Shared retentions cannot support subgrouping in Algonquian: Against Goddard (2018)

Natalie Weber Yale University 3 Aug 2022


Overview

- Recent argument in Goddard (2018) that Blackfoot is a sister to the rest of the Algonquian family
 - Blackfoot split first from a putative Proto-Algonquian-Blackfoot
 - Remaining Algonquian languages form a subgroup
- Two claims supporting this argument
- This paper: neither claim provides evidence for subgrouping
 - Today: just the first claim

Outline

- 1. Blackfoot's position in Algonquian
- 2. Claim #1: Shared innovation in Proto-Algonquian
 - Goddard's (2018) proposal
 - Problems with the proposal
 - An alternative analysis
- 3. Discussion

Blackfoot's position in Algonquian



Algonquian

- Blackfoot = westernmost language
- Spoken in:
 - Alberta, Canada
 - Montana, USA

• [Map by Eric Leinberger]




Blackfoot

- Four sovereign Nations
 - 3 reserves in Canada
 - 1 reservation in USA ("Blackfeet")

• [Map by Kevin McManigal]

Proto-Algonquian (subset of languages shown)



Proto-Algonquian

- Proto-Algonquian is well-established (cf. Aubin 1975; Bloomfield 1925, 1946; Goddard 1979; Hewson 1993; Hockett 1942; Michelson 1935; Miller 1959; Pentland 1979; Siebert 1941, 1975; Silver 1960; Voegelin 1941)
- Internal structure is rather flat
 - Only Eastern Algonquian is a subgroup (Goddard 1974, 1980)
 - But contested (Pentland 1992; Proulx 1984)
- Areal groupings (cf. Mithun 1999)


Innovations and archaisms in Blackfoot

- Innovative sound changes "all contribute towards making Blackfoot vocabulary as a whole **appear as un-Algonquian**" (Michelson 1935: 142-143).
- "There are some apparent **lexical archaisms** in Blackfoot" (Goddard 1994: 188)
- "Blackfoot is clearly the most **divergent** language in the Algonquian family" (Goddard 2018).

Blackfoot's position is contested!

- Various relationships have been proposed:
 - A branch of its own (Michelson 1912)
 - Grouped with Cree and Cheyenne (Hayden 1863)
 - Grouped with Conoy and Beothuk (Pentland 1979)
 - Oldest dialectal layer of Algonquian (Goddard 1994)
- "Blackfoot is by far the most **divergent** of the Algonquian languages [...] and it remains to be shown whether [...] Blackfoot is a **sister** language of PA rather than a daughter" (Proulx 1980)

Goddard's (2018) proposal



Two arguments for shared innovations

- 1. Proto-Algonquian deletes #i / ___C
- 2. Proto-Algonquian restructures an older paradigm of "post-inflectional suffixes" into the so-called absentative paradigm

This talk: just the first claim

Shared innovations in Proto-Algonquian

Roots with initial *iC

Blackfoot has many stems and roots in #iC

- PA *po-n- 'cease'
 - cf. Meskwaki <u>po·ni</u>kegwa 'he pays his debt'
- Blackfoot ipon- 'terminate, end, be rid of '
 - ponihtáát 'pay!'
 - nits<u>ipóni</u>hta 'I paid'
 - <u>iipón</u>ihtaawa 'he paid'

"Independently, under synchronic conditions that have not been described, word-initial BI | iC-| is sometimes realized as C-" Goddard (2018).

Blackfoot has many stems and roots in #iC

- PA *ketem- (root)
 - Meskwaki <u>keteminaw</u>- 'take pity on, bless with supernatural power'
- Blackfoot ikimm- TA 'show kindness to, bestow power on'
 - <u>ikímm</u>isa! 'bestow power on him!/care for her!'
 - <u>ikímm</u>iiwa 'he bestowed power on him'
 - nits<u>íkimm</u>oka 'he bestowed power on me'

Initial*i is rare in Proto-Algonquian

- No PA short *i in the first syllable, except:
 - before consonant clusters (some but not all);
 - before PA *r
 only reconstructible in PA *iren- 'ordinary'
 - in demonstratives e.g. *iyog 'this (inan.)', *ini 'that (inan.)'
 - and in relative roots e.g *i θ ~ *i \dot{s} '{so}; to {somewhere}'
- But no lexical roots begin in *ip-, *ič-, *it-, *ik-, *is-, *iš-, *im-, or *in-.

Initial syllables in PA are weak

- No true consonant clusters
- No contrast between *i and *e
- Relative roots beginning in *t, e.g. PA *taθ- 'somewhere'

	PA	Unami Delaware	
Initial	*taθ-	té∙kəne <u>tal</u> á∙wsu	'he lives in the woods'
Non-initial	*entaθ-	nt <u>əntal</u> á∙wsí∙ne∙n	'for us to live there'
Changed [†]	*e∙ntaθ-	yú <u>ental</u> a∙wsíenk	'here where we live'


[†] initial change = morphological ablaut of initial syllable (Costa 1998)

Motivation for proposal

• Case study: PA *taθ- 'somewhere'

	PA		pre-PA	
Initial	*taθ-	<	*entaθ-	reduction
Non-initial	*entaθ-	<	*entaθ-	
Changed [†]	*e∙ntaθ-	<	*e∙ntaθ-	

Proposal: innovation in Proto-Algonquian



reduction in initial syllables

Problems with proposal

- 1. Blackfoot *also* has initial weak syllables
- 2. Blackfoot has C-initial nouns (and other non-verbal categories)
- 3. Blackfoot has C-initial verbs (sometimes)

1. Blackfoot *also* has initial weak syllables

- No true consonant clusters
- No contrast between *i and *e (> B i)
- Relative roots show reduction, e.g. oht- 'instrumental, source'

Initial <u>ts</u>ítskixpissi 'when he danced by'
Non-initial áxk<u>uxts</u>itokoopsskaa?wa 'so she can make broth with (them)'
Changed <u>ixts</u>ítsksspai?wa 'he is looking past'

[Blackfoot Words: word-AT1969-0758, word-AT1969-0016, word-AT1969-0293]

1. Blackfoot *also* has initial weak syllables

• Case study: oht- 'instrumental, source'

	Blackfoot [†]		pre-Blackfoot	
Initial	ts-	<	*oht-	reduction
Non-initial	uxts-	<	*oht-	
Changed	ixts-	<	*e·ht-	

 $+/t/ \rightarrow [ts]/_{i,j}$

2. Blackfoot has C-initial nouns

- Nouns begin in C, not iC
- Unexpected if Blackfoot reflects PAB forms in *iC!

Blackfoot		Proto-Algor	Proto-Algonquian		
kóóna	'ice'	*ko∙na	'snow'		
mííni	'berry'	*mi∙ni	'berry'		
miistsísa	'tree'	*mi-twiya	'quaking aspen'		
<u>ksíssk</u> stakiwa	'beaver'	*ki∙šk-	'cut, chop, sever'		
<u>pisst</u> óóhtsi	'inside'	*pi∙nt-	'inside'		


3. Blackfoot has C-initial verbs (sometimes)


- Imperatives and subjunctives (with no prefixes)
 - PA *po·n- 'cease'
 - B <u>pon</u>ihtáát 'pay!'
- Statives (with no prefixes)
 - PA *ra-nk- 'light in weight'
 - B <u>saahk</u>sstssímma anná pookááwa 'the child is light in weight' (Frantz & Russell 2017: 232)

Summary: Problems with proposal

- Blackfoot shows synchronic reduction in initial syllable
 - This was motivation for *i > Ø / #___ in Proto-Algonquian
 - So why doesn't Blackfoot delete...?
- Blackfoot must delete in many cases
 - Nouns and non-verbs
 - Imperatives and subjunctives
 - Statives

An alternative analysis





Synchronic analysis: roots in #C ~ #iC

Initial	Non-initial	
<u>pon</u> ihtáát	áaks <u>iponi</u> htaawa	After C
'pay!'	'she will pay'	
	áká <u>ípon</u> ihtsiwa	After V
	'he is dead'	

(Frantz & Russell 2017: 91)

Synchronic analysis: non-alternating roots

Initial Non-initial

<u>ipótsim</u>atsísa! áaks<u>ipótsim</u>atsiiwa *After C*

'poison him!' 'she'll poison him'

(none found) After V

(Frantz & Russell 2017: 92)


Synchronic analysis: two groups of roots

Initial	Non-initial	UR	Gloss
p on-	- ip on-	/pon-/	'cease'
ip otsim-	- ip otsim-	/ipotim-/	'poison'
*p	*-p		

- NB: very few roots in #iC under this analysis
- Similar to Proto-Algonquian

Historical record

- For roots with invariant #i, often possible to show this is a recent addition by looking at the historical record.
- Tool: Blackfoot Words database (https://www.blackfootwords.com/)



Historical record: Blackfoot Words

- relational database of inflected words and phrases, and their subparts
- 63,493 lexical forms have been digitized to date from 30 sources
- timespan: 1743–2017 (almost 300 years!)
- Version 1.1 includes 9 of 30 sources

- F&R 2017 = Frantz & Russell (2017)
- word-AB1234-000789 = unique id from the database

Historical record: kimm- 'pity'

• i<u>kímm</u>isa! 'bestow power on him!/care for her!' [F&R 2017: 46]

• <u>kímm</u>isa! pity thou him! [word-AT1969-1405]

• <u>kim'is</u> pity him! [word-JT1889-6231]

• <u>kim'okit</u> pity me! [word-JT1889-6232]

• <u>kímm</u>okit pity me! [word-CU1938-13981]

Morphological ablaut ("initial change")

- Initial change = morphological ablaut of first syllable (Costa 1996)
- In C-initial stems, initial change has been restructured:
 - Archaic: first vowel ablauts (~100 stems; Taylor 1967)
 - Novel: add an initial i- or ii-
- Archaic changed forms can diagnose whether a syllable is initial
- Not all stems have archaic changed forms

(aspects of Blackfoot initial change in Berman 2006; Frantz 2017; Proulx 2005; Taylor 1967, 1969)

Root: ipotsim- 'poison'

Plain: <u>ipótsim</u>atsísa! 'poison him!' [F&R 2017: 92]

ipótsimatsiiwáyi 'she poisoned it' [F&R 2017: 92]

Changed: <u>iipotsím</u>atsiiway 'he poisoned him' [word-AT1967-105]

náápotsimatsiiway 'he poisoned him' [word-AT1969-2978]

niipotsímatsisa 'poison thou him!' [word-AT1967-107]

Root: pon- 'cease' is C-initial

Plain: ponihtáát! 'pay!' [F&R 2017: 91]

poonixtátsisa 'pay thou him!' [word-AT1967-112]

Changed forms:

• Archaic: paanixtátsisa 'pay thou him!' [word-AT1967-111]

• New: iipónihtaawa 'he paid' [F&R 2017: 91]

- If this root were /ipon-/, it should pattern with other *i*-initial roots
- Initial change only affects first syllable, showing that p is initial

Summary


Evidence that Blackfoot roots begin in *C


1. Synchronic analysis explains roots in #C ~ #iC

2. Historical record explains roots in invariant #iC

3. Morphological ablaut additional evidence

An alternative analysis





An alternative analysis

- Blackfoot roots are shared retentions from PA with additional innovations within the verbal system
 - Roots in non-initial position have initial #i
 - Some roots reanalyzed as truly #i-initial, contrasting with C-initial roots
 - Initial change in C-initial roots was restructured
- Shared retentions cannot support subgrouping (cf. Atkinson & Gray 2005; Koch & Bowern 2004).

Discussion

Synchronic analysis

- Synchronic analysis is necessary!
 - Morphophonological alternations
 - Phonological underlying forms
 - Internal reconstruction
- Cannot look at words in isolation without considering their place in the system.

Historical record

- Digitizing and annotating the historical record is necessary!
 - Blackfoot Words aims to do this (Weber et al. 2022)
 - Huge task!
 - Two years and counting...

Comparative method

- New cognate sets are needed!
 - Many papers on historical phonology in Algonquian compare forms in a language to the established Proto-Algonquian reconstructions
 - But new data might reveal new things!
 - Need new cognate sets and correspondence sets

Summary

- No evidence for Proto-Algonquian-Blackfoot
 - No major prevalence of #iC roots in Blackfoot
 - Determined by synchronic analysis
 - Alternative: Blackfoot continues PA roots in #C

In memoriam

Donald Frantz (d. 2021)



David Pentland (d. 2022)




Photo by Arden Ogg

Nítohtsikaahsi'taki! Thank you!