

Hunter Thompson Lockwood and Monica Macaulay

18 Applicatives across Algonquian

Abstract: This paper surveys applicatives and related constructions across the Algonquian language family. Most of the languages have multiple affixes that license benefactives, goals, recipients, and other participants as objects, and there are some constructions which license oblique arguments as well. Examples with both an overt O1 and O2 are relatively rare, but the data collected shows that word order in applicative constructions is fairly free, with all possible orderings of verb and object(s) attested. We also consider a number of other forms, including the “relative root” construction, in which a derivational component of the stem licenses an oblique object, concluding that they are syntactic lookalikes rather than true applicatives because there is no corresponding BC. The closely-related relative preverb construction, however, is a true applicative because a corresponding BC can be identified. “Relational verbs” are also addressed; these are valence-neutral morphological lookalike forms found primarily in the Cree language group.

1 Introduction

This chapter surveys applicatives and related constructions across Algonquian, a large family of North American languages which extends eastward from the Canadian Rocky Mountains, across the northern Great Plains and midwestern United States, and along the east coast of both countries.

The Algonquian languages are rich in applicative and applicative-like constructions. On the one hand, in most of the languages there are multiple affixes that license benefactives, goals, recipients, and other participants as objects. This reflects what Rhodes describes as a conspiracy “to avoid the creation of oblique nominals” (2010: 428). At the same time, there are also constructions which do license oblique arguments, and even what Junker and Toivonen (2015) call “ghost participants” (participants which are indexed on the verb, but cannot be instantiated as an overt argument).

In the next section we provide relevant background on Algonquian language structure. In sections 3 and 4 we discuss affixal applicatives, and in Section 5 we look at the

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to Julie Brittain, Dave Costa, Dianne Friesend, Inge Genee, Ryan Henke, Will Oxford, Joe Salmons, Olivia Sammons, Natalie Weber, an anonymous reviewer, and the editors of this volume for their comments and help with this chapter. Of course, they are not responsible for any errors. The authors’ names appear in alphabetical order. This material is in part based upon work supported by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Graduate School and the National Science Foundation DLI-DEL program under grant number BCS1953103. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

syntax of such constructions. Sections 6 and 7 then present two constructions which include what Algonquianists call “initials” (or roots) and “preverbs”, and Section 8 discusses the relational verb construction. Section 9 concludes.¹

2 Background on Algonquian morphosyntax

Algonquian languages are polysynthetic, with complex inflectional and derivational morphology. In this section we briefly introduce topics relevant to applicatives.

2.1 Verb types

Verbs in Algonquian languages fall into four basic types based on the (grammatical) animacy of their absolutive arguments (subject of intransitive and object of transitive), as shown in Table 1.² Each type has a distinct set of agreement paradigms, called “orders”. In most of the languages, the most common are INDEPENDENT (generally for main clauses) and CONJUNCT (generally for subordinate clauses).

Table 1: Basic verb types.

Type	Abbreviation	Subject	Object
Inanimate Intransitive	II	inanimate	
Animate Intransitive	AI	animate	
Transitive Inanimate	TI		inanimate
Transitive Animate	TA		animate

Where the distinction is not relevant, we use the term “object” as a cover term for the grammatical relations O1 and O2, which behave differently with respect to person, animacy, and indexation (see Section 2.5). O1 and O2 coexist in ditransitive constructions, and can then be characterized as primary and secondary objects, respectively. The transitive verbs of Table 1 have an object of the O1 type.

¹ Our sources are listed in Appendix A. Some Menominee examples are taken from Bloomfield (1928); these are noted with a text title abbreviation and a line number. The title abbreviations appear in Appendix B.

² Animacy is the standard term for the division of nouns into noun classes in the Algonquian languages. Based on a study of stem contrasts, Goddard finds evidence that animate nouns typically denote “the special or particular counterpart of the more ordinary, general, or inclusive inanimate, or the animate is a part and the inanimate the whole” (2002: 216), and notes the influence of other factors like size. Ultimately, however, Goddard concludes that animacy is grammatical in Algonquian, and that “[t]he basic meaning of the animate gender is a function of the contrast with the inanimate gender” (2002: 224).

In addition to the verb categories in Table 1, there are a few mismatches between syntax and morphology; most relevant for our purposes are the so-called “AI+O verbs”. These are verbs which in some of the languages inflect exactly like AI verbs but allow an object, and in other languages add special inflection to an AI verb reflecting an object, without derivational morphology changing the stem category. As described further in Section 2.5, this object is of the O2 type. AI+O verbs are illustrated in (1) and (2):³

- (1) Menominee (Bloomfield 1962: 47)

Nepēw ne-kāta-menāē-m.
 water 1-FUT-drink.AI-1
 ‘I want to drink some water.’

- (2) Ojibwe [Odawa] (Rhodes and Valentine 2015: 1208)

Ngii-bwen wiiyaas
 ni-gii=abwe-n wiiyaas
 1-PAST=roast.AI-n meat
 ‘I roasted the meat’

In (1), the stem /menāē-/ is animate intransitive and inflects as a normal AI verb, despite the fact that it has an object. In (2), however, the AI stem /abwe-/ is marked with the suffix *-n*, a special inflectional marker which appears in various environments in Ojibwe, including on AI+O verbs. The details will not concern us here, but as we show below, AI+O verbs play an important role in applicativization.

2.2 Derivation of verb stems

Most basic verb stems contain at least two derivational parts, the initial and the final.⁴ (3) provides a few examples of what is known among Algonquianists as PRIMARY DERIVATION.⁵

³ We use the orthography of our sources in examples, except for Menominee, where we use the modern orthography. Several sources use capital letters for morphophonemes which show particular alternations (which are not important for present purposes). Vowel length may be indicated with double vowels, a raised dot, a macron, or a circumflex. Some authors use a raised dot or colon before a suffix to indicate that it lengthens a preceding short vowel. Abbreviations used in examples appear at the end of the chapter.

⁴ The maximal template for a simple word across Algonquian is tripartite: INITIAL-MEDIAL-FINAL. Medials form a small class relative to the other types of element, and are optional. Initials are also called ‘roots’ by many Algonquianists, but we prefer to use ‘initial’ because of the potential confusion with other uses of the term ‘root’ in linguistics.

⁵ The translations and glosses in our examples may be slightly simplified, for ease of exposition. In this set of examples, the second and third lines show only the derivational morphemes in each word, enclosed by slashes.

(3) SW Ojibwe (OPD)

- a. *gwayakosin* ‘it (inan.) lies straight’
/gwayakw-sin/
/straight-lie.II/
INITIAL-FINAL
- b. *gwayakoshin* ‘s/he/it (an.) lies straight’
/gwayakw-shin/
/straight-lie.AI/
INITIAL-FINAL
- c. *bagamiwidoon* ‘arrive carrying it (inan.)’
/bagam-wid/
/arrive-carry.TI/
INITIAL-FINAL
- d. *bagamiwizh* ‘arrive carrying him/her/it (an.)’
/bagam-wiN/
/arrive-carry.TA/
INITIAL-FINAL

Each pair of examples contains an initial (*gwayakw-* or *bagam-*) followed by a final providing both lexical and grammatical information. The grammatical information in each case is the verb type, and as these examples show, finals often come in pairs according to the animacy of the relevant argument. We will see this again when considering applicative suffixes.

Verb stems can be modified further by adding another final through SECONDARY DERIVATION. (4a), below, shows a TI verb meaning ‘sip it (inanimate)’. In (4b) a secondary final *-a*’ has been added to the stem of that verb, causativizing it, and yielding the TA verb ‘give (animate) a sip of it’.

(4) SW Ojibwe (OPD)

- a. *gwaabandan* ‘sip it (inan.)’
/gwaab-and/
/scoop.up-act.on.by.mouth.TI/
INITIAL-FINAL
- b. *gwaabanda*’ ‘give him/her/it (an.) a sip of it’
/[gwaaband]-a/
/[sip.it]-cause.TA/
[STEM]-FINAL

Many of the applicative suffixes that we describe below fall into the category of secondary derivation; that is, they attach to a stem (the BC), creating a new stem (the AC).

2.3 Notes on verb inflection

A few inflectional categories and related phenomena are relevant to the discussion of applicatives.

The marking of inflection on transitive verbs is conventionally treated as governed by a set of prominence hierarchies (see Zúñiga 2008; Macaulay 2009). Consider the examples in (5) (where stems are bracketed):

(5) Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 4: 14, 17–18)

- a. *ne-[wa-pam]-a-w-a*
I-[look.at]-TS-3-SG
'I look at him'
- b. *newa-pamekwa*
ne-[wa-pam]-ekw-w-a
I-[look.at]-TS-3-SG
'He looks at me'
- c. *ke-[wa-pam]-i*
2-[look.at]-TS
'You (sg.) look at me'
- d. *ke-[wa-pam]-en-e*
2-[look.at]-TS-EP
'I look at you (sg.)'

Both (5a) and (5b) carry the first person prefix, despite the fact that the first person is subject in the former and object in the latter. In (5c) and (5d) the second person prefix appears, again marking subject in the former and object in the latter. The customary analysis is that the prefixes are governed by a prominence hierarchy of the form $2 > 1 > 3$. The suffixes glossed "TS" (theme sign) in the examples then distinguish subject and object. Traditionally, *-a-*, as in (5a), is called the direct theme sign, meaning that the subject outranks the object on the hierarchy, while *-ekw*, in (5b), is called inverse, meaning that the object outranks the subject. Authors differ on whether the two theme signs in (5c) and (5d) should likewise be treated as direct and inverse; we do not address that here.

TI verbs also have theme signs, which can be said to agree with the inanimate object. Many Algonquian languages have three classes of TI verbs, illustrated below for Meskwaki:

(6) Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 4: 11–12)

- a. *[wa-pat]-am-w-a*
[look.at]-TS-3-SG
'S/he looks at it.'

- b. [pye-t]-o-w-a
[bring]-TS-3-SG
'S/he brings it'
- c. [mi-čij]-Ø-w-a
[eat]-TS-3-SG
'S/he eats it.'

(6a) illustrates a TI Class 1 verb, marked by theme sign *-am*, which alternates with *-a* in other person/number combinations. (6b) illustrates Class 2, marked by theme sign *-o*. Some languages also have a small and idiosyncratic class of TI3 verbs, which in Meskwaki has no theme sign (we have added a zero to make this explicit).

Many analyses treat some or all of the theme signs as object agreement (e.g. Pentland 1999; Oxford 2019); this puts them into the realm of more familiar morphological functions. Theme signs are relevant in our description of several of the applicative types below.

2.4 Preverbs

Most Algonquian languages have a class of preverbs, which attach to the beginning of the verb stem and contribute tense, aspect, adverbial, and other meanings. The following examples illustrate preverbs (underlined> in Cheyenne:

- (7) Cheyenne (Leman 2014: 250–251)
 - a. Né-to'se-vá'ne-onésé-[héhpóheh]-a
2-going.to-only-try-[scare]-INV
'He is only going to try to scare you.'
 - b. Ná-ohké-sáa-'oné'séóme-péhéve-[tséhést-o'ané]-he
1-HAB-not-EP-truly-well-[Cheyenne-pronounce]-NEG
'I truly do not pronounce Cheyenne well.'

The categories of preverb and initial overlap to a great extent in terms of content and form; in some of the languages many are identical in form, but in others preverbs have an extra derivational morpheme, often *-i*, as shown in Table 2.

The two are clearly distinguished in terms of relative position, however: the initial is always the first morpheme in the stem, and preverbs appear to the left of the stem. They are also distinguished by boundary; initials are part of derivational morphology, forming stems, but in most Algonquian languages preverbs compound with stems, with a word boundary intervening.

We show in sections 6 and 7 how preverbs participate in applicative formation in some contexts.

Table 2: Meskwaki initials and preverbs
(Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 6: 12–13).

Initial	Preverb	Meaning
<i>asa-m-</i>	<i>asa-mi-</i>	‘too much’
<i>menw-</i>	<i>menwi-</i>	‘well’
<i>nah-</i>	<i>nahi-</i>	‘know how’
<i>ni-šw-</i>	<i>ni-šwi-</i>	‘two’
<i>po-n-</i>	<i>po-ni-</i>	‘cease’

2.5 Grammatical relations

Grammatical relations in Algonquian languages have not been extensively studied, with some exceptions such as work on Ojibwe by Rhodes (e.g. 1990) and Dryer (1986), and work on Meskwaki by Dahlstrom (e.g. 2009). It is broadly accepted, though, that Algonquian languages are of the PO (primary object) type, in Dryer’s (1986: 815) terms; that is, that the relations subject, primary object (O1), and secondary object (O2) are the relevant grammatical relations in these languages.⁶ Because (as we show below) objects of monotransitive verbs and primary objects of ditransitive verbs are treated alike, contrasting with secondary objects, the languages can be said to show secondary alignment (Malchukov et al. 2010: 3–5).

Subjects are morphologically marked on verbs as the only argument of true intransitive verbs and as one argument of some forms of transitive verbs, as we have seen in many of the examples above, including (7b). Primary objects are distinguished first and foremost by animacy, as illustrated in Table 1, and in (8) below:

(8) Menominee (Bloomfield 1975: 261)

- a. *wanēhnetaw*
[wan-e-hNEt]-ā-w
[lose-EP-lay.TI]-TS-3
‘S/he loses it’
- b. *wanēhsemaew*
[wan-e-hsem]-āē-w
[lose-EP-lay.TA]-TS-3
‘S/he loses him, her, it (an.)’

⁶ We remain neutral here on whether nominals or agreement satisfy argument structure. Both positions have been taken in approaches to Algonquian syntax; see especially LeSourd (2006).

In these examples the object's animacy is determined by the form of the final: *-hNEt* derives a TI verb (with inanimate object), and *-hsem* derives a TA verb (with animate object). Additionally, the form of the theme sign signals the animacy of the object: *-ā* in (8a) is a TI theme sign and *-āē* in (8b) is a TA theme sign.

Ditransitives in Algonquian languages take two objects, an O1 (usually recipient or benefactive, but also a range of other thematic roles) and an O2 (almost always a patient or theme). Dahlstrom (2009: 227) makes the point that a prepositional dative alternation of the sort found in English is not available in Meskwaki (nor in other Algonquian languages): "The double object construction is the only possibility".⁷ (9) provides an example of a basic ditransitive in Plains Cree:

- (9) Plains Cree (Wolvengrey 2011: 59)
Ni-kī-[mīy]-ā-w ana awāsis maskisina
 1-IPFV-[give]-TS-3 that child shoe.INAN.PL
 'I gave that child shoes.'

Here, the primary object is the recipient, the child. The secondary object is *maskisina* 'shoes', which is inanimate. The verb has a TA theme sign (*-ā*), which shows that it agrees with the (animate) primary object.

Various authors have pointed out that the two objects in a ditransitive construction show a range of morphosyntactic differences. While primary objects are restricted only by animacy (as shown in [8]), Rhodes (1990), for example, shows that secondary objects are restricted to third person and cannot passivize. Dahlstrom (2009) provides a longer list of tests for Meskwaki that show the same result. An illustration of the person restriction is shown in (10):⁸

- (10) Ojibwe (Lochbihler 2012: 118)⁹
 a. **gi-gii-miin-aa niin*
 2-PAST-give-TS me
 Intended: 'You gave me to him/her.'
 b. **ni-gii-miin-aa giin*
 1-PAST-give-TS you
 Intended: 'I gave you to him/her.'

⁷ In the Algonquianist tradition, ditransitives and applicatives are usually called "double object constructions", "double goal constructions", "benefactives", and "TA+O verbs".

⁸ Meadows (2010: 108) provides elicited examples from Blackfoot showing a first and second person O2, so that language may not share this restriction.

⁹ Lochbihler (2012: 23) says that most of her data come from Eastern Ojibwe, but that she also includes data from other dialects. She marks these two examples as just "Ojibwe".

These examples show that ditransitives are ungrammatical with a non-third person O2. Furthermore, these authors (and others) have also shown that, by these criteria, the object of an AI+O is likewise an O2.

There is less consensus on the status of oblique arguments in Algonquian. The term “oblique” often goes undefined in the Algonquianist literature, but Dahlstrom defines it as follows: “Oblique arguments . . . are ones in which a thematic role is explicitly encoded, perhaps by choice of preposition, as in English, or by semantic case marking, as in Finnish” (2014: 58).¹⁰ She goes on to say that the most common type of encoding for obliques found in Algonquian languages is the appearance of what are known as relative roots; they are the subject of Section 6. Briefly (and incompletely), relative roots are derivational components (initials) which license oblique arguments, as in (11):

- (11) Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2015: 60)
Meneseki e-hočiwenekoči
 menes-eki e-h-očiwen-ekoči
 island-LOC AOR-carry.O.from.(there)-3>3/AOR
 ‘It (an eagle) carried him from the island.’

In (11), the verb ‘carry (animate) from there’ contains the relative root *ot-* ‘source of motion’ and the final *-iwen-* ‘carry’. This adds an oblique argument to the valence of the verb, which in this sentence is realized by the locative-marked noun *meneseki* ‘island’. However, Dahlstrom points out that a variety of categories may fulfill this requirement for an oblique argument – a noun (bare or locative), a demonstrative, or an adverbial particle, for example. More examples can be found in Section 6.

2.6 Word order

The syntax of Algonquian languages is strongly influenced by discourse factors. As Dahlstrom (2017) points out, many authors have argued that clauses in Algonquian languages are basically verb-initial, but with preverbal positions for at least a topic and a focus constituent.¹¹ She also points out that attempts at determining basic word order based on the relative ordering of S, O, and V inevitably find a lack of significant patterns in the data. Costa (2017: 349) goes so far as to say “the concept of ‘basic word order’ as it is applied to configurational languages is not useful in describing Miami-Illinois word order”. Sullivan (2012) notes the importance of considering the source of

¹⁰ Dahlstrom is writing here within the framework of Lexical Functional Grammar, but we find the definition broad enough to generalize.

¹¹ There is also a large literature on Algonquian language structure in the minimalist tradition, which for the most part has a very different approach to word order. We do not address that kind of approach here.

data in such studies. He points out that elicitation bias towards an English-like SVO pattern is a real possibility for languages that do allow that as one acceptable word order. He resolves this with a picture-description task for Southwestern Ojibwe, the results of which support the kind of discourse-driven model that Dahlstrom describes.

Dahlstrom (1995: 3 and elsewhere) argues for a relatively flat templatic structure for Meskwaki word order, with slots for topic, negative, focus, and oblique before the verb, and for other constituents after it. Other authors (e.g. Johnson et al. 2015; Costa 2017) have made similar claims for other Algonquian languages, although the relative positions of specific elements differ across the languages.

At the same time, as is typical with polysynthetic languages, phrases corresponding to arguments are often omitted. This plays a large role in our discussion of the syntax of ditransitives, because of the difficulty of finding a large enough set of data for any given language with both objects present as overt nominals.

One final factor that is relevant to word order is the possibility for discontinuous constituents. Quantifiers and demonstratives, for example, may be separated from their heads, and placed in initial position, as in (12):

(12) Swampy Cree (Reinholtz 1999: 201, 204)

- a. *Niso kî-sipwêhtêwak awâsisak*
 two 3.PFV-leave.PL child.PL
 ‘The two children left.’
- b. *Awa kî-sipwêhtêw awâsis*
 this 3.PFV-leave child
 ‘This child left.’

Reinholtz argues that these modifiers appear preverbally because they are in focus position; a further indication of the discourse factors that drive syntax in Algonquian languages.

2.7 Our data and examples

We provide full sentence examples where possible, but our sources do not always provide sentences containing the relevant forms. This is partly because many of our examples come from dictionaries which only supply headwords, and partly because many of the other works cited are more focused on morphology than syntax.

The data are also unavoidably skewed towards those languages for which there are good descriptive grammars and dictionaries, as well as towards those we know best. This chapter thus serves as a preliminary survey of applicatives in Algonquian, but further empirical research is needed.

3 The ubiquitous applicative suffixes

*-amaw and *-aw

Most Algonquian languages have an applicative affix that can be traced back to Proto-Algonquian *-amaw (Bloomfield 1946: 115), illustrated in (13) with data from Menominee.¹²

(13) Menominee (Bloomfield 1928 [MGV 106], 1975)

- a. TI: *enāēsenam* ‘s/he reaches for it; moves it by hand’
 Stem: /aenaesen-/
 b. TA: *Enāēsenamowaewen anenoh omāētemōhseman eneh ohkānaeh.*
 he.hand.it.to.her.OBV this.OBV his.wife.OBV that awl
 ‘He handed the awl to his wife.’

In (13a) we first provide the surface form of the verb, with the (inflectional) TI theme sign *-am*, and below that we show its stem, /aenaesen-/. That stem becomes an applicative TA verb in (13b) with the addition of (derivational) *-amow*.

In addition, many of the languages have an applicative that Bloomfield reconstructs as PA *-aw (1946: 115), illustrated for Unami in (14):

(14) Unami (Goddard 2021: 165)¹³

- TI: |səkàpəpat-| ‘wet it’
 > TA: |səkàpəpataw-| ‘wet O2 for O1’

Both *-amaw and *-aw fit the definition of P-applicative adopted in this volume: there is a morphological marking asymmetry, there is no change to the S/A argument, and verbs in which the applicative appears license a primary object AppP (e.g. *anenoh omāētemōhseman* ‘his wife’ in [13b]).

We address three topics in the sections that follow: first (§ 3.1) we provide a thorough look at *-amaw and *-aw, showing some of the many differences in their evolution in the daughter languages. Second, in § 3.2 we look at the relationship between the two suffixes, and third, in § 3.3 we look at the status of *-aw in Blackfoot, which differs from its status in other languages.

¹² We adopt the convention in this section of using the PA form when we want to refer to a category across the family; thus *-amaw will stand for the various forms (*-amaw*, *-amow*, *-omo*, etc.) found in the daughter languages.

¹³ Goddard uses the vertical bar to enclose underlying forms.

3.1 Description of *-amaw and *-aw

(15)–(17) provide a larger set of examples containing reflexes of *-amaw from a variety of Algonquian languages.¹⁴

(15) Blackfoot -*omo* (Frantz 1991: 105)

- a. TA: *nitsíyissksipistayaawa* (stem /yIssksipist-/) ‘I tied up [your horses]’
 > TA: *nitsíyissksipistomoawa* (stem /yIssksipist-omo-/) ‘I tied it up for him’
- b. TA: *Nitsíyissksipistomoawa nitákkaawa óta’siksi.*
 I.tied.them.up.for.him my.partner his.horses
 ‘I tied his horses up for my partner.’

(16) SW Ojibwe -*amaw* (OPD)

- a. AI: *ininan* (stem /inin-/) ‘hold, handle it a certain way’
 > TA: *ininamaw* (stem /ininamaw-/) ‘hand (it) to him or her a certain way’
- b. TA: *Ningii-ininamawaa akiwenzii asemaan.*
 I.handed.it.to.him old.man tobacco
 ‘I handed the old man some tobacco.’

(17) a. Innu -*am(a)u* (Drapeau 2014: 227–228)¹⁵

- AI+O: /tshimuti-/ ‘voler’ (‘steal’)
 > TA: /tshimutam(a)u-/ ‘voler quelque chose à quelqu’un’
 (‘steal something from somebody’)
- b. Meskwaki -*amaw* (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 7:16)
 TI: /mešen-/ ‘catch it’
 > TA: /mešenamaw-/ ‘catch O2 for O’
- c. Myaamia -*amaw* (MPD)
 TI: /mahsenaham-/ ‘owe it’
 > TA: /mahsenahamaw-/ ‘owe it to him’
- d. Plains Cree -*amaw* (Wolfart 1973: 75)
 TI: /ātot-/ ‘tell of it’
 > TA: *ātotamawēw* (stem /ātotamaw-/) ‘he tells of it for him’

¹⁴ Some authors do not treat *-amaw as a unitary affix; we address this in § 3.2. Also note that applicatives are not formed from II verbs, presumably for the pragmatic reason that inanimates are unlikely to be subjects of verbs whose semantics would allow for applicativization.

¹⁵ Innu examples from Drapeau (2014) are given in their original orthography, which does not mark vowel length. The symbol <ñ> represents a sound which is [l] or [n] in different dialects of Innu. Translations have been supplied by the present authors. Drapeau writes the suffix under discussion as -*am(a)u* to indicate contraction it undergoes in certain contexts.

- e. Unami *-amaw* (Goddard 2021: 165)
 TI: |sōkah-| ‘pour (it)’
 > TA: |sōkahamaw-| ‘pour O2 on O1’

In general, reflexes of **-amaw* are described as creating “benefactives” (e.g. Bliss 2010, Drapeau 2014) or “double-object verbs” (e.g. Wolfart 1973; Goddard 2021). The applied object usually carries roles such as beneficiary, goal/recipient, or source, and sometimes comitative or various locative roles.

Consider next (18) and (19), which provide more examples of **-aw* applicatives:¹⁶

- (18) Menominee *-uw* (Bloomfield 1928 [BOY 008], 1975)¹⁷
 a. TI: *osēhtaw* (stem /oseht-/) ‘s/he makes it’
 > TA: *osīhtuwaew* (stem /osehtuw-/) ‘s/he makes it for him or her’
 b. TA: ... ‘s *osīhtuwacen* *omāhkesenan onīcianaehsan*.
 when.she.made.them.for.him.OBV his.moccasins her.child.OBV
 ‘... when she made moccasins for her child.’
- (19) a. Plains Cree *-aw* (Wolfart 1973: 75)
 AI+O: /nahasta-/ ‘place it right, put it away’
 > TA: *nahastawēw* (stem /nahastaw-/) ‘he places it right for him’
 b. Meskwaki *-aw* (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 6:5)
 AI: /pene·hke-/ ‘hunt turkeys’
 > TA: /pene·hkaw-/ ‘hunt turkeys for O’
 c. Myaamia *-aw* (MPD)
 TI: /mam-/ ‘take it, buy it’
 > TA: /mamaw-/ ‘buy it from him, take it from him’
 d. SW Ojibwe *-aw* (OPD)
 AI: /manise-/ ‘s/he harvests, cuts firewood’
 > TA: manisaw (stem /manisaw-/) ‘cut (it) as firewood for him/her’

The applied objects added by **-aw* bear the same sorts of thematic roles as those added by **-amaw*, with beneficiary and goal among the most common.

Bloomfield’s (1946: 115) description of the distribution of **-amaw* and **-aw* in PA is instructive for understanding their distribution in the modern languages: there he

¹⁶ When **-aw* attaches to a vowel-final AI stem, the stem vowel drops. There are also often stem-final vowel replacements before the various applicative suffixes; these will be evident in the examples below.

¹⁷ Bloomfield (1946: 115) describes the relationship between **-aw* and Menominee *-uw* as “phonetical-ly queer”, presumably meaning that the change of **a* > *u* is unexplained. In this example *-uw* triggers vowel harmony, resulting in the /i/ in the second syllable of the TA form.

says that *-amaw attached to TI1 stems, but *-aw attached to TI2 stems.¹⁸ This is to some extent reflected in the modern data: *-aw appears with AI stems, and it also appears with TI stems of classes 2 and 3 in the languages that have them. Table 3 provides a closer look at the distribution of *-amaw and *-aw with respect to the stems to which they attach.

Table 3: Base categories for *-amaw and *-aw.

	*-amaw					*-aw				
	AI	TI(1)	TI2	TI3	TA	AI	TI(1)	TI2	TI3	TA
Blackfoot	✓	✓			✓					
Plains Cree	✓	✓				✓				
SW Ojibwe		✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	
Menominee		✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	
Meskwaki		✓				✓		✓	✓	
Potawatomi		✓				✓		✓	✓	
Myaamia		✓				✓			✓	
Nishnaabemwin		✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	
N. East Cree		✓								
Naskapi		✓								
Innu	✓	✓								
Unami		✓				✓				

Over time, the pattern has become somewhat less clear, but the basics of the system described by Bloomfield are still visible. First, only Blackfoot allows an applicative to be derived from a TA verb. Second, languages with TI2 verbs never use *-aw for a TI1. At the same time, Nishnaabemwin and SW Ojibwe have some TI2 verbs that take *-amaw, and a few languages use *-amaw with AI or TI3 verbs.¹⁹

In some of the descriptions of applicatives formed from AIs, it is not clear whether the stems are plain AI or AI+O.²⁰ But in Plains Cree, Wolfart (1973: 75) is explicit that both *-amaw and *-aw attach to “syntactically transitive AI stems” (AI+Os), although he implies that it is less common with *-amaw. As he puts it, “This is obviously an area of extreme productivity and considerable fluctuation”.

Since reflexes of the two suffixes are found across such a wide range of Algonquian languages, they both appear to be of PA origin. But, as we have shown, their relative attachment sites are no longer completely complementary for all of the languages, and so in most cases they can no longer be considered allomorphs.

¹⁸ Bloomfield says that TI2 stems developed out of “pseudo-transitive”, or AI+O stems. Other authors (e.g. Goddard 1979: 71–72) reconstruct *-am and *-aw for TI classes 1 and 2.

¹⁹ Unami has two subtypes of TI1; Goddard (2021: 68) notates them as TI(1a) and TI(1b).

²⁰ We use “AI” as a cover term in Innu for a set of subcategories of “transitive” AI verbs which includes AI+O; see Drapeau (2014: 227–228).

At this point we turn to the relationship between *-amaw and *-aw.

3.2 The /am/ in *-amaw

In many of the languages, *-amaw attaches to all TI verbs, or primarily to TI verbs of class 1 in languages that have subclasses of TI verbs. The shorter suffix *-aw attaches to AI verbs, and in the languages that have them, to TI2 (and sometimes TI3) verbs.

At the same time, Bloomfield (1946: 99) reconstructs a theme sign *-am for TI1 verbs with third person subjects. It is natural to wonder whether this *-am accounts for the /am/ in the applicative *-amaw, especially given the existence of the applicative *-aw. That is, is *-amaw synchronically one suffix, *-amaw, or two, *-am-aw? Both analyses are found in the literature: some authors (including Bloomfield 1962 and Valentine 2001) treat it as a unitary affix, while others (e.g. Wolfart 1973; Goddard 2021; Dahlstrom 2021) treat it as consisting of the TI theme sign *-am plus a secondary final *-aw. This difference of analysis is illustrated with Plains Cree data in (20):

(20) Plains Cree (PCD)

- TI1: *âtotam* (/âtot-/) ‘s/he tells about something’
 > TA: *âtotamawêw* ‘s/he tells about (it/him) for someone’
- a. Unitary applicative suffix *-amaw*
[âtot]-amaw-êw
 [tell.about.it]-APPL-INFLECTION
- b. Theme sign *-am* + applicative suffix *-aw*
[âtot]-am-aw-êw
 [tell.about.it]-TI1.TS-APPL-INFLECTION

At first glance, it might seem like the most parsimonious analysis of *-amaw is the one shown in (20b), since it allows us to generalize *-aw across all TI subtypes. Dahlstrom’s analysis of the Meskwaki applicative takes exactly this approach, as illustrated in (21):

(21) Meskwaki *-aw* (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 7:16)

- a. AI: /ašike-/ ‘build a house’
 > TA: /ašikaw-/ ‘build a house for O’
- b. TI1: /mešen-/ ‘catch O’
 > TA: /mešenamaw-/ ‘catch O2 for O’
- c. TI2: /pi-tikat-/ ‘bring O inside’
 > TA: /pi-tikataw-/ ‘bring O2 inside for O’
- d. TI3: /na-t-/ ‘go after O’
 > TA: /na-taw-/ ‘go after O2 for O’

In order to claim that there is a single applicative suffix, Dahlstrom must describe its distribution as “attach[ing] to AI, TI2, and TI3 stems; with TI class 1 verbs the applicative attaches to a theme, composed of the verb stem plus the TI class 1 theme sign *-am-*” (2021, Ch. 7: 16).

There is an analytic trade-off here: on the one hand, if we claim that there is just one applicative suffix, **-aw*, this comes at the cost of complicating the statement of the types of base it attaches to (as in Dahlstrom’s account just given). On the other hand, we could simplify the statement about the type of base to which the applicative attaches (the stem in all cases), but that comes at the cost of positing two suffixes, **-amaw* for TI1 verbs and **-aw* for the rest.

Our inclination is to take the latter approach. A major consideration for us is that most Algonquianists consider theme signs to be inflectional, and the analysis represented by (20b) and (21b) places an inflectional morpheme (*-am*) inside a derivational morpheme (*-aw*).²¹ Some linguists, however, would not see this as a problem (either not embracing the distinction between inflection and derivation, or not accepting the strict relative linear ordering of the two types); cf. Bochner (1984) and LeSourd (1995).

Hoffman and Oxford (2021) suggest a third approach: that the *-am* inside derivational suffixes (like *-aw*) is a distinct morpheme, but that it is not synchronically the same morpheme as the theme sign *-am*, whatever its diachronic origin may be. We refer the reader to their paper for further discussion, and here leave the issue an open question.

3.3 **-aw* as a syntactic lookalike in Blackfoot

Although in most of the languages, **-aw* appears to be a full-fledged applicative, in Blackfoot it functions as an equipollent syntactic lookalike. Consider (22)–(24):

(22) Blackfoot (Frantz 1991: 104)

- a. TI: *nítsskiitatoo’piaawa* ‘I baked them’
Root /ihkiit-/ + TI final /-watoo/
- b. TA: *Nítsskiitqawaistsi nitána.*
nit-ihkiit-q-a:-wa-aistsi n-itán-wa
1-bake-BEN-DIR-3SG-PRO 1-daughter-3SG
‘I baked them for my daughter’

²¹ Hoffman and Oxford (2021: 136) point out that there has also been some discussion in the literature of whether theme signs should be treated as inflectional or derivational; see the references cited in their paper.

(23) Blackfoot (BD, Taylor 1969: 249)

AI: *innootaa* ‘butcher’

> TA: */-Innooto-/* ‘butcher (for someone)’

(24) Blackfoot (BD)

AI: *ohpommaa* ‘buy (something)’

> TA: *ohpommo* ‘buy for, buy from, trade to’

The first pair of examples above show the initial /ihkiit-/ ‘bake’; it is followed by a TI final in (22a), and by the benefactive TA final *-o* (*-aw) in (22b). In (23)–(24) the AI verbs both contain the AI final *-aa*; this is replaced by *-o* in the TA forms. Thus the BC and the AC are both marked, with a common initial in each case.

4 Other affixal applicatives

In addition to *-aw and *-amaw, there are numerous other, less common applicative suffixes listed for many of the languages. These also satisfy the criteria for a true applicative. Space does not permit full description of all of these affixes; instead, we provide an overview of the more frequently noted ones.

We have organized these by the initial consonant(s) of the suffix; this is purely for convenience, and no claims about cognacy are intended.

4.1 /-st-/ applicatives

This set of applicative suffixes, illustrated in (25)–(28), occurs in at least four languages across the Cree–Montagnais–Naskapi (CMN) continuum.

(25) Innu *-sht* (TI) / *-shtu* (TA) ‘circumstantial’ (Drapeau 2014: 229–230)²²

a. AI: *Mañi atimikapu*

Marie she.stands.with.back.turncd

‘Marie est debout de dos.’ (‘Marie is standing with her back turned.’)

b. > TI: *nitatimikapush^uten katshitapatakanit*

I.stand.with.back.to.it television

‘Je suis debout dos à la télévision.’

(‘I am standing with my back to the television.’)

²² In Drapeau (2011: 61) these are given as *-štaw* / *-štam*, and defined as ‘Locational Reference’.

- c. AI: *Mañi nipepu*
 Marie she.sits.up.watching
 ‘Marie passe la nuit assise à veiller.’
 (‘Marie spends the night watching.’)
- d. > TA: *Mañi nipepishtueu utauia*
 Marie she.sits.up.watching.over.him her.father
 ‘Marie passe la nuit à veiller son père.’
 (‘Marie spends the night watching her father’.)

(26) Western Naskapi “on behalf of” (Brittain 2001: 4)

AI > TA: *-stimuw*

(27) Northern East Cree “benefactive” (Collette 2014: 90–91)

AI > TI: *-stim*

AI > TA: *-staw*

AI > TA: *-stimaw*

(28) Plains Cree “action on a general goal with a transitive animate beneficiary”
 (Wolfart 1973: 75)

AI > TA: *-stamaw*

This particular set of applicatives may be composed of more than one suffix, either synchronically or diachronically. Plains Cree, for example, has a suffix *-st* which derives a TI verb from an AI verb, and it seems plausible that *-stamaw* is *-st* + *-amaw*. But Wolfart argues that this is not the correct analysis since the specific inanimate object that would be expected from the addition of *-st* is not present in the sense of the derived TA verb (note his definition “action on a general goal”). Brittain (1993: 76) gives a suffix for Innu which is parallel to the Plains Cree one, but different from the ones Drapeau gives, *-shtamau*. She explicitly analyzes it as “the unidentified *-sht-*, the TI theme sign *-am-* and the applicative *-au-*”. Brittain (2001: 4) likewise treats Western Naskapi *-stimuw* as composed of three suffixes, concluding that *-st* is a secondary TI final which accounts for the distinctive semantics, ‘on behalf of’. We leave the internal structure of these suffixes an open question.

4.2 /-ht/ applicatives

A few languages have applicatives in /-ht/, as follow:

(29) Unami | -ht | (TI[1a]), | -htaw | (TA), | -htam | (TA) “applicative” (Goddard 2021: 164)

- a. AI: | apĩ- | ‘be (somewhere)’
 > TI: | apĩht- | ‘be in’
 > TA: | apĩhtaw- | ‘be in’

- b. AI: *tkáwsu* 'he is gentle, good-natured, mild, well-minded'
 > TA: |*təkawəsīhtam-*| 'regard favorably'

(30) Meskwaki "applicative" (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 7: 17–18)

- AI > TI: *-ht*
 AI > TA: *-htaw*
 AI > TA: *-h*

These suffixes all attach to an AI stem, and form both TA and TI applicatives. In the Meskwaki case, Dahlstrom pairs the suffixes *-ht* and *-htaw*, which generally add a goal argument, and *-ht* and *-h*, "associated with a range of thematic roles" (2021, Ch. 7: 18).

4.3 /-m/ applicatives

Many of the languages have an applicative of the form *-m* (or in Blackfoot, *:-m*), which appears in the comitative construction discussed in § 7. But the suffix appears on its own without comitative meaning in some cases as well.²³

(31) Blackfoot *:-m* (TA) (BD)

- AI: *okska'si* 'run'
 > TA: *yiistapokska'siim* 'flee, run away from'

(32) Menominee *-m* (TA) "secondary suffix" (Bloomfield 1962:334)

- AI: *kemōtaew* 's/he steals'
 > TA: *kemōtemaew* 's/he steals from him/her'

(33) Unami |*-m*| (TA) "applicative" (Goddard 2021:164)

- AI: |*kīwīkē-*| 'go visiting'
 > TA: |*kīwīkam-*| 'visit'

The few examples found are formed from AI verbs and have animate goal and source objects.

²³ Thanks to Natalie Weber for bringing the Blackfoot example to our attention. In (31), *yiistap-* is a preverb.

4.4 /-t/ applicatives

A number of languages have applicatives that either consist solely of /-t/ or start with /t/, as illustrated in (34)–(38).

- (34) Menominee *-t* (TI) “action [. . .] upon an object” (Bloomfield 1928 [HMM:030–031], 1962: 342)

- a. AI: *mēcemāēhkaew* ‘s/he prepares food for storage’
 b. > TI: *eneq-peh enoh metāēmoh māwaw*
 then that woman all
 kew-mēcemāēhkatah eneh mēcemēhsaeh
 HAB-she.prepare.it.as.stored.food that meat
 ‘then the woman would preserve all that meat and store it away’

- (35) Unami “applicative” (Goddard 2021: 163)

AI > TI(1a): | -t |

- (36) Western Naskapi “benefactive” (Brittain 2001: 4)

AI > TA: *-tuw*

- (37) Northern East Cree “applicative” (Collette 2014: 92)

AI > TI: *-tut*

- (38) Innu “applicative” (Drapeau 2014: 230)²⁴

AI > TI: *-tut*

AI > TA: *-tutu*

The Menominee and Unami suffixes each have a matching suffix which creates TA verbs, but does not start with /-t/. In Menominee it is /-N/ and in Unami it is | -l |. These both result from a merging of PA *-θ and *-l (Bloomfield 1946: 87; Goddard 1980) and subsequent changes, so they are likely cognate.

For Western Naskapi, again, Brittain (2001: 4) treats the form given as composed of multiple suffixes: *-t-uw*. She claims that the applicative *-uw* is barred from attaching to an AI verb, so the TI final *-t* attaches to create a non-occurring TI stem, allowing *-uw* to follow.

²⁴ These are given as *-ttam* and *-ttaw* in Drapeau (2011) and called the “generalized applicative”. By this, she means that they add an AppP with a “semantically unspecified” thematic role (2011: 58), in contrast to other more specified applicative suffixes in the language.

4.5. Additional applicative suffixes

In this section we list, by language, suffixes that do not fall into the classes above.

- (39) Arapaho (Cowell and Moss 2008: 148–150)
 AI > TI: *:-t* “applicative”
 AI > TA: *:-ton* “applicative”
- (40) Blackfoot (Taylor 1969: 253)²⁵
 AI > TI: *-ISkiSt* “transitive inanimate”
 AI > TA: *-ISkiSto* “transitive animate”
- (41) Menominee (Bloomfield 1962: 342, 355)
 AI > TA: */-N/* “action [. . .] upon an object” (matches TI *-t*)
 AI > TI1: *-qt* “secondary suffix”
 AI > TA: *-qtaw* “secondary suffix”
- (42) Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 7: 18)
 AI > TI: *-not* “applicative”
 AI > TA: *-notaw* “applicative”
- (43) Myaamia (Costa p.c.)²⁶
 AI > TI: *-ilotam* “applicative”
 AI > TA: *-ilotaw* “applicative”
- (44) Unami (Goddard 2021: 163–166)
 AI > TA: *|-l|* “applicative” (matches TI *|-t|*)
 AI > TA: *|-lax|* “benefactive”
 AI+O > TA: *|-mal|* “applicative” (only one example)

5 The syntax of affixal applicatives

Recall from Section 2.5 that there are a number of factors which distinguish an O1 and an O2 in Algonquian languages. Monotransitive verbs (the TA and TI categories) select for the animacy of their (primary) object, for example, while ditransitives restrict their

²⁵ The author says, “It is likely that more than one morpheme is present, but if so, their identities are unknown” (1969: 253).

²⁶ The Meskwaki suffixes in (42) and the Myaamia in (43) are likely cognate.

O2 to third person. Also recall that the object of an AI+O verb has been shown to be an O2 by numerous authors (e.g. Rhodes 1990).

With that background in mind, consider the two primary monotransitive sources for affixal ditransitives, TI and AI+O stems. TI verbs by definition have a third person inanimate base object, which serves as the O2 in the ditransitive. The object of an AI+O likewise serves as the O2 if the verb is made ditransitive. An important point about the O2 of a ditransitive, though, is that it is not limited in animacy, even when derived from a TI verb:

(45) Menominee (Bloomfield 1962: 48)

- a. *Wāwanon* *kepītuan*.
egg.INAN.PL I.bring.them.to.you
'I bring you eggs.'
- b. *Anōhkanak* *kepītuan*.
raspberry.AN.PL I.bring.them.to.you
'I bring you raspberries.'

The examples in (45) contain an applicative built off the TI2 verb *pītāw* 's/he brings it (inan.)' with the applicative suffix *-uw* (and subsequent contraction). (45a) shows an inanimate O2, 'eggs', while (45b) shows an animate O2, 'raspberries'.

The examples in (46), from Meskwaki, are parallel, but with an AI+O verb:

(46) Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2009: 231)

- a. *ahpe-nemo-wa* *na-tawino-n-i*
depend.on-3.IND medicine-INAN.SG
'He relies on the medicine.'
- b. *ahpe-nemo-wa* *o-si-me-h-ani*
depend.on-3.IND his-younger.sibling-AN.OBV.SG
'He relies on his younger brother.'

Thus, a monotransitive TI verb has an inanimate O1, necessarily third person, which becomes the O2 of a derived applicative, losing the animacy restriction in the process. An AI+O verb has an O2 object, restricted to third person but unrestricted in terms of animacy, and it remains the O2 if the AI+O undergoes applicativization.

Turning to word order, we pointed out in Section 2.6 that discourse factors like topic and focus have been shown to drive the syntax of simple clauses in Algonquian languages, and that many linguists have argued that there is no "basic" word order that can be described in terms of subject, object, and verb. When it comes to ditransitives, claims differ. Dahlstrom (2009: 226) and Bruening (2001: 59) both find that the most common order is V O1 O2. As Dahlstrom points out, this is consistent with the unmarked position for non-topic and non-focused arguments.

Large, tagged corpora are not available for most Algonquian languages, so a thorough investigation of the syntax of applicatives requires further resources and

research. Furthermore, as we noted earlier, most of the works that describe applicatives in Algonquian languages focus on the morphology, and often do not give an example in a sentence. But a survey of the data containing applicatives which was available to us likewise shows a skew towards postverbal positioning of secondary objects, although the full picture indicates that word order in these constructions is no more constrained than word order in corresponding monotransitive constructions.

To this point we have seen the orders V O1 O2 (in [13b], [15b], and [16b]), V O2 O1 (in [18b]), V O1 (in [22b], [25b], [25d], etc.), and O2 V (in [45a–b]). In total, from the articles and grammars we surveyed, we were able to collect 99 sentences with one or more overt objects in a construction with an applicative suffix.²⁷ This is purely a convenience sample, but even this small number of examples showed every possible ordering of object and verb. Table 4 illustrates.

Table 4: Applicative construction word orders.

O1 < V		O2 < V		V < O1		V < O2	
O1 O2 V	1	O2 O1 V	1	V O1	6	V O2	29
O1 V O2	8	O2 V	3	V O1 O2	20	V O2 O1	27
		O2 V O1	4				
	9		8		26		56

Table 4 shows that it is most common for object(s) to appear postverbally, consistent with unmarked word order. Clearly, among such examples, V O2 (O1) word order is the most common, but we hesitate to draw any firm conclusions from the data. This is in part due to the small size of our sample, but also due to the possibility of elicitation bias, since so many of the examples come from articles containing what we believe to be sentences elicited in isolation. What we can conclude is that word order in Algonquian affixal applicative constructions is fairly free, with all possible orderings of verb and object(s) attested.

The combination of the employment of preverbal topic and focus positions and the fact that overt nominals are often omitted account at least in part for the fact that the applicative and lookalike constructions we have described above do not require a particular position for an AppP.

6 Relative root constructions

Algonquian languages have a class of initials known as RELATIVE ROOTS, which, as mentioned in Section 2.5, license an oblique argument in the clause (Dahlstrom 2014: 57–60;

²⁷ 36 of the 99 sentences are in Menominee, due to our easy access to that data.

Costa 2017: 363–367). Bloomfield defined relative roots as a special class of initials “that refer to an *antecedent* in the phrase” (1946: 120, emphasis in original). The relative roots that he reconstructed are exemplified in Table 5, below, with the forms in a sample of Algonquian languages.²⁸

Table 5: Relative roots.

Proto-Algonquian	PCree	Men	Nish	Mesk	Unami	Gloss (after Dahlstrom 2014)
*eθ-	<i>is-/it-</i>	<i>aeN-</i>	<i>iN-</i>	<i>in-</i>	<i>al-</i>	goal, manner
*went-	<i>oht-</i>	<i>oht-</i>	<i>ond-</i>	<i>ot-</i>	<i>want-</i>	source, cause, reason
*axk(w)-	<i>isko-</i>	<i>ahkw-</i>	<i>akw-</i>	<i>ahkw-</i>	<i>sahk-</i>	so long
*tahθ(w)-	<i>tahto-</i>	<i>tahNw-</i>	<i>daS(w)-</i>	<i>tasw-</i>	<i>(-ən)tax-</i>	so many, so much
*taθ-	<i>tat-</i>	<i>taN-</i>	<i>daN-</i>	<i>tan-</i>	<i>(-ən)tal-</i>	stationary location
*axpi-ht-		<i>ahpēht-</i>	<i>apiit-</i>	<i>ahpi-t-</i>		degree

Relative roots, like all initials, are the first morpheme of a primarily derived stem, as described in Section 2.2. Like many initials, they also have corresponding preverb forms, shown in Table 6 for Odawa (preverbs are conventionally joined with a hyphen to the verb stem, and are in boldface here).²⁹

Table 6: Odawa relative roots and corresponding preverbs (Rhodes 2006: 11).

Relative Root		Corresponding Preverb	
<i>iN-</i>	‘to, like’	<i>zhi-niikmod</i>	‘growl like so’
<i>ond-</i>	‘from, because of’	<i>nji-googiid</i>	‘dive from there’
<i>akw-</i>	‘length’	<i>ko-gkenmaad</i>	‘know s.o. for so long’
<i>das(w)-</i>	‘number’	<i>dso-bboon’gizid</i>	‘be so many years old’
<i>daN-</i>	‘at’	<i>dzhi-siboodood</i>	‘sharpen s.t. on it’
<i>apiit-</i>	‘extent’	<i>piichi-ngadenmaad</i>	‘know s.o. so much’

We argue that some relative root constructions are X-applicatives and others are looka-likes. We begin by discussing relative preverbs, which we analyze as true applicatives. For reasons of space, we omit discussion of the syntax of relative root constructions, but see Rhodes (2010) for a thorough overview of the topic in Ojibwe.

²⁸ Abbreviations in the table: PCree = Plains Cree, Men = Menominee, Nish = Nishnaabemwin, Mesk = Meskwaki. See Appendix A for sources. Orthographic representations and glosses have been updated to follow modern work.

²⁹ Nishnaabemwin and Odawa are roughly the same varieties of Ojibwe; see Valentine (2001: 1–3) for discussion.

6.1 Relative preverbs as X-applicatives

In their preverb forms, relative roots serve an applicativizing function. In each set of examples below, from Blackfoot, the verbs in (a) contrast with the verbs in (b), which contain the relative preverb *it-* ‘then, there’ (underlined in the examples). In both cases, the preverb is an additional overt marker that distinguishes it from the base construction.

(47) Blackfoot (Bliss 2014: 2)

a. *Anna Leo áíkskima.*

ann-wa Leo a-íkskima
DEM-PROX Leo IPFV-hunt.AI
‘Leo hunts.’

b. *Anna Leo itáíkskima omi itáo’tsstoyi.*

ann-wa Leo it-a-íkskima om-yi itao’tsstoyi
DEM-PROX Leo then-IPFV-hunt.AI DEM-INAN November
‘Leo hunts in November.’

(48) a. *Nitsooyi.*

nit-ioyi
1-eat.AI
‘I ate.’

b. *Nitsitsooyi anni itáisooyo’pi.*

nit-it-ioyi ann-yi itaisooyo’p-yi
1-there-eat.AI DEM-INAN table-INAN
‘I ate at the table.’

In the forms with relative preverbs, the S/A participant is unchanged, the verb is marked with respect to the BC, and the AC requires an additional phrase. We treat this additional phrase as an oblique, following Dahlstrom’s definition given in Section 2.5 above.³⁰

The semantics of that additional phrase depends on the relative preverb used. The example above contained Blackfoot *it-*, adding a time or location. The Ojicree examples

³⁰ There is some disagreement in the literature over the status of this type of argument. We follow Dahlstrom (2014), whose definition of ‘oblique’ was given in Section 2.5 above. Recall that for her, relative roots (and by extension, relative preverbs) are in fact the most common encoding of oblique arguments in Algonquian languages. However, see Rhodes (2006), who argues that relative root complements are not only distinct from oblique arguments, but are a unique type of argument distinct from all others. See also Kim (2020) for a formal treatment of oblique nominal constructions in Blackfoot.

below illustrate the relative preverbs *onci-*, which adds a source or reason, and *ahpiihci-*, which licenses a degree expression.³¹

- (49) Ojicree (Slavin 2012: 73)
- a. *Waahsa onci-piishaawak.*
 far from-they.come.AI
 ‘They came from far away.’
 - b. *Niishitana ta-ahpiihci-tahkaayaa.*
 twenty FUT-such-be.cold.II
 ‘It will be twenty degrees below zero.’

Relative root constructions are still grammatical if the applicative phrase is not present in the sentence, as long as the oblique argument is understood in context.³²

- (50) Nishnaabemwin (ND; speaker Angeline Williams)
- Mii dash gaa-izhi-waabmigod*
 and.so IC.PAST-there-it.see.him/her.TA
 ‘So now it saw him there.’

When the applicative phrase is not overt, the interpretation is “one of definite pronominal/deictic reference” (Rhodes 2006: 13).

6.2 Relative roots as lookalikes

As initials, relative root constructions are syntactic lookalikes rather than true applicatives. Verbs with relative roots are not built on fully-derived verbs, so no well-formed construction can be identified as the BC. There are often verbs that are parallel in structure and meaning, differing only in the initial chosen, but since the initial component is required for a well-formed stem, there is no alternation.

Consider the following Menominee example, which contains a relatively pragmatically neutral TA verb meaning ‘chase, pursue’:

- (51) Menominee (Bloomfield 1928 [LNX 079])
- Wōh, nepāēmenaesehopah ayāpāew!*
 whew but.I.was.chasing.it.AN stag
 ‘Whew, but I was chasing a stag!’

³¹ Ojicree is a dialect of Ojibwe (also known as Severn Ojibwe).

³² Initial change (IC in the gloss of [50]) is a grammatically conditioned morphological process of ablaut (and in some Algonquian languages, other processes like infixation) that occurs at the left edge of some verb forms; see Costa (1996).

This verb consists of the initial /paem-/ ‘straight-line movement’ and the TA final /-naesehw/ ‘chase’. Many verbs with the ‘chase’ final can be formed by substituting different initials:

(52) Menominee (Bloomfield 1975)

- a. *pītenaesehaew* ‘s/he chases him/her/it (an.) here’; initial /pīt-/ ‘come’
- b. *onēnesehāew* ‘s/he gets, chases him or her out of bed’; initial /on-/ ‘rise, lift, up’
- c. *matāpīnesehāew* ‘s/he chases him/her/it (an.) down to the water’s edge’; initial /matāpī-/ ‘down toward water’

Combining the relative root /aeN-/ ‘to there, in that way’ with this final creates *enāesehaew* ‘s/he chases, drives him, her, it (animate) there, towards there’, exemplified in (53).³³

(53) Menominee (Bloomfield 1928 [BOY 123])

Wahkītāhkyah eneq kew-enāesehotituaq.
 hilltop it.is.there HAB-they.chase.each.other.there
 ‘It was there that they chased each other to the summit’

Here, the relative root /aeN-/ of the AC licenses an oblique expressing goal; in this case ‘hilltop’. Yet, as we have shown, there is no corresponding BC that lacks the relative root.

There are a small number of relative root verbs which look at first glance like true applicatives. Consider (54):

(54) Menominee (Bloomfield 1975)

- a. *ācemow*
 /āt-e-mi/
 /tell.of-EP-by.vocal.sound.AI/
 ‘s/he narrates, reports an event, tells a story’
- b. *enācemow*
 /aeN-ācemi/
 /in.that.way-narrate.AI/
 ‘s/he tells a story, narrates in that way’

It might look from the surface forms like (54a) is the BC for (54b), but *ācemow* is made up of an initial *āt-* plus a final *-mi*, while *enācemow* is made up of the relative root *aeN-* plus

³³ The verb in (53) has undergone secondary derivation, adding a reciprocal final and becoming morphologically intransitive; this has no bearing on the relative root construction being discussed.

the final *-ācemi*. While *-ācemi* is diachronically related to the verb *ācemow*, we do not see this as a synchronic relationship, and so (54a) cannot be the BC for (54b).³⁴

7 Comitative constructions

Many Algonquian languages have a comitative construction, which adds another participant to the action described by the verb. Most of these constructions are P-applicatives, although at least one (described below) is not an applicative at all. As with the relative root construction, the comitative may contain either an initial or its corresponding preverb, but in addition there may also be a final, *-w* or *-m*. Table 7 illustrates:

Table 7: Elements of the comitative.

LANGUAGE	FORM(S)	LANGUAGE	FORM(S)
Final only		Initial + final	
Arapaho	<i>-w</i>	Menominee	<i>wēt- + -m</i>
Initial only		Meskwaki	<i>wi-t- + -m</i>
Plains Cree	<i>wîcê(w)-</i>	Nishnaabemwin	<i>wiid- + -m</i>
Swampy Cree	<i>wît-</i>	Unami	<i>wît- + -m</i>
Menominee	<i>wēt-</i>	Proto-Algonquian	<i>*wiit- + *-m</i>
Meskwaki	<i>wît-</i>		
Preverb only		Preverb + final	
Plains Cree	<i>wîci-</i>	Blackfoot	<i>ohpok- + -m</i>
Menominee	<i>wēc-</i>	Arapaho	<i>niit- + -w</i>
Unami	<i>wiči-</i>	Swampy Cree	<i>wîci + -m</i>
		Meskwaki	<i>wi-čī- + -m</i>
		Nishnaabemwin	<i>wiiji- + -m</i>
		Innu	<i>wîci- + -m</i>
		Unami	<i>wiči- + -m</i>
		Proto-Algonquian	<i>*wiiči- + *-m</i>

As the table shows, most of the languages require a bipartite construction to create a comitative, although some can form it with just the preverb or the final.

Taking first the case with a final only, Arapaho adds *-w* to an intransitive verb of joint action such as that shown in (55a) to produce a transitive example like the one in (55b):

³⁴ There are differences of opinion among Algonquianists on what counts as synchrony and what as diachrony; we follow Macaulay and Salmons (2017) here.

(55) Arapaho (Cowell and Moss 2008: 148)³⁵

- a. *ceehyóootí3i'*
ceehyoooti-3i'
1C.quarrel.AI-3PL
'They are quarreling'
- b. *ceehyóootiibé3en*
cehyoootiiw-e3en
1C.quarrel.TA-1SG>2SG
'I am quarreling with you'

It is not clear, however, if an overt AppP could appear with this construction.

Just like relative roots, when the comitative construction involves only an initial, no BC can be identified, because any potential alternates show the same level of morphological complexity. These verbs tend to be translated as 'do X together', and we do not consider them applicatives. But in some of the languages, such as Menominee, use of the initial plus the final *-m* does create an applicative:

(56) Menominee (Bloomfield 1975)

- a. *wēhpaew*
/wēt-pāē/-w
/along.with-sleep.AI/-3
's/he sleeps with someone, with people' (AI)
- b. *wēhpemaew*
/[wēhpae]-m/-āew
sleep.with-APPL-3>3OBV
's/he sleeps with him, her, it (animate)' (TA)

Here, the BC (56a) is intransitive with an indefinite object, and contains the relative root *wēt-*. But the AC (56b) adds a suffix and the person slept with becomes the primary object of an applicative transitive verb.

Use of the preverb alone might count as a true applicative in some of the languages, but unfortunately the examples we have lack an AppP, so we cannot be sure of their status. However, when the comitative involves a preverb and the relevant final, the resultant construction is a true applicative, as seen in (57):

³⁵ The symbol <3> in Arapaho stands for /θ/.

(57) Arapaho (Cowell and Moss 2008: 370)

- a. *héétnií3kóohúno'*
 eti-niit-i-koohu-no'
 IC.FUT-with-EP-run.AI-1PL.INCL
 'We will run together' (AI)
- b. *héétnií3kóohúúwoot híbio*
 eti-niit-i-koohu-w-oot i-bi[h]-o
 IC.FUT-with-EP-run-TA-3SG>3OBV 3SG-older.sister-OBV
 'S/he will run with his older sister.'

(57a) contains the preverb /niit-/ 'with' combined with the final 'run', forming a verb of joint action. However, use of /niit-/ and the suffix *-w*, as in (57b), makes the added participant an O1, creating the comitative applicative construction.

Much more work is clearly required on the comitative construction across the family.

8 Relational verb constructions

The relational is a valence-neutral morphological lookalike construction found primarily in the CMN languages.³⁶ That is, it is morphologically marked with respect to a base construction, but it does not change the valence of the verb. Junker describes relational forms as verbs "where the person affected by the event is in the background", and adds that "The relational construction does not increase the syntactic valency of verbs. Rather it registers the presence, in the universe of discourse, of additional third-person participants" (2003a: 319). Consider (58), where the stems are bracketed and the relational marker *-w* is underlined:³⁷

(58) Plains Cree (Wolfart 1973: 60)

- a. *ēkwa ētokwē ē-[napatēstāwikē]-w-iht*
 then I.guess IC-[build.lean-to.AI]-REL-INDEF.ACT
 'Then, I guess, a lean-to was built for her.'

³⁶ Goddard (1995: 141–146) describes a similar construction in Meskwaki. Additionally, Possessor Raising is found in e.g. Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2021, Ch. 7: 20–22) and Mi'kmaq (Hamilton 2017; Denny et al. 2021); the latter has been called a relational by Hewson (1991: 25–26), but we leave the relationship between these constructions and the relational for future research.

³⁷ Segmentation and analysis has been added to these examples and the ones that follow.

- b. *tāpwe [matōtisānihkē]-w-ān*
 indeed [build.sweat-lodge.AI]-REL-INDEF.ACT
 ‘Accordingly, a sweat-lodge was built for him.’

Both of these examples are in the indefinite actor form, generally translated as an agentless passive. But note that both also have a benefactive, the presence of which is only indicated by the relational *-w* (and indeed, cannot be indicated by an AppP). These are the “ghost participants” referred to in the introduction.

In the next section we explore the most commonly-described relational construction, based on AI and TI stems. In § 8.2 we show how, in Innu, a TA verb with an inanimate subject may also participate in the relational. In § 8.3, we discuss a similar construction containing TA verbs with animate subjects.

8.1 Canonical relationals: Form, function, and characteristics

(59) and (60) exemplify non-relational and relational forms of independent order AI and TI verbs, respectively, for purposes of comparison.

- (59) Western Swampy Cree (Cenerini 2014: 35)

- a. *ni-[nîpâ]-n*
 1-[sleep.AI]-LCL
 ‘I sleep’
 b. *ni-[nîpâ]-w-â-n*
 1-[sleep.AI]-REL-TA.DIR-LCL
 ‘I sleep in relation to him/her/them.’

- (60) Western Swampy Cree (Cenerini 2014: 35)

- a. *ni-[wâpaht]-ê-n*
 1-[see.TI]-TI.TS-LCL
 ‘I see it.’
 b. *ni-[wâpaht]-am-w-â-n*
 1-[see.TI]-TI.TS-REL-TA.DIR-LCL
 ‘I see it in relation to him/her/them.’

These examples illustrate the morphological marking asymmetry of the construction with the absence vs. presence of *-w*. The rest of the morphology appears to be drawn from multiple paradigms, and consequently it is difficult to fit relationals into any single category in opposition to other verb forms. Figure 1 provides a template for AI and TI relational verbs; below that, we walk through each position.

	1	2	3	4
AI(+O) stem		relational -w	TA TS -â/-ê	person
TI stem	TI TS -am	relational -w	TA TS -â/-ê	person

Figure 1: Relational verb templates: AI and TI Verbs.

Position 1: Canonical relational verbs are built on an AI, AI+O, or TI base. In the latter, the relational marker follows the TI theme sign *-am*. This theme sign has a different distribution with relational verbs in the independent order, though, than it does with non-relational verbs in that order: it only appears in forms with third person subjects in non-relational verbs, but appears in forms with any subject in relational verbs. (Compare [60a] and [60b].)

Position 2: This suffix is generally considered the main marker of the relational participant, always an animate third person. *-w* marks third person across many other paradigms in Algonquian languages as well (although it is not always restricted to animate arguments).

Position 3: This suffix appears to be the TA independent order direct theme sign. In TA verbs in most of the CNM group, this theme sign is *-â* in forms with first and second person subjects acting on third person objects, and *-ê* in third on third obviative forms, and it has the same distribution in relational verbs. Many authors treat this theme sign in non-relational verbs as agreement with a third person object; here, it could be said to agree with a third-person participant present in the discourse but not the clause. (We address the transitivity of the relational construction directly below.)

Position 4: A marker for person of subject follows the TA theme sign. In the independent relational it is the same as AI person marking, while in the conjunct relational it parallels TA person marking.

Despite the presence of the TA theme sign in the construction, there is disagreement in the literature over the transitivity of relational verbs. Drapeau (2014: 248–249) concludes that they are transitive because of the (notional) presence of a third person object. However, this analysis requires *-w*, an inflectional suffix, to change lexical category, which inflectional morphemes are not generally believed to do. If we were to treat relational *-w* as derivational, though, it would follow an inflectional morpheme (the TI theme sign *-am*), which (as we have discussed in § 3.2) is at least an atypical relative ordering.

Junker (2003a:318) argues that the addition of the relational suffix does not change valence: an AI relational verb remains intransitive and a TI relational verb remains monotransitive with an inanimate object. She supports this by showing that it is ungrammatical to add an overt object corresponding to the participant marked by the relational *-w*.

Cenerini takes a more nuanced view of the transitivity of the construction, saying that “by acknowledging a second animate participant in the discourse, the relational verb takes on some transitive animate (mono- or ditransitive) properties, without being

fully transformed into one” (2014: 44). She suggests instead that transitivity forms a continuum, as illustrated in Table 8:

Table 8: Cline of transitivity (Cenerini 2014: 42).

Intransitivity	↔	Transitivity	↔	Ditransitivity
AI non-relational	AI relational	TI non-relational	TI relational	Applicative <i>-amaw</i>

That is, in her view, the AI relational is not completely transitive, and the TI relational is not completely ditransitive.

Despite the ungrammaticality of the presence of an overt AppP, relational verbs do cooccur with the kinds of phrases expected of their base forms: a locative in the case of an AI (61) and an inanimate object in the case of a TI (62). Significantly, though, these nominals are possessed in each case, and the possessor is the participant singled out by the relational.³⁸

(61) East Cree (Junker 2003a: 32)

Nipâ-w-e-u *u-nipewin-iyi-hch*
 sleep.AI-REL-TA.DIR-3 3-bed-OBV-LOC
 ‘S/he sleeps in his/her (someone else’s) bed.’

(62) East Cree (Junker 2003a: 32)

Wâpahtam-w-e-u *u-mûhkumân-iyû*
 see.TI-REL-DIR-3 3-knife-OBV
 ‘S/he sees his/her (someone else’s) knife.’

As these examples show, one feature of the construction is that it enforces disjoint reference between the subject and the relational participant.³⁹ In (61), the possessor of the bed must be distinct from the subject, and in (62), the knife must belong to someone else. When there is coreference between a possessor in this position and the subject of the verb, the relational is not grammatical.

Relational verbs are also distinct from TA verbs in other ways. First, the inflection following the TA theme sign in the independent order is AI/TI inflection, but it is TA inflection in the conjunct order. Second, an overt inanimate object may be present in a TI relational construction (whether it is analyzed as the primary object or not), which is not possible in a non-relational TA construction. Third, although the added participant

³⁸ Junker discusses interactions between the obviative and the relational at length. We omit this due to space considerations.

³⁹ Junker (2003a: 319) says that for East Cree, the relational form must be used to express disjoint reference. Cenerini (2018: 96), however, shows that it is not obligatory in Swampy Cree when expressing disjoint reference.

is animate (as one would expect with a TA verb), it is restricted to third person animate. This is reflected in the TA theme signs (*-â/-ê*) that appear in the construction. Unlike true TA verbs, though, relationals based on AI or TI verbs do not allow the inverse theme sign, nor inverse constructions (although see § 8.2 below).

Three contexts for use of the relational are reported in the literature. The first, which adds reference to a possessor, has been demonstrated above in (61)–(62). In such cases, the relational picks out an animate third person possessor of an inanimate object as more salient than the object itself.⁴⁰

A second context for relationals is cross-clausal, “in the matrix clause when the actor of the subordinate verb is a third person, and in the subordinate clause when the actor of the main clause is a third person” (Cenerini 2014: 53).⁴¹ (63)–(64) illustrate:

(63) Innu (Drapeau 2014: 245)

Nimishkamuan passikanñu Pieñ ka natuapatak
I.find.it.REL rifle Pierre SUB.PAST he.look.for.CONJ

‘Je trouve le fusil que Pierre cherchait.’ (‘I find the rifle that Pierre was looking for.’)

(64) Innu (Drapeau 2014: 248)

Nitshisseñimiku eka iañimishuk
she.knows.about.me NEG I.am.strict.CONJ.REL

‘Elle sait de moi que je ne suis pas sévère.’ (‘She knows of me that I am not strict.’)

In (63) the third person subject of the subordinate clause is marked by the relational *-u* on the verb in the main clause (‘find’), while in (64) the third person subject of the main clause is highlighted by the relational in the subordinate clause (‘be strict’).

Finally, Junker reports a third context for the relational in East Cree, which she calls the “presentative”, meaning that the action happens “in the presence of someone else” (2003a: 324).⁴² Consider (65):

(65) East Cree (Junker 2003a: 325)

Ni-wâpahtam-w-â-n mistiku-yû.
1-see.TI-REL-DIR-1 wood-OBV

‘I see a stick (in the presence of him/her).’

⁴⁰ When there is an overt possessor, it is part of the possessive phrase, rather than a separate argument. For discussion of the parallels between relational verbs and external possessor constructions, see Cenerini (2018).

⁴¹ Cenerini (2014: 45) also notes that the relevant third person could appear in a different sentence than the one containing the relational.

⁴² Cenerini was not able to find examples of this in Swampy Cree (2014: 89).

Junker says that use of (65) might imply that the stick was located near some other person or that another person was present who did not see the stick.

8.2 TA relationals with inanimate subjects

Drapeau (2014: 246–247) reports that in Innu, the relational can also occur with a TA verb with an inanimate subject. Figure 2 shows the parallels in structure between such TA relationals and the more widely-described types. (66) provides an example.⁴³

	1	2	3	4
AI(+O) stem		relational -w	TA TS -â/-ê	person
TI stem	TI TS -am	relational -w	TA TS -â/-ê	person
TA stem	TA TS -(i)ku	relational -u	TA TS -â	person

Figure 2: Relational verb templates: AI and TI verbs; TA verbs with inanimate subject.

(66) Innu (Drapeau 2014: 246)

a. *Nipishtaukun utapan*

it.hits.me car

‘Une auto me frappe.’ (‘A car hit me.’)

b. *Nipishtaukuan Pieñ utapan*

it.hits.me.REL Pierre car

‘L’auto de Pierre me frappe.’ (‘Pierre’s car hit me.’)

Figure 2 shows that this type of relational has the same basic structure as the other types. The theme sign in position 1 is the inverse -(i)ku because the forms have inanimate subjects. The second theme sign, in position 3, is restricted to -â because the construction does not permit third person undergoers of the action: a sentence like ‘Jean est frappé par l’auto de Paul’ (‘Jean is hit by Paul’s car’) cannot be expressed with a relational verb in Innu.

Person marking in these forms is the same as we have seen for the others: in the independent, AI/TI person marking appears, while the conjunct takes TA person marking.

⁴³ (66b) contains a possessive relational; Drapeau (2014: 246) also provides a cross-clausal example which we omit for brevity.

8.3 TA relationals with animate subjects

Several Algonquian languages, including those in the CMN group, have a morpheme *-im* which occurs with TA verbs and was treated as an obviative marker in earlier analyses (e.g. Wolfart 1973: 47 for Plains Cree and Pentland 1999: 234 for Proto-Algonquian).⁴⁴ However, a number of authors (e.g. Junker 2002; Cenerini 2014; Drapeau 2014) have noted parallels between relational *-w* and the *-im* construction. Consider the following examples:

- (67) Plains Cree (Wolvengrey 2011: 67)

Nikī-wīchīmāwa cān otānisa.

ni-kī-wīchī-im-ā-w-a cān o-tānī-s-a

1-past-help.TA-*im*-DIR-1>3' John 3-daughter-OBV

'I helped John's daughter(s).'

- (68) Plains Cree (Dahlstrom 1991: 48)

wa-pam-im-e-w o-kosis-iyiw-a

see.TA-*im*-DIR-3 3-son-OBV-OBV

'He_i [prox.] saw his_j [obv.] son_k [obv].'

- (69) Moose Cree (Cenerini 2014: 104, from Ellis 2004: 499)

kī-ayāwēw napakāhtikwa kâ-kî-natawêlimimatipan.

kī-ayāw-ê-w napakāhtikw-a kâ-kî-natawêlim-im-atipan

PAST-have.TA-TA.DIR-1>3 plank-OBV.AN CONJ-PAST-want.TA-*im*-2PAST

'He had the planks which you had been wanting.'

The morpheme *-im* appears in similar, although not identical, constructions as those used with relational *-w*: (67) and (68) show possessives with *-im*, and (69) shows a cross-clausal use.

Figure 3 highlights the structural parallels between verbs with relational *-w* and one with *-im*.⁴⁵

	1	2	3	4	5	6
AI(+O) stem		relational <i>-w</i>	TA TS <i>-â/-ê</i>		person	
TI stem	TI TS <i>-am</i>	relational <i>-w</i>	TA TS <i>-â/-ê</i>		person	
TA stem	TA TS <i>-(i)ku</i>	relational <i>-u</i>	TA TS <i>-â</i>		person	
TA stem		<i>-im</i>	TA TS <i>-â/-ê</i>	(obv.)	person	(plural/obv.)

Figure 3: Relational verb templates compared to TA verbs with *-im* (based on Cenerini 2014: 117, Table 5.12).

⁴⁴ Cenerini (2014: 108–110) shows that this construction also occurs in Kickapoo and Northern Ojibwe.

⁴⁵ This template does not include all inflectional positions for the TA verb. For a more thorough treatment see e.g. Wolfart (1973: 47–49) or Collette (2014: 243).

As Figure 3 shows, *-im* appears immediately after the TA stem, and before the direct theme sign, followed by person marking. In this case *-â/-ê* function as a true theme sign, marking direct interactions on a TA verb.

Dahlstrom (1991: 39, 48), Wolvengrey (2011: 77), and Cenerini (2014: 114–115) all describe two contexts for use of *-im*, both direct: a local person acting on a third person obviative (illustrated by [67] and [69]), and a third person proximate acting on a further obviative (68).⁴⁶ As both Wolvengrey and Cenerini point out, in each of these contexts, the subject and the object are two steps away from each other on the person hierarchy (local > 3 > 3' > 3''), and the added participant is thus always a third person falling between the other two. Mühlbauer (2008: 133), following Junker (2003b), argues that *-im* should be viewed as a marker of disjoint reference between the argument and the other participant invoked in the construction, and this highlights another parallel between the *-im* construction and the relational.

9 Conclusion

This chapter has surveyed applicative and applicative-like constructions across the Algonquian language family. In what follows, we summarize the characteristics of these constructions.

Morphology

- Canonical applicatives are marked on the predicate with a suffix. The two most common ones, **-aw* and **-amaw*, are reconstructible and were distinguished in Proto-Algonquian by the verb category to which they attached; this distinction has been obscured in many of the present-day languages.
- Relative preverbs and comitative preverbs (the latter usually in concert with an applicative suffix) combine with verb stems to form true applicatives, although the corresponding derivational constructions do not (see below).
- Suffixal applicativization derives TA and TI verbs, and comitative preverbs form TA verbs. All of the derived transitive verbs inflect regularly.
- The inflection of relational verbs appears to be cobbled together from multiple paradigms.

⁴⁶ The CNM languages and the others with the *-im* construction show various differences in how it is realized; e.g. in Innu it can occur in the inverse with an obviative subject (Drapeau 2014: 251). We leave these differences aside for present purposes.

Syntax

- The applied phrase is a primary object with suffixal applicatives. This is also the case for comitatives formed with both a preverb and a suffix, but evidence is lacking for comitatives formed just with a preverb.
- Relative roots and preverbs add an oblique argument, which is most often filled by an adverbial particle or a nominal. Nominal obliques may be optionally marked with a locative suffix when semantically appropriate.
- The most salient feature of the relational construction is that it does not allow an overt AppP.
- The object of an AI+O verb is an O2, and this remains the case when an O1 is added by applicativization. The object of a TI verb is an O1, and this base object becomes an O2 when the verb is applicativized.
- Research remains to be done on combinations of applicativization and other voice operations, as well as on comparison of applicatives and underived ditransitives.
- We have little information on the word order of applicative constructions in Algonquian. The unmarked location of the AppP in the clause appears in most of the languages to be postverbal, but AppPs are subject to the same discourse factors that drive word order in non-applicative clauses, and so they may occur preverbally as well. More detailed research across the family is needed on this.
- In many of the languages the position of the AppP in relative root constructions is flexible, as with the affixally-licensed ACs. However, in Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 2014: 57) and Miami-Illinois (Costa 2017: 363), oblique arguments (including relative root complements) typically immediately precede the verb.

Semantics

- Most of the affixal applicatives license arguments that can be of various types, with benefactives and goals being the most common roles added. However, the examples provided in our sources often seem to be somewhat arbitrary, with little attempt at exhaustive coverage of semantics. A notable exception to this is Drapeau (2011), who contrasts what she calls the “generalized applicative” of Innu (with a range of meanings added) to several other, more specific constructions.
- Relative roots and relative preverbs each license specific types of obliques, e.g. source, extent, manner, etc.
- There is also a dedicated construction for the comitative across the family, which is a true applicative in some cases in some languages, but a syntactic lookalike in others.

Lookalikes

- In two cases, the relative root construction and the comitative construction, an applicative lookalike is created with the use of a derivational morpheme (an initial) that licenses an additional participant or role in the construction. These are syntactic lookalikes because they lack corresponding BCs.

- The relational construction is morphologically marked but does not change the valence of the verb; thus, it is a valence-neutral morphological lookalike.
- All of the languages have a handful of syntactic lookalikes with weak predicate lability, usually including the verb ‘give’.

Appendix A: Sources of data by language

LANGUAGE	SOURCE	ABBREVIATION (IF USED)
Arapaho	Cowell and Moss (2008)	
Blackfoot	Blackfoot Dictionary online Bliss (2010, 2014) Frantz (1991) Taylor (1969)	BD
Innu	Brittain (1993) Drapeau (2011, 2014)	
Menominee	Bloomfield (1928, 1962, 1975) Macaulay fieldwork	
Meskwaki	Dahlstrom (2009, 2014, 2021)	
Mi'kmaq	Inglis (1986)	
Myaamia	Myaamia-Peewaalia Dictionary Lockwood research	MPD
Nishnaabemwin	Nishnaabemwin Dictionary online Valentine (2001)	ND
Northern East Cree	Eastern James Bay Dictionary on the Web Collette (2014)	
Odawa	Rhodes (2006)	
Ojicree	Slavin (2012)	
Plains Cree	Dahlstrom (1991) Plains Cree Dictionary Itwêwina Dictionary Wolfart (1973) Wolvengrey (2011)	PCD ITW
Proto-Algonquian	Bloomfield (1946) Hewson (n.d.)	
Southern East Cree	Junker (2003a)	
SW Ojibwe	Ojibwe People's Dictionary	OPD
Swampy Cree	Ellis (2000)	
Western Naskapi	Brittain (2001)	
Western Swampy Cree	Cenerini (2014)	
Unami (Delaware)	Goddard (2021)	

Appendix B: Abbreviations from Bloomfield (1928)

TEXT TITLE	PAGES	ABBREVIATION
A Boy is Blessed by Mosquitos and by a Hairy Serpent	554–559	BOY
How the Menomini Married	2–5	HMM
Lynx Tries to Kill a Stag	364–367	LNK
Me'napus Goes A-Visiting	186–197	MGV

Abbreviations

AC	applicative construction
AI	animate intransitive verb
AN	animate
AOR	aorist
APPL	applicative
BC	base construction
BEN	benefactive
CMN	Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi
CONJ	conjunct
DEM	demonstrative
DIR	direct
EMPH	emphatic
EP	epenthetic
FUT	future
HAB	habitual
IC	initial change
II	inanimate intransitive verb
IPFV	imperfective
INAN	inanimate
IND	independent indicative
INDEF.ACT	indefinite actor
INV	inverse
LCL	local
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
O	object
OBV	obviative
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
PRO	pronominal
PA	Proto-Algonquian
PROX	proximate
REL	relational
SG	singular
S.O.	someone

s.t.	something
SUB	subordinate
TA	transitive animate verb
TI	transitive inanimate verb
TS	theme sign
3'	third person obviative
3''	third person further obviative
x > y	x outranks y in a participant hierarchy
x > y	x acts on y

References

- Blackfoot Dictionary. 2015–2021. <https://dictionary.blackfoot.atlas-ling.ca>. (Accessed 3 October 2021.)
- Bliss, Heather. 2010. Argument structure, applicatives, and animacy in Blackfoot. In Heather Bliss & Raphael Girard (eds.), *Proceedings of WSCLA [Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the Languages of the Americas]* 13 and 14, 58–69. Vancouver: UBC Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Bliss, Heather. 2014. Marking the boundaries: Blackfoot preverbs in narrative and elicitation. In Pat Littell, Analía Gutiérrez, Raphael Girard & Natalie Weber (eds.), *Proceedings of WSCLA [Workshop on Structure and Constituency of the Languages of the Americas]* 17, 1–14. Vancouver: UCB Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1928. *Menomini texts*. New York: Publications of the American Ethnological Society.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1946. Algonquian. In Cornelius Osgood & Harry Hoijer (eds.), *Linguistic structures of Native America*, 85–129. (Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 6). New York: Viking Fund.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1962. Charles F. Hockett (ed.), *The Menomini language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1975. Charles F. Hockett (ed.), *Menomini lexicon*. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology and History.
- Bochner, Harry. 1984. Inflection within derivation. *The Linguistic Review* 3(4). 411–421.
- Brittain, Julie. 1993. *Two valency-increasing processes in Sheshatshit Innu-Aimun: Applicative and causative formation*. St. John's, Newfoundland: MUN MA thesis.
- Brittain, Julie. 2001. The morphosyntax of the Algonquian conjunct verb. *New York: Garland*.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. *Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT dissertation.
- Cenerini, Chantale. 2014. *Relational verbs: Paradigm and practice in a Manitoba dialect of Swampy Cree*. Regina, Saskatchewan: University of Regina MA thesis.
- Cenerini, Chantale. 2018. External possessor constructions and Cree relational inflection compared. In Evelien Keizer & Hella Olbertz (eds.), *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar* 205. 89–129. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Collette, Vincent. 2014. *Description de la morphologie grammaticale du cri de l'Est (dialecte du Nord, Whapmagostui)*. Quebec: Laval University dissertation.
- Costa, David J. 1996. Reconstructing initial change in Algonquian. *Anthropological Linguistics* 38(1). 39–72.
- Costa, David J. 2017. Miami-Illinois word order. *Anthropological Linguistics* 59(4). 349–389.
- Cowell, Andrew & Alonzo Moss, Sr. 2008. *The Arapaho language*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- 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. 2009. OBJ₀ without OBJ: A typology of Meskwaki objects. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG09 Conference*, 222–239. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 2014. Multiple oblique arguments in Meskwaki. In J. Randolph Valentine & Monica Macaulay (eds.), *Papers of the 42nd Algonquian Conference*, 56–68. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 2015. Meskwaki comparatives: A first look. In J. Randolph Valentine & Monica Macaulay (eds.), *Papers of the 43rd Algonquian Conference*, 15–27. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 2017. Seeking consensus on the fundamentals of Algonquian word order. In Monica Macaulay, Margaret Noodin & J. Randolph Valentine (eds.), *Papers of the 45th Algonquian Conference*, 59–72. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 2021. *Meskwaki syntax*. <https://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/adahlstrom/publications-2/selected-manuscripts/meskwaki-syntax-book/>. (Accessed 2 June 2021.)
- Denny, Yvonne, Arlene Stevens, Elizabeth Paul, Barbara Sylliboy & Dianne Friesen. 2021. A ditransitive analysis of possessor raising in Mi'kmaq. In Monica Macaulay & Margaret Noodin (eds.), *Papers of the 50th Algonquian Conference*, 83–98. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Drapeau, Lynn. 2011. A generalized applicative in Innu. In J. Randolph Valentine & Monica Macaulay (eds.), *Papers of the 43rd Algonquian Conference*, 58–71. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Drapeau, Lynn. 2014. *Grammaire de la langue Innue*. Quebec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- Eastern James Bay Dictionary on the web. 2018. <https://dictionary.eastcree.org/>. (Accessed 24 October 2021.)
- Ellis, C. Douglas. 2000. *Spoken Cree level I: West Coast of James Bay*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Ellis, C. Douglas. 2004. *Spoken Cree level II: West Coast of James Bay*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Frantz, Donald G. 1991. *Blackfoot grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Goddard, Ives. 1974. Remarks on the Algonquian independent indicative. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40(4). 317–327.
- Goddard, Ives. 1979. *Delaware verbal morphology: A descriptive and comparative study*. New York: Garland.
- Goddard, Ives. 1980. Eastern Algonquian as a genetic subgroup. In William Cowan (ed.), *Papers of the 11th Algonquian Conference*, 143–158. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Goddard, Ives. 1995. Notes on Fox (Mesquakie) inflection: Minor modes and incompletely described morphemes. In David H. Pentland (ed.), *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, 124–150. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Goddard, Ives. 2002. Grammatical gender in Algonquian. In H. C. Wolfart (ed.), *Papers of the 33rd Algonquian Conference*, 195–231. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Goddard, Ives. 2021. *A grammar of Southern Unami Delaware (Lenape)*. Petosky, Michigan: Mundart Press.
- Hamilton, Michael David. 2017. Ditransitives and possessor raising in Mi'gmaq. In Monica Macaulay & Margaret Noodin (eds.), *Papers of the 46th Algonquian Conference*, 81–100. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Hewson, John. 1991. Verbal derivation in Micmac. *Journal of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association* 13. 21–33.
- Hewson, John. n.d. *Proto Algonkian word formatives*. <http://www.mun.ca/linguistics/people/faculty/protoalgonkian.php>. (Accessed 4 July, 2017.)
- Hoffman, Sarah & Will Oxford. 2021. Derivational functions of theme signs in Ojibwe. In Monica Macaulay & Margaret Noodin (eds.), *Papers of the 50th Algonquian Conference*, 135–153. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Inglis, Stephanie Heather. 1986. *The fundamentals of Micmac word formation*. St. John's, Newfoundland: MUN dissertation.
- Itwëwina Plains Cree Dictionary. 2019–2021. <https://itwewina.altlab.app/>. (Accessed 13 September 2021.)
- Johnson, Meredith, Monica Macaulay, Bryan Rosen & Rachel Wang. 2015. A survey of word order in Menominee. In Monica Macaulay & J. Randolph Valentine (eds.), *Papers of the 43rd Algonquian Conference*, 154–178. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Junker, Marie-Odile. 2002. La grammaire des relations: constructions possessives et obviation in Cri de l'Est. In Sophie Burelle & Stanca Somesfalean (eds.), *Canadian Linguistic Association Conference Proceedings / Actes du Congrès de l'Association canadienne de linguistique*, 145–155. <https://cla-acl.ca/actes/actes-2002-proceedings.html>.
- Junker, Marie-Odile. 2003a. East Cree relational verbs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69(3). 307–329.
- Junker, Marie-Odile. 2003b. East Cree dependent nouns and disjoint reference. *Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics* 28(1). 11–13.
- Junker, Marie-Odile & Ida Toivonen. 2015. East Cree ghost participants. In Miriam Butt & Tracy H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG15 Conference*, 125–144. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Kim, Kyumin. 2020. Oblique nominals, a verbal affix and late merge. *Linguistics* 58(6). 1737–1773. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0179>.
- Leman, Wayne. 2014. *The Cheyenne language*. Unpublished manuscript.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 1995. Diminutive verb forms in Passamaquoddy. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 61(1). 103–134.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 2006. Problems for the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. *Language* 82(3). 486–514.
- Lochbihler, Bethany Christina. 2012. *Aspects of argument licensing*. Montreal: McGill University dissertation.
- Macaulay, Monica. 2009. On prominence hierarchies: Evidence from Algonquian. *Linguistic Typology* 13(3). 357–389.
- Macaulay, Monica & Joseph Salmons. 2017. Synchrony and diachrony in Menominee derivational morphology. *Morphology* 27(2). 179–215.
- Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: a typological overview. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*, 1–65. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Meadows, Kimberley. *On the role of sentience in Blackfoot: Evidence from the accompaniment and associative constructions*. Calgary: University of Calgary MA thesis.
- Mühlbauer, Jeffrey Thomas. 2008. *kâ-yôškâtahk ôma nêhiyawêwin: The representation of intentionality in Plains Cree*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia dissertation.
- Myaamia-Peewaalia Dictionary. 2021. <https://mc.miamioh.edu/ilda-myaamia/dictionary>. (Accessed 25 October 2021.)
- Nishnaabemwin dictionary (Odawa and Eastern Ojibwe online dictionary). 2015–2021. <https://dictionary.nishnaabemwin.atlas-ling.ca>. (Accessed 5 October 2021.)
- Ojibwe People's Dictionary. 2012–2021. <https://ojibwe.lib.umn.edu>. (Accessed 4 October 2021.)
- O'Meara, John. 1992. Intransitive verbs with secondary objects in Munsee Delaware. In William Cowan (ed.), *Papers of the 23rd Algonquian Conference*, 322–333. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Oxford, Will. 2019. Inverse marking and multiple agree in Algonquin: Complementarity and variability. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 37. 955–996.
- Pentland, David H. 1999. The morphology of the Algonquian independent order. In David H. Pentland (ed.), *Papers of the 30th Algonquian Conference*, 222–266. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Plains Cree dictionary. 2015–2021. <https://dictionary.plainscree.atlas-ling.ca>. (Accessed 13 December 2021.)
- Reinholtz, Charlotte. 1999. On the characterization of discontinuous constituents: evidence from Swampy Cree. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 65(2). 201–227.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 1990. Ojibwe secondary objects. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrell & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*, 401–414. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 2006. *Clause structure, core arguments and the Algonquian relative root construction*. Belcourt Lecture. Winnipeg: Voices of Rupert's Land.

- Rhodes, Richard A. 2010. Missing obliques: Some anomalies in Ojibwe syntax. In Donna B. Gerdts, John C. Moore & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Hypothesis A / Hypothesis B: Linguistic explorations in honor of David M. Perlmutter*, 427–456. (Current Studies in Linguistics 49). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Rhodes, Richard A. & Rand Valentine. 2015. Transitivity in Ojibwe. In Andrej Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 2: Case studies from Austronesia, the Pacific, the Americas, and theoretical outlook*, 1205–1264. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Slavin, Tanya. 2012. *The syntax and semantics of stem composition in Ojicree*. Toronto: University of Toronto dissertation.
- Sullivan, Michael. 2012. Making statements in Ojibwe: A survey of word order in spontaneous sentences. In Monica Macaulay, Margaret Noodin & J. Randolph Valentine (eds.), *Papers of the 44th Algonquian Conference*, 329–347. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Taylor, Allan Ross. 1969. *A grammar of Blackfoot*. Berkeley: University of California dissertation.
- Valentine, J. Randolph. 2001. *Nishnaabemwin reference grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wolfart, H. Christoph. 1973. *Plains Cree: A grammatical study*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 63(5). 1–90. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Wolvengrey, Arok Ellessar. 2011. *Semantic and pragmatic functions in Plains Cree syntax*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2008. How many hierarchies, really? Evidence from several Algonquian languages. *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte* 86. 277–294.