A restriction on vocalic clitic coalescence in San Juan Piñas Mixtec*

Michelle Yuan (yuanm@ucla.edu) // AIS, March 5, 2024

1 Introduction

- In San Juan Piñas Mixtec, a V(erb)-S(ubject)-O(bject) language, pronouns may be expressed as **pronominal clitics**, which also appear in V=S=O order.

(1) a. ni^{1}-ta^{3}ʔvi^{5} [**ɲa^{5}** **Ga^{5}bi^{61}**] [**ɲa^{1}** **ʒoo^{3}**]
COMPL-break CL.3SG.F Gaby CL.3.N water.jug
'Gaby broke the water jug.' (V S O)

b. ni^{1}-ta^{3}ʔvi^{5}**=ɲa^{5}=ɲa^{3}**
COMPL-break=CL.3SG.F=CL.3.N
'She broke it.' (V=S_{Cl}=O_{Cl})

- In this talk, I present a curious restriction on **vocalic (=V) clitics**—specifically, their ability to attach to everything except **full noun phrases (henceforth, DPs)**.
  - The restriction is preliminarily illustrated in (2).

(2) *ʃi^{13}ni^{31} [ti^{5} vi^{3}lʲ]**=a^{5}**
COMPL.see CL.3.AN cat =CL.3SG.F
Intended: 'The cat saw her.'

No analysis yet… I welcome any suggestions, directions, etc.!

2 Language background

- Mixtec belongs to the Eastern branch of the Otomanguean language family, and is spoken primarily in Oaxaca, MX, and neighbouring states.
  - Estimates of individual varieties range from around 20 (Bradley and Hollenbach, 1988) to 81 (INALI, 2008).[1]
  - According to Josserand (1983), these varieties can be classified into twelve distinct dialect areas; San Juan Piñas Mixtec is located within the Southern Baja dialect area.
- SJPM (Tò'ōn Ndá'ví) is very much underdocumented, and is spoken in the town of San Juan Piñas (pop. ~900), Santiago Juxtlahuaca, Oaxaca, as well as in diaspora communities in California and beyond.

*Thank you to Claudia Juárez Chávez, Basilisa Pérez Morales, and Cirila Pérez Morales for their judgments and discussion of the examples discussed here, as well as to Gaby Caballero, Claudia Duarte Borquez, Ben Eischens, Iara Mantenuto, Sharon Rose, Natalie Weber, and audiences at UCSD and WSCLA 26 for helpful feedback.

[1]However, given the internal diversification of Mixtec, it has been suggested that Mixtec itself is a family and Otomanguean is a 'hyper-family' or 'stock' (Suárez, 1983).

- The data in this talk represent one part of an ongoing collaborative research project on SJPM (2020–present), documenting and analyzing the grammatical properties of the language.[2]
  - In collaboration with Gabriela Caballero (UCSD) and Claudia Duarte Bórquez (UCSD), as well as language experts Claudia Juárez Chávez, Basi Pérez Morales, and Cirila Pérez Morales.

- **A note on transcription:**
  - This talk uses the IPA, plus the Chao numerical system for tones.
  - Three level tones (H = V^5, M = V^3, L = V^1), plus a floating L-tone; the tones may combine to form various rising and falling contours (e.g., LH = V^{15}, ML = V^{31}).
  - Upstepped (e.g. V^6) and downstepped (e.g. V^4, V^2) tones are also attested in restricted environments.[3]

- As mentioned, the base word order of SJPM is **VSO**, regardless of whether the nominals are full (lexical) noun phrases (DPs) or pronominal clitics.
  - No morphological case distinctions in the language.

(3) a. ni^1-ta^{3}ʔvi^5 [ɲa^5 Ga^{5}bi^{61}] [ɲa^1 ʒoo^3]
COMPL-break CL.3SG.F Gaby CL.3.N water.jug
'Gaby broke the water jug.' (V S O)

b. ni^1-ta^{3}ʔvi^5=ɲa^5=ɲa^3
COMPL-break=CL.3SG.F=CL.3.N
'She broke it.' (V=S_{Cl}=O_{Cl})

c. ta^{13}ʔvi^5=ɲa^5 [ɲa^1 ʒoo^3]
COMPL.break=CL.3SG.F CL.3.N water.jug
'She broke the water jug.' (V=S_{Cl} O)

d. ta^{13}ʔvi^5 [ɲa^5 Ga^{5}bi^6]=ɲa^1
COMPL.break CL.3SG.F Gaby =CL.3.N
'Gaby broke it.' (V S=O_{Cl})

  - Note: That the object clitic is attaching to the full DP subject in examples like (3d) can be concluded on the basis of tonal processes, e.g., L-tone spreading from a L-final host:[4]

(4) a. ko^{3}ni^{31} [ti^5 vi^{3}lu^5]=**ɲa^3**
IRR.see CL.3.AN cat =CL.3.N
'The cat will see it.' < SJP0480:06:41.3 >

b. ko^{3}ni^{31} [ti^5 k^{w}a^{5}ʒu^1]=**ɲa^1**
IRR.see CL.3.AN horse =CL.3.N
'The horse will see it.' < SJP0480:07:44.5 >

- Full noun phrases bear a classifier that is segmentally identical to their pronominal clitic counterparts (and often, though not always, tonally identical as well).[5]

[2] This project began through field methods classes taught at UCSD (taught by C.J.C. & J. McIntosh in 2018; C.J.C., G. Caballero & M. Yuan in 2020; C.J.C & G. Caballero in 2022; J. McIntosh in 2023).

[4] Many loanwords in SJPM, like *Ga^{5}bi$^{6(1)}$* 'Gaby' in (3d), also bear a floating L tone. See Caballero et al. (to appear) for discussion.

[5] There are surface tonal differences for some classifier vs. clitic pairs, but they seem to be fully phonologically predictable.

- To distinguish between the two in this handout, classifiers will be represented as standalone words (with spaces) while pronominal clitics will be treated as enclitics.[6]

(5) *Partial classifier vs. clitic forms:*

	Cl NP	**V=Cl**
3.N	ɲa^{1} NP	V=ɲa$^{1/3}$
3.AN	ti^{5} NP	V=ti^{5}
3.LIQ	ra^{5} NP	V=ra^{5}
	...	

- The full pronominal clitic paradigm is given in (6). The vocalic (=V) clitics are in blue:

(6) *1st/2nd person:*

1SG	**2SG**	**1PL.IN**	**1PL.EX**	**2PL**
=e^{1}	=õ^{5}	=e^{5}	=ndi$^{1/3}$	=ndo^{5}

(7) *3rd person:*

3SG.M	**3SG.F**	**3.N**	**3PL.M**	**3PL.F**	**3PL.N(HUM)**	**3.AN/RND**	**3.ARB**	**3.LIQ**
=ra$^{1/3}$	=ɲa^{5}	=ɲa$^{1/3}$	=^{n}dʒa$^{1/3}$	=na^{5}	=na$^{1/3}$	=ti^{5}	=tõ^{5}	=ra^{5}
	=ã^{5}	=ã$^{1/3}$						

Important:

- There are two forms for 3SG.F and 3.N: =CV and =V.
- Even though there are =V clitics in the 1st/2nd person, all such clitics are categorically ruled out in object position (because of the Person-Case Constraint [Yuan 2024, to appear]).
- So in what follows I focus on 3SG.F and 3.N (and will occasionally compare the patterns with 1st/2nd person =V clitics, only if needed).

3 Properties of vocalic (=V) clitics

- The clitics are relatively unpicky about their hosts, able to 'lean' on **whatever element immediately precedes them**. Illustrated here with =CV clitics:

(8) a. [$_{VP}$ no^{3}mi^{3} **tã^{5}ʔã^{3}**]=**na^{5}**
IRR.hug each.other =CL.3PL.F
'They will hug each other.' (V O=S$_{Cl}$)

b. [$_{DP}$ [$_{NP}$ tʃu^{3}tʃa^{31} **i^{3}kĩ^{3}**]=**ra^{1}**]
atole coarse =CL.3SG.M
'his coarse atole' (N Adj=Poss$_{Cl}$)

c. ko^{3}ni^{31} [$_{DP}$ ti^{5} **kwa^{5}ʒu^{1}**]=**ɲa^{1}**
IRR.see CL.3SG.AN horse =CL.3SG.N
'The horse will see it (e.g. the baby).' (V S=O$_{Cl}$)

- These =CV clitics presumably adjoin outside of the minimal prosodic word, yielding a recursive prosodic word, e.g., [[(tã^{5}ʔã^{3})$_{FT}$]$_{ω}$=na^{5}]$_{ω2}$.

[6] Actually, as there is a bimoraic minimal word requirement in Mixtec (e.g. Pike, 1944; Carroll, 2015; Penner, 2019; Uchihara and Mendoza Ruiz, 2022), the classifiers are probably prosodically dependent on an adjacent element as well—I am just not sure if they are proclitics, enclitics, or both, depending on the context.

- Subject to certain processes that apply across the stem-clitic boundary (e.g., L-tone spreading); excluded from other processes that apply within the minimal prosodic layer (e.g., nasalization).

- The vocalic clitics are even more prosodically integrated, **coalescing segmentally and tonally** with their hosts.[7]

  - Since =V clitics surface <u>within</u> the bimoraic foot, they presumably adjoin internal to the minimal prosodic word.

(9) a. $[[(ka^1ku^3)_{FT}]_{\omega}$**=ŋa^5**$]_{\omega 2}$
IRR.survive=CL.3SG.F
'She will survive.' < SJP0436:16:04.9 >

b. $[(ka^1k^j$**=ã^5**$)_{FT}]_{\omega}]$
IRR.survive=CL.3SG.F
'She will survive.' < SJP0436:16:16.7 >

- In most contexts, there is no restriction on =V cliticization (i.e., coalescence).

  - <u>Note:</u> This is broadly true for <u>all</u> =V clitics, regardless of person (modulo independent restrictions that make certain combinations untestable).

(10)

	P^0	N^0(POSS)	V^0	Adv^0	Non-pron. clitic	Pron. clitic	VP-int. object
=V?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ex.	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)

1. As the object of a preposition, e.g., *ʃĩ^{5}ʔĩ^3* 'with':

(11) a. ʃĩ^{5}ʔĩ^3**=ŋa^5** / ʃĩ^{5}ʔ**=ã^5**
with=CL.3SG.F / with=CL.3SG.F
'with her'

b. ʃĩ^{5}ʔ**=ĩ^{31}** / ʃĩ^{5}ʔ**=õ^5**
with=CL.1SG with=CL.2SG
'with me' / 'with you (sg.)'

2. As the possessor of a noun, e.g., *vi^{3}lu^5* 'cat':

(12) a. vi^{3}lu^5**=ŋa^5** / vi^{3}l^j**=a^5**
cat=CL.3SG.F cat=CL.3SG.F
'her cat'

b. vi^{3}l^w**=i^{51}** / vi^{3}l**=õ^5**
cat=CL.1SG cat=CL.2SG
'my cat' / 'your (sg.) cat'

3. As the subject of a verb phrase, whether attached to the verb (e.g., *ka^{1}ku^3* 'survive'), or a postverbal adverb (e.g., *nã^{3}ʔã$^{3(1)}$* 'early'):

(13) a. ka^{1}ku^3**=ŋa^5** / ka^{1}k^j**=ã^5**
IRR.survive=CL.3SG.F IRR.survive=CL.3SG.F
'She will survive.'

b. ka^{1}k^w**=i^{31}** / ka^{1}k**=õ^5**
IRR.survive=CL.1SG IRR.survive=CL.2SG
'I will survive.' / 'You (sg.) will survive.'

(14) a. $[_{VP}$ ^{n}da^{3}ko^{1}o^3 nã^{3}ʔa^{31}]**=ŋa^5** / . . . nã^{5}ʔ]**=ã^{15}**
IRR.wake.up early =CL.3SG.F early =CL.3SG.F
'She will wake up early.'

b. $[_{VP}$ ^{n}da^{3}ko^{1}o^3 nã^{3}ʔ]**=ẽ^{31}** / . . . nã^{5}ʔ]**=õ^{15}**
IRR.wake.up early =CL.1SG early =CL.2SG
'I will wake up early.' / 'You (sg.) will wake up early.'

4. It is possible for =V clitics to coalesce with other <u>non-pronominal</u> clitics (e.g., positive/emphatic *=va^3*:

[7] See e.g., DiCanio et al. (2020) on discussion of the resulting patterns in other varieties.

(15) a. i^{5}ʒo^{6} va^{1}ʔa^{3}=va^{3}=**ɲa^{5}** / . . . va^{1}ʔa^{3}=v=**a^{5}**
CONT.exist good=EMPH=CL.3SG.F good=EMPH=CL.3SG.F
'She's fine.'

b. i^{5}ʒo^{6} va^{1}ʔa^{3}=v=**e^{31}**
CONT.exist good=EMPH=CL.1SG
'I'm fine.'

5. It seems to be possible for =V clitics to also coalesce to other pronominal clitics, though I haven't tested a wide variety of combinations yet.
   - Note: Due to the PCC (banning all 1st/2nd person object clitics), I show this only with 3rd person object =V clitics:

(16) a. ka^{3}tõ^{5}=ndo^{5}=ɲa^{3} / ka^{3}tõ^{5}=nd^{w}=**a^{5}**
IRR.tie=CL.2PL=CL.3.N IRR.tie=CL.2PL=CL.3.N
'Tie it!' (pl. addressee)

b. no^{3}mi^{3}=ndi^{1}=ɲa^{1} / no^{3}mi^{3}=nd^{j}=**a^{1}**
IRR.hug=CL.1PL.EX=CL.3.N IRR.hug=CL.1PL.EX=CL.3.N
'We will hug it (e.g., the baby).'

6. Finally, in V-O-S constructions (which are rare), a subject =V clitic may even coalesce with a preceding internal argument inside the VP.
   - In reciprocal constructions, the reciprocal object *tã^{5}ʔã^{3}* must pseudo-incorporate into the fronted verb.
   - Note: As reciprocal objects require a plural antecedent, this is difficult to replicate for both 3SG.F and 3.N. . .

(17) a. [$_{VP}$ ʃa^{5}ʃi^{5} ʒu^{5} tã^{5}ʔã^{3}] ʒoo^{5}
CONT.eat mouth each.other PRON.1PL.IN
'We are kissing each other.' (V O S)

b. [$_{VP}$ ʃa^{5}ʃi^{5} ʒu^{5} tã^{5}ʔ]=**ẽ^{5}**
CONT.eat mouth each.other =CL.1PL.IN
'We are kissing each other.' (V O=S$_{Cl}$)

In sum: =V clitics are generally distributionally unconstrained, able to attach to (coalesce with) a wide variety of hosts.

4 No =V cliticization to full DPs

- **But:** =V clitics cannot attach to **full DPs (including strong pronouns)**—instead, the =CV variant is needed.
  - (Again, due to the PCC, I only illustrate with 3rd person object clitics.)

(18) a. ʃi^{13}ni^{31} [$_{DP}$ **ti^{5} vi^{3}lu^{5}**]=**ɲa^{5}**
COMPL.see CL.3.AN cat =CL.3SG.F
'The cat saw her.'

b. *ʃi^{13}ni^{31} [$_{DP}$ **ti^{5} vi^{3}l^{j}**]=**a^{5}**
COMPL.see CL.3.AN cat =CL.3SG.F
Intended: 'The cat saw her.'

(19) a. ka^{3}tõ^{5} [$_{DP}$ **ndu^{1}ʔu^{1}**]=**ɲa^{1}**
IRR.tie PRON.1PL.EX =CL.3.N
'We will tie it.'

b. *ka^{3}tõ^{5} [$_{DP}$ **ndu^{1}ʔ$^{(w)}$**]=**a^{1}**
IRR.tie PRON.1PL.EX =CL.3.N
Intended: 'We will tie it.'

- This is shown above with **object clitics attaching to full DP subjects**. I can't think of any other configurations in which to replicate this restriction...
  - e.g., there are no double object constructions in SJPM (they are all V-DP-PP sequences).
- Importantly, this restriction involves a =V attaching **outside** of a DP.
  - In contrast, recall that possessor clitics within a DP may be =CV or =V, repeated below.

(20) [$_{DP}$ vi^{3}lu^{5}=**ɲa^{5}**] / [$_{DP}$ vi^{3}lʲ=**a^{5}**]
cat=CL.3SG.F cat=CL.3SG.F
'her cat'

- The restriction is still in effect, even if the clitic is not linearly adjacent to the DP-internal noun—e.g., if it is cliticizing to a postnominal modifier.
  - Again, there is a contrast between whether the pronominal clitic is located outside vs. inside the DP.

(21) a. ko^{3}ni^{3} [$_{DP}$ ɲa^{1} le^{5}e^{6} **lo^{3}ʔo^{3}**]=**ɲa^{5}**
IRR.see CL.3SG.F baby small =CL.3SG.F
'The little baby will see her.'

b. *ko^{3}ni^{3} [$_{DP}$ ɲa^{1} le^{5}e^{6} **lo^{3}ʔ$^{(w)}$**]=**a^{5}**
IRR.see CL.3SG.F baby small =CL.3SG.F
Intended: 'The little baby will see her.'

(22) a. [$_{DP}$ [$_{NP}$ le^{5}e^{6} **lo^{3}ʔo^{3}**]=**ɲa^{5}**]
baby small =CL.3SG.F
'her little baby'

b. [$_{DP}$ [$_{NP}$ le^{5}e^{6} **lo^{3}ʔ$^{(w)}$**]=**a^{5}**]
baby small =CL.3SG.F
'her little baby'

Importantly, this is not a restriction inherent to =V object clitics—**it is actually a restriction on full DP subjects**.

- That is, full DP subjects seem to be unable to serve as licit hosts for =V clitics.
- In fact, =V object clitics are permitted when not attached to a subject.

1. We have already seen that =V object clitics can attach to subject clitics (repeated here with more data):[8]

(23) a. ka^{3}tõ^{5}=nd^{w}=**a^{5}**
IRR.tie=CL.2PL=CL.3.N
'Tie it!' (pl. addressee)

b. no^{15}mʲ=**o^{5}**=**ɲa^{3}** / no^{15}mʲ=**w**=**a^{5}**
NEG.IRR=hug=CL.2SG=CL.3.N NEG.IRR=hug=CL.2SG=CL.3.N
'Don't hug it (the baby)!' (sg. addressee)

[8] The =V=V clitic sequence in (23b) is almost certainly mistranscribed...

2. Positive imperatives with 2SG addressees are expressed without an overt subject.
    - Again, no issue with =V object clitics, which now attach directly to the verb:

(24) no^{3}mi^{3}=**ɲa^{5}** / no^{3}m^{j}=**ã^{5}**
IRR.hug=CL.3SG.F IRR.hug=CL.3SG.F
'Hug her!' (sg. addressee)

3. Although SJPM is VSO, the subject may be displaced to the clausal periphery (e.g., in neg-fronting and wh-movement contexts), yielding **SVO word order**.

(25) a. **ni^{3} ĩĩ^{3}=na^{1}** ta^{15}ʔvi^{5} ___ ki^{1}si^{3}
NEG one=CL.3PL.N NEG.IRR=break pot
'None of them will break the pot.' (S V O)

b. **^{n}dʒa^{5} ku^{5}u^{3}=na^{1}** ta^{13}ʔvi^{5} ___ ki^{1}si^{3}
WH CONT.be=CL.3PL.N COMPL.break pot
'Who (is it that) broke the pot?' (S V O)

- In such contexts, =V object clitics are again licit:

(26) a. ni^{3} ĩĩ^{3}=ti^{5} ko^{15}-tu^{3}vi^{3}=**ɲa^{5}**
NEG one=CL.3.AN NEG.COMPL-sting=CL.3SG.F
'None of them (e.g. wasps) stung her.' (S V=O$_{Cl}$)

b. ni^{3} ĩĩ^{3}=ti^{5} ko^{15}-tu^{3}v^{j}=**a^{5}**
NEG one=CL.3.AN NEG.COMPL-sting=CL.3SG.F
'None of them (e.g. wasps) stung her.' (S V=O$_{Cl}$)

(27) a. ^{n}dʒa^{5} ku^{5}u^{3}=na^{1} ʃi^{13}ni^{31}=**ɲa^{5}**?
WH CONT.COP=CL.3PL.N COMPL.see=CL.3SG.F
'Who (is it that) saw her?' (S V=O$_{Cl}$)

b. ^{n}dʒa^{5} ku^{5}u^{3}=na^{1} ʃi^{15}n^{j}=**a^{15}**?
WH CONT.COP=CL.3PL.N COMPL.see=CL.3SG.F
'Who (is it that) saw her?' (S V=O$_{Cl}$)

- Lastly, there seems to be variation across Mixtec in whether the restriction on attaching =V to full DPs holds.
    - Mantenuto (2020) provides an example suggesting that this restriction is <u>absent</u> in San Sebastián del Monte Mixtec (the forms for 3.N are *=ña* and *=Vn*):

(28) a. sísi **tìnà=an**
CONT.eat dog=CL.3.N
'The dog eats it (e.g., the tortilla).' (Mantenuto, 2020, p. 67)

5 Speculative thoughts

- **My thoughts (still developing) for SJPM:**
    - Subject DPs cannot serve as hosts for =V clitics, but can serve as hosts for =CV clitics.
    - =V clitics are prosodically integrated into their hosts, and attach at a lower prosodic level than =CV ones.
    - . . . So this is maybe the root of the restriction?

- **How to formulate this restriction?** It has been pointed out to me that this is reminiscent of CRISP-EDGE constraints (e.g. Ito and Mester, 1999; Selkirk, 2011).
  - These are a family of constraints enforcing "crisp" prosodic edges, by preventing linking/spreading/sharing of features across various prosodic junctures.
- The coalescence of a =V clitic to the rightmost mora of its host would suggest a **non-crisp right-edge**.
  - The question, then, would be why this is tolerated in most environments—but not tolerated into DPs.
  - Tolerated environments could be captured by specifying the type of prosodic category sensitive to the constraint (e.g., CRISPEDGE(Φ), as opposed to CRISPEDGE(σ), CRISPEDGE(ω), etc.)
- But recall that coalescence into a **complex VP** is possible (some exs. repeated below). Are these not also (presumably) phonological phrases (Φ)?

(29) a. [$_{VP}$ ^{n}da^{3}ko^{1}o^{3} nã^{5}ʔ]=**ã^{15}**
IRR.wake.up early =CL.3SG.F
'She will wake up early.'

b. [$_{VP}$ ʃa^{5}ʃi^{5} ʒu^{5} tã^{5}ʔ]=**ẽ^{5}**
CONT.eat mouth each.other =CL.1PL.IN
'We are kissing each other.'

c. [$_{VP}$ ka^{3}tõ^{5} tu^{3}k^{j}]=**ã^{5}**
IRR.tie again =CL.3SG.F
'Tie it again!' (sg. addressee)

- Coalescence is even possible into a **PP (containing a nominal complement) within a fronted VP**, (30b) ((30a) provides a near-minimal pair for comparison).
  → Reciprocal objects of prepositions front with the verb, for mysterious reasons...

(30) a. [$_{VP}$ ni^{1}-kã^{1}ʔ]=**e^{1}** ʃĩ^{5}ʔĩ^{3} ɲa^{5} si^{5}ʔi^{6}
COMPL-talk =CL.1SG with CL.3SG.F woman
'I talked to the woman.' (V=S_{Cl} PP)

b. [$_{VP}$ kã^{5}ʔã^{1} [$_{PP}$ ʃĩ^{5}ʔĩ^{3} tã^{5}ʔ]]=**ẽ^{5}**
CONT.speak with each.other =CL.1PL.IN
'We (incl.) are talking to each other.' (V PP_{recip}=S_{Cl})

- So is there something special about DPs? Some recent work on the syntax-prosody interface has sought to privilege the prosodic status of DPs/nominal arguments (e.g. Clemens, 2019).

6 More on =V cliticization: Classifiers

- Lastly, recall that the pronominal clitics are identical to the classifiers in the language.
  - Interestingly (though maybe unsurprisingly?), the 3SG.F and 3.N classifiers may also appear as vocalic and undergo coalescence!
  - I have not tested this systematically yet, but here are some examples:

(31) a. ʃi^{5}ni^{6} [**ɲa^{15}** Pa^{5}lo^{5}ma^{6}] [ti^{5} le^{3}so^{3}]
CONT.see CL.3SG.F Paloma CL.3.AN rabbit
'Paloma sees the rabbit.' < SJP0521:29:57.8 >

b. ʃi^{5}n^{j}[=**a^{15}** Pa^{5}lo^{5}ma^{6}] [ti^{5} le^{3}so^{3}]
CONT.see=CL.3SG.F Paloma CL.3.AN rabbit
'Paloma sees the rabbit.' < SJP0521:29:20.3 >

(32) a. vi^{3}lu^{5} **ɲa^{5}** Mi^{5}ʃel^{61}
cat CL.3SG.F Michelle
'Michelle's cat'

b. vi^{3}lʲ**=a^{5}** Mi^{5}ʃel^{61}
cat=CL.3SG.F Michelle
'Michelle's cat'

(33) a. ʃĩ^{5}ʔĩ^{3} **ɲa^{5}** Pa^{5}lo^{5}ma^{6}
with CL.3SG.F Paloma
'with Paloma'

b. ʃĩ^{5}ʔ**=ã^{5}** Pa^{5}lo^{5}ma^{6}
with=CL.3SG.F Paloma
'with Paloma'

- **Still bad:** Coalescence of a =V classifier to a full DP.

(34) a. ʃi^{13}ni^{31} [ti^{5} vi^{3}lu^{5}] [**ɲa^{5}** Pa^{5}lo^{5}ma^{6}]
COMPL.see CL.3.AN cat CL.3SG.F Paloma
'The cat saw Paloma.'

b. *ʃi^{13}ni^{31} [ti^{5} vi^{3}lʲ][**=a^{5}** Pa^{5}lo^{5}ma^{6}]
COMPL.see CL.3.AN cat =CL.3SG.F Paloma
Intended: 'The cat saw Paloma.'

- **Also:** Note that, while DPs may be fronted to clause-initial position, the vocalic variant of the classifier is not permitted in those environments.
  - Presumably because there is no clitic host.
  - This, in turn, suggests that the vocalic variant of the classifier is **necessarily an enclitic**, but the CV variant is not.

(35) a. [ɲa^{5} Ga^{5}bi^{61}] ni^{1}-ta^{3}ʔvi^{5}=ɲa^{5} [ɲa^{1} ʒoo^{3}]
CL.3SG.F Gaby COMPL-break=CL.3SG.F CL.3.N water.jug
'Gaby broke the water jug.'

b. *[**a^{5}** Ga^{5}bi^{61}] ni^{1}-ta^{3}ʔvi^{5}=ɲa^{5} [ɲa^{1} ʒoo^{3}]
CL.3SG.F Gaby COMPL-break=CL.3SG.F CL.3.N water.jug
Intended: 'Gaby broke the water jug.'

References

Bradley, Henry C., and Barbara Hollenbach, ed. 1988. *Studies in the syntax of mixtecan languages*. Dallas, TX and Arlington, TX: SIL and the University of Texas at Arlington.

Caballero, Gabriela, Claudia Duarte-Bórquez, and Claudia Juárez Chávez. to appear. Tonal upstep and downstep in San Juan Piñas Mixtec (Tò'ō̲n Ndā'vĩ). In *Proceedings of WSCLA 26*. Vancouver, BC: UBCWPL.

Carroll, Lucien S. 2015. Ixpantepec Nieves Mixtec word prosody. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA.

Clemens, Lauren Eby. 2019. Prosodic noun incorporation: The relationship between prosody and argument structure in Niuean. *Syntax* 22:337–377.

DiCanio, Christian, Caicai Zhang, Douglas H. Whalen, and Rey Castillo García. 2020. Phonetic structure in Yoloxóchitl Mixtec consonants. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 50:333–365.

INALI. 2008. Catálogo de las lenguas indígenas nacionales: Variantes lingüísticas de méxico con sus autodenominaciones y referencias geoestadísticas.

Ito, Junko, and Armin Mester. 1999. Realignment. In *The prosody-morphology interface*, ed. René Kager, Harry van der Hulst, and Wim Zonneveld, 188–217. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Josserand, Judy Kathyrn. 1983. Mixtec dialect history. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Ann Arbor, MI.

Mantenuto, Iara. 2020. 'other' and 'more' in San Sebastián del Monte Mixtec and beyond. Doctoral Dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.

Penner, Kevin L. 2019. Prosodic structure in Ixtayutla Mixtec: Evidence for the foot. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1944. Analysis of a Mixteco text. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 10:113–138.

Selkirk, Elizabeth. 2011. The syntax-phonology interface. In *The handbook of phonological theory*, ed. John Goldsmith, Jason Riggle, and Alan Yu, 435–485. Blackwell, 2nd edition edition.

Suárez, Jorge A. 1983. *The mesoamerican indian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Uchihara, Hiroto, and Juana Mendoza Ruiz. 2022. Minimality, maximality and perfect prosodic word in Alcozauca Mixtec. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 40:599–649.

Yuan, Michelle. 2024. More on 'Lexical DP Blocking' effects in the PCC: Evidence from Mixtec. Poster presentation at NELS 54.

Yuan, Michelle. to appear. Two restrictions on pronominal clitics in San Juan Piñas Mixtec (Tò'ōn Ndā'ví). In *Proceedings of WSCLA 26*. Vancouver, BC: UBCWPL.