The morphosyntax of PERSON, NUMBER and GENDER in Kanyen'kéha agreement /
La morphosyntaxe de PERSONNE, de NOMBRE et de GENRE dans l'accord du Kanyen'kéha

Nathan Brinklow, Monique Dufresne, Greg Lessard
Queen's University
Rose-Marie Déchaine
UBC

1. The problem. Iroquoian languages are famous for complex and seemingly opaque agreement morphology. In the verbal series, three pronominal paradigms are recognized (Mithun 2006): intransitive Actor/Subject agreement, intransitive Patient/Object agreement, transitive agreement. The paradigms register contrasts in PERSON (1st, 2nd, 3rd), NUMBER (SINGULAR, DUAL, PLURAL) and GENDER (MASCULINE, FEMININE, ZOIC, NEUTER). Their exponence bears on current morphosyntactic analyses: while some proposals introduce NUMBER higher than PERSON (1), others locate NUMBER lower than PERSON (2). At first glance data from Kanyen'kéha (Mohawk; Northern Iroquoian) seems to support the [NUM>PERS] analysis in (1). However, closer inspection leads to the conclusion that the [PERS>NUM] analysis of (2) is the correct analysis.

(1)   **NUMBER** >   PERSON   > GENDER   (e.g., Harbour 2016)

(2)   PERSON   > **NUMBER** > GENDER   (e.g., Noyer 1992, amongst others)

2. Teasing apart [NUM>PERS] from [PERS>NUM]. The clearest evidence of PERSON/NUMBER interaction in Kanyen'kéha comes from transitive agreement in the context of DUAL number and local forms (1st person acting on 2nd person (1:2); 2nd person acting on 1st person (2:1). As shown in (3), the DUAL prefix ***eni-*** takes scope over the subject argument (3a), the object argument (3b), or both (3c). Inasmuch as semantic scope correlates with syntactic c-command (Szabolsci 1997), one might conclude from (3) that NUMBER (here DUAL) c-commands PERSON. However, such a conclusion would be premature, as the Kanyen'kéha DUAL is best analyzed as an unselective quantifier (Lewis 1975) adjoined to the left edge of the *v*P phase (4), from where it may scope over the *pro*DP in Spec,vP, the *pro*DP complement to *v*, or both *pro*DP's. PERSON agreement, introduced to the left of DUAL marking, predictably further restricts the DUAL construal, yielding the interpretations in (3). The DUAL has both a narrower and broader range of meanings that might be expected if it were simply number marking: (i) it is restricted to human beings; (ii) it is required with reciprocals; (iii) it participates in lexically conditioned alternations as in (5); and more generally (iv) it appears with events whose denotation involves a cardinality of two, including entities ('two dollars'), locations ('move from there to here'), and states ('change from one state to another').

(3) &   k-eni-hró:ris   a.   2**DUAL** :1   '**We**DU tell (youSG)
        1-DUAL-tell   b.   2   :1**DUAL**   '**I**SG tell (youDU)
                            c.   2 **DUAL**:1DUAL   '**We**DU tell (youDU)

(4)   [CP PERSON [… [*v*P DUAL [*v*P *pro*DP [v' [*v pro*DP]]]]

(5)   *wahatí:ien*   'they put/laid it down'   *wa'thatí:ien*   'they gambled'
        roronhiá:ken 'he is physically suffering' *tehotonhakárien*   'he is phys'y/mentally suffering'
        (OCNL1-12:COM, §6.1, p. 86*f.*)

3. Consequences. By bringing into view previously untreated aspects of Kanyen'kéha pronominal agreement, our analysis challenges the [NUM>PERS] analysis of (1) advocated by Harbour (2016). Moreover, in addition to confirming the [PERS>NUM] analysis of (2), inspection of how Kanyen'kéha NUMBER interacts with PERSON reveals novel findings: (i) the neutralization of

NUMBER/GENDER contrasts reflects markedness (Koenig & Michelson 2015); (ii) the combination of PERSON, NUMBER, and GENDER is compositional; (iii) there is one "base paradigm" (the Agent paradigm) from which the other two paradigms are derived; to our knowledge this is not recognized in previous treatments.

References
Ackema, P. & A. Neeleman. 2019. Processing Differences Between Person and Number: A Theoretical Interpretation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 10, Article 211. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00211

Harbour, D. 2016. *Impossible Persons*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Koenig, J.-P. & K. Michelson. 2015. Invariance in argument realization: the case of Iroquoian. *Language* 91.1: 1-47.

Lewis, D. 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*, ed. by E. Keenan, 3-15. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mithun, M. 2006. Iroquoian Languages. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, ed. by K. Brown. Vol. 6, 31-34. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Noyer, R. 1992. Features, positions, and affixes in autonomous morphological structure. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Szabolsci, A. 1997. *Ways of Scope Taking*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer.