

## The prosodic and syntactic constituency of demonstratives in Blackfoot

Joseph W. Windsor  
University of Calgary

Blackfoot, a North American Indigenous language with approximately 3,350 speakers, contains a morphologically rich demonstrative system suggested to contain 900 possible combinations (Bliss 2013:138). Previous syntactic analyses have argued for demonstratives in this language to instantiate D<sup>0</sup>s (Wiltschko 2009); specifiers merged in Spec,DP with subsequent raising to Spec, KP (Bliss 2013); or, as separate syntactic domains forming a parallel with the nominal and verbal spines (Bliss & Wiltschko 2014). In this talk, I use prosodic and syntactic evidence to argue that the demonstrative is part of the nominal projection, external the DP.

I examine right-edge aspiration and vowel coalescence to argue for a prosodic constituency of nominal expressions in Blackfoot which is built from underlying syntactic structure via Match Theory (Selkirk 2011). I show that in sentences such as those in (1), demonstratives are phonologically phrased separate from other nominal elements.

- (1) a. [an:a<sup>h</sup>]φ      [iimita:ma<sup>h</sup>]φ      [ino:kama<sup>h</sup>]φ  
          anna            iimitááwa        inóókawa  
          ann-wa        imitaa-wa        ino-oka-wa  
          DEM-PROX    dog-PROX        see.TA-INV-21  
          ‘that dog sees us’
- b. [an:iksi<sup>h</sup>]      [(akε:)ω (maxkiçkine:ksi<sup>h</sup>)ω]φ      [ino:kama<sup>h</sup>]φ  
          anniksi<sub>i</sub>        akáímahkihkinaiksi            inóókawa  
          ann-iksi        aka-iimahkihkinaa-iksi        ino-oka-wa  
          DEM-ANIM.PL    old-sheep-ANIM.PL            see.TA-INV-21  
          ‘those old sheep see us’

The attested phonological constituency is argued to only be possible (due to Phase Theory (Chomsky 2001, 2008; Kratzer & Selkirk 2007)) if the demonstrative is in a projection external to the DP without raising from a DP-internal position.

This analysis has consequences for the theories of parallelism between the nominal and verbal domains (*e.g.*, Abney 1987; Giusti 1996, 2015; Wiltschko 2014). I maintain a strong parallelism in a Universal Spine Hypothesis framework (Wiltschko 2014) by showing that demonstratives in Blackfoot fulfill the same syntactic function as CP elements, namely: referentiality (Cinque 1990; Haegeman 2006; Szabolcsi 2006; deCuba & MacDonald 2012, 2013; *cf* Giusti 2015) as can be seen in (2) where the demonstrative and the non-referential suffix *-i* are in complementary distribution:

- (2) a. nitsíín            (\*oma)            aakííkoani  
          nit-íín            (om-wa)            aakíí-koan-i  
          1.SG-see.AI    (DEM<sub>5</sub>-PROX)    woman-DIM-NON<sup>^</sup>REF.SG  
          ‘I saw some girl’
- b. nitsínoawa            oma            aakííkoana  
          nit-íno-aa-wa        om<sub>5</sub>-wa        aakíí-koan-wa  
          1.SG-see.TA-DIR-3.SG DEM-PROX        woman-DIM-PROX  
          ‘I saw that girl’