INTERROGATIVES

Interrogatives are of the two basic types, wh- and yes/no. The yes/no type is indicated by the interrogative enclitic -sh attached to the first word of the sentence: e.g. dAsAche’Lsh ‘are you hungry?’, dAsAche’Lshunh ‘is he hungry?’, dik’sh dAsche’L ‘aren’t you hungry?’, dik’shuhnu: dAsche’L ‘aren’t they hungry?’ For this, see further chapter on enclitics. The present chapter deals with wh- type interrogatives.

It should be noted that interrogatives were not thoroughly investigated in elicitation. Further, as interrogatives much less common in narration than in conversation, the documentary corpus, textual and otherwise, is not rich in interrogatives. Hence, coverage of interrogatives is somewhat weaker than coverage of most other grammatical categories.

WH- INTERROGATIVES

The basic Eyak wh-interrogative words or stems are de: ‘what?’, du: ‘who?’, da: ‘where?’, dAX ‘how?’, and k’e: ‘how?’. From comparison with Athabaskan *dE-WE (or *wE-dE) ‘who?’ and *dE-yE (or *yE-dE) ‘what?’ it is clear that Eyak has dA- as its wh-element, confirmed internally by dAX in comparison with wAX ‘thus, in that manner’, lAX ‘in this manner’ (cf. ’Aw ‘that’, ’Al ‘this’). It will also be shown that k’e: has come from outside the system, partly supplanting dAX. Finally, and marginal to the system, tla: ‘where?’ will be treated at the end.

To all these, except in their use with negative prefix k’u- as negative words, the interrogative enclitic -d is attached, directly or after certain suffixes, or attached to other following words forming a noun phrase in the sentence, as will be shown below in the subsection on syntax.

The interrogative words are also used in non-interrogative sentences, in two ways. One is in negative words, k’ude: ‘nothing’, k’udu: ‘no one’, k’udAX ‘cannot < ‘no way’, k’uda: ‘nowhere’ (uncertain), as mentioned above. These are shown elsewhere in detail, in the chapter on Negatives. The other such use, often with proclitic dA- ‘ipse’, is non-interrogative dAde:-d ‘something, anything’, dAdu:-d ‘someone, anyone’, dAk’e:-d ‘some way, any way’, dAda:-d ‘somewhere, anywhere’, or as a relative, ‘anyone who’, ‘that which’, etc.

The interrogatives are extensively covered in the 1970 dictionary as far as they were documented by 1965, in their basic interrogative and derivative uses. There is, however, significant further documentation in the post-1965 materials, especially from enquiry into their derivational suffixation, for which considerable potential is revealed. The information in the 1970 dictionary is treated here in summary only, as here we shall concentrate on the post-1965 material, which is cited by speaker and date.

The different interrogatives will be treated together after some consideration of them individually, especially in the irregularity with which they now fit together to constitute a system. Clearly parallel are du:-d ‘who?’ and de:-d ‘what?’ in their patterning, also in their relation with Athabaskan. Not so with da:-d ‘where?’, which might have been like du:-d and de:-d in origin, but which is heavily contaminated by the postposition o-da:-d ‘in the area of o’, especially with postposition-final -d ‘punctual’, cf. o-d ‘in punctual
contact with o’. Because of that, for one thing, where there is either duplication of -d’s, i.e. both postposition-final and interrogative enclitic, da:dd, or possibly, allowing for overlap of categories, interrogative and locational, simplification, or haplology, to da:d. For more detail on this, see da:2 in the dictionary. Further, there are no clear spontaneous attestations of a negative k’uda: ‘nowhere’ to parallel k’udu: ‘no one’, k’ude: ‘nothing’. For more on this see chapter on Negatives.

Another major irregularity or complication in the interrogative system is in dAX ‘how?’ and k’e:-d ‘how?’ For one thing dAX itself appears to be composed of the dA-interrogative-initial particle as in du:, de:, da:, plus postposition o-X ‘by means of o; in non-punctual contact with o’. For this cf. also (')wAX ‘thus, in that way’, (')lAX ‘in this way’, earlier ‘AwAX and ‘AlaX, transparently, for which cf. further ’Aw ‘that’, ‘Al ‘this’ (both of which still ended with a vowel in Rezanov 1805). Use of dAX is quite unlike the three other dA-interrogatives, as it is now highly specialized, used only in the negative k’u-dAX ‘cannot, impossible’ < ‘no way to’, and in dAX-k’-d ‘how much/many?’. (Cf. also (')wAXk’ that much/many’, (')lAXk’ ‘this much/many’.) It may be questionable whether dAX in k’udAX and dAXk’ should even be identified as a single morpheme from a strictly synchronic point of view.

By far more general for ‘how, in what manner/way?’ is k’e:-d. For this, cf. above all k’e:-sh, k’e:-’sh ‘perhaps, probably, approximately’, indicating any kind of uncertainty, where -sh is still certainly the interrogative enclitic particle, though no k’e(:) is attested without that particle. Also unlike du:, de:, dAX, there is definitely no negative *k’uk’e;; for that, instead, we have, as noted, either k’udAX ‘cannot, impossible’, somewhat evolved or specialized in meaning from ‘no way, in no manner’, or, more frequently or generally, k’ude:dah ‘no way, in no manner, not at all’, from k’ude: ‘nothing’ with general adverbializer -dah.

Prefixation, proclitics

Three prefixes or proclitics are attested with interrogatives. Two, k’u- negative prefix, and proclitic dA- ‘ipse’, can combine, so are found of course in the order dA-k’u-, thence often dik’u-. These are covered with the interrogatives in the dictionary and in the chapter on Negatives.

The third is affective or exclamatory ‘iL-’, intensifier often or usually with overtones of vexation or disgust: ‘iL:ke:duh ‘how the hell…?’, from Sophie 1987 ‘iLk’e:dAw ‘:anda’ sahL, ‘iLk’e:chi:dAw ‘:anda’ sahL ‘how did you get here?!’ (surprised, unhappily or happily), ‘iL:duh XAsahL ‘what in God’s name did you eat?’, ‘iL:de:duh Xah ‘what ever has he been eating?!’, ‘iLdu:duh sA’ehL, ‘iLdu:chi:duh sA’ehL ‘whom ever did he marry?!’. No combinations of ‘iL- with k’u- or dA- are attested; once, with Sophie, 1987, *?iLdAk’ude:d and *?dA’iLk’ude:d were tested, with only puzzled results; results might have been clearer if all three had not been tested together. -- The other attestation of affective ‘iL- is with the stem chi’ in the exclamation ‘iLchi’sh(dAg), of surprise and usually vexation, clearly to be segmented ‘iL-chi’-sh-dAg, where -dAg is ‘also’, and -sh- is the interrogative enclitic. The stem chi’ is in origin very probably and interestingly the same as the -chi- in ‘whom ever?, who on earth?’; to be further exemplified below. Note further the parallel alternation V: ~ V’-sh in chi: ~ chi’-sh here and k’e: ~ k’e’-sh ‘perhaps’ above (where the variant k’e:’sh may simply be an affective expansion).
Conceivable *?'iLk’e:sh(dAg) was never tested. It is not possible to distinguish whether this ‘iL- is a prefix or a proclitic.

Suffixation (or compounding)

Aside from the interrogative enclitic -d, at least one morpheme, the intensifier -chi:- already mentioned just above, can be suffixed to interrogative stems, to any interrogative stem; it is not attested with any other kind of stem. This unique morpheme or stem, ‘wh-… ever, on earth, in God’s name’, is well attested in de:-chi:-d ‘what on earth?’ du:-chi:-d ‘who on earth?’, da:-chi:-d:- ‘where on earth?’, and k’e:chi:-d ‘how on earth?’.

dAXk’-chi:-d:’how ever many?’ (The -k’- of dAX-k ‘how many?’ is suffixed not only to dAX-, but it also occurs, as shown above, with (’)wAX and (’)lAX.)

The exact position of -chi:- with respect to other suffixation between the interrogative stem and enclitic -d is uncertain. Clearly it is last or second-last, but with respect to postpositions, we have inadequate and ambivalent data: Marie pre-1966 de:wa:chi:d wAX yileh ‘what on earth did you do that for?’, has postposition preceding, then much later testing for this, Marie 9/20/96, ?du:chi:tl’duh ‘whom ever with?’ uncertain, *du:chi:Xa’d ‘whom ever next to?’ rejected, ?du:Xa’chi:d uncertain. The only unquestioned form, de:wa:chi:d, shows postposition before -chi:-, and the only outright rejected form, *du:chi:Xa’d shows postposition after -chi:-, definitely favoring the postposition before the -chi:-; the two others, one with postposition after and one with postposition before are questioned, cancelling each other out, leaving the “vote” in favor of postposition preceding -chi:-. (Late note: from Lena, 6/13/71, we have dAXk’lAXa:shuglAXa’lAwchi:d ‘iXa ‘how ever many big strawberries do you have?!’, which shows that the -chi:- can in fact be separated altogether from the interrogative, along with the -d enclitic itself, to the end of the whole noun phrase, so indeed is par of the enclitic, which it must immediately precede.)


With dAX and k’e:, which could be considered adverbial rather than nominal, postpositions are less freely used, but are nevertheless clearly attested. With dAX ‘how?’, postpositions are of course limited, but we have dAXk’d’a:Xd ‘how many times?; a number of times’ with specialized o-da’X ‘o times’, and in specialized sense, dAXk’iXa’d ‘at what hour o’clock?’ with o-Xa’ ‘at o’. With k’e:-d ‘how?’ on the other hand, from Sophie 1987, p. 57, we have k’e:leh[d?]shdAw ‘I wonder why’ (see below for enclitic combination -sh-d- ), k’e:wa:dhAw ‘for what purpose?’; k’e:Xa’dAw ‘where is it?, what for?’ (‘next to, near what?; in relation to what?’), also k’e:XdAw qu’xsheh ‘what shall I kill it with’ along with de:XdAw qu’xsheh ‘id.’ In these instances k’e:-d is
treated like de:-d, perhaps questionably, and perhaps indicating a relatively recent origin and expanding role of k’e: in the system of interrogatives.

Before 1971 the only hint that adjectives could be suffixed to or compounded with interrogative was the dAde:kihdAw ‘any little thing’, with diminutive -kih, by no means a regular adjective, morphologically unique. For further on -kih with interrogatives, see below. Then from Anna 6/71, we have de:lAwdA’Aw ‘what’s that big thing?’ (which may be a mistranscription for de: lAW-; cf. k’e: WAX- below). Following that up in the last session with Lena 7/13/71, we have de:shiyahdA’Aw ‘what’s that nasty thing?’, du:siyahdA’anh ‘who’s that nasty person?’, de:tsidzgdA’Aw ‘what’s that narrow thing?’, de:dik’dA’Aw ‘what’s that short thing?’, and then de:wahshiyah(chi:)dA’Aw, ‘for (the purpose of) what (ever on earth) bad thing is it?’ where the postposition o-wah(d) not only precedes the -chi:-, but much more surprisingly, precedes also the adjective -shiyah ‘bad’, perhaps incorrectly . Then, following those up with Sophie 1987 we have de:shiyahdAw ‘what nasty thing?’, k’e:shiyahdunh ‘a:nda’ sahL ‘how the hell did he get here?’, k’e:du:dkinh ‘a:nda’ sahl ‘how did that lovely little (girl) get here?’ with the diminutive not only following the enclitic -d-, but nasalized as in sg. human relative, followed and confirmed by k’e:du:dkinhnu: ‘a:nda’ shA’a’chL ‘how did they (cute girls) get here?. This then was further elaborated with anatomical qualifier -gudA- ‘buttocks’ k’e: gAdAdzu:dkinhnu: ‘a:nda’ shA’a’chL ‘how did those cute-butt (girls) get here?’ then finally ‘ilK’e:gAdAdzu:ki[h?]yu:ch:shduhnu: ‘a:nda’ shA’a’chL ‘I wonder how in God’s name such cute little butts ever got here!’ and ‘ilDu:gAdAdzu:ki[h?]yu:ch:shduhnu: ‘a:nda’ shA’a’chL ‘I wonder who in God’s name such cute little butts are who got here’, now also with exclamatory prefix ’il-, the diminutive immediately following the adjectival stem, -yu: ‘plural’, and -sh-d- enclitic combination ‘I wonder’. This no doubt approaches the limit of elaboration of the interrogative word. If we add to that the postposition in its more likely position, we have the following order of elements: proclitic or prefix (’il-, dA-; k’u-) + interrogative (de:, du:, da:, k’e; in highly limited way dAX) + qualifier + adjective + -yu: ‘pl.’ + postposition + -chi-: intensifier + -sh interrogative enclitic + -d interrogative enclitic + human relativizer enclitic -uhn,-uhnu:); diminutive -kih appears in at least two positions, following adjective, or, quite irregularly or uniquely, following -d- enclitic, there combining with the human relativiers, as -kinh, -kinhnu:, at least for Sophie.

Before moving on to syntactically more complex constructions (interrogative noun phrases), we touch upon some of the basic uses of interrogative in negatives and relatives. Negatives with k’u- prefix: k’ude: XAdahG ‘there’s nothing to eat’ (Lena, more precisely ‘nothing is being eaten’?), k’udu:yu:tl’ ‘Adawi’L q’e’ ‘idAIAlehGInu: ‘they got nobody to war with anymore’ (Anna, more precisely ‘they’re warring with no one more’?), but then Sophie 1987 k’udu:tl’ ‘uwa: ‘u:da’ qu’xah ‘I got no one to go there with’, k’udu:Xa’ wAX ‘ixit’eh ‘I got no one to be living with’, with the verbs in the positive. With a negative verb, presumable k’udu:tl’ ‘uwa: ‘u:da’ qu’xahG, the meaning would be ‘I’m not going there with anyone of them’, k’udu: Xa’ wAX ‘a’xt’u:G, meaning would be ‘I’m not living with anyone’. This important potential distinction was not further checked.

For negatives such as dik’ du: dunh ‘u:la’Lga:G ‘nobody knows’, dik’ (dA)k’e: dunh ‘AsliLG ‘he didn’t do anything, nothing happened to him’, see chapter on negatives.

The interrogatives de: and du: can be found as possessor of inherently possessed nouns (as well as as o of postpositions), i.e. anatomical or kinship nouns. We have these only as elicited from Sophie 1987: de:ts’Alihd ‘bones of what?’, de:dA’uGLdAwn, du:ma:dAw ‘whose mother?’; also, however, de: k’utse’d ‘meat of what?’, which is almost certainly not precisely glossed. ‘Flesh of what?’ is presumably de:tse’d, ‘whose flesh?’ du:tse’d, but ‘whose meat (game, store-bought)’ would be du:ya’ k’utse’d, and de: k’utse’d must mean ‘what (game or store-bought) meat?’

Syntax

This brings us to interrogative noun phrases, consisting of more than one word, of which the interrogative is the first, and the interrogative -d enclitic is suffixed to the last word of the phrase. In the de: k’utse’d ‘what meat?’ construction above, the de: is attributively adjectival, as in several other such attestations: de: Lila:’dA’anh ‘what man/boy is he?’ (Anna 6/71), de: ‘Ana:shahdA’Aw ‘what (species of) flower is that?’ (Lena 6/13/71), de: ya:dA’Aw ‘what thing is that?’; and with de: as o of postposition, de:loh da:dd ‘about what place (is he speaking)?’. This same use is found in the relative: dAde:d Ga:ndich’idjgyu: ‘any (kind of) small birds’, in this instance with enclitic not final, though presumable dAde: Ga:ndich’idjgyu:d would be at least as acceptable; cf. next below.

Examples where interrogative is possessor of non that is not inherently possessed (not anatomical or kinship term) are du:ya’ ‘AxdA’Aw ‘whose canoe is that?’, du:ya’ XAwa:dA ‘whose dog?’ (Sophie 1987, p. 59), for which Sophie also allowed du:ya’dAw XAwa: ‘id.’. Thus framing the whole noun phrase with -d enclitic at end appears to be optional, but probably preferable, considering following examples.

In the construction with postposition o-a: ‘of o’ following de:du:, ‘which/who of o’ the enclitic is phrase-final: de: ‘uwa:dAw qu’xsheh ‘which one of them (non-human) shall I kill?’, du: ‘uwa:du:nh sAshehL ‘whom of them did he kill?’ (Marie 8/20/96), du: lAXa:d ‘who/which one of you pl.?’. We have several attestations of de: itself or as o of postposition in phrases with ya: ‘thing’, the enclitic -d being phrase-final in each: de: ya:dA’Aw ‘what (thing) is that?’, dik’ dAdu:lah ya’da: dA’Le:G ‘it’s nobody’s fault’ (‘it’s not a thing which is about anyone’), de:wa:ya: Lu:ndiyahstahdA ‘what good is a mouse-skin?’, de:wa:ya:dA’Aw ‘what’s that good for?’, de:wa:ya:dA ‘why?’ (‘thing/material as potential for what?’); note also da:ch’a:hd ya:dA’Aw ‘where’s that thing from?’

The interrogative dAX-k’-d ‘how many?’ is relatively limited or specialized, but is most frequent of course in noun phrases, where the enclitic is regularly phrase-final: dAXk’iXa dAXaw: iXa ‘how many dogs do you have?’, with classified nouns and noun-class particle: dAXk’ lAXa: la’mahdd iXa ‘how many berries do you have?’,
dAXk’lAXa: shuglAXa’lAwchi:d ’iXa’ ‘how ever many gig strawberries do you have?!’
(Lena 6/13/71), dAXk’ da: shdu:lihGd da’li:LXah ‘how many tables do you have?’,
dAXk’ a:na:d tAGL da’li:LXah ‘how many hammers do you have?’ (where enclitic is
on noun-class particle instead of phrase-final). Relative use is quite common:
dAXk’n’u:duhnu: ‘how many (people) are they?’, also ‘quite a few people’, but dAXk’n’u:
’i’e’hdGAyu:d ‘your quite a few wives’, dAXk’n’u: Lila:’GAyu:d ‘quite a number of
men’, dAXk’ a:na:d ‘some months’ (elliptic, l-class noun), as o of o-Xa’ with
specialized meaning as o of postposition: dik’ ’u:la’xLga:G dAXk’iXa’d q’e ’anh
qu’xdah ‘I don’t know what time (at what hour o’clock) I’ll come back home’, and with
specialized postposition o-da’X ‘o times’: dAXk’da’Xd ‘how many times?; quite a few
times’, as shown above.

Most interestingly, we have 3 instances clearly including a verb phrase subordinated
to postposition o-da:X, the most general subordinator, written as a separate word by
convention and translated ’and’: dAtli: dAXk’ ’u:ch’ ’uleh GAIA Ga’ya:L da:Xduhnu:
‘already a number of years were passing for her there and’, k’e:yu: q’e’ k’uGAdAle:L
da:XdAw ‘all sorts of more things were happening and’, de:ga’ AwXa’ wA X ’i:t’eh
da:XdunhAw ’Aw ’a’q’e: ‘quite a while he had been living with it (giant rat) and (then)
he attempted it (escape)’. These non-exceptions may literally prove the rule that the
interrogative enclitic ’-d can be noun-phrase final, where it is usual or preferred, and can
not be verb-phrase-final, as here too the phrase to which the -d is attached is only a noun
phrase, where a verb phrase is nominalized as o of subordinating postposition. Further
examples of this were not tested. To indulge in speculation, presumable du:
sAsinhLlehduddhu: niX ‘because someone died they’re weeping’ might well be
acceptable (along of course with e.g. presumable du:d sAsinhLlehdq’uhnu: niX or
conceivable ?du: sAsinhLlehdq’uhnu: niX ‘id.’).

The possibility of interrogative with enclitic -d after verb-phrase was tested only late
and desultorily – possibly also earlier, but without record. With Sophie 1987 we have
*du: sAh’ehLdunh ‘whom did he marry?’, adjudged “goofy”, but a day or so later, along
with the normal du:dunh sAh’ehL ‘whom did he marry?’, du: sAh’ehLdunh ‘id.’ is
accepted, possibly from fatigue. From Marie 8/3/96 we have du:chi:d wAX qa’leh ‘who
on earth will do that?’, with *duchi: wAX qa’lehdAw ‘id.’ definitely rejected. From this
much it appears that du: V-d as an interrogative is not acceptable as such, but that
Sophie’s partial acceptance of du: sAh’eLdunh may not have been entirely due to fatigue;
it may be rather that as a relativized nominal phrase ‘she whom he married’ it might
indeed be acceptable.

Once, late with Marie, a double interrogative was tested, *du:d du:d sAshehL ‘who
killed whom?’ and rejected, though possibly in another situation, or with another
speaker, or with personal enclitic, e.g. ??du:duh du:d sAshehL, or with another gloss, e.g.
‘who killed someone?’, such could conceivably be accepted. More important, but never
tested, was the distinction ‘who killed a bear?’ and ‘whom did a bear kill?’; Simple du:d
lixah sAshehL would most likely be read ‘who killed a bear?’, and *?!lixah du:d sAshehL
would almost certainly be rejected rather than accepted for ‘whom did a bear kill?’; The
latter meaning could certainly be specified e.g. by du:dunh(,) lixah ’anh sAshehL, but it
remains uncertain whether a second reading of basic minimal du:d lixah sashehL could
be ‘whom did a bear kill?’; Cf. the ambiguity, tested and confirmed, of ’anh lixah
sAsheLinh dAXunh ‘the person who killed a bear; the person whom a bear killed’. Here
the principle is evidently that where a process, in this case relativization, displaces an
argument of the basic SOV structure, ambiguity results.

Copular -A-; -sh-d- ‘I wonder’

Copular -A- with -d enclitic is common: de:da’Aw ‘what is it/that?’, de:da’Al ‘what
is this?’, du:da’a’ah ‘who is he/that?’, du:da’a’i: ‘who are you sg.?’, du:da’ai: ‘who’s
there?’, du:yu:da’a’ahnu: ‘who are they?’, de:siyahda’Aw ‘what’s that nasty (thing)?’,
du:siyahda’an ‘who’s that nasty (person)’, de: ‘Ana:shahda’Aw ‘what (species) is that
flower?’, du: Lila:’da’a’ah ‘what man is that?’. This use can apparently be extended e.g.
to du:da’a’ah ’a:nd sAtehL ‘who is he (who) is lying here?’, actually preferred to du:dunh
’a:nd sAtehL ‘who is lying here?’ by Marie 8/3/96, presumably by momentary lapse.

The combination of interrogative enclitics, -sh-d-, in that order, ‘I wonder’, is
commonly attested with interrogatives: de:shdA’Aw ‘I wonder what it is, what could it
who he is’, k’e:shdunh sAliL ‘I wonder what he did, what could have happened to him?’,
da:shdunh ‘I wonder where he …’. See further chapter on enclitics -d, -sh, -q’.

de:ga’d:Xd ‘when?’; k’e’wAXd ‘why?’

A further derived interrogative of special interest is de:ga’d:Xd ‘when?’ (at any
time, past, present, or future). This is certainly derived from de:ga’-d- ‘like what?, what
kind of?, to what extent?, how much?, quite an amount of’, i.e. de: as o of ‘o’-ga’ ‘like o’.
Identification of -da:X is a bit problematical: presumably da:3, o-da:-X, uses 2d.-f. and
3., as vague meaning of postposition or subordinator, extended to concept of time e.g. in
ne:tl’-da:X ‘at first’, qi’-ya:-da:X ‘sometime(s)’. It is strange, however, that a we have a
postpositional phrase the o of which is itself a postpositional phrase, de:ga’. For the
semantics, cf. however also de:ga’- Awxa’ wAX ‘i:t’eh da:XdunhAw … ‘he had been
living with it for quite some time and/when he …’ above. Dictionary examples for
de:ga’d:Xd are only with customary, e.g. de:ga’d:Xd te’ya’ Xi:ya:k’ ‘when do you eat
fish?’, but from Marie 8/20/96 de:ga’d:Xdaw ’a:nda’ sahL ‘when did you come here?’,
de:ga’d:Xdaw ’a:nda’ q’e’ qu’yidah ‘when will you come back here?’. This form is of
course also attested, in the relative use, usually or probably by chance always with da-
‘just any time we felt like it’; also in negatives, in the sense ‘not at any time, never’:
Marie 8/20/96 dik’ dAde:ga’d:Xd te’ya’ XahGinh ‘he never (at no time) eats fish’, dik’
dAde:ga’d:Xd ’a:nda’ q’e’ ’AsdahL.Ginh ‘he never came back here’, dik’
dAde:ga’d:Xd ’a:nda’ qe’ qu’xda:g ‘I’ll never come back here’.

Another derived interrogative of somewhat problematical structure is k’e:’wAXd
‘why?’ . This is obviously composed of k’e:-d ‘how?’ and (’)wAX ‘thus, so, that way’ (cf.
(’)lAX ‘this way’, ’Aw ‘that’, ’Al ‘this’, dAX- ‘how’, o-X ‘by means of o’), in which it
may be surprising that the potential glottal initial appears as such, unless the form is most
definitely one word at the phonological level. (Even in such cases, after long vowel,
appearance of ‘ is not quite certain, cf. de:lAwda’Aw ‘what’s that big thing?’ , if not
mistranscribed, from Anna above, where de:-’Aw ‘what big’ is certainly in one word; cf.
da: wAX 'i:t’eh ‘we dwell’ never [da:’wAX].) Evidently the compounding took place after the very late reduction *’AwAX > (’)wAX took place. This is a third way of saying ‘why?’ Cf. de:lehdunh wAX sAliL ‘why (because of what) did he do that?’; de:wah(d)dunh wAX sAliL ‘why (for what purpose) did he do that?’; here k’e:wAXduh wAX yileh ‘why are you doing that?’, k’e:’wAXchi:duh wAX yileh ‘why on earth are you doing that?’; k’e:’wAXshdunhnu: wAX ‘i:t’eh ‘I wonder why they’re that way’. The k’e:’wAXchi:d further proves, now at the morphological level, that-’wAX is in the same word with k’e:-, not just the same noun-phrase. Obviously this unique compounding is the result of the movement and incorporation of (’)wAX from the verb-phrase into the interrogative.

tla: ‘where?’

Finally, there is one other interrogative, marginal to the system, tla: qi’ and tla:X ‘where?’ sometimes rhetoric or skeptical. For one thing, tl- initials are quite rare; -a: could be an expanded augment, cf. da:3; qi’ is ‘place where’, and -X is probably o-X ‘in non-punctual contact with o’ and locational and postposition final ‘movement within area’. This differs distinctly from other interrogatives in lacking -d enclitic: e.g. tla:Xuhnu:, tla:X ʼahnu ‘where are they?’, tla:XA’i: ‘where are you?’ (so both without and with copular -A-), tla:X sini:k’lAw ‘where’s my big nose?’ (answer to insulting epithet), tla:X dAXunh ‘where is a person?’ (no people present). In tla:Xchi:d sita:’ ‘where on earth is my father?’, and Anna (late Raven text, 6/71) tla:Xchi:d ʼila:X ‘where are your (missing) eyes?’, tla:X is treated as fully regular interrogative, both with -chi:- and, probably because of that, also -d enclitic.