

Willie Myers. NELS 55, 2024.

Summary. This talk examines the syntax and semantics of event repetition in Kanien'kéha (Mohawk; Iroquoian). Drawing on data of the 'repetitive' prefix *s-* and *á:re* 'again', I make three main claims: (i) the repetitive prefix signals the presence of a repetitive operator (realized overtly as *á:re*) with a semantics similar to English *again*; (ii) this operator is syntax-sensitive, meaning that the adjunction site of the repetitive operator determines the scope of the resulting presupposition; and (iii) the array of repetitive presuppositions available—specifically the presence of *objectless* presuppositions—provides evidence for the severing of the internal argument, at least in Kanien'kéha. Taken together, these claims account for the full array of repetitive presuppositions in the language and shine a light on potential cross-linguistic variation in argument structure.

Repetitive concord as an operator-particle relation. The repetitive prefix *s-* is often equated to English *again* (Bonvillain 1973). Like *again*, it appears to modify an event and introduce a presupposition that a similar event occurred previously (1a). Evidence for this presuppositional status comes from projection facts; when the repetitive occurs within the scope of negation, as in (1b), the presupposed content projects.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---|----|--|
| (1) | a. | Context: you bought a car last year.
S-ke-'serehta-hní:non-s.
REP-1sgA-car-buy-HAB
'I'm buying a car again.' | b. | Context: you've never bought a car.
#Iah te-s-ke-'serehta-hní:non-s.
no NEG-REP-1sgA-car-buy-HAB
Intended: 'I am not buying a car again.' |
|-----|----|---|----|--|

In addition to occurring on its own, the repetitive prefix often appears with the standalone repetitive morpheme *á:re*, also translated as 'again'. Notably, when *á:re* appears, a repetitive prefix is necessarily required on the verb (2). Crucially, the co-occurrence of these two morphemes does not drive a double repetition reading. Relationships like this between non-verbal and verbal morphology are not uncommon in Mohawk (see the negation in (1b)).

- (2) **Are'** *(s)-wa'-k-atáwen-'.
again REP-FACT-1sgA-swim-PUNC
'I swam again.'

I account for this 'repetitive concord' by taking up an operator-particle analysis (Lee 2005; Quek and Hirsch 2017). Under this approach, the repetitive prefix signals the presence of a repetitive operator with a semantics similar to English *again*. *á:re*' is the overt realization of this operator while the repetitive prefix is a semantically vacuous concord marker. I assign the operator the same semantics as repetitive *again*: a modifier of properties of events ($\langle\langle v,t \rangle, \langle v,t \rangle\rangle$) which triggers a precondition on its application corresponding to a presupposition (see, e.g., von Stechow 1996; Jäger and Blutner 2003; Beck and Johnson 2004).

- (3) $\llbracket \text{REP-Op} \rrbracket P(e)$ is defined iff $\exists e^1 \exists e^2 [e^1 \prec e^2 \prec e \ \& \ P(e^1) \ \& \ \neg P(e^2)]$.
When defined, $\llbracket \text{REP-Op} \rrbracket P(e) = P(e)$.

The repetitive operator is syntax-sensitive. The presupposition introduced by *á:re*' is sensitive to its adjunction site. Specifically, material within the scope of the operator must be included in the presupposition. This structural sensitivity can be seen in comparing two sentences in which the position of *á:re*' differs. In (4a), *á:re*' appears before an adverbial and consequently scopes over it. In (4b), it appears after the same adverbial, resulting in a presupposition which does not include the adverbial.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|--|----|---|
| (4) | a. | Sok áre' [iotohétston néntie s-wa'-i-atáwen-'].
then again in.the.afternoon REP-FACT-FL.A-swim-PUNC
'Then, [she swam in the afternoon] again.' (cannot be first time swimming in afternoon) | b. | Sok iotohétston néntie áre' [s-wa'-i-atáwen-'].
then in.the.afternoon again REP-FACT-FL.A-swim-PUNC
'Then, [she swam] again in the afternoon.' (can be first time swimming in afternoon) |
|-----|----|--|----|---|

Assuming that word order correlates with syntactic position, the fact that the position of *á:re*' affects the contents of the presupposition indicates that the operator is sensitive to syntactic structure.

The realization of the operator is also syntax-sensitive. There are cases where the repetitive morpheme seems to appear without *á:re'*, as shown in (1). In these cases, I argue that there is a covert repetitive operator with the same semantics as *á:re'*. To motivate this claim, I show that the realization of an overt repetitive operator correlates with the scope of its presupposition. When the presupposition scopes above the verb phrase, the operator is overt; when it scopes within the verb phrase, the operator is covert. Evidence for this distinction comes from comparing repetitive sentences with and without *á:re'*. When *á:re'* does not appear overtly, a subjectless presupposition is available, as in (5a). When *á:re'* is overt, this presupposition is illicit; the subject must be included in the presupposition (5b).

(5) Context: Mary kicked the ball. Then. . .

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| a. | Kó:r s-wa'-ra-rashéntho-'.
Paul REP-FACT-MsgA-kick-PUNC
'Paul [kicked it] again.' | b. | #Are' Kó:r s-wa'-ra-rashéntho-'.
again Paul REP-FACT-MsgA-kick-PUNC
Cannot mean: 'Paul [kicked it] again.'
Can only mean: '[Paul kicked it] again.' |
|----|---|----|--|

A possible reason for this pattern is the polysynthetic structure of Kanien'kéha. Because tense, aspect, mood, and subject/object agreement are inflected on the verb, there is no way for a standalone morpheme such as the repetitive operator to appear overtly between these morphemes.

Diagnosing VP-internal syntactic complexity. Having established that the Kanien'kéha repetitive operator modifies events and is syntax-sensitive, I propose that it can be used to diagnose syntactic complexity, in particular, within the VP. This follows a long line of work using *again* as such a diagnostic in English (see, e.g., Bale 2007; Smith and Yu 2021). In Kanien'kéha, the repetitive can give rise to both subjectless and objectless propositions, as seen in (5a) and (6) respectively, suggesting that the verb can be severed from both its external and internal arguments. This first finding is not surprising as this occurs with many other languages. The second, however, is surprising, as it casts doubt on much work that takes the internal argument as a complement of the verb (à la Kratzer 1996).

(6) Context: my friend Jen and I went on a shopping spree.

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| a. | Wa'-k-anishonhshawi-'tshera-hní:non-'.
FACT-1sgA-ring-NMLZ-buy-PUNC
'I bought a <u>ring</u> .' | b. | S-wa'-ie-hna'ta-hshera-hní:non-'.
REP-FACT-Fl.A-purse-NMLZ-buy-PUNC
' <u>She</u> bought a <u>purse</u> .'
Lit.: 'A buying event happened again, by her, of a purse.' |
|----|--|----|---|

Though not shown here, I also demonstrate that restitutive readings are available with the repetitive, indicating that the verb is further severed from its causative light verb. Taken together, these examples further support the syntax-sensitivity of the repetitive operator.

Implications. I argue that the Kanien'kéha verb root is a bare predicate of events and that all arguments are related to the verb externally (likely via thematic roles introduced by functional projections). This analysis accurately predicts the empirical data without need for stipulations. Additionally, it reinforces past accounts of polysynthetic languages which argue that all arguments are introduced high (Baker 1996, a.o.). One major question this raises is why English (and most language) lack objectless presuppositions, if the Kanien'kéha facts argue for severing the internal argument. This seems to indicate cross-linguistic variation in argument structure. I address this large implication further in the talk.

References. Baker, M. 1996. The Polysynthesis Parameter. • Bale, A. 2007. Quantifiers and verb phrases: An exploration of propositional complexity. *NLLT*. • Beck, S. & K. Johnson. 2004. Double objects again. *LI*. • Bonvillain, N. 1973. A Grammar of Akwesasne Mohawk. • Jäger, G. & R. Blutner. 2003. Competition and interpretation: The German adverb *wieder* ('again'). • Kratzer, A. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. • Lee, Y. 2005. Exhaustivity as Agreement: The Case of Korean *Man* 'only'. *NLS*. • Quek, Y. & A. Hirsch. 2017. Severing focus form and meaning in Standard and Colloquial Singapore English. • Smith, R. & J. Yu. 2021. Agentless presuppositions and the semantics of verbal roots. *NLLT*. von Stechow, A. 1996. The different readings of *wieder* "again": A structural account.