Comparative Approaches to the Diachronic Morpho-Syntax of the Indigenous Languages of North and Central America

4 June 2019 – Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona USA
Lattie F. Coor Hall, Room 4403
976 S Forest Mall

9:15 - 9:30   Welcome, Elly van Gelderen

Chair: Elly van Gelderen, Arizona State University

9:30 - 10:45   Pamela Munro, University of California at Los Angeles,
Personal DPs in Yuman Languages

10:45 - 11:00   ***break***

Chair: Pamela Munro, University of California at Los Angeles.

11:00 - 11:40   John Powell, University of Arizona,
A Diachronic Partial Accounting for -k and -m Verbs in Yuman River Languages

11:40 – 12:20   Karen Dakin, SLI-Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, UNAM,
Uto-Aztecan Nominalization and Naua Verb Derivation.

12:20 - 1:20   ***lunch***

Chair: Alana Johns, University of Toronto

1:20 - 2:00   David Mora-Marin, University of North Carolina,
The Morphology and Syntax of Possession in the Mesoamerican Languages and Their Neighbors: A
Comparative, Historical, and Areal Approach

2:00 - 2:40   Jonah Bates, University of Kansas,
Deriving the Eastern Cholan 2nd-Position Polar Question =ka from Proto-Mayan *qa

2:40 - 3:20   Clarissa Forbes, University of Arizona
The synchrony and diachrony of person-sensitive patterns in Tsimshianic

3:20 - 3:30   ***break***

Chair: John Powell, University of Arizona

3:30-4:10   Alana Johns, University of Toronto,
Dialect variation and Brick Walls (Inuktitut)

4:10-4:50   Julien Carrier, University of Toronto,
Double agreement and morphosyntactic alignment shift in Inuktitut

6:00-8:00   Workshop Closing Reception/Conference Opening Reception, Location TBA

"Personal DPs" in Yuman Languages

Pamela Munro, UCLA (munro@ucla.edu)

The complexity of the Yuman pronominal agreement system is well known, with the analytical problems it presents clearly laid out by Hinton and Langdon (1976). A set of prefixes marking object and subject (in that order, when relevant) may be reconstructed for Proto-Yuman, with the subject prefixes for intransitive verbs also used on nouns to mark possessors. Crawford (1966) and Halpern (1946, 1947) have previously noted the existence of another sort of personal prefixation on nouns, used to indicate that those nouns stand in apposition to pronouns (in the Yuman equivalent of a phrase like *we the people*); these prefixes may also be used on relative verbs (in phrases similar to *we who are about to die salute you*). In this paper I examine additional examples of this restricted type of personal agreement. Crucially, the reconstructed prefixes in this set are most similar to the reconstructed set of Yuman object prefixes, a fact which (surprisingly?) suggests a connection with the Yuman copular construction.

Deriving the Eastern Cholan 2nd-Position Polar Question =*ka* from Proto-Mayan *qa*

JONAH BATES
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Summary: This paper proposes a Proto-Mayan conditional complementizer **qa*, whose descendants can be found in the Wastekan, Mamean, and Ch'olan branches. The history of the proposed complementizer involves: 1. Loss of conditionality in Wastek, 2. Relegation to non-subordinated conditional clauses in Cholan, 3. Reanalysis as 2P through fronted focus across Cholan and 4. Use as matrix-clause interrogative marker in Eastern Cholan.

Introduction: The Eastern Cholan languages Ch'orti', and its extinct sister Ch'olti' (Sattler 2004), have a second-position interrogative clitic =*ka* that marks an utterance as a polar question (1).

(1) u-yub'y-e't   =**ka** i-nujx-i
     A3S-can-B2S   =INT C2S-swim-SC
     'Can you swim?'
     (Lopez de Rosa 2004:214)

By itself, having a second-position clitic for polar questions is not uncommon for Lowland Mayan languages. However, in languages like Tseltal and Tzotzil this particle is clearly associated with a negative morpheme, having been grammaticalized from a negative-base polar question format. Since none of these languages have negation similar to *ka,* what is its origin story?

Comparison: The other two Cholan languages are Ch'ol and Chontal. Chontal does have a morpheme *ka* involved in questions but not in second-position. In the Chontal of San Carlos, *ka* is only used to build wh-question words, as in *ka + k'in* 'day' → *ka k'in* 'when'. In this dialect polar questions are intonational or marked with a sentence final tag *ma-ka,* which can be broken down into *ma* 'NEG' and *ka*. These *ka* morphemes definitely appears cognate the *ka* of Eastern Cholan. Ch'ol, on the other hand has a morpheme =*ki* that is used to mark only fronted (topicalized) conditional clauses (2) and as the final element in (or cliticized to) wh-question words like *chuki* 'what', *majchki* 'who', *baki* 'where', *jalaj(-ki)* 'when', and *bajche'(ki)* 'how'. I take =*ki* to be cognate to Eastern Cholan =*ka*, despite the vowel difference. It does not mark polar questions in Ch'ol, that function being taken over by =*ba*, which Ch'ol shares with the Tzeltalan languages.

(2) tsa'=**ki**   keji ja'al, mi   keje i-bujty'-el   ja'
     PFV=COND start rain   IPFV start A3-increase-NF river
     'If it rains, the river will grow.' (Vazquez Alavarez 2011:410)

Common Cholan *a* regularly descends to Ch'ol *ä̇* not *i*. However, **V → i* is also found in the aspect markers *tza'/ta'* 'PFV' and *muk'/mu'* 'IPFV', whose bare (non-clitic-hosting) forms are *tyi* and *mi*. Noting this trend, the Proto-Cholan morpheme should be reconstructed as **ka*. It is reconstructed in clause initial position based on considerations of reanalysis. That is to say, it is highly plausible to mis-analyze a clause-initial *ka* with constituents focused above it as being in 2nd position but it would be very difficult to reanalyze a 2P-clitic as clause-initial since it would never occur without an overt host.

Looking for cognates beyond Cholan:

The Cholan languages are part of the Cholan-Tzeltalan (or Greater Tzeltalan) sub-family. However, neither of the Tzeltalan languages show any evidence of a cognate for *ka*. Similarly, no cognates could yet be located in the Yukatekan, Q'anjob'alan, or K'ichean branches. However, both Wastek and the Mamean languages Mam and Tektiteko have intriguing possible cognates. In

the Mamean languages, there exists a morpheme *qa* (Mamean[q]:Cholan[k]), which is used to introduce conditional clauses (3).

(3) **qa** Ø-x-el   ky-laq'o-7n-a   Ø-ky-laq'oo-n-x-a
     IF B3SG-DIR-POT A2PL-buy-DS-2PL B3SG-A2PL-buy-IMP-DIR-2PL
     'If you want to buy it, buy it!" (Mam; England 1983:329)

Additionally the most divergent of the Mayan languages, Wastek, has a declarative complementizer *ka* that is used with perfective complements (Edmonson 1988). However, since the imperfective in Wastek descends from a participle, the perfective simply continues the patterns common to all finite clauses in Proto-Mayan. This suggests that *ka* is the general complementizer in Wastek.

Analysis:

Proto-Mayan **qa* started as a conditional, and subordinate interrogative, complementizer. In Wastek, the conditional sense was lost, leaving it as a declarative or general complementizer. Similarly, English *if* also developed from a purely conditional or subordinate interrogative to declarative in some clauses (see discussion in López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2014). In the Core Mayan languages, *qa* remained conditional and clause-initial, as it remains in Mam and Teko but was lost in Yukatekan, Q'anjob'alan, K'ichean, and finally Tzeltalan. In Cholan this morpheme became overt in *matrix* conditionals. Such a change is attested in the Slavic languages. Slavic conditional *li* also became overt in matrix conditionals and was subsequently relegated to second position through the intermediate stage of fronted (focused) elements to its specifier position (King 1994). In Russian, this resulted =*li* being a 2nd position yes/no question marker as bare matrix conditionals were reanalyzed as polar questions. A similar course of events could explain the position and use of =*ka* in Ch'olti', Ch'orti and Ch'ol. The fact that Ch'ol also participated in this change, but not its sister Chontal, suggests this change was spread across a dialect continuum after the Eastern/Western Cholan split. In Western Cholan (i.e. Ch'ol and Chontal), *ka* was allowed to be overt in subordinate clauses involving overt wh-elements. This is similar to Dutch *of*, which descended from Proto-Germanic *jabai* but, unlike its English cognate *if*, can be expressed overtly along with wh-words as in *wie of* 'who (subordinate)'. Finally, Ch'ol allowed overt *ki* in matrix wh-questions resulting in reanalysis and fossilization of -*ki* to the end of the wh-words.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Edmonson, B. (1988). *A Descriptive Grammar of Huastec (Potosino Dialect)*. PhD Thesis. University of Tulane.
England, N. (1983). Ergativity in Mamean (Mayan) Languages. In *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 49(1), pp. 1-19. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
King, T. (1994). Focus in russian yes-no questions. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics,2*(1). pp. 92-120.
Knowles, S.M. (1984). *A Descriptive Grammar of Chontal Maya (San Carlos Dialect* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Accession no. 8420718)
López-Couso, M. J. & Méndez-Naya, B. (2014). The use of if as a declarative complementizer in English: Theoretical and empirical considerations. In *Linguistic Insights*. 181. pp. 85-108.
Lopez de Rosa, L. (2004). *U'tirache ojroner Maya Ch'orti': Gramática descriptiva Ch'orti'*. Guatemala City: Academia de Lenguas Mayas de Guatemala (ALMG).
Osorio May, J. (2005). *Análisis de la morfología verbal del Yokot'an, "Chontal" del poblado de Tecoluta, Necajuca, Tabasco*. MA thesis. Maestría en Lingüística Indoamericana.
Sattler, M. (2004). Ch'olti: An analysis of the Arte de la lenga Ch'olti. In Wichmann, S. (ed.) *Linguistics of Maya Writing* (14). pp. 365–405.
Schwabe, K. (2004). The particle li and the left periphery of Slavic yes/no interrogatives. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*. doi:10.1515/9783110912111.385
Vázquez Álvarez, J. (2011). *A grammar of Chol, a Mayan language*. PhD dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Double agreement and morphosyntactic alignment shift in Inuktitut

Julien Carrier

University of Toronto

In this talk, I present a comparative analysis of inflectional paradigms in Eskimo-Aleut languages to account for the diachronic properties of the ergative construction in Inuktitut. More specifically, I wish to demonstrate how the neutralisation of certain features in transitive agreement has led to an ongoing morphosyntactic alignment change. Johns (1992) claims that ergativity is derived from nominalization in Inuktitut. The proposal is mainly based on the morphological parallel in case and agreement between the ergative construction in the participial mood and the possessive construction, as shown in (1a-b).

Kivalliq dialect (Johns, 1992: 69)

1) a. *anguti-**up***   *kapi-ja-**a***   ERGATIVE
       man-GEN   stab-PASS.PART-3SG/3SG
       'The man stabbed it'

    b. *anguti-**up***   *qimmi-**a***   POSSESSIVE
       man-GEN   dog-3SG/3SG
       'The man's dog'

Johns argues that transitive verbs are nominalized by the passive participle *-jaq* but re-verbalized later. The latter operation is apparent when the object is first or second person as an extra agreement morpheme appears, similar to those used for agreement with intransitive subjects, as shown in (2a-b).

North Baffin Inuktitut

(2) a. *taku-ja-a-**nga***   ERGATIVE
       see-PASS.PART-3SG/3SG???-1SG
       'He/she sees me'

    b. *taku-ju-**nga***   INTRANSITIVE
       see-ACT.PART-1SG
       'I see'

Thus, while a single agreement morpheme encodes the subject and the object when the object is third person (1a), two morphemes are required if the object is first/second person (2a). The first one is nominal and encodes the subject and a 'default' third person object (as there is no exponent for first/second person possessed elements in possessive constructions). The second one is verbal and encodes only the object. I call the patterns in (1a) *nominal configurations* and the ones in (2a) *mixed configurations*. The mixed ones are of special interest because Eskimo-Aleut languages vary whether their inflections still encode the singular-plural distinction with third person subjects. For instance, the number with third person subjects is never ambiguous in Central Yupik, ambiguous in West Greenlandic when first/second objects are plural and then systematically ambiguous in North Baffin Inuktitut, as shown in Table 1.

3rd SUBJECT		OBJECT											
		1st		2nd		1st		2nd		1st		2nd	
		SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
	SG	*a-nga*	*a-kut*	*a-ten*	*a-ci*	*a-nga*	**a-tigut*	*a-tit*	**a-si*	**a-nga*	**a-tigut*	**a-tit*	**a-si*
	PL	*at-nga*	*it-kut*	*at-gen*	*ice-ci*	*an-nga*	**a-tigut*	*at-sit*	**a-si*	**a-nga*	**a-tigut*	**a-tit*	**a-si*
		Central Yupik (Reed & al., 1977: 139)				West Greenlandic (Fortescue, 1984: 289)				North Baffin Inuktitut (Harper, 1974: 33-35)			

Table 1 - Nominal and verbal inflections for 'mixed configurations' across three Eskimo-Aleut languages

I propose that nominal and mixed configurations differ on the number of agreement heads involved. In nominal configurations, the double agreement is driven by two probes located on the head of a DP. The first probe seeks a match in an object or possessed element whereas the second one is valued upon the following Merge of a transitive subject or possessor in Spec, D. However, a second cycle of Agree

(cf. Béjar 2003) is triggered when the object is first/second person due to the idiosyncratic morphological gap in agreement discussed above and displaces agreement from D to Infl where intransitive agreement occurs. This is how mixed configurations emerge. This second cycle of Agree is signaled by the default agreement with a third person object and the reverse order in which the verb agrees with its arguments, i.e. from object → subject in nominal configurations to subject → object in mixed configurations (cf. Bok-Bennema 1991). Importantly, I assume that the valuations of the probes on D from the first cycle of Agree are retained through agreement displacement to Infl until Spell-Out deletes them (cf. Rezac 2002).

I argue that the neutralization in number agreement with third person subjects in mixed configurations stems from the variation across Eskimo-Aleut languages in the feature specifications of the probe projected by Infl (cf. Béjar 2003; Béjar & Rezac 2009). Originally, the probe was minimally specified (i.e. [$u\Phi$]) but its feature specifications became more articulated in some language varieties. This change created an interaction between the valuations of the probes on Infl and D and triggered default number agreement with the subject whenever the object represents a better match to value the probe's specifications (see Oxford (2018) for a similar analysis in Algonquin). For example, in West Greenlandic, the probe is specified with [$u\Phi$, $u$plural] and number agreement with third person subjects is neutralized when first/second objects are plural. In North Baffin Inuktitut, the probe is specified with [$u\Phi$, $u$plural, $u$participant] and number agreement with third person subjects is consequently neutralized no matter if first/second person objects are plural or singular. Finally, note that the neutralisation patterns presented in Table 1 are consistent across all verbal moods and also in other person combinations.

In fact, the only person combination in transitive agreement for which Inuktitut has distinct forms for a singular or a plural third person subject is when the object is third person singular. It is not surprizing then that the grammatical person of the subject has been argued to play a role on different aspects in the ongoing morphosyntactic alignment change from ergative to accusative in Inuktitut, where the ergative construction appears to be used less and less frequently in favor of the antipassive construction. For instance, it has been shown that third person subjects in ergative constructions can no longer be used in certain contexts (cf. Spreng 2005), are extremely rare in the speech of Inuit children during language acquisition (cf. Allen 2013), are sometimes marked with the absolutive (cf. Carrier 2017a) and are statically disfavored in variationist research (cf. Carrier 2017b). I claim that the historical neutralisation in transitive agreement across Eskimo-Aleut languages is the origin of the morphosyntactic alignment shift in Inuktitut and the underlying reason for many changes affecting the ergative construction now.

References

Allen S. 2013. The acquisition of ergativity in Inuktitut. In *The acquisition of ergative structures,* ed. E.L. Bavin, and S. Stoll, 71–105. Amsterdam/Phidadelphia: John Benhamins Publishing Company.

Béjar, S. 2003. Phi-syntax: A theory of agreement. PhD dissertation, University of Toronto.

Béjar, S., and M. Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 35–73.

Bok-Bennema, R. 1991. *Case and agreement in Inuit*. Berlin and New York: Foris publications.

Carrier, J. 2017a. Ergativity on the move. Presented at *Inuktitut Language and Linguistics Workshop*, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Carrier, J. 2017b. The ergative-antipassive alternation in Inuktitut: Analyzed in a case of new-dialect formation. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 62, 661–684.

Fortescue, M. 1984. *West Greenlandic*. London: Croom Helm.

Harper, K. 1974. *Some aspects of the grammar of Eskimo dialects of Cumberland Peninsula and North Baffin Island*. Ottawa, Ontario: National Museum of Canada.

Johns, A. 1992. Deriving Ergativity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23: 57-88.

Oxford, W. 2018. Inverse marking and Multiple Agree in Algonquin. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-9428-x

Reed and al. 1977. *Yup'ik Eskimo Grammar*. University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Rezac, M. 2002. Cyclic domains and (multiple) specifier constructions. Ms. , University of Toronto.

Spreng, B. 2005. Third person arguments in Inuktitut. *UBCWPL* 17: 215-225.

Diachronic morphology Workshop

"Uto-Aztecan Nominalization and Naua Verb Derivation"

Karen Dakin

SLI-Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, UNAM

In this paper, I will make various proposals based both on internal reconstruction, particularly as described by Givón (1971, 2000), but also using comparative Uto-Aztecan data, about the function of a proto-Uto-Aztecan nominalizing suffix **-*Li* in various constructions, specifically as a –*li* in Nahua.

In reconstructing derivational morphology in Nahua, it becomes evident that there have been a series of regular phonological changes that include shifts in prosodic patterns that cause the reduction and loss of unstressed vowels that in turn lead to the creation of consonant clusters. The new clusters then may undergo assimilations, dissimilations or reduction through loss of one or more of the consonants. However, by sifting through those several changes, it is possible to hypothesize the formation of a morphological construction that has been the basis for the derivation of both new nouns and verbs with increased valences through nominalization of the verb roots. The reconstruction of those constructions and their interaction with the phonological changes are the subject of this paper.

One of the basic proposals is that on adding or subtracting an argument to a verb in Nahua, the main verb apparently must first have had to be nominalized before it could receive further derivation, whether as a deverbal resultative noun, an applicative or causative verb that takes a second object, or in a different way, as an impersonal verb. It is possible to reconstruct **-*Li*- as that proto-Uto-Aztecan resultative or patientive nominalizing suffix and **-*ka*- as a parallel agentive one. The existing contrasting forms of some verbs also attest the existence still of the old nominative/accusative case contrast in pre-Nahua.

In the following examples, stages are proposed for the historical derivation of two resultative noun forms of the same transitive verbs from proto-Uto-Aztecan. Nahua patientive transitive verb forms and the nouns derived from them require an object noun or prefix before the verb, represented here by the indefinite object morpheme here exemplified by *[tla-].* Parentheses indicate dropped vowels or consonants.

Resultative patient nouns:

1. [tla-] *čīwa* 'to do'

> Reconstructed earlier forms:
> a. Nominative: *[tla]-čīw(a)-l(i)-t* > [*tla*-]-*čīw–tli*
>   OBJ- do.VT-NOM-ABS
>
>   'deed, something done''
> b. Accusative: *[tla]- čīwa-l(i)-la* > *tla*-*čīwa*-*l*-*li*
>   OBJ-do.VT-NOM-ACC

In many cases, however, because of restrictions caused by variations such as consonant clusters in the root verb, there is only one basic form for the resultatives, as in (2).

2. *-itki* 'to carry', *tlatki-tl,* 'burden, load', *-ihkwilowa* 'to write', *tlahkwilōlli,* 'writing'.

An example of the restriction is the resultative derived from the transitive verb *-itki* 'to carry'. The only permitted form is *tla-tkitl* 'load', because the consonant cluster blocks a hypothetical *tlatk-tli** and the form *tlatkilli** is also blocked because a short *i* would be lost after *k*. For the *-owa* verb class, the only resultative of the transitive verb *-hkwilowa* 'to draw, write', is *tla-hkwilōlli,* with the *–owa* going to long *–ō.* There is no resultative following the vowel loss pattern of *čīwa* in (1), because *–owa* becomes long *–ō,* and is not lost.

In her classification of all the verbs in Molina's 16th century Naua dictionary, Una Canger (1980) analyzed and described in detail the class of existing *–owa* verbs and their applicative and causative derivations, pointing out interesting dialectal contrasts in the applicative and causative derivations. Dakin (2006a, b) reconsidered the forms analyzed by Canger in terms of the dialectal variation noted and the regularity of phonological changes in Naua, in particular derivations that involve the Uto-Aztecan nominalizing suffix *-Li,* and proposed a reconstruction of this verb class as ROOT-Li-wa for both CV- and CVCV- roots. In other words it is proposed that there is evidence that the nominalizer *-Li* and the verbalizer *–wa* were basic elements for all of the *–owa* class. Under specific conditions determined by the identity of the root consonants, the *-L-* dropped, creating *–Vwa* transitive and *–Vwi* intransitive verbs, for example, transitive *–polowa* 'lose', derived from the CV root *po, po-li-wa.* But at the same time, *pačowa* 'to press down on', must have come from a pUA *pa¢i-li-wa,* in which the *–Li-* was lost, but only after it had palatalized *¢ to č through dissimilation and palatalization of the *¢ to č.*

References

Canger, Una. 1980. *Five Studies inspired by Nahuatl Verbs in -oa*. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague. 19. Copenhagen.

Dakin, Karen 2006a   Aspectos históricos de la evolución de la clase de verbos nahuas en *-oa, V Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en Acatlán*, Pilar Máynez y María Rosario Dosal G. México (eds.), Facultad de Estudios Superiores-Acatlán-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Pp. 425-440. 2006.

Dakin, Karen 2006b   Verbos nahuas en *-li-wa:* una interpretación histórica de los verbos en –oa, *Memorias, VIII Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noroeeste*, Rosa María Ortiz Ciscomani (ed.). Hermosillo, Vol. II, Pp. 217-230. 2006.

Givón, Talmy 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archaelogist's field trip. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 7: 394-415.

Givón, Talmy 2000. Internal Reconstruction; as method, as theory. In Spike Gildea (ed.), *Reconstructing Grammar*, 107-159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

The synchrony and diachrony of person-sensitive patterns in Tsimshianic

Clarissa Forbes; University of Arizona

The Tsimshianic languages of northern British Columbia share a number of syntactic properties, including verb-initial order and a complex ergative agreement pattern. In this paper, I illustrate that the languages of this small family exhibit alternations based on the person features of clausal arguments in two distinct ways: VSO/VOS word order alternations, and verbal agreement. I demonstrate that across the family these alternations occur independently, and argue that this motivates an account in which they are derived in different ways: either by *morphology* or *syntax*. I present an analysis of restrictions on local person in each branch, assuming a common clause structure, and demonstrate how distinct synchronic models generate the patterns of each branch. Finally I compare the two branches in a diachronic light, considering their Proto-Tsimshianic origin and possible paths of grammaticalization to the two subtly different patterns attested today.

Data: Both the Interior and Maritime branches of the Tsimshianic family exhibit a base VSO word order, e.g. (1). However, independent-order clauses where a third person subject acts on a first or second person direct object – an 'inverse' (3<1) configuration – instead show VOS word order, e.g. (2). The following examples are from Nisg̱a'a (Interior) (Jelinek 1986: 9).

(1)   Hlimoom-i[-t]=s   Ann **'nit**.
       help-TR[-3.II]=DET Ann 3SG
       'Ann helped <u>her</u>.' *(VSO)*

(2)   Hlimoom-i-t **'nii'y** =t   Ann.
       help-TR-3.II 1SG   =DET Ann
       'Ann helped <u>me</u>.' *(VOS)*

In the Interior languages, ergative agreement in the form of a verbal suffix remains consistent even while the linear order of arguments reverses. However, in the Maritime branch, the same shift to VOS word order is accompanied by a change in the pattern of agreement. When the object is third person (*pro*, below), suffixal ergative agreement is used as in (3), cognate with the Interior pattern above. When both arguments are participants, both pre- and post-verbal agreement markers are used, one indexing each argument, as in (4). If only the object is a participant, there is preverbal ergative agreement, and the object is realized as a verb-adjacent pronoun, as in (5).

(3)   Na anoog̱-a-**m**.
       PST like-TR-1PL.II
       'We used to like him.'

(4)   **Ma** anoog̱-**u**
       2.I like-1SG.II
       'You like me.'

(5)   **T** ap'ag̱a='nu
       3.I remember=1SG
       'He remembered me.'
       (Sasama 2001; Dunn 1979)

In summary, inverse '3-on-participant' contexts in the Interior involve VOS order and postverbal agreement, while for Maritime languages they involve VOS order and marked preverbal agreement (compare agreement in (2) and (5)). Together, this data motivates an analysis of person-sensitive alternations where *word order* and *agreement* are treated independently; shift in linear order does not uniformly trigger shift in agreement, and vice versa.

Synchronic analysis: I propose that both the word order and agreement alternations in Tsimshianic result from repair operations to address a *licensing failure* in independent-order clauses. Crucially, the two distinct types of alternation arise due to differences in the grammatical locus of the person-licensing requirement, which I propose may be based either in syntax or morphology; each motivates a different type of repair. The classic Person Licensing Condition is *syntactic* (Béjar and Rezac 2003); I propose that it may also be *morphological*, and is so in the Interior languages.

(6)   *Two Person Licensing Conditions:*
    a. **S-PLC:** a [PART] feature must enter into an Agree relation with a functional head.
    b. **M-PLC:** a [PART] feature must be realized through overt agreement, or else surface in an appropriate prosodic position.

I account for the Interior pattern, in which the only alternation involves word order, in accordance with the M-PLC. Independent-order clauses typically have only ergative agreement; absolutive arguments do not agree, and are therefore unlicensed. However, under the M-PLC, agreement with a local object is not necessary so long as it is verb-adjacent. Assuming a *v*P-raising structure for Tsimshianic V1 order (Massam 2000), I demonstrate how subject and object arguments are amenable to reordering at the point of linearization. In the Maritime languages, by contrast, adjacency is not sufficient; agreement with a local object is required by the S-PLC. The failure of licensing in the default derivation triggers the insertion of secondary, preverbal agreement normally restricted to the dependent order (e.g. Kalin 2018). Notably, VOS order is never the result of incorporation or object shift on the basis of person, supporting a broad generalization that such object-based processes access definiteness/specificity, rather than person (Coon and Preminger 2017).

DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS: The two Tsimshianic branches share a robust pattern regarding the special nature and treatment of local persons in independent-order clauses, but differ in the details. In the Interior languages this has only resulted in VSO/VOS alternations, with even these declining in some varieties, while in the Maritime languages it has resulted in distinct agreement patterns and the development of a reduced verb-adjacent pronoun paradigm. I consider the nature of these patterns at their common Proto-Tsimshianic origin. Local objects were clearly adjacent to the verb, but was the early agreement pattern more characteristic of the current Interior or Maritime system? I review several possibilities, proposing that the systematic use of preverbal agreement in the independent order is ultimately an innovation of the Maritime branch, but that the function of the independent/dependent-order split may itself play a role. The independent order may have been predominantly used in contexts with a third person, and taken longer to be used in contexts with two local persons, allowing variation in how licensing conditions were consequently grammaticalized.

CONTRIBUTIONS: This comparative account of the Tsimshianic languages forwards an analysis of person-related asymmetries in the domains of both word order and agreement. While distinct synchronic patterns merit distinct synchronic analyses, I also reflect on their common origin.

Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance linguistics: theory and acquisition*, ed. Ana Teresa Perez-Leroux and Yves Roberge, 49–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Coon, Jessica, and Omer Preminger. 2017. Split ergativity is not about ergativity. 226–252. Oxford University Press.

Dunn, John Asher. 1979. Pronominal concord in Coast Tsimshian. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45:224–231.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1986. The ergativity hypothesis and the argument hierarchy in Nisgha. In *Papers for the 21st International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*. Seattle, WA.

Kalin, Laura. 2018. Licensing and differential object marking: the view from Neo-Aramaic. *Syntax* 21:112–159.

Massam, Diane. 2000. VSO and VOS: Aspects of Niuean word order. In *The syntax of verb-initial languages*, ed. Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle, 97–116. Oxford University Press.

Sasama, Fumiko. 2001. A descriptive study of the Coast Tsimshian morphology. Doctoral Dissertation, Kyoto University.

Dialect variation and Brick Walls:
Alana Johns, Dept. of Linguistics, University of Toronto

We know that languages run into quandaries where no straightforward solution is obvious.
Consider the following. In western dialects of Inuktitut, restriction i. disallows ergative case as
heads of relative clause (1a), thus requiring the agent to appear in the antipassive (1b).
Restriction ii. disallows names as antipassive objects (2).

    (1) a. anguti-up nanuq   taku-jaa
       man-erg. p.bear(abs) see-part.3s/s
       *'the man who saw the polar bear'
       ok 'The man saw the polar bear.'

      b. angut nanur-mik   taku-juq
       man(abs) p.bear-mod.s see-part.3s
       'the man who saw the polar bear.'

      c. nanuq anguti-up taku-jaa
       p.bear man-erg. see-part.3s/s
       'the polar bear that the man saw.'

    (2)   angut   taku-juq   arna-mik   (*Saali-mik)
        man(abs) see-part.3s woman-mod.s   Sally-mod.s
        'The man saw a/the woman' *Sally

So how does the language express something meaning [the man (*erg) who saw Sally
(*antipassive)]? The relative clause construction in this case faces a seeming Brick Wall. It could
disallow the construction entirely or possibly devise another means of construction. Instead, the
language allows names to be objects of antipassives in just this circumstance (see Manning 1996)

    (3) angut   Saali-mik   taku-juq
       man(abs) Sally-mod.s see-part.3s
       'The man who saw Sally.'

Here, just a tiny hole was made in the Brick Wall, but other Brick Walls have different solutions.
       In this paper, we examine two further instances of Brick Walls in Inuktitut, Brick Wall1
which is found in Labrador Inuttut (an Eastern dialect of Inuit) and Brick Wall2 which is found
in Eastern Inuit dialects. Both Brick Walls concern properties of the ergative system, which
supports the idea that it unstable over time. We have two main questions: A) How does a Brick
Wall arise and B) What do various dialects do in response to a Brick Wall. We will focus largely
on B).
    Brick Wall1 (Labrador Inuttut) results from the fact that an overt absolutive object is no
longer possible. The results of this Brick Wall are Route 1, which is found in (4) and (5).
    (4) The absolutive object is only found in non-overt (null) form. This leads to ergative
        constructions being anaphoric as discussed in Johns (2017; 2018) and Woolford (2017).
    (5) The overt object appears only in antipassive. A corollary of (4), overt objects appear as
        antipassive objects, thus abrogating the essential features of an ergative pattern.
However, there are speakers, a minority within the community, who adopt a third solution shown
in (6).
    (6) Juntâ-**p**   atâta-nga-**nik**   taku-lau-<u>ngi</u>-**tanga**

Juntâ-erg. father-3s -mod.s   see-past- NEG-part.3/3s
'Juntâ did not see his father.

Here a non-absolutive case is used for an overt object in the ergative construction. While this solves Brick Wall1, this route 2 has not been adopted by the majority of speakers, who take Route 1.

Brick Wall2 is general within the ergative system in the group of dialects called Eastern Inuit. It entails that first and second person objects are no longer possible in the participial mood of the verb. Here dialects follow slightly different paths. In Baffin dialects, where the alternative indicative mood remains marked for special meaning, the route taken is to utilize the default participial mood, and the construction appears as an antipassive with an overt 1/2 pronominal object, as in (7).

(7) ippatsaq qimmi-ra **ilin-ni**   mali-lauq-tuq   ilinniarvim-mut
    yesterday dog-1s/s you-mod.s   follow-past-**part.**3s   school-all.s
    'Yesterday my dog followed you to school.

In contrast, in the Labrador dialect, the indicative mood has become less marked. The solution in this dialect is that first/second objects continue to appear in the ergative construction, but only in the no longer marked indicative mood, as in (8a). If the participial is used, the AP version is found (8b).

(8) a. ippasak Kimmi-ma mali-lauk-**Kâtit (*tâtit)**   ilinniavi-mmut.
    yesterday dog-erg. follow-past-**indic.3s/2s** (*part.3s/2s)   school-all.s
    OR
    b. ippasak Kimmiga **ili-nnik**   mali-laut-tuk   ilinniavi-mmut
      yesterday dog-1s/s   2s-mod.s   follow-past-**part**.3s   school-all.s
    'Yesterday my dog followed you to school.'

In this dialect, there are contexts where the indicative is not allowed for independent reasons, and as a result, we only find the (8b) solution.

These routes are clearly forms of repair. But what led to the need for repairs? I argue that the indicative transitive mood has become true phi agreement (as in West Greenlandic – see Yuan 2018), while the participial mood has lost the ability to undergo Head Movement to a higher position.

References
Johns, A. 2017. Anaphoric arguments in Unangax and Eastern Canadian Inuktitut. In L. D.
Kaplan and A. Berge, eds., Studies in Inuit Linguistics: In Honor of Michael Fortescue.
Johns, A. 2018. An Agreement/Case Mismatch?. Wa7 xweysás i nqwal'úttensa i ucwalmícwa:
He loves the people's languages: Essays in honour of Henry Davis
155-168.
Manning, C. 1996. Ergativity: Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations. California:
Stanford, CSLI.
Yuan, M. 2018. Dimensions of ergativity in Inuit: Theory and microvariation. MIT dissertation.
Woolford, E. 2017. Mainland Scandinavian object shift and the puzzling ergative pattern in
Aleut. In Laura Bailey and Michelle Sheehan, eds, Order and Structure in Syntax. Language
Science Press: Berlin.

John W. W. Powell
University of Arizona

A Diachronic Partial Accounting for –k and –m Verbs in Yuman River Languages

In the River languages of the Yuman family, all verbs are suffixed with either a realis –k or –m (generally in complementary distribution). One of the major puzzles in Yuman linguistics is the debate of whether this distribution is "innovative or archaic" (Munro, 1981: p. 128). Munro and Gordon (1990) convincingly argue that it is innovative, but then where and what did the –k and –m verbal realis come from? First, this paper supports Munro and Gordon's (1990) theory that –m was lexicalized in Proto-River (PR), but through the analysis of eighteen –k/–m minimal pairs in Piipaash (Maricopa; mrc). Second, this paper provides evidence for an –m origin further back from an imperfective construction. This paper provides a diachronic argument examining the origins of –m through comparative synchronic morphosyntax of Yuman languages. Fifteen Yuman grammars are examined,[1] utilizing the newest classification on Yuman languages by Miller (2018), which combines Pai and River sub-branches, previously theorized as distinct, into a historic Pai-River macro-branch. With evidence from Pai languages, this paper argues for a diachronic development of –m verbs in River emerging from imperfective markers in Proto-Pai-River (PPR).

Across Yuman languages, –k indicates same subject (SS) and –m, different subject (DS) in the switch-reference system. Additionally, the morphemes are PP case, with –k being locative "hither" and –m being ablative "thither." Kendall (1975) argued for polysemy of the morphemes, a proximate (–k) and a distant (–m). Yet this explanation cannot account for –k/–m verbs in the River branch, as there is no functional difference found in the realis allomorphy. In Piipaash, Gordon (1980) concluded, "It is impossible to find any feature or set of features, whether phonological, syntactic or semantic, which distinguish -m verbs from -k verbs" (Gordon, 1980, p. 123). Previous literature has researched –k/–m in individual River languages (Gordon, 1980; Miller, 1992; Munro, 1981), but little compares verbal use of –k/–m or considers its diachronic origin, to other Yuman branches outside River, even as novel –k/–m uses have been documented in Pai languages (Kendall, 1975; Redden, 1980; Yamamoto, 1976).

About a quarter of verbs in both Piipaash and Mohave (mov) are –m verbs, though there is freer variation in Mohave. However, Quechan (yum) features only 22 –m verbs (Miller, 1992), virtually all being –m verbs in Piipaash and Mohave. Many of the Quechan –m verbs are auxiliaries or durative or stative verbs (Miller, 1992), similar to the tendencies of Mohave verbs being intransitive, stative, and adjectival (Munro, 1976; 1980). With –k/–m verbs being limited to River, Munro and Gordon (1990) argued that they likely originated from PR, and evidence from minimal pairs in Piipaash in this study support this, which are almost all accounted for due to loss of derivational morphology. However, that does not explain what they came from.

To answer this, examining –k and –m beyond River is necessary. There are –m imperfective (or incompletive) markers in some Pai languages (Hardy, 1979; Kendall, 1976). Example (2) from Tolkapaya (yuf) provides a typical VERB$_1$-k AUX-m shape for imperfect construction.

(1) smaa-k   yu-m
    sleep-SS   be-IMPF   "He/she is asleep" (Hardy, 1979, p. 20, with modifications)

The connection between the imperfective aspect in some Pai languages and the durative, stative, and adjectival tendencies of –m verbs in Mohave and Quechan provide evidence for a common –m in PPR, as no similar –m exists outside of Pai and River. This paper argues that the imperfective –m in PPR, first applied to auxiliaries as well as durative and stative verbs, was lexicalized, and grew to other aspectual classes in PR. The –m applied to more verbs in Mohave and Piipaash. The paper also advances a theory for the rigidity of –k/–m in Piipaash, the freer variation in Mohave, and the small number of –m verbs in Quechan. This paper provides evidence for a theory progressing the debate on this old Yuman puzzle.

---

[1] (Crawford, 1966; Gorbet, 1976; Gordon, 1986; Halpern, 1947; Hardy, 1979; Joel, 1966; Kendall, 1976; Kozlowski, 1972; Langdon, 1966; Miller, 2001; Mixco, 1971; 2000; Munro, 1976; Seiden, 1963; Watahomigie et al., 2001)

References

Crawford, J. (1966). *The Cocopa language*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.

Gorbet, L. P. (1976). *A Grammar of Diegueño Nominals*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Gordon, L. (1980). -k and -m in Maricopa. In P. Munro, *Studies of switch-reference* (pp. 119-144). Los Angeles: University of California.

Gordon, L. (1986). *Maricopa morphology and syntax*. Berkeley: University of California Publications in Linguistics.

Halpern, A. (1947). *A Grammar of the Yuma Language*. University of Chicago dissertation.

Hardy, H. (1979). *Tolkapaya syntax: Aspect, modality, and adverbial modification in a Yavapai dialect*. University of California, Los Angeles dissertation.

Joel, D. J. (1966). *Paipai Phonology and Morphology*. University of California, Los Angeles dissertation.

Kendall, M. (1975). *The /-k/, /-m/ problem in Yavapai syntax*. International Journal of American Linguistics, 40(1), 1-9.

Kendall, M. (1976). *Selected problems in Yavapai syntax: The Verde Valley dialect*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Kozlowski, E. (1972). *Havasupai simple sentences*. Indian University dissertation.

Langdon, M. (1966). *A grammar of Diegueño: The Mesa Grande dialect*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.

Miller, A. (1992). *-k and -m in Yuma narrative texts*. In J. Redden (Ed.), Papers from the 1992 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference and the J. P. Harrington Conference at UCSB & Museum of Natural History, Santa Barabara (pp. 69-81). Carbondale, IL: Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University.

Miller, A. (2001). *A Grammar of Jamul Tiipay*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Miller, A. (2018). *Phonological Developments in Delta-California Yuman*. International Journal of American Linguistics, 84(3), 383-533.

Mixco, M. (1971). *Kiliwa Grammar*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.

Mixco, M. J. (2000). *Kiliwa*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Munro, P. (1976). *Mojave Syntax*. New York: Garland Publishin, Inc.

Munro, P. (1981). Mojave -k and -m: It ain't necessarily so. In J. Redden (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1981 Hokan languages workshop and Penutian language conference* (pp. 124-129). Carbondale, IL: Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University.

Redden, J. (1980). On Walapai /-k/ and /-m/. In J. Redden (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1980 Hokan languages workshop* (pp. 96-99). Carbondale, IL: Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University.

Seiden, W. (1963). *Havasupai Phonology and Morphology*. Indiana University dissertation.

Watahomigie, L. J., Bender, J., & Yamamoto, A. Y. (2001). *Hualapai Reference Grammar*. Osaka: Osaka Gakuin University.

Yamamoto, A. (1976). *Notes on the interpretation of /-m/ and /-k/ in Walapai*. In J. Redden (Ed.), Proceeedings of the first Yuman languages workshop (pp. 149-152). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.