Finiteness, Tense, and Feature Inheritance in Inuktitut
Bettina Spreng
University of Saskatchewan
Finiteness is traditionally considered a dependency between tense and agreement to enable subject case. When tense is absent, agreement is too, resulting in a non-finite clause. However, not all languages correlate subject agreement/case and finiteness in this way. There are languages that have non-finite clauses that have tense such as West Flemish (1) or non-tensed finite clauses such as Portuguese (2). Furthermore, finiteness has been argued to exist even without agreement (Afarli, 2016) and the term is often seen as "…difficult to pin down." (Cowper 2016:47).

In the Minimalist Program, the concept of inheritance of φ-features from C to T provides a formal explanation for the traditional idea of finiteness in that it connects tense and agreement (Chomsky 2008). It accounts for the fact that T is not able to establish Agree by itself despite having an EPP feature while there is ample evidence that φ-features are hosted in C (Bayer, 1984). Feature inheritance (FI) thus enables A-movement to T initiated by the probe from T's inherited φ-features. While this seems at first glance of somewhat non-optimal design, Richards (2007, 2012) argues that feature inheritance (FI) is the a necessary and only way to reconcile the following premises.

Premise 1: Value and Transfer of uFs (φ-and EPP) must happen simultaneously.
Premise 2: The edge (C) and non-edge (TP) of a phase are transferred separately.

In this paper, I will present some evidence from Inuktitut that shows that C-T φ-inheritance cannot be a necessary part of the derivation in a language where subject agreement and case are not contingent on Tense. I follow Den Dikken (2014), which argues *Premise 1* is untenable (see also Epstein et al. 2010). I argue that in Inuktitut however, T has no EPP and agreement and subject case is solely hosted on C (Compton 2017). T instead has a non-probing *Tense* feature. Evidence that Tense is present and interpretable in Inuktitut but not correlated to subject case and agreement comes from tense interpretation in embedded conjunctive clauses (Hayashi and Oshima 2015), morpheme order (Compton 2017, Hayashi and Spreng 2005), and proposals that Inuktitut has no non-finite conjunctive clauses (Johns & Smallwood 1999). The analysis is based on the view that subjects are always absolutive and ergative case is inherent case in Inuktitut similar to many other proposals along those lines for other ergative languages such as Woolford (2006), Anand and Nevins (2006), Coon (2013), Polinsky (2016). It should in principle be compatible with other proposals on ergativity in Inuktitut (Johns 1992, Pittman 2009), since it only affects the issue of FI and whether it is a necessary component of Phase-based Syntax (Chomsky, 2008). FI and thus the concept of finiteness can hereby be shown to be subject to language variation as discussed in detail in Eide (2016).

(1) a. Mee ik da gisteren   te zeggen hee-se   dat hus   gekocht
      with I that yesterday to say   has-she that house bought
     'Because of my saying that yesterday she has bought that house.'

   b. Voor gie da te krygen goa-je vele   moeten veranderen
      for   you that to get   go-you much must   change
      'In order to get that you'll have to change a lot.'   (Haegeman 1985:125)

(2) o   Manel pensa [CP ter-emi   [IP amogos t$_i$ levado o livro]
      the Manel thinks   to.have-Agr   his friends taken the book
      'Manel thinks that his friends have taken the book'   (Raposo 1987:98)

References

Afarli, Tor A. 2016. Agreement is not an essential ingredient of finiteness: Evidence from impersonal sentences in Norwegian dialects and in English. In *Finiteness Matters : On finiteness-related phenomena in natural languages*, ed. Kristin M. Eide, 171-188. John Benjamins.

Bayer, Josef. 1984. COMP in Bavarian Syntax [Mar.]. *Ling. Rev.* 3:209-274.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Compton, Richard. 2017. Left-periphery φ-agreement and A-movement in Inuktitut. In *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistics Association*. Ryerson University, Toronto.

Cowper, Elizabeth. 2016. Finiteness and Pseudo-finiteness. In *Finiteness matters : on finiteness related phenomena in natural languages*, ed. Kristin Melum Eide, 47-78. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Den Dikken, Marcel. 2014. On feature interpretability and inheritance. In *Minimalism and Beyond: Radicalizing the interfaces*, eds. Peter Kosta, Steven L. Franks, Teodora Radeva-Bork and Lilia Schürcks, 37-55. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eide, Kristin Melum ed. 2016. *Finiteness matters: on finiteness related phenomena in natural languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Epstein, S. D., Kitahara, H., and Seely, T. Daniel. 2010. Uninterpretable Features: What are they and what do they do? In *Exploring Crash-Proof Grammars*, ed. Michael T. Putnam, 125-142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1985. INFL, COMP and nominative Case assignment in Flemish infinitivals. In *Features and Projections*, eds. Peter Muysken and Henk van Riemsdijk, 123-137. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hayashi, Midori, and Spreng, Bettina. 2005. Is Inuktitut tenseless? *Proceedings of the 2005 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistics Association*.

Hayashi, Midori, and Oshima, David Y. 2015. How multiple past tenses divide the labor: The case of South Baffin Inuktitut. *Linguistics* 53:773-808.

Johns, Alana. 1992. Deriving Ergativity [Winter]. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:57-88.

Johns, Alana, and Smallwood, Carolyn. 1999. On (non-)finiteness in Inuktitut. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 17:159-170.

Pittman, Christine. 2009. Complex verb formation revisited: Restructuring in Inuktitut and Nuu-chaa-nulth. In *Variations on Polysynthesis: The Eskaleut Languages.*, eds. M.-A. Mahieu and N. Tersis, 135-147. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Polinsky, Maria. 2016. *Deconstructing ergativity: two types of ergative languages and their features*: Oxford University Press.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: the Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:85-109.

Richards, Marc. 2007. On Feature Inheritance: An Argument from the Phase Impenetrability Condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:563-572.

Richards, Marc D. 2012. On feature inheritance, defective phases, and the movement-morphology connection. In *Phases*, ed. Angel J. Gallego, 195-232. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.