

## Two Approaches to Applying the New Effect Category to Personal Reference Adjuncts

I like aftermeasure's idea of showing the new Effect category on Personal Reference Adjuncts (PRA) themselves. That way, a speaker can show the Effect of one party on the verbal formative while showing a different effect on a different party via the PRA. So I've been playing around with the possibilities and I've come up with two different approaches.

Before detailing the two approaches, however, I first need to unveil the new design for modular personal reference adjunct I've come up with. This adjunct can accommodate either single or dual personal referents and replaces the previously presented separate forms of those adjuncts.

### Single-referent or Dual-referent personal reference adjunct

'	V <sub>C</sub>	C <sub>1</sub>	( C <sub>2</sub>	( V <sub>C</sub> )	Stress (if word is multi-syllabic)
	Case of Personal Referent 1	Personal Referent 1	Personal Referent 2 (if present)	Case of Personal Referent 2 (if present)	Ultimate stress = CPT version on preceding formative (or following formative if adjunct is clause-initial.

The tell-tale sign of this adjunct is that it looks like the beginning of a simple formative that suddenly ends before any 2nd consonant-form can fill the Mood or C<sub>A</sub> slots.

So, utilizing the above format for personal reference adjuncts, here are the two approaches I've come up with to showing Effect on PRAs.

**First Approach:** Have a different consonant-form for each personal referent depending on its Effect. The advantage of this approach is that it makes for nice simple combination forms when you combine two (or even three) personal referents into one adjunct. This approach, however, has two disadvantages that I can see:

- 1) There are only enough consonants available to provide BENEFICIAL/DETRIMENTAL forms for animate referents only (although I'm not certain how often one would need to use non-NEUTRAL effect for inanimate referents).
- 2) When combining these forms with each other (e.g., **n+t+r** → **ntr / rtn / rnt**), I wanted to ensure the greatest number of phonotactically permissible combinations while also making such combinations easy-to-pronounce. However, accomplishing this means having a less-than-systematic distribution of the single consonant forms (making them harder to memorize).

		NEUTRAL	BENEFICIAL	DETRIMENTAL	
1m	monadic speaker	<b>r</b>	<b>n*</b>	<b>l</b>	"I"
2m	monadic addressee	<b>s</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>z</b>	"you (sg.)"
2p	polyadic addressee	<b>š</b>	<b>ť</b>	<b>ž</b>	"you (pl.)"
ma	monadic animate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>m</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>b</b>	"he" / "she" / "they (sg.)"
pa	polyadic animate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>ň</b>	<b>k</b>	<b>g</b>	"they (pl.)"
mi	monadic inanimate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>f</b>	—	—	"it"
pi	polyadic inanimate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>v</b>	—	—	"they (inanimate)"
Obv	Obviative/Resumptive	<b>ç</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>č</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> -party other than most recently referenced
IPa	impersonal animate	<b>d</b>	<b>ž</b>	<b>j</b>	"one" "you" "people" "a person" (French "on")
IPi	impersonal inanimate	<b>ǫ</b>	—	—	"something" "a thing" "things"
Col	Collective	<b>x</b>	—	—	NOMIC 3 <sup>rd</sup> -party
Abt	Abstract	<b>ss</b>	—	—	ABSTRACT 3 <sup>rd</sup> -party

\* **-n-** assimilates to **-m-** before **-p-** and **-b-** (as the forms ma/NEU+ma/BEN or ma/NEU+ma/DET are unlikely and can be shown via separate adjuncts if necessary).

## Examples:

1m/NEU/ERG + 2m/BEN/ABS → *orte*    2m/NEU/AFF + ma/DET/THM → *isba*    [1m/DET+2p/BEN+ma/NEU]/ABS → *el̥me*  
 2m/BEN/ERG + pa/DET/ABS → *otge*    2p/DET/AFF + mi/THM → *ižfa*

**Second Approach:** In this approach, each personal referent has a single consonant-form for NEUTRAL effect. BENEFICIAL effect is then shown by prefixing (or suffixing) an **-s-**, while DETRIMENTAL is shown by prefixing or suffixing an **-l-**. This approach is more systematic and probably easier to memorize, and allows for Effect to be shown on inanimate referents. However, there are several disadvantages to this approach:

- 1) Combinations of BENEFICIAL and DETRIMENTAL forms quickly become phonetically bulky and awkward. Some combinations that are readily available in the first approach, become phonotactically impermissible in this second approach (requiring the need for two separate adjuncts), e.g., 2m/DET/AFF + Obv/DET/THM → *ižča* vs. *\*iltvla*
- 2) If the speaker utilizes certain prefixed forms instead of suffixed forms, it can lead to ambiguities (e.g., is **-rst-** composed of **r+st** or **rs+t**? The speaker would need to know to utilize the form **-rc-**).
- 3) To address these awkward or ambiguous forms, I've had to introduce allomorphic options below (shown in **red**), but the speaker would still need to be aware of the need to use them.

		NEUTRAL	BENEFICIAL	DETRIMENTAL	
1m	monadic speaker	<b>r</b>	<b>sr / rs</b>	<b>lr / rl / n</b>	“I”
2m	monadic addressee	<b>t</b>	<b>st / c</b>	<b>lt / tl</b>	“you (sg.)”
2p	polyadic addressee	<b>š</b>	<b>ç</b>	<b>lš / šl</b>	“you (pl.)”
ma	monadic animate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>k</b>	<b>sk / ks</b>	<b>lk / kl</b>	“he” / “she” / “they (sg.)”
pa	polyadic animate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>p</b>	<b>sp / ps</b>	<b>lp / pl</b>	“they (pl.)”
mi	monadic inanimate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>f</b>	<b>sf / fs</b>	<b>lf / fl</b>	“it”
pi	polyadic inanimate 3 <sup>rd</sup> party	<b>ṭ</b>	<b>sṭ / ṭs / ž</b>	<b>lṭ / ṭl</b>	“they (inanimate)”
Obv	Obviative/Resumptive	<b>v</b>	<b>zv / vz</b>	<b>lv / vl</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> -party other than most recently referenced
IPa	impersonal animate	<b>ḍ</b>	<b>zḍ / ḍz / j</b>	<b>lḍ / ḍl</b>	“one” “you” “people” “a person” (French “on”)
IPi	impersonal inanimate	<b>d</b>	<b>zd / ž</b>	<b>ld / dl</b>	“something” “a thing” “things”
Col	Collective	<b>b</b>	<b>zb / bz</b>	<b>lb / bl</b>	NOMIC 3 <sup>rd</sup> -party
Abt	Abstract	<b>g</b>	<b>zg / gz</b>	<b>lg / gl</b>	ABSTRACT 3 <sup>rd</sup> -party

## Examples:

1m/NEU/ERG + 2m/BEN/ABS → *orce*    2m/NEU/AFF + ma/DET/THM → *itkla*    [1m/DET+2p/BEN+ma/NEU]/ABS → *enčk*  
 2m/BEN/ERG + pa/DET/ABS → *ostple*    2p/DET/AFF + mi/DET/THM → *ilšfla*

So . . . which approach shall we go with?