

Ditransitive licensing of Long Distance Agreement in Meskwaki  
Amy Dahlstrom

The construction of Long Distance Agreement (LDA; also called Raising or Copying to Object) is well known in Algonquian languages: in LDA the matrix verb is inflected to agree with one of the arguments of its complement clause.<sup>1</sup> The LDA construction which is familiar across the family exhibits a matrix verb which is a monotransitive Transitive Animate (TA) verb, as illustrated in (15) below. In this paper I present evidence that, in Meskwaki at least, the range of verbs which may appear as the matrix verb in a Long Distance Agreement construction is greater than has been previously reported. Specifically, Meskwaki also allows ditransitive verbs, the TA+O class, to license Long Distance Agreement. These TA+O verbs are formed with the secondary final *-aw*.

An example of the construction in question is given in (1):<sup>2</sup>

- (1) ki·hkehčimeko–nenehke·netamo·ne i·nokimani e·šimiyani  
ke-i·h-kehči–=meko –nenehke·netamaw-ene  
2-FUT-greatly–=EMPH –think.of.TA+O-1>2/IND

[i·noki=mani IC-išim-iyani]  
today=now IC-speak.so.to-2>1/PART/OBL  
'I will think seriously of what you told me today.' W371  
(literally: 'I think of you [what you told me].')

In (1) the matrix verb is *nenehke·netamaw-* 'think', here in a ditransitive form. The matrix verb is inflected for a first person singular subject and a second person singular object in the independent indicative paradigm, expressed by the second person prefix *ke-* and the suffix *-ene*. The matrix verb's object is coreferential to the subject of the lower clause, the second person subject of *e·šimiyani* 'what you told me', so the literal gloss of this example is 'I think of you [what you told me]'.

The structure of this paper is as follows: I will first give some background on the secondary final *-aw*, which appears not only in the construction under discussion but which also has other functions, and make explicit my assumptions about the relationship between thematic roles like AGENT and syntactic functions like SUBJECT. I then review the properties of the more familiar type of Long Distance Agreement before turning to a detailed examination of the Long Distance Agreement construction with ditransitive matrix verbs. I show that the ditransitive construction differs syntactically from the more familiar type of Long Distance Agreement in that the ditransitive type expresses the lower clause as a participle (i.e. as an NP) rather than as an embedded S as in the familiar monotransitive LDA construction. In the final section I'll point out some similarities between the ditransitive LDA construction and the Possessor Raising construction, another construction associated with the secondary final *-aw*.

#### THE SECONDARY FINAL *-AW*

Examples (2–4) illustrate the formation of secondary stems with the suffix *-aw*. In terms of its morphological requirements, *-aw* attaches directly to the stem of Transitive Inanimate class 2 and class 3 verbs, as seen in (3) and (4). For Transitive Inanimate class 1 verbs, the final attaches





2016) in the east. Consider the elicited pair of sentences in (14-15), where (14) does not exhibit Long Distance Agreement and (15) does:

- (14) nekehke·neta e·hkakano·neti·hači  
 ne-kehke·net-a e·h-kakano·neti·h-ači  
 1-know-1>0/IND AOR-converse.with-2>3/AOR  
 ‘I know you have been talking to him.’
- (15) ke-kehke·nem-ene e·h-kakano·neti·h-ači  
 2-know-1>2/IND AOR-converse.with-2>3/AOR  
 ‘I know you have been talking to him.’  
 (literally: ‘I know **you** [you have been talking to him].’)

In (14) the matrix verb stem *kehke·net-* ‘know’ is Transitive Inanimate and there is no agreement on the matrix verb for any argument of the lower clause. In (15), on the other hand, the matrix verb *kehke·nem-* ‘know’ exhibits object agreement with the subject of the complement clause. Since the matrix verb in (15) is inflected for an animate object, the form of the matrix verb’s stem must be Transitive Animate. (15) is an example of Long Distance Agreement.

The matrix verbs permitting Long Distance Agreement express cognition or other mental states as seen in (16), where the lefthand column contains the verb form used with no Long Distance Agreement, and the righthand column contains the verb form required if Long Distance Agreement is chosen. Note that nearly all the verbs contain the primary final *-e·netTI /-e·nemTA*, denoting mental action.

(16) Sample of matrix verbs permitting the familiar type of LDA

	<i>No LDA</i>	<i>LDA</i>	
a.	ša·kwe·nemo- AI	ša·kwe·nem- TA	‘be unwilling’
b.	išite·he- AI	ine·nem- TA	‘think thus, intend thus’
c.	kehke·net- TI	kehke·nem- TA	‘know’
d.	wa·wane·net- TI	wa·wane·nem- TA	‘fail to know’
e.	natawe·net- TI	natawe·nem- TA	‘want, seek to know’
f.	aka·wa·t- TI	aka·wa·n- TA	‘desire’
g.	menwe·net- TI	menwe·nem- TA	‘like’
h.	tane·net- TI	tane·nem- TA	‘expect’

The verbs in the righthand column are uniformly Transitive Animate, while their counterparts in the lefthand column may be either Animate Intransitive or Transitive Inanimate.

What is the argument structure of the verbs in (16)? Let’s look first at a verb in the lefthand column which is Animate Intransitive:

- (17) ša·kwe·nemo- ‘be unwilling < SUBJ COMP>’  
 experiencer proposition

In (17), the matrix stem form used without Long Distance Agreement requires two arguments, a subject and a COMP, the grammatical function associated with complement clauses.











clause must be interpreted as being about the uncle (e.g. because the uncle is the possessor of the bad-smelling hide) and thus an instance of Long Distance Agreement being sensitive to the topic relation, not to a grammatical function of the lower clause.<sup>4</sup>

#### COMPARISON OF MONOTRANSITIVE LDA, DITRANSITIVE LDA, AND POSSESSOR RAISING

The previous section has described similarities between the two types of Long Distance Agreement constructions. We will now consider how the two are different. The familiar LDA construction with a monotransitive matrix verb is subcategorized for a subject, an object, and a COMP (the grammatical function associated with complement clauses). The less frequently encountered construction with a ditransitive matrix verb is subcategorized for a subject, a first object, and a second object expressed as a participle, a nominalized clause.

- (36) Monotransitive LDA:           SUBJ OBJ **COMP** &   OBJ = (**COMP** TOPIC)  
 Ditransitive LDA:                SUBJ OBJ **OBJ2** &    OBJ = (**OBJ2** TOPIC)

In both constructions the object is related to topic: topic of the complement clause or topic of the participle functioning as second object.

Finally, we can point out that the ditransitive version of Long Distance Agreement also bears a resemblance to the Possessor Raising construction mentioned in the first section of the paper. Both constructions are ditransitive; both are formed with the secondary final *-aw*; in both the first object does not bear a thematic role to the (matrix) verb. The difference between the two constructions is schematized in (37):

- (37) Possessor Raising:   OBJ = OBJ2 **POSS**  
 Ditransitive LDA:        OBJ = OBJ2 **TOPIC**

In Possessor Raising, the first object is understood to be coreferential to the possessor of the second object, while in the ditransitive LDA construction the first object is understood to be coreferential to the topic of the nominalized clause functioning as second object.

#### CONCLUSION

In this paper we have examined three constructions with athematic objects bearing some relationship to another element in the sentence: Possessor Raising, where the object is identified with the possessor of the second object, monotransitive Long Distance Agreement, where the object is identified with the topic of the complement clause, and ditransitive Long Distance Agreement, where the object is identified with the topic of the nominalized clause functioning as the second object.

I have argued that the factor determining whether the matrix verb in a Long Distance Agreement construction is monotransitive or ditransitive is the phrasal category of the embedded proposition: if it is a clause, a monotransitive matrix verb is used, but if it is a participle—a nominalized clause—the ditransitive variant is chosen. In other words, to understand how Long Distance Agreement functions in Meskwaki, attention must be paid not only to grammatical functions like subject and object but also to the constituent structure categories of S and NP.

## REFERENCES

- Bliss, Heather. 2009. Structuring Information in Blackfoot: Against an A'-Agreement Analysis of Cross-Clausal Agreement. Proceedings of the 2008 Canadian Linguistics Association Annual Conference, ed. by Susie Jones. [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2008/CLA2008\\_Bliss.pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2008/CLA2008_Bliss.pdf)
- Branigan, Phil, and Marguerite MacKenzie. 2002. Altruism, A'-Movement, and Object Agreement in Innu- aimûn. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 385-408.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1991. *Plains Cree Morphosyntax*. New York: Garland.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1995. *Topic, Focus, and Other Word Order Problems in Algonquian*. The Belcourt Lecture. Winnipeg: Voices of Rupert's Land.
- 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, pp. 118–197. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary, John J. Lowe, and Louise Mycock. 2019. *The Oxford Reference Guide to Lexical Functional Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frantz, Donald G. 1978. Copying from Complements in Blackfoot. *Linguistic Studies of Native Canada*, ed. by Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye, pp. 89–109. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Fry, Brandon J., and Michael D. Hamilton. 2016. Long-distance Agreement in Algonquian: Accounting for Syntactic Variation. *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Ross Burkholder, et al., pp. 159–174. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Goddard, Ives. 1995. Notes on Fox (Mesquakie) Inflection: Minor Modes and Incompletely Described Morphemes. *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, 124–150. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Goddard, Ives. 2006. *The Autobiography of a Meskwaki woman: A New Edition and Translation*. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.
- Goddard, Ives, and Lucy Thomason. 2014. *A Meskwaki-English and English-Meskwaki Dictionary: Based on Early Twentieth-Century Writings by Native Speakers*. Petoskey, MI: Mundart Press.
- Junker, Marie-Odile. 2003. East Cree Relational Verbs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69(3), pp. 307–329.
- Kiyana, Alfred. 1913. *wisakea osani okyeni osimeani okomeseani*. [Wisahkeha, His Father, His Mother, His Younger Brother, His Grandmother.] Manuscript 2958-a, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 2019. Raising and Long-distance Agreement in Passamaquoddy: A Unified Analysis. *Journal of Linguistics*, 55(2), pp.357–405.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 1994. Agency, Inversion, and Thematic Alignment in Ojibwe. *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. by Susanna Gahl, et al., pp. 431–446. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Wolfart, H. Christoph. 1973. *Plains Cree: A Grammatical Study*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s., vol. 63, part 5. Philadelphia.

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank the audience at AC52 for their comments and questions and two anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions. LeSourd (2019) argues that Raising and Long Distance Agreement are actually two separate constructions in Passamaquoddy, with a full NP appearing in the matrix clause in Raising but in the lower clause for Long Distance Agreement, but for the purposes of the present paper I will use the term Long Distance Agreement for the entire family of such constructions.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations: 1P = first person exclusive plural, 21 = first person inclusive plural, 3' = animate obviative, 0 = inanimate, 0' = inanimate obviative, ANIM = animate, AOR = aorist prefix; aorist conjunct inflection, AOR.PRET = aorist preterit, DIM = diminutive, EMPH = emphatic, FUT = future, IC = Initial Change (ablaut rule), INAN = inanimate, IND = independent indicative, INTERR.PART = interrogative participle, NEG = negative inflection, O = (first) object, O2 = second object, OBL = oblique head of relative clause, OBV = obviative, PART = conjunct participle, PL = plural, POSS = possessor, PRET.PART = preterit participle, REDUP = reduplication, SG = singular, SUBJUNCT = subjunctive. Subject and object features in verb inflection are separated by > and are followed by identification of the verbal paradigm. The head of a relative clause is identified following the label PART (participle). Vowel length is marked by a raised dot. Examples cited as W are from Kiyana 1913.

<sup>3</sup> See Dahlstrom (1995:9) for an example of a monotransitive Long Distance Agreement construction in which the complement clause does not contain any element coreferential to the athematic object.

<sup>4</sup> Example (35) is somewhat reminiscent of the relational verb forms of Cree (cf. Wolfart (1973:60–61) and Junker (2003)), which express functions comparable to ethical datives in European languages. In Cree, the relational forms are homophonous with Possessor Raising. Meskwaki also has special morphology for relational verb forms, but the Meskwaki relational morphology is distinct from the stems bearing the secondary final *-aw* characteristic of Meskwaki Possessor Raising and ditransitive Long Distance Agreement. See Goddard (1995:141–146) for the details of Meskwaki relational morphology and numerous examples of its use. It is clear from the morphology of the matrix verb in (35) that this is not a Meskwaki relational form.