Affixhood is syntactically determined in Inuktitut

This paper argues that affixhood is predictable from the syntax in Inuktitut, contrary to the common assumption that affixes must be marked as such in the grammar. We show that the morphologically complex unit usually referred to as a word in Inuktitut, see (1), is actually a phonological word corresponding to a syntactic phase (see Sadock 1980 for arguments that this unit has the same properties as English words). Thus words in Inuktitut correspond to DPs or CPs (following Wojdak (2005) among others we assume that vP need not be a phase).

In a basic transitive clause with one CP containing two DPs, there are three words since there are three phases, as in (2). Even in more complex constructions word boundaries correspond to phase boundaries. To illustrate this, we consider noun incorporation and a set of "affixal" verbs in the language

Johns (2006) argues that noun incorporation in Inuktitut involves a closed set of light verbs which obligatorily incorporate (suffix onto) a noun stem, as in (3). Crucially, an incorporated noun cannot bear the case and number morphology that is otherwise required on nouns. Our analysis reduces this contrast to the fact that noun stems do not constitute phases, while full DPs (which are marked for case and number) are phases and therefore must be separate phonological words, as they are in (2).

Affixal verb constructions in Inuktitut (Smith 1982; Grimshaw and Mester 1985; Woodbury and Sadock 1986), exemplified in (4)–(6), contain a verbal stem followed by an "affixal" verb. Pittman (2006) analyzes affixes of the –*guma* 'want' type in (4) as modals (see also Johns 1999) and affixes of the –*qu* 'order' type in (5) and of the –*niraq* 'say' type in (6) as restructuring verbs (see Wurmbrand 2001; Cinque 2001) which take complements smaller than a CP. Pittman's analysis, argued for on independent grounds, combined with ours, predicts the bound status of the affixal verbs, since there is only one CP phase in each construction type.

One potential counterargument to our analysis is the existence of both bound adjectives, as in (7), and free adjectives, as in (8) (see Fortescue (1980)). We account for this dichotomy by proposing that bound adjectives are APs while free adjectives are CPs. The free adjectives can be used as main predicates (containing both mood and agreement, as in (9)), pointing to their status as CPs. Note that the attributive adjective in (8) has essentially the same form, still containing mood and agreement. The choice between bound and free adjectives depends on whether or not the adjective is in the same phase as the noun it modifies. Free adjectives are separate words because they constitute a separate CP phase.

In sum, this paper considers several different types of constructions in Inuktitut and shows that in all cases units that are considered to be words in the language correspond to either CPs or DPs. Phonological word boundaries in Inuktitut are thus in fact phase boundaries. Affixhood is not specified idiosyncratically for each morpheme in the language but is instead the result of the way in which phonological words are built. In this paper we also briefly discuss phonological processes that are constrained by phase boundaries. This paper builds on recent work by Adger (to appear) and Kahnemuyipour (2004) in which phases are referred to by phonological processes, specifically sentential stress assignment, showing that phonology can make use of phases.

Examples:

(1) tuktu-lia-qati-gi-tqing-napin-ngit-ki-ga
    caribou-get-one.who.does.with-have.as-again-be.about.to-not-decl.-1sg./3sg.
    'I will never go caribou hunting again with him.'   (Siglit, adapted from Lowe 1985)

(2) Piita   niri-lau-nngit-tuq   palaugaang-mi
    Peter(abs) eat-d.past-neg-decl.3sg bannock-obl
    'Peter was not eating bannock.'   (Baffin, authors' field notes)

(3) niqi-tuq-tunga
    meat-consume-decl.1sg
    'I'm eating meat.'   (Baffin, Johns 2006)

(4) Jaani-up tuktu   niri-guma-janga
    John-erg caribou(abs) eat-want-decl.3sg./3sg
    'John wants to eat the caribou.'   (Baffin, Pittman 2006)

(5) Jaani-up tuktu   niri-qu-lauq-tanga   Miali-mu
    John-erg caribou(abs) eat-order-d.past-decl.3sg./3sg. Mary-obl
    'John ordered Mary to eat the caribou.'   (Baffin, Pittman 2006)

(6) Jaani-up niri-nira-lauq-tanga   tuktu   Miali-mu
    John-erg eat-say-d.past-decl.3sg./3sg. caribou(abs) Mary-obl
    'John said that Mary ate the caribou.'   (Baffin, Pittman 2006)

(7) iglu-jjua-liu-lauq-tunga
    house-big-make-d.past-decl.1sg
    'I made a big house.'   (Baffin, authors' field notes)

(8) ani-juq   nanuq   taku-lauq-tuq   natting-mi
    big-part.3sg polar.bear(abs) see-d.past-decl.3sg seal-obl
    'The big polar bear saw the seal.'   (Baffin, authors' field notes)

(9) nanuq   ani-juq
    polar.bear big-decl.3sg
    'The polar bear is big.'   (Baffin, authors' field notes)

References

Adger, D. to appear. Stress and Phasal Syntax. *Linguistic Analysis*.
Cinque, G. 2001. Restructuring and the order of aspectual and root modal heads. In *Current Studeis in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds), Elsevier, Amsterdam, 137-155.
Fortescue, M.D. 1980. Affix ordering in West Greenlandic Derivational Processes. *IJAL* 46:259-78.
Grimshaw, J. and Mester, R. 1985. Complex verb formation in Eskimo. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 1-19.
Johns, A. 1999. On the lexical semantics of affixal 'want' in Inuktitut. *IJAL* 65, 176-200.
Johns, A. 2006. Agreement and noun incorporation. Paper presented at the Noun Incorporation and Its Kind conference, University of Ottawa, February 20-22, 2006.
Kahnemuyipour, A. 2004. The Syntax of Sentential Stress. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Toronto.
Pittman, C. 2006. Restructuring the clause in Inuktitut. Poster presented at the 11th Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Languages of the Americas, University of British Columbia, March 31-April 2, 2006.
Sadock, J. 1980. Noun incorporation in Greenlandic: A case of syntactic word formation. *Langauge* 56, 301-319.
Smith, L. 1982. An analysis of affixal verbal derivation and complementation in Labrador Inuttut. *Linguistic Analysis* 10, 161-189.
Wojdak, R. 2005. The linearization of affixes: Evidence from Nuu-chah-nulth. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of British Columbia.
Woodbury, A. and Sadock, J. 1986. Affixal verbs in syntax: A reply to Grimshaw and Mester. *Natural Langguage and Linguistic Theory* 4, 229-244.
Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Mouton do Gruyter, Berlin/New York.