

Notes on Demonstratives in Kutenai

Matthew S. Dryer

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

na 'this' (obviative nas)
ʔin 'that' (obviative ʔis)
quʔ 'yon' (obviative quʔs)

(In the majority of cases in my texts, EG spells quʔ 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 quʔs; again I follow her spelling.) There is also a relatively infrequent variant form of ʔin, namely ʔinu (obviative ʔinuʔs). 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 ʔinu, are as follows:

na	'this'	125	nas	'this, obviative'	128
ʔin	'that'	41	ʔis	'that, obviative'	71
quʔ	'yon'	46	quʔs	'yon, obviative'	153
ʔinu	'that'	8	ʔinuʔs	'that, obviative'	0

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

ʔin qanaʔ yuxa-ʔunis-nam-ni ʔin ʔa·kwiʔq̣yuʔiʔit
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 *niʔ* occurs. In my texts, there are 344 instances of the proximate form of *niʔ*, and 794 instances of its obviative form *niʔs*. *niʔ* is sometimes translated as ‘that’; it is not clear what governs the choice between *niʔ* and anaphoric uses of *ʔin*. Examples of adnominal uses of the definite article:

ʔaxax-am-ni niʔ ʔa-kuq̄nuk
 arrive-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC the lake
 ‘they arrived at the lake’

taxa-s n=ʔik-ni skinkuʔ niʔ-s ʔa-kuʔak-s
 then-OBV INDIC=eat-INDIC coyote the-OBV meat-OBV
 ‘then Coyote ate the meat’

Note that it is also not uncommon for definite noun phrases to consist of only a noun, as illustrated by *skinkuʔ* ‘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 *titqatʔ* ‘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:

	<i>niʔ(s)</i>	no article	demonstrative
definite, singular	18	2	1
definite, plural	2	9	0
indefinite, singular	1	9	0
indefinite, plural	1	2	0
indefinite, predicative	0	12	0

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:

?anmit-in ?in pus
 throw.out-IMPER.SG that cat
 ‘throw that cat out’

n²uqukiya# ?ik-ni pus ?i-s ?a#u?-s
 INDIC=out.of eat-INDIC cat that-OBV dish-OBV
 ‘a cat ate out of that dish.’

hin #xa# mitxa-ki#-ni qu tu#q#qamna
 1SUBJ FUT shoot-2PL-INDIC that bird
 ‘you will all shoot at that bird’

n²itmak²#uq-ni na ?a-k#ama#
 INDIC=get.rusty-INDIC this knife
 ‘this knife got rusty’

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:

waha pa# ki=?in [na ?a-q#maknik²] [na ktunaxa]
 no EVID SUBORD=be this person this Kutenai
 ‘no, but he was a Kootenay from here.’
 (literally: ‘no, he was a person from here, a Kutenai from here’)

It is even possible for a demonstrative to modify a personal pronoun, again with locative meaning:

n=aqaʔ-ni ʔa·kiɕqa-nikʷ=ɕ ʔa·kanuxu-nikʷ=ɕ
 INDIC=exist-INDIC Elmo-person=and Tobacco.Plains-person=and
 tax [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’.

#uʔ-ni na-s kamna#a-ʔis
 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:

taxa-s [na ʔaq#ɕmaknikʷ na] ʔat=k ɕinam taxa-s
 then-OBV this person this HABIT=SUBORD go then-OBV
 ʔat ɕukat-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:

ɕukat-i [niʔ-s k=a#xu] xaʔ#ɕin
 take-INDIC the-OBV SUBORD=carry dog
 ‘Dog took what she carried’

taxa-s [niʔ kiʔ-sik] ɕinaʔ ʔaʔqanax-i
 then-OBV the SUBORD=fat go.and go.across-INDIC
 ‘then the fat one went across’

san-mu-ni [niʔ-s=ɕ kʰaqaqnap-s ʔakis]
 upset-INSTR-INDIC the-OBV=and SUBORD=do-OBV.SUBJ ʔakis
 ‘he was very upset because of what ʔakis had done’

tax qaʔa kiʔ=in [niʔ kʰitʰxn-aps kʰawʔa-s
 then who SUBORD=be the SUBORD=bite-INVERSE grizzly-OBV
 ʔa·kaqʔni-ʔis]
 face-3POSS
 ‘then who was the person that got bit on the face by a grizzly bear?’

qawsaqap-maʔ-ni [niʔ-s ʔat kʰiʔtkin-s
 be.there-COMIT-INDIC the-OBV HABIT SUBORD=make-OBV.SUBJ
 kʰik-ʔ-is]
 SUBORD=eat-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ
 ‘he was there with the one who did the cooking’

The following are examples with demonstrative plus headless relative clause:

naqʔaʔaʔk-ni [ʔin k=in haʔkuʔ-mu]
 leak-INDIC that SUBORD=2SUBJ carry.water-INSTR
 ‘that thing you’re carrying water in is leaking’

taxa-s na-s taxa-s qa ʔin-s-i
 then-OBV this-OBV then-OBV NEG be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC
 xma=k taʔ ʔitkin-iʔ [ʔin k=qaqa]
 HYPOTH=SUBORD able make-PASSIVE that SUBORD=be.that.way
 ‘now today there’s no way anyone could make something like that’

nʰin-s-i ɕuɕaɕqatuna-s [ʔi-s
 INDIC=be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC yarrow.plant-OBV that-OBV
 k=waʔkin]
 SUBORD=bring
 ‘what he brought is a yarrow plant.’

patʰiʔ-ni [na k=u yukiyaʔku ʔinamu]
 thick-INDIC this SUBORD=1SUBJ skim.off?? cream
 ‘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 qaqana?# ‘instantly’ and verb kqa# ‘travel’, literally ‘that which travels instantly’, has apparently been lexicalized to mean ‘car’.

n=i't'qa?-ni #kam-ni'ntik qu-s
 INDIC=fill-INDIC child-PLUR that-OBV
 k=qaqana?#-kqa#-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#q'at'i #awiya#-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#
 say-INDIC turtle then-OBV HYPOTH SUBORD=2SUBJ give-BENEF
 [k=in huqa-mu-#]
 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=qat' ?itkin-ki]
 good-INDIC that 2SUBJ REL.OBL=thus do-REL.OBL
 ‘it is good what you did’

#u#i?-ni [?in hin ya=qaki?-ki]
 not.important-INDIC that 2SUBJ REL.OBL=say-REL.OBL
 ‘what you said made no difference to them’

ʔitk'am-s-i [ʔi-s ya=qakiʔ-ki]
 not.important-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC that-OBV REL.OBL=say-REL.OBL
 'what he said is of no importance'

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:

huyas, hu ɕxaʔ ɕxa-ni [ya=qaʔ ʔitkin-ki
 well 1SUBJ FUT say-INDIC REL.OBL=thus do-REL.OBL
 ka·kin niʔ-s pik'ak-s]
 wolf the-OBV long.ago-OBV
 'well now I will tell you what Wolf did long ago'

ma qaky-am-ni [hin=ɕ ya=qaʔ
 PAST say-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC 2SUBJ=and REL.OBL=thus
 ʔitkin-kiʔ-ki]
 do-2PL-REL.OBL
 'it was stated what you were to do'

taxa-s k=iɕkiʔ ya=qanaʔ ʔupiʔ-ʔ-is-ki
 then-OBV SUBORD=search REL.OBL=there kill-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ-REL.OBL
 niʔ-s ʔa·qantʔa-nam-is
 the-OBV teepee?-UNSPEC.POSS-OBV
 'then he went where all the occupants of a tepee were killed to search'

Examples with a demonstrative combining with a “headed” “internally-headed” relative clause (a further subcase of use #2):

[ʔin ma kiʔ=kqaɕ paʔkiy] n'uʔani
 that PAST SUBORD=travel woman INDIC=be.one.who.did
 'that woman that went around brought this on'

[ʔin ma=k qakʔatiqnu ɕuxuna]
 that PAST=SUBORD crawl.around ant
 m=u n'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:

kaʔ-s kiʔ=in [niʔ kiʔ=kup ka=aqatwumʔaʔt] ?
 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#xu 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# yuwi#xu=#
 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 qaki# si# q'ina# ?i#ki#-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 #xa# ?in-s-i ?a:knuq#u#am'
 this-OBV FUT be-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC bald.eagle
 ‘these will be for Bald eagle’

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

na-s wa#kin-#-is-ni k=u
 this-OBV bring-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC SUBORD=1SUBJ
 #xa# ?ik-na#a?-is=#
 FUT eat-1PL-OBV.NONSUBJ=and
 ‘here someone brought us this to eat and’

naqan=¢ ?upxa ni?-s ya=qakika-nik'in-s-ki
 whether=FUT know the-OBV REL.OBL=come-??-OBV.SUBJ-REL.OBL
 na-s ?a-q'una?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 ?inu. The following example appears to be a sixth example, but is anomalous in that the Kutenai verb qaki?ni 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=¢ qaki?-ni
 then this 2SUBJ=FUT say-INDIC
 'do these things'

The rarity of demonstrative pronouns other than ?inu 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 qawisqa-n
 that stand-IMPER.SG
 'stand there!'

ʔin tax=sʔ qanama-nam-ni
 that then=DUR road-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC
 ‘there’s the road’

qu ɕxaʔ qaʔ waʔuqʔkukut-ni
 there FUT thus rain-INDIC
 ‘it will rain over there’

ɕi·kat-inʔ! qu-s n=in-i kuyuʔki
 look-IMPER.SG that-OBV INDIC=be-INDIC Kuyukwe
 ‘Look! There are the Kuyukwe’

wistʔaʔ-anqaʔ-ni ʔa·kiɕʔaʔin qu
 seven-stand.there-INDIC tree that
 ‘there are seven trees standing there.’

naqaʔ-ni nasuʔkin qu=ɕ n=aqaʔ-ni nasuʔkin na=ɕ
 exist-INDIC chief there=and exist=INDIC chief here=and
 ‘there was a chief for there and here’
 (literally: ‘a chief existed there and a chief existed here’)

na-s ʔa qakax-i
 this-OBV back come-INDIC
 ‘he came back here.’

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:

ʔi-s k=in qakin
 that-OBV SUBORD=2SUBJ do.something.to
 ‘is that what you did to him?’

tax ʔin ʔaki hu=ɕ qakn-is-kiʔ-ni
 then that also 2SUBJ=FUT do.to-2OBJ-2PL-INDIC
 ‘then that’s also what I will do to you’

ʔi-s ɕxaʔ qas-s-i niʔ-s ʔaʔ-s
 that-OBV FUT be.that.big-OBV.SUBJ the-OBV moccasin-OBV
 ‘that’s the size she’ll make the moccasin’
 (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:

ʔi-s=ɕ k=in=sɬ qakik-miɬ
 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 ʔin is apparently in apposition to the headless relative clause following the verb, since in the English translation, the ‘that’ is modifying ‘story’:

ʔin ma=k=in qaki niʔ k=u haqaɬpaɬni
 that PAST=SUBORD=2SUBJ say the SUBORD=1SUBJ tell.story
 niʔ k=sqapniɕʔaʔin
 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 ʔin tax paɬ=sɬ
 then-OBV that then EVID=DUR
 ʔup-iɬ-mu-nam-nam-ni
 die-TRANS-INSTR-RECIP-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC
 ‘he was what that killing was over’

In this example, the verb ʔup ‘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 siɬ qa·qaskʔaʔq-ni niʔ-s ma=k
 this-OBV DUR cut.off.so.much-INDIC the-OBV PAST=SUBORD
 waɬikɕ-ik ʔa·kuɬak-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:

na-s xma n=aqa# qu?qa-s
 this-OBV HYPOTH INDIC=in.that.way ??-OBV.SUBJ
 ‘she must have been around this tall. (gesturing)’

In the following example, the demonstrative appears to be expressing manner ‘in that way’:

?in ?at n=u# qana#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-s=¢ n’in-s-i huki-?is
 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 ?in ‘be’. The same applies to the following example:

qapsin ki=?in qu
 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:

tax ?in k=in=# #a ?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 kinuqsa#a tinamu?is ‘the pig’s fat’ is obviative (since nouns with third person possessors are always obviative), so it must be the subject.

n=in-s-i kinuqsa#a t'inamu-ʔis na
 INDIC=be=OBV.SUBJ-INDIC pig fat-3POSS this
 'this here is bacon grease'

In the following example, it is not clear whether ʔis is functioning as subject or as the complement of qaqapsi 'be that way'; the English translation suggests that it is the complement:

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

ʔinu

The form ʔinu, as noted above, is a form of ʔin 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:

ʔinu maʔ¢ quqakin-ki‡
 that PROHIB do.something.to-IMPER,2PL
 'don't do anything to her'

ʔi-s qaka-‡ yuwaka-kis-qatq̄nu-ni ʔinu
 that-OBV come=PRVB come.to.top-DUAL-??-INDIC that
 'the two came climbing up that way'

‡in=s ‡atkiki‡ ʔanaxam-ni ʔinu
 must-DUR DUR? hunt-INDIC that
 'those people must have been hunting'

n=in-i swin-nis ʔinu
 INDIC=be-INDIC daughter-2SG.POSS that
 'that one is your daughter.'

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

hin n=uw-saqa ʔinu...
 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:

ɕxas k=in ?upxa ?in ya=qakxanmitu--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-aq̄a#ka?hu# #in qawxa# 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.SUBJ-INDIC that Flathead
 ‘the trail goes over and down to the Flathead country’

taxa-s sawu#ka=ɕ k=qaki pa# k=qawxa#
 then-OBV Sawu#ka=and SUBORD=say EVID SUBORD=there
 #axa-s sisikli qu-s kanuq#unmituk-s
 arrive-OBV.SUBJ Jesus.Christ that-OBV White.River-OBV
 ‘then Sawu#ka said that Jesus Christ arrived at White River’

qu-s kamanquku#-s ?at #in qakika#xu?-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’:

qu ʔan pikʔak qaqaʔ qa·kiʔ
 there further old.times that.way there
 haqw-um-ni=ʔ na ʔa·knukʔiniʔis
 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 adverbially, 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:

xunaxam-is-ni qu-s ʔaʔasuk-s
 go.towards.water-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC that-OBV ocean-OBV
 ‘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 ʔis:

paʔ ʔikʔ-maʔa·-tinqap-s-i waʔmu-s ʔi-s
 EVID split-wound-??-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC blood-OBV that-OBV
 ʔa·kiʔqʔahiy-ʔis
 finger-3POSS
 ‘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.

skaquḥ-ni suyapi ?i-s ?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’.

xa-s paḥ wax-i ?i-s ?uk’unamu-s
 then-OBV EVID come-INDIC that-OBV same.thing-OBV
 ?a·k’aquwuk-s
 Akaquwuk-OBV
 ‘then they arrived at that same place, Akaquwak ’

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:

qanaḥ huḥinqaḥ ?i-s ?a·kuḍyuminna-s
 there walk.up.hill 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

?in combines with the noun ?a-q#a ‘inside’ to mean ‘in there’:

tamuxu-ni ?in ?a-q#a
 dark-INDIC that inside
 ‘it is dark in there’

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

saxu?mik ?a-ki?#a?in ?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 #iyni k=saqɑ kwist’a#a?#am
 that across subord=be.there seven.heads
 ‘across there where the one with the seven Heads are’

n-awi?akati?-ni qapsin qu-s #iyni-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 paʃ qu-s ʃatiʃ
 that-OBV on.top-OBV EVID that-OBV ??
 qakawiʃiʃ nukuna-s-i miʃ'qaqas-s
 ?? chickadee-OBV
 'way up there, Chick-a-dee was smiling down'

or with the noun naʔta 'high up, top' to mean 'up there to the top':

ʃa qawxaʃ huʃinqa-ʃ-i qu-s naʔta-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 ʔat=ʃ ʃaqanaʃnu-ni 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 ʔaqat'ak 'nearby, near' to mean 'near here':

n=ʔin-i na ʔaqat'ak
 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=sʃ mat-i ʔin ʔa-ʔunaʃ-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=ʃ ʔaki ʃxaʃ qsa-ni na
 then-OBV=and also FUT be.that.many-INDIC this
 ʔaʃ=ka=ʔaqat' k=u=ʃ stikʃ-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:

ʔaxax-i niʔs ʔa·kitʔa-ʔis-is niʔ-s nupik'a-s
 arrive-INDIC the-OBV house-3POSS-OBV the-OBV nupik'a-OBV
 'he got to the house of the nupik'a'

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

ʔa ɕ'inax-i niʔ-s ʔa·kikʔu-ʔis
 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=akitʔa* '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.

ɕ'ina-n ʔin ka=akitʔa=ɕ ...
 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:

hin ɕxaʔ ɕ'inaʔkin-miʔ-ni ki=ʔik qu-s
 2SUBJ FUT take-OBV.NONSUBJ-INDIC SUBORD=eat that-OBV
 ʔa·kitʔa-ʔis
 house-3POSS
 '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:

kanmiyit-s ?at qu-s ʔa qa·kiʔ haq̣maʔiʔ-ni qu-s
 morning-OBV HABIT that-OBV back there wake.up-INDIC that-OBV
 nawaspaʔ-ʔis=ʔ
 son.in.law-3POSS=and

‘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 ʔaqaʔasuk-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 tax Walla Walla, Vancouver ...
 that then
 ‘over there in Walla Walla and Vancouver ...’

napit hin qa qaʔ ʔitkin-kiʔ ʔin taxa
 if 2SUBJ NEG in.that.way do-2PL that then??
 ‘If you do not do that’

has k=in ʔupxa ʔin tax ʔaki
 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:

ʔitk'am-s-i [ʔi-s ya=qakiʔ-ki]
not.important-OBV.SUBJ-INDIC that-OBV REL.OBL=say-REL.OBL
'what he said is of no importance'

On the first interpretation, ʔis 'that-obv' is outside the relative clause yaqakiʔki '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, ʔis 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:

ʔi-s k=in qakin
that-OBV SUBORD=2SUBJ do.something.to
'is that what you did to him?'
(literally: 'did you do that to him?')

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:

[ʔin ma kiʔ=kqaɕ paʔkiy] n'uʔani
that PAST SUBORD=travel woman INDIC=be.one.who.did
'that woman that went around brought this on '

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:

[ʔin ma=k qakʔatiqnu ɕuxuna]
 that PAST=SUBORD crawl.around ant
 m=u n=ʔin-i
 PAST=1SUBJ INDIC=be-INDIC
 ‘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:

paʔ k=qa ʔin-s ɕupqaʔ-
 EVID SUBORD=NEG be-OBV.SUBJ deer-OBV
 [quʔ sawiɕnuqs-ki]
 that stand.in.water-REL.OBL
 ‘it was not a deer standing in the water’
 (literally: ‘that ‘it was standing in water’ was not a deer’)

qa ʔin-i wuqtʔi [quʔ k=ʔakaxamʔ]
 NEG be-INDIC fisher that SUBORD=come.out
 ‘that is not Fisher who came out’
 (literally: ‘that ‘it came out there’ is not Fisher)

qa ʔuʔa-ni xaxas [quʔ k=akʔuxunaʔtit[??]]
 NEG be.one.who.does.it-INDIC skunk that SUBORD=??
 ‘it is not Skunk who makes the noise’
 (literally: ‘that ‘it makes noise’ is not skunk’)

paʔ n=ʔin-i [qu k=qa-kiʔ ɕapinmaɕ-akqa]
 EVID INDIC=be-INDIC that SUBORD=at.there all.day.long-lie
 ‘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:

pa# ?at qa haq'wu-k#-am-nam-ni
 EVID HABIT NEG carry.meat-BENEF-RECIP-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDIC
 [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 *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:

[qu-s ?at hu
 that-OBV HABIT 1SUBJ
 ya=qawxa-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'')

#axax-i [qu-s
 arrive-INDIC that-OBV
 ya=qawsaqw-um-is-ki] ni? #uxuna
 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')

k=saki‡ qunaki‡-ka [qu-s ya=aki‡
 SUBORD=DUR lecture-UNSPEC.OBJ that-OBV REL.OBL=thus
 ‡xa-ma‡-‡-is-ki]
 speak-COMIT-PASSIVE-OBV.SUBJ-REL.OBL

‘he was preaching over at that church’

(literally: he was preaching at ‘people are spoken with there’)

(or (perhaps more likely), literally: he was preaching at that ‘where people are spoken with’)

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
 saƙqa?-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.k’i-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:

[qu ?at ya=qawxa# #a manqa#-am-ki
 that HABIT REL.OBL=there back go.across-UNSPEC.SUBJ-REL.OBL
 [qu taxa-s #ina# wa'tax-am]]
 that then-OBV go.and cross.mountain-UNSPEC.SUBJ
 'where the road crosses the old trail that goes into Alberta, '
 (literally 'the road crosses there, one crosses the mountains there')

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.

pa'ti?-ni [na k=u yukiykaku tinamu]
 thick-INDIC this SUBORD=1SUBJ skim.off?? cream
 'this cream I skimmed off is thick'

The same appears to be true for the following:

[na k=u haqa#pa#ni]
 this SUBORD=1SUBJ tell.story
 'the story I just told'
 (literally: this 'I told story')
 (or, literally: 'I told-story this')

[na hu #xa# ya.=qanax-a#a?-ki] #xa#
 this 1SUBJ FUT REL.OBL=go.along-1PL.SUBJ-REL.OBL FUT
 saqan-ni tinamu
 hang-INDIC fat
 'there where we are going, lard will be hanging'
 (literally: 'this where we are going, lard will be hanging')

tax [na ?aki hu=ɕ ya=qak-ʔ-is-ki=ɕ]
 then this also 1SUBJ=FUT REL.OBL=say-TRANS-2SG.OBJ-REL.OBL=and
 hin=ɕ qanikitɕiʔt-i
 2SUBJ=FUT believe-INDIC

‘now this here also what I am about to tell you, you better believe’

k=in qaʔwiy-miʔ kiʔ=ʔuʔ-s
 SUBORD=2SUBJ think-OBV.NONSUBJ SUBORD=not.exist-OBV.SUBJ
 k=iʔwa [na k=ʔaqahaqanqa·ɕ]
 SUBORD=kill.game this SUBORD=go.by??

‘you think that they, those who went by, killed nothing?’

(literally: ‘do you think that what these ones who went by killed doesn’t exist?’)

The same is true for the following, though, the demonstrative na is inexplicably not marked obviative:

?at qaky-am-ni k=aqa ?a·qɕmaknikʔ
 habit say-UNSPEC.SUBJ-INDEF SUBORD=exist person
 [na k=qɑ-ʔuʔk-qɑ]
 this SUBORD=thus-sound-STATIVE

‘they say there are people that speak this language’

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:

?a·ɕxa-nat-ap-kiʔ kaʔ-s
 ah say-TRANS-1SG.OBJ-IMPER.2PL what.OBL-OBV
 k=u=ʔ ?a·qakin [na k=u
 SUBORD=1SUBJ=IRREAL do.to this SUBORD=1SUBJ
 ?iʔwa]
 kill.game

‘tell me what to do with my game’

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=ɕxaɬ qanam] ɬin quqakiɬ
 this SUBORD=FUT go.there must somewhere
 ya·kxa-ma-nam-is-ni=ɕ
 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=qakiɬ haqa] n^ʔupiɬ-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 kqaɕ-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 ɬa qanax-i [na hu
 this HYPOTH 1SUBJ back go-INDIC this 1SUBJ
 ya=qakax-aɬaʔ-ki]
 REL.OBL=come-1PL-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:

ʔitmaʔ-ni ʔiyamu [na-s hu
 have.no.road-INDIC game this-OBV 1SUBJ
 ya=qaka-miʔ-ki]

REL.OBL-come-OBV.NONSUBJ-REL.OBL

‘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:

hin ʔxaʔ hamat-ikʔ-i [na-s k=u
 2SUBJ FUT give-BENEF-INDIC this-OBV SUBORD=1SUBJ
 ʔituqʔiʔqa-miʔ]

write-OBV.NONSUBJ

‘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:

[na-s ʔaki k=ɕ=ɕ'inax-am-is]
 this-OBV also SUBORD=FUT=leave-UNSPEC.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ
 k=ɕxaʔ qawxaʔ yakxax-am-is
 SUBORD=FUT there meet-UNSPEC.SUBJ-OBV.SUBJ
 'the ones leaving from here would join up with the other camps party'

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·kiʔ often translates as 'there':

qa·kiʔ q̣apinmaɕ-akqa-ʔni
 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:

ʔin qa·kiʔ ʔik-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·kiʔ ʔik-ni ka=a·kitʔaʔ-miʔ
 there eat-INDIC 1POSS=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:

xa-s hu qa·kiʔ wukat-i k=wiʔqa t'awu
 then-OBV 1SUBJ there see-INDIC SUBORD=big gun
 'that is where I first saw the big gun (i.e. the cannon)
 (literally: 'I first saw the big gun there')

qa·kiʔ hakq'yt-ni=ʔ
 there have.meeting-INDIC=and
 'the meeting was held there and'

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

na-s qa·kiʔ xunaqu-ni ʔa·kinmituk-s
 this-OBV there fall.into.water-INDIC river-OBV
 'it was here where he fell into the river'

The preverb qa·kiʔ is only one of a number of preverbs that can be glossed 'there'. qa·kiʔ indicates position at a location, while qawxaʔ indicates motion towards a location:

ʔukat-i ʔaxa-ʔis=ʔ qawxaʔ ʔit'na--mit-i
 take-INDIC bed.pad-3POSS=and there unroll-throw-INDIC
 'she picked up her bed pad, threw it there'

qawxaʔ tinaxam'-ni niʔ-s ʔa·kitʔa-nam-is
 there enter-INDIC the-OBV house-UNSPEC.POSS-OBV
 'she went inside the tepee'

In addition to qa·kiʔ and qawkaʔ, there are a number of other preverbs which appear to mean something like 'there' although their precise meaning and the differences in meaning among them and qa·kiʔ and qawkaʔ 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.