

## Chapter 6

# Mainland Scandinavian object shift and the puzzling ergative pattern in Aleut

Ellen Woolford

University of Massachusetts

Eskimo-Aleut languages turn out to have the same two types of object shift that Holmberg (1986) describes for Scandinavian. Specific objects move out of the VP in Inuit (Bittner & Hale 1996) and I argue that object shift also occurs in Aleut, but it is limited to pronouns as in Mainland Scandinavian. Aleut differs from Mainland Scandinavian in that, for independent reasons, only third pronouns successfully undergo object shift. Shifting first and second person pronouns is blocked by PCC-like constraints on the portmanteau agreement that occurs in object shift constructions. Shifting reflexives is also blocked, because it would incur a violation of the Anaphor Agreement Effect. The surface pattern in Aleut has been described as one where ergative case marks the subject only when another argument in the clause is null. I argue that there is no direct cause and effect relationship between these. The key is the fact that pronouns that agree are not spelled out. Agreement correlates with ergative case because, as in Inuit, ergative case marks the subject in Aleut only when the object moves out of the VP, and in this situation, again as in Inuit, there is portmanteau agreement with the ergative subject and nominative object in object shift constructions. Like Inuit, Aleut has possessor raising/stranding so that the possessor of an object can undergo object shift, trigger agreement, and thus pro drop. From the English translations of Aleut sentences, it initially appears that null objects of prepositions also correlate with ergative subjects, but Aleut, like Inuit, has possessed relational nouns which function like prepositions if they take locative case. These also allow possessor raising and object shift, with the same consequences described above.

## 1 Introduction

Holmberg (1986) establishes that Scandinavian languages divide into two types with respect to the kind of objects that undergo object shift (movement of an object out of the VP to a position below the subject): In Mainland Scandinavian languages such as Swedish, only pronouns undergo object shift, as in (1), while Icelandic allows all specific objects to undergo object shift, as in (2)<sup>1</sup>:

<sup>1</sup>The verb moves out of the VP to 'second position'. Objects that precede the negative have undergone object shift.



- (1) Swedish (Holmberg 1986: 242)  
Johan köpte den inte.  
John bought it not  
'John did not buy it.'
- (2) Swedish (Holmberg 1986: 242)  
\*Johan köpte boken inte.  
John bought book.the not  
'John did not buy the book.'
- (3) Icelandic (Holmberg 1986: 2)  
Jón keypti bókina ekki.  
John bought book.the not  
'John did not buy the book.'

The goal of this paper is to show that the Eskimo-Aleut languages divide into the same two types. Inuit parallels Icelandic in that specific objects undergo object shift (Bittner & Hale 1996).<sup>2</sup> In this paper I argue that, despite its obfuscating surface complexity, Aleut is like the Mainland Scandinavian languages in that only pronouns undergo object shift.

There are some additional consequences of object shift in the Eskimo-Aleut languages which are not present in the Scandinavian languages. In clauses with object shift in the Eskimo-Aleut languages, the case pattern is ergative-nominative, and the agreement is portmanteau, reflecting features of both the ergative subject and the nominative object.<sup>3</sup> The two types of object shift produce two slightly different surface case and agreement patterns in Inuit versus Aleut. In Inuit, the subject is ergative and the agreement is portmanteau when the object is specific, because specific objects undergo object shift in Inuit. In contrast, in Aleut, the subject is ergative and the agreement is portmanteau only if the object is a pronoun, because only pronouns undergo object shift in Aleut.

Additional complications in Aleut (to be discussed below) produce a surface ergative pattern which initially seems entirely unlike that of other ergative languages, even that of the related language Inuit. The Aleut pattern has been described as marking the subject with ergative case if and only if there is a null argument elsewhere in the clause

- 
- (i) a. Structure without object shift: [subject  $V_i$  neg [ $_{VP}$   $t_i$  object]]  
b. Structure with object shift: [subject  $V_i$  object $_j$  neg [ $_{VP}$   $t_i$   $t_j$ ]]

<sup>2</sup>Although object shift is typically associated with Scandinavian languages, it is known to occur in other languages, such as Turkish (Diesing 1996) and Hindi (Bhatt & Anagnostopoulou 1996). See Thráinsson (2001) for an overview of object shift. Bittner & Hale (1996) show that specific objects move out of the VP in Inuit/West Greenlandic; although they do not label this movement as object shift, it nevertheless fits the definition of object shift as movement of an object out of the VP to a position below the subject.

<sup>3</sup>Exactly why object shift alters the case pattern in Eskimo-Aleut languages is controversial. Bittner & Hale (1996), working within dependency case theory, claim that shifting the object brings it close enough to the subject to allow it to serve as a case competitor. Woolford (2015) suggests that object shift creates a defective intervention effect that can be avoided by a 'last resort' use of ergative case on the subject.

(Bergsland 1997; Boyle 2000; Sadock 2000; 2009). This surprising correlation between ergative case and null arguments has been referred to as the Aleut Effect:

(4) *Description of The Aleut Ergative Pattern (the Aleut Effect):*

In Aleut, the subject gets ergative case if and only if there is a null NP elsewhere in the clause.

This description of the Aleut pattern contrasts sharply with the ergative pattern in Inuit, following Bittner & Hale (1996):

(5) *The Inuit Ergative Pattern:*

In Inuit Greenlandic, the subject is marked with ergative case if and only if the object moves out of the VP, and only specific objects move out of the VP.

Despite this apparent dissimilarity, Hale (1997) nevertheless suggests that the analysis of Inuit in Bittner & Hale (1996) can be extended to Aleut.<sup>4</sup> Hale sketches an analysis wherein only null pronouns move out of the VP in Aleut.<sup>5</sup> Sadock (2000) and Boyle (2000) point out that Hale's account of Aleut suffers from various technical problems, and does not account for all of the Aleut data. While Hale's proposal to extend Bittner and Hale's account of Inuit to Aleut is incomplete, and handicapped by some now outmoded assumptions of the framework of Chomsky (1995), I argue that his basic idea is correct: object shift is the key to understanding the case patterns of both Inuit and Aleut. I show that the differences between these two languages stem from the difference in what type of objects undergo object shift; specific objects object shift in Inuit but only pronouns undergo object shift in Aleut, a difference that parallels the two types of object shift that Holmberg (1986) shows occurs in Scandinavian languages.

With the benefit of improvements in syntactic theory since Hale's 1997 paper, particularly in the area of case and agreement, and with the benefit of excellent subsequent work on other Native American languages, I am able to present an account of the complex Aleut pattern which preserves Hale's basic idea: subjects get ergative case only when the object moves out of the VP in both Inuit and Aleut, however the two languages differ in what kind of objects move out of the VP. Nevertheless, I argue that Hale's proposal has one important factor backwards: Hale postulates that pronouns undergo object shift only if they are null in Aleut.<sup>6</sup> In contrast, I argue that cause and effect goes in the other

<sup>4</sup>Fortescue (1985: 6) also recognizes the parallel between Aleut and other Eskimo languages with respect to constructions with and without an ergative subject and agreement with both the subject and the object.

<sup>5</sup>Hale (1997) proposes that only null objects move out of the VP in Aleut, and assuming that case drives movement, following Chomsky (1995), he postulates that null pronouns in Aleut lack case and must therefore move to get case. Boyle (2000) shares this assumption that only null pronouns that move out of the VP, although his motivation for the movement is different: a need for null pronouns to be licensed by moving to Spec TP. Merchant (2011) suggests the movement of null pronouns in Aleut is like clitic movement in other languages.

<sup>6</sup>To limit object shift to null pronouns, Hale (1997) claims that overt pronouns get case in situ, but null pronouns have to move to get case. Aside from the problem of why this would be so, case no longer drives movement in more recent versions of theory (e.g. Chomsky 1995; 2000). Moreover, under the assumption that the decision as to which pronouns will and will not be pronounced (spelled out) is not made until PF, there is no distinction between overt and null pronouns in syntax.

direction: pronouns are null only if they undergo object shift, because only shifted pronouns are in a position to trigger agreement, and only agreeing pronouns can be pro dropped (not spelled out/pronounced at PF), in both Aleut and Inuit.

A complication in Aleut is that object shifting some kinds of pronouns is blocked because it would cause the derivation to crash. Object shifting first and second person pronouns out of the VP is blocked by PCC-like effects on the resulting portmanteau agreement (with the ergative subject and nominative object), similar to what we see in dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic with first and second person objects (Sigurðsson 1996).<sup>7</sup> Thus first and second person object do not undergo object shift in Aleut, and thus they do not agree. Because they do not agree, they cannot be pro dropped (null). Thus first and second person object pronouns are overt and in situ in Aleut. Object shift of reflexives is also blocked, due to the Anaphor Agreement Effect (Rizzi 1990; Woolford 1999).<sup>8</sup>

The proposed analysis of Aleut does not posit anything new. The complex Aleut pattern results from the interaction of nine known syntactic and morphological properties, each of which is independently motivated in other languages. Almost all of these properties have been documented in Inuit and/or other Native American languages such as Nez Perce and Navajo:<sup>9</sup>

(6) *Nine Independently Motivated Properties of Aleut:*

1. Mainland Scandinavian type object shift (pronouns only)
2. Possessor raising, as in Inuit (Bittner 1994: 71) and Nez Perce (Deal 2010).
3. Possessed positional nouns/nominal stems in Aleut which have the function of postpositions (Fortescue 1985; Bergsland 1997)
4. Ergative subject only in object shift constructions (as in Inuit and Nez Perce)<sup>10</sup>
5. Portmanteau agreement with subject and object in object shift constructions (as in Inuit)
6. Object shift of reflexives is blocked in Aleut, as in Inuit (Bittner 1994: 82) and Nez Perce (Deal 2010), which is an instances of the Anaphor Agreement Effect (Rizzi 1990; Woolford 1999)
7. Object shift of first and second person objects is blocked because the resulting portmanteau agreement from probing both the ergative subject and the nominative object would incur a PCC-type violation (cf. Icelandic dative subject constructions (Sigurðsson 1996))

---

<sup>7</sup>PCC stands for Person Case Constraint. Bonet (1994) formulated this constraint to account for person restrictions on sequences of a dative and accusative clitic in Romance. This term has been extended to apply to person restrictions on agreement in clauses with a dative subject and a nominative object in Icelandic and other languages. See Anagnostopoulou (2005) for discussion and additional references.

<sup>8</sup>Reflexives are prohibited in positions construed with agreement (Rizzi 1990).

<sup>9</sup>This contrasts with the view expressed in Boyle 2000 that Aleut syntax is unlike that of any other language.

<sup>10</sup>Since Bittner & Hale (1996) established that there is a type of ergative language where ergative case is used on the subject only when the object moves out of the VP, additional languages of this type have emerged, e.g. Nez Perce and Niuean. See Woolford (2015) for a survey and discussion of this type of ergative language.

8. Pro-drop of pronouns that agree (as in Inuit (Bok-Bennema 1983; 1991))
9. Fronted topical objects, with a resumptive pronoun in situ (as in Navajo Speas 1990; Willie 1991) and as argued for Aleut by Boyle (2000))

The conclusion of this paper is that the Aleut Effect, that is, the observed surface correlation between ergative case on the subject and a null argument elsewhere in the clause in Aleut is a true correlation, but there is no direct causal relation. Both ergative subjects and null objects are independent, indirect consequences of Mainland Type Object Shift of pronouns:

- Pronouns that undergo object shift agree, and agreeing pronouns are dropped (null) in Eskimo Aleut languages, as in many languages.
- Object shift places the object in a local relation with the subject, which requires ergative case on the subject in the Eskimo-Aleut languages, as in Niuean and Nez Perce.<sup>11</sup>

This paper is organized as follows. The data and the proposed analysis of basic transitive clauses in Aleut, with a comparison to Inuit, is presented in §2. This section includes a discussion of clauses with a fronted topical object, clauses with a first or second person object, and clauses with a reflexive object. §3 focuses on possessor raising constructions in Aleut, where the raised possessor behaves like any object, just as in Inuit and Nez Perce. §4 turns to possessed relational/positional nouns in Aleut, which also allow possessor raising. §5 discusses some remaining questions and §6 is the conclusion.

## 2 Transitive clauses in Inuit and Aleut

### 2.1 Object shift

Object shift occurs in both Inuit and Aleut, but the two languages differ as to what kind of object undergoes object shift, paralleling the Scandinavian languages. Inuit is like Icelandic wherein specific objects undergo object shift, while non-specific objects do not. Bittner (1994) gives the following minimal pair. In the example in (7), the object is specific: there is one specific book which Juuna has not got:

- (7) Inuit (Bittner 1994: 2)  
 Junna-p atuagaq ataasiq tigu-sima-nngi-laa.  
 Junaa-ERG book one get-PERF-NEG-IND.3SG.SG  
 ‘There is one book which Juuna hasn’t got (yet).’

Bittner argues that the specific object has moved out of the VP, based on evidence involving the scope of negation.

- (8) [ Junna-ERG one book<sub>i</sub> [ <sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> got.neg ] ]

<sup>11</sup>See Woolford (2015) for a survey and discussion of this type of ergative language.

The case pattern in object shift constructions in Inuit is ergative-nominative, with portmanteau agreement resulting from the multiple agree relation created when T probes to and through the ergative subject down to the nominative object.

In contrast, in the example in (9), the object is non-specific. This object “can only take narrow scope, indicating that it remains below negation, inside the VP” (Bittner 1994: 35).

- (9) Inuit (Bittner 1994: 35)  
Juuna ataukka-mik ataasi-mik tigu-si-sima-nngi-la-q.  
Junna book-INSTR one-INSTR get-AP-PERF-NEG-IND-3SG  
‘Juuna has not got one book.’

- (10) [ Junna-ERG [VP one book got ] ]

Here the subject has nominative case and the agreement is only with the subject.

Although we don’t see a word order change in the above pair of examples, more ergative languages of this type have emerged in the linguistics literature, and for some there is clear word order evidence. One of these is Niuean. Massam (2010) gives the following pair of examples from Niuean where word order changes indicate whether or not object shift has occurred before the VP fronting that characterizes this verb initial language. In the example in (11), there is a specific object and object shift occurred before VP fronting. The resulting word order is VSO and the case pattern is ergative nominative:

- (11) Niuean (Massam 2010: 98)  
[VSO specific object]<sup>12</sup>  
Ne inu e Sione e kofe.  
past drink ERG Sione NOM coffee  
‘Sione drank the coffee.’

- (12) a. Base order: S [VP V O]  
b. Order after object shift: S O<sub>i</sub> [VP V t<sub>i</sub> ]  
c. Order after VP fronting [VP V t ] S O

In contrast, the example in (13) has a non-specific object and no object shift has occurred. The object thus fronts with the verb inside the fronted VP, so that the resulting word order is VOS:

- (13) Niuean (Massam 2010: 98)  
[VOS non-specific object]  
Ne inu kofe a Sione.  
PAST drink coffee NOM Sione  
Sione drank coffee.

---

<sup>12</sup>In Niuean the ergative case morpheme for proper nouns, *e*, happens to look just like the nominative case morpheme for common nouns, *e*.

- (14) a. Base order: S [<sub>VP</sub> V O]  
 b. Order after VP fronting: [<sub>VP</sub> V O] S

I argue that Aleut manifests a pattern similar to the related Inuit language, the difference being that only pronouns undergo object shift in Aleut, paralleling Mainland Scandinavian. Transitive clauses with non-pronominal arguments have an ordinary nominative-accusative case pattern in Aleut (although neither case is marked) and agreement is only with the subject:

- (15) Aleut (Boyle 2000: 2 (1a) from Bergsland & Dirks 1981: 32)  
 Piitra-*ᵗ* Ivaana-*ᵗ* kidu-ku-*ᵗ*.  
 Peter-3SG John-3SG help-PRES-3SG  
 ‘Peter is helping John.’

Non-pronominal objects remain in situ in the VP in Aleut:

- (16) [ Peter(NOM) [<sub>VP</sub> John(ACC) V-3SG]]

In contrast, I argue that (third person) pronoun objects undergo object shift in Aleut, as in Mainland Scandinavian.<sup>13</sup> The case pattern in object shift constructions in Aleut is ergative-nominative, as in Inuit (Bittner 1994; Bittner & Hale 1996). The agreement is portmanteau, expressing features from both the ergative subject and the nominative object:<sup>14</sup>

- (17) Aleut (Boyle 2000: 3 (1b) from Bergsland & Dirks 1981: 32)  
 Piitra-m kidu-ku-u.  
 Peter-ERG help-PRES-3SG/3SG  
 ‘Peter is helping him.’

- (18) [ Peter-ERG pro.NOM<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> V-3SG/3SG]]

The object pronoun is not pronounced (not spelled out at PF) because it agrees and agreeing pronouns drop in Aleut, as in Inuit. We see both subject and object pronoun drop in the following Aleut example:

<sup>13</sup>We will see below that the object shift construction is blocked with first and second person objects, as well as with reflexive objects in Aleut.

<sup>14</sup>The ergative case is labeled ‘relative’ in descriptive work on Aleut. The portmanteau agreement series is referred to as the anaphoric series, reflecting the fact that this series identifies the feature of a null object. Work on Aleut generally uses the traditional typological label ‘absolutive’ for the object of a clause with an ergative subject, however the term ‘absolutive’ was meant to be the neutral label of a typological pattern (Dixon 1994) rather than the label of an actual case. As Bittner (1994) argues for the related language Inuit/West Greenlandic, the identity of this case is nominative in Aleut. There are ergative languages that have accusative objects, e.g. Warlpiri (Legate 2006), but accusative objects do not participate in portmanteau agreement with the subject.

- (19) Aleut (Boyle 2000: 3 (5) from Bergsland & Dirks 1981: 10)  
Kidu-ku-ngis.  
help-PRES-3/3PL  
'They are helping him/her/them.'

Bok-Bennema (1983) gives the following examples with subject and object pronoun drop from Yupi'k:

- (20) Yup'ik (Bok-Bennema 1983: 1)  
Yurar-tug.  
dance-IND.3SG  
'She/he is dancing.'
- (21) Yup'ik (Bok-Bennema 1983: 2)  
Tangrr-aa.  
see-IND.3/3  
'He/she sees him/her/it.'

## 2.2 Topical objects

Aleut allows a topical object to precede the clause, with a resumptive pronoun in situ, as in example (23):

- (22) Aleut (Boyle 2000: 3 (6a) from Bergsland 1969: 27)  
Tayaĝu-ġ qa-ġ qa-ku-ġ.  
man-SG fish-SG eat-PRES-3SG.  
'The man is eating the fish.'
- (23) Aleut (Boyle 2000: 4 (6b) from Bergsland 1969: 27)  
qa-ġ tayaĝu-m qa-ku-u.  
fish-SG<sub>i</sub> man-ERG eat-PRES-3/3SG  
'The fish, the man is eating it.'

This is not movement leaving a trace, but rather a base generated topic linked to a resumptive pronoun in situ (Boyle 2000), paralleling what Willie (1991) and Speas (1990) argue for in Navajo. As with any pronoun object, this resumptive pronoun undergoes object shift, triggers agreement on the verb, and is thus not spelled out at PF (pro-dropped):

- (24) fish<sub>i</sub> [ man-ERG pro.NOM<sub>i</sub> [VP t<sub>i</sub> V-3/3]]

## 2.3 First and second person objects

Something different happens with first and second person objects; these do not undergo object shift, do not agree, and must thus be spelled out at PF. The case pattern is nominative-accusative, as in any transitive clause without object shift in Aleut:



- (25) Aleut (Bergsland 1997: 344)  
 Tayag<sup>u-x̂</sup> ting kidu-ku-x<sup>^</sup>.  
 man-3SG(NOM) me(ACC) help-PRES-3SG  
 ‘The man is helping me.’

I argue that the object shift construction is blocked/crashes with first and second person objects because the portmanteau agreement that would result violates PCC-type constraints, similar to what has been observed in Icelandic dative subject constructions with first and second person nominative objects, as in Sigurðsson 1996; 2004.<sup>15</sup>

- (26) Icelandic (Sigurðsson 2004: 148)  
 Honum mundu alltaf líka þeir.  
 him.DAT would.3PL always like they.NOM  
 ‘He would always like them.’

- (27) Icelandic (Sigurðsson 2004: 148)  
 \*Honum munduð alltaf líka þið.  
 him.DAT would.2PL always like you.NOM  
 ‘He would always like you.’

Thus the only grammatical version of this construction in Aleut is the one without object shift, as in (25), because it has a nominative-accusative case pattern and agreement only with the subject.<sup>16</sup>

## 2.4 The pattern with reflexive objects

In both Inuit and Aleut, object shift is blocked (or the object shift construction crashes) when the object is a reflexive. We see this for Inuit in the following pair of examples from Bittner 1994. The Inuit example in (28) has a specific object, which undergoes object shift, with the resulting ergative-nominative case pattern. In contrast, in the example in (29) with a reflexive object, object shift has not occurred and the case pattern is nominative-dative:

- (28) Inuit (Bittner 1994: 82 )  
 Suulu(t)-p Kaali aallaa-vaa.  
 Suulu-ERG Kaali shoot-IND.3SG/3SG  
 ‘Suulut shot Kaali.’

<sup>15</sup>See Anagnostopoulou (2005) for discussion and additional references on PCC effects.

<sup>16</sup>In contrast to Aleut, the related language Inuit allows first and second person objects to undergo object shift. We know that PCC-type effects are not universal, and that languages that do manifest PCC effects vary widely in exactly which feature combinations are prohibited; however, we may be able to identify a more specific reason why first and second person objects are allowed to undergo object shift in Inuit, in contrast to Aleut. In addition to portmanteau agreement, Inuit has pronominal clitics which suffix to the portmanteau agreement. When a first or second person object moves out of the VP, Inuit may avoid some PCC-type violations by encoding only the number of the object in the portmanteau agreement, and encoding the first or second person feature of the object in a separate pronominal clitic. See Fortescue (1985) and Woolford (2016).

- (29) Inuit (Bittner 1994: 82)  
Sullut immi-nut aallaa-vuq.  
Sullut self-DAT shoot-IND.3SG  
'Suulut shot himself.'

The object shift version of the reflexive object example is ungrammatical:

- (30) Inuit (Bittner 1994: 82)  
\*Suulu(t)-p immi aallaa-vaa.  
Sullut-ERG self shoot-IND.3SG/3SG  
'Suulut shot himself.'

This is an example of the Anaphor Agreement effect (Rizzi 1990; Woolford 1999): anaphors cannot occur in positions normally associated with agreement.<sup>17</sup>

We see the same pattern with reflexive objects in Aleut. The following example in (31) has a pronoun subject (which is not spelled out because it agrees), and an overt reflexive object. The agreement, which is only with the subject, tells us that object shift has not occurred. Although the subject pronoun is not spelled out, because it agrees, the reflexive pronoun has to be spelled out because it does not agree:

- (31) Aleut (Bergsland 1969: 139)  
Txin achixa-ku-ġ.  
3.REFL.SG teach-PRES-3SG  
'He taught himself.'

This contrasts with the example in (32) with a pronoun object that is disjoint in reference with the subject. Here we see by the portmanteau agreement on the verb that object shift has occurred. The shifted object is dropped (not spelled out at PF) because it agrees.

- (32) Aleut (Bergsland 1969: 139)  
Kidu-ku-u.  
help-PRES-3/3SG  
'He is helping him.'

### 3 Possessed objects

#### 3.1 Possessor raising

Pronominal possessors of objects behave like pronominal objects in Aleut. I argue that this is due to possessor raising, paralleling Nez Perce (Deal 2013).<sup>18</sup> Nez Perce is like Aleut in that it has object shift resulting in an ergative subject and portmanteau agreement, and

<sup>17</sup>The Anaphor Agreement Effect appears to be universal (Woolford 1999), but why it holds is still a mystery.

<sup>18</sup>Bittner (1994: 71–72) shows that Inuit allows possessor raising, but only with some verbs.

it also has clearly transitive clauses without object shift where the subject is nominative and agreement is only with the subject.

- (33) Nez Perce (Rude 1988: 552)  
 Háama hi-'wi-ye wewúkiye.  
 man(NOM) 3-shoot-ASP elk(ACC)  
 'The man shot an elk.'
- (34) Nez Perce (Rude 1988: 552)  
 Háama-nm pée-'wi-ye wewúkiye-ne.  
 man-ERG 3/3-shoot-ASP elk-OBJ  
 'The man shot an elk.'

In terms of what kind of object undergoes object shift, Nez Perce is more like Inuit and Icelandic in that non-pronominal arguments can undergo object shift. According to Rude (1982; 1986), it is the more topical objects that undergo object shift in Nez Perce, and less topical objects do not.

Nez Perce allows possessor raising, as Deal (2013) shows, and raised possessors undergo object shift; as in other object shift constructions in Nez Perce, the subject is ergative and the agreement is portmanteau and the object takes the case glossed as objective.<sup>19</sup>

- (35) Nez Perce (Deal 2013: 398 (14) from Rude 1986: 119)  
 Hi-nees-hex-ne'ny-e ma-may'as-na pist.  
 3<sup>rd</sup>-PL.OBJ-see- $\mu$ -PAST PL-child-OBJ father  
 'He saw the children's father.'

In contrast, we see an unraised possessor in the following example in (36). The first object has undergone object shift, and we see the genitive possessor in the second object:

- (36) Nez Perce (Deal 2013: 400 (20a))  
 'Ew-'nii-se Tatlo-na Angel-nim taaqmaał.  
 3OBJ-give-IMPERF Tatlo-OBJ Angel-GEN hat  
 'I'm giving Tatlo Angel's hat.'

In contrast to Nez Perce, Aleut only allows pronominal possessors to undergo possessor raising and object shift.<sup>20</sup> The pair of examples below shows the contrast between an NP possessor in (37), and a pronominal possessor in (38). In (37), there is no object shift, which is what we expect with non-pronominal objects in Aleut; thus the subject case is nominative and the agreement on the verb is only with the nominative subject:

<sup>19</sup>See Deal (2013) for a discussion of the morpheme she glosses as  $\mu$ .

<sup>20</sup>Deal (2013) argues that object shift is directly from the possessor position, without a separate step of possessor raising in Nez Perce. This could be true of Aleut as well.

- (37) Aleut (Boyle 2000: 3 (4a) from Bergsland 1997: 144)  
 Piitra- $\hat{x}$  [hal-s ada-a] kidu-ku- $\hat{x}$ .  
 Peter-3SG [boy-PL father-3/3] help-PRES-3SG  
 ‘Peter is helping the boys’ father.’

In contrast in (38) below the possessor of the object is a pronoun. This pronoun undergoes object shift, and we see all the usual consequences of object shift in Aleut. The subject is ergative and the shifted plural pronoun is cross-referenced in the portmanteau agreement on the verb. Because it agrees, the object shifted pronoun is not pronounced (i.e. it is pro-dropped):

- (38) Aleut (Bergsland 1997: 144)  
 Piitra-m ada-ngis kidu-ku-ngis.  
 Peter-ERG father-3/3PL help-TNS-3/3PL  
 ‘Peter is helping their father.’

- (39) [ Peter-ERG their.NOM<sub>i</sub> [ [t<sub>i</sub> father] help-3/3PL ]]

### 3.2 No object shift of coreferent possessors

Aleut parallels Nez Perce as well in constructions where the pronominal possessor of the object is coreferent with the subject. Here object shift is blocked in both languages, and Deal’s account of why extends to Aleut. Deal (2013: 413) points out that Binding Condition B rules out a pronominal object being coreferent with the subject, as in the Nez Perce example in (40) where the pronominal possessor has undergone object shift (as evidenced by the ergative subject and portmanteau agreement on the verb):

- (40) Nez Perce (Deal 2013: 413 (54a))  
 Pit’iin’-im paa-’yaa $\hat{x}$ -na’ny-a ’ip-ne picpic.  
 girl-ERG 3/3-find- $\mu$ -REM.PAST his/her-OBJ cat  
 ‘The girl<sub>i</sub> found his/her<sub>j</sub> cat.’ (no coreference)

If there is coreference, only the version without object shift (and without ergative case and portmanteau agreement) in (41) is grammatical:

- (41) Nez Perce (Deal 2013: 413 (54b))  
 Pit’iin’ hi-’yaa $\hat{x}$ -n-a [’ip-nimi picpic].  
 girl(NOM) 3-find-ASP-REM.PAST [her-GEN cat]  
 ‘The girl<sub>i</sub> found her<sub>i</sub> cat.’ (coreference)

If the object shifted pronoun were to be interpreted as a reflexive rather than an ordinary pronoun, coreference in (41) would also be ruled out, but for a different reason: the reflexive pronoun would agree and that would be an instance of the Anaphor Agreement Effect: anaphors are barred from positions that agree. Thus the only solution is to

block object shift when there is co-reference between the subject and the possessor of an object.

The same pattern is found in Aleut. When a pronoun possessor undergoes object shift, it cannot be interpreted as coreferent with the subject:

- (42) Aleut (Bergsland 1997: 54)  
 Hla-m [ ada-a ] kidu-ku-u.  
 boy-ERG<sub>i</sub> pro<sub>j</sub> [ t<sub>j</sub> father-3/3 ] help-PRES-3/3  
 ‘The boy<sub>i</sub> is helping his<sub>j</sub> father.’ (no coreference)

As Deal (2013) concludes for Nez Perce, this is due to Binding Condition B which prohibits coreference between a pronoun object and a c-commanding subject in the same clause.

Coreference is only possible if the pronoun possessor does *not* undergo object shift, as in (43). We can tell that object shift has not occurred in (43) because the subject is not ergative and the verbal agreement is only with the subject.

- (43) Aleut (Bergsland 1997: 54)  
 Hla- $\hat{x}$  [ ada-an ] kidu-ku- $\hat{x}$ .  
 boy-SG(NOM)<sub>i</sub> [pro<sub>i</sub> father-3.REFL ] help-TNS-SG  
 ‘Peter is helping his (own) father.’

Note that the pronoun possessor is null (not spelled out) even in its base position inside the object NP in (43) because it agrees with the head noun, and agreeing pronouns are dropped (not spelled out).

## 4 Possessed relational nouns in Aleut

From the English translations of the following examples, one could easily get the impression that the subject is ergative in Aleut when the object of a PP is null, and as far as we know, object shift does not occur out of PPs. However, these constructions do not actually involve PPs, but rather possessed directional nouns with an oblique case suffix (Fortescue 1985, Bergsland 1997: 47). These constructions work like the possessed object constructions discussed above in §3. The version of the sentence in (44) has a non-pronominal NP possessor, which remains in situ, since only pronouns undergo object shift in Aleut. In contrast, the version of the sentence in (45) has a pronominal possessor, which does undergo object shift.

- (44) Aleut (Bergsland 1997: 126)  
 Piitra- $\hat{x}$  tayagu-m had-a- huya-ku- $\hat{x}$ .  
 Peter-3SG man-GEN direction-3/3-LOC go-PRES-3SG  
 ‘Peter is going toward the man (in the man’s direction).’

- (45) Aleut (Bergsland 1997: 127)  
Piitra-m had-a-n huya-ku-u.  
Peter-ERG direction-3/3-LOC go-PRES-3/3SG  
'Peter is going toward him/her (in his/her direction).'

We observe the same differences in the case and agreement patterns in these examples as we do in examples (37) and (38) in §3.

## 5 Remaining questions

There are remaining issues concerning Aleut grammar that have not been discussed in this paper. One is the question that Sadock (2000) asks: what determines which features are expressed by the agreement morphology in different constructions in Aleut? This paper addresses only part of this question, predicting when verbal agreement in clauses can and cannot be portmanteau; verbal agreement cannot be portmanteau unless object shift has occurred. However, the question of which agreement features will be spelled out at PF is a separate issue. Sadock suggests that in some instances, the choice of what agreement features to realize at PF, especially in agreement in DPs (which have not been discussed in this paper), can depend on functional/communicative factors.

Another remaining question concerns Aleut examples where (under the analysis proposed in this paper) object shift appears to occur out of some kind of embedded/adjunct clause. Berge (2010) cites the following pair of examples from Bergsland (1997: 248). In the first example in (46), the verb 'go.to.sleep' agrees only with its subject. In contrast, in the second example in (47), the agreement is portmanteau, also encoding the 3PL features of what looks like the null subject of the adjunct/embedded clause, "When (they) stopped talking":

- (46) Aleut, Atkan dialect (Berge 2010: 10)  
Hla-s tunum-kada-ku-z-iin ting saġani-na-q.  
boy-PL talk-CESS-IND-PL-ENCL 1SG go.to.sleep-part-1SG  
'When the boys stopped talking, I went to sleep.'
- (47) Aleut, Atkan dialect (Berge 2010: 10)  
Tunum-kada-ku-z-iin ting saġani-qa-ning.  
talk-CESS-IND-PL-ENCL 1SG go.to.sleep-part.an-1SG/3PL.an  
'When they stopped talking, I went to sleep.'

One possible clue to understanding these particular examples is that the morpheme *-iin* which Berge glosses simply as 'enclitic' is actually the 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> plural possessive ending on nouns *-iin*, as in *adam-aziin* 'to our fathers' (Bergsland 1997: 149). This suggests the possibility that what is translated as 'when they stopped talking' might be more accurately translated as '(at) their stopping-talking'. If so, this could be another instance of possessor raising.

Merchant (personal communication) suggests the possibility of a similar analysis of Aleut examples which, from their English translations, would appear to involve movement out of a relative clause. As Merchant notes in his 2011 paper “Some Aleut relative clauses have something like the form of a possessed clause.” (Merchant 2011: 397)

## 6 Summary and conclusions

The goal of this paper has been to show that the Eskimo-Aleut languages parallel the Scandinavian languages in manifesting two types of object shift, one where only pronouns undergo object shift, and one where all specific objects undergo object shift. Aleut is like the Mainland Scandinavian languages in allowing only pronouns to undergo object shift, while Inuit is like Icelandic in allowing all specific objects to shift.

We have seen that the consequences of object shift are much more complex in the Eskimo Aleut languages than they are in Scandinavian languages. In the Eskimo-Aleut languages, clauses with object shift have an ergative subject and portmanteau agreement, in contrast to clauses without object shift which have a nominative subject and agreement only with the subject. These consequences of object shift have also been observed in other ergative languages such as Nez Perce and Niuean. Additional factors interacting with object shift in Aleut include possessed relational nouns instead of PPs and possessor raising.

A second goal of this paper has been to show that, although the surface pattern of Aleut shows a perfect correlation between ergative case on the subject and a null object (The Aleut Effect), this correlation does not reflect causation. Instead, object shift (interacting with other factors) causes both ergative subjects and null objects in Aleut. While the surface complexity of the Aleut pattern might initially seem to warrant adding significant generative machinery to the grammar, I have shown in this paper that the Aleut Effect follows automatically from a combination of nine grammatical constructions/factors, each of which is independently motivated in other languages.

## Acknowledgements

It is a privilege to have been invited to contribute to this volume dedicated to Anders Holmberg in honor of his important contributions to linguistic theory. In my case, without his contributions in the area of object shift typology, I would never have been able to solve the mystery of the puzzle known as the Aleut Effect. I would like to thank Jason Merchant and Margaret Speas and two anonymous reviewers for reading this manuscript and providing many helpful comments.

## References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions: A feature checking analysis. In Lorie Heggie & Francisco Ordóñez (eds.), *Clitic and affix combinations: Theoretical perspectives*, 199–235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Berge, Anna. 2010. Unexpected non-anaphoric marking in Aleut. In Jan Wohlgemuth & Michael Cysouw (eds.), *Rara and rarissima: Documenting the fringes of linguistic diversity*, 1–22. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1969. A problem of transformation in Aleut. *Word* 25(1–3). 24–38.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1997. *Aleut grammar: Unagam tunuganaan achixaasix*. Fairbanks, Alaska: Alaska Native Language Center.
- Bergsland, Knut & Moses Dirks. 1981. *Atkan Aleut school grammar*. Anchorage: National Bilingual Materials Development Center, Rural Education, University of Alaska.
- Bhatt, Rajesh & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1996. Object shift and specificity: Evidence from ko-phrases in Hindi. In Lise Dobrin, Kora Singer & Lisa McNair (eds.), *CLS 32: Papers from the main session*, 11–22. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Bittner, Maria. 1994. *Case, scope, and binding*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bittner, Maria & Ken Hale. 1996. Ergativity: Toward a theory of a heterogeneous class. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27. 531–604.
- Bok-Bennema, Reineke. 1983. On pro-drop pronominal anaphors in Eskimo. *Tilburg papers in language and literature* 37. 1–22.
- Bok-Bennema, Reineke. 1991. *Case and agreement in Inuit*. New York: Foris.
- Bonet, Eulalia. 1994. The person-case constraint: A morphological approach. *MIT working papers in linguistics* 22. 33–52.
- Boyle, John. 2000. The Aleut effect: Competition at TP. In *Proceedings of CLS*, vol. 37, 221–38. Chicago.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2010. Ergative case and the transitive subject: A view from Nez Perce. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28. 73–120.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2013. Possessor raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44. 391–432.
- Diesing, Molly. 1996. Semantic variables and object shift. In Samuel Epstein & Höskuldur Thráinsson (eds.), *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, vol. 2, 66–84. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Dixon, Robert MW. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fortescue, Michael. 1985. Anaphoric agreement in Aleut. In Alide Machtelt Bolkestein, Casper de Groot & J. Lachlan Mackenzie (eds.), *Predicates and terms in functional grammar*, 105–126. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hale, Kenneth L. 1997. The Misumalpan causative construction. In Joan Bybee, John Haiman & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Essays on language function and language type*, 199–216. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.



- Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Stockholm: Dept. of General Linguistics, University of Stockholm dissertation.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2006. Split absolutive. In Alana Johns, Diane Massam & Juvenal Ndayiragije (eds.), *Ergativity*, 143–171. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Massam, Diane. 2010. V1 or V2?: On the left in Niuean. *Lingua* 120(2). 284–302.
- Merchant, Jason. 2011. Aleut case matters. In Etsuyo Yuasa Yuasa, Tista Bagchi & Katherine Beals (eds.), *Pragmatics and autolexical grammar: In honor of Jerry Sadock*, vol. 176, 193. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. On the anaphor-agreement effect. *Rivista di linguistica* 2(1). 27–42.
- Rude, Noel. 1982. Promotion and topicality of Nez Perce objects. In Monica Macaulay & Orin Gensler (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 463–483. Berkeley: University of California.
- Rude, Noel. 1986. Topicality, transitivity, and the direct object in Nez Perce. *IJAL* 52. 124–153.
- Rude, Noel. 1988. Ergative, passive, and antipassive in Nez Perce. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and voice*, 547–560. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 2000. Aleut number agreement. In *Annual meeting of the Berkeley linguistics society*, vol. 26, 121–138. Berkeley, California.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 2009. The efficacy of anaphoricity in Aleut. In Marc-Antoine Mahieu & Nicole Tersis (eds.), *Variations on polysynthesis: The Eskaleut languages* (Typological Studies in Language 86), 97–113. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1996. Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57. 1–46.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. Icelandic non-nominative subjects: Facts and implications. In Peri Bhaskararao & Karumuri Venkata Subbarao (eds.), *Non-nominative subjects*, vol. 2 (Typological Studies in Language 61), 137–160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Speas, Margaret. 1990. *Phrase structure in natural language* (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 21). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2001. Object shift and scrambling. In Mark Baltin & Chris Collins (eds.), *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, 148–202. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Willie, MaryAnn. 1991. *Navajo pronouns and obviation*. Tucson: University of Arizona dissertation.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1999. More on the anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(2). 257–287.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2015. Ergativity and transitivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46(3). 489–531.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2016. Two types of portmanteau agreement: Syntactic and morphological. In Geraldine Legendre, Michael T. Putnam, Henrietta de Swart & Erin Zaroukian (eds.), *Optimality theoretic syntax, semantics, and pragmatics: From uni- to bidirectional optimization*, 111–135. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

