

Possessor Raising and Object Incorporation in Chukchi

Alexey Vinyar (alexvinyar@yandex.ru), Higher School of Economics

1. Introduction: Possessor and Indirect Object (IO) Raising

NI in Chukchi – Type III ([Mithun 1984], [Polinsky & Nedjalkov 1987], [Kozinsky et al. 1988], [Spencer 1995])

➤ Obligatory Possessor (POSS) → DO

Possessor serves as verb's DO when 'former' DO is incorporated. Verb agrees with former possessor and it's case-marked by nominative (A in Chukchi in marked by instrumental, O and S – by nominative).

(1) POSS → DO 'Raising'

- a. *ekke-ne* *ʔattʔa-qey-ti* *raqametwaw-ne-na-t* *attʔay-in*
son-AN.INS dog-DIM-NOM.PL feed-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O-PL father-POSS
- b. *ekke-ne* *attʔay-a-n* *ʔattʔa-nqametwaw-ne-n*
son-AN.INS father-NOM.SG dog-feed-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
- c. **ekak-ø* *attʔay-ʔattʔa-nqametwak-wʔ-e*
son-NOM.SG father-dog-feed-TH-2/3SG.S
'Son fed father's dogs'.

Relationals can be raised (2).

(2) REL → DO 'Raising'

- a. *ratamnew-ni-n* *saj-koka-ken* *kayaryajpa-n*
lose-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O tea-pot-REL cover-NOM.SG
'He lost the tea pot's cover'.
- b. *kayaryajpa-natamnew-ne-n* *saj-kok-ø*
cover-lose-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O tea-pot-NOM.SG

➤ Optional IO → DO in trivalent verbs:

(3) IO → DO Raising

- a. *attʔa-ø* *ritq-nejmek-wʔ-i* *naakka-ɣta*
mother-NOM.SG porridge-bring.closer-TH-2/3SG.S daughter-DAT
'Mother brought (the/a) porridge closer to the daughter'.
- b. *attʔa-ta* *ritq-nejmew-ni-n* *neekak-ø*
mother-INS porridge-bring.closer-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O daughter-NOM.SG

➤ Goals/Places can be raised when affected (compare (4) and (5)):

(4) IO ('Place') can't be raised

- a. *attʔa-ø* *kojnʔa-tret-ɣʔ-e* *stote-tkana-k*
mother-NOM.SG cup-put-TH-2/3SG.S table-TOP-LOC
'Mother put (the/a) cup on the table' ((b) means 'Put the cup for the table').
- b. *#attʔa-ta* *kojnʔa-tret-ne-n* *stot-ø*
mother-INS cup-put-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O table-NOM.SG

(5) IO ('Place') Raising

- a. *awerʔa-jme-ɣʔ-e* *pʔajmejotɣa-tkana-k*
cloth-hang-TH-2/3SG.S drying.stick-TOP-LOC
'(Mother) hang (the/a) clothes on the drying stick'.
- b. *awerʔa-jme-ne-n* *pʔajmejotɣa-n*
cloth-hang-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O drying.stick-NOM.SG

➤ Adjuncts with beneficiary role can be raised, too (6):

- a. *attʔay-e* *watʔa-ø* *pʔane-ni-n* *enaratʔ-eta*
father-INS knife-NOM.SG sharpen-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O neighbor-DAT
- b. *attʔay-e* *watʔa-mna-ne-n* *enaratʔa-n*
father-INS knife-sharpen-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O neighbor-NOM.SG
'Father sharpened (the/a) knife for the neighbor' (the knife doesn't belong to the neighbor).

Questions:

- Is 'Possessor Raising' (PR) a derivation from possessive construction or Possessor and incorporated noun (IN) doesn't form a constituent ([Baker et al. 2005], [Barrie 2016] vs [Michelson 1991], [Evans 2003: 457], [Muro 2009: 89])?
- Does the process of 'IO Raising' differ from 'Possessor Raising'?

2. POSS → DO vs IO → DO

Assumption: PR is a derivation from possessive construction (distinct from optional IO → DO raising).

Prediction: When the possessed DO is incorporated while IO is present, IO will remain IO and POSS will be raised to DO.

Reality: if Recipient/Beneficiary IO (7) or Goal/Place IO (8) is present, the incorporation of possessed DO is impossible:

(7) IO (Recipient) blocks 'Possessor Raising'

- a. *attʔa-ta* *ekk-in* *ritqrit* *jit-ni-n* *naaka-ɣta*
mother-INS son-POSS porridge.NOM.SG give-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O daughter-DAT
'Mother gave son's porridge to the daughter'.
- b. **attʔa-ta* *ekak-ø* *ritq-jit-ni-n* *naaka-ɣta*
mother-INS son-NOM.SG porridge-give-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O daughter-DAT
'Mother gave son's porridge to the daughter'.

(8) IO (Place) blocks 'Possessor Raising'

- *attʔa-ta* *neekak-ø* *awerʔa-jme-ne-n* *pʔajmejotɣa-tkana-k*
mother-INS daughter-NOM.SG cloth-hang-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O drying.stick-TOP-LOC
'Mother hang daughter's clothes on the drying stick'.

(9) Adjunct (Beneficiary) blocks 'Possessor Raising'

- a. *attʔay-e* *ekk-in* *watʔa-ø* *pʔane-ni-n* *enaratʔ-eta*
father-INS son-POSS knife-NOM.SG sharpen-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O neighbor-DAT
- b. **attʔay-e* *ekak-ø* *watʔa-mna-ne-n* *enaratʔ-eta*
father-INS son-NOM.SG knife-sharpen-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O neighbor-DAT
'Father sharpened son's knife for the neighbor'.

(10) Omitted IO blocks PR

- #attʔa-ta* *neekak-ø* *awerʔa-jme-ne-n*
mother-INS daughter-NOM.SG cloth-hang-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
Impossible meaning: 'Mother hang daughter's clothes';
Possible meaning 'Mother hang clothes on her daughter'.

(11) Even inalienable possessors can't be raised

- a. *attʔa-ta* *toptar-eta* *ekk-in* *mʔanya-tɣa-n* *rakaterow-ne-n*
mother-INS doctor-DAT son-POSS hand-SING-NOM.SG show-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
'Mother showed son's hand to the doctor'.
- b. **attʔa-ta* *toptar-eta* *ekak-ø* *mʔanya-nkaterow-ne-n*
mother-INS doctor-DAT son-NOM.SG hand-show-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

Preliminary conclusion: possessor can't be 'raised' to DO via DO incorporation when BEN/RCP is present or implied

Possible explanations:

- 'POSS → DO' construction is syntactically 'IO → DO', so another IO blocks 'POSS Raising' ([Michelson 1991] & [Muro 2009]-style)
- 'X → DO via DO incorporation' is a specific construction, which has few relations to analytic expressions without incorporation. Ability to 'raise' an NP is connected with notions of 'affectedness' ([Nedjalkov 1976]-style approaches)

3. Discussion

3.1. Is POSS → DO actually IO → DO?

Many superficial POSS → DO constructions may have analytic variants as constructions with IO: (1) can be expressed by (12) with the same meaning, but in some constructions with REL → DO relational can't be expressed as IO (13).

- (12) *ekke-ne* *ʔattʔa-qey-ti* *raqametwaw-ne-na-t* *attʔay-eta*
son-AN.INS dog-DIM-NOM.PL feed-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O-PL father-DAT
'Son fed dogs for father (dogs belong to the father)'

- (13) **ratamnew-ni-n* *saj-koka-jpa* *kayaryajpa-n*
lose-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O tea-pot-ABL cover-NOM.SG
Intended meaning: 'He lost the tea pot's cover (He lost the cover from the tea pot)'.

Different explanation is needed: not all 'POSS/REL → DO' constructions can be reduced to IO → DO.

We can't say that all Xs raised to DO are verb's arguments: Adjuncts can be raised, too (6,9).

3.2. Separate construction?

- Some morpho-syntactically identical constructions allow or disallow IO raising (compare (4) and (5)) due to subtle semantic differences.
- Affectedness semantics plays the role in Subject Incorporation [Nedjalkov 1976] and antipassive constructions ([Kozinsky et al. 1988]).
- Lack of same 'affectedness-like' meaning blocks POSS → DO (8), where IO but not POSS is affected?

4. Conclusion

- Problematic to postulate [Baker et al. 2005]-like 'Possessor Raising' for Chukchi: 'Possessor Raising Incorporation' can happen only when 'Possessor' can be interpreted as Beneficiary/Maleficiary/Recipient
- Problematic to reduce all 'X → DO' constructions to 'IO → DO': Not all meanings can be expressed & adjuncts can be raised
- 'Raising' in Chukchi differs from 'Raising' in other languages
- Maybe 'X → DO via Incorporation' can be regarded as a separate construction, which can occur only when X can be interpreted as 'most affected' or 'most Beneficiary-like'?

References

- Baker, Mark. 1996. The Polysynthesis Parameter. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mark, Roberto Aranovich, and Lucia Golluscio. 2005. "Two Types of Syntactic Noun Incorporation: Noun Incorporation in Mapudungun and Its Typological Implications." *Language*, 81: 138–176
- Barrie, Michael. 2015, to appear. Two kinds of structural noun incorporation. *Studia Linguistica*.
- Evans, Nicholas. 1997. Role or cast? Noun incorporation and complex predicates in Mayali. *Complex predicates*, ed. by Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan, and Peter Sells, 397–430. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2003. Bininj Gun-wok: A pan-dialectal grammar of Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Michelson, Karin. 1991. Possessor Stranding in Oneida. In *Linguistic inquiry*, Vol. 22, 756–761.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60: 847–894.
- Muro, Allesio. 2009. Noun incorporation: A new theoretical perspective. Ph.D. Dissertation, Università degli Studi di Padova.
- Polinskaja & Nedjalkov 1987 — M. Polinskaja, V. P. Nedjalkov. *Contrasting the absolutive in Chukchee* // *Lingua* 71, 1987. P. 239–269.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1976. *Diathesen und Satzstruktur im Tschuktschischen*. Satzstruktur und Genus Verbi, ed. by Rudolph Lutsch and Rudolph Ruzicka, 181–211. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Spencer, Andrew. 1995. Incorporation in Chukchi. *Language* 71: 439–489.