[Revised version 1 August 2017; to appear in Papers of the 48th Algonquian Conference, M Macaulay & M Noodin, eds. Michigan State University Press.]

Embedded questions in Meskwaki: syntax and information structure

Amy Dahlstrom

In descriptive and theoretical treatments of the syntax of Algonquian languages, there has been quite a bit of work done on the syntax of questions (cf. Johnson and Macaulay 2015 and the work cited there).[1] Less attention has been paid specifically to the syntax of embedded questions: that is, when a main verb like 'ask', 'wonder', or a negated main verb 'know' takes a complement clause which is in the form of a question. Perhaps the explanation for the relative neglect of embedded questions in Algonquian syntax is that many languages of the family employ strategies that seem to be identical to the formation of main clause questions. For example, consider the Plains Cree examples in (1-2):

Plains Cree

(1) **tānisi** kā-kī-isi-nikamoyan?
how CNJ-PAST-thus-sing.2
'How did you sing?' (Wolvengrey 2011:312)

(2) namōya kiskēyihtam ēkwa [**tānisi** kik-ēsi-kakēskimāwasot]
not know.3>0 now how CNJ-thus-counsel.one's.children.3

ayisiyiniw
person
'now people do not know [how to counsel their children]'
(Wolvengrey 2011:232)

The question word *tānisi* is used to ask 'how?' in the main clause question in (1) and also in the embedded question in (2). In both instances, the question word appears at the left edge of its clause.

Ojibwe and Menominee are similar to Plains Cree in that they also employ independent question words in an embedded question:

Ojibwe

(3) Wa-nda-gkenim [**aaniin** naa endshiwaad giwi
go.and.find.out.2s>3 **how** as.many.as.they.were those

eyaajig wadi].
who.were.there there
'Go find out [how many of them there are over there].' (Valentine 2001:990)

Menominee

(4) ’S aw-kocēmonakeh [**wāēkiq** cew-āwek eneh
AOR IRR-ask.TA.1PL>3CONJ **what** EPIS-be.II.0CONJ that.INAN

nayōhtah].
carry.on.back.TI.3>0CONJ
‘We will ask him [what it is that he carries on his back].’
(Johnson and Macaulay 2015:369)

Meskwaki, however, exhibits a different pattern. Main clause questions contain independent question words, as in (5) with *kaši* ‘how’. But the independent question words do not appear in embedded questions, as in (6).[2]

Meskwaki

(5) kašiča·hi išina·kosiwaki?
kaši=ča·hi išina·kosi-waki?
how=so appear.thus-3P/IND.IND
‘What did they look like?’ W346P

(6) ni·hmawiča·hi –nana·tohtawa·waki e·ne·nemikwe·hiki
n-i·h-mawi–=ča·hi –nana·tohtaw-a·waki [IC-ine·nem-ikwe·hiki]
1-FUT-go.to–=so –ask-1>3P/IND IC-think.thus.of-3P>1/INT.PART/OBL
‘So I will go to ask them what they think of me.’ W140GH

Meskwaki uses a special inflected form of the verb called the INTERROGATIVE PARTICIPLE to express embedded questions: the inflection on the verb itself indicates which argument of the verb is being questioned.

In this paper I demonstrate how the interrogative participles function to express embedded questions and show how they are related to formally similar evidentials and a sub-class of relative clauses in Meskwaki. In the last section I raise some issues about the interaction of syntactic structure and information structure in embedded questions.

WHAT IS A PARTICIPLE?

Participles are verb forms used as nouns or modifiers of nouns. Meskwaki exhibits both conjunct participles and interrogative participles. That is, the portion of the inflectional morphology agreeing with the subject and object of the verb comes from the conjunct order for conjunct participles and from the interrogative order for interrogative participles.[3] Since conjunct participles are more common and have a wider distribution, I will first illustrate participle formation with a conjunct participle.

(7) Template for participle formation:
Initial Change + Verb.stem + Subj.(&.Obj).Agr + Head.suffix

As seen in (7), participles are formed by applying the ablaut rule of Initial Change to the left edge of the verb stem and with suffixes that encode subject (and object) features of

the lower verb, plus a final suffix which encodes features of the head of the relative clause.[4] The head suffixes are listed in (8):

(8) Head suffixes

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)
g.	-i	oblique head	(obl)

(9) contains a conjunct participle built from the stem *mahkate·wi·*- 'fast', which modifies the head noun *oškinawe·ha* 'young man'. The suffix *-t* indicates that the subject of 'fast' is 3rd person singular; the head suffix *-a* indicates that the head of the relative clause is the 3rd person singular argument, coreferential to the subject of 'fast' and to the head noun *oškinawe·ha* 'young man'.

(9) oškinawe·ha me·hkate·wi·ta
oškinawe·h-a IC-mahkate·wi·-ta
young.man-SG IC-fast-3/PART/3
'A young man who fasted' L.title

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

In (10) the head of the conjunct participle is 3rd person obviative singular, coreferential to the object of the lower verb *nes*- 'kill', and to the demonstrative pronoun which is the head of noun phrase, *i·nini* 'that one (obv.)'

(10) i·nini ne·sa·čini pačana
i·nini [IC-nes-a·čini pačan-a]
that.ANIM.OBV IC-kill-3>3'/PART/3' Lazybones-SG
'that one (obv) whom Lazybones (prox) killed' L306

IC	+	*nes*	+	*a·t*	+	*ini*
		kill		3>3' (subj & obj)		3' (head)

(11) illustrates the formation of a participle whose head corresponds to an oblique argument of the lower clause. The verb stem *oči·*- 'be from' requires an oblique argument expressing source; a conjunct participle formed on the oblique argument has the gloss 'the place from which they came.'

(11) we·či·wa·či
IC-oči·-wa·či
IC-be.from-3P/PART/OBL
'the place from which they came' (Dahlstrom 2015:152.11L)

IC	+	*oči·*	+	*wa·t*	+	*i*
		be from		3P (subject)		oblique (head)

Participles in which the head is an oblique argument expressing stationary location exhibit a slight irregularity in formation. Instead of Initial Change applying to the left edge of the verb, the aorist prefix is used instead:

(12) e·howi·kiwa·či
e·h-owi·ki-wa·či
AOR-dwell.there-3P/PART/LOC.OBL
'the place where they live'

AOR	+	*owi·ki*	+	*wa·t*	+	*i*
		dwell (there)		3P (subject)		oblique (head)

As stated above, (9-12) are examples of conjunct participles, where the suffixes indicating the subject (and object) of the lower verb are drawn from the conjunct order of inflection. Interrogative participles are formed using the same template given above in (7), but the suffixes agreeing with the subject and object of the lower verb are taken from the interrogative order. Interrogative participles used as relative clauses indicate that the existence of the referent is not presupposed or have an evidential function – that is, they explicitly mark something about the speaker's source of evidence. (13) illustrates a relative clause for which the existence of the referent is not presupposed:

(13) ne·sa·kwe·na
IC-nes-a·kwe·na
IC-kill-3>3'/INT.PART/3
'whoever kills him' [if anyone] L120

IC	+	*nes*	+	*a·kwe·n*	+	*a*
		kill		3>3' (subj & obj)		3 (head)

Likewise, 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.

(14) e·hnatone·hamowa·čike·hi wi·hpwa·wi–taši–kemiya·nikwe·ni
e·h-natone·h-amowa·či=ke·hi IC-wi·h-pwa·wi–taši–kemiya·n-nikwe·ni
AOR-search.for-3P>0/AOR=and IC-FUT-not–there–rain-0'/INT.PART/OBL
'And they were looking for a place where it would not rain' R138.47

Interrogative participles used as relative clauses may also be used with an evidential function, to explicitly indicate the absence of direct, firsthand knowledge on the part of the speaker.[5] For example, (15) is an interrogative participle formed on the stem *omeso·ta·ni-* 'have (second object) as a parent'. Here the speaker, a young man, can surely assume that the addressee, an old woman, had parents; however, since he is too young to have known the parents personally, he uses an interrogative participle.

(15) we·meso·ta·niwane·hiki
IC-omeso·ta·ni-wane·hiki
IC-have.O2.as.parent-2/INT.PART/3P
'whoever your parents were' W19B

(16) is similar: here the interrogative participle with a stationary location as the head indicates that the speaker does not know where the other people are living.

(16) e·howi·kikwe·hikimekoho ma·hiye·ka mehtose·neniwaki
e·h-owi·ki-kwe·hiki=mekoho ma·hiye·ka
AOR-dwell.there-3P/INT.PART/LOC.OBL=EMPH these.ABSENT

mehtose·neniw-aki
person-PL
'wherever these (absent) people might be living' W108D

The two functions of interrogative participles display a clear connection: interrogative participles may be used if the speaker has no reason to assume the existence of any referent satisfying the description of the relative clause (examples (13-14)), or this type of participle may be used to explicitly distance the speaker from claiming firsthand knowledge of the existence of the referent.

OTHER INTERROGATIVE ORDER PARADIGMS: PLAIN INTERROGATIVE AND PRIORITIVE

The various verbal modes classified together as the interrogative order all exhibit suffixes containing a *-w* which Goddard (2004:106) labels the irrealis *-w*, viewing the system from a diachronic perspective.[6] The Meskwaki irrealis *-w* ultimately derives from a Proto-Algonquian negative morpheme, as demonstrated in Goddard 2006:189ff. The link between interrogative order inflection and evidential functions can be seen most clearly in the verbal mode labelled the PLAIN INTERROGATIVE, in which there is no initial change applied to the left edge of the verb stem and which does not exhibit the variation in head suffixes seen above with the interrogative participles.[7] The plain interrogative is used as an evidential indicating that the speaker is deducing after the fact that an event occurred:

(17) nesekokwe·nima·hi·na mahkwani
nes-ekok**w**e·ni=ma·hi=i·na mahkw-ani
kill-3'>3/PLAIN.INTERR=after.all=that.ANIM bear-OBV
'A bear (obv) must have killed that guy (prox), after all.' L111

(18) aniwisa·hikwe·ni
aniwisa·hi-k**w**e·ni
run.fast.DIM-3/PLAIN.INTERR
'He must have run fast.' W1005

In (17) the speaker bases his comment on tracks in the snow and evidence of a struggle. (18) is from a long text about the culture hero Wisahkeha; the speakers are young women who failed to keep up with a no longer visible Wisahkeha. It may be noted that Meskwaki utterances containing the plain interrogative are specifically used for expressing inferred knowledge; a separate verb form, the DUBITATIVE mode of the independent order, is used for more general statements expressing what is probably true.

The relatively uncommon verbal mode of the PRIORITIVE is used to indicate that the action in the main clause occurred before the action in the adverbial clause:

(19) me·h–ki·ši–wi·seniwa·kwe
IC-me·h–ki·ši–wi·seni-wa·k**w**e
IC-before–PERF–eat-3P/PRIOR
'before they had finished eating, …' L161

In this context the irrealis *w* is motivated because the subjects had not in fact finished eating at the relevant moment reported here.

MAIN CLAUSE QUESTIONS AND PARTICIPLES

Returning to the subject of questions, we saw above that main clause questions in Meskwaki contain an independent question word. Example 5 is repeated below:

(5) kašiča·hi išina·kosiwaki?
kaši=ča·hi išina·kosi-waki?
how=so appear.thus-3P/IND.IND
'What did they look like?' W346P

The verb in (5) is inflected in the independent indicative paradigm, typical of main clauses. This paradigm is used only with the three Meskwaki question words which begin with *k* : *kaši* 'how?'*, ke·swi* 'how many?' and *ke·senwi* 'how many times?'.

The other question words in Meskaki begin with *w* (*we·ne·ha* 'who?', *we·kone·hi* 'what?') or with *ta·* (e.g. *ta·ni* 'where?', *ta·tepi* 'whither?; whence?') and typically are found with conjunct participle inflection on their accompanying verb:

(20) we·ne·hča·hi i·ni e·ta?
we·ne·ha=ča·hi i·ni IC-i-ta?
who=so that IC-say.thus-3/PART/3
'Who said that?' W156N

(21) ta·tepiya·pi we·či·yani?
ta·tepi=ya·pi IC-oči·-yani?
whence=may.I.ask IC-be.from-2/PART/OBL
'Where did you come from?' W851

Though conjunct participles are the usual forms in such questions, it is also possible to use interrogative participle inflection in a main clause question:

(22) we·kone·hi wi·hmi·čiwa·ne·ni?
we·kone·hi IC-wi·h-mi·či-wa·ne·ni?
what IC-FUT-eat-1>0/INT.PART/0
'What will I eat (if there is anything to eat)?' (Michelson 1937:70.33–34)

INTERROGATIVE PARTICIPLES IN EMBEDDED QUESTIONS

With the above background we can now turn to the phenomenon of embedded questions. Embedded questions in Meskwaki differ from main clause questions in two ways. First, no independent question word is employed in the embedded question. Second, interrogative participles are rare and marked in main clause questions but required in embedded questions.

The examples below demonstrate how different types of arguments of the lower clause may be questioned in an embedded question. In (23) the subject is questioned:

(23) e·hwe·pi–nana·tohtawi·nameki ... e·škike·hi–mi·čikwe·na
e·h-we·pi–nana·tohtaw-i·nameki ...
AOR-begin–ask-X>1P/AOR

[IC-aški–=ke·hi –mi·či-kwe·na]
IC-first.time–=and –eat-3>0/INT.PART/3
'They (unspec) began to ask us … who ate it first.' W63MN

The object of the lower verb may be questioned:

(24) e·hpwa·wi–kehke·nema·či wi·hasemiha·kwe·hini
e·h-pwa·wi–kehke·nem-a·či [IC-wi·h-asemih-a·kwe·hini]
AOR-not–know-3>3'/AOR IC-FUT-help-3>3'/INT.PART/3'
'He (prox) didn't know whom (obv) he (prox) should help.'
(Michelson 1930:118)

(6), repeated below, illustrates an oblique expressing manner being questioned:

(6) ni·hmawiča·hi –nana·tohtawa·waki e·ne·nemikwe·hiki
n-i·h-mawi–=ča·hi –nana·tohtaw-a·waki
1-FUT-go.to–=so –ask-1>3P/IND.IND

[IC-ine·nem-ikwe·hiki]
IC-think.thus.of-3P>1/INT.PART/OBL
'So I will go to ask them what they think of me.' W140GH

(25-27) provide additional examples of an oblique in the lower clause being questioned: an oblique expressing stationary location in (25), one expressing source of motion in (26), and an oblique expressing quantity in (27).

(25) e·hpwa·wi–kehke·nema·wa·či e·hawinikwe·ni oškinawe·hani
e·h-pwa·wi–kehke·nem-a·wa·či
AOR-not–know-3P>3'/AOR

[e·h-awi-nikwe·ni oškinawe·h-ani]
AOR-be.there-3'/INT.PART/LOC.OBL young.man-OBV
'They (prox) didn't know where the young man (obv) was.' J186.14

(26) e·hnana·tohtawoči we·či·kwe·ni
e·h-nana·tohtaw-eči [IC-oči·-kwe·ni]
AOR-ask-X>3/AOR IC-be.from-3/INT.PART/OBL
'She was asked where she came from.' W930

(27) e·hnana·toše·či še·škesi·hani e·tašinikwe·ni
e·h-nana·toše·-či [še·škesi·h-ani IC-taši-nikwe·ni]
AOR-ask-3/AOR young.woman-OBV IC-be.so.many- 3'/INT.PART/OBL
'He (prox) asked how many young women (obv) there were.' J40.2

EMBEDDED YES-NO QUESTIONS

Interrogative participles are also used if a yes-no question is embedded as a complement clause. In this construction a 'dummy' relative root preverb *iši–* is added to the lower verb and the participle is formed on the expletive oblique associated with *iši–*.

(28) e·hnana·tohtawa·či e·ši–ki·yose·nikwe·ni. "ehe·he," e·hiniči ...
e·h-nana·tohtaw-a·či [IC-iši–ki·yose·-nikwe·ni]
AOR-ask-3>3'/AOR IC-thus–walk.around-3'/INT.PART/OBL

"ehe·he," e·h-i-niči
yes AOR-say.thus-3'/AOR
'He (prox) asked him (obv) whether he (obv) had walked around.
"Yes," he (obv) said…' (Michelson 1927:44.10-11)

Since an embedded yes-no question requires the relative root preverb *iši–*, otherwise associated with obliques of manner or of goal of motion, a verb such as *e·ši–ki·yose·nikwe·ni* in (28) is ambiguous out of context. In a different context the same verb might mean 'how he (obviative) walked around.' In (28), however, the following line in which the obviative third person responds *ehe·he* 'yes' confirms that the construction is an embedded yes-no question.

Interrogative Complement Omitting the Main Verb

The association between interrogative participle inflection and embedded questions is so strong in Meskwaki that an interrogative participle may be used on its own, with no overt matrix verb, as if the participle is the complement of an understood main verb 'I wonder…'.

(29) e·šawikwe·niškwe nekwisa?
IC-išawi-kwe·ni=iškwe ne-kwis-a?
IC-fare.thus-3/INT.PART/OBL=woman's.EXCLAM 1-son-SG
'I wonder how my son is doing?' R116.43

(30) e·hawiwe·kwe·ni, maneto·tike?
e·h-awi-we·kwe·ni, maneto·tike?
AOR-be.there 2P/INT.PART/LOC.OBL spirit.VOC.PL
'I wonder where you are, spirits?' R509.29

(31) we·yo·siwakwe·nani·hka, nesese?
IC-o·si-wakwe·na=ni·hka, nesese?
IC-have.O2.as.father 21/INT.PART/3=man's.EXCLAM elder.brother.VOC
'I wonder who our father is, brother?' W276G

Although (29-31) resemble subordinate clauses with a 'missing' main verb, I do not wish to claim that there is a covert, unpronounced main verb in these examples. Instead, I hypothesize that these are main verbs displaying an inflectional pattern that is more commonly found in embedded clauses.

Syntax and Information Structure

Examples (1-6) at the beginning of the paper contrasted two strategies for expressing embedded questions: the morphological strategy seen in Meskwaki versus employing a question word as a separate syntactic constituent (Plains Cree, Ojibwe, and Menominee). We may note that both strategies are semantically identical: both clearly indicate that the complement clause is interrogative and identify the element being questioned. Comparing the two constructions, I conjecture that Meskwaki's morphological strategy is archaic. That is, loss of final vowels in the sister languages would entail that the distinctions encoded by the head suffix in final position of the participle would be obscured, favoring the spread of the main clause question formation strategy to embedded clauses as well.

Elsewhere (e.g. Dahlstrom 1993) I have proposed the template in (32) as accounting for much of the word order variation observed in Meskwaki main clauses:

(32) [$_{S'}$ TOPIC [$_{S}$ NEG FOCUS OBLIQUE V XP*]]
{SUBJ, OBJ, OBJ2, COMP}

The position dedicated to FOCUS (following a negative element, if any, and preceding any oblique argument) is where independent question words in main clauses appear.

Could we hypothesize that the focus position is not present in Meskwaki subordinate clauses? The answer to this question is no: other elements which typically appear in the main clause focus position also appear to the left of the verb in subordinate clauses, e.g. *ke·ko·hi* 'something' in (33) or the contrastive independent pronoun in (34):

(33) …e·hkaka·to·nena·ni ke·ko·hi wi·hnahihto·yani
e·h-kaka·to·n-ena·ni [**ke·ko·hi** wi·h-nahiht-o·yani]
AOR-urge-1>2/AOR something FUT-know.how.to.make-2>0/AOR
'…when I push you to learn to make something.' (Goddard 2006a:27)

(34) ... wi·hanwa·či·yani ki·na·na i·ni wi·hišawiyakwe
wi·h-anwa·či·-yani [**ki·na·na** i·ni wi·h-išawi-yakwe]
FUT-consent-2/AOR we.inclusive that FUT-do.thus-21/AOR
'… you should consent for **us** to do that.' (Goddard 2006a:135)

The syntactic position labeled FOCUS thus seems to be available in Meskwaki for a lower question word, if the morphological strategy were not employed.

It is worth emphasizing that the position labelled FOCUS in (32) is a syntactic position: a syntactic position which is occupied by elements which typically bear the information structure relation of focus in the sense of Lambrecht 1996. This may be seen most clearly in a main clause question-word question, where the material following the question word is presupposed; the answer to the question word fills in the gap in the open proposition. Consider example (21), repeated below:

(21) ta·tepiya·pi we·či·yani?
ta·tepi=ya·pi IC-oči·-yani?
whence=may.I.ask IC-be.from-2/PART/OBL
'Where did you come from?' W851

The question in (21) presupposes 'you came from x-place', and the answer to (21) will identify the value of x.

An embedded question, on the other hand, has quite different information relations. An embedded question does not seek an answer to 'what is the value of x?'

(26) e·hnana·tohtawoči we·či·kwe·ni
e·h-nana·tohtaw-eči [IC-oči·-kwe·ni]
AOR-ask-X>3/AOR IC-be.from-3/INT.PART/OBL
'She was asked where she came from.' W930

Rather, an embedded question like (26) is a report on an earlier speech event.

The difference between the information structure of (21) and that of (26) is important to keep in mind. Though space does not permit exploring this issue in depth in the current paper, consider the following example, offered in a recent paper by Fry and Mathieu (to appear) as part of their arguments against explaining Long Distance Agreement in terms of the information structure relation topic:[8]

(35) ngikenmaa wegonesh gaa-zheshemgowang nen kwezhegaasan
ni-gikenim-aa wegonesh gaa-zheshemgow-ang
1-savoir.VTA-DIR.3(IND) qui wh.PASSÉ-voler-3PL(CONJ)

nen kwezhegaas-an
ces biscuit-PL
'Je sais qui a volé ces biscuits.' (Fry and Mathieu (to appear), ex. (3))
(lit. 'I know **him** [who stole the cookies]')

In (36) the question word *wegonesh* 'who' in the lower clause triggers agreement on the higher verb.

Fry and Matheiu's argument runs as follows: question words bear focus; a single element cannot be both focus and topic; therefore (36) shows that topic is not the relevant notion for explaining Long Distance Agreement.[9] However, the discussion of examples (21) and (26) above demonstrates that the premise that all question words bear the information structure relation of focus is not valid: the context in which a given question word is used must be taken into account. The fact that question words in main clauses bear the information structure relation of focus does not entail that a question word in an embedded question is also an instance of focus.

CONCLUSION

In this paper I have outlined the morphological strategy employed by Meskwaki to express embedded questions and contrasted this strategy with the more familiar syntactic strategy found in Plains Cree, Ojibwe, and Menominee. Meskwaki embedded questions are expressed by interrogative participles: the details of participle formation for both conjunct and interrogative participles were presented, along with examples of main clause questions containing participles. Some formally similar other paradigms belonging to the interrogative order, all containing the irrealis suffix *-w*, were illustrated, providing a motivation for this morphological set to perform the function of expressing embedded questions. Examples of embedded questions questioning subject, object, and various types of oblique arguments were provided, and the strategy for expressing an embedded yes-no question explained. Finally, the relation between a syntactic position in which main clause questions typically appear and the information structure relation of focus was explored, showing that we cannot assume that embedded questions exhibit the same information structure relations as that of main clause questions.

REFERENCES

Brugman, Claudia, and Monica Macaulay. 2015. Characterizing Evidentiality. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2):201-37.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 1993. The Syntax of Discourse Functions in Fox. *Berkeley Linguistics Society 19. Special Session on Syntactic Issues in Native American Languages*, ed. by David A. Peterson, pp. 11–21. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 1996. Narrative Structure of a Fox Text. *nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in Honour of H.C. Wolfart*, ed. by J.D. Nichols and A.C. Ogg, 113-162. Algonquian and Iroquoian Memoir 13. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2015. Highlighting Rhetorical Structure through Syntactic Analysis: An Illustrated Meskwaki Text by Alfred Kiyana. *New Voices for Old Words: Algonquian Oral Literatures*, ed. by David J. Costa, 118-197. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2016. On the Pragmatic Relationship Indexed by Long Distance Agreement in Meskwaki. Paper read at the 2016 SSILA meetings, Washington DC.

Fry, Brandon and Éric Mathieu. [To appear]. La sémantique de l'accord à longue distance en ojibwé algonquin. *Papers of the Forty-sixth Algonquian Conference*, edited by Monica Macaulay and Margaret Noodin. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Goddard, Ives. 1994. *Leonard Bloomfield's Fox Lexicon: Critical Edition*. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoir 12, Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Goddard, Ives. 2004. Meskwaki Verbal Affixes. *Papers of the 35th Algonquian Conference*, edited by H.C. Wolfart, 97-123. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Goddard, Ives. 2006a. *The Autobiography of a Meskwaki Woman*. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Goddard, Ives. 2006b. The Proto-Algonquian Negative and its Descendants. *Papers of the 37th Algonquian Conference*, edited by H.C. Wolfart, 161-208. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Johnson, Meredith, and Monica Macaulay. 2015. A Monoclausal Analysis of Menominee Wh-Questions. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81:337-377.

Jones, William. 1907. *Fox Texts*. American Ethnological Society Publications 1. Leiden.

Kiyana, Alfred. 1913. *wisakea osani okyeni osimeani okomeseani*. [Wisahkeha, his father, his mother, his younger brother, his grandmother.] Manuscript 2958-a in National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1996. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge University Press.

Michelson, Truman. 1925. Accompanying Papers. *Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* 40, 23-658. Washington: G.P.O.

Michelson, Truman. 1927. *Contributions to Fox Ethnology*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 85. Washington: G.P.O.

Michelson, Truman. 1930. *Contributions to Fox Ethnology II*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 95. Washington: G.P.O.

Michelson, Truman. 1937. *Fox Miscellany*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 114. Washington: G.P.O.
Valentine, J. Randolph. 2001. *Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar*. University of Toronto Press.
Wolvengrey, Arok Elessar. 2011. *Semantic and Pragmatic Functions in Plains Cree Syntax.* Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication.

---

[1] Many thanks to the audience at the 48th Algonquian Conference for their comments.
[2] Abbreviations in the Meskwaki examples: 1P = first person exclusive plural, 21 = first person inclusive plural, 3' = obviative, 0 = inanimate, 0' = inanimate obviative, ANIM = animate, AOR = aorist, DIM = diminutive, EMPH = emphatic, EXCLAM = exclamation, FUT = future, IC = Initial Change (ablaut rule), IND.IND = independent indicative, INT.PART = interrogative participle, LOC.OBL = oblique head of relative clause expressing stationary location, O2 = second object, OBL = oblique head of relative clause, OBV = obviative, PART = conjunct participle, PERF = perfective, PLAIN.INTERR = plain interrogative inflection, PL = plural, PRIOR = prioritive, SG = singular, VOC = vocative, X = unspecified subject. Sources for examples: J = Jones 1907, L = text in Dahlstrom 1996, R = Michelson 1925, W = Kiyana 1913.
[3] See Goddard 1994:187-204 for a complete listing of the verbal morphology of the conjunct, interrogative, and other orders in Meskwaki.
[4] The ablaut rule of Initial Change applies to the vowel of the first syllable of the verb stem or compound verb. In Meskwaki, short *e*, *i*, *a* change to long *e·*; short *o* changes to *we·*; long vowels are not affected.
[5] See Brugman and Macaulay 2015 for an extensive overview of evidentiality. The encoding of evidential functions in Meskwaki is the 'scattered' type (Brugman and Macaulay 2015:224) rather than occurring in a single paradigmatic slot: besides the evidential use of interrogative participles illustrated in (15) and (16) and the use of the plain interrogative exemplified in (17) and (18) for inferred knowledge, there is also a hearsay evidential second position enclitic =*ipi*, which is a grammaticalized verb form meaning 'people say'.
[6] The irrealis *w* is not indicated as a separate morpheme in the interlinear glosses; instead, the complex of suffixes is glossed with the subject (and object) features which the complex encodes.
[7] Another paradigm, the CHANGED INTERROGATIVE, is found in the protasis of conditional clauses, also reflecting the irrealis function of the -*w* suffix.
[8] It is not clear that (36) should be analyzed as an embedded question; a negated main verb 'know' ('I don't know who stole the cookies') would strengthen the argument here.
[9] See Dahlstrom 2016 for discussion of other arguments put forward by Fry and Matheiu (to appear) on Long Distance Agreement.