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Notes


Slide 3 (Maliseet-)Passamaquoddy data are from Francis & Leavitt 2008 (henceforth FL08). The inflectional paradigm on this slide is the AI independent subordinative (FL08:640–655; ‘sing’ examples from p. 647), which is used in certain types of dependent clauses. I selected this paradigm because it uniformly employs the “central agreement” slot (Goddard 1969) to index the subject.

The -n~-ni suffix that occurs throughout the independent subordinative paradigm is a “formative element” (Goddard 2007) that may be considered to mark the subordinative mode. I gloss it simply as ‘n’ here.

Slide 4 The “peripheral agreement” slot (Goddard 1969) occupies word-final position and indexes third persons only.

The (partial) inflectional paradigm on this slide is the Passamaquoddy AI independent indicative.

For a complete list of the languages that have lost (and retained) obviative number in peripheral agreement, see Bliss & Oxford 2017.

Slide 5 The first paradigm on the slide is the Passamaquoddy AI independent subordinative, repeated from Slide 3; the second paradigm is the AI conjunct indicative (FL08:640–655). The vocabulary items that express plurality in the two paradigms are:

(1) 
  a. Independent subordinative: -en ‘1pl’, -ya ‘2pl, 3pl’
  b. Conjunct indicative: -ek ‘1pl’, -ekw ‘2pl’, -hti ‘3pl’ (augments -t ‘3’)

Slide 6 The first paradigm is the Passamaquoddy AI conjunct indicative, repeated from Slide 5. The second paradigm is the Southwestern Ojibwe TA conjunct indicative negative passive (Nichols 1980:315); only 3rd-person forms are shown. Negative forms are shown because their morphophonology is more straightforward than that of the corresponding affirmative forms. In these forms, obviation is marked adjacent to the “theme sign” slot (Bloomfield 1946) immediately after the verb stem; the 3pl central agreement suffix is -wa· (augments -t ‘3’).

Slide 7 In languages that distinguish obviative number in peripheral agreement (C) but not in central agreement (T), the impoverishment rule is as given on the slide: [T, obv, pl] → [T, obv]. In languages that have lost the obviate number contrast on T as well, the impoverishment rule can be simplified to [obv, pl] → [obv] so that it applies to all agreement heads.


Slide 10 In the theoretical literature, the earliest mentions of the Swampy Cree hierarchy reversal that I am aware of are Anderson 1992:130 and Déchaine 1999:60. The same hierarchy reversal occurs in neighbouring Moose Cree as well (Ellis 1971).

Slide 13 The paradigm on this slide shows the underlying forms of the Passamaquoddy peripheral suffixes, based on the surface forms in FL08:638.

Slide 14 The three Plains Cree paradigms on this slide are from Wolfart 1973: 29, 33, 35. See Bliss & Oxford 2017 for further discussion of the inanimate/obviative syncretism.

Slide 16 Proto-Algonquian: Bloomfield 1946; Miami-Illinois: Costa 2003; Massachusetts: Goddard & Bragdon 1988. The Proto-Algonquian syncretism pattern (animate obviative singular = inanimate plural) is by far the most common across the family, but this does not mean that it is somehow more basic or more natural than the Miami-Illinois and Massachusetts patterns. Rather, since most of the Algonquian languages have undergone relatively little grammatical change, the prevalence of the PA pattern is simply the result of inertia.
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