

Verb stem alternation and successive cyclic movement in Falam Chin

Introduction. Falam Chin (South-Central Tibeto-Burman; Burma/Myanmar) exhibits the phenomenon of *verb stem alternation* (VSA) (Osburne 1975; Thuan 2008; King 2010) common to Chin languages (e.g., King 2009; Bedell et al. 2009). VSA manifests as non-affixal morphological change across a subset of stems, with alternants – henceforth stems I and II – falling into several disparate classes of change (e.g., final [ŋ] → [n] as in *cing/cin* ‘plant’; addition of final stop as in *pe/pek* ‘give’; low → falling tone as in *zùm/zûm* ‘believe’, a.o.). While the precise distribution of stem I vs. II varies across the family, (2-3) exemplify their complementary distribution with *wh*-questions in Falam: **stem I** appears in **subject** *wh*-questions (2), while **stem II** appears in **non-subject** *wh*-questions (3). (1) shows the **stem I default**. Note that Falam is SOV, morphologically ergative, and *pro*-drop; the data in this abstract come from elicitation.

Claim. On the basis of contrasts such as in (2)-(3),

King (2009) claims in descriptive work that VSA serves a disambiguating function, treating stems I and II as ‘agentive’ vs. ‘nonagentive’, respectively (s.a. Osburne’s (1975) notion of ‘thematic focus’). I build on this work but argue instead that **choice of stem** in (2-3) cannot be thematic, but is **conditioned by whether successive cyclic movement** (Chomsky 1973, 1977, 1986) **has taken place through spec, vP**.

Evidence that stem change is best analyzed as a reflex of successive cyclic movement comes from: i) the fact that the same complementary distribution of stem forms is found in other instances of subject vs. non-subject A'-movement; ii) the behavior of stem change in long-distance *wh*-questions; and iii) the fact that stem change does **not** occur when A'-movement does not take place, in *wh*-in-situ contexts.

Stem change as a reflex of successive cyclic movement. Just as some languages show morphological evidence of successive cyclic movement through the edge of CP (e.g., Irish, McCloskey 1979; Dinka, van Urk 2015), others show similar evidence of movement **through the edge of vP** (e.g., Indonesian, Saddy 1991; Asante Twi, Korsah & Murphy 2020); see overviews in Georgi 2017; van Urk 2020. Such movement is taken to be triggered by an edge/EPP feature on v^0 that allows its specifier to serve as an

(4)
$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Intermediate movement to Spec, vP} \\ \text{[CP Obj [C' C ... [vP Obj [v' v}_{[EPP]} [VP ... Obj ...]]]] } \\ \text{Subsequent movement to Spec, CP} \end{array}$$
 an escape hatch for subsequent movement (4). Evidence that stem change in Falam is a reflex of such successive cyclic movement through

spec, vP comes first from predicted **asymmetries** in A'-movement: **only movement of non-subjects triggers stem II** in matrix *wh*-questions ((2) vs. (3)) and beyond. The same complementary distribution of stem forms is also found in **relative clauses** and **topicalization**.

(5) shows that subject relatives require stem I, while non-subject relatives require stem II (6). (7) moreover shows a passive involving topicalization of an underlying object, in which stem II is likewise required. (Topicalization of subjects, not shown here, triggers stem I). Note that both **adjunct wh-questions and relatives likewise require stem II**, but are not shown here due to space limitations.

Basic transitive clause: stem I

lothlopa=in vainim a **-cing/*cin**
farmer=ERG corn 3-plant.I/*plant.II
'The farmer planted corn.'

Subject wh-question: stem I

zo=in saw vainim a **-cing/*cin**?
who=ERG FOC corn 3-plant.I/*plant.II
'Who planted corn?'

Non-subject wh-question: stem II

ziang saw lothlopa=in a **-cin/*cing**?
what FOC farmer=ERG 3-plant.II/*plant.I
'What_i did the farmer plant ___i?'

Subject relative: stem I

[uico a-lo **-pe/*pek**-tu] lothlopa ka-bawm
[dog 3-2.OBJ-give.I/*give.II-REL] farmer 1-help
'I helped the farmer_i that ___i gave you the dog.'

Non-subject relative: stem II

[lothlopa=ih a-lo **-pek/*pe**-mi] uico ka-bawm
[farmer=GEN 3-2.OBJ-give.II/give.I-REL] dog 1-help
'I helped the dog_i that the farmer gave you ___i.'

Object topicalization: stem II

Bor cu **hmuh/*hmu**-zo a-si
Bor TOP see.II/*see.I-PERF 3-be
'Bor_i was seen ___i.'

Evidence from long-distance *wh*. If *wh*-movement is successful cyclic, and stem change is triggered by an edge feature on v^0 , then a prediction of the present analysis is that stem change should occur in the **matrix verb** of both **long-distance non-subject** and **subject questions** (s.a. [Korsah & Murphy 2020](#)), as successive cyclic movement should proceed stepwise through the specifier of the matrix vP in both cases. Crucially, this is borne out: In **non-subject** (8), both embedded and matrix verbs appear in stem II. In **subject** (9), embedded ‘cook’ remains stem I (as expected), but matrix ‘believe’ surfaces as stem II:

- (8) Long-distance **non-subject** *wh*-question (9) Long-distance **subject** *wh*-question
 Ziang saw Bor=in a [-suan] na [-zûm]? Zo=in saw buh a [-suang] ti na [-zûm]?
 what FOC Bor=ERG 3-cook.II 2-believe.II who=ERG FOC rice 3-cook.I C 2-believe.II
 ‘What_i do you think that Bor cooked ___i?’ ‘Who_i do you think ___i cooked rice?’

Evidence from *wh*-in-situ. Further evidence that stem II is the reflex of successive cyclic movement comes from the fact that **stem II is disallowed when A'-movement does not take place**. Falam allows *wh*-in-situ in addition to *wh*-movement (differing with respect to fronting and the presence of the focus marker *saw*; [King 2009](#)). Crucially, stem change is **not triggered** in the context of *wh*-in-situ: the contrast in (10) shows that stem I is permissible in non-subject questions only if the *wh*-phrase remains in its base position (10a). Notably, Falam likewise allows for **long-distance *wh*-in-situ** (with evidence against covert movement coming from island insensitivity alongside focus intervention effects; [Beck 2006](#)). We thus further predict that, in these contexts, stem change should not be triggered on *either* the embedded or matrix verb, as there is **no movement at all** through vP. This is also borne out as in (11-12): no stem change is found on either verb in non-subject (11) (cp. (8)) or subject (12) (cp. (9)) questions alike.

Taken together, these data all support an analysis in which stem II is triggered by successive cyclic movement through spec, vP, as stem change is triggered just in case A'-movement through this position has taken place.

Stem alternation as contextually-conditioned allomorphy. Drawing a parallel with the treatment of morphosyntactically-conditioned stem change within Distributed Morphology (e.g., Germanic umlaut conditioned by features such as past tense; see esp. [Embick & Halle 2005](#); [Embick 2012, 2016](#)), I analyze stem change in Falam as the result of contextual conditioning ([Harley & Noyer 1998](#); [Bobaljik 2000](#)) by an EPP feature on a local v^0 (cp. [McCloskey's \(2002\)](#) analysis of C in Irish; cf. [Korsah & Murphy 2020](#)). Given the patterns laid out above, recall that there are two derivations for Falam *wh*-questions: one involving *wh*-movement (13), the other *wh*-in-situ (14) (illustrated as SVO for exposition):

- (13) *wh*-movement through vP (14) *wh*-in-situ
 [vP what [v' v⁰<sub>[EPP]] [vP plant what]]] [vP ... [v' v⁰] [vP plant what]]]
 ↑</sub>

In case *wh*-movement occurs, v^0 bears an EPP/edge feature triggering movement through its specifier. We can then understand stem change on a given verb (with the specific change listed by class; see [Thuan 2008](#); [King 2009](#)) as conditioned by locality to such a v^0 , consistent with [Bobaljik's \(2012\)](#) adjacency condition for root allomorphy, which requires that the trigger for allomorphy be adjacent to the root.

Outlook. This work offers the first formal analysis of VSA in Falam, demonstrating that stem change is not thematically conditioned, but a reflex of successive cyclic movement through Spec, vP. These data add further support for such movement, with a novel morphological signature in the form of stem allomorphy. In the talk, I also show how the analysis accounts for stem change in temporal adjuncts.

References

- Beck, Sigrid. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14.1:1–56.
- Bedell, George, Kee Shein Mang, Roland Siang Nawl, & Khawlsongkim Suantak. 2009. The morphosyntax of verb stem alternation. *Himalayan Linguistics* 22(1):141–157.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2000. The ins and outs of contextual allomorphy. In *University of Maryland working papers in linguistics*, volume 10, 35–71. University of Maryland.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Condition on transformations. In *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen Anderson & Paul Kiparsky, 232–286. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *wh*-movement. In *Formal syntax*, ed. Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow, & Adrian Akmajian, 71–132. New York Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. The MIT Press.
- Embick, David. 2012. Contextual conditions on stem alternations: Illustrations from the Spanish conjugation. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2010. Selected papers from ‘Going Romance’ Leiden*, ed. S.L. Franco & A. Saab, 21–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Embick, David. 2016. On the distribution of stem alternants: Separation and its limits. In *The morphome debate: Diagnosing and analyzing morphomic patterns*, ed. R. Bermúdez-Otero & A. Luís, 276–305. Oxford: OUP.
- Embick, David, & Morris Halle. 2005. On the Status of Stems in Morphological Theory. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2003. Selected papers from ‘Going Romance’ Nijmegen*, ed. T. Geerts, I. van Ginneken, & H. Jacobs, 37–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Georgi, Doreen. 2017. Patterns of movement reflexes as the result of the order of Merge and Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48(4):585–626.
- Harley, Heidi, & Rolf Noyer. 1998. Mixed nominalizations, short verb movement and object shift in English. In *the Proceedings of NELS 28*, ed. P. Tamanji & K. Kusumoto, 1–15. Amherst: GLSA.
- King, Deborah. 2009. Syntactic and pragmatic functions of Kuki-Chin verb stem alternation. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1:141–157.
- King, Deborah. 2010. Voice And Valence-altering Operations In Falam Chin: A Role And Reference Grammar Approach. Doctoral dissertation, UT Arlington.
- Korsah, Sampson, & Andrew Murphy. 2020. Tonal reflexes of movement in Asante Twi. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38:827–885.
- McCloskey, James. 1979. *Transformational syntax and model theoretic semantics: A case study in Modern Irish*. Riedel: Dordrecht.
- McCloskey, James. 2002. Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*, ed. S. Epstein & T.D. Seely, 184–226. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Osburne, Andrea. 1975. A transformational analysis of tone in the verb system of Zahao (Laizo) Chin. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.
- Saddy, Douglas. 1991. *Wh*-scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. In *More papers on wh-movement*, ed. L. Cheng & H. Demirdache, 183–218. Cambridge: MITWPIL.
- Thuan, Khar. 2008. A phonological description of Falam. Master’s thesis, Chiangmai: Payap University.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2015. A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: A case study of dinka bor. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2020. Successive Cyclicity and the Syntax of Long-Distance Dependencies. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 6:111–130.