

**Shiaohui Chan**  
**535 Assignment 19**

1. Explain how the facts from conjunction show that 1st and 2nd person subject affixes are true agreement, while the 3rd person subject affixes are not true agreement.

That first/second person subject inflection represents agreement can be demonstrated in the fact that the absence of the conjunction results in ill-formedness, as the Slave sentences below show. In (a), the subject noun phrase consists of a noun (Jimmy) and a pronoun (sij). In (b) the pronoun is dropped. In (c), the absence of the conjunction (gots') results in the ill-formedness of the sentence because now the verb has dual subject agreement but the NP with which it agrees is overtly singular.

- (a) Jimmy gots' eh sij tehk' áa 1200 a-thí-dlá  
and 1sg muskrat preverb-**1dual Subject**-do  
'Jimmy and I got 1200 muskrat.'
- (b) Jimmy gots' eh tehk' áa 1200 athídlá
- (c) \*Jimmy tehk' áa 1200 athídlá

However, in the following sentence, the subject noun phrase has a real world singular referent, yet the verb contains the human plural subject inflection, and the meaning that obtains is one in which the subject is a group defined by the name individual.

- (d) duhdei ehtsée e-ge-ni-h-sud-i  
here grandfather unspecified Object-**3pl Subject**-aspect-valence-drag-suffix

Hence, sentence (d) does not show a grammatical relation of agreement between two entities.

2. What is a 'disjoint anaphor'?

A disjoint anaphor is a number form with the limited distribution of an anaphor that must be interpreted as disjoint in reference to the subject, as demonstrated by **y** below:

- y-egh nee-nee-yo  
disjoint anaphor-to preverb-aspect-walk  
'He walked up to **him** (disjoint anaphor)'

3. What evidence does Rice give to argue that the *g-* (*j, q, k, h, x*) 'subject' plural marker is not in fact a subject marker, but rather just a 'human plural' marker that can combine with a disjoint object anaphor to give a 'disjoint with plural c-commanding NP' meaning?

I'll follow the author and call the combination of the subject plural marker with a disjoint object anaphor as "*kii*" for this discussion. Let's look at the following examples from Dogrib and Slave:

(a) Dogrib:

Joe h<sub>i</sub> Moise h<sub>i</sub>      **gi-tà**                                      gha elà              whe-h-tsi  
and              and      **pl disjoint anaphor**-father      for boat              aspect-valence-stem  
'Joe and Moise built a canoe for her father.'

(b) Slave:

**ki-tá**                                      rá-ke-re-yi-h-t'u  
**pl disjoint anaphor**-father      preverb-*human pl*Subject-qualifier-aspect-valence-stem  
'They hit his/her father.'

First, the above two examples show that *kii* shows up at places where subject marking is completely unexpected: example (a) shows that *kii* appears as object of a postposition, and example (b) shows that it appears as the possessor of a nonsubject. Besides, if we look closely at example (b), *kii* co-occurs with the human plural number subject *k* (italicized in the example). If *kii* were a concatenation of *y* (object inflection) and *k* (subject inflection), its co-occurrence with *k* in the above example would be surprising.