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1. Introduction

In this paper I examine some aspects of the syntax of two pairs of verbs in Fox: sanakesiwa ‘he is difficult’/sanakatwi ‘it is difficult’ and wećinowesiwa ‘he is easy’/wećinowatwi ‘it is easy’. The forms sanakesiwa and wećinowesiwa are Animate Intransitive (AI) verbs, requiring a subject of animate gender, while sanakatwi and wećinowatwi are Inanimate Intransitive (II). The construction in which the AI forms of ‘be difficult’ and ‘be easy’ appear is reminiscent of the English syntactic construction known as “tough movement”, in that the subject of the matrix verb is coreferential with an argument of the verb’s clausal complement.¹ The Fox construction, however, differs from English tough movement in two important ways: there is no gap in the lower clause, and the subject of the lower clause may undergo tough movement. (Although I do not believe a movement transformation is involved in the Fox construction, I will sometimes speak of an argument “undergoing tough movement” as shorthand for saying that this argument functions both as subject of the matrix verb and as an argument within the verb’s clausal complement.²) In Section 3 of the paper some related constructions are surveyed, including cases where tough movement seems to have access to the internal structure of complex verbs.

Examples of English tough movement are given below.

---

¹ A description of tough movement may be found in McCawley (1988:99–103). McCawley points out that only certain English predicates allow this construction (tough, hard, impossible, simple, a breeze, a bitch, ... , all allow tough movement, but not possible, unusual, ...).

² Instead of positing a movement transformation, I assume that the relationship between the two syntactic constructions in Fox may be captured by listing two separate but related lexical entries (cf. Bresnan 1982). The lexical entry for the counterpart to tough movement would require that the subject of ‘be difficult’ or ‘be easy’ be coreferential to an argument in a lower clause.
(1) a. It's difficult to make you angry.
   b. You are difficult to make θ$_1$ angry.

(2) a. It's easy to make you angry.
   b. You are easy to make θ$_1$ angry.

In both (1) and (2) tough movement has applied to the (b) sentences, but not to the (a) sentences. That is, in the (b) sentences the object of the lower clause appears to have been moved to be the subject of the higher predicate, leaving behind a gap which is understood as coreferential to the subject of the higher predicate. In the (a) sentences, on the other hand, the higher predicate takes an expletive subject.

2. A Fox Counterpart to Tough Movement

Turning now to Fox, let's begin by considering the II verb sanakatwi 'it is difficult'. The verb sanakatwi may be predicated either of a proposition, expressed by a clause, or of an entity, expressed by an NP or by pronominal inflection on the verb. If predicated of an entity, it describes that entity as being a difficult thing, as in the following textual examples.

(3) pe·hki·ke·h·ye·hapa sanakato·hapa nepo·weni
    really·and·l.conclude be.difficult 0/emph.pres death
    'Surely death is a very difficult thing.' W176

(4) nen-iwa·'pi ke·htena·meko ki·ša·koči-sanakateniwi išawiweni
    man=quot truly·emph extremely-be.difficult 0'/ii ceremony
    'As for the men, it's said, the ceremony is indeed extremely difficult . . .' AR40:236.24

Example (4) has a proximate third person topic (Dahlstrom 1993): nen-iwa 'man'. This makes the inanimate subject išawiweni 'ceremony' obviative, reflected in the inflectional morphology on the verb. The II stem sanakatwi is here suffixed with -(e)niwi for an inanimate obviative singular subject.

The verb sanakatwi may also be used with a clause as its argument, to assert that it is difficult for someone to do something. In the following example sanakatwi is inflected for an expletive inanimate subject.

3 Grammatical abbreviations include 1p = first person plural exclusive, 21 = first person plural inclusive, 3' = third person obviative, 0 = inanimate, 0' = inanimate obviative, 0p = inanimate plural, X = unspecified subject, obv = obviative, dim = diminutive, ii = independent indicative, aor = aorist conjunct, emph.pres. = emphatic present, part. = participle (used in relative clauses). The sources for textual citations are abbreviated as follows: AR40 = Michelson 1925; B72 = Michelson 1921; ošk = Kiyana 1912; W = Kiyana 1913. Examples without textual citation were provided by Adeline Wanatee, to whom I am extremely grateful.
Example (5) is taken from a long text about the culture hero Wisahkeha. In this rather metaphysical passage Wisahkeha is telling the other manitous about the world and the people he will create. In this world, time will go forward, not backward, so when the manitous bless a person, their blessing will take effect in the future. The sentence in (5) is Wisahkeha telling the manitous that in general, they will not be able to bless people retroactively.

2.1. A choice of constructions

In the use of 'be difficult' with a clausal complement, a choice of syntactic constructions is available. One option was illustrated in (5), where sanakatwi takes an expletive subject. The other option is to take an argument from the clausal complement of sanakatwi and make it the subject of 'be difficult'. The following examples illustrate the two options:

(6) sanakatwi wi’h=a’hkwe’heneki
be.difficult 0/ii fut=make.angry X-2/aor
'It’s difficult to make you angry.'

(7) kesanakesi wi’h=a’hkwe’heneki
be.difficult 2/ii fut=make.angry X-2/aor
'You are difficult to make angry.'

(8) sanakatwi wi’h=kano’neči
be.difficult 0/ii fut=talk.to X-3/aor
'It’s difficult to talk to him.'

(9) sanakesiwa wi’h=kano’neči
be.difficult 3/ii fut=talk.to X-3/aor
'He’s difficult to talk to.'

In (6) and (8) the verb of the higher clause is the II verb sanakatwi 'it is difficult'. In (7) and (9), on the other hand, the verb of the higher clause is formed from the AI stem sanakesi-. In (7) sanakesi- is inflected with the prefix ke- to indicate second person singular subject, while in (9) it is suffixed with -wa to indicate third person proximate singular subject.

The same syntactic opposition is also available with 'be easy':

(10) wečinowatwi wi’h=anehkawoči i na ihkwe'wa
be.easy 0/ii fut=get.to.know X-3/aor that woman
'It’s easy to get to know that woman.'
The verb of the higher clause in (10) is the II verb *wečinowatwi* ‘it is easy’, inflected for an expletive subject. In (11), on the other hand, the higher verb is formed from the AI stem *wečinowesi-* , inflected for a third person proximate singular subject.

The Fox opposition illustrated in the above pairs of sentences is similar to the English tough movement opposition in that an argument of the lower clause may optionally be expressed as subject of the higher clause. In (7), for example, the second person object of the lower verb ‘make angry’ is also expressed as subject of the higher verb ‘be difficult’. This necessitates the use of the AI form of the verb in the higher clause, since it has an animate subject. Another similarity between the Fox opposition and English tough movement may be mentioned here. Tough movement in English is restricted to only a handful of predicates (see fn. 1); in Fox, this syntactic phenomenon is lexically restricted as well. I have found no other verb besides ‘be difficult’ and ‘be easy’ which participates in this construction.

One major difference between the English tough movement construction and the Fox counterpart involves the realization of the moved argument of the lower clause. In English, there is a gap corresponding to the extraction site of the moved element, represented by the null set symbol in (1b) and (2b). In Fox, though, there is no gap: in both (6) and (7), for example, the lower verb is inflected for an unspecified subject acting on a second person singular object. The object inflection in (7) is a pronominal copy of the second person subject of the higher verb. Likewise, the pairs of sentences in (8) and (9), and (10) and (11), show that the Fox counterpart to tough movement must be considered a copying operation, rather than movement.

All of the above illustrations of tough movement in Fox contained an unspecified subject in the lower clause. Tough movement applies much more generally, however: for example, the subject of the lower clause may be a specific third person or nonthird person.

(12) *wečinowatwi* wi’h=anehkawakwe
be.easy 0/ii fut=get.to.know 21–3/aor
‘It’s easy for us (incl.) to get to know her.’

(13) *wečinowesiwa* wi’h=anehkawakwe
be.easy 3/ii fut=get.to.know 21–3/aor
‘She’s easy for us (incl.) to get to know.’
TOUGH MOVEMENT IN FOX

The opposition between (12) and (13), and between (14) and (15), is similar to that already seen above: the object of the lower verb may optionally also be expressed as subject of the higher clause. In both (13) and (15), where that option is taken, the matrix verb must appear in the AI form of 'be easy' or 'be difficult'.

The expletive subject of (14) requires some comment. It is inanimate obviative, while the expletive subject in previous examples is inanimate proximate. An expletive subject of the matrix verb is marked obviative if the subject of the lower clause is third person, as in (14). But if the lower clause contains a third person object, this third person does not trigger obviation on the expletive subject of the higher verb. Instead, the expletive subject remains proximate, as can be seen in the elicited examples (8), (10), and (12), and the textual example (5).

2.2. No restrictions on person, gender, obviation

So far, we have seen examples where tough movement applies to copy a nonthird person or proximate third person object of the lower clause as subject of the matrix verb. Other categories of arguments may also undergo tough movement, including obviative third person and inanimates. The following pair of examples illustrates tough movement applying to an obviative object of the lower clause.

(16) wečinowatwi wi'h-apahapahe nihemeći otapeno-hemwa-wani
be.easy 0/ii fut-make.laugh X-3'/aor their.child.obv
'It's easy to make their child laugh.'

(17) wečinowesiniwani wi'h-apahapahe nihemeći
be.easy 3'/ii fut-make.laugh X-3'/aor
'He (obv.) is easy to make laugh.'

With inanimate arguments, it is sometimes hard to tell if tough movement has applied. Recall that one consequence of tough movement applying to animate arguments is a change in the shape of the matrix verb stem: the AI form must be used if an animate third person is made subject. With inanimates, however, the II verb stem will be used in both syntactic variants: if tough movement does not apply, the matrix verb will be Inanimate Intransitive with an expletive subject, and if tough movement does

(14) sanakateniwi wi'h-a'hkwe hehki
be.difficult 0'/ii fut=make.angry 3(p)-2/aor
'It's difficult for them to make you angry.'

(15) kesanakesi wi'h-a'hkwe hehki
be.difficult 2/ii fut=make.angry 3(p)-2/aor
'You are difficult for them to make angry.'
apply to copy an inanimate argument as subject of the matrix verb, then the matrix verb will be Inanimate Intransitive to agree with the gender of its subject. To find a clear morphological difference between the two syntactic variants, then, we must turn to plural inanimate arguments, which trigger agreement for number when subject of an intransitive independent indicative verb.

(18) wečinowatwi wi h-mehkameki ahte himinani
    be.easy 0/ii fut-find X-0/aor strawberries
    ‘It's easy to find strawberries.’

(19) ahte himinani wečinowato'ni wi h-mehkameki
    strawberries be.easy 0p/ii fut-find X-0/aor
    ‘Strawberries are easy to find.’

The form ahte himinani ‘strawberries’ is inanimate plural. In (18), where tough movement has not applied, the matrix verb is inflected for an expletive subject — inanimate proximate singular. In (19), on the other hand, ahte himinani has been made the subject of the matrix verb, reflected by the plural agreement on the verb.

2.3. Long distance dependencies

In several current syntactic theories, tough movement is considered to be a variety of topicalization or wh-movement (Chomsky 1977, Bresnan 1982). The most important motivation for considering tough movement a type of topicalization or wh-movement is that the distance between the subject of the tough predicate and the coreferential gap is unbounded: the gap need not occur in the very first clause down; instead it may be two, three, or more clauses down in the tree structure. In this, tough movement is similar to wh-question movement or topicalization, both of which display long distance dependencies between the moved item and the coreferential gap. Consider the following English examples:

(20) a. This book is difficult [to persuade the students [to read θ]i]
    b. Which book did [the teacher persuade the students [to read θ]i]?
    c. This book [the teacher persuaded the students [to read θ]i]

Example (20a) shows that a long distance dependency is possible for tough movement in English; (20b) and (20c) show that it is comparable to the long distance dependencies of wh-movement and topicalization, respectively.

4The analysis of English tough movement nevertheless remains problematic for GB, LFG, and other syntactic frameworks.
In Fox, also, there may be a long distance dependency between the subject of the matrix predicate and the coreferential element in a lower clause, as seen in the following example.\(^5\)

\[(21)\] we'cinowatwi \[wi'h=anohka'neči apenohaki\]  
be.easy 0/ii fut=give.O.job.of X-3(p)/aor children  
\[wi'h=natone'hamowa'či ahte'himinani]\]  
fut=look.for 3p-0/aor strawberries  
'It’s easy to get the kids to look for strawberries.'

\[(22)\] ahte'himinani we'cinowatoni \[wi'h=anohka'neči\]  
strawberries be.easy 0p/ii fut=give.O.job.of X-3(p)/aor  
apenohaki \[wi'h=natone'hamowa'či\]  
children fut=look.for 3p-0/aor  
'Strawberries are easy to get the kids to look for.'

In (22) the subject of ‘be easy’ is ‘strawberries’, which is coreferential to the object of the clause two levels down.

### 2.4. Subject-to-subject copying

So far, the Fox analog to tough movement looks rather similar to the English construction. But there is one very surprising difference. In the English tough movement construction, there is a constraint blocking the subject of a lower clause from undergoing tough movement. But in Fox, subjects of lower clauses may also undergo tough movement.

\[(23)\] nesanakesi \[wi'h=kano'nak\]  
be.difficult 1/ii fut=talk.to 1-3/aor  
lit., ‘I am difficult for me to talk to him.’  
(= ‘It is difficult for me to talk to him.’)

\[(24)\] kesanakesipena \[wi'h=anehkawak\]  
be.difficult 21/ii fut=get.to.know 21-3/aor  
lit., ‘We (incl.) are difficult for us to get close to her.’  
(= ‘It’s difficult for us to get close to her.’)

In (23) and (24) the first person subjects of ‘be difficult’ are coreferential with the subjects of the lower clauses.

A lower subject may also undergo tough movement if the matrix predicate is ‘easy’:

---

\(^5\)Note that in Moose Cree even constructions corresponding to NP movement in English exhibit long distance dependencies (James 1984).
(25) kewečinowesipena wi’h=anehkawakwe
be.easy 21/ii fut=know 21-3/aor
lit., ‘We (incl.) are easy for us to get to know her.’
(= ‘It’s easy for us to get to know her.’)

(26) kewečinowesipena wi’h=mehkamakwe ahте’himinani
be.easy 21/ii fut=find 21-0/aor strawberries
lit., ‘We (incl.) are easy for us to find strawberries.’
(= ‘It’s easy for us to find strawberries.’)

So far we have seen subjects of transitive verbs undergoing tough movement. Subjects of intransitive verbs may also undergo tough movement:

(27) nesanakesipena i’noki wi’h=na’kwa’ya’ke
be.difficult 1p/ii now fut=leave 1p/aor
‘We (excl.) are difficult for us to leave now.’
(= ‘It is difficult for us to leave now.’)

(28) čačawi hi kesanakesi wi’h=nepa’yani
sometimes be.difficult 2/ii fut=sleep 2/aor
lit., ‘Sometimes you’re difficult for you to sleep.’
(= ‘Sometimes it’s difficult for you to sleep.’)

Third person subjects may also undergo tough movement:

(29) sanakesiwaki wi’h=nepa’wa’či
be.difficult 3p/ii fut=sleep 3p/aor
lit., ‘They are difficult for them to sleep.’
(= ‘It’s difficult for them to sleep.’)

(30) sanakesiwa wi’h=kanošiči
be.difficult 3/ii fut=talk.to 3-1/aor
lit., ‘He’s difficult for him to talk to me.’
(= ‘It’s difficult for him to talk to me.’)

Both proximate and obviative third person subjects of the lower clause may undergo tough movement. Consider the following set of sentences involving proximate and obviative NPs. The first pair of sentences illustrates the unexceptional application of tough movement to the object of the lower clause:

(31) ma’haki šeškesi’haki sanakesiwaki
these young.women be.difficult 3p/ii
[wi’h=kanо’nekowaci i’nihi oškinawe’hahi]
fut=talk.to 3’-3p/aor those.obv young.men.obv
‘These girls are difficult for those guys to talk to.’
(32) i'nihi ośkinawe-hahi sanakesiniwahi
those.obv young.men.obv be.difficult 3p/ii
[wih=kano' na-wači ma'haki šeškesi'haki]
fut=talk.to 3p-3'/aor these young.women

'Those guys are difficult for these girls to talk to.'

In (31) the proximate NP 'these girls' is the subject of the higher clause, and also the object of the inverse verb of the lower clause. In (32) the verb of the lower clause is the direct counterpart of the verb in (31). The obviative NP 'those guys' is both subject of the higher clause and the object of the lower clause. Both (31) and (32) illustrate the usual pattern of tough movement where there is coreference between the higher subject and a nonsubject argument of the lower clause.

The following pair of sentences, however, involve coreference between the subjects of both clauses:

(33) ma'haki šeškesi'haki sanakesiwaki
these young.women be.difficult 3p/ii
[wih=kano' na-wači i'nihi ośkinawe-hahi]
fut=talk.to 3p-3'/aor those.obv young.men.obv
lit., 'These girls are difficult for them to talk to those guys.'
(= 'It is difficult for these girls to talk to those guys.')

(34) i'nihi ośkinawe hahi sanakesiniwahi
those.obv young.men.obv be.difficult 3p/ii
[wih=kano' nekowači ma'haki šeškesi'haki]
fut=talk.to 3'-3p/aor these young.women
lit., 'Those guys are difficult for them to talk to these girls.'
(= 'It is difficult for those guys to talk to these girls.')

Example (33) has a proximate subject of 'be difficult' which is coreferential to the subject of the lower clause; (34) displays the same pattern of coreference, with obviative subjects. The examples in this section show that subject-to-subject copying in Fox tough movement is available to all person categories, including obviative third person.

2.5. Ellipsis of complement

The clausal complement of sanakatwi or sanakesiwa may be omitted if the context makes it clear what activity is difficult. The following examples have been taken from texts.

(35) kaši-yo='na iši-sanakesiwa mahkwa?
how=of.course=that.anim thus-be.difficult 3/ii bear
'Why is that bear so hard [to catch]?' ošk.7
(Context: the people have been trying to kill a bear for four days, but they are unable to catch him.)

(36) še tên a sanakateniwi
but be.difficult 0'/ii
'But it is difficult [for him to go back into the past.].' W475
(Context: of all the manitous, only the Keš'ë-Maneto'wa has the ability to go back into the past.)

Notice that the verb of (36) is inflected for an obviative expletive subject, as required by the third person subject of the (understood) clausal complement.

3. Related Verbs

The discussion so far has concerned only intransitive forms of the higher predicates 'be difficult' and 'be easy'. There is also a Transitive Inanimate (TI) form that may be used to express the difficulty or ease of doing something. Consider the following sentences:

(37) nesanakihto wi'h=kano'naki
have.hard.time 1-0/ii fut= talk.to 1-3/aor
'I have a hard time talking to him.'

(38) kewexinowihtopena wih=mehkamakwe ahte'himinani
have.easy.time 21-0/ii fut=find 21-0/aor strawberries
'We (incl.) have an easy time finding strawberries.'

The stems of the matrix verbs of (37) and (38) are sanakiht-, we'činowiht-, respectively; both are class 2 TI stems. Example (37) is inflected with ne- -o for first person singular subject acting on an inanimate object, while (38) is inflected with ke- -o'pena, for first person inclusive plural subject, inanimate object. (Many Fox verbs requiring clausal complements are inflected for an inanimate object, best analyzed as an expletive object.)

There seems to be a semantic difference between the tough movement construction and the TI form of the matrix verb. Contrast (27), repeated below, with the construction using a TI matrix verb:

(39) nesanakesipena i'noki wi'h=na'kwa'ya'ke
be.difficult 1p/ii now fut= leave 1p/aor
'We (excl.) are difficult for us to leave now.'
(= 'It is difficult for us to leave now.')

(40) nesanakihto'pena i'noki wi'h=na'kwa'ya'ke
have.hard.time 1p-0/ii now fut=leave 1p/aor
'We (excl.) have a hard time leaving now.'
According to Adeline Wanatee (personal communication), (40), with the TI matrix verb, expresses a more personal feeling: e.g., it’s difficult because we hate to go. Example (39), on the other hand, does not imply anything about the subject’s internal state: the difficulty in leaving might be due to us hanging around and talking.

In (37), (38), and (39) the subject of the TI matrix verb is coreferential to the subject of the lower verb. Coreference may also obtain between the subject of the TI matrix verb and the object of the complement clause:

(41) sanakihto'wa wi'hanakan'aki
have.hard.time 3–0/ii fut=talk.to 1–3/aor
lit., ‘He has a hard time for me to talk to him.’

In other words, neither the tough movement construction described in Section 2 nor the construction with the TI matrix verb places a restriction on what syntactic role the coreferential argument in the lower clause may bear.

The initials sanak- and we'cinow- may also be used in other verb stems. sanak- is especially productive: two examples are given below of the TI verb sanake’netamwa ‘he thinks it difficult’. Here sanak- functions as a secondary predicate, predicated of the verb’s object.

(42) a'neta='pi pe'hi=meko sanake’netamo’ki
some=quot really=emph think.difficult 3p-0/ii
wi'hi=mami’shi’hiwa’či
fut=be.ceremonial.attendant 3p/aor
‘Some, it’s said, thought it very hard to be ceremonial attendants.’ AR40:256.18

(43) i’ni=koči ki’na’na e’h=mehtose’neniwe’hiyakwe
that=you.see we be.alive.dim 21/part/21
se’nakε’netam’hiyakwe mehtose’neniwiweni
think.difficult.dim 21–0/part/0 life
‘Life, you see, is something we poor mortals think is pitifully hard.’ B72:60.7 (144E in ms.)

In (42) sanak- ‘difficult’ is predicated of a clausal argument, while in (43) it is predicated of a nominal argument. (In 43 the ablaut rule of initial change has applied to the verb as part of the participle inflection, changing the first a of sanak- to e’.) This is the same range of arguments found

---

6 The form of the Fox example and the translation are taken from a new edition of the Owl text by Ives Goddard, to whom I am grateful for permission to cite these examples.
with the simple verb \textit{sanakatwi} ‘it is difficult’, which may be predicated of either an entity or a proposition.

Examples (42) and (43) contain the TI verb \textit{sanake'netamwa} ‘he thinks it difficult’, in which \textit{sanak}- is predicated of an inanimate object. \textit{sanake'ne-mewa} ‘he thinks him difficult’ is the Transitive Animate (TA) counterpart. Again \textit{sanak}- is predicated of the object, but here the object is animate. In order for \textit{sanak}- to be predicated of an animate argument, the tough movement construction must apply. That is, the animate object of \textit{sanake'ne-mewa} ‘he thinks him difficult’ must be coreferential to an argument in an overt or understood complement clause. This is illustrated in the following textual example, in which the complement clause is elided.

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
(44) i=na-ki-na na taswi me'neto'witehka soyakwe
      that.anim=we so.many be.called.manitou 21/part
      wi=han=se=na=ka nemakwa
      fut=think.difficult 21-3/part/3

      ‘That [i.e., tobacco, animate] is something all of us called manitous will
      think is hard to get.’ B72:42.39 (85F in ms.)
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

The argument which undergoes tough movement here is ‘tobacco’, which belongs to the animate gender class in Fox. It is the object of the understood complement clause ‘for us to get tobacco’, deleted here since it is recoverable from the context (cf. 35, above). Since \textit{sanak}- ‘difficult’ is predicated of an animate argument, the TA form of the verb containing \textit{sanak}- is required.

The syntax of the verbs in (42–44) is intriguing: many of the syntactic properties described for the independent verbs \textit{sanakesiwa} ‘he is difficult’ and \textit{sanakatwi} ‘it is difficult’ in Section 2 are also found with verbs containing the morpheme \textit{sanak}- ‘difficult’ as a secondary predicate. That is, \textit{sanak}- may be predicated either of an entity (43) or of a proposition (42); the proposition may be deleted if recoverable from the context (44); and \textit{sanak}- participates in the tough movement construction, in which an argument within the clausal complement of \textit{sanak}- also functions as the subject of \textit{sanak}- (44). What does this mean for the syntax of Fox? For the independent verbs \textit{sanakesiwa} ‘he is difficult’ and \textit{sanakatwi} ‘it is difficult’, the information regarding subcategorization and participation in tough movement would uncontroversially be stated in the lexical entry for each verb. The fact that the morpheme \textit{sanak}- controls these same properties suggests that it, too, should be given a separate listing in the lexicon. Complex verb forms such as \textit{sanake'ne-mewa} ‘he thinks him difficult’ must then allow the syntax to have access to their internal morphological structure, treating

\footnote{Also from Goddard’s edition of the Owl text.}
the initial morpheme *sanak-* as a separate argument-taking predicate with distinct syntactic properties.

In conclusion, in this paper a number of syntactic properties of Fox verbs meaning 'be difficult' and 'be easy' have been described. There is a syntactic opposition in Fox which is reminiscent of tough movement in English, but which involves copying rather than movement, and which is much less constrained than the English construction. Besides the tough movement construction, Fox has additional verb forms available to express the ease or difficulty of activities. The complex verb forms in which *sanak-* 'difficult' functions as an incorporated secondary predicate exhibit many of the same properties as the independent tough movement predicate verbs, motivating a treatment of Fox in which syntactic processes have access to internal morphological structure.
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