

## Syntactic disharmony in subordinate clauses in Tuparí

Adam Roth Singerman – University of Chicago

This talk examines syntactic disharmony in finite subordinate clauses in Tuparí, a Tupían language of Rondônia, Brazil. Other members of the Tuparían branch seem to make only limited use of finite subordination: in Mekens, for instance, such subordination takes place exclusively in the context of direct quotation, with non-finite adverbial constructions used otherwise (Galucio 2001, 2011). Like Mekens, Tuparí makes ample use of adverbial constructions that consist of nominalized VPs or *v*Ps followed by a case ending, without any tense morphology. But Tuparí also has a productive and very frequent construction in which an entire finite clause is embedded by the morpheme *hè*. In (1) the verb *pora* ‘tap’ selects an NP complement, here headed by *hè*. *hè* in turn selects the CP *herop non òpot te’a* ‘there was a rubber tree’. Observe that the tense marker *òpot* ‘PAST’ appears in both the matrix and embedded clauses here:

- (1) Here *òpot* ’on owãram herop non *òpot* te’a *hè* pora .  
then PAST 1SG go.nearby.1SG [<sub>CP</sub> rubber.tree other PAST be.there ] HÈ tap  
‘Then I went a short distance, to tap the other rubber tree that was there.’

This same finite subordination construction is employed for embedded *wh*-questions, as in (2). Here *ke* ‘FUTURE’ appears in the embedded question, immediately following the *wh*-word *katkaere*:

- (2) Puop’om nẽ ’en katkaere *ke* ìap *hè*-re ?  
not.know YES/NO 2SG [<sub>CP</sub> when FUTURE come.3SG ] HÈ-OBL  
‘Do you not know when he will come?’

The tense morphemes illustrated above – *òpot* ‘PAST’, *ke* ‘FUTURE’ – sit obligatorily in second position (2P), immediately after the first constituent in their containing clause: *here* ‘then’ in the matrix CP in (1), *herop non* ‘other rubber tree’ in the embedded CP in (1), and *katkaere* ‘when?’ in the embedded CP in (2). The existence of 2P tense enclitics (as well as 2P enclitics marking clause type and information structure, not discussed here for reasons of space) indicate that the highest layer of the Tuparí clause is right-branching, even though AspPs and VPs are always head-final. Note that such headedness splits are well-attested elsewhere in the Tupían family, including the Arikém (Storto 1999) and Mondé (Moore 1984) branches.

Now, what is surprising in examples such as (1) and (2) is the position of the subordinator *hè*. Embedded clauses with right-branching complementizer layers overwhelmingly prefer clause-initial to clause-final subordinators. But Tuparí *hè* comes at the *end* of its complement, giving rise to a disharmonic configuration of the form [<sub>hèP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C InflP ] *hè* ]. This kind of configuration – in which right-branching phrase structure is embedded underneath left-branching phrase structure – is quite rare cross-linguistically. Indeed, Tuparí may be unique in displaying embedded 2P with a final rather than initial subordinating element. (I know of no other comparable cases.)

Two different explanations have been proposed to account for the rarity of disharmonic structure of the shape [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>YP</sub> Y ZP ] X ]: the Final-over-Final Constraint, which attributes this gap to an innate principle of Universal Grammar (Biberauer et al. 2009, Biberauer et al. 2014), and the Performance-Grammar Correspondence Hypothesis, which aims to derive the gap from independently motivated processing preferences (Hawkins 1994, 2014). After putting forth the major descriptive generalizations concerning syntactic disharmony in finite subordinate clauses in Tuparí, this talk will examine the ramifications of data such as (1) and (2) for Biberauer et al.’s approach, on the one hand, and for Hawkins’s, on the other.

## References

- Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, and Ian Roberts. 2014. A syntactic universal and its consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2):169–225.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Glenda Newton, and Michelle Sheehan. 2009. Limiting synchronic and diachronic variation and change: The Final-over-Final constraint. *Language and Linguistics* 10(4):701–743.
- Galucio, Ana Vilacy. 2001. The morphosyntax of Mekens (Tupi). Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Galucio, Ana Vilacy. 2011. Subordinate adverbial constructions in Mekens. In *Subordination in Native South American Languages*, eds. Rik van Gijn, Katharina Haude, and Pieter Muysken, 25–43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hawkins, John A. 1994. *A performance theory of order and constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, John A. 2014. *Cross-linguistic variation and efficiency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moore, Denny. 1984. Syntax of the language of the Gavião Indians of Rondônia, Brazil. Doctoral Dissertation, City University of New York.
- Storto, Luciana. 1999. Aspects of a Karitiana grammar. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.