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- Southern Oceanic, Central Vanuatu
- endangered, ca. 1,000 speakers
- first extensively documented in the 2010s by Kilu von Prince, but very little published literature, including no grammar
- All language examples in this presentation are from the corpus she and the speaker community compiled during her stays with them.
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## Dalkalaen grammar

- SVO (or more like TSPO) syntax
(1) [Temyarr en tii] $]_{T}[n g a y]_{S}[\emptyset-m a-d o]_{P}$ [fyan m-a-n im. $]_{O}$ demon SUB DIST 3 3-REAL-stay under C2-POSS-3 house The demon was in its house. (story \#3: a rat and a bird steal food from a demon)
- theory of word and morpheme boundaries still in the making
(2) [Temyarr en tii] $]_{T}[n g a y]_{S}\left[\begin{array}{ll}m a & d o ?]_{P}[f y a n ~ m-a-n ~ i m .]_{O}\end{array}\right.$ demon SUB DIST 3 REAL stay under C2-POSS-3 house The demon was in its house.
(story \#3: a rat and a bird steal food from a demon)
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## Verbs and modifiers in rigid order

- verb plus modifiers "in rigid order, like affixes around a root"

| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MOD | IRR | SAM | REAL | CONT | V | RED | TR |
| Table: [WIP] Slots of the Dalkalaen verb complex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Verb modifiers as free forms

- modifiers "usually" free forms which can be said and glossed in isolation

| gloss | modifier | slot |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MOD | ga | -5 |
| IRR | ba | -4 |
| SAM | na, maro, muju, ... | -3 |
| REAL | ma | -2 |
| REAL:PFV | ta | -2 |
| REAL:NEG | to | -2 |
| CONT | do | -1 |
| TR | ne | +1 |
| RES | kuu, gate, kebwinu, $\ldots$ | +1 |

Table: Dalkalaen verb modifiers
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Temyarr en tii ngay $\emptyset$-mo-do fyan m-a-n im.
demon SUB DIST $3 \quad$ 3-REAL-stay under C2-POSS-3 house
The demon was in its house.
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## ... or are they?

- A large part of verb markers exhibit significant reduction of their vowels
- from vowel harmony

Temyarr en tii ngay $\emptyset-m o-d o ~ f y a n ~ m-a-n ~ i m . ~$
demon SUB DIST 3 3-REAL-stay under C2-POSS-3 house The demon was in its house. (story \#3: a rat and a bird steal food from a demon)

- to vowel deletion
(4) Tomo maro-m-yan lo maro-m-kyep~kyep
rat 1EX:DU-REAL-go DISC 1EX:DU-REAL-poop~poop koo $\sim k o o$ gon lo ngay $\emptyset$-ma-merr.
race~race just DISC 3 3-REAL-die
The rat and I had a pooping contest and she died. (story \#4: a rat and a crab have a pooping contest)
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## Then again ...

- Some monosyllabic markers are much less prone to vowel reduction, e.g. to- 'real:neg'.
- Many subject agreement and resultative markers are polysyllabic. These also have much more stable vowels.
- At least two markers are obviously recently grammaticized:
- do- 'cont' (< do 'stay') could easily be analyzed as an auxiliary or even a verb in a serial verb construction.
- -ne 'TR' (< ne ‘[object determiner]’) often appears in an ambiguous position where it's not easy to tell apart from its word counterpart.

Ni ba-na-do fyan, ba-na-do-tee~tee-ne temyarr en tii.
1 IRR-1-stay down IRR-1-CONT-look~look-TR demon SUB DISC
I'll stay down and watch that demon.
(story \#3: a rat and a bird steal food from a demon)

## Verbs can also occur without their markers

- Verb roots can appear in isolation when their subject is the same as a preceding verb's, as well as in SVCs.
$\emptyset$-Ma-do-roo to, molone ji~je nyee, top goote 3-REAL-CONT-steal chicken destroy RED~thing PL hit destroy basel nyee.
bird PL
It steals chickens, breaks things, kills birds. (nature discourse 1: about the hawk)


## So what do we do?

- Synthetic ambiguity of verb complexes seems to be kind of accepted and glossed over in grammatical descriptions of different Oceanic languages, with structurally similar languages analyzed as highly synthetic in some cases and highly isolating in others (Butz \& von Prince 2022).
- Any examples of grammatical descriptions that treat this issue very seriously and deal with it very rigorously?


## Onward to the inverse problem: person/number marking

|  | Singular | Dual | Paucal | Plural |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 in | -g | -ntaru | -njul | -r |
| 1ex |  | -nəmru | -nəmjul | -nəm |
| 2 | -m | -mru | -mjul | -mi |
| 3 | -n | -ru | -ril | $\sim \mathrm{V}$ |

Table: Dalkalaen person-number endings

|  | Singular | Dual | Paucal | Plural |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 in | ni | entaru | enjul | er |
| 1 ex |  | gənəmru | gənəmjul | gənəm |
| 2 | neg | gəmru | gəmjul | gəmi |
| 3 | ngay | (ə)ngaru | (ə)nyeril | (ə)nyee |

Table: Dalkalaen personal pronouns

- The personal pronouns of Dalkalaen can be divided into two groups.
- Singular personal pronouns are unique monomorphemic words which don't share their morphology with any other grammatical formative of the language.
- Non-singular personal pronouns (NSPPs) are morphologically complex surface forms mostly comprised of the general person-number endings of Dalkalaen and epenthetic vowels which adjust the endings to fit the phonotactic constraints of Dalkalaen syllable structure.
- NSPPs exhibit some weird syncretism on the one hand, and a high degree of discretism(?, i.e. affix suppletion) on the other (somewhat reminiscent of e.g. case endings in conservative IE languages).

|  | Singular | Dual | Paucal | Plural |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1in |  | e-n-ta-ru | e-n-jul | e-r |
|  | ni | EP-1-???-DU | EP-1-PC | EP-1:PL |
| 1ex | 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  | g-ə-n-əm-ru | g-ə-n-əm-jul | g-ə-n-əm- $\emptyset$ |
|  |  | NI?-EP-1-EX-DU | NI?-EP-1-EX-PC | NI?-EP-1-EX-PL |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | neg | g-ə-m-ru | g-ə-m-jul | g-ə-m-i |
|  | 2 | NI?-EP-2-DU | NI?-EP-2-PC | NI?-EP-2-PL |
| 3 | ngay | nga-ru |  | nye-ril |

Table: Morphological make-up of Dalkalaen personal pronouns?

## Again: What do we do?

- Do we split up the surface forms (cf. Distributed Morphology, Halle \& Marantz 1994), try to explain the similarities and accept the irregularities?
$\Rightarrow$ presents us with a lot of theoretical problems
- Or do we instead lump together a bunch of categories into high-exponence morphemes, interpreting the surface forms of the words at face value (cf. Word-and-Paradigm Morphology, Blevins 2016)?
$\Rightarrow$ looks less chaotic in a table, but potentially glosses over structural realities
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