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1. Introduction

- Algonquian stems: tripartite templatic structure: [Initial-Medial-Final]. (Bloomfield 1927 et seq.)
- Medial, Final: non-initial position, constrained class membership, dozens of similar lexemes...
- ...so can we collapse them into "non-Initial"? No, apparently: bc distinct morphology, syntactic distribution, range of possible semantics. (cf. Goddard 1990)

Goal: Streamline the set of basic categories underlying Algonquian stem structure by deriving the differences between Medials and Finals from morphosyntactic structure, instead of stipulating a fundamental categorical distinction.

Tools:
- Boeckx 2008: syntactic projection always maximally tripartite: structure beyond this is iteration.
- Apply maximal triparticity to stem level and subcomponent (Initial, Medial, Final) levels:
  - stem: at most: I-M-F
  - IMF subcomponents: at most: lexical Root, light element (n/v), + one secondarily merged element.
- Predict [PA *-w : ø] in related [Final : Medial] pairs (via indpd'tly attested nominalizer in PA *-w).
- Postmedial PA *-ak paralleled in N. Iroq noun incorporation "nominalizer" (Baker 1997); so...
- nP complex, rather than a bare lexical Root, needed for noun incorporation into a verbal stem.
- Readily observable bc Alg and N. Iroq langs systematically wear their Root-to-stem-deriving syntax right on their morphological sleeves.

Results:
- Eliminate pre-structural distinction btw Medial and Finals: emergent from maximal triparticity.
- Reduce bound/affixal lexeme types to minimal possible set: prefixal vs. suffixal head-parameterizations of morphophonological dependency (= Initials and non-Initials).
- Apply this within the light noun/verb-based maximal triparticity analysis, show that further Medial-Final contrasts to reduce to morphosyntactic structure; w/that account both for surface alternations and distributional and semantic differences between the two.
- Now set up to observe parallel with N. Iroquoian noun incorporation, with potential applicability to noun incorporation models in general.

Structure: italicized sections will be touched on only briefly or in part

§2: Maximal triparticity and the fractal nature of syntax (= Boeckx 2008:ch: 4)
§3: Standard model of Algonquian stem structure
§4: Proposal: binary branching for maximally tripartite stem and subcomponent structure
§5: Review
§6: Roots and light elements: the internal maximal triparticicy of I-M-F elements
§7: Sneaking more structure in: Premedials and Prefinals
§8: Light elements: Postmedials and Postfinals
§9: The Northern Iroquoian connection

N.B.: morpheme-structural terms Initial, Medial, and Final capitalized to highlight their analytical status, and also to retain the lower-case equivalents more clearly and strictly as terms referring to position in the wordform.
2. **Maximal triparticity and the fractal nature of syntax (Boeckx 2008:ch. 4)**

- Boeckx 2008:159: well-formed projections of an element X project at most three, nested elements.
- I am now suggesting a term for this: **maximal triparticity**
- Emergent from binary merge (p. 124); hence the triparticity of X-bar syntax, among others.
- This tripartite hierarchial organization is **fractal**: it pervades narrow syntax, reappearing at all levels/scales of projection. (p. 129)

(1) Maximal triparticity of a well-formed projection representation (Boeckx 2008:59)

![Diagram](image)

**Proposal:** Extend this to Algonquian stem structure.

**Requirements:** Evidence for maximal triparticity in Algonquian stem structure?

Yes, lots: starting basically from Bloomfield (1927, et seq.), and especially Goddard 1990.

**Specifically:** Stem structure is maximally tripartite: Initial, Medial, Final

Stem structure subcomponents are then themselves maximally tripartite:

- **Initials:** maximally tripartite when derived from tripartite stems
- **Medials:** Premedial-Medial-Postmedial
- **Finals:** Prefinal-Concrete Final-Abstract Final  [= Prefinal-Final-Postfinal]

**Main requirements of maximal triparticity to watch out for:**

- Maximal triparticity means that anything with more than three pieces must have some degree of syntactic-structural iteration within it.
3. Standard model of Algonquian stem structure

3.1 Initials, Medials, and Finals: brief sketch

**Initials:** open/elsewhere class; can be bound Roots or bound Stems; Initial "slot" = position for stems recycled into primary and secondary derivation

**Medials:** (very coarsely) = incorporated nouns

**Finals:** ultimate determiners of the stem's syntactic category/argument structure (nominal, verbal, transitivity); often carry substantially rich semantics themselves

3.2 Primary stem derivation

- Algonquianist literature on stem structure distinguishes between *primary* and *secondary stem derivation* (Bloomfield 1927 et seq., subsequently refined by Goddard 1990; also examined extensively in O'Meara 1990).

- Goddard 1990:451: primary derivation stems can consist simply of an Initial (2a), or of an Initial plus a Final (2b), or maximally of an Initial plus a Medial plus a Final (2c).

(2) Primary stem derivation structures (Penobscot; following Goddard 1990:451)

a. Initial

Stem: \textit{napi}(y)- 'water'

Initial: \textit{napi-} 'water'

cf. stem: \textit{napi-w.i-} 'NI is watery, wet (in the sense of covered or washed by water)'

b. Initial-Final

Stem: \textit{apakass.in-} 'NA lie facedown, flat, right-side down; NA lie flat on h/her belly'

Initial: \textit{apak-} 'flat'

Final: \textit{-hs.in} 'NA lie, be laying'

c. Initial-Medial-Final

Stem: \textit{apakihpsk*anes.in-} 'NA lie flat on h/her back'

Initial: \textit{apak-} 'flat'

Medial: \textit{-(a)hpask*an.e-} 'back'

Final: \textit{-hs.in} 'NA lie, be laying'

\footnote{Primary stem derivation gives at most a ternary structure, \textit{I-M-F}. This is maximal triparticity at the stem level.}
3.3 Other stem derivation types: NMIs versus SSIs; Initial-Medial stems

• Rhodes 2003 contrasts the construction in (2c), which he terms stem-internal incorporation (SII), with non-medial incorporation (NMI).

• In NMI constructions, the nominal element (underlined in (3b) always follows a stem formed with a transitive Final (3a), and is always the notional primary object of that stem. [cf. Hirose 2003]

(3) Non-medial incorporation Ojibwe, Rhodes 2003:3:(6)

a. ningii- oninaa 'I got him ready.' [transitive stem]
   nin - gii - onin - aa
   1 SUBJ - PAST - make ready - 3AN OBJ
   stem: on- in - ready - grasp -

b. ningii- oninasabii 'I prepared my nets.' [NMI stem]
   nin - gii - oninasabii
   1 SUBJ - PAST - make nets ready
   stem: on- in - asabii ready - grasp - net

• SIIs are less constrained: can be intransitive as well as transitive, with their Medial incorporants able to occur not only as notional primary objects, but also as classifiers thereof, or as notional obliques (especially instrumentals) or notional absolutes of unaccusatives. (Rhodes 2003:4)

• Rhodes argues for a third construction, stems consisting of an Initial plus a Medial but without a Final (4'b), identifying these as a subtype of SII because they share the same structural and semantic freedoms that distinguish SIIs from NMIs.

(4') Initial-Medial stem Ojibwe, after Rhodes 2003:5:(10)

a. nabagaa 'It is flat.' [Initial-Final stem]
   nabagaa - w
   be flat - 3 SUBJ
   stem: nabag - yaa
       flat - INAN

b. ninabagijaane 'I have a flat nose.' [Initial-Medial stem]
   ni - nabagijaane
   1 SUBJ - be flat-nosed
   stem: nabag- (i)jaane
       flat - nose

• (4b)-type construction appears to be strongly productive in most Algonquian languages, forming stems describing states of body parts. A comparable stem is easily found in Penobscot:

(4") Initial-Medial stem Penobscot

sekáskihtane sekask-iktan.α-[w]
'he has a flat or depressed nose' (PD:422) flat-nose.LVNA-W
Two alternative analyses:

(a) I-M stems are actually I-M-F stems with a morphosyntactically real but zero Final.
(b) The stem-final -e in Ojibwe (α in Penobscot), implicitly analyzed as a Postmedial in the Rhodes 2003 account, is in fact an abstract Final, making these stems structurally I-M-abstractF.

No decisive evidence offered here; structure argued for can accommodate either.

3.4 Secondary stem derivation

• Goddard 1990: secondary stem derivation distinguished by a reduced set of forms and functions:
  (a) Secondary stems only "have the form Stem + Final or Theme + Final" (Goddard 1990:471)

  Stem-Final  
  Theme-Final  

  for "Theme", see Goddard 1990:450ft6 and Quinn 2006:ch2

(b) Primary and secondary stem derivation both can take primary stems as input (= Initial), but secondary stem derivation adds only Finals, never Medials.

(c) Secondary stem-forming Finals semantically abstract, mostly category-changing (G...1990:471)

• Secondary derivational Finals thus look more functional-structural in nature, i.e. the topmost layer of event-and-argument-structure-building morphosyntax.

• But: Rhodes 2003:14 asserts that the semantically rich NMIs are secondary stem derivation.

(5) Secondary stem derivation: examples

a. primary derivation

walítahasọ  
[wal-тαh.α-]  
-[as.i]  
-[W]  

'he is happy' (PD:472)  
[good- -heart.LN-]  
-[rflx.LV^NA]  
-W  
[Initial- -Medial-]  
-[Final]  
-Idp_3

b. secondary derivation: intransitive to causative

nolítahásihkha  
[na-[wal-tαh.α-as.i]-]  
-[hkVh.^α]  
-[w]  

'I make him happy' (PD:464)  
[1-[good-heart.LN-rflx.LV^NA]-]  
-[caus.LV^d.DIR]  
-W  
[Initial]-  
-[Final/Theme]  
-Idp_3

c. secondary derivation: intransitive (verbal) to nominal

walítaháswákan  
[wal-tαh.α-as.i-]W-  
-αk.an  

'happiness' (A.D.:Lonesome Song)  
[good-heart.LN-rflx.LV^NA]-W-  
-[NOM.LN]  
-[Initial]-W-  
-[Final]

• Why is primary stem derivation maximally ternary at each level of derivation, while secondary stem derivation is maximally binary?

No answer here, just a model that can accommodate these facts.
4. **Proposal: binary branching for maximally tripartite stem and subcomponent structure**

4.1 **Brittain 2003 model of Algonquian verb stem structure**

- Maximally ternary structure is not flat: built out of asymmetrical binary branching.
- **Structurally** establishes a fundamental contrast between Initials and "non-Initials" in taking the Medial and Final as elements forming as a vP constituent together against the **Left Edge**.

(6) Verb Stem Template (Brittain 2003:2(4))

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Left Edge</strong> vP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP        v (Verbalizer: category-defining morpheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Verb Finals and some Concrete Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nP) V (Root) roughly corresponds to Concrete Verb Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) (n) (Nominalizer: category-defining morpheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) (Root) Medial position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Left Edge: = Initial; consists of an element, itself potentially internally complex, that "lacks a category-defining morpheme and thus is categoryless" (Brittain 2003:3)

- Left Edge is **adjointed** to a vP constituent headed by [Root-VP+light verb] complex (=Final), whose Root may take a bare nP complement consisting of a [Root-NP+ light noun] complex (=Medial).

In short: an open, categoryless component (the Initial/Left Edge)...plus one verbal and (optional) nominal component, each formed by combination of a functional-structural light element with a precategorical Root (cf. Marantz 1997, inter alia)

(7) I-M-F structure, per Brittain 2003

- Initial: open (adjointed to vP)
- Medial: [N(P)]n (complement of V)
- Final: [V(P)]v (with Left Edge adjoined to it)

- As the dominating node, vP sets the syntactic category of the complex as verbal: this creates the verbal stem.
- Brittain 2003:2 notes specifically that "[t]he [Left] Edge Position is always present and must always be filled, no matter how extensively the template is expanded"; also claims that the Left Edge position is to be filled by movement.
4.2 Proposed new model

4.2.1 Model and motivations: a stripped-down verb stem template

(8) Verb Stem Template (new)

![Diagram of Verb Stem Template]

(a) No particular evidence driving a need to represent NP and VP levels in the Medial and Final collocations; purely precategorical bare Roots plus light elements already needed and sufficient.

(b) No need to claim that the Left Edge is filled by movement in the narrow syntactic sense. Can be better accounted for as a morphophonological property of Medials and Finals.

(c) Left Edge material is not all adjuncts; resultative complements also appear in Left Edge. So need a structure where vP can take a Left-Edge event-structural complement along with Medial.

4.2.2 Representational economy

- Omit NP, VP levels: keep only minimal structure that’s morphologically reflected on the surface.
- Already—and only—need notion of precategorical bare Roots collocated with their respective light elements, with the latter introducing syntactic categorization (Marantz 1997, Arad 2003, Kihm 2005) and event-and-argument structure (Ramchand 2008).
- Maintains tight theoretical claim: only light elements can introduce arguments, while precategorical Roots cannot—i.e. V/Root does not take the Medial nP as its complement.

(9) I-M-F structure, simplified

* Initial: Root; or stem (=stem/n/v)
  * Medial: [Root]n
  * Final: [Root]v

Key parameter of Algonquian morphosyntax: light elements are in the vast majority of cases morphologically overt.

- Many Medials do not evince a visible segmentable light n, but many do: the Postmedial.
- Finals nearly all have a visible segmentable light v (=abstract Final); exceptions are much rarer.

An Algonquian stem generally wears its precategorical-to-functional morphosyntactic structure on its morphophonological sleeve.

**Methodology:** take the visible cases to attest the underlying system; take cases where such elements are not visible as either direct categorization or zero morphology for the light element.
4.2.3  Left Edge is not filled by narrow-syntactic movement

•  Brittain 2003:2 Left Edge must be present; can be filled by movement to adjoin to vP.

Claim:  Attribute Left Edge effect strictly to morphophonological features of the Medial and Final.

•  Left Edge surface structure results simply from the fact that Medial and Final components are, evidently and eminently learnably, morphophonologically suffixal.

•  Left Edge requirement due not to any special syntactic property/status of Left Edge material, but simply because, being suffixal, the -(Medial)-Final complex demands a prosodic-phonologically valid host; they cannot stand alone as a well-formed phonological word.

Advantages:

(a)  Already have to learn that Medials and Finals are morphophonologically non-initial.
(b)  Predicts heterogeneity in Left Edge material, which is attested:

•  Left Edge constraint can be satisfied either by a bound prefixal lexeme or a freestanding stem.

•  Brittain notes Initials (= Left Edge) manifest rich range of functions: adjectival, adverbial, quantificational, verbal, prepositional (adpositional), and nominal.

•  This suggests a negatively-defined elsewhere class, rather than a positively-defined one.

(c)  If movement here were taken in the narrow-syntactic sense of feature-driven movement, then motivating movement would require an entirely stipulative formal feature on all Left Edge material, since this material is otherwise quite syntactically and semantically heterogenous.

❖  Much more efficient, then, to attribute the observed effect to some property of the Medials and Finals, as these are demonstrably much more constrained classes, both in form and especially in syntax and semantics (see Quinn 2008, Rhodes 2005, Valentine 2001:333, and O’Meara 1990).


(a)  When the Left Edge is filled, any additional Initials surface as a Preverbs, components that are phonologically independent in a number of ways (Goddard 1990:478), but are part of the verbal complex in hosting pronominal clitics and Initial Change.

•  Whether an Initial surfaces as a Preverb or as a bound part of the stem simply depends on whether or not the Left Edge is alread filled.  Hence in (9), the stem men.o-'NA drink' already has its Left Edge filled with an Initial men-; an added aspectual Initial kiš- 'finish' thus can only surface as a Preverb (10b).

(10)  Left Edge filled: Initial to Preverb  Meskwaki (Fox), adapted from Goddard 1990:478:(146)

a.  menowa
    'he drinks'
    men.o-[w]-a
    drink.LVN_LA_W-NA

b.  kiši-menowa
    'he has finished drinking'
    kiši-meno-[w]-a
    finish-[drink.LVN_LA]-W-NA
• Contrast (11b): here the Left Edge is open, due to the availability of a Final -i·seny.e 'NA eat'---
evidently derived from the full stem seen in (11a)--- the result is that the Initial ki·ši 'finish' now
surfaces as an Initial, completely phonologically bound into the stem.

(11) Left Edge open: Initial stays Initial | Meskwaki (Fox), adapted from Goddard 1990:478:(147)
a. wi·seniwa | wi·sen.i-[w]-a
   'he eats' | eat.LV^NA-W-NA
b. kiši·senye·wa | kiš-iseny.e-[w]-a
   'he has finished eating' | finish-eat.LV^NA-W-NA

• Evidence that this pattern is purely morphological: Passamaquoddy-Maliseet does have in its
lexicon a Final -hsom.i meaning 'NA drink'.  So an Initial-Final construction corresponding to the
Preverb-Stem construction in (10b) above is possible: the Final -hsom.i can collocate directly with
Initial ki·ši 'finish', creating a 'surface stem' kisossomi-, glossable as 'NA have been drinking'.

(12) Left Edge open: Initial stays Initial | Passamaquoddy-Maliseet
kisossomi(‘)t | kis-hsom.i-t-(V?)
'when he has been drinking' | PERF/finish-drink.LV^NA-NACj-(absentative?)
(PMD:<pqalokiqe>)

• Indeed, when both a full stem (13a) and a Final are available, near-synonymous doublets of
Preverb-Stem (13b) and Initial-Final (13c) arise.

(13) Full stem and Final doublets | Penobscot
stem: mits.i- 'NA eat'
Final -hp.i 'NA eat'
a. mitso | mits.i-[w]
   'he eats' (PD:282) | eat.LV^NA-W
b. kisí-mitso | kis-mits.i-[w]
   '1) he can eat, 2) he did eat' (PD:216) | PERF/finish-eat.LV^NA-W

c. kíshpo | kis-hp.i-[w]
   '1) he can eat, 2) he has eaten,
3) he finishes eating' (PD:217) | PERF/finish-eat.LV^NA-W

• (13b) vs. (13c) contrast unclear; major senses of the components are the same---taken together
with the previous examples, Left Edge effects evidently driven entirely by the presence/absence
of an unhosted non-Initial...and nothing more.

(b) Scopal effects show that Left Edge status does not reflect a single syntax.  Goddard 1990:479-480
argues that the scope reading of the the Preverb ki·ši- 'finish' over the whole stem (14b) is
inappropriate to the wordform's context.  The appropriate reading is that in (14c), with Preverb
narrowly scoping together with stem-derived Initial ki·ke·no·w- 'NA have a clan feast', before
attaching the TA Final -e·nem 'think about NA' (i.e. -e·nemaki 'when I thought ... about them').
4.2.4 Left Edge material can be complements as well as adjuncts

A. Assume depictives are adjuncts of vP and resultatives are complements (Ramchand 2008).
B. Brittain 2003 model suggests that all Left Edge material enters the derivation as an adjunct to vP.
C. But resultatives (15a) and depictives (15b) both systematically also appear as Left Edge elements.

(15) Left Edge resultatives and depictives

A. resultative

\[\text{nəsəkʷəskamə} \quad \text{na-səkʷəsk-amə-}[w]\]

'I chew him into pieces, masticate him' (PD:426)

B. depictive

\[\text{amehsakəsitəsə} \quad \text{amehsak-əsit.e-wəhs.e-}[w]\]

'he walks barefooted' (PD:61)

5. Review

A. With Initial/Left Edge status as essentially syntactically meaningless...
B. I offer an alternative, stripped-down verb stem template, based on maximal triparticity.
C. Noun stems explicitly claimed to parallel structure in (16).

(16) Verb Stem Template

\[\text{[Left Edge...]} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{nP} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{Root} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{Root} \quad \text{v} \quad \text{[Left Edge...]}\]

D. Template does not include the Left Edge at all, because the Left Edge is simply an epiphenomenon to a feature shared by Medials and Finals, namely, their suffixal morphophonology.
• Left Edge content syntactically merges either above or below this structure, but always morphophonologizes to the Left Edge.

• Maintains maximal triparticity in that structure is a minimal binary interface domain, consisting maximally of three components, with two organized around the single core light element head.

• Makes it clear that the dominating node is the projection of that same core light element head; here = vP, which captures the syntactic behavior of such collocations as verbs.

• Specifically, the core head (light v) maxes out its phase/locality in merge-hosting first its own Root and then a possible merged nP/vP. Anything more involves iterations of phasal structure.

• Translation to Algonquianist tradition:

  Root.n = (nominal) Medial
  Root.v = verbal Final

• Roots merge directly with light elements, adjoining with them to form a light element phrase. No explicit phrasal complement syntax needed.

• Being iterable/fractal syntax, this structure offers an escape hatch into additional phases of structure in three major directions:
  
  (a) The last-merged cophasal element can have internal structure (as seen in Medials), and
  
  (b) Overall structure can occupy same slot again: i.e., 2ndary deriv. = this vP merged w/in another vP
  
  (c) Roots themselves can adjoin directly to other Roots

Q: How does a -Medial-Final complex take an xP complement (= resultative)? Isn't it maxed out?
A: Whole component is still a vP (w/ nP adjoined to Root.v complex), so can take a complement vP, but only at the cost of building a multiple-event-argument structure. Which is what we get in a resultative construction. Similarly when this structure is itself embedded in a vP: this gives rise to mono- and ditransitives.

Key: Core head (= light v) can support no more structure than this, with first merge [Root v] and then second merge [nP[Root v]]. No more than that: hence -Medial-Final complexes travel as Finals, but nothing more.

• Surface triparticity of stems arises bc minimally bipartite -M-F collocation is suffixal, requiring some coincidentally costructural third component to satisfy its morphophonological needs: this is the Left Edge.

Preview: internal maximal triparticity of I-M-F subcomponents

(17) Traditional descriptive triparticity of the Medial and Final subcomponents:

Medial = Premedial-Concrete_Medial-Postmedial = Premedial-Medial-Postmedial
Final = Prefinal-Concrete_Final-Abstract_Final = Prefinal-Final-Postfinal

Q: Initials also tripartite?
A: Yes, but only bc many Initials are recycled tripartite stems: to show their triparticity is moot.
6. **Roots and light elements: the internal maximal triparticity of I-M-F elements**

6.1 Overview

- Analyzing I-M-F elements to be maximally tripartite in their internal structure clarifies cases of surface ambiguities and other similarities between Medials and Finals; and also predicts attested tendency for the "Post-..." elements to trigger contextual allomorphy in the Roots they host.

6.2 Surface ambiguities: related Medials and Finals

- Given how roots can enter the structure here, it is quite likely that a Root found in a Medial will also be found in a Final. This is because both components have a common minimal merge structure: simply Root plus light element, i.e. [Root.x].

(18) Common minimal merge structure of Medials and Finals

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{xP} \\
/ \ \\
\ldots \ \\
/ \ \\
\text{Root} \ \\
\text{x}
\end{array}
\]

- This is what we find, and quite often: namely, collocations of [Root.n] for a Medial and [Root.v] for a verbal Final, with both having the same Root.

(19) [Root.n] Medial and [Root.v] Final pairs: Root -əč(i) 'excrement'

| Medial: -əč.ak | 'SOFT STICKY MASS' |
| Final: -əč.ə | 'NA have... excrement' |

a. pəməčákohe | pəm-əč.ak-wəhs.e-[w] |
'he walks in mud' (PD:374) | along-excrement.LN-walk.DO\textsubscript{NA}-W |

cf. pəmohse | pam-wəhs.e-[w] |
'he walks along, by' (PD:377) | along-walk.DO\textsubscript{NA}-W |

b. màskəče | mask-əč.ə-[w] |
'he has malodorous feces' (PD:252) | stinky-excrement.LV\textsubscript{NA}-W |

- Notice that the semantic differences between the respective Medial and Final collocations can be quite substantial: (19a) being a classificational abstraction, and (19b) being quite concrete.

\(\checkmark\) Reflects the fact that each is a simple merging of a Root with a light element, with no intervening functional structure to "fix" stable/consistent interpretations of the Root. (Arad 2003, Borer 2005ab)

6.3 Surface ambiguities: Root vs. Medial complex

- When the Final lacks a Root of its own (i.e. is only a light element), the distinction between a Root and a Medial complex can be seen...

- ...provided the Medial has an overt light noun, e.g. the Postmedial -ak.

- Then we see a surface stacking with the form Root.LN.LV
(20) Verbal Final from a Medial

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
/ \\
\text{nP} \\
/ \\
\text{Root} \\
\text{n} \\
\text{v}
\end{array}
\]

\[-aht \quad -ak \quad -.at\]

a. Medial: -aht.ak-  'CORD'
Final: -aht.ak-.at  'NI be ... cordlike object'

atapahtákanike  atap-aht.ak-an.k.e-[w]
'he winds, does winding' (PD:85)  wind-cord.LN-by_hand.gnrc_obj.DO\(^{NA}\)-W

kíntakat-kínahtakat  kin-aht.ak-[w]
'it is a large string, rope, hair' (PD:211)  big-cord.LN.LV\(^{NL}\)-W

b. Medial: -ap.ek-  'LIQUID' (-ap.ek- < PA *-epy.ak-)
Final: -ap.ek-.at  'NI be ... liquid/water'

matápekáłamsan  mat-pek-alam.Vhs.an-[w]
'the water is agitated by the wind' (PD:262)  moved-water.LN-wind.wind.LV\(^{NL}\)-W

kínapekat  kin-ap.ek-at-[w]
'it is a great expanse of water' (PD:209)  big-water.LN.LV\(^{NL}\)-W

• Many Medials build a corresponding nominal Final by apparently "stacking" the Postmedial light noun -ak with a Final light noun in -.w, cognate to the familiar PA *-w creating deverbal nouns (Quinn 2006:198-200, Goddard 1974:324-325).

• Stacking: first-merge -ak-headed Medial complex to the light n element heading Final complex:

(21) Nominal Final from Medial

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{nP} \\
/ \\
\text{nP} \\
/ \\
\text{Root} \\
\text{n} \\
\text{n}
\end{array}
\]

\[-p \quad -ak \quad -.w\]

Medial -p.ak-  'leaf'  (cf. mìpi NI 'leaf' (PD:281))
Nominal Final -p.ak.w-  'leaf'

a. sekatepákahte  sekate-p.ak-aht.e-[w]
'the leaf is placed in flattened position, depressed'  flattened-leaf.LN-seated.LV\(^{NL}\)-W
(S:23:44)

b. sekátepakʷ  sekate-p.ak.w
'Rugel's Plantain [CQ: gloss not certain]' (S:23:44)  flattened-leaf.LN.LN
Needless to say, there are also nominal Finals formed by merging Roots directly with the light noun element, giving nominal Finals in [Root.n] matching verbal Finals in [Root.v].

(22) [Root.v] and [Root.n] Final pairs

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{xP} \\
/ \ \\
\ldots \ \\
/ \\
\text{Root} \ x \quad [x = v, x = n]
\end{array}
\]

a. v-Final: -atan.e- 'NI be ... mountain'
   n-Final: -atən.w- 'mountain'

ktàtənok
'at/on the large mountain' [Mt. Katahdin] (PD:225)

kəht-atan.w-ak
great-mountain.LN-LOC

pàmatone
'1) the hill/mountain extends;
2) there is an extent of hills/mountains' (PD:373)

pam-atan.e-[w]
along-mountain.LV^NL-W

b. v-Final: -ahkamik.e- 'NI be ... land'
   n-Final: -ahkamik.w- 'land'

niwahkámike
'it is a dry land, it is an arid country' (PD:329)

dry-land.LV^NL-W

niwáhkamikʷ
NI 'desert' (PD:329)

dry-land.LN

6.4 Contextual allomorphy

• While the [Root.x] collocation is formal-syntactic in structure, whether or not a given Root actually combines with either of these specific light elements is a strongly lexical matter. Indeed, some Roots show contextual allomorphy in such collocations.

(23) [Root.v] contextual allomorphy

. NAv-Final: -əs.i- 'NA be ... heated'
   Nlv-Final: -ət.e- 'NA be ... heated'

pàkihkaso
'he (bread, etc.) is baked, scorched, he is cooked dry by water evaporation, is over-cooked or burned' (PD:369)

scorched-heat.LV^NA-W

pàkihkəte
'1) it is baked; 2) it is overcooked, cooked dry, burned dry by water evaporation' (PD:369)

scorched-heat.LV^NL-W

• Contrast this with Medial-Final collocations, which rarely if ever show such effects. Given that we assert that [Root.x] reflects the closest and earliest possible merge of purely lexical material with functional elements, more contextual allomorphy for [Root.x] and less for [Medial-Final] is not surprising.
Here again the maximal triparticity model constrains relations between subcomponents of Medials and Finals in precisely the directions we find attested, while doing same for relations between Medials and Finals themselves.

7. Sneaking more structure in: Premedials and Prefinals

7.1 Overview

• So far we have seen that the model readily accounts for most simple collocations of Medial and Final, and helps parse out surface-ambiguous collocations thereof.

• Here we will see how it deals with the initial components of Medials and Finals: the Prefinals and Premedials, and also with related cases of structures that appear to violate maximal triparticity.

7.2 Prefinals

• How do we deal with a seemingly quadripartite -Medial-Prefinal-Root-LV structure?

(24) Prefinal -əhte 'striking' in apparently quadripartite collocation

a. -əhte-ah.° 'strike NA'                  Prefinal-Root.LV°
   natam ihtəhə 'I cut him in half with an axe, blow' (PD:c.465)

b. -kʷe-əhte-ah.° 'chop NA's head off'    Medial-Prefinal-Root.LV°
   natamikʷéhtəhə '[... I cut off his head with a blow' (PD:c.465)

• Cannot palm Medial off to the Initial since we rarely see [Initial+BodyPartMedial] as recurrent Initials; would also block comparing these patterns to evidently similar possessor-raising noun incorporation constructions in other languages.

• Instead can sneak Prefinal into the first-merged Root, leaving the ultimate v-organized structure still able to host the Medial, and still conform to maximal triparticity.

(25) Prefinals as Root-adjunct to first-merged Root

• I.e. the solution is to go down a fractal scale, adjoining at the Root level.

• Seems like the road to infinite regression, but one point makes it solid: as this structure suggests, Prefinals typically do have a very close lexical-selectional relationship with the first-merged Root, and virtually never collocate directly with the light verbs:
(26) Prefinals: close lexical-selectional relationship with the first-merged Root

a. Prefinal -əhte 'striking'

-əhte-hs.in 'NA fall'
-əhte-əl.aw 'strike NA w/projectile'
-əhte-əhk.aw 'collide bodily with/kick NA'

b. Prefinal -αčkʷ 'dragging'

-αčkʷ-əl.al 'drag NA'
-αčkʷ-pVh.⁰ 'drag NA (sharply)'

(27) Root mahkase- 'coal, ember, black'

a. mkàse makhase.w
NA: 'live coal, ember'; NI: 'burnt out coal' (PD:282)
Nkàses makhase.s
NI 'ember, small coal, small live coal' (PD:282)
Nkàseshs makhase.ahs
NI 'charcoal, dead coal' (PD:282)
Nkàsess makhase.w.ahs
NA 'crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos brachyrhynchos)' (PD:282)

b. derived Initial mahkase-w- 'black'

mkaséwihle makhase.w-hl.α-[w]
'he turns black' (PD:283)

• Prefinals are in fact strikingly unproductive, each only associating with a handful of Roots at most: this makes sense if they are fundamentally structurally dependent on those Roots.

• Only one of these Prefinal Roots in fact attests outside of these Prefinal collocations: -akhase. Derived---by common loss of initial sonorant and alternation of weak vowels /ə a/ ---from Root mahkase- 'coal, ember, black':

-akhase-as.⁰ 'burn NA'
-akhase-as.i 'NA burn [middle/anticaus]'
-akhase-at.e 'NI burn [middle/anticaus]'

- Derived Initial mahkase-w-: only attested meaning is 'black': again predicted here, as light noun -w structures a maximal domain (= Spellout/Encyclopedia interface) that "fixes" the semantics specifically to 'black', and no other meaning of the Root; cf. Arad 2003, Borer 2005ab.

❖ The maximal triparticity structure predicts precisely the kinds of Prefinals that are attested.
7.3 Premedials

- Premedials: even more limited set: only cited Premedial is PA \(*-a\) element (Goddard 1990:466 ft41, Denny and Mailhot 1976), found in Medials like Pb \(-\text{atap.e-} 'head'\) (28b); cf. stem in (28a).
- But this PA \(*-a\) is evidently not distinctive to Medials: \(-\text{atap}\) also occurs as a nominal Final (28c).

(28) Noun Final and Medial
a. noun stem \(-\text{tap}\)
   
   nàt\text{ap}  
   'my head'  
   1-head
b. Medial \(-\text{atap.e-}\)
   
   k\text{=}ask\=\text{atapehtaha-}  
   'strike NA on the head to death'  
   to\text{-}death\=PrM\.head.I\=N\=striking\=by\_\=tool.LV\=d.DIR

c. nominal Final \(-\text{atap}\)
   
   wasák\=at\=\text{ap}  
   'skull' (PD:475)  
   empty\=PrM\.head

- Premedial \(*-a\) needs to be set up as a Prefinal as well; i.e. as an adjunct to the first-merged Root.
- Seems likely as a "Pre-"-element: close lexical association to the first-merged Root, and lacks a clear classificational or incorporated-element relationship with the overall Medial complex.
- Predicted: Premedial-carrying Medials can host a third element. No evidence, however, that any Medial can host a third element. Nominal rather than verbal nature of the Medial light element may relevant here.

8. Light elements: Postmedials and Postfinals

8.1 Overview

- Terminal subcomponents of Medials and Finals: the light elements.
- Give category and event-and-argument structure to Roots; or, conversely, Roots add semantic richness to the functional structures realized by the light elements.
- Here: Postmedial = abstract Final analytically, being light n and light v/n respectively.
- Thus relabel abstract Final as Postfinal. And take all "Post-..."s as light elements.

Evidence:

(a) Both types of "Post-..." subcomponent share not only morphophonological properties, i.e. minimal prosodic weight and terminal edge position...

(b) ...but also the crucial property of determining basic syntactic category. (Rhodes 2006, 1980)
That the verbal Postfinals also contrast some features of internal aspect (see esp. Denny 1980 et seq., Rhodes 2005) further suggests a light-element analysis, as light verbs often comorphologize with the narrower, more internal types of aspect.

- For Finals, that these elements contrastively determine syntactic category should be clear from all the examples cited so far.
- How light verbs realize notional transitivity contrasts is a bit more complex than traditionally believed: derived via specific configurations of argument-introducing light verbs, and not just simple concatenation of [+transitive] components. (Quinn 2006:ch2)
- Postfinals thus assumed to be light verbs or light nouns, and not discussed further.

8.2 Postmedials: in search of a noun

- Harder to show that the Postmedial element is a light noun, bc Medials necessarily do not form the category-determining component of the overall stem: how are we to know that a Medial is a noun (nP) and not simply a complex Root?
- Three points of evidence:
  (a) Limited but suggestive hint of Postmedial -.ak directly nominalizing a precategorical Root. = §8.3
  (b) A substantial set of Medials acts as a shape-classifiers, a category typically drawn from and associated with nominals crosslinguistically. = §8.4
  (c) An equally substantial set of Medials carries out crosslinguistically typically noun-based functions: both obliques and notional objects. = §8.5

8.3 Precategorical Root (w)əl- 'concave, hollow, hole' meets Postmedial -.ak

- The precategorical Root (w)əl- 'concave, hollow, hole' is well-attested in Penobscot:

(29) Precategorical Root (w)əl- 'concave, hollow, hole'

\begin{verbatim}
walahkámike        wal-ahkamik.e-[w]
'there is a valley' (PD:450)     hollow-land.LV^NI-W

waláhkamik\^w        wal-ahkamik.w
NI 'valley, hollow, doles' (PD:450)  hollow-land.LN

wálate             wal-ate
NA 'dish, plate' (PD:450)            hollow-belly

wáličo             wal-čo
NA 'birch bark or wooden container, hollow dish' (PD:450)  hollow-container

wàlke              wal-əhk.e-[w]
'he digs, hollows out, excavates' (PD:451)  hollow-do.DO^NA-W

kíšalke          kis-əlk.e-[w]
'he has made a cache, has finished'       finish-hollow-do.DO^NA-W
\end{verbatim}
burying something' (PD:214)

• When \(\text{w}l\)- collocates with Postmedial -ak, resulting semantics are "fixed" to the entity sense of 'hole'. This is the source of the classificational Medial -\(\text{w}l\)-ak- 'HOLE', attested as a clear Medial in (30a, b), and as a Medial collocated into light verb Final in (30c):

\[(30)\] Precategorical Root \(\text{w}l\)- 'concave, hollow, hole' plus Postmedial -ak = 'hole'

a. \(\text{nəkəpəl\(\text{w}l\)əkəhə}\)

'I close the opening of him, close the hole in him' (PD:190)

cf. \(\text{nəkəpəhə 'I close him'} (PD:191)

b. \(\text{nətəsik\(²\text{w}l\)əkəhə}\)

'I ream him' (PD:77)

cf. \(\text{nətəsik\(²\)ha 'I plunge something through him'} (PD:77)

c. \(\text{k\(²\)nəlakat}\)

'It has a large hole, there is a large hole in it' (PD:208)

• Equally telling is the existence of a noun stem meaning 'hole' that is derived from little more than \(\text{w}l\)- 'concave, hollow, hole' plus Postmedial -ak = 'hole'.

\(\text{wəlak}\)

NI 'natural hole in ground or tree, rock (not in clothes), hole of animal burrow (PD:453)

• Ultimate nominal status of stem \(\text{wəlak}\)- is no doubt due to light noun Final -\(w\),

• ...but: structural parallel with other -\(w\)-derived stems:

\(\text{wəl-\(³\)həkmək\(w\)}\)- 'valley [...]'

(cf. (29) above)

\(\text{wəl-\(³\)həpəsk\(w\)}\)- 'hollow stone'

(cf. \(\text{wələhəpəsk}\)\(²\) NI 'a concave, hollowed out stone' (PD:453))

• ...suggests that -ak is at least a nominal-type Root in origin, parallel to Roots -ahkamik 'land, earth' and -əhpəsk 'rock, stone'.

• Assuming that light functional elements generally develop from lexical Roots, this is expected.

8.2 Medials as shape-classifiers

• A subset of Medials act as shape-classifiers, a category crosslinguistically derived from nominals.

• Algonquian classificatory Medials show the same distinctions of shape-classification known familiarly from East/SE Asian-areal languages such as Mandarin, Hmong Daw, and Thai.

• Alg shape-classifying Medials are morphologically separate from verbal Roots of handling / stance, unlike in Athabaskan languages, even as they form much the same lexical collocations.

• Hence we find classificatory Medials contrasting the same basic features of dimensional rigidity
(STICK vs. CORD vs. SHEET vs. LUMP/ROUND OBJECT), as well as negative dimensionality (HOLE) and textural manifestation (GRANULAR vs. SOFT/STICKY MASS vs. LIQUID).

(31) Classificatory (shape-classifier) Medials

-\(-\text{ahk}\)- '1D RIGID OBJECT' (← 'tree, stick')
  cf. Md 枝 zhī, HmD tus
-\(-\text{aht.}\text{ak}\)- '1D NON-RIGID OBJECT' (← 'cord, string')
  cf. Md 條 tiáo, HmD txoj
-\(-\text{ek}\)- '2D NON-RIGID OBJECT' (← 'skin, hide')
  cf. Md 張 zhāng, HmD daim
-\(-\text{ahpsk}\)- 3D/Round Object/Lump' (← 'rock')
  cf. Thai สุน lūuk
-\(-\text{al.}\text{ak}\)- 'HOLE' (← 'hole')
  cf. HmD ่หов
-\(-\text{amk}\)- 'GRANULAR MASS' (← 'sand, gravel')
-\(-\text{ač.}\text{ak}\)- 'SOFT/STICKY MASS' (← 'excrement')
-\(-\text{ap.}\text{ek}\)- 'LIQUID' (← 'water')
  cf. Thai น้ำ náam

(32) Classificatory Medials: examples

a. \(-\text{ahk}\)- '1D RIGID OBJECT' (← 'tree, stick')
   natēsahk\wenteha  'I pierce him, run him through with a spear' (PD:453)
   kinahk\walañe  'he (bird) has a long tail' (PD:207)

b. \(-\text{aht.}\text{ak}\)- '1D NON-RIGID OBJECT' (← 'cord, string')
   sakhahtāk\wihleñ 'he (snake, worm) squirms, wriggles into view' (PD:417)
   matehtak\̨htehs\̨øñ  'there is the sound of throbbing (as when a bowstring flutters)' (PD:255)
   cf. matēhtehs\̨øñ  'it makes the sound of an impact' (PD:255)

c. \(-\text{ek}\)- '2D NON-RIGID OBJECT' (← 'skin, hide')
   matēkalams\̨øñ  'it (fabric, sheet, hide, tent) is moved by the wind' (PD:262)
   cf. mátalams\̨øñ  'it (a solid object, stick, twig, door) is moved by the wind' (PD:262)

(33) \(-\text{al.}\text{ak}\)- 'HOLE' (← 'hole')
   nakapālak\wøha  'I close the opening of him, close the hole in him' (PD:190)
   cf. nàk\wøpæha  'I close him' (PD:191)

(34) \(-\text{ahpsk}\)- 3D/Round Object/Lump' (← 'rock')
   wasakhābpskohs\̨øañ 'she came waddling forth (Sbd)' (k&p:4)
   kinābpskatøpe 'he has a big round head' (PD:207)

(35) \(-\text{amk}\)- 'GRANULAR MASS' (← 'sand, gravel')
   katawāmkihpo  'he eats with a sandy or grinding noise' (PD:201)
   pomāmkihle  'II: it is a stretch, an extent of sandy, gravelly beach; AI: he goes along the beach, proceeds along the beach' (PD:374)

(36) \(-\text{ač.}\text{ak}\)- 'SOFT/STICKY MASS' (← 'excrement')
   kalāmōk\wihle  'he/it is sticky, viscous' (PD:187)
   cf. kalāmihle  'he/it is adhesive, clinging, adherent' (PD:187)
   matečåk\wihpo 'he makes an unpleasant noise in eating' (PD:255)
East/SE Asian-areal classifiers uncontroversially nominal: asserting otherwise for semantically and functionally parallel Algonquian classifiers would require positive motivating evidence.

8.3 Medials as instrumental and other oblique incorporants

• A subset of Medials carry semantics typically realized as oblique nominals in other languages.
• These include Medials naming the instrument involved in the verbal event structure:

(38) Medials: instrument-naming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>namalakʷámkha</td>
<td>'I cover him with earth, soil'</td>
<td>(PD:274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namalakʷipákha</td>
<td>'I cover him with leaves'</td>
<td>(PD:274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namalakʷìpisákha</td>
<td>'I cover him with bushes'</td>
<td>(PD:274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malakʷaskihkawahokẹ</td>
<td>'he lies covered with grass'</td>
<td>(PD:274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malakʷèkhoso</td>
<td>'he pulls the covers over himself'</td>
<td>(PD:274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakapáhkehkawa</td>
<td>'I block/obstruct his passage with earth, dirt'</td>
<td>(PD:190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nanúči-kalapkéhtahaa</td>
<td>'I go frighten them out' [CQ: by hitting the ground]</td>
<td>(S:30:..986.jpg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. nakaláptahaa [sic]</td>
<td>'I (purposely) frighten an animal away.' [sic: I...him]</td>
<td>(S:30:..985.jpg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• ...and Medials naming other oblique-nominal notions like embedding medium:

(39) Medials: embedding medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>naketolayákhaman</td>
<td>'I remove snow from it, I uncover it from snow'</td>
<td>(PD:183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wačkwadlayákhosò</td>
<td>'he approaches through the snow'</td>
<td>(PD:461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ketalákʷhike</td>
<td>'he removes something, things from the ice'</td>
<td>(S:30:..985.jpg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• ...and Medials extending "instrument" naming means/medium through which event manifests:

(40) Medials: extended instrumentals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wasákhikatáwálakʷihlan</td>
<td>'he came into view in the sound of crackling ice'</td>
<td>(S:30:..988.jpg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matelákʷihle</td>
<td>'the ice makes a noise in moving or cracking, the ice sounds, there is a sound of moving ice'</td>
<td>(PD:255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matelákʷihtan</td>
<td>'the ice roars in the current, there is a sound of ice flowing in the water'</td>
<td>(PD:255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matkamikihpote</td>
<td>'the earth trembles, there is an earthquake'</td>
<td>(PD:262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alihkawáhikle</td>
<td>'he/it bleeds'</td>
<td>(PD:50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• ...and Medials naming the notional object being acted upon, the object that names the activity:

(41) Medials: notional object of activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>talahkolosanáhike</td>
<td>'he is making a fence, stockade'</td>
<td>(PD:449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alahkahíke</td>
<td>'1) he tills, cultivates the soil, 2) he hoes'</td>
<td>(PD:32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alaskásawe 'he mows, cuts grass' (PD:35)
alihkʷekátki 'he chews gum, pitch' (PD:50)

These stems epitomize Mithun 1984:848's name-worthiness criterion for noun incorporation, with the Medials' contribution matching that seen in incorporated nouns in other languages (cf. Baker 1988, 1996).

Extensive, high-frequency set of Medials names involved body parts: further suggests a nominal analysis for all Medials, as this is a common class of nominal incorporant (Mithun 1984:858).

(42) Medials as incorporated body-part nominals

a. Body-part Medials: transitive: part-whole relations with core argument

wakʷaskʷatapéthah 'he struck him dead on the head (Sbd)' [CQ gloss] (késihlätGD:24)
cf. nakʷaskʷtah 'i kill him with a blow (by axe, club, etc.)' (PD:231)
nakəlatonépila 'i tie his mouth (with string, cord, thong)' (PD:186)
cf. nakəlapíla 'i tie him, tie him up, tether him' (PD:186)
namásálawepha 'i catch him quickly by the tail, i grab him by the tail' (PD:275)
cf. namasipha 'i catch him' [ms.: namásálawepha] (PD:275)

b. Body-part Medials: intransitive: part-whole relations with core argument

matalωólhpeso 'he wags his tail' (PD:262)
pilsitehle 'his foot is numb, becomes numb' (PD:396)
milihtinétotam 'he gestures, talks with his hands' (PD:281)
sehsałakikʷelámsoke 'the wind makes his eyes water, his eyes water from the wind' (PD:422)

These classes of Medials strongly suggest that Medials are more than just underspecified Roots, and are instead light-noun headed collocations, bound w/in stem structure as non-individuated quasi-arguments.

Following general claims of most accounts of noun incorporation (Baker 1988, 1996 et al.) and of bare noun + light verb constructions (Grimshaw and Mester 1988, Öztürk 2005), in taking Medial incorporants to be syntactically minimal nouns, i.e. nP elements.

Following the Marantz 1997 tradition, to claim syntactic object is an nP is to assert that its precise structure is of a Root plus a light noun: [Root.n].

In Algonquian languages, this can be seen first and foremost in the frequent presence of overt light noun morphology at the terminal edge of the Medial complex, i.e. Postmedials.

Q: What about the other Postmedial, the Pb -e element (PA *-e)?
A: Evidence less clear: there is a lightish nominal PA *-ay~e- available (cf. Munsee nhákkay NID 'my body (O'Meara 1996:64) and Pb NID nháke 'my body [...] (PD:7)). But just as likely a light verb, since a number of NA and NI light verbs have this PA *-e- form. Single lone vowel = hard to prove.

Q: Why must an incorporant be an nP and not just a Root?
A: Don't know for sure: perhaps a vP can only second-merge with a fellow xP, not a bare Root; or the light noun component is crucial to an entity interpretation...either way, the same pattern is also found in genetically unrelated areal neighbors: the Northern Iroquoian languages.
9. **The Northern Iroquoian connection**

- Northern Iroquoian languages too often add an element typically glossed as a *nominalizer* onto an incorporated noun (Hopkins 1988, Baker 1997, Abbott 2006, inter alia).

- H88:195 re Mohawk: a nominalizer or "increment" -hser/tsher forms deverbal noun stems:

  (43) Nominalizer -hser/tsher

  a. 
  kahyatúhsera
  'book' (H88:195:(3.171))
  ka-hyatu-hser-a?
  ZA-write-nom-nsf

  b. 
  khyatons [CQ: = khyátus]
  'I write' (Maracle 1993:37)
  k-hyatu-s
  1A-write-hab

- [-nom-nsf] stacking of two nominalizers exactly parallels light nouns stacking to form -ak.w (21).

- A further class of deverbal noun stems does not need -hser/tsher in forming a freestanding noun stem, but does require it when incorporated:

  (44) Incorporation requiring use of nominalizer -hser/tsher

  a. 
  stem atyaʔtawi- 'jacket'

  yotyaʔtawishervitév [sic] 
  'a jacket is hanging' (H88:197:(3.182))
  yo-at-yaʔt-a-wi-tsher-v?t-v
  ZP-srf-body-J-be in a cylinder-nom-be hanging-stat

  atyáʔtawi
  'jacket' (H88:196:(3.179))
  (w)-at-yaʔt-a-wi-
  ZA-srf-body-J-be in a cylinder

  b. 
  stem atehkwahra- 'table'

  áhsv nəʔtkatekhwahratsheratá:se?
  ahsv n-a-aʔ-t-k-ate-khw-a-hra-tsher-a-taseʔ?
  three part-fact-H-du-1A-srf-food-J-put on-nom-J-go around-punc

  'I went around the table three times.' (H88:7:(1.12))

  atehkwà:ra
  'table' (H88:196:(3.177))
  (w)-ate-khw-a-hra
  ZA-srf-food-J-put on

  c. 
  stem anitskwhaha- 'chair'

  Ro-anitskwa[h]ra-tsher-a-hniuru.
  NS/MSGO-chair-nom-ø-be.hard
  'His chair is hard.' (Baker 1997:283)

  anitskwà:ra
  'chair' (H88:196:(3.178))
  (w)-an-itskw-a-hra
  ZA-srf-thigh-J-put on

- Nominalizer -hser/tsher tracks Postmedial -ak in incorporation, and in light element stacking.

- N. Iroquoian languages share with Algonquian languages the (frequently) overt realization of light noun morphology in incorporants; this suggests a broad syntactic principle at work.
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