

## Building a paradigm: Why the independent order works the way it does

Will Oxford

University of Manitoba

will.oxford@umanitoba.ca

A salient property of most Algonquian languages is the existence of two parallel but formally distinct paradigms of verb inflection known as the INDEPENDENT and CONJUNCT orders. The conjunct is the older of the two, reflecting the original system of verb inflection prior to the addition of the independent. The origin of the independent was identified by Goddard (1974, 2007; see also Proulx 1982): it arose through the reanalysis of deverbal noun forms as verb forms, a diachronic pathway also attested in Amazonian languages (Gildea 2008) and Uto-Aztecan (Jacobs 1975) and possibly in Austronesian as well (Starosta, Pawley, and Reid 1982). Goddard's account explains the basic properties of the independent order, but many unanswered questions remain. My presentation will consider three of these questions:

1. **No prefix in third-person intransitives.** The basic INDICATIVE mode of the independent order has two distinct inflectional templates for third-person forms. One template involves the third-person prefix \*we- while the other involves the umlauting central suffix \*-w̄. Transitive third-person forms can use either template, but intransitive third-person forms always use the umlauting template—that is, they always lack a person prefix. Why?
2. **Expansion of the direct-inverse system.** In the Proto-Algonquian conjunct order, the direct-inverse agreement pattern occurs only in TA non-local forms (e.g. 'she sees him'), but in the independent order it occurs in both TA non-local forms and TA mixed forms (e.g. 'she sees me'). Why was the direct-inverse pattern extended to TA mixed forms in the independent?
3. **The exceptionality of local forms.** Unlike the rest of the TA independent, the local forms (e.g. 'you see me') do not show a direct-inverse agreement pattern; instead, their inflection follows a similar pattern to that of the conjunct order. Why do the independent local forms work differently from their mixed and non-local counterparts?

In each case, I will suggest that the answer lies in the strategies that speakers employed to fill out portions of the independent paradigm that were left unfilled by the original noun-to-verb reanalysis. This gradual process of paradigm-building explains why the morphological patterns of the independent order are far more heterogeneous than those of the conjunct order.

### References

- Gildea, Spike. 2008. Explaining similarities between main clauses and nominalized phrases. *Amérindia* 32: 57–75.
- Goddard, Ives. 1974. Remarks on the Algonquian independent indicative. *IJAL* 40: 317–327.
- Goddard, Ives. 2007. Reconstruction and history of the independent indicative. In *Papers of the 38th Algonquian Conference*, ed. H. C. Wolfart, 207–271. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Jacobs, Roderick A. 1975. *Syntactic change: A Cupan (Uto-Aztecan) case study*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Proulx, Paul. 1982. The origin of the absolute verbs of the Algonquian independent order. *IJAL* 48: 394–411.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol. 2, edited by Halim Amran, Lois Carrington, and S. A. Wurm, 145–170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.