Ergative extraction marking as participant exponence [*]

Bernat Bardagil-Mas
UC Berkeley
bardagil@berkeley.edu

Today's talk

- Jê verbs: long and short forms

- Case marking alignment

- Main and dependent clauses in Panará

- Extraction asymmetries

1 Panará

- In South America, the Jê language family is found from central Brazil to south-eastern Brazil

- Panará belongs to the Northern Jê branch. It is spoken by 500-600 people in southern Pará and northern Mato Grosso

Location of the Panará Indigenous Land.
Source: Instituto Socioambiental.

- Panará is an atypical Jê language:
    - A polysynthetic language in a broadly analytic family
    - A uniformly ergative case-marking language in a broadly accusative/ergative family
    - A free constituent order language in a strongly verb-final family

2 Clause type and case alignment

- In Jê languages, the case marking alignment is accusative in clauses with a short form of the verb

- Ergative case alignment is present exclusively in nominal environments, marked with a long form of the verb

(Bardagil 2018; Nonato 2014; Salanova 2007; Urban 1985)

Dependent clauses obligatorily take a long-form verb, and therefore the case alignment is ergative.

(1) a. *[**Ba**   tep krẽ   ] kêt.   *Mẽbêngôkre*
          1SG.NOM fish eat.SH   NEG
          'I didn't eat fish.'

     b. *[**Ije**   tep krẽ   ] kêt.
          1SG.ERG fish eat.SH   NEG
          'I didn't eat fish.'

     c. [**Ije**   (/*Ba)   tep krẽn] kêt.
          1SG.ERG /1SG.NOM fish eat.LG   NEG
          'I didn't eat fish.'

Unlike every other Jê language, the case marking of arguments in Panará in dependent clauses is identical to that of main clauses.

- Exemplified with a relative clause (Panará has IHRCs):

(2) Joopy hẽ ti=   ∅=   krẽ swasĩrã.   *Panará*
      jaguar ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS eat w.l.peccary
      'The jaguar ate a white-lipped peccary.'

(3) [Patty hẽ ti=   ∅=   pĩra swasĩra] rê=   ∅=
      Patty ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS kill peccary   1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS

      ku=   krẽ.
      chew eat
      'I ate the peccary that Patty killed.'

3 Syntactic ergativity

In some languages, a clear asymmetry exists between the syntactic properties of the two arguments of a transitive predicate.

- One argument in transitive clauses has a prominence in constituency, access to syntactic operations, and coreference regulations

- Such prominence makes this argument similar to the single argument of the intransitive clause

When such asymmetry follows an ergative pattern we talk about **syntactic ergativity**. Syntactic ergativity is sometimes manifested as an extraction asymmetry. *Typically one that restricts the ergative argument.*

- ERG + ABS_{INTR} vs. ABS_{TR} $\longrightarrow$ Syntactic accusativity

- ERG vs. ABS_{INTR} & ABS_{TR} $\longrightarrow$ Syntactic ergativity

Limitations on argument extraction that are typically observed cross-linguistically in ergative systems are focalization, wh-fronting, or relativization (Deal 2015; Queixalós 2013).

E.g.: West Greenlandic relativization exhibits syntactic ergativity (Bittner 1994):

(4) miiqqa-t   [$_{\text{ABS}}$ sila-mi   pinnguar-tu-t   ] ABS_{INTR}
     child-PL.ABS _   outdoors-LOC play-REL.INTR-PL
     'The children who are playing outdoors.'

(5) miiqqa-t   [Juuna-p $_{\text{ABS}}$ paari-sa-i   ] ABS_{TR}
     child-PL.ABS Juuna-ERG _   look.after-REL.TR-3SG.PL
     'The children that Juuna is looking after.'

(6) *angut   [$_{\text{ERG}}$ aallaat   tigu-sima-sa-a   ]   ERG
     man.ABS _   gun.ABS take-PRF-REL.TR-3SG.SG
     Intended: 'The man who took the gun.'

4 Panará syntactic ergativity

Panará does not exhibit ergative-absolutive (or nominative-accusative) asymmetries in most operations, with one exception:

- Demonstratives

- Wh-extraction

- Relativization

- **Extraction from embedded clauses** $\Longleftarrow$

4.1 Demonstratives

- In Panará, all arguments can be specified with a demonstrative determiner, or realized as a demonstrative pronoun:

(7) a. **Mãja** jy= pôô   ABS$_{INTR}$
  this INTR arrive
  'This one here arrived.'

   b. Kupêri hẽ ti= s= anpun **mãja**.   ABS$_{TR}$
  Kupêri ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see this
  'Kupêri saw this one here.'

   c. **Mãja hẽ** ti= s= anpun Kupêri.   ERG
  this ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see Kupêri
  'This one here saw Kupêri.'

4.2 Syntactic ergativity: Ā-movement

- Wh-extraction is available to all absolutives, as well as the ergative:

(8) a. Inpy jy= sõti
  man INTR sleep
  'The man slept.'

   b. $\boxed{\text{Prẽ}}$ jy= sõti?   ABS$_{INTR}$
  who INTR sleep
  'Who slept?'

(9) a. Inpy hẽ ti= s= anpun inkjêê.
  man ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see woman
  'The man saw the woman.'

   b. $\boxed{\text{Prẽ}}$ hẽ ti= s= anpun inkjêê?   ERG
  who ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see woman
  'Who saw the woman?'

   c. $\boxed{\text{Prẽ}}$ inpy hẽ ti= s= anpun?   ABS$_{TR}$
  who man ERG 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see
  'Who did the man see?'

- Relativization is also available to all argument types:

(10) Jy= ∅= sõti [inkjêê jy= ∅= pôô].   ABS$_{INTR}$
  INTR 3SG.ABS sleep woman INTR 3SG.ABS come
  'The woman that arrived is sleeping.'

(11) [Toopatũ hẽ   ti=   pĭri swasĩra] inkjẽ   junpjâ hẽ.   ERG
       old-man ERG 3SG.ERG kill peccary 1SG.ERG father ERG
       'The old man that killed a peccary is my father.'

(12) [Ka   hẽ   ka=   pĭri swasĩra ka sipjâ mã] nãsisi inpe.   ABS$_{TR}$
       2SG ERG 2SG.ERG kill peccary 2SG wife DAT sweet real
       'The peccary you killed for your wife was really tasty.'

4.2.1 Syntactic ergativity: Embedded extraction

Panará does present an Ā-looking phenomenon that exhibits an ergative-absolutive asymmetry. There is a construction with a topic participant in a main clause that corresponds to an argument of a dependent clause. Although it is quite clearly an Ā operation, it is yet inconclusive whether the relation is movement or prolepsis.

- Intransitive absolutive arguments can be extracted from an embedded clause like a complement clause:

(13) Ti=   s=   anpun Perankô hẽ [joopy jy=   tẽ   ].   ABS$_{INTR}$
       3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   Perankô ERG jaguar INTR leave
       'Perankô saw the jaguar that fled (the jaguar flee).'

(14) ⌈Joopy⌉ ti=   s=   anpun Perankô hẽ [_   jy=   tẽ   ].
       jaguar 3SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   Perankô ERG   INTR leave
       'Perankô saw *the jaguar* that fled (the jaguar flee).'

- This is also available to transitive absolutives:

(15) Rê=   s=   anpun [joopy hẽ   ti=   pĭri kôôtita].
       1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   jaguar ERG 3SG.ERG kill chicken
       'I saw the jaguar killing a chicken.'

(16) ⌈Kôôtita⌉ rê=   s=   anpũ [joopy hẽ   ti=   pĭri _].   ABS$_{TR}$
       chicken 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   jaguar ERG 3SG.ERG kill
       'I saw *the chicken* that the jaguar killed.'

- However, ergatives cannot undergo the same operation straight off:

(17) Rê=   s=   anpun [joopy hẽ   ti=   pĭri kôôtita].   ERG
       1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   jaguar ERG 3SG.ERG kill chicken
       'I saw the jaguar killing a chicken.'

(18) *[Joopy] rê=   s=   anpun [_   ti=   pĩri kôôtita].
     jaguar 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
     Intended: 'I saw *the jaguar* that killed the chicken.'

(19) *[Joopy] [hẽ] rê=   s=   anpun [_   ti=   pĩri kôôtita].
     jaguar   ERG 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
     Intended: 'I saw *the jaguar* that killed the chicken.'

There is however a strategy that allows extraction of the ergative constituent: a morpheme *tân* on the main clause's verb.

(20) a. *Joopy rê=   s=   anpũ ti=   pĩri kôôtita.
        jaguar 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
        'I saw the jaguar that killed the chicken.'

     b. *Joopy hẽ rê=   s=   anpũ ti=   pĩri kôôtita.
        jaguar ERG 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
        'I saw the jaguar that killed the chicken.'

     c. Joopy rê=   [tân]= s=   anpũ ti=   pĩri kôôtita.
        jaguar 1SG.ERG ??   3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
        'I saw the jaguar that killed the chicken.'

(21) a. Ippẽ   ka=   [tân]= pĩri ti=   sipyri Pakrekaka.
        stranger 2SG.ERG ??   kill 3SG.ERG kidnap Pakrekaka
        'You killed the Kayapo that had kidnapped Pakrekaka.'

     b. *Panprĩ rê=   [tân]= sanpun ti=   sipyri ippẽ   hẽ.
        child   1SG.ERG ??   see   3SG.ERG kidnap stranger ERG
        'The child that I saw was kidnapped by the Kayapo.'

     c. Panprĩ rê=   sanpun ti=   sipyri ippẽ   hẽ.
        child 1SG.ERG see   3SG.ERG kidnap stranger ERG
        'The child that I saw was kidnapped by the Kayapo.'

- These are not juxtaposed clauses, where the morpheme *tân* would be unnecessary— even ungrammatical:

(22) [Joopy [hẽ] rê=   s=   anpun] [ti=   pĩri kôôtita].
     jaguar ERG 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
     'I saw a jaguar, it killed the chicken.'

(23) *Joopy [hẽ] rê=   s=   anpun [_   ti=   pĩri kôôtita].
     jaguar ERG 1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS see   3SG.ERG kill chicken
     'I saw *the jaguar* that killed the chicken.'

5 Discussion

Panará "embedded extraction" exhibits a syntactically ergative asymmetry:

$$\text{ERG} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{ABS}_{INTR} \text{ \& ABS}_{TR} \rightarrow \text{Syntactic ergativity}$$

Although reminiscent of antipassive constructions, the Panará construction with *tân* is crucially different.

- An **antipassive** allows the ergative argument to access the properties restricted to the absolutive (focus, relativization, etc.)

(24) a. *Angut [aallaat tigu- sima- sa- a].
       man gun.ABS take PRF REL.TR 3SG.SG
       "The man who took the gun."

   b. Angut [aallaam-mik tigu- **si**- sima- su- a].
      man gun-INS take AP PRF REL.INTR SG
      "The man who took the gun."

- Panará *tân* is also unlike Mayan agent focus ([Erlewine 2016](#))

The Panará *tân* morpheme is homophonous with a specialized comitative adposition that has an "at your place" semantics.

(25) Rê= a= tân= ∅= kuri tepi.
      1SG.ERG 2SG.ABS COM 3SG.ABS eat fish
      'I ate fish at your house (with you).

- However, locative-comitative *tân* behaves like a transitive postposition, and when incorporated obligatorily takes an absolutive clitic that matches the postposition's object.

In the inherent case literature ([Aldridge 2012](#); [Assmann et al. 2015](#); [Coon, Mateo Pedro & Preminger 2014](#)), syntactic ergativity is often derived by movement of the absolutive constituent to a position higher than the ergative,[*] where the latter is blocked from extracting:

(26)   [$_{vP}$ DP$_{ABS}$ [$_{vP}$ DP$_{ERG}$ [$_v$ V   ___$_{ABS}$]]]

- However, partial syntactic ergativity such as in Panará cannot be captured by this approach.
  - The ergative DP is not blocked in any other Ā movement (wh, relatives)
  - This suggests that in Panará "embedded extraction" the ergative is not blocked either

---

[*]Motivated by e.g. the need to be assigned absolutive case from T at the *v*P edge. See ([Deal 2015](#): ch.2) for a discussion.

5.1 The proposal

The question that the data examined above is the following:

- Why cannot the ergative in a lowe clause that topicalizes in the upper clause with un-marked (absolutive) case be cross-referenced with an absolutive clitic (or no clitic)?

My working hypothesis is that Panará *tân* is back-up morphological exponence for an out-of-place ergative constituent

- In some cases, a DP with absolutive case in a clause inherits ergative features from another clause
    - By being Ā-extracted from a relative clause in which it's ergative
    - By being co-indexed with an ergative DP in a relative clause

(27) Joopy rê=   tân = sanpũ [⟨joopy hẽ⟩ ti=   pĩri kôôtita].
      jaguar 1SG.ERG   see   jaguar ERG 3SG.ERG kill chicken
      'I saw *the jaguar* that killed the chicken.'

- Regardless of the relation between the high and low elements, neither the ergative nor the absolutive clitic can cross-reference this [ABS, ERG] DP, either because of a feature mismatch or a templatic restriction

(28) [MAIN   DP–$\xrightarrow{cliticize}$ INFL   ... [DEPENDENT   ...   ⟨DP⟩]]

- Absence of a clitic for this participant is equivalent to indexing it with 3SG.ABS {∅}, which would create a mitmatch

- The locative-comitative morpheme *tãn* doubles as a rescue pronominal clitic

6 Conclusion

To conclude, I have presented novel data on partial syntactic ergativity in Panará.

- Ergative constituents require an extra piece of morphology on the verb to be extracted (or co-indexed)

- I proposed that the constraint on Ā extraction of ergative DPs from a relative clause boils down to a morphological restriction

- In this view, neither an ergative nor an absolutive clitic are possible exponents for the [ERG|ABS] feature specification of the DP

- Instead, a more underspecified morpheme (locative-comitative *tân*) is inserted to achieve cross-reference of the constituent

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, ABS = absolutive, AP = antipassive, COM = comitative, DAT = dative, ERG = ergative, INS = instrumental, INTR = intransitive, LG = long form, NEG = negative, NOM = nominative, PRF = perfect, REL = relative, SG = singular, SH = short form, TR = transitive.

References

Aldridge, Edith. 2012. Antipassive and ergativity in Tagalog. *Lingua* 122(3). 192–203.

Assmann, Anke, Doreen Georgi, Fabian Heck, Gereon Müller & Philipp Weisser. 2015. Ergatives move too early: on an instance of opacity in syntax. *Syntax* 12(4). 343–387.

Bardagil-Mas, Bernat. 2018. *Case and agreement in Panará*. University of Groningen PhD thesis.

Bittner, Maria. 1994. *Case, scope and binding*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Coon, Jessica, Pedro Mateo Pedro & Omer Preminger. 2014. The role of case in A-bar extraction asymmetries: evidence from Mayan. *Linguistic Variation* 14(2). 179–242. 10.1075/lv.14.2.01c

Deal, Amy Rose. 2015. Ergativity. In Artemis Alexiadou & Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Syntax - Theory and analysis. An international handbook*, 654–708. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Erlewine, Michael Y. 2016. Anti-locality and optimality in Kaqchikel Agent Focus. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34. 429–479.

Nonato, Rafael. 2014. *Clause-chaining, switch-reference and coordination*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology PhD thesis.

Queixalós, Francesc. 2013. *L'ergativité est-elle un oiseau bleu?*, vol. 26 (LSLT). Munich: Lincom.

Salanova, Andrés. 2007. *Nominalizations and aspect*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology PhD thesis.

Urban, Greg. 1985. Ergativity and Accusativity in Shokleng (Gê). *International Journal of American Linguistics* (16). 164–187.