

## Person agreement prefixes across Algonquian: evidence for three separate paradigms

Ksenia Bogomolets

University of Auckland

This paper presents evidence suggesting that synchronically three distinct sets of person agreement prefixes (PAPRF) are found across Algonquian, illustrated in Table 1 for Arapaho: (i) PAPRF of alienable possession (AP), (ii) PAPRF of inalienable possession (IAP), and (iii) PAPRF denoting agreement on verbs (V).

Table 1. PAPRF in Arapaho

<i>Person</i>	<i>Inalienable</i>	<i>Alienable</i>	<i>V Agreement</i>
I	ne*-	net-	ne-
II	e*-	et-	e-
III	i*-	it-	∅-

\*subject to extensive allomorphy

### Evidence:

#### I. AP and IAP are segmentally different.

AP, compared to IAP, exhibit two properties across Algonquian: (i) they are regular, while IAP are subject to allomorphy and phonological idiosyncrasies, and (ii) they have an underlying consonant, /t/ or /d/ depending on the language. The following suggests that /t~/d/ in PAPRF is underlying rather than epenthetic (contra Cowell & Moss 2011; Goddard 2007, 2015; Newell & Piggott 2014, Oxford 2014): (i). The consonant quality (/t~/d/) is constant across languages; (ii). Epenthesis of /t~/d/ is unattested in Algonquian outside of the person prefixes; (iii). /t~/d/ in AP-PAPRF surfaces when there is no vowel hiatus in Arapaho, Passamaquoddy, Blackfoot. I analyze /t~/d/ as underlying and extra-syllabic.

#### II. V-PAPRF are not equivalent to either AP or IAP.

Differences between the possessives and V-PAPRF vary per language, but can include: (i) V-PAPRF lacks an overt prefix (Arapaho, Cree dialects, Wampanoag) or has a different morpheme in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person (Cheyenne); (ii) Differences in lexical specification for tone or stress (Cheyenne); (iii) V-PAPRF might not have underlying /t~/d/ unlike the AP (Arapaho); and (iv) V-PAPRF do not show morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies unlike the IAP (all surveyed languages).

Synchronic evidence is thus in favor of reconstructing three sets of markers (Proulx 1989) rather than one set (Goddard 2007, 2015; Oxford 2014; i.a.). This has implications for various issues to be explored in the talk: whether person agreement is clitic-like or affixal, vowel hiatus and its relation to morpho-syntactic domains, and reconstruction of verbal and nominal inflection.

**References.** Cowell, Andrew & Moss Sr, Alonzo. (2011). *The Arapaho language*. University Press of Colorado; Goddard, Ives. (2007). Reconstruction and history of the independent indicative. In H. C. Wolfart (ed.), *Papers of the 38th Algonquian conference*, 207–271. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba; Goddard, Ives. (2015). Arapaho historical morphology. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 345-411; Newell, Heather & Glynne Piggott. (2014). Interactions at the syntax-phonology interface: Evidence from Ojibwe. *Lingua* 150. 332–362; Oxford, William Robert. (2014). *Microparameters of agreement: A diachronic perspective on Algonquian verb inflection*. University of Toronto dissertation; Proulx, Paul. (1989). A sketch of Blackfoot historical phonology. *International journal of American linguistics*, 55(1), 43-82.