

## Possessive Paradigms in Mi'gmaq: Alienability as Syntactic Proximity

Many Algonquian languages grammaticalize differences between alienable and inalienable possession: *alienable* indicates possessive relationships that may change over time, and *inalienable* is a permanent possessive relationship like those denoting blood relatives (see Nichols & Bickel in *World Atlas of Language Structures*, or Nichols 1988). This presentation uses original fieldwork data of Listuguj (QC) Mi'gmaq to explore the phonological and morphological consequences of overtly-marked alienability. These distinctions present a structural dissimilarity between the types of possession: alienable possessums are syntactically distant from their possessors compared to inalienable possessums (Dobler 2008, Ritter & Rosen 2010).

### Possession in Mi'gmaq: Phonological support

Inalienable possession is *uniquely* expressed by the affixation of a possessor-indicating prefix to the possessum stem. This is the minimal form of any inalienably possessed noun, though additional affixes may be added to express plurality of the possessum or possessor.

- i) **n-ujj**  
1-father  
"my father"

Alienable possession, in contrast, may be expressed through multiple strategies unavailable to inalienable possession. One of these methods is the affixation of a version of the same prefix set as used for inalienable possession, with an epenthetic [-t-] not included in Listuguj orthography. This form requires a suffix [-m] which may introduce a possessor as a type of external argument.

- ii) **'n<sup>t</sup>-a'su'n-m**  
1-blanket-poss  
"my blanket"

### Modification: Morphological support

Alienability affects the position of the modifying prefixes relative to the stem: the possessive affix is adjacent to the inalienable "grandchild" but the modifier 'gji interposes between the affix and the alienable possessum "bishop".

- iii) **'nt-'gji-pa'tlia's-m-inu**  
1-great-priest-POSS-poss'r.pl  
"our bishop"fdf
- iv) **pitui-g-ujij**  
great-2sg-grandchild  
"your (sg) great-grandchild"

### The outcome

Phonological evidence from the prefixes (the epenthetic [t]), combined with morphological evidence from modification, indicates that there is a difference in syntactic proximity between the possessive affix and alienable/inalienable possessums.

### References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. Derivation by phase. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18. Cambridge (Massachusetts): MIT.
- Dobler, Eva. 2008. The Morpho-Phonology of (In)alienable Possession. Proceedings of the 2008 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association. Accessed through [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2008/CLA2008\\_Dobler.pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2008/CLA2008_Dobler.pdf)

Dobler, Eva. 2010. Morpho-Phonological Edge Effects and their Implications. Working paper associated with the McGill Syntactic Interfaces Research Group.

Nichols, Johanna. 1988. On alienable and inalienable possession. *In Honor of Mary Haas: From the Haas Festival Conference On Native American Linguistics*, ed. by William Shipley, 557-610. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Piggott, Glyne. 2011. "Alienable vs inalienable possessive constructions in Ojibwe." Presentation for McGill University, LING 415: Field Methods of Linguistics. October 25, 2011.

Ritter, E. & S. T. Rosen. (2010) "Possessors as Arguments: Evidence from Blackfoot." Paper presented at 42nd Algonquian Conference, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland

World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Chapter 59: Possessive Classification, eds. Bickel, B. and Nichols, J. <http://wals.info/chapter/59>