

Chapter 5

Functions of the verbal paradigms

“[I]t follows that the number of verbal pronominal affixes must, theoretically at least, run into the thousands; and at times I despair of ever being able to reduce this to order. My only consolation is that I know that for simple conversation six or seven hundred will suffice.” (Michelson 1927b:408)

The previous chapter analyzed the set of affixes in the independent indicative paradigm—73 forms in all. But the independent indicative is only one of twenty-six verbal paradigms in Meskwaki, nearly all of which have at least as many forms as the independent indicative.¹ Two paradigms used in relative clauses contain especially many forms: the conjunct participle and interrogative participle are inflected for the head of the relative clause as well as for subject and object. That means that each of the 70 or so affixes encoding subject and object in the conjunct participle might be followed by any one of six different final suffixes indicating features of the head of the relative clause, and similarly for the interrogative participle. When one considers the overall complexity of verb inflection in Meskwaki, the depth of Michelson’s despair in the quote above is easy to sympathize with! It will be shown in this chapter, however, that the impressive number of inflectional paradigms in Meskwaki is used to convey detailed syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic information, including whether the verb is used in a main clause, or in a subordinate clause of a particular type (complement, temporal, conditional, relative clause, purpose clause, etc). In this regard, Meskwaki is a counterexample to certain claims about the nature of nonconfigurational languages. Jelinek 1984:65 conjectures that adjoined clauses in ‘W-type’ languages may be interpreted either as temporal adverbial clauses or as relative clauses (based upon Hale 1976). This is not the case in Meskwaki, as may be seen by comparing the relative clauses described in 5.3. with the temporal adverbial clauses in 5.7.1. The material in this chapter also argues against Mithun’s (1984b) view that languages with polysynthetic morphology avoid subordination altogether. The textual examples provided in each section of this chapter testify to the frequent use in Meskwaki of subordinate clauses of all types.

Table 1 provides an overview of the range of functions associated with the various inflectional paradigms. The table follows the traditional grouping of paradigms into ORDERS based upon morphological similarities (see, for example, Bloomfield 1927, 1946).² For each paradigm listed in the table there is a pointer to the section(s) of this chapter in which it is discussed, and an illustration of the paradigm with an inflected form of the stem *wača·ho-* ‘cook’. In each example the inflectional affixes are underlined, as is the output of INITIAL CHANGE, an ablaut rule applying to

¹ The prioritive, assertive, and conclusive paradigms are incomplete (see appendix); the imperative paradigm only has forms for 2, 2p, and 21 person subjects; the injunctive has only 3rd person subject forms.

² In general I use the traditional terminology for the paradigms as established by Jones 1911, Michelson 1925 (inter alia), Bloomfield 1925, 1927. Some additional minor paradigms have been identified by Goddard 1995.

the vowel of the first syllable of the verb required in some of the paradigms.³ By comparing the inflected forms of *wača·ho-* in Table 1 some of the justification of grouping the paradigms into orders may be seen. For example, the independent indicative and independent dubitative both use the affixes *ke-* *-pwa(·)* to mark second person plural. In the conjunct order, third person is expressed by the suffix *-t* (palatalized to *č* by a following *i*). Additional similarities may be found by inspecting the listings of the full paradigms in the appendix.

TABLE 1: MESKWAKI VERBAL PARADIGMS
illustrated with stem *wača·ho-* ‘cook’

INDEPENDENT ORDER

Independent indicative	5.1 Assertions (also 5.2. Modals and evidentials, 5.4. Questions, 5.6. Complement clauses, 5.8. Conditionals)	<i><u>ke</u>wača·<u>hopwa</u></i> ‘you (pl.) cook’
Dubitative	5.2. Modals and evidentials (also 5.4. Questions)	<i><u>ke</u>wača·<u>hopwa</u>·<u>toke</u></i> ‘you (pl.) probably cook’
Assertive	5.1. Assertions	<i>wača·<u>ho</u>·<u>pani</u></i> ‘she definitely cooked’
Conclusive	5.2. Modals and evidentials	<i>wača·<u>ho</u>·<u>hapa</u></i> ‘she must have cooked’

³ The rule of initial change is found throughout the Algonquian family (cf. Costa 1996). In Meskwaki, initial change changes short *a*, *e*, and *i* to *e*; short *o* to *we*; and leaves long vowels unchanged.

CONJUNCT ORDER

Plain conjunct	5.2. Modals and evidentials	<i>i-ni a-mihtahi wača-hoči</i> ‘then she would cook’
Aorist conjunct	5.6. Complement clauses (also 5.7. Adverbial clauses, 5.1. Assertions)	<i>e-hwača-hoči</i> ‘that she cooked’
Changed conjunct	5.7. Adverbial clauses	<i>we-ča-hoči</i> ‘when she cooked’
Negative	5.1. Assertions (also 5.2. Modals and evidentials, 5.6. Complement clauses)	<i>a-kwi wača-hočini</i> ‘she didn’t cook’
Iterative	5.7. Adverbial clauses (also 5.6. Complement clauses)	<i>we-ča-hočini</i> ‘whenever she cooks’
Subjunctive	5.8. Conditionals (also 5.7. Adverbial clauses, 5.6. Complement clauses)	<i>wača-hote</i> ‘if she cooks’
Conjunct participle	5.3. Relative clauses (also 5.4. Questions, 5.6. Complement clauses)	<i>we-ča-hota</i> ‘the one who cooks’
Past aorist conjunct	5.6. Complement clauses (also 5.1. Assertions, 5.2. Modals and evidentials)	<i>e-hwača-hotehe</i> ‘that she had cooked’
Changed unreal	5.8. Conditionals	<i>keye-hapa we-ča-hotehe</i> ‘it turned out she cooked!’
Past negative	5.1. Assertions	<i>a-kwi wača-hotehe</i> ‘she hadn’t cooked’
Unreal	5.8. Conditionals	<i>wača-hotehe</i> ‘if she had cooked’

Past conjunct participle	5.3. Relative clauses	<i>we·ča·hotehe</i> 'the one who had cooked'
Injunctive	5.5. Commands	<i>wača·hoče</i> 'let her cook'
INTERROGATIVE ORDER		
Plain interrogative	5.2. Modals and evidentials (also 5.4. Questions)	<i>wača·hokwe·ni</i> 'she must have cooked'
Changed interrogative	5.8. Conditionals	<i>we·ča·hokwe·ni</i> 'if she cooks'
Interrogative participle	5.3. Relative clauses (also 5.6. Complement clauses, 5.4. Questions)	<i>we·ča·hokwe·na</i> 'whoever cooks'
Aorist interrogative	5.7. Adverbial clauses	<i>e·hwača·hokwe·ni</i> 'at whatever time she cooks'
Prioritive	5.7. Adverbial clauses	<i>me·hi·wača·hokwe</i> 'before she cooked'
PROHIBITIVE ORDER		
Potential	5.2. Modals and evidentials (also 5.4. Questions, 5.8. Conditionals)	<i>wača·hoša</i> 'she could cook'
Prohibitive	5.5. Commands (also 5.2. Modals and evidentials, 5.4. Questions)	<i>ka·ta wača·hohkani</i> 'don't cook!'
Future imperative	5.5. Commands	<i>wača·hohkani</i> 'cook (later on)!'
IMPERATIVE	5.5. Commands	<i>wača·hono</i> 'cook!'

As can be seen from the table, the morphological similarity of paradigms within a given order does not entail that the functions of the paradigms will also be similar. For example, the conjunct order paradigms share certain morphological features, but their functions range from expressing main clause negation, to complement clauses, modals, conditionals, temporal adjuncts, relative clauses, and third person imperatives. Indeed, in some cases a single inflectional paradigm may be associated with more than one function (e.g. the aorist conjunct). In describing the various uses to which the inflectional paradigms are put, I have chosen to organize this chapter by syntactic/semantic/pragmatic function. I begin with main clause assertions and describe which paradigms are used for this purpose. The subsequent sections take up modal and evidential main clauses, relative clauses, main clause questions, commands, complement clauses (both declarative and interrogative), adverbial clauses of various types, and finally conditionals. The functions of the various paradigms are illustrated by examples (drawn from texts wherever possible), with the inflectional morphology on the verb underlined. Before turning to the discussion of specific functions, however, some general comments about tense and negation are in order. Most verbs unmarked for tense are interpreted as nonfuture; i.e., either a past tense or present tense reading is possible, depending upon the context. Future tense is expressed by the prefix *(w)i·h-*. A subset of the paradigms in the conjunct order contain the suffix *-ehe* (or the allomorph *-oha*; see appendix), which marks past tense (remote or relative past, depending upon the paradigm), irrealis, or a combination of past and irrealis. The interpretation of *-ehe* will be detailed below for each of the paradigms containing it.

Negation in Meskwaki is expressed by a variety of structural means: by independent particles (*a·kwi*, *ka·ta*, *awita*), by the enclitic *=ihi*, or by the preverb *pwa·wi-*. *a·kwi* is used for negated main clause assertions and yes-no questions; it requires a verb inflected in the negative paradigm. *ka·ta* is used for negative commands and requires a verb inflected in the prohibitive. *awita* is used for negating main clause modal statements or yes-no questions and requires a verb inflected in the potential. (Each of these three particles may be used on its own, without a verb: *a·kwi* ‘no’, *ka·ta* ‘don’t!’, and *awita* ‘it couldn’t be.’) The enclitic *=ihi* is used for exclamations, with verbs inflected in the independent indicative or in the potential. Everywhere else the preverb *pwa·wi-* is used. Examples of negation are provided in this section for as many constructions as possible.

5.1. Assertions

In this section I will first discuss the most common patterns of verb inflection in positive and negative main clause assertions, and then take up some minor or restricted patterns. In using the term ‘assertion’ I mean to exclude questions, commands, and the various types of modal, evidential and conditional constructions.

The INDEPENDENT INDICATIVE is used for main clauses in nonnarrative contexts which express positive assertions.

- (1) nemya·na·hpawa·na·wa
 have.bad.dream.about 1–3/ind.ind
 ‘I had a bad dream about him.’ L58

- (2) nesekwisa neki·šikenekwa
 my.aunt raise 3–1/ind.ind
 ‘My aunt raised me.’ A17B
- (3) no·hkoma nepye·či–natomekwa
 my.mother.in.law come–summon 3–1/ind.ind
 ‘My mother-in-law came and asked me to come over.’ A90F
- (4) ni·hkomekwa
 fut.swallow 3–1/ind.ind
 ‘He [a whale] will swallow me.’ W268D

In each example above the inflectional affixes of the independent indicative paradigm have been underlined. No attempt has been made to provide an interlinear gloss for each component affix of the inflection (as was done in chapter 4); rather the complex of features encoded by the inflectional affixes is given following the gloss of the verb stem. Note that compounds of a preverb (6.2) plus a verb stem, as in (3), are treated as a single unit for the purposes of inflection: the inflectional prefix is attached to the left edge of the leftmost preverb and the inflectional suffixes are attached to the right edge of the verb stem. (Compare (3) with the simple verb stem in (2).) Future tense in the independent indicative is marked by adding the prefix (*w*)*i·h-* to the left edge of the verb (or leftmost preverb). The inflectional prefixes of the independent order attach to the left of the future prefix, as can be seen in (4).

Negative assertions in main clauses are expressed by the particle *a·kwi* ‘not’ plus a verb inflected in the NEGATIVE paradigm. The negative paradigm is formally part of the conjunct order: it is formed by suffixing the verb with the appropriate conjunct person/number suffix(es), followed by the suffix *-ini*.

- (5) šewe·na a·kwi kohtamakwini
 but not fear 21–0/neg
 ‘But we (incl) are not afraid of it’ A104D
- (6) a·kwi wi·hneškimena·nini
 not fut.scold 1–2/neg
 ‘I will not scold you.’ A136B

(6) shows that future tense may be marked on verbs inflected in the negative paradigm.

Logical double negation may be expressed by using *a·kwi* to negate a verb containing the negative preverb *pwa·wi-*.

- (7) a·kwi=ke·hi wi·hpwa·wi–kehke·netamanini
 not=and fut.not–know 2–0/neg
 ‘You would not fail to know about it.’ W218R

The enclitic *=ihi* ‘not’ is used in exclamatory main clauses, with either independent indicative inflection or with potential inflection (see 5.2. for the use of potential inflection). It frequently occurs with the particle *meči* ‘quite’ in statements which are obviously true, as in the following.

- (8) *meči*=‘h=we·na’=‘na *apeno·hiwa!*
 quite=not=in.fact=that.anim be.child 3/ind.ind
 ‘After all, that [grandmother of ours] is not a child!’ W129N

The initial and final short *i* in *=ihi* are often deleted by clitic sandhi, leaving only an *h*. See Goddard 1991 for discussion of clitic sandhi, as well as discussion of the optional cliticization of pronouns such as *i·na* ‘that.animate’ in (8) above.

Logical double negation may also be expressed by combining *=ihi* with an independent indicative verb containing the negative preverb *pwa·wi-*.

- (9) *ki·hpwa·wi*==‘hi’=‘yo *-kehke·netā!*
 fut.not=not=of.course -know 2-0/ind.ind
 ‘You won’t fail to know about it!’ W194G

Since the preverb *pwa·wi-* is the first phonological word in (9), it serves as the host for the enclitics *=ihi* and *=iyo*.

The vast majority of main clause assertions are inflected with the inflectional paradigms discussed above: independent indicative for positive assertions and negative for negative assertions. There are, however, other inflectional paradigms that may be used in a more restricted way. For example, the rare ASSERTIVE paradigm is used for strong assertions (Goddard 1995):

- (10) *we·pesi·hi·pani*
 be.crazy 3/assertive
 ‘He sure is crazy.’ (Goddard 1995)

Another paradigm found in main clause assertions is the PAST NEGATIVE, which expresses remote past tense. (Formally, the past negative is like the negative paradigm, except the past tense suffix *-ehe* replaces the suffix *-ini*.) With second person subjects, the past negative often has the force of a mild rebuke.

- (11) *a·kwi=ča·h=ye·toke nana·ši mešotehe i·niya ... nemešo·ha ...*
 not=so=it.seems ever strike.with.missile X-3/past.neg that.absent my.g.father
 ‘So it seems that my late grandfather ... had never been shot’ B85:70.3
- (12) *a·kwi=ke·h=ye·toke ka·hkami wi·tamawiyanehe.*
 not=and=it.seems in.first.place tell.to 2-1/past.neg
 ‘Why didn’t you tell me in the first place?’ W591

When the past negative is used with nonfirst persons, as in (11) and (12), it conveys an additional evidential function: the speaker cannot be certain about the statement, since it happened in the past. The enclitic =*ye·toke* ‘it seems’ often appears with past negative verbs with nonfirst person subjects.

There are also two contexts in which main clause assertions may contain verbs inflected in the AORIST CONJUNCT paradigm.⁴ First, when the main clause is preceded by a temporal adverbial clause (cf. 5.7.1. for discussion of such clauses):

(13) *ni·šwa·pitakesiyane* *i·ni* *wi·hnatawi–ona·pe·miyani*
 be.twenty 2/subjct then fut.seek.to–take.husband 2/aor
 ‘When you are twenty, you will want to get married.’ A66E

(14) *kaho·ni* *me·ta·swipepo·nwe·ya·ni*,
 and.then be.ten.years.old 1/ch.conj

i·niye·ka=‘ni *ni·ča·paki* *e·hpo·ni–mata·kwe·nemaki*
 those.absent=then dolls cease–enjoy 1–3(p)/aor

‘So then, when I reached ten years of age,
 I ceased then to care for those dolls.’ A14AB

The main clause in such constructions typically contains *i·ni* ‘then’, as in (13) and (14). (In (14) *i·ni* has undergone cliticization, attaching to the absentative demonstrative *i·niye·ka*.)

The second context in which aorist conjunct inflection is found in main clause assertions is in traditional narratives. Here the use of aorist in main clauses is found in all types of main clauses, not just ones following a temporal clause as we saw in (13) and (14):

(15) *našawaye* *nekoti neniwa okwisani* *e·hmahkate·wi·na·či*
 long.ago one man his.son.obv make.O.fast 3–3’/aor
 ‘Long ago a certain man (prox) made his son (obv) fast.’ L1

(16) *metemo·he·ha* *e·hneškima·či* *i·nini* *ihkwe·wani*
 old.woman.dim scold 3–3’/aor that.obv woman.obv
 ‘The little old lady (prox) scolded that woman (obv).’ W31C

The preverb *pwa·wi–* ‘not’ is used to negate the aorist conjunct in all of its uses, including main clauses in narrative.

(17) *e·hpwa·wi–ki·šihto·či* *na·tawino·ni*
 not–fix 3–0/aor medicine
 ‘He hadn’t prepared any medicine’ N19D

⁴ The aorist conjunct always bears a prefix: either *e·h-* for nonfuture tense or *wi·h-* for future. The nonfuture *e·h-* is not glossed in the examples.

Another inflectional paradigm available for main clauses in narratives is the PAST AORIST CONJUNCT, which indicates that the time of the story is remote past:

- (18) *i·ni=ye·toke e·ha·mi·wa·tehe*
 then=it.seems move.camp 3p/past.aor
 ‘Then, it seems, they moved camp.’ B85:74.14
- (19) *kapo·twe=ye·toke=‘ni e·hwe·pi–a·hkwamataminehe i·nini okwiswa·wani*
 soon=it.seems=then begin–be.sick 3’–0/past.aor that.obv their.son.obv
 ‘Soon, it seems, that son (obv) of theirs (prox) began to be sick.’ B85:74.5

Like the past negative, the remote past tense of the past aorist conjunct is associated with an evidential function of uncertainty on the part of the speaker; the enclitic *=ye·toke* ‘it seems’ often accompanies past aorist conjunct verbs.

5.2. Modals and evidentials

Not all main clause statements assert the truth of a proposition: often a speaker merely states that something is possible, or that something would be true in an alternative state of affairs, or that some action ought to be taken. Such statements are often expressed in English with modal verbs such as *might, could, would, should*, etc.; in this section we will see how comparable notions are expressed in Meskwaki verb inflection. The choice of inflectional paradigm may also convey a range of evidential distinctions: that is, what the speaker’s authority for the statement is. In contrast to the constructions discussed in 5.1, which are typically used for statements based upon firsthand knowledge, other inflectional paradigms indicate that the speaker is guessing, or inferring from other evidence, or reporting what he has been told. The material in this section of the chapter will be limited to modal and evidential statements in main clauses; modal and evidential distinctions in questions and subordinate clauses will be discussed in the relevant sections below.⁵

5.2.1. Modals

The POTENTIAL paradigm is used to express a number of modal notions, such as ability, possibility, and statements about alternative states of affairs.

- (20) *ni·na=‘yo=wi·na=‘na nešiye·ka·ha*
 I=of.course=contrast=that.anim kill 1–3/pot
 ‘I, after all, could kill that [bear]’ L130

⁵ It should also be noted that evidential distinctions may be expressed by means other than the choice of inflectional paradigm: enclitics such as *=ipi* ‘it is said’, *=ye·toke* ‘I suppose; it seems’, and *=ye·hapa* ‘I conclude’ are frequently used to soften what would otherwise be straight assertions. (There is a formal similarity between the enclitics *=ye·toke* and *=ye·hapa*, on the one hand, and the inflectional endings for dubitative verbs and conclusive verbs on the other.)

- (21) *kehke·nema·sa=meko e·šawinikwe·ni*
 know 3–3’/pot=emph fare.thus 3’/int.part/obl
 ‘He (prox) might know what happened to him (obv)’ R586.12⁶
- (22) *meso·te·we=meko neškinawone·ha*
 all.over=emph hate X–3/pot
 ‘He would be hated everywhere.’ W288E

Potential inflection is also used in the apodosis of hypothetical or counterfactual conditional constructions; see 5.8. for examples.

Potential verbs are negated with the independent particle *awita*:

- (23) *ni·na=mata awita nana·ši wi·kowihka·ha*
 I=rather not ever be.sleepy 1/pot
 ‘I, however, would never get sleepy.’ B105:24.45
- (24) *i·noki=ke·h=wi·na awita owiye·ha neškimisa*
 now=but=contrast not anyone forbid 3–1/pot
 ‘But now no one would forbid me.’ A130B

The negative enclitic =*ihi*, used in exclamations, may also appear with verbs inflected in the potential:

- (25) *nesi·me·ha=‘hi=‘yo wa·wane·netasa!*
 my.younger.brother=not=of.course fail.to.know 3–0/pot
 ‘My younger brother wouldn’t fail to know about this!’ W253P

A less common way of expressing modal notions is to use the particle *a·mihtahi* ‘should; would; could; might’ plus a verb inflected in the PLAIN CONJUNCT.⁷ *a·mihtahi* always occurs with either *i·ni* ‘then’ or *o·ni* ‘and then’.

- (26) *i·ni a·mihtahi i·ni išawiyakwe*
 then should that do.thus 21/conj
 ‘Then we (incl) should do that.’ W227K
- (27) *i·ni=meko a·mihtahi we·pi–a·ya·swe·ti·hiyani*
 then=emph would begin–quarrel.with 2–1/conj
 ‘Right then you would begin to quarrel with me.’ W295M

⁶ The higher verb in (21) is inflected for a third person obviative object, agreeing with the subject of the lower clause. This phenomenon (copying to object) is discussed in 10.1.

⁷ The plain conjunct is ‘plain’ in contrast to the aorist conjunct (preceded by a prefix) and the changed conjunct (in which the first syllable undergoes the ablaut rule of initial change).

- (28) i·ni a·mihtahi na·kwa·ye·kwe
 then could leave 2p/conj
 ‘Then you could leave’ W186K

The PROHIBITIVE paradigm, though primarily used for negative commands (5.5), also functions to add a modal reading of ‘might’. It is often used for situations which the speaker views negatively.

- (29) nešiwana·čihⁱye·kani
 cause.ruin.for 2–3(p)/proh
 ‘You might ruin things for them’ A33F
- (30) ča·keška·hkiče
 all.fall 0/proh
 ‘It [one’s hair] might all fall out.’ A48E
- (31) “kya·we·toke,” išihki·ke
 be.jealous 3/dub say.thus.about X–1/proh
 ‘People might say about me, “He’s probably jealous.”’ A153I

It may also be mentioned here that the future prefix (*w*)*i·h*- often has a modal reading of obligation when used with verbs inflected in the independent indicative or negative paradigms:

- (32) ni·hpo·ni=‘pi –mahkate·wi
 fut.stop=quot –fast 1/ind.ind
 ‘I should stop fasting, they said.’ L16
- (33) ki·howi·wi
 fut.have.a.wife 2/ind.ind
 ‘You should get married.’ M25L
- (34) a·kwi=ča·hi=‘na wi·hona·pe·miyanini
 not=so=that.anim fut.have.O2.as.husband 2/neg
 ‘So you must not marry that [man].’ A76E
- (35) wi·hapwi·heti·waki
 fut.wait.for.recip 3p/ind.ind
 ‘They should wait for each other.’ R582.7

The future prefix is also found in another modal-like construction. It may be added to a verb in the PAST AORIST CONJUNCT to express unfulfilled intentions: ‘X was going to [verb] (but didn’t).’

- (36) wi·hwi·če·nomaketehe=ča·hi
 fut.play.with 1p–3/past.aor=so
 ‘We (excl) were just going to play with him.’ W78H

- (37) me·mečine·h=kohi wi·hni·miya·nehe
 for.the.last.time=obviously fut.dance 1/past.aor
 ‘I was going to dance one last time, you know.’ W158E

5.2.2. Evidentials

We now turn to the inflectional paradigms which indicate evidential distinctions. The DUBITATIVE is used for speculations, and is often glossed ‘probably’ or ‘must’.

- (38) owiye·ha kekaka·čihekowa·toke
 someone joke.with 3–2p/dub
 ‘Probably someone was playing a joke on you two.’ W103P

- (39) i·nina·h=we·na na·hkači ki·hka·nena·naki šawesi·toke·hiki
 then=rather again our.friends be.hungry 3p/dub
 ‘By this time our friends must be hungry again.’ W298N

- (40) pe·hki=ni·hka=mani kehči–si·po·wi·toke!
 really=man’s.exclam=this great–be.a.river 0/dub
 ‘This must be a really big river!’ W80F (said looking at the ocean)

The dubitative is negated with the preverb *pwa·wi–*:

- (41) keki·ša·koči—meko –pwa·wi–nenošē·petoke
 as.much.as.possible—emph –not–heed 2/dub
 ‘I guess you really don’t listen.’ W38F

Alternative statements—either X, or Y—typically contain dubitative or prohibitive inflection on the verbs of the conjoined clauses. (See 5.4.3. for examples of alternative questions, which display the same pattern.) The use of such inflection (dubitative for speculation, prohibitive for possibility) is appropriate for alternative statements, since at most one of the set of alternative statements may be true.

- (42) me·mešihka našawaye nepo·hi·toke,
 perhaps long.ago die.dim 3/dub
 o=meše=ke·hi ke·waki pema·tesī·hi·toke
 or still be.alive.dim 3/dub
 ‘Perhaps the poor guy died long ago,
 or maybe he’s still alive.’ W279CD

- (43) ta·na·hka=ke·hi a·hpawa·hka,
 or dream 1/proh
 ta·na·hka=ke·hi šekikwa·mehka
 or urinate.in.sleep 1/proh
 ‘Either I might have had a dream,
 or I might have wet my bed.’ W109LM

The translation of the subject of (42) as ‘the poor guy’ is due to the diminutive suffix on the stems of both verbs; as discussed in 3.6, one function of the diminutive is to express pity. In (43), the context is that the speaker had thought she had gotten up in the middle of the night to go to the toilet.

Another inflectional paradigm with an evidential function is the PLAIN INTERROGATIVE, which indicates that the speaker is deducing after the fact what must have happened.

- (44) *nesekokwe·ni=ma·hi·=‘na mahkwani*
 kill 3’-3/interr=after.all=that.anim bear.obv
 ‘A bear (obv) must have killed that guy (prox), after all.’ L111
- (45) *aniwisa·hikwe·ni*
 run.fast.dim 3/interr
 ‘He must have run fast.’ W1005
- (46) *ki·ša·kotekwamo·hiwa·ne·ni*
 sleep.soundly.dim 1/interr
 ‘I must have been sound asleep.’ W496

In (44), the victim’s tracks had been seen in the snow, joined by the tracks of a bear. There were also signs of a struggle and that the man had been killed and eaten. The plain interrogative is appropriate here because the speaker did not witness the killing himself, but rather deduces that it happened on the basis of available evidence. Similarly, (45) was said about a boy now out of sight and (46) was said upon awakening; in both cases the plain interrogative expresses a deduction made by the speaker.

The plain interrogative is also negated with the preverb *pwa·wi-*:

- (47) *pwa·wi=ke·hi -ayi·kwa·mi·kwe·hiki*
 not=but -be.zealous 3p/interr
 ‘But they must not have done their best.’ W1012

The rare CONCLUSIVE is used for definite conclusions (Goddard 1995), often in exclamations:

- (48) *i·ya·h=ča·h=ye·hapa ki·ši-pye·hapa!*
 there=so=I.conclude perf-come 3/conclusive
 ‘So he must have already arrived there!’ L98
- (49) *we·nah=ye·hapa ni·hkehči-mi·htamimeko·hapaniki!*
 here.is=I.conclude fut.great-vex.O.by.speech 3p-1/conclusive
 ‘So now I am sure they shall vex me greatly!’ B89:48.30–31 (cited in Goddard 1995)

Three of the paradigms described in 5.1. may be viewed as also having an evidential function. First, the use of aorist conjunct for main clauses in traditional narratives can be considered a type of evidential, marking the story as one the narrator was told, not his own lifestory. Second, the two paradigms used to mark remote past in main clauses (past negative and past aorist conjunct), both convey speaker uncertainty when used with nonfirst persons, as noted in 5.1.

5.3. Relative clauses

Verbs in relative clauses are inflected as participles (Goddard 1987): ordinary relative clauses use the CONJUNCT PARTICIPLE (or PAST CONJUNCT PARTICIPLE) inflection, while INTERROGATIVE PARTICIPLE inflection is used as an evidential, indicating that the speaker does not have first-hand knowledge of the referent. Participles are used not only in relative clauses but also in some question and complement clause constructions (5.4. and 5.6, respectively), so a discussion of participle morphology and syntax is in order at this relatively early point in the chapter. The section begins with a description of participle morphology, including tense marking, followed by a discussion of some syntactic issues involving relative clauses. The final part of the section discusses the pragmatic conditions under which interrogative participles are used. The basic scheme for participle formation is as follows:

(50) IC + Verb.stem + Subj.(&Obj).Agr + Head.suffix

‘IC’ stands for the ablaut rule of initial change. As explained in footnote 3, initial change applies to the initial syllable of the verb stem changing short *a*, *e*, *i* to long *e*’, short *o* to *we*’, and leaving long vowels unchanged. (In the examples of this chapter, the output of initial change is underlined when the rule changes the quality or quantity of the vowel, but not when it applies vacuously to a long vowel.) ‘Subj.(&Obj).Agr’ stands for the suffix or suffixes encoding subject and object of the verb of the relative clause. Conjunct order suffixes are used for conjunct participles and interrogative order suffixes are used for interrogative participles (see appendix). The subject and object agreement is followed by a suffix indicating features of the head of the relative clause. The suffixes for third person heads are listed below:

(51)	a.	-a	anim. prox. sg.	(3)
	b.	-iki	anim. prox. pl.	(3p)
	c.	-ini	anim. obv. sg.	(3’)
	d.	-ihi	anim. obv. pl.	(3’p)
	e.	-i	inan. sg.	(0)
	f.	-ini	inan. pl.	(0p)

The head suffixes are identical to the suffixes found on the ‘that’ series of demonstrative pronouns (3.8).⁸

To see how the inflectional scheme of (50) works, consider the conjunct participle *me·hkate·wi·ta* in the following example.

⁸ Participles with nonthird person heads are formed identically to aorist conjunct inflection: e.g. *e·hikhwe·wiyakwe* ‘we (incl.) who are women’ A104A; *e·hmehtose·neniwiyani* ‘you who are a human being’ R66.42.

- (52) oškinawe·ha me·hkate·wi·ta
 young.man fast 3/part/3
 ‘A young man who fasted’ L.title

me·hkate·wi·ta ‘(the one) who fasted’ may be broken down as follows:

- (53) IC + *mahkate·wi·* + *t* + *a*
 fast 3 (subject) 3 (head)

The verb stem is *mahkate·wi·*- ‘fast’. Initial change applies to the vowel of the initial syllable of the stem, changing the short *a* to long *e·*. The subject of the verb ‘fast’ in (52) is proximate animate third person singular, expressed by the conjunct order suffix *-t*. Moreover, the head of the relative clause in (52) is also proximate animate third person singular, agreeing with the features of the noun *oškinawe·ha* ‘young man’. The features of the head of the relative clause are expressed by the head suffix *-a*. (Note that in the interlinear gloss of (52) the first ‘3’ in the formula ‘3/part/3’ identifies the category of the subject and the final symbol identifies the category of the head of the relative clause.)

Two points to notice about the syntax of relative clauses may be mentioned here. First, there is no relative pronoun in Meskwaki; that is, no separate word corresponding to ‘who’ in the translation of (52). Instead, the head suffix on the participle performs the functions of a relative pronoun: it identifies the construction as a relative clause, it provides grammatical information about the head of the relative clause, and it must be coreferential with some element in the lower S. Second, there is no ‘gap’ in the inflection of the verb of the relative clause. The head of the relative clause in (52) is coreferential with the subject of the verb, and the verb bears separate inflection for both a proximate singular subject and a proximate singular head of the relative clause.

The head suffixes on conjunct participles are like other instances of third person inflection in Meskwaki in that they may function either as agreement or pronominally. When a participle is used to modify a noun, as in (52), the head suffix on the participle agrees with the noun in person, number, gender, and obviation. Participles may also appear on their own, however, in which case the head suffix functions as a pronominal head of the relative clause (‘the one(s) who ...’), as in the following examples.

- (54) ne·wakiki
 see 1–3(p)/part/3p
 ‘the ones whom I saw’ W346J

- (55) me·wi–pesetawa·čiki te·powa·ničihī
 go.to–listen.to 3p–3’/part/3p hold.council 3’/part/3’p
 ‘the ones (prox) who went to listen to the ones (obv) holding a council’ W326F

- (56) pwa·wi–otapeno·heminičihī
 not–have.children 3’/part/3’p
 ‘the ones (obv) who do not have children’ W151J

In (54) the verb stem is *ne·w-* ‘see’; since the vowel of the initial syllable is long, initial change does not alter the vowel. In (55) there are two participles, each with a pronominal head. The first is formed from the compound stem *mawi-pesetaw-* ‘go to listen to’; initial change applies to the initial syllable of the leftmost preverb in compound stems. The second participle in (55) functions as the object of the first participle, and is formed from the stem *tepowe-* ‘hold a council, meeting’.⁹

(56) shows that relative clauses are negated with the preverb *pwa·wi-* ‘not’; here the initial syllable of the preverb contains a long vowel, so initial change produces no change in the vowel.

More examples illustrating how relative clauses may be used within NPs are provided below:

(57) a·neta ke·htesi·hiničih
 some be.old.dim 3’/part/3’p
 ‘some of the old folks (obv)’ (i.e. the ones who are old) N5B

(58) i·nini [ne·sa·čini pačana]
 that.anim.obv kill 3–3’/part/3’ Lazybones
 ‘that one (obv) whom Lazybones (prox) killed’ L306

(59) i·nini we·nekwi·kaniničini neniwani
 that.anim.obv have.wings 3’/part/3’ man.obv
 ‘that man (obv) with wings’ N14G

(60) me·nwawita neniwa me·nwito·to·hka
 do.right 3/part/3 man treat.O.well 3–2/part/3
 ‘a well-behaved man who treats you well’ A181E

(57) and (58) are examples of a relative clause used with a quantifier and demonstrative pronoun, respectively. (59) shows a relative clause preceding the noun it modifies (and following a demonstrative pronoun); (60) contains two relative clauses, one preceding the noun it modifies and one following.

Nonrestrictive relative clauses are formed in the same way as restrictive relative clauses:

(61) kehči–maneto·wa ahpemeki e·wita
 great–spirit up.above be.[there] 3/part/3
 ‘the Great Spirit, who is up above’ W308D

⁹ (55) also illustrates two idiosyncratic features of participle morphology. First, stems ending in *e·* (such as *tepowe-* ‘hold a council’) change the *e·* to *a·* when inflected as a participle where the head is coreferential to a third person subject or possessor of subject. Second, the suffix *-wa·*, used to mark third person proximate plural arguments in the conjunct order, is deleted if the head of the relative clause is third person proximate plural. That is, the first participle in (55) is *me·wi-pesetawa·čiki*, not **me·wi-pesetawa·wa·čiki*. (See Goddard 1987 for more discussion.)

It is clear that the relative clause of (61) is nonrestrictive: there are many spirits in Meskwaki religion, but only one spirit who is known as *kehči-maneto-wa* ‘the Great Spirit’.

An extremely common relative clause construction in Meskwaki is one in which the head of the relative clause is coreferential to an oblique argument of the lower verb. In such cases, the head suffix is nearly always *-i* (inanimate singular); the inanimate plural head suffix *-ini* is sometimes used to indicate multiple locations, as will be seen below. To see how such relative clauses are formed, consider the following two examples, each with a verb containing the relative root *ot-* in the stem-initial position or in a preverb. As explained in 1.2.3, verbs containing this morpheme are subcategorized for an oblique argument expressing source or cause. The examples below are relative clauses with pronominal heads, in which the head is coreferential to the oblique argument expressing source or cause:

- (62) we·či·wa·či
 be.from 3p/part/obl
 ‘the place from which they came’ M11K (stem *oči-*)
- (63) we·či-pwa·wi-kosaki
 from-not-fear 1-3/part/obl
 ‘the reason why I’m not afraid of him’ W59K
 (compound stem *oči-pwa·wi-kos-*)

Participles in which the head is coreferential to an oblique argument of the lower verb will be marked ‘obl’ in the interlinear gloss.

Examples of relative clauses in which the head is coreferential with obliques of other types are given below. The relative root *in-* (preverb *iši-*) is associated with obliques of goal or manner; with quoting verbs, the words spoken function as an oblique argument of manner. The relative root *ahpi·ht-* (preverb *ahpi·hči-*) ‘to such an extent’ is used with scalar notions such as age, weight, speed, etc.

- (64) e·šiweto·wa·či
 take.O.thither 3p-0/part/obl
 ‘the place to which they took it’ (stem *išiwet-*)
- (65) e·šinehkawa·či
 chase.O.thither 3-3’/part/obl
 ‘the place to which he chased him’ (stem *išinehkaw-*)
- (66) e·nena·ni
 say.thus.to 1-2/part/obl
 ‘that which I said to you’ W144H (stem *in-*)
- (67) e·na·hpawa·či
 dream.thus 3/part/obl
 ‘what he dreamed’ L15 (stem *ina·hpawa-*)

- (68) e·ši–mya·neteki
 thus–be.bad 0/part/obl
 ‘a bad way’ (a way which is bad) W23F
 (compound stem *iši–mya·net-*)
- (69) e·hpi·hči–kehkya·ya·ni
 to.such.extent–be.old 1/part/obl
 ‘how old I am’ (the extent to which I am old) A44G
 (compound stem *ahpi·hči–kehkya·-*)

Relative clauses in which the head is coreferential to an oblique argument expressing stationary location are formed in an idiosyncratic way. The ablaut rule of initial change does not apply; instead the aorist prefix *e·h-* is attached to the verb stem. This is true both for verbs containing the relative root *tan-* (preverb *taši-*), associated with stationary location, and for verbs like *owi·ki-* ‘dwell’, which are subcategorized for an oblique of stationary location even though they do not contain *tan-*.¹⁰

- (70) e·htaši–komisahekoči
 there–swallow 3’–3/part/loc.obl
 ‘the place where [the whale, obv] swallowed her up’ W266L
- (71) e·hawaneči e·howi·kiwa·či
 carry X–3/aor dwell 3p/part/loc.obl
 ‘He_i was carried to the place where they_{i+j} lived.’ N2O
 (i.e., the house where he and his family live)
- (72) e·hpenopenowa·či e·howi·kiwa·čini
 redup.set.out 3p/aor dwell 3p/part/pl.loc.obl
 ‘They set out for the places where they lived.’ W368
 (i.e., each going to his own house)
- (73) kehči–ma·wa·ka·ni [e·hma·nwikamikesiniči aša·hahi]
 great–winter.camp have.many.houses 3’/part/loc.obl Sioux.obv
 ‘a big winter-camp where the Sioux (obv) had many houses’ M7D

In (71), the proximate object of ‘carry’ must be interpreted as part of the proximate plural subject of the relative clause, hence the overlapping reference in the gloss. (72) is an example of the inanimate plural head suffix *-ini* being used to indicate multiple locations (compare (71), where the people involved all live in the same house). (73) demonstrates that relative clauses in which the

¹⁰ The only exception to this rule are participles in which the preverb *a·mi-* ‘would, could, should’ is used: here the aorist prefix is not used and initial change applies instead:

- (i) a·mi–tašisenye·henako·we=‘yo·we
 would–let.O.eat.[there] 1–2p/part/loc.obl=past
 ‘where I would have let you (pl) feast’ R140.37

head is coreferential to an oblique argument of the lower verb may be used to modify a head noun, though their use with pronominal heads is more common.

We now turn to the question of marking tense on verbs inflected as participles. Participles which are unmarked for tense are used in relative clauses with either a present tense or a past tense interpretation: e.g., *me·hkate·wi·ta* in (52) could be ‘the one who is fasting’ or ‘the one who fasted’. If the future prefix *wi·h-* is used, it marks the verb of the relative clause as future:

(74) *wi·htepa·načiki*
 fut.love 2–3(p)/part/3p
 ‘the ones whom you will love’ W362

(75) *wi·hanemi–ma·mi·čiči* *owi·ya·si*
 fut.away–redup.eat 3–0/part/0 meat
 ‘meat for him to eat on his journey’ N22I

(76) *wi·hiyani*
 fut.say.thus 2/part/obl
 ‘what you will say’ N22J

If the future prefix *wi·h-* is present, it counts as part of the verb stem for the purposes of initial change (since the vowel of *wi·h-* is already long, initial change does not alter it). Relative clauses in which the head is coreferential with an oblique argument of stationary location mark future tense by replacing the aorist prefix with the future prefix:

(77) *wi·howi·kiyani*
 fut.dwell 2/part/loc.obl
 ‘the place where you will live’ A40F

If the time of the verb of the relative clause is past relative to the time of a past tense main clause, this may be indicated by using the PAST CONJUNCT PARTICIPLE inflectional paradigm. In the past conjunct participle paradigm, the suffix *-ehe* replaces the head suffix. Some examples of past conjunct participles are provided below.

(78) *ki·wi–na·na·kana·tehe*
 around–redup.follow 3–3’/past.part/3
 ‘the one (prox) who had been following him (obv) around’ W103A

(79) *we·či·wa·tehe*
 be.from 3p/past.part/obl
 ‘the place where they had come from’ W21H

(80) *e·hne·taki* [*e·htašihemetehē* *okwisani*]
 see 3–0/aor attack X–3’/past.part/loc.obl his.son.obv
 ‘He (prox) saw the place where his son (obv) had been attacked.’ L103

The future prefix may be used with the past conjunct participle inflection to indicate unfulfilled intentions or a past modal reading:

- (81) wi·hkekye·hkima·tehe
 fut.teach 3–3'/past.part/0
 'that which he (prox) was going to teach them (obv)' W133L
- (82) wi·hinenekehe
 fut.say.thus.to X–2/past.part/obl
 'what they (unspec) were going to say to you' M25C
- (83) i·ni=ke·hi wi·hišiyanehe
 that=but fut.say.thus.to 2–1/past.part/obl
 'But that is what you should have told me.' W591

In the relative clauses given so far, we have seen examples of the head of the relative clause being coreferential to the subject of the verb inflected as a participle (52, 55–57, 59, 60, 78), to the object (54, 58, 61, 74, 75), to the second object (81), and to an oblique argument (62–73, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82, 83). However, the role of the coreferential element in the lower S is not restricted to arguments of the highest verb in the relative clause. For example, the head of the relative clause may be coreferential with the possessor of a noun within the lower S:

- (84) i·na ihkwe·wa [ona·pe·mani ne·hi–mi·hkečihwa·nita]
 that woman her.husband.obv know.how–doctor.people 3'/part/3
 'that woman (prox) whose husband (obv) was a doctor' M30M
- (85) [o·swa·wahi ne·peničiki] apeno·haki
 their.fathers.obv die 3'/part/3p children
 'children (prox) whose fathers (obv) have died' R268.18

In both (84) and (85) the participle is inflected for an obviative subject and a proximate head of the relative clause (proximate singular in (84), marked by the final suffix *-a*, and proximate plural in (85), marked by *-iki*). In both the head of the relative clause is coreferential with the possessor of the subject of the lower verb.

It is also possible to have long distance relativization, where the head of the relative clause corresponds to an argument of a complement clause:

- (86) i·na ša·kwe·nemoya·na wi·hne·waki
 that.anim be.unwilling 1/part/3 fut.see 1–3/aor
 'That's the person I don't want to see.'
- (87) a·čimoyana e·haka·wa·šiči wi·hne·wiči
 report 2/part/3 want 3–1/aor fut.see 3–1/aor
 'the one you said wanted to see me'

The head of the relative clause in (86) is coreferential with the object of the verb in the complement clause. The matrix verb is inflected as a participle with a third person singular head, while the verb of the complement clause does not take participle inflection. Instead the lower verb bears future aorist inflection, appropriate for complement clauses (5.6). Likewise, in (87) the head of the relative clause is coreferential to the subject of the complement clause. Only the highest verb is inflected as a participle.

The next example (from Goddard 1987:113) is of particular interest: here the head of the relative clause is coreferential with the object of an adjunct clause (the ‘if’ clause).

- (88) *na·tawino·ni* [*menoke* *a·mi-kaški-oni·ča·nesiki*]
 medicine drink X-0/subjunct would-able-have.child X/part/0
 ‘a medicine that, if one drinks it, one would be able to have children’ A192F

The verb inflected as a participle is *a·mi-kaški-oni·ča·nesiki* ‘one would be able to have children’, with the inanimate singular head suffix *-i* agreeing with the features of *na·tawino·ni* ‘medicine’. However, the head is coreferential to the object of *menoke* ‘if one drinks it’, which is inflected in the subjunctive paradigm (5.8).

If a relative clause is used to modify a noun (or, more accurately, N’), in nearly all cases the N’ being modified will be external to the relative clause: either to the left of the relative clause (52, 60, 61, 73, 84, 88) or to the right (59, 60, 75, 85). However, a few examples have been found of relative clauses in which the N’ being modified is internal to the relative clause. Note the position of *aša·haki* ‘Sioux’ in the following example:

- (89) *i·niye·ka* [*pe·minehkawa·čiki* ***aša·haki*** *ihkwe·wani*]
 those.absent chase 3p-3’/part/3p Sioux.pl woman.obv
 ‘those aforementioned Sioux (prox) who were chasing the woman (obv)’ R48.1

The relative clause modifies *aša·haki* ‘Sioux’, identifying them as the ones chasing the woman, but the noun appears between the verb inflected as a participle and *ihkwe·wani* ‘woman’, the object of the relative clause. However, examples in which the N’ being modified is clearly internal to the relative clause are rare.¹¹

Section 5.2. described the use of various inflectional paradigms to express modal or evidential distinctions in main clauses. For example, the potential paradigm is used to express ‘would; could; might’ in main clauses. In relative clauses, however, the potential paradigm is not available, because the verb of the relative clause must be inflected as a participle. Instead, the preverb *a·mi-* ‘would; could; should’ is compounded with the verb of the relative clause to express modal notions:

¹¹ Note that (60) is not an example of an internally-headed relative clause, but is rather an example of two stacked relative clauses, one preceding the N’ it modifies and the other following its N’:

[_{N’} [_S *me·nwawita*] [_{N’} *neniwa*]] [_S *me·nwito·to·hka*]
 ‘a [_{N’} [well-behaved] [_{N’} man]] [who treats you well]’

- (90) a·mi–ona·pe·miyana
would–have.O2.as.husband 2/part/3
‘the one whom you would marry’ W359
- (91) a·mi–pwa·wi–nese·kwiki
would–not–kill 2p–3(p)/part/3p
‘the ones whom you (pl) would not kill’ W152I
- (92) a·mi–išawiyani
should–do.thus 2/part/obl
‘what you should do’ W345M

An example of *a·mi–* glossed as ‘could’ may be found in (61). *a·mi–* is used only with verbs inflected as participles, not with any other type of inflection.

Evidential distinctions comparable to those discussed in 5.2.2. for main clauses may be expressed in relative clauses by inflecting the verb of the relative clause as an INTERROGATIVE PARTICIPLE. For example, interrogative participles are used when the speaker presumes that the referent of the NP exists but does not have firsthand knowledge of it:

- (93) we·meso·ta·niwane·hiki
have.O2.as.parent 2/int.part/3p
‘whoever your parents were’ W19B
(said by a young man to an old woman)
- (94) e·howi·kikwe·hiki=mekoho ma·hiye·ka mehtose·neniwaki
dwell 3p/int.part/loc.obl=emph these.absent people
‘wherever these (absent) people might be living’ W108D
- (95) ke·waki=koči kenenehke·neta·petoke
still=of.course think.about 2–0/dub
- [kekyā e·nahina·čimohenokwe·ni]
your.mother redup.instruct.thus 3–2/int.part/obl
- ‘I suppose, of course, you must still think about
whatever your mother used to tell you.’ A139D

In (93), the speaker presumes that the addressee, like everyone else, had parents, but since he is too young to have known her parents he uses an interrogative participle to refer to them. Similarly, in (94) the people who have left (referred to with an absentative demonstrative pronoun) are presumably living somewhere, but the speaker does not know where that place is. (Note that interrogative participles in which the head is coreferential with an oblique expressing stationary location take the aorist prefix *e·h-* instead of initial change, just as in the conjunct participle inflection.) In (95), the speaker is again presuming that the addressee was instructed by her mother, but since he was not present during the instruction he uses an interrogative participle to refer to

what the addressee was told. (Note also the use of dubitative inflection on the main verb in (95): it is also speculation on the part of the speaker that the addressee still thinks about what she was told.)

Interrogative participles are also used if the speaker does not presuppose the existence of the referent:

- (96) ne·sa·kwe·na
kill 3-3'/int.part/3
'whoever kills him' [if anyone] L120
- (97) wi·hona·pe·miwane·na
fut.have.O2.as.husband 2/int.part/3
'whoever you may marry' [if anyone] A66F
- (98) e·hčahkwi·temya·hikwe·ni
be.shallow.water 0/int.part/loc.obl
'wherever the water might be shallow' [if anywhere] O7C

In this use an interrogative participle is often found as the object of verbs like *natone·h-* 'search for', where the existence of the object need not be presupposed:

- (99) e·hnatone·hamowa·čiči=ke·hi wi·hpwa·wi-taši-kemiya·nikwe·ni
search.for 3p-0/aor=and fut.not-there-rain 0'/int.part/loc.obl
'And they were looking for a place where it would not rain' R138.47

((99) also illustrates the use of the negative preverb *pwa·wi-* in interrogative participles.)

5.4. Questions

Now that the morphology and syntax of participle inflection has been explained, we can return to a consideration of main clause phenomena. This section will describe the formation of main clause questions: question word questions in 5.4.1, yes-no questions in 5.4.2, and alternative questions in 5.4.3.

5.4.1. Question word questions

There are two syntactic constructions associated with question-word questions, both of which have the question word at the left of the clause, in Focus position (8.4).¹² Most question-word questions are framed as an equational sentence, in which the question word is equated with a relative clause with a pronominal head (5.3). This construction is found with the question words beginning in *w* (*we·ne·ha* 'who?', *we·kone·hi* 'what?') and those beginning in *ta·* (e.g. *ta·ni*

¹² It should be noted that in Mesquakie culture direct question-word questions are considered rude in many situations. One way of avoiding a question-word question is to use a yes-no question like the following: *o·=nekotahi ketoči?* 'Oh, you come from someplace?' W572 (in place of 'Where do you come from?').]

‘where?’, *ta·tepi* ‘whither?; whence?’).¹³ To ask, for example, ‘What did I forget?’, one literally says ‘What is [that which I forgot]?’:

- (100) *we·kone·h=ča·h* *wē·ni·hke·ya·ni?*
 what=so forget 1/part/0
 ‘What did I forget?’ W218B

Note that Meskwaki has a zero copula in this and other equational constructions. More examples of question-word questions using the equational construction are given below:¹⁴

- (101) *we·ne·h=ča·hi i·ni* *e·ta?*
 who=so that say 3/part/3
 ‘Who said that?’ W156N [stem *i-* ‘say thus’ + suffixes *-ta*]
- (102) *we·kone·hi* *wi·hoči–kya·tama·ti·yakwe*
 what fut.from–hide.O2.from.recip 21/part/obl
 ‘Why should we conceal it from each other?’ B105:88.9–10.
- (103) *ta·tepi=ya·pi* *wē·či·yani?*
 whence=may.I.ask be.from 2/part/obl
 ‘Where did you come from?’ W851
- (104) *ta·ni=ča·hi* *e·howi·kiwa·či?*
 where=so dwell 3p/part/loc.obl
 ‘Where do they live?’ W124N

The question word *ta·ni* may be used not only for ‘where?’ (stationary location), as in (104), but also for other oblique notions:

- (105) *ta·ni=ya·pi* *e·hpi·hčiwanakesiyani?*
 how=may.I.ask weigh.so.much 2/part/obl
 ‘How much do you weigh?’ W1000

The other syntactic construction is found with question-words beginning in *k*: *kaši* ‘how?’, *ke·swi* ‘how many?’ and *ke·senwi* ‘how many times?’.¹⁵ Questions with these question words are typically followed by a main clause verb, rather than an equational construction with a zero copula. The main clause verb is often inflected in the INDEPENDENT INDICATIVE.

- (106) *kaši=ča·hi* *išina·kosiwaki?*
 how=so appear.thus 3p/ind.ind
 ‘How did they look?’ W346P

¹³ The stem *we·ne·h-* ‘who?’ may also be incorporated into a verb; see 6.3.2.

¹⁴ The enclitics *=ča·hi* ‘so’ and *=ya·pi* ‘may I say/ask’ often occur with question-word questions and soften the force of the question.

¹⁵ The stem *ke·sw-* ‘how many?’ may also be incorporated into a verb; see 6.3.2. and 7.3.

- (107) *kaši=ča·h* *keto·tawa·wa?*
 how=so do.thus.to 2-3/ind.ind
 ‘What did you do to him?’ W126D
- (108) *kaši=ya·pi* *išisowaki* *ko·šisemaki?*
 how=may.I.ask be.thus.named 3p/ind.ind your.grandchildren
 ‘What are your grandsons’ names?’ W573
- (109) *ke·swi* *ki·hnemato* *kepiwani?*
 how.many fut.set.up 2-0/ind.ind twigs
 ‘How many twigs will you set up?’ J20.6
- (110) *ke·senwi=ya·pi* *keno·ta·ke*
 how.many.times=may.I.ask hear 2/ind.ind
i·niya *wi·čawiwaka* *e·hpakamaki?*
 that.absent live with 1-3/part/3 hit 1-3/aor
 ‘Exactly how many times did you hear that I hit my late wife?’ A145E

In both constructions, negative questions are formed with the preverb *pwa·wi-*:

- (111) *ta·ni=ye·toke* *e·ši-pwa·wi-kehke·netame·kwe?*
 how=it.seems thus-not-know 2p-0/part/obl
 ‘How can you not know about them (inan)?’ R54.28
- (112) *kaši=we·ča·h* *keteši-pwa·wi-po·ni-mahkate·wi·na·wa?*
 how=rather=so thus-not-stop-make.fast 2-3/ind.ind
 ‘So why don’t you let him stop fasting, then?’ L69

The modal and evidential distinctions discussed in 5.2. for main clause statements may also be expressed in question-word questions. For the question words beginning in *k*, the main clause verb may be inflected in the DUBITATIVE, PLAIN INTERROGATIVE, or POTENTIAL paradigms.

- (113) *kaši=‘yo=mana* *išawi·toke?*
 how=of.course=this.anim fare.thus 3/dub
 ‘What’s the matter with this guy, I wonder?’ W11H
- (114) *kaši=ča·h=ki·na* *išawiwane·ni?*
 how=so=you fare.thus 2/interr
 ‘What has happened to you?’ W128O
- (115) *kaši=ča·h* *to·tawiye·kapa* *ki·ši-nesate?*
 how=so do.thus.to 2-3/pot perf-kill 2-3/subjunct
 ‘What would you do to him after you kill him?’ W189H

Dubitative inflection, as in (113), softens the force of the question; the addressee is not forced to supply an answer. In (114), plain interrogative inflection is used because the speaker deduces

something must have happened to the addressee (the addressee's face is swollen from bee stings). In (115), potential inflection is used on the verb to ask about a hypothetical situation.

In the equational construction, a modal question may be formed by adding the preverb *a·mi-* 'could; would; should' to the relative clause:

- (116) *ta·ni=ya·pi* *a·mi- 'ši-mata·kwa·čimekosiya·ke?*
 how=may.I.ask could-thus-be.talked.about.interestingly 1p/part/obl
 'How could we (excl) be talked about in an interesting way?' W187A

The relative clause in the equational construction may also be inflected as an INTERROGATIVE PARTICIPLE if the speaker does not presuppose the existence of the referent:

- (117) *we·kone·hi* *wi·hmi·čiwa·ne·ni?*
 what fut.eat 1-0/int.part/0
 'What will I eat (if there is anything to eat)?' B114:70.33-34

Interrogative participle inflection is also used in another construction expressing evidential question-word questions. In this construction, the question word is omitted; the inflection for the head of the relative clause on the interrogative participle identifies the element being questioned:

- (118) *e·šawikwe·ni= 'škwē* *nekwisa?*
 fare.thus 3/int.part/obl=woman's.exclam my.son
 'I wonder how my son is doing?' R116.43
- (119) *e·hawiwe·kwe·ni,* *maneto·tike?*
 be.there 2p/int.part/loc.obl spirit.voc.pl
 'I wonder where you are, spirits?' R509.29
- (120) *we·yo·siwakwe·na=ni·hka,* *nesese?*
 have.O2.as.father 21/int.part/3=man's.exclam elder.brother.voc
 'I wonder who our father is, brother?' W276G

This construction is identical to the formation of interrogative complement clauses (5.6.2), which take interrogative participle inflection on the verb and do not contain a question word. The use of this construction for a main clause question, however, functions as an evidential, softening the force of the question.

5.4.2. Yes-no questions

The verb of a yes-no question may be inflected in any paradigm appropriate for main clauses. The INDEPENDENT INDICATIVE is the most frequently encountered paradigm in positive yes-no questions:¹⁶

¹⁶ Yes-no questions are distinguished from the corresponding declarative statements by rising intonation and a shift in stress (Goddard 1991:160). Compare the stress pattern of the following utterances:

(121) nešihka kepya?
 alone come 2/ind.ind
 ‘Did you come alone?’ C5C

(122) ayo·h=nekotahi kepo·ni·pwa?
 here=somewhere camp 2p/ind.ind
 ‘Are you people camping somewhere nearby?’ K103C

Negative yes-no questions take *a·kwi* ‘not’ and a verb inflected in the NEGATIVE paradigm, just as negative assertions do.

(123) a·kwi owi·wičini?
 not have.wife 3/neg
 ‘Isn’t he married?’ W845

(124) a·kwi=ya·pi na·hk ahto·yanini makiminani?
 not=may.I.ask again have 2–0/neg big.berries
 ‘Don’t you have any more big berries?’ J250.13

The inflectional paradigms discussed in 5.2. which express modal or evidential functions may also be used with yes-no questions. For example, the DUBITATIVE may be used to make a query less direct and peremptory:

(125) i·ninah=we·na ki·šite·toke?
 then=rather be.finished.cooking 0/dub
 ‘Is it finished cooking, I wonder?’ J260.20

POTENTIAL inflection may be used to ask about a hypothetical situation:

(126) a·nawi=meke –kočawihkakoha wi·hnana·hkwi·yakwe?
 fail.to=emph –try 21/pot fut.fight.back 21/aor
 ‘After all, would we (incl) fail to try to defend ourselves?’ B105:80.4

(127) i·na=we·na kotaka ona·pe·miyanehe
 that=rather other take.O2.as.husband 2/unreal
 i·ni ke·ko·h iši–mi·nenene·ha?
 that anything thus–give X–2/pot
 ‘If you had married that other one,
 would you have been given anything like that?’ A92FG

i.	kí·ši–na·kwé·wa perf–leave 3/ind.ind ‘He’s already left’	ii.	kí·ši–ná·kwe· <u>wa?</u> perf–leave 3/ind.ind ‘Has he already left?’
----	--	-----	--

In (i), the stress falls on the penultimate syllable of the verb *na·kwe·wa*. In the yes-no question in (ii), however, the stress is shifted to the antepenultimate syllable. Question-word questions do not display this intonational pattern, however; they pattern together with statements.

PROHIBITIVE inflection may be used to express possibility, especially regarding an unwelcome situation:

- (128) a·hkwamatakani?
 be sick 2-0/proh
 ‘Are you perhaps sick?’ A168F

As discussed in 5.2.2, the future prefix (*w*)*i·h-* plus independent indicative inflection often has a modal reading of obligation in statements. In yes-no questions with first person subjects, however, the future prefix expresses a request for permission:

- (129) ni·hmaw–anenwi?
 fut.go–swim 1/ind.ind
 ‘May I go swimming?’ A14D
- (130) ni·hki·wa·pama·pena=ča·hi?
 fut.go.around.looking.at 1p-3(p)/ind.ind=so
 ‘May we go around and look at them?’ WIT70

Modal and evidential yes-no questions are negated in the same way as modal and evidential statements: potential verbs take the negative particle *awita*; dubitative verbs are negated with the preverb *pwa·wi-*.

- (131) awita=ye·toke kaški–mawa·patakakoha
 not=I.suppose able–go.to.look.at 21-0/pot
 ‘Mightn’t we be able to go look at it?’ R194.1
- (132) pwa·wi–natone·hwe·toke pešekisiwani?
 not–look.for 3-3’/dub deer.obv
 ‘I suppose he (prox) doesn’t hunt deer (obv)?’ J58.12

5.4.3. Alternative questions

Alternative questions are of the form ‘Is it X? or is it Y?’, usually implying that these alternatives exhaust the set of possibilities. Like the alternative statement construction (5.2.), the verbs in alternative questions are inflected with the PROHIBITIVE or DUBITATIVE paradigms.

- (133) nešihka=ke·hi tepowe·hka·ke,
 alone=and hold.council 1p/proh
- o=meso·te·we=ke·hi tepowe·hka·ke?
 or=all=and hold.council 1p/proh
 ‘Should we [two] meet alone,
 or should all of us meet?’ W320

- (134) pwa·wi—=ke·h=ni·hka —oki·hka·ke
 not—=and=man's.exclam —have.mother 1p/proh
 o=meše=ke·hi netoki·pena·toke?
 or have.mother 1p/dub
 'Do we not have a mother, or do we have a mother?' W266DE

(134) is a question asked by two orphaned boys to their grandmother.

5.5. Commands

There are four different paradigms used for expressing commands: the imperative, the injunctive, the future imperative, and the prohibitive. (The prohibitive and future imperative are formally very similar (see Goddard 1985 for discussion).) The IMPERATIVE is used for positive commands with second person or first person inclusive plural subjects, where the action is to be carried out in the immediate future.

- (135) peteki iha·no!
 back go 2/imp
 'Go back!' L240
- (136) ata·we·neniwa mawi—wa·pama·ta·we
 trader go—look.at 21—3/imp
 'Let's go see the trader.' R62.29

For third person subjects the INJUNCTIVE paradigm is used.

- (137) natawi—či·tapiče
 stop.to—sit.up 3/injunct
 'She is to sit up for a while.' A111G
- (138) wa·se·ya·če
 be.light 0/injunct
 'Let there be light.' W311
- (139) pemwiče
 shoot 3—1/injunct
 'Let him shoot me!' W1063

The FUTURE IMPERATIVE paradigm is used for positive commands to be carried out in the (remote) future.

- (140) i·ni=meko e·šimeneki išawihkani
 that=emph say.thus.to X—2/part/obl do.thus 2/fut.imp
 'Do [later on] exactly what you were told.' W37B

In one sense, of course, all commands have future tense: the desired action is to be carried out subsequent to the moment of speaking. Commands with the future imperative, however, mark the action as one to be carried out at some remove from the moment of speaking, not in the immediate future. For example in (140), the speaker is urging her young grandson to conduct himself properly when he reaches adulthood.

The examples so far have all been positive commands. Negative commands are expressed by *ka·ta* ‘don’t’ plus a verb inflected in the PROHIBITIVE paradigm.

(141) *ka·ta i·ni inowe·hkani!*
 don’t that speak.thus 2/proh
 ‘Don’t talk that way!’ L132

(142) *ka·ta=ča·h=ke·ko·hi tepa·tamawiye·kakwe keta·hi·nemena·ni*
 don’t=so=anything be.stingy.with.O2.to 21–3(p)/proh our.thing
 ‘Let’s not be stingy towards them with any of our things.’ W446

There may also be logical double negation in negative commands, expressed by adding the negative preverb *pwa·wi-* to the verb.

(143) *ka·ta i·ni pwa·wi–ište·he·hke·ko, no·šisemetike*
 don’t that not–think.thus 2p/proh grandchild.voc.pl
 ‘Don’t fail to think about that, grandchildren.’ W169F

ka·ta plus a verb in the prohibitive may also be used for third person subjects.

(144) *ka·ta owiye·ha no·ta nowi·hkiče*
 don’t anyone too.soon go.out 3/proh
 ‘Let no one go out too soon.’ R200.9–10

(145) *ka·ta=na·hka owiye·ha ke·ko·hi iši–ka·čimenakiče*
 don’t=again anyone any.way thus–push.by.speech 3–2/proh
 ‘Don’t let anyone talk you into anything again.’ W313

As mentioned in 5.2, the future prefix used with independent indicative or negative inflection often has a modal reading of ‘should’. Such forms are another, more indirect, way of expressing commands. Example (33) is repeated below:

(146) *ki·howi·wi*
 fut.have.a.wife 2/ind.ind
 ‘You should get married.’ M25L

5.6. Complement clauses

Complement clauses are subordinate clauses subcategorized for by the matrix verb; they may express a statement (declarative complement) or a question (interrogative complement).¹⁷ This section will first describe the inflection of verbs in declarative complements, and then take up interrogative complements in 5.6.2. In Meskwaki, a complement clause may bear one of two grammatical relations to the matrix verb—Comp or oblique, as discussed in 1.2. Whether the clause as a whole is functioning as Comp or as an oblique argument of the matrix verb has no effect on the inflection of the lower verb, however, as will be seen in the examples below.

5.6.1. Declarative complements

The verb in a declarative complement clause is typically inflected in the AORIST CONJUNCT. The following examples illustrate aorist conjunct inflection in complement clauses bearing the Comp function.

- (147) nemata·kwe·neta [COMP e·hanenwi·ya·ni]
enjoy 1–0/ind.ind swim 1/aor
'I enjoyed swimming' A14C
- (148) asemihekwa=meko [COMP e·hahte·himinehke·či]
help 3'–3/ind.ind=emph pick.strawberries 3/aor
'He (obv) really helped her (prox) pick strawberries.' A69E
- (149) e·hkehke·nemekowa·či [COMP e·haka·wa·tamowa·či]
know 3'–3p/aor want 3p–0/aor
[COMP wi·hkehči–ni·miwa·či]
fut.greatly–dance 3p/aor
'They (obv) knew that they (prox) wanted to dance vigorously' R218.42
- (150) neša·kwe·nemo=meko [COMP ke·ko·hi wi·hinena·ni]
be.unwilling 1/ind.ind=emph anything fut.say.thus.to 1–2/aor
'I really don't want to tell you anything' W788
- (151) ki·na=koči kekohta [COMP wi·hneseneki]
you=obviously fear 2–0/ind.ind fut.kill X–2/aor
'You yourself are afraid of being killed' W421
- (152) e·ha·naha·nawihto·wa·či=meko [COMP wi·hpwa·wi–ni·miwa·či]
redup.fail.to 3p–0/aor=emph fut.not–dance 3p/aor
'None of them could help dancing' R124.10
(lit., 'They each failed to [not dance]')

¹⁷ It should be noted that certain classes of complement clause constructions in English often correspond to preverb-verb compounds in Meskwaki (e.g. the preverbs *koči-* 'try', *we pi-* 'begin', *po ni-* 'stop', etc). See 6.2. for discussion of preverbs.

Nonfuture aorist complements ((147), (148), and the higher Comp clause of (149) are used for realized, actual events, while the future aorist (the lower Comp clause of (149), (150), (151), and (152)) expresses unrealized, potential events. (152) shows that complement clauses are negated with the preverb *pwa·wi-*. (The distributive reading of (152) is due to the reduplication of the matrix verb.)

In addition to the many matrix verbs which are subcategorized for a clausal argument, there are also a few particles which take a complement clause bearing the Comp function.¹⁸ For example, *a·kwi kana·kwa* ‘impossible’ often occurs with a complement clause containing a verb inflected in the future aorist:

- (153) *a·kwi=meko kana·kwa* [_{COMP} *i·tepi wi·ha·ya·ni*]
 impossible there fut.go 1/aor
 ‘It is impossible for me to go there’ W313

Complement clauses bearing an oblique grammatical function to the matrix verb often express direct or indirect quoted speech or thought. The manner of other types of action may also be expressed by an oblique complement clause. Such clauses, like most other oblique arguments, appear immediately to the left of the verb (8.5). The verb in an oblique complement clause is often inflected in the aorist conjunct (future or nonfuture):

- (154) [_{OBL} *ahpene·či wi·hwi·šiki*—*mekoho –nenehke·netamowa·či*] *ki·hišima·pwa*
 always fut.seriously—emph –think.of 3p-0/aor fut.tell.thus.to 2p-3(p)/ind.ind
 ‘You are to tell them that they are always to think of it seriously.’ O78F

- (155) *awita=meko* [_{OBL} *wi·hwa·pama·či*] *išite·he·sa*
 not=emph fut.look.at 3-3’/aor think.thus 3/pot
 ‘He (prox) wouldn’t think of looking at them (obv).’ R454.23

- (156) [_{OBL} *mehto·či=meko ši·ši·pa e·hanemehka·či*] *e·hanemi–inose·či*
 like=emph duck travel.away 3/aor away–walk.thus 3/aor
 ‘She (prox) walked away just like a duck (prox) walks.’ W572

- (157) [_{OBL} *wi·na=meko e·hma·wači–ši·pačiči*]
 he=emph most–be.impervious.to.cold 3/aor

e·hiši–kehke·nemekeči *mehtose·neniwahi.*
 thus–know 3’–3/aor people.obv

‘The people (obv) knew that
 he (prox) was the most impervious to cold’ N4NO

¹⁸ Perhaps *a·mihtahi* ‘would; should; could; might’, used with verbs inflected in the plain conjunct (5.2), should also be analyzed as a particle subcategorized for a complement clause.

(154) is an example of indirect quotation, evident from the use of third person as the subject of the oblique clause rather than second person, which would mark direct quotation.¹⁹ (155) illustrates indirectly quoted thought. (156) is an example of a clausal oblique expressing manner (how the old woman walked). In (157), the preverb *iši-* ‘thus’ added to the matrix verb changes the grammatical function of the complement clause from Comp to oblique (cf. 7.3).

PAST AORIST CONJUNCT inflection on the verb of the complement clause indicates relative past tense: i.e., that the time of the complement clause is prior to that of the main clause.

(158) ayo·h=meko ki·h-pya·ya·ni,
here=emph perf-come 1/ch.conj.

e·hkehke·netama·ni [COMP e·hkemo·temiwa·tehe aša·haki]
know 1-0/aor steal.O2.from 3p-1/past.aor Sioux.pl

‘After I arrived here,
I realized that the Sioux had stolen it from me’ M15HI

In (158) the past aorist inflection on the Comp clause indicates that the time of the Sioux stealing the speaker’s canoe was prior to the speaker’s arrival. Past aorist inflection may also be used in oblique complement clauses:

(159) [OBL e·hki·ši-na·kwa·nitehe] e·hišihkawe·niči okwisani
perf-leave 3’/past.aor S’s.tracks.be.thus 3’/aor his.son.obv
‘His son’s (obv) footprints showed that he (obv) had already left.’ L84

The matrix verb stem in (159) is *išihkawe-* ‘(Subject)’s tracks are thus’; the oblique argument of the verb describes what the tracks or footprints reveal. Here the oblique clause is inflected with the past aorist, reflecting the fact that the son’s leaving was prior to his father’s discovery of the footprints.

Some matrix verbs in Meskwaki take complements that are more noun-like than the examples we have seen so far. For example, matrix verbs formed from the stems *a·čimo-* ‘report, tell a story’ or *a·čimoh-* ‘tell, tell a story to’ often take a complement describing what the story is about. The complement is a relative clause with a pronominal head, in which the head is coreferential to an oblique argument in the lower clause. The verb of the complement is inflected

¹⁹ In Meskwaki, directly quoted speech or thought also functions as an oblique argument of the quoting verb. However, the material inside the quote is a representation of the actual utterance or thought; the quoted verb is therefore inflected as if it were in a main clause:

[OBL “netakihto neči·ma·ni,”] e·hina·či o·sani
lose 1-0/ind.ind my.canoe say.thus.to 3-3’/aor his.father.obv
‘He (prox) said to his father (obv), “I lost my canoe.”’ M15G

[OBL “ni·hwe·ta·se·wi,”] išite·he·yane
fut.be.warrior 1/ind.ind think.thus 2/subjunct
‘If you think, “I will be a warrior,” ...’ M21J

as a CONJUNCT PARTICIPLE (cf. 5.3). For example, if the verb stem in the lower clause is *išawi-* ‘do thus; fare thus’, the participle *e·šawiči* (inflected for third singular subject and a head coreferential to the oblique argument) means ‘what he did; what happened to him’, as in the first example below:

(160) *o·ni=‘na metemo·he·ha e·ha·čimoči*
and.then=that old.woman.dim report 3/aor

[COMP *e·šawiči e·hko·kenike·či*
fare.thus 3/part/obl wash.things 3/aor

‘And then that little old lady told about what happened to her while she was doing the wash.’ W7J

(161) *e·ha·čimoha·či* [COMP *e·na·hpawa·či*
tell 3–3’/aor dream.thus 3/part/obl
‘He (prox) told him (obv) what he (prox) had dreamed.’ L15

(162) *e·ha·čimoheči* [COMP *wi·hinowe·či*
tell X–3/aor fut.speak.thus 3/part/obl
‘He was told what to say.’ N22G

(163) [OBL *na·na·kači=meko e·šimeči* *e·hinowe·či*
exactly=emph say.thus.to X–3/part/obl speak.thus 3/aor
‘He said exactly what he had been told.’ N23L

As (163) shows, conjunct participle inflection may be used in oblique complements as well as in Comp complement clauses.

Two minor patterns of verb inflection in complement clauses may be mentioned here: both are found in oblique clauses, not Comp clauses, and both are used in constructions expressing ‘like, as if’. The first construction involves matrix verbs containing the relative root *ahpi·ht-*, especially *ahpi·hcawi-* ‘act like’ and *ahpi·hčite·he-* ‘imagine’. (The basic meaning of the relative root *ahpi·ht-* is ‘to such an extent’; the final *-awi-* is ‘do’ and the final *-ite·he-* is ‘think’.) The oblique argument of such verbs is a clause containing the particle *mehto·či* ‘like’ and a verb inflected as if the clause were a main clause assertion (5.1).

(164) [OBL *mehto·ci=‘pi=mekoho pemwa·pi* *ahpi·hcawiwa*
like=quot=emph shoot X–3/ind.ind act.like 3/ind.ind
‘They say he acted just as if he were shot.’ O46C

(165) [OBL *mehto·či=‘pi=mekoho mena·škonowaki* *ahpi·hčite·he·waki*
like=quot=emph eat.meat 3p/ind.ind imagine 3p/ind.ind
‘They imagined that they were eating fresh meat, it’s said’ W252P

In both (164) and (165) the verb of the oblique clause is inflected in the INDEPENDENT INDICATIVE, used for positive main clause assertions.

The preverb *ahpi·hči-* may also be added to a verb stem producing a reading comparable to English *too* plus a complement clause:

- (166) ke·waki=ke·h=mani [OBL a·kwi mehto·či me·h–kehke·netamo·hiye·kwini]
 still=but=now not like yet–be.conscious.dim 2p–0/negative

ketahpi·hči–a·ya·nekino·hipwa
 to.such.extent–redup.be.small 2p/ind.ind

‘You (pl) are too young to be aware.’ W150EF
 (lit. ‘You are so small, as if you aren’t conscious yet’)

The oblique clause in (166) is negative, so the verb is inflected in the NEGATIVE paradigm, otherwise used for negating main clauses.

Another construction for expressing ‘like, as if’ in an oblique clause involves inflecting the lower verb for an unspecified subject in the ITERATIVE paradigm. The matrix verb in this construction always contains the relative root *in-* ‘thus’.

- (167) i·nina·h=ke·hi=‘pi [OBL a·hpawa·kini] išawiwa
 then=but=quot dream X/iter do.thus 3/ind.ind
 ‘But at that time, it’s said, he acted like someone dreaming.’ W620

- (168) [OBL ke·kye·pi·kwe·kini] e·htaši–išawiyakwe
 be.blind X/iter prog–do.thus 21/aor
 ‘We are acting like blind people.’ R174.2–3

- (169) [OBL wi·hme·menatamekini] taši–ineške·wa=‘yo·we
 fut.vomit X–0/iter prog–move.thus 3/ind.ind=past
 ‘He was retching as if to vomit.’ W25K

A final pattern deserving of mention is found in complement clauses of matrix verbs inflected in the subjunctive: the verb of the complement clause is sometimes inflected in the subjunctive as well. This is reminiscent of the Classical Greek phenomenon known as ‘attraction’ (e.g. Smyth 1959:259), in which the apparent violation of rules for noun or verb inflection is attributed to the influence of a nearby word.

- (170) ka·škehtawate [COMP mani inowe·wa·te]
 hear 2–3(p)/subjunct this say.thus 3p/subjunct
 ‘If you hear them say this ...’ K4B

- (171) ki·hpene [OBL wi·hpe·mate] ina·hpawa·yane
 in.the.event sleep.with 2–3/subjunct dream.thus 2/subjunct
 ‘If anyway you dream that you are sleeping with him ...’ A169H

As the above examples show, the ‘attraction’ of subjunctive inflection into complements occurs with both Comp and oblique clauses. However, this pattern of inflection is not obligatory: the complements of most subjunctive verbs are inflected like ordinary complement clauses. For example, in both the following examples the verb of the complement clause is inflected in the future aorist:

(172) *wi·pači=ke·hi nahikeke*
 in.case=but be.proper 0/subject

[COMP *wi·hna·twe·we·kahwe·kwe* mehtose·neniwa]
 fut.summon.by.drumming 2p-3/aor person

‘But if it is appropriate for you to summon people by drumming ...’ N26F

(173) [COMP *wi·hpo·ni=ke·hi i·nahi -ki·wita·či* ine·nemate,
 fut.stop=but there -stay.around 3/aor think.thus.of 2-3/subject
 ‘But if you think he should no longer be there ...’ W350P

(See 9.1.2. for discussion of the position of the preverb *po·ni-* ‘stop’ in (173).)

5.6.2. Interrogative complements

Interrogative complements in Meskwaki are simpler to describe than declarative complements: the verb of the complement clause is always inflected as an INTERROGATIVE PARTICIPLE, and the grammatical function borne by the complement clause is always Comp, not oblique.

As explained in 5.3. on relative clauses, participles are inflected not only for subject and object of the lower clause, but also for the head of the relative clause. When an interrogative participle is used in an interrogative complement clause, the inflection for the head of the relative clause indicates which element of the lower clause is being questioned. No overt question word appears in interrogative complement clauses. For example, in both the following sentences the questioned element corresponds to the object of the lower clause:

(174) *e·hpwa·wi-kehke·nema·či* [COMP *wi·hasemiha·kwe·hini*]
 not-know 3-3'/aor fut.help 3-3'/int.part/3'
 ‘He (prox) didn’t know whom (obv) he (prox) should help.’ B95:118.30

(175) *a·kwi=mani na·hka kehke·nemakini*
 not=now again know 1-3/neg

[COMP *a·mi- i·ni -ina·wake·na*]
 should- that -say.thus.to 1-3/int.part/3

‘Now I also don’t know whom I should say that to.’ R578.23

In (174) the interrogative participle bears the final suffix *-ini*, indicating a third person obviative singular head. These features match those of the object of the lower clause ‘help’. Similarly, in (175) the final suffix is *-a*, marking a third person proximate singular head, which is coreferential to the object of ‘say’.

In the next example, the questioned element is the subject of the lower clause:

- (176) e·hwe·pi–nana·tohtawi·nameki ... [COMP e·ški–=ke·hi –mi·čikwe·na]
 begin–ask X–1p/aor first.time–=and –eat 3–0/int.part/3
 ‘They (unspec) began to ask us about ... and who ate it first.’ W63MN

The final suffix on the interrogative participle in (176) is *-a*, indicating a third person proximate singular head, coreferential to the subject of the lower verb.

Oblique arguments of the lower verb may also be questioned in an interrogative complement clause:

- (177) ni·hmawi–=ča·hi –nana·tohtawa·waki [COMP e·ne·nemikwe·hiki]
 fut.go.to–=so –ask 1–3p/ind.ind think.thus.of 3p–1/int.part/obl
 ‘So I will go to ask them what they think of me.’ W140GH

- (178) e·hnana·tohtawoči [COMP we·či·kwe·ni]
 ask X–3/aor be.from 3/int.part/obl
 ‘She was asked where she came from.’ W930

- (179) e·hnana·tohtawiči [COMP we·či–pešekwa·hiwa·ne·ni]
 ask 3–1/aor from–be.divorced 1/int.part/obl
 ‘He asked me why I got divorced.’ A143G

- (180) e·hpwa·wi–kehke·nema·wa·či [COMP e·hawinikwe·ni oškinawe·hani]
 not–know 3p–3’/aor be.there 3’/int.part/loc.obl young.man.obv
 ‘They (prox) didn’t know where the young man (obv) was.’ J186.14

- (181) e·hnana·toše·či [COMP še·škesi·hani e·tašnikwe·ni]
 ask 3/aor young.woman.obv be.so.many 3’/int.part/obl
 ‘He (prox) asked how many young women (obv) there were.’ J40.2

In (177) the questioned element is the manner oblique of the lower verb, in (178) and (179) a source oblique is questioned, in (180) an oblique of stationary location is questioned, and in (181) an oblique expressing number, required by the verb *taši-* ‘be so many’, is questioned.

The examples we have seen so far contain interrogative complements which correspond to question word questions. It is also possible to embed a yes-no question as the complement of a matrix verb. Here, however, a conflict arises between the requirements of the interrogative participle inflection and the function of embedded yes-no questions. An interrogative participle

must be inflected for the head of the participle. With embedded question-word questions, the head of the participle identifies the element being questioned. With yes-no questions, however, there is no single argument or adjunct of the lower clause being questioned; rather, it is the truth of the entire statement which is in question. The problem is solved by adding a dummy oblique argument to the subcategorization frame of the verb of the embedded yes-no question (with the preverb *iši-* ‘thus’). The sole function of this dummy oblique is to provide a category for the head inflection on the interrogative participle:

(182) *e·hnana·tohtawa·č̣i* [COMP *e·ši–ki·yose·nikwe·ni*]
 ask 3–3’/aor thus–walk.around 3’/int.part/obl
 ‘He (prox) asked him (obv) whether he (obv) had walked around.’ B85:44.10

(183) *kepye·č̣i=–kohi* –*natawi–kehke·nemene*
 come=obviously –seek.to–know 1–2/ind.ind

[COMP *e·ši– ke·htena* –*ketemino·nokwe·ni* maneto·waki]
 thus– truly –bless 3(p)–2/int.part/obl spirits

‘I came seeking to find out
 whether the spirits really blessed you.’ R84.5–6

The oblique in the lower clause added by the preverb *iši-* is a purely formal requirement of this construction; the embedded question is not literally questioning the oblique. For example, if the preverb in (182) literally meant ‘thus’ the gloss would be ‘he asked him *how* he walked around.’ The fact that (182) contains a yes-no interrogative complement is obvious from the next line of the story: “*ehe·he,*” *e·hinič̣i* “‘Yes,” he (obv) said.’

As noted in the previous section, some particles are subcategorized for a Comp argument. The particle *ke·nema·pi* ‘I don’t know’ often occurs with a Comp clause containing an interrogative participle:

(184) *ke·nema·pi=ki·na* [COMP *e·ši–mi·nawe·netamo·hiwane·ni*]
 I.don’t.know=you thus–think.seriously.about.dim 2/int.part/obl
 ‘I don’t know whether you have thought seriously about it.’ W305H

(185) *ke·nema·pi* [COMP *owiye·ha a·mi–iši–na·ta·tisokwe·ni*]
 I.don’t.know anyone could–thus–get.O2.for.self 3/int.part/obl
 ‘I don’t know whether anyone could get them for himself.’ R54.20

(186) *ke·nema·pi=ki·na* [COMP *e·ši–kehke·nema·wate·ni*]
 I.don’t.know=you thus–know 2–3/int.part/obl
 ‘I don’t know what you know about him.’ W349Q

(184) and (185) are embedded yes-no questions; (186) is an embedded question word question.

5.7. Adverbial clauses

We now turn to the inflection of verbs in adverbial clauses. In contrast to complement clauses, which are subcategorized for by matrix verbs, adverbial clauses function as optional modifiers of the main clause. Three types of adverbial clauses are described in this section: temporal clauses, reason clauses, and purpose clauses.

5.7.1. Temporal clauses

Temporal adverbial clauses locate the time of the action of the main clause relative to the time of some other event. Meskwaki has distinct inflectional paradigms for indicating ‘when [in the future]’, ‘when [in the past]’, ‘whenever’, and ‘before’. ‘When [in the future]’ is expressed by the SUBJUNCTIVE. (The subjunctive is also used in conditionals (5.8).)

(187) ne·wake, ni·hkehči–neškima·wa
see 1–3/subjunct fut.greatly–scold 1–3/ind.ind.
‘When I see him, I’m really going to scold him.’ N7G

(188) ki·hwa·pamipwa nesake
fut.look.at 2p–1/ind.ind kill 1–3/subjunct
‘You (pl) will see me when I kill him.’ L220

As (187) and (188) show, the subjunctive clause may occur either before or after the main clause. If the event named by the subjunctive clause is new information, the subjunctive clause precedes the main clause; if it has been previously discussed, the subjunctive clause follows the main clause.

As discussed in 4.2, many time expressions in Meskwaki are verbs with expletive subjects. Such verbs are inflected in the subjunctive if referring to future time:

(189) anemi–ana·kwi·hike i·ni wi·hwa·pawa·patame·kwe
become–evening.dim 0/subjunct then fut.redup.look.at 2p–0/aor
‘When it gets to be early evening then you (pl) will see it,’ L218,219

If the subjunctive verb contain the perfective preverb *ki·ši–* (or initial *ki·š–*), it is often glossed ‘after’, as in (115), repeated below:

(190) kaši=ča·h to·tawiye·kapa ki·ši–nesate?
how=so do.thus.to 2–3/pot perf–kill 2–3/subjunct
‘What would you do to him after you kill him?’ W189H

(191) ki·ši–tepowe·ya·ke
perf–hold.council 1p/subjunct
‘After we (excl) hold a council ...’ W324Q

There is an idiomatic combination of *mani* ‘this’ plus the preverb *iši–* on a verb in the subjunctive, meaning ‘just as ...’ or ‘as soon as ...’:

- (192) *mani=ke·hi* *iši-pepo·nike*
 this=and thus-be.winter 0/subjunct
 ‘And as soon as it is winter ...’ K4H

The CHANGED CONJUNCT paradigm is used to express ‘when [in the past]’, with functions parallel to those of the subjunctive. Additionally, in narrative texts it often marks the beginning of a new scene (Dahlstrom 1996b).

- (193) *pe·mi-nowi·či* *e·hwa·ko·moči*
 pass-go.out 3/ch.conj give.thanks 3/aor
 ‘When she went out she gave thanks.’ W280N

- (194) *to·hki·či* *metemo·ka,*
 wake.up 3/ch.conj old.woman
- awiya·toke=meko* *o·šiseme·hani* *e·hapihapiniči*
 still.the.same=emph her.grandchild.obv redup.sit 3’/aor

‘When the old woman woke up,
 her grandchild was still sitting in the same place.’ W91J

The changed conjunct is often used with verbs expressing time:

- (195) *e·na·kwi·hiniki* *e·hne·se·či*
 be.evening.dim 0’/ch.conj. recover 3/aor
 ‘In the early evening he felt better.’ W174R

- (196) *ke·tawi-wa·paniki* *e·hna·kwa·wa·či*
 almost-be.dawn 0’/ch.conj leave 3p/aor
 ‘When it was almost dawn they left.’ W166P-167A

If the changed conjunct verb contains the perfective preverb *ki·ši-*, *ki·h-*, or initial *ki·š-* it is glossed ‘after’:

- (197) *ki·ši-wi·seniči,* *e·hna·kwa·či*
 perf-eat 3/ch.conj leave 3/aor
 ‘After he ate, he left.’ L223,224
- (198) *o·ni* *ki·šike·či,* *e·hni·sa·wata·soči*
 and.then perf.build.house 3/ch.conj unload.one’s.things 3/aor
 ‘And after he built his house, he unloaded his things.’ M13B

The idiomatic combination of *mani* ‘this’ plus the preverb *iši-* ‘thus’ to express ‘just as ...’ is also found with verbs inflected in the changed conjunct:

- (199) mani e·ši-pi·nahoči, e·hpo·ni-kehke·netaki
 this thus-be.put.inside 3/ch.conj. cease-know 3-0/aor
 ‘Just as she was placed inside, she lost consciousness.’ W298JK
- (200) mani e·ši-awatenamawoči, e·hnahkonahkonaki
 this thus-offer.O2.to.O X-3/ch.conj redup.accept.by.hand 3-0/aor
 ‘As soon as it was offered to him, he took it.’ M22F

The ITERATIVE paradigm is used to express ‘whenever’ (implying a series of events), and may refer either to past or future time. The iterative paradigm is used in the same contexts as the subjunctive and changed conjunct examples above, but indicates that the activity occurred (or will occur) on more than one occasion.

- (201) o·ni=na·hkači mena·škono·ni e·ka·wa·tamakwini, ki·hna·kwa·pena
 and.then=again fresh.meat want 21-0/iter fut.leave 21/ind.ind
 ‘And then, whenever we want meat, we will set out.’ W303AB
- (202) ki·ši-ča·ki-kepatenikini, e·hpo·ni-anenwi·či
 perf-all-freeze 0⁷/iter stop-swim 3/aor
 ‘Whenever it had frozen completely, he stopped swimming.’ N1G

(201) is an example of the iterative referring to future events while in (202) the iterative refers to past events. The perfective preverb *ki·ši-* in (202) indicates that the action of the main clause follows that of the iterative clause.

The relatively rare PRIORITIVE paradigm is found in temporal adverbial clauses in construction with the preverb *me·hi-* ‘before’:²⁰

- (203) ma·maya=meko me·h-ki·ši-wi·seniwa·kwe
 early.morning=emph before-perf-eat 3p/prior
- e·hnatomeči wi·hmawi-wi·seniwa·či
 summon X-3(p)/aor fut.go-eat 3p/aor

‘Early in the morning, before they had finished eating, they were invited to go and eat.’ L161,162

- (204) me·h=meko -nehki·nikwe ki·šeso·ni
 before=emph-go.down 3⁷/prior sun.obv
- e·hnana·hišinowa·či
 lie.down 3p/aor

‘Even before the sun went down they went to bed.’ W132B

²⁰ The prioritive is also used with the particle *metwi* ‘going on too long’ (Goddard 1995).

Another way of forming a temporal adverbial clause expressing ‘before ...’ is to use a changed conjunct verb containing the preverbs *aye·ši-* (or *aye·hi-*) ‘still’ and *pwa·wi-* ‘not’:

- (205) e·ye·ši—meko –pwa·wi–nenehke·nema·či wi·hne·wa·či,
 still—emph –not–think.about 3–3’/ch.conj fut.see 3–3’/aor
- e·hne·wa·či i·niye·ne omešo·mesani
 see 3–3’/aor that.absent his.grandfather.obv

‘Before he (prox) was expecting to see him (obv),
 he (prox) saw that aforementioned grandfather (obv) of his.’ N9EF

The AORIST CONJUNCT, discussed above in its use with complement clauses and in main clauses in narrative, may also be used for adjunct clauses. Such clauses are variously glossed ‘when ...’, ‘as ...’, or ‘because ...’ to suit the context. Examples of the aorist used for reason clauses are given in 5.7.2; temporal uses of the aorist are given here.

- (206) ni·na=koh=wi·na nese·kesi=meko ta·taki
 I=certainly=contrast scared 1/ind.ind=emph sort.of
- i·ni e·hina·hpawa·ya·ni
 that dream.thus 1/aor

‘But you know, I was really kind of scared
 when I dreamed that.’ L39,40

- (207) ma·maya=meko e·hmawa·pataki,
 early=emph go.look.at 3–0/aor
- e·hašenoniki=či·hi oči·ma·ni!
 be.gone 0’/aor=exclam his.canoe

‘When he went to check on it early in the morning,
 why, his canoe was gone!’ M13EF

The AORIST INTERROGATIVE is used with *na·hina·hi* ‘when’ to express the speaker’s uncertainty about the exact time:

- (208) na·hina·h=meko e·hki·ši·seni·hiwa·ke·ni,
 when=emph perf.eat.dim 1p/aor.int
- i·ni wi·hna·kwa·ya·ni
 then fut.leave 1/aor

‘Whenever we get done eating a little, then I will leave.’ L196,197

5.7.2. Reason clauses

Adverbial clauses expressing ‘because ...’ contain verbs inflected in the AORIST CONJUNCT paradigm:

- (209) a·kwi wi·ša·pene·ya·nini, e·hše·kesiya·ni
not be.hungry 1/neg be.frightened 1/aor
‘I wasn’t hungry, because I was frightened.’ A42G
- (210) i·tepi e·ha·či, e·hanemi—meko –a·hkwe·wite·he·či
there go 3/aor become—emph –feel angry 3/aor
‘He went there, because he was really starting to feel angry.’ N7F

The first aorist verb in (210) is the main verb, inflected in the aorist conjunct because it is in a narrative context (5.1). The second verb in (210) is the reason clause.

Reason clauses usually follow the main clause, but the next example shows that it is also possible for a reason clause to precede the main clause:

- (211) e·hasa·mi—kehči—ne·neškimi^{yani}=kohi, kekosene.
too.much—greatly—redup.scold 2–1/aorist=you.know fear 1–2/ind.ind
‘You know, because you always scold me too much, I am afraid of you.’ N8MN

A reason clause may be equated with a participle in which the head is coreferential to an oblique argument expressing reason:

- (212) [ni·na=ma·h=e·ye·ki e·hte^{pa}·naki nek^{wisa}]
I=after.all=also love 1–3/aor my.son

[we·či—mahkate·wi·naki]
from—make.fast 1–3/part/obl

‘Because I also love my son is why I’m making him fast.’ N72–73

5.7.3. Purpose clauses

Clauses expressing the purpose of an action contain verbs inflected in the AORIST CONJUNCT plus the future prefix *wi·h-*:

- (213) kepanohikani e·hayo·či wi·hmenoči.
lid use 3–0/aor fut.drink 3–0/aor
‘He used the lid to drink [the water].’ N5N
- (214) ki·hkekye·nena·pwa wi·hpwa·wi—ki·pisa·či
fut.hold 2p–3/ind.ind fut.not–fall.over 3/aor
‘You (pl) should hold her so that she does not fall over.’ A112A

The purpose clause in (213) is *wi·hmenoči* ‘for him to drink it’; in (214) it is *wi·hpwa·wi–ki·pisa·či* ‘lest she fall over’.

5.8. Conditionals

This section describes the various types of ‘if’ constructions in Meskwaki, and related expressions of wishing and surprise. The inflection of verbs in conditional constructions in Meskwaki depends first of all on whether the condition is counterfactual or merely hypothetical. Hypothetical conditions refer to future or present situations that may occur or be occurring; counterfactual conditions either are known to be contrary to fact (if they refer to the past or present) or are future situations which the speaker expects not to occur.

Hypothetical conditionals typically have the verb of the protasis (the ‘if’ clause) inflected in the subjunctive.²¹ The verb in the apodosis (the result clause) may be inflected in the INDEPENDENT INDICATIVE plus the future prefix (*w*)*i·h-*, or the verb of the apodosis may be inflected in the POTENTIAL:

(215) *kaškihto:ya·ne,* *i·ni* *ni·hišawi*
 be.able.to 1–0/subjunct that fut.do.thus 1/ind.ind
 ‘If I can, I will do that.’ W363

(216) *pwa·wi–penoyane,* *ki·hnesene*
 not–set.out 2/subjunct fut.kill 1–2/ind.ind.
 ‘If you don’t go away, I will kill you.’ N28A

(217) *mo·hči=meko pemwiyane,*
 even=emph shoot.at 2–1/subjunct

awita nana·ši mešwihkapa
 not ever hit.with.missile 2–1/pot

‘Even if you shoot at me, you would never hit me.’ R564.27–28

(215) and (216) have independent indicative inflection plus the future prefix in the apodosis; (217) has potential inflection in the apodosis.

A less common construction for expressing hypothetical conditionals has the verb of the protasis inflected in the CHANGED INTERROGATIVE. The apodosis may contain either independent indicative inflection or potential inflection.

²¹ Subjunctive inflection is also used for temporal adverbial clauses glossed ‘when [in the future]’ (5.7.1); Meskwaki may be described as here not grammaticizing the distinction between events the speaker views as hypothetical and events the speaker assumes will take place. However, the changed interrogative paradigm (see below) is available if one wants to unambiguously specify that the event is hypothetical.

(218) te·pwe·wa·ne·ni, keye·či·h=meko wi·hkemiya·wi
 tell.truth 1/ch.int short.time=emph fut.rain 0/ind.ind
 ‘If I am telling the truth, it will rain very soon.’ K10AB

(219) ke·htena we·wi·hka·nema·wakwe·ni,
 really have.as.friend 21–3/ch.int

meše=meko ki·hki·wi–taši– mehto·či –asemihekona·na
 freely fut.around–prog– like –help 3–21/ind.ind

‘If he is really our friend,
 it will be like he just goes around helping us.’ W391

(220) o·=ke·htena i·ni e·šite·he·wane·ni,
 oh=really that think.thus 2/ch.int

nawači==meko –ma·mahkate·wi·hkakoha
 stop.to–emph –redup.fast 21/pot

‘Oh, if you really think that way,
 we ought to fast first.’ W212MN

Counterfactual conditionals take a different pattern of inflection from hypothetical conditionals. The verb of the protasis is inflected in the UNREAL paradigm, while the verb of the apodosis is nearly always inflected in the POTENTIAL.

(221) pwa·wi==mata –ona·pe·miya·nehe, wi·tamo·naka·wa·hi
 not==instead –have.husband 1/unreal tell.to 1–2p/pot
 ‘If I weren’t married, I would tell you about it.’ W187C

(222) ‘hao’ inenaka·h=wi·na,
 okay say.thus.to 1–2/pot=contrast

aye·me·h we·pi–mahkate·wi·yanehe
 a.while.ago begin–fast 2/unreal

‘I would have told you, “All right,”
 if you had started fasting a good while back.’ L21,22

(223) pwa·wi==‘yo·we –mesi–te·pwe·še·yanehe e·hketemino·neki,
 not==past –all–believe.by.hearing 2/unreal bless X–2/aor
 mani mi·nenaka·ha
 this give 1–2/pot

‘If you had not believed everything you heard when you were blessed,
 I would have given you this.’ N16CDE

A less commonly found pattern of inflection for counterfactual conditionals uses the unreal paradigm in both the protasis and the apodosis; the verb of the apodosis also bears the future prefix *wi·h-*.

- (224) *i·ya·hi awitehe, wi·hpya·tehe ayo·hi.*
 there be 3/unreal fut.come 3/unreal here
 ‘If he were there, he should come here.’ W846

The protasis of (224) is a present tense counterfactual: in the previous context the speaker had asked, “Is he over there?” and was told “No.”

The unreal inflection in counterfactual conditions may be used with any tense: (221), (222), and (223) are examples with past tense, (224) is an example with present tense, and the following elicited example shows that unreal inflection may be used to refer to the future as well:²²

- (225) *wa·panike ni·miwa·tehe, mawi–wa·pamiye·ka·kehe*
 be.dawn 0’/subj dance 3p/unreal go–look.at 1p–3(p)/pot
 ‘If they would dance tomorrow, we would go see them.’

In contrast to the range of tenses found with the unreal, however, subjunctive inflection cannot be used for hypothetical events set in the past:

- (226) **ana·kowe ši·ša·te me·mešihka e·sepanahi nesa·sa*
 yesterday hunt 3/subj surely raccoons.obv kill 3–3’/pot
 (‘If he (prox) hunted yesterday, he (prox) might have killed raccoons (obv).’)

We now turn to two constructions which display similarities to conditionals: wishes and expressions of surprise. Wishes in Meskwaki are expressed by the particle combination *ta·ni·=‘nahi* ‘I wish’ (literally ‘how=emphatic’) plus a clause containing a verb inflected in the SUBJUNCTIVE or the UNREAL. Subjunctive inflection is used for wishes which the speaker views as possibly coming true; unreal inflection is used when the wish is viewed as an impossible one. There are many textual examples of subjunctive inflection used in wishes:

- (227) *ta·ni·=‘nahi no·šiseme·ha pwa·wi–te·pwe·htake kanawi·ni!*
 how=emph my.grandchild not–believe 3–0/subjunct s peech
 ‘I wish my grandson wouldn’t listen to such talk!’ W639

- (228) *ta·ni·=‘nahi menwi–mehtose·neniwiwa·te no·šisemena·naki!*
 how=emph well–live 3p/subjunct our.grandchildren
 ‘Would that our grandchildren live good lives!’ O82F

²² Formally, the unreal paradigm is distinguished from the subjunctive by the suffix *-ehe*, which elsewhere in the conjunct order marks past tense. (224) and (225) show that in the unreal the suffix *-ehe* is not restricted to past tense.

- (229) ta·ni·='nahi nenohtawiyamete maneto·wa!
 how=emph understand 3-1p/subjunct spirit
 'Would that the spirit understand us (excl)!' R24.25

No textual examples of unreal inflection in wishes have been found, but this function is described in Jones's sketch of Meskwaki (Jones 1911:841) and is readily accepted by my consultant. Compare the following pair of elicited examples:

- (230) ta·ni·='nahi pya·te!
 how=emph come 3/subjunct
 'I wish he would come!' (and I believe it's possible he will)

- (231) ta·ni·='nahi pya·tehe!
 how=emph come 3/unreal
 'I wish he would have come!' (I've given up hope of him coming)

The distinction between subjunctive inflection and unreal inflection seen in conditional clauses is thus also found in wishes: subjunctive inflection signals that the speaker views the event in question as possible, while unreal inflection is used for contrary-to-fact or contrary-to-expectation situations.

Finally, a construction used for expressing surprise combines the particle *keye·hapa* 'in fact' with a verb inflected in the CHANGED UNREAL:

- (232) keye·hapa=ke·h=wi·na iše=meko e·šimikehe
 in.fact=but=contrast just=emph tell.thus.to X-1/ch.unreal
 'But it turned out that I was being told fibs.' A13D

- (233) keye·hapa=ke·hi='pi i·nini mahkwani a·wahki·kwe·sahekotehe
 in.fact=but=quot that.obv bear.obv scratch.O's.face 3'-3/ch.unreal
 'But it turned out, they say, that the bear (obv) had scratched her (prox) face.' W122H

At first glance it may seem odd to discuss a construction expressing surprise in the same section as counterfactual conditionals and wishes. Cross-linguistically, however, a connection between irrealis forms and expressions of surprise has been pointed out by James 1982:387 for Latin and Chafe 1995 for Caddo. The motivation for using irrealis forms in such constructions seems to be that the situation is contrary to the speaker's previous expectation (rather than being contrary to fact).