NOM refrigerator-NI put-AUX cookie-ACC most} \\
& \text{paatii-ni motte itta} \\
& \text{party-LOC brought} \\
& \text{‘Taro brought most cookies that Yoko had put in the fridge to the party.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Taro-wa [ [ Yoko-ga reezooko-ni kukkii-o hotondo} \\
& \text{Taro-TOP Yoko-NOM refrigerator-NI cookie-ACC most} \\
& \text{irete-oita-nol-o paatii-ni motte itta} \\
& \text{put-AUX-NM-ACC party-LOC brought} \\
& \text{‘Yoko put most cookies in the fridge and Taro brought them to the party.’} \\
& \text{(Shimoyama, 1999)}
\end{align*}
\]

- In contrast to Japanese, incorporated nominals in Inuktitut RCs are interpreted as though they take RC-external scope, (26).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(26) Inuktitut: IHRCs with numeral ‘only one’ take head-external scope} \\
\text{Context: Carol made five necklaces to sell, but Taiiviti bought only one of them.} \\
\text{a. Kiuru tallima-nik ujami-liu-laur-mat} \\
& \text{takkua} \\
& \text{Carol-ABS five-PL.MOD necklace-make-PST-CAUS.3S.S DEM.PL.ABS} \\
& \text{tammarmik niuviaksa-ri-laur-tangit} \\
& \text{all-ABS for.sale-TR-PST-3S.S/3P.O} \\
& \text{‘Having made five necklaces, Carol had them all for sale...’} \\
\text{b. kisiani Taiiviti-up niuvi-lauq-tanga [RC Kiuru-up atausi-tuaq} \\
& \text{but David-ERG buy-PST-3S.S/3S.O Carol-ERG one-only.ABS} \\
& \text{ujami-liu-lauq-tanga} \\
& \text{necklace-make-PST-3S.S/3S.O} \\
& \text{‘...but David bought only one necklace that Carol made.’} \\
& \text{Unavailable: ‘Taiiviti bought a necklace that Carol made only one of.’}
\end{align*}
\]