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According to Morgan (1991), the three demonstratives in Kutenai have the following meanings:

na 'this' (obviative nas)
÷in 'that' (obviative ÷is)
qu? 'yon' (obviative qu?s)

(In the majority of cases in my texts, EG spells qu? as just qu; I follow her spelling in examples below and I generally use this spelling in the text. EG similarly spells the obviative form qu?s; again I follow her spelling.) There is also a relatively infrequent variant form of ÷in, namely ÷inu (obviative ÷inu?s). As discussed below, it appears to be used only as a demonstrative pronoun.

The frequency in my texts of the proximate and obviative forms of the three demonstratives, and of ÷inu, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Proximate</th>
<th>Obviative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>÷in</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qu?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>÷inu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to tell from texts how accurately Morgan's glosses 'that' and 'yon' capture the meaning difference between ÷in and qu?, whether ÷in is supposed to mean 'that near you' or whether it is supposed to be a location intermediate between na and qu?. There are certainly instances in the texts of ÷in referring to things apparently not near the hearer, and apparently at what is probably not intermediate among the things visible to the speaker:

÷in qana+ yuxa-÷unis-nam-ni ÷in ÷a-kwiçqyu+i?it that there top-travel-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC that mountain.top 'when people were travelling over that mountain top ... '

We can distinguish the following four uses of demonstratives in Kutenai:
(i) combining with nouns (adnominal)
(ii) combining with relative clauses to form referring expressions (like noun phrases but with no noun)
(iii) as demonstrative pronouns functioning as grammatical arguments of the verb
(iv) as demonstrative pronouns functioning grammatically as non-arguments of the verb.

Use (iv) is much more frequent than the other three uses. As discussed below, there are many examples whose proper analysis is ambiguous: it is not clear whether they are instances of use (ii) or as instances of use (iv), where the demonstrative is inside the relative clause.

The first two uses of demonstratives above are also syntactic environments in which the definite article ni? occurs. In my texts, there are 344 instances of the proximate form of ni?, and 794 instances of its obviative form ni?s. ni? is sometimes translated as 'that'; it is not clear what governs the choice between ni? and anaphoric uses of ?in. Examples of adnominal uses of the definite article:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{\#axax-am-ni} \quad \text{ni? } ?\text{a-ku?nuk} \\
&\text{arrive-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC the lake} \quad \text{they arrived at the lake}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{taxa-s } n=\text{ik-ni} \quad \text{skinku? ni?-s } ?\text{a-ku?ak-s} \\
&\text{then-OBV INDIC=eat-INDIC coyote the-OBV meat-OBV} \quad \text{then Coyote ate the meat}
\end{align*}\]

Note that it is also not uncommon for definite noun phrases to consist of only a noun, as illustrated by skinku? ‘coyote’ in the preceding example, though in this example, the absence of an article is connected with the fact that the noun is being used like a proper noun. Of the 56 instances in my texts of the common noun ti?cax ‘man’, the frequency of occurrence with or without the definite article in the Kutenai coinciding with definiteness and number in the English translations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ni?(s)</th>
<th>no article</th>
<th>demonstrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definite, singular</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite, plural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite, singular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite, plural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite, predicative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These numbers also show that the definite article tends to be used with singular referents and tends not to be used with plural referents.

**Adnominal Demonstratives**

The following are examples with demonstratives used adnominally:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{throw.out-IMPER.SG} & \quad \text{that cat} \quad \text{\textquoteleft throw that cat out\textquoteright} \\
\text{INDIC=eat-INDIC} & \quad \text{that-OBV dish-OBV} \quad \text{\textquoteleft a cat ate out of that dish.\textquoteright} \\
\text{1SUBJ FUT} & \quad \text{that bird} \quad \text{\textquoteleft you will all shoot at that bird\textquoteright} \\
\text{INDIC=get.rusty-INDIC} & \quad \text{this knife} \quad \text{\textquoteleft this knife got rusty\textquoteright}
\end{align*}\]

Despite the fact that the obviative forms nas ‘this’ and qus (qu?s) ‘that (more distant) are the two most frequent demonstrative forms in the texts, there is not one clear instance of either of them occurring adnominally with a concrete noun, though there are instances with locational nouns (see below). There are also only four instances of the obviative form ?is, and even some of these are subject to an alternative analysis, as discussed below. (The example above with ?is is not from a text.) It is not clear what the significance of this rarity of adnominal obviative forms of demonstratives is. It may be because the pragmatics associated with demonstratives is more naturally associated with the pragmatics associated with proximates rather than opposed.

Even modifying a noun, a demonstrative can have locative meaning:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{no EVID SUBORD=be this person} & \quad \text{this Kutenai} \quad \text{\textquoteleft no, but he was a Kootenay from here.\textquoteright} \\
\text{(literally: \textquoteleft no, he was a person from here, a Kutenai from here\textquoteright)}
\end{align*}\]
It is even possible for a demonstrative to modify a personal pronoun, again with locative meaning:

\[ n = aqa^-ni \quad ?a-ki\tilde{c}qa-nik' = \tilde{c} \quad ?a-kanuxu-nik' = \tilde{c} \]
INDIC=exist-INDIC Elmo-person=and Tobacco.Plains-person=and
\[ \text{tax} \ [\text{na kamna+a}] \]
then this 1PL.
‘there were people from Elmo and Tobacco Plains people and us from St. Mary’s’

The following also has a demonstrative plus a personal pronoun; the proper analysis is not clear, but it seems to mean something like ‘there is none here, at our place’.

\[ \#u^-ni \quad na-s \quad kamna+a^-?is \]
not.exist-INDIC this-OBV 1PL-OBV.NONSUBJ
‘there is none around here’

The following example contains a referring expression which appears to contain two demonstratives modifying a noun, one with adnominal demonstrative meaning, the other (following the noun) with locative meaning:

\[ \text{taxa-s} \ [\text{na } \tilde{c}maknik' \text{ na }] \quad \text{at=k} \quad \text{\tilde{c}inam taxa-s} \]
then-OBV this person this HABIT-SUBORD go then-OBV
\[ \text{at} \quad \text{\#ukat-i} \]
HABIT take-INDIC
‘now when these people from here go there they collect them.’

**Demonstratives plus relative clauses**

The second use of demonstratives is in combination with relative clauses to form referring expressions (what are generally called “noun phrases”, though this is not really an appropriate term, since it implies the presence of a noun, which is absent in this use). Since this construction parallels a similar one with the definite article plus a relative clause, let me first illustrate the definite article in this use:

\[ \text{\#ukat-i} \quad [\text{ni^-s } \text{k=a+xu}] \quad \text{xa^-?\#in} \]
take-INDIC the-OBV SUBORD=carry dog
‘Dog took what she carried’
then-OBV the SUBORD=fat go and go across-INDIC
‘then the fat one went across’

he was very upset because of what ?akis had done’

‘then who was the person that got bit on the face by a grizzly bear?’

‘he was there with the one who did the cooking’

The following are examples with demonstrative plus headless relative clause:

‘that thing you’re carrying water in is leaking’

‘now today there’s no way anyone could make something like that’

‘what he brought is a yarrow plant.’

‘this cream I skimmed off is thick’
qapsin ki= ?in [ ?in k= in ha= xu]
what SUBORD= be that SUBORD= 2SUBJ carry
‘what is that you are packing?’

The following is formally similar, though in this case the combination
of subordinative proclitic, preverb qaqañ a ? t ‘instantly’ and verb
kqaç ‘travel’, literally ‘that which travels instantly’, has apparently
been lexicalized to mean ‘car’.

n=˚it' qa?- ni ˚ k a m- ni t i k i qu- s
INDIC= fill- INDIC child- PLUR that- OBV
k= qaqañ a ? t - k a ç - s
SUBORD= instantly- travel- OBV. SUBJ
‘that car is full of children’

Note that a relative clause can function as a referring expression
without a demonstrative or definite article:

?at yunaqa? - ni k= a+ qa'ti ˚ awiyan+ - s
HABIT many- INDIC SUBORD= pick huckleberry- OBV
‘there were many who picked huckleberries’
(literally: ‘those who pick huckleberries were many’)

qaki? - ni kaxax taxa- s xma k= in hama? t- ki t
say- INDIC turtle then- OBV HYPOTH SUBORD= 2SUBJ give- BENEF
[ k= in huqa- mu- t ]
SUBORD= 2SUBJ defeat- INSTR- PASSIVE
‘Turtle said you ought to give him what he won off you now’
(literally: ‘Turtle said that you ought to give him what you were
defeated over’)

Examples with a demonstrative combining with a headless relative
clause, with an oblique (something that is not a subject or object)
relativized (a subcase of use #2), using the proclitic ya= and the suffix
-ki:

su?k- ni [ ?in hin ya= qa t ˚ itkin-k i]
good- INDIC that 2SUBJ REL.OBL= thus do- REL.OBL
‘it is good what you did’

˚ uçi?- ni [ ?in hin ya= qaki? - ki]
not. important- INDIC that 2SUBJ REL.OBL= say- REL.OBL
‘what you said made no difference to them’
Note that these oblique relative clauses can occur without a demonstrative or definite article, and appear to do so more commonly than relative clauses that are simply subordinative in form:

\[ \text{huyas, hu } \text{ } \phi xa+ \phi xa-ni } \text{ [ya=q}a+ ?itkin-ki} \text{ well } \text{ ISUBJ FUT say-INDIC REL.OBL=thus } \text{ do-REL.OBL} \text{ ka-kin ni?-s pik˚ak-s} \text{ wolf the-OBV long.ago-OBV 'well now I will tell you what Wolf did long ago'} \]

\[ \text{ma qaky-am-ni } \text{ [hin=ç ya=q}a+ PAST say-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC 2SUBJ=and REL.OBL=thus } \text{ ?itkin-ki#-ki} \text{ do-2PL-REL.OBL 'it was stated what you were to do'} \]

\[ \text{taxa-s } k[i]k[i]# ya=qana+ ?upi#-i-s-ki } \text{ then-OBV SUBORD=search REL.OBL=there kill-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBL-REL.OBL \text{ ni?-s a-qant# a-nam-is the-OBV teepee?-UNSPEC.POSS-OBV 'then he went where all the occupants of a tepee were killed to search'} \]

\[ \text{Examples with a demonstrative combining with a "headed" "internally-headed" relative clause (a further subcase of use #2):} \]

\[ \text{[?in ma ki?=k}qaç pa+k]i[y] n=]\text{u+ani that PAST SUBORD=travel woman INDIC=be.one.who.did 'that woman that went around brought this on'} \]

\[ \text{[?in ma=k qak+atiq}nu quxuna] \text{ that PAST-SUBORD crawl.around ant m=}\text{u n=}\text{in-i PAST-1SUBJ INDIC=be-INDIC 'that ant that was crawling around was me'} \]

Again, one finds similar examples with the definite article rather than a demonstrative:

\[ \text{ka?-s ki?=in } \text{ [ni? ki?=kup ka=aqatwum#a}t]\text{? WH-OBV SUBORD=be the SUBORD=pink 1POSS=dress 'where is my pink dress?' } \]
(literally: ‘where is the ‘my dress is pink’?’)

taxa-s ?at n=anq˚ukup-ma+s-i [ni?-s then-OBV HABIT INDIC=fire-COMIT-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC the-OBV ma k=a+ju ni?-s ?akuk+anq˚ukup-s] PAST SUBORD=carry the-OBV spark-OBV ‘the fire is started with the sparks they packed along’

Demonstrative Pronouns as Arguments of the Verb

Examples of use #3, where the demonstrative pronoun is functioning as a grammatical argument of the verb. In the following example, ?is appears to be functioning as object:

taxa-s ?i-s k=qawxa+ yuwixu=c then-OBV that-OBV SUBORD=there flatten.with.body=and ‘then he would flatten it with his body and’

In the next example, na is clearly functioning as the object of the verb:

hu qakiki+s i+ ?ina+ ?ikiki+s-ni na 1SUBJ there DUR go.and search-INDIC this ‘that’s why I went in search of this one’

In the following two examples, the obviative form nas is functioning as subject:

na-s çxa+ ?in-s-i ?a+knusï+am+ this-OBV FUT be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC bald.eagle ‘these will be for Bald eagle’

na-s çxa+ ?in-s-i swa? this-OBV FUT be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC cougar ‘these will be cougar’s share’

na-s wa+kin+s-is-ni k=u this-OBV bring-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC SUBORD=1SUBJ çxa+ ?ik-na+ a?-is=c FUT eat-1PL-OBV.NONSUBJ=and ‘here somone brought us this to eat and’
naqan=ç upxa ni?-s ya=qakika-nikin-s-ki
whether=FUT know the-OBV REL.OBL=come-??-OBV.SUBJ-REL.OBL
na-s a-quna=wuk-s
this-OBV branch-OBV
'[I wonder] if he'll know which parts these branches are from'

However, these five examples are the only clear examples of a demonstrative pronoun functioning as a grammatical argument of the verb in all of my texts, out of over 450 uses of the demonstratives other than ñinu. The following example appears to be a sixth example, but is anomalous in that the Kutenai verb qakiʔni means 'say' and thus doesn't match the English translation (and does not appear to make sense in the context). I suspect that this is either a slip of the tongue, or a transcription error (and that this is a real example of a demonstrative pronoun functioning as argument of the verb):

tax na hin=ç qakiʔ-ni
then this 2SUBJ=FUT say-INDIC
'do these things'

The rarity of demonstrative pronouns other than ñinu as grammatical arguments of the verb is probably due to the fact that grammatical arguments of the verb are normally expressed by pronominal morphemes in the verbal complex, although there are no overt morpheme for proximate third persons. If something is not a grammatical argument of the verb, even if it is semantically an argument, there is apparently a need to express this somehow, and demonstrative pronouns are used for this purpose.

**Demonstrative Pronouns as Nonarguments**

Demonstratives can also be used in contexts in which English would use a demonstrative adverb 'here, there'. I will assume here that this is apparently simply a reflection of the general fact that any appropriate noun phrase can serve as an expression of a location. This use is much more common than the preceding one, and is in fact by far the most frequent use of demonstratives in Kutenai. They occur in nonargument roles other than location, but the vast majority do involve location.

?in qawis qa-n
that stand-IMPERRG
'stand there!'
The following are examples in which a demonstrative pronoun represent something that is semantically an argument of the verb, but it is neither the subject nor the object of the verb:

\[ \text{that-OBV SUBORD-2SUBJ do.something.to} \]

\[ \text{is that what you did to him?} \]

\[ \text{then that also 2SUBJ-FUT do.to-2OBJ-2PL-INDIC} \]

\[ \text{then that's also what I will do to you} \]

\[ \text{that-OBV FUT be.that.big-OBV.SUBJ the-OBV moccasin-OBV} \]

\[ \text{that's the size she'll make the moccasin'} \]

\[ \text{(literally: 'the moccasin will be big to the extent THAT')} \]

Similarly, the verb qaki 'say' is grammatically intransitive and the thing said is not grammatically an argument of the verb:
that-OBV=and SUBORD=2SUBJ-DUR say-OBV.NONSUBJ
'[she was really wishing] that you would say that”'

The following is similar, with the same verb qaki ‘say’, except that ?in is apparently in apposition to the headless relative clause following the verb, since in the English translation, the ‘that’ is modifying ‘story’:

\[
\text{?in ma=k=in qaki ni? k=u haqa+p+ni}
\]

that PAST-SUBORD=2SUBJ say the SUBORD=1SUBJ tell.story

\[
i? k=sqapni+\text{a?in}
\]

the SUBORD=turn.into.tree??

‘you mentioned that story I told about someone turning into a tree.

In the following example, the demonstrative is representing a secondary object of a derived ditransitive verb:

\[
taxa-s ?in tax pa+=s+
\]

then-OBV that then EVID-DUR

\[
?up-i+=mu-nam-nam-ni
die-TRANS-INSTR-RECIPE-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC
\]

‘he was what that killing was over’

In this example, the verb ?up ‘die’ is transitivized to mean ‘kill’ and is then turned into a ditransitive verb to mean ‘to kill because of’, using the instrumental applicative construction, which adds a secondary object representing the instrument or (as in this example) the nonagentive cause.

In the following example, the demonstrative is representing the amount:

\[
na-s si+ qa\cdot qask\cdot a?q-ni ni?-s ma=k
\]

this-OBV DUR cut.off.so.much-INDIC the-OBV PAST-SUBORD

\[
wa+ik+\text{a\cdot ku}+ak-s
\]

ask.for-REFL meat-OBV

‘he only cut off this much of the meat that he had asked for.’

It is not clear in the following example whether the demonstrative pronoun nas is representing the subject of the verb, or the amount, but it appear to be the latter:
In the following example, the demonstrative appears to be expressing manner 'in that way':

\[ ?i\text{in } ?a\text{t } n=\text{u}\# q\text{ana}\#\text{unis-nam-ni} \]

that HABIT INDIC=finish travel-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC

'they say people used to travel that way'

There are various examples involving the copula verb where it is not always clear whether a demonstrative pronoun is functioning as the subject or as the complement of the copula. For example, the following looks at first sight as an example where the demonstrative is functioning as an argument of the verb:

\[ ?i\text{-s }= \# n=\text{in-s-i } h\text{uki-?i}\# \]

that-OBV=and INDIC=be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC flea-3POSS

'that is his flea'

It is not clear, however, which of the two nominal expressions in this example is the subject and which is the complement of the copula verb 'be'. The same applies to the following example:

\[ q\text{apsin } k\text{i=} ?i\text{in } q\text{u} \]

what SUBORD=be that

'what is that?'

In the following example, the demonstrative is clearly the complement of the copula and not the subject, since the subject is shown as second person:

\[ t\text{ax } ?i\text{in } k=\text{in=\# } \# a ?i\text{in} \]

then that SUBORD-2SUBJ-IRREAL again be

'may that be you from now on'

(literally: 'may you be that again')

Despite the English translation, the demonstrative in the following example seems to be the complement of the copula, since it is not marked obviative and the copula is inflected as having an obviative subject, and \( k\text{inuqs}\#a \text{t}\text{inamu?i}\#s \) 'the pig's fat' is obviative (since nouns with third person possessors are always obviative), so it must be the subject.
In the following example, it is not clear whether ?is is functioning as subject or as the complement of qaqapsi 'be that way'; the English translation suggests that it is the complement:

taxa-s ?i-s qaqp-s-i
then-OBV that-OBV be.that.way-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC
'then that's how it was'

?inu

The form ?inu, as noted above, is a form of ?in that only occurs as a demonstrative pronoun. Unlike the other demonstratives, it freely occurs as the grammatical argument of the verb, and in fact the majority of my examples are such:

?inu ma?‡ quqakin-ki‡
that PROHIB do.something.to-IMPER,2PL
‘don’t do anything to her’

?i-s qaka-‡ yuwaka-kis-qatqinu-ni ?inu
that-OBV come=PRVB come.to.top-DUAL-?-INDIC that
‘the two came climbing up that way’

‡in=s ‡atkiki‡ ?anaxam-ni ?inu
must-DUR DUR? hunt-INDIC that
‘those people must have been hunting’

n=’in-i swin-nis ?inu
INDIC=be-INDIC daughter-2SG.POSS that
‘that one is your daughter.’

In the following example, ?inu does not denote a syntactic argument of the verb:

hin n=uw-saga ?inu...
2SUBJ INDIC=finish-be.there that
‘whenever you get done staying there ...’
Its obviative form ?inu’s does not occur in my text data, but is illustrated in the following example. Note that this example also illustrates its use for a nonargument; from its obviative form, we can tell that it corresponds to the ‘there’ in the English (rather than the object ‘it’ which has no overt realization and would be proximate):

?inu?-s qawxakin-in!
that-OBV put.there-IMPER,2SG
‘put it there!’

Demonstratives with Proper Names Denoting Places

?in and qu can be used with proper names from English denoting places:

çxas k=in ?upxa ?in yaqakxanmitu-ki
?? SUBORD-2SUBJ know that REL.OBL=??-REL.OBL
?in hi-i Columbia River
that PTCL
‘do you know where the Columbia River is at?’

The following examples show the same, but with Kutenai place names:

?in k-xun-aq˚aku+?hu+ ?in qawxi+ xun-ax-i pa+kiy
that SUBORD-water-border must there water-go-INDIC woman
‘they say that a woman went down to the river at New-Gate’

?at xunama-nam-ni qu ?a-qnisa+ HABIT go.down.towards.water-UNSPEC.SBJ-INDIC that Flathead
‘the trail goes over and down to the Flathead country’

taxa-s sawuka=ø k=qaki pa+ k=qawxa+
then-OBV Sawuka=and SUBORD=say EVID SUBORD=there
˚axa-s sisikli qu-s kanuq+unmituk-s
arrive-OBV.SBJ Jesus.Christ that-OBV White.River-OBV
‘then Sawuka said that Jesus Christ arrived at White River’

qu-s kamanguku+s ?at ˚in qakika+vu?-ni
that-OBV Sandpoint-OBV HABIT must bring.on.horseback??-INDIC
‘they would bring the stuff on pack horses from Sandpoint’

In a similar fashion, the proximal demonstrative na ‘this’ combines with place names with the meaning ‘here in X’:
there further old. times that way there
be. there- UNSPEC. SUBJ- INDIC = and this Eureka??
‘even further back people occupied them places and here in Eureka’

I believe that the proper analysis of these examples is that the demonstrative is functioning adverially, meaning ‘there’ or ‘here’ and that the name of the place is in apposition to it. In this respect, they are similar to examples like the following, in which a common noun is apparently in apposition to a demonstrative pronoun functioning locatively:

‘they got there, to the coast’

Adnominal Demonstratives or Nouns in Apposition to Demonstrative Pronouns denoting Locations?

As noted above, there are four instances in my texts of obviative demonstratives in apparently adnominal function with nouns. However, the preceding section points to a possible alternative analysis for at least some of these examples, according to which the demonstrative is actually a pronoun functioning as a locative, with the noun in apposition to it.

In the following sentence, for example, there is nothing in the English translation that corresponds to the demonstrative ïis:

‘there were two streams of blood gushing from his finger’

It is hard to interpret the demonstrative here as adnominal, with either deictic or anaphoric meaning: the finger is neither in the preceding text nor in the discourse context: a translation “there were two streams of blood gushing from that finger of his”. However, the location could be implicit in the discourse context. To see this, consider the English translation of the text preceding this example is:
‘Then he heard the shot. As he got through he heard the shot. He couldn’t tell where the sound came from. Then as he stood there, it seemed like he’d just come back to his senses. He heard this sound like pisssh. Then he looked around. There were two streams of blood gushing from his finger.’

The immediately preceding sentence has him looking around, looking for the cause or source of the sound. The implication seems to be that in his looking around, he saw the streams of blood coming from his finger, suggesting a translation ‘There were two streams of blood gushing there, from his finger’. In this example, the demonstrative is apparently functioning locatively, with ‘his finger’ in apposition.

The following example is not translated with a demonstrative. While the preceding text does not explicitly mention the river, it does employ a verb meaning ‘go to water’, so the demonstrative in this example could be interpreted as an adnominal demonstrative.

\[
\text{skaqu+ni suyapi ?i-s } \text{?a-kinmituk-s} \\
go. by. boat- INDIC white. person that- OBV river- OBV}
\]
‘they were rowing down the river’

Again, however, it could equally well be interpreted as functioning as a demonstrative pronoun functioning locatively, with the noun in apposition, as ‘they were rowing down there, on the river’.

The next example could probably be translated either with an adnominal demonstrative as shown, or with a pronoun ‘then they arrived there, at the same place, Akaquwak’.

\[
\text{xa-s } \text{pæ wax-i } \text{?i-s } \text{?ukunamun-s} \\
\text{then- OBV EVID come- INDIC that- OBV same. thing- OBV}
\]
\[
\text{?a-kaquwuk-s} \\
\text{Akaquwuk- OBV}
\]
‘then they arrived at that same place, Akaquwuk’

The next example is glossed ‘that hill’ by the native speaker, but there is no mention of a hill in the preceding context (and the hill doesn’t seem to be present in the context), so this sounds a bit odd in the English:

\[
\text{qana+ hućingaç } \text{?i-s } \text{?a-kućyuminna-s} \\
\text{there walk. up. hill } \text{that- OBV mountain. side- OBV}
\]
‘they would go up that hill’
However, the previous context is about a village and people going out hunting, so the general location is implicit, so that perhaps an alternative translation would have been ‘they would go up there, the hill’. But an even more natural English translation would be ‘they would go up the hill there’, where in this English sentence, we have a demonstrative adverb used anaphorically modifying a noun. Kutenai, like many languages, lacks a distinct construction in which a locative adverb can modify a noun, though since the words that correspond to locative adverbs in English belong to the same set of forms that occur adnominally, it is possible that adnominal uses of the demonstrative in Kutenai cover the range of both adnominal ‘that’ and adnominal ‘there’ in English.

**Demonstrative plus locative noun**

?i in combines with the noun ?a·qå a‘inside’ to mean ‘in there’:

\[
\text{tamuxu-}ni \ ?i \ ?a·qå a
\]
dark-INDIC that inside
‘it is dark in there’

or with the noun ?umi? ‘down, bottom’ to mean ‘down there’:

\[
saxu?mik \ ?a·kiç+a?i\text{ni} \ ?i-s \ ?umi?-s
\]
lie tree that-OBV down-OBV
‘a tree (or log) is lying down there’

Similarly qu combines with the noun liyni‘across’ to mean ‘across there’:

\[
qu \ ?i\text{y}ni \ k=s\text{a}qa \ kwistå+a?å\text{am}
\]
that across subord=be.there seven.heads
‘across there where the one with the seven Heads are’

\[
n-awiçakati?-ni \ \text{qapsi} \ ?u-s \ ?i\text{y}ni-s
\]
INDIC=appear.to.be.there-INDIC thing that-OBV across-OBV
\[
?a·kinmituk-s
\]
river-OBV
‘there appears to be something across the river’

or with the noun yunu ‘on top’ to mean ‘way up there’:

qu-s yunu-s pa† qu-s †ati†
that-OBV on.top-OBV EVID that-OBV ??
qakawi†i†i†nukuna-s-i miqqaqas-s
?? chickadee-OBV
‘way up there, Chick-a-dee was smiling down’

or with the noun na?ta ‘high up, top’ to mean ‘up there to the top’:

†a qaawxa† huqinaqqa-‡i qu-s na?ta-s
back there walk.upwards-INDIC that-OBV high.up-OBV
‘they climbed back up to the top’

or with the noun yawu ‘below, deep under’ to mean ‘deep under there’:

taxa-s ?at=‡ qaqaquna-‡i qu-s yawu-s
then-OBV HABIT-FUT crawl.inside??-INDIC that-OBV below-OBV
‘then he will crawl inside’

Similarly, na combines with the noun qaqaq ‘nearby, near’ to mean ‘near here’:

n=‡in-i na qaqaq
INDIC=be-INDIC this near
‘it is not far from here.’

Demonstratives with possessed nouns

The demonstrative can co-occur with a possessor:

taxa-s hu=s‡ mat-i ?in qaqaqun-‡nis
now-OBV 1SUBJ-DUR dispose.of-INDIC that teeth-2SG.POSS
‘now I have gotten rid of your teeth’

The following may be a second example, though it’s not clear if na is modifying the noun; it does not correspond in any obvious way to anything in the English translation:

taxa-s=‡ aki qaqaqsa-‡i na
then-OBV=and also FUT be.that.many-INDIC this
?a‡=ka=qaqaq‡ ka=u=‡ stick‡-is
PLUR=1POSS=child SUBORD=1SUBJ=FUT bet-2OBJ
‘then that’s how many of my children I will bet you’
Note that the definite article can also occur with a demonstrative, as illustrated by the first occurrence of niʔs in the following example:

\[
\text{arrive-INDIC the-OBV house-3POSS-OBV the-OBV nupik’ā-OBV}
\]

'he got to the house of the nupikā'

The following is similar, but with the possessor expressed only by the possessive suffix on the noun:

\[
\text{back go-INDIC the-OBV town-3POSS}
\]

'he went back to his town'

It is not clear, however, whether the demonstrative in the following example is modifying ka=akit+a ‘my house’ or whether it is functioning adverbially; in the absence of a reason to think that it means ‘that house’, the more likely analysis is the second, meaning ‘go over there, to my house’, with the possessed noun in apposition to the demonstrative, analogous to examples cited above of nouns in apposition to demonstrative pronouns functioning locatively.

\[
\text{go-IMPER.SG that 1POSS=house=and}
\]

'go over to my house [that house of mine] and ...'

OR 'go over there, to my house, and ...'

The same applies to the following:

\[
\text{you will take his food to his room}
\]

The following is similar, except that the accompanying noun literally denotes a person rather than a place, though it is interpreted as the place of that person. I suspect the demonstrative here makes clear the locative meaning:
"next morning he would wake up and be back at his son-in-law’s house and"

These examples are no different from examples like the following in which there is a nonpossessed noun apparently in apposition to a demonstrative pronoun functioning locatively:

xunaxam-is-ni qu-s ?aqasuk-s
go.towards.water-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC that-OBV ocean-OBV
‘they got there to the coast’

**Demonstrative plus taxa**

There is a noun **taxa** which is amongst the most frequent words in Kutenai narrative texts, typically occurring at the beginning of sentences in its obviation form **taxas** when it is most naturally glossed ‘then’ (though this doesn’t adequately capture its full range of uses). But it also occurs in a construction with demonstratives where its meaning is not entirely clear:

qu taxa Walla Walla, Vancouver ...
that then
‘over there in Walla Walla and Vancouver …’

napit hin qa qa+ ?itkin-ki+ ?in taxa
if 2SUBJ NEG in.that.way do-2PL that then??
‘If you do not do that’

has k=in ?upxa ?in tax ?aki
PTCL SUBORD-2SUBJ know that then also
‘do you know anything about it?’

na taxa
this then
‘nowadays’
Ambiguous cases

Many examples are in principle syntactically ambiguous between whether the demonstrative should be considered outside the relative clause, combining with the relative clause to form a referring expression, or inside the relative clause. The following example illustrates this ambiguity:

\[
\text{\textit{\texttt{\$it\textasciitilde{\kappa}am-s-i}}} \quad \text{\textit{\texttt{\[\text{\texttt{\$i-s \quad ya=qaki?-ki}\]}}}}
\]
\[
\text{not.important-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC \quad that-OBV \ REL.OBL=say-RELOBL}
\]
\[\text{\textquoteleft what he said is of no importance\textquoteright}\]

On the first interpretation, \textit{\texttt{\$i-s \quad ya=qaki?ki}} 'he said', and is not a pronoun but a determiner combining with the clause to form a referring expression, analogous to an adnominal use of the demonstrative except that it is combining with a clause rather than with a noun. On the second interpretation, \textit{\texttt{\$i-s}} is a demonstrative pronoun inside the relative clause, functioning as the semantic argument of the verb so that the clause means 'he said that'. The position of the demonstrative is consistent with both analyses: demonstratives in referring expressions always appear first in the referring expression, and demonstrative pronouns often appear early in clauses. The following is a simple clause (one not involving a relative clause) in which the demonstrative must be inside the clause and corresponds to the first interpretation above:

\[
\text{\textit{\texttt{\$i-s \quad k=in \quad qakin}}}
\]
\[
\text{that-OBV \ SUBORD-2SUBJ \ do.something.to}
\]
\[\text{\textquoteleft is that what you did to him?\textquoteright}
\]
\[\text{\textquoteleft literally: \textquoteleft did you do that to him?\textquoteright\textquoteright}\]

Conversely, the following is an example in which the demonstrative apparently must be outside the clause, since there is a separate noun in subject position:

\[
\text{\textit{\texttt{\[\text{\texttt{\$in \ ma \ ki?=k\textasciitilde{\iota}a \ p\textasciitilde{\iota}kiy}\] \ n=\texttt{\$u\textasciitilde{\iota}ani}}}}}
\]
\[
\text{that \ PAST \ SUBORD=travel \ woman \ INDIC=be.one.who.did}
\]
\[\text{\textquoteleft that woman that went around brought this on\textquoteright}\]

In the following example, the demonstrative is clearly inside the relative clause, because there is a definite article in the determiner position, and the definite article does not co-occur with a demonstrative:
The definite article is one way to express the equivalent of a temporal clause, nominalizing a clause to yield a referring expression denoting a time. The demonstrative in this example must therefore be denoting the location inside the relative clause, to which the final referring expression naʔa-kwuk+iʔit 'this mountain' is in apposition.

In the following example, the gloss suggests that the demonstrative is inside the relative clause, though it could still be outside the clause:

\[?an\-yaxa\-n \ [\textit{\text{ʔin \ hakqa\?-ki}}]\]
\textit{out-fetch-IMPER.SG that lie-RELOBL}

'go out and bring in what's out there'

The normal rules of obviation, however, would require that \textit{ʔin} be obviative if it were inside the relative clause, since it is distinct from the subject of \textit{hakqa?} 'lie'.

The demonstrative in the following example is most plausibly interpreted as outside the relative clause, since \textit{ʔin} does not normally occur as a demonstrative pronoun in argument position:

\[n=\textit{\text{ʔin-s-i \ quqa\-qatuna-s}} \ [\textit{\text{i-s}}]\]
\textit{INDIC=be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC yarrow.plant-OBV that-OBV}

\[k=\textit{wa\-kin}\]
\textit{SUBORD=bring}

'what he brought is a yarrow plant.'

Both examples cited above as examples illustrating a demonstratives combining with a "headed" "internally-headed" relative clause (a relative clause containing a noun or noun phrase in the position relativized) might be seen as ambiguous as to whether the demonstrative really is combining with the clause or is inside the clause. The translator's gloss seems to assume that the demonstrative is outside the clause:

\[\textit{ʔin \ ma \ ki?=kqa\# \ pa\-kiy} \ n=\textit{\text{u\-ani}}\]
\textit{that PAST SUBORD=travel woman INDIC=be.one.who.did}

'that woman that went around brought this on'

(literally 'that 'the woman went around' brought this on')

(or, literally ' 'the woman went around there' brought this on')
that ant that was crawling around was me'  
(literally 'I was that 'the ant was crawling around')  
(or, literally 'I was 'the ant was crawling around there')

However, the second reading is not possible with either of these sentences, because that reading would require that the demonstrative be obviative. The fact that it is proximate entails that it is referring to the subject of these relative clauses; if it were referring to a location, then the requirement that two proximates within the same clause be coreferential would be violated.

The following are examples with qu in which the demonstrative cannot be inside the relative clause, since if it were, it would have to be obviative, since it would not be coreferential with the subject:

\[
\text{pa }\text{?} \text{k} \text{= qa }\text{? in-s }\text{?u-pqa?-s} \\
\text{EVID SUBORD-NEG be-OBV.SUBJ deer-OBV} \\
\text{[qu? sawi\$nuqs-ki]} \\
\text{that stand.in.water-REL.OBL} \\
\text{‘it was not a deer standing in the water’} \\
\text{(literally: ‘that ‘it was standing in water’ was not a deer’)}
\]

\[
\text{qa }\text{? in-i wuqt'i} \text{[qu? k='akaxam\$]} \\
\text{NEG be-INDIC fisher that SUBORD=come.out} \\
\text{‘that is not Fisher who came out’} \\
\text{(literally: ‘that ‘it came out there’ is not Fisher)}
\]

\[
\text{qa }\text{?u+a-ni} \text{ xaxas [qu? k=ak\$uxuna?tit[??]]} \\
\text{NEG be.one.who.does.it-INDIC skunk that SUBORD=??} \\
\text{‘it is not Skunk who makes the noise’} \\
\text{(literally: ‘that ‘it makes noise’ is not skunk’)}
\]

\[
\text{pa }\text{n= in-i} \text{[qu k=qa-ki\$ qapinma\$-akqa]} \\
\text{EVID INDIC=be-INDIC that SUBORD=at.there all.day.long.lie} \\
\text{‘it was that one who laid in the cow bed all day’}
\]

(The English gloss of the preceding example is ambiguous between a cleft reading ('he was the one who laid in the cow bed all day') and a
relative clause reading (‘the one who laid in the cow bed all day’); it is clear in the context that it is the latter reading which is intended.)

The following example could be interpreted either way:

\[\text{pa\# ?at qa haq\#wu-k\#-am-nam-ni} \]
EVID HABIT NEG carry.meat-BENEF-RECIP-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC
\[\text{[qu taxa hak\#u-nam-ki]} \]
that TAXA have.house-UNSPEC.SUBJ-REL.OBL
‘the people of that town don’t carry meat for one another’
(literally: ‘those ‘they have houses’ don’t carry meat for one another’)
(or, literally: ‘they have houses there’ don’t carry meat for one another’)

In this example, the proximate form of the demonstrative argues against the second interpretation (according to which it is inside the relative clause); however, the verb here is inflected for an unspecified subject, and in texts, proximate forms not coreferential with an unspecified subject are not uncommon.

When the relative clause denotes the location at which the event took place, the most common interpretation of the oblique relative construction \(\text{ya=...-ki} \), the two analyses have more similar meaning. The demonstrative is obviative in these examples, but that is consistent with either interpretation, since these clauses are denoting the location, and there is a noun phrase other than the location which is proximate, so that the location would be obviative. These could all be analysed as having the demonstrative inside the relative clause, since in all these cases, there is certainly an implicit location in the relative clause:

\[\text{[qu-s ?at hu} \]
that-OBV HABIT 1SUBJ
\[\text{ya=qaw\#xa-yaxa-k\#u-mi\#-ki]} \]
REL.OBL=there-fetch-water-OBV.NONSUBJ-REL.OBL
‘[Q: Where did you get it from?] A: Over there where I get water’
(literally: ‘I get water there’)
(literally: ‘that ‘where I get water’ ’)

\[\text{#axax-i [qu-s} \]
arrive-INDIC that-OBV
\[\text{ya=qaws\#aqw-um-is-ki]} \]
REL.OBL=be.there-UNSPEC.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ-REL.OBL the ant
‘that ant got to where they were at’
(literally: ‘the ant got to ‘they were there’)
(or, literally: ‘the ant got to that ‘where they were’)

\[\text{ni? \#uxuna} \]
the ant
‘that ant got to where they were at’
(literally: ‘the ant got to ‘they were there’)
(or, literally: ‘the ant got to that ‘where they were’)

\[\text{\#uxuna} \]
the ant
Actually, there is a third logically possible analysis of examples like the preceding, and that is that the demonstrative is not only outside the relative clause, but also outside the referring expression, that it is simply a demonstrative pronoun in the main clause, being used adverbial to denote the location of the action of the main verb and that the relative clause is a referring expression in apposition to it, so that a literal translation would be something like "he was preaching there, 'where people are spoken with' ".

The following example is similar, except that the initial demonstrative is proximate, even though the location denoted by the relative clause is apparently in apposition with the second occurrence of qu, which is marked obviative; I assume that this is strictly speaking an error:

[qu m=u ya=aki+ ?iknuquku-ki] qu-s +in that PAST=1SUBJ REL.OBL=there smoke-REL.OBL that-OBV must sak qa?-ni be.there-INDIC 'it must be where I had a smoke' (literally: 'it must be there, 'I had a smoke there' ') (or, literally: 'it must be there, that 'where I had a smoke' ')

The following is an example where the instrumental secondary object with an instrumental applicative verb is relativized, and the meaning is the same, whether the demonstrative is interpreted as the secondary object inside the relative clause or as a demonstrative outside the relative clause:

+a+?? ?ik-ni ?i-s k=itkin-mu ?a-ki-s ?? eat-INDIC the-OBV SUBORD=make-INSTR arrow-OBV 'he was eating that stuff he was making his arrows out of' (literally: 'he was eating 'he made arrows with that') (or, literally: 'he was eating that 'he made arrows with it')
The following example involves a demonstrative plus headless relative clause functioning as a location within another demonstrative plus relative clause. We might interpret both demonstratives as being inside the relative clause, with the embedded relative clause in apposition to the demonstrative in the main clause:

\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{qu } & \text{ at } y\text{a}=qaw\text{a}+ \text{ a } \text{ manq}a+\text{-am-ki} \\
\text{that } \text{HABIT REL.OBL=there } \text{back go.across-UNSPEC.SBJ-REL.OBL} \\
[\text{qu } & \text{ t}a\text{x}a-\text{s } \text{q}i\text{n}a+ \text{ w}a\text{tax-am}] \\
\text{that } \text{then-OBV go.and } \text{cross.mountain-UNSPEC.SBJ} \\
\text{where the road crosses the old trail that goes into Alberta,} \\
\text{(literally } \text{the road crosses there, one crosses the mountains there)}
\end{align*}
\]

Normal rules of obviation would predict that qu ought to be obviative under either analysis; however, the verbs here have unspecified subjects and, as noted, we often fail to get obviative forms in such contexts.

This sort of ambiguity doesn't really arise as often with the proximal demonstrative. The following example does not mean 'the cream that I skimmed off here', partly because of the meaning, but partly because na is proximate, because it is coreferential with tinamu and it would have to be obviative to mean 'here'. There are enough examples of demonstratives inexplicably lacking obviative marking, so that the grammatical evidence should not be considered conclusive.

\[
\begin{align*}
p\text{ati?-ni } [n\text{a } & k=\text{u } y\text{u}k\text{i}y\text{k}ak\text{u } t\text{inamu} \\
\text{thick-INDIC this SUBORD-1SUBJ sk}i\text{m.off?? } \text{cream} \\
\text{this cream I skimmed off is thick}
\end{align*}
\]

The same appears to be true for the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
[n\text{a } & k=\text{u } h\text{aq}a+\text{pa+ni}] \\
\text{this SUBORD-1SUBJ tell.story} \\
\text{the story I just told} \\
\text{(literally: this 'I told story')} \\
\text{(or, literally: 'I told-story this')} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[n\text{a } & h\text{u } q\text{xa+ y}a-=qanax-a+\text{a?-ki}] \\
\text{this 1SUBJ FUT REL.OBL=go.along-1PL.SBJ-REL.OBL FUT} \\
\text{saq}an\text{-ni } t\text{inamu} \\
\text{hang-INDIC fat} \\
\text{there where we are going, lard will be hanging} \\
\text{(literally: 'this where we are going, lard will be hanging')}
\end{align*}
\]
the following, though, the demonstrative na is inexplicably not marked obviative:

Although na ‘this’ is not translated in the following example, it apparently is outside the relative clause, because the speaker is referring to a pile of animals next to him that he has killed, so the meaning of ‘this’ fits, but he did not kill the animals in that place, so ‘here’ doesn’t fit. Its lack of obviative marking also implies this interpretation, though there are enough examples of na inexplicably lacking obviative marking that the grammatical evidence alone should not be considered conclusive:

The following examples, however, are ones where the absence of obviative marking on na suggests that it is outside the relative clause, but the translation (with ‘here’) suggests that it belongs inside the relative clause.
[na k=cxa₇ qanam] ₊in quçaki₇
this SUBORD=FUT go.there must somewhere
ya=kxa-ma-nam-is-ni=c
meet-??-UNSPEC.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC=and
‘the one that goes from here must meet up with it somewhere’
(interpretation suggested by translation: ‘it must meet up somewhere
with the ‘it will go from here’ ’)
(interpretation suggested by proximate form of na: ‘it must meet up
somewhere with this ‘it will go from there’ ’)

[na k=caki₇ haqa] n=˚upi₇-ni
this SUBORD=there be.at INDIC=kill-INDIC
‘it was the one from here who killed him’
(interpretation suggested by translation: ‘ ‘he is from here’ killed him’)
(interpretation suggested by proximate form of na: ‘this ‘he is from
there’ killed him’)

Because the following has a first person subject, the proximate form of
na is consistent with the use of ‘here’ in the translation:

[na hu kçaф-ki]
here 1SUBJ travel-REL.OBL
‘my travelling here’

However, the following example is more ambiguous. Note that
the phrase introduced by na following the verb is apparently in
apposition to the na at the beginning of the sentence:

na xma hu ₊a qanax-i [na hu
this HYPOTH 1SUBJ back go-INDIC this 1SUBJ
ya=qakax-a₊aʔ-ki]
REL.OBL=come-IPL-REL.OBL
‘and I should go back the same way we came through’
(literally: ‘I should go back here ‘where we came’ ’)
(literally: ‘I should go back here this ‘where we came’ ’)

The following also allows a third reading, where the
demonstrative is not only outside the relative clause but does not form a
constituent with the relative clause, but the relative clause is in
apposition:
‘there were no game trails the way I came.’
(literally: ‘the game have no trails where I came by here’)
(or, literally: ‘the game have no trails on this ‘where I came’ ’)
(or, literally: ‘the game have no trails here, where I came by’)

In the following, the demonstrative is outside the relative clause:

‘you will give him this letter I wrote’
(literally: you will give him this ‘I wrote it’)

To sum up, there are many cases in which a demonstrative could
either be interpreted locatively inside the relative clause or as a
determiner outside the relative clause. In so far as there are arguments
supporting one or the other of these two analyses, these arguments
generally prefer the analysis where the demonstrative is outside the
relative clause. In cases where the semantics seems to prefer a locative
interpretation, the above discussion assumes that this is an argument that
the demonstrative is inside the relative clause. But there are two
problems with this argument. First, apart from these examples where
the demonstrative seems to have locative meaning, referring expressions
denoting specific entities generally occur with a definite article or a
demonstrative. Second, as noted above, there are a few instances of
adnominal demonstratives or demonstratives with pronouns appear to be
have locative meaning, analogous to the ‘there’ in English ‘the man
there’, rather than nonlocative demonstrative meaning, as in English
‘that man’. This suggests that even the examples with locative meaning
could be analysed as having the demonstrative outside the relative
clause, despite the fact that semantically, they would be denoting the
location inside the relative clause. For example, in the following
example, the translation ‘leaving from here’ suggests that the
demonstrative is inside the relative clause, denoting the location of the
leaving. A translation ‘these ones leaving would ...’ does not seem
appropriate. However, my suggestion is that the demonstrative could be
outside the relative clause, but still give the meaning in question:
An odd consequence of this analysis, however, is that relative clauses would be different from normal clauses in that it would not be normal for them to occur at the beginning of relative clauses.

Demonstrative preverbs

In addition to the demonstrative words described above, there are a number of preverbs that can be described as having demonstrative meaning, especially locative demonstrative meaning. For example the preverb qa-ki+ often translates as 'there':

qa-ki+ qapinma+ ak qa-?ni
there all.day.long-lie-INDIC
'he lay there the whole day'

It is not uncommon for the meaning 'there' to be expressed both by a demonstrative pronoun and by a preverb:

?in qa-ki+ ?ik-in
that there eat-IMPER.2SG
'eat there'

Examples like the preceding can be considered instances of a more general phenomenon whereby the preverb co-occurs with a noun phrase denoting a location:

qa-ki+ ?ik-ni ka=a-kit+a?-mi+
there eat-INDIC IPOSS=house-OBV
'he ate at my house.'

The function of the preverb in these examples seems to be that of making explicit the fact that the noun phrase denotes a location, rather than bearing some other semantic relation in the verb. The preceding example, for example, could in principle mean 'he ate my house' if the preverb were not present. But it is also common for the preverb to be the sole expression of location:
that is where I first saw the big gun (i.e. the cannon)’
(literally: ‘I first saw the big gun there’)

‘the meeting was held there and’

Note furthermore that the preverb does not specifically mean
‘there’ as opposed to ‘here’ and and can occur with a proximal
demonstrative pronoun functioning locatively to mean ‘here’:

‘it was here where he fell into the river’

The preverb $qa\cdot ki\cdot$ is only one of a number of preverbs that can
be glossed ‘there’. $qa\cdot ki\cdot$ indicates position at a location, while
$qawxa\cdot$ indicates motion towards a location:

‘she picked up her bed pad, threw it there’

‘she went inside the tepee ’

In addition to $qa\cdot ki\cdot$ and $qawxa\cdot$, there are a number of other
preverbs which appear to meaning something like ‘there’ although their
precise meaning and the differences in meaning among them and $qa\cdot ki\cdot$
and $qawxa\cdot$ are unclear.

Although the closest translation for English for these preverbs
may be something like ‘there’, I think that it is probably a mistake to
view them as demonstrative in meaning. In English – and many
languages – demonstrative adverbs cover the range of meanings that for
arguments is covered by both third person pronouns and demonstrative
pronouns. While demonstrative pronouns often have anaphoric
meaning, the meaning of so-called demonstrative adverbs appears to be
more akin to that of third person pronouns, or in fact perhaps even
more akin to that of third person pronominal affixes on verbs. While
third person is not indicated in the verbal complex in Kutenai, except
for obviative third persons and unspecified subjects, the affect of preverbs seems to be that of establishing that the clause contains a location, something akin to the way in which applicative affixes establish the presence in the clause of some element that is not semantically an argument of the verb. Thus, just as an appropriate English translation for a transitive verb like *wu-kati* 'see' without any overt expression of the arguments is something like 'he/she/they saw him/her/it/them', so too the appropriate expression of *qa-ki*+ wukati is something like 'he/she/they saw it there', where the fact that the location is expressed by 'there' in the English translation is because English expresses anaphoric locations by 'there'. If we were to translate *wu-kati* as ' __ saw __', then we could translate *qa-ki*+ wukati as ' __ saw __ at location __', so that the meaning of *qa-ki*+ here is not 'there' but 'at location'. If we view the meaning of these preverbs this way, then this would explain why it is not uncommon for one of these preverbs to co-occur with a demonstrative pronoun meaning 'there': the preverb means 'at location __' and the demonstrative pronoun fills in what the location is.