

Problems for the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd

Indiana University

Department of Anthropology

Student Building 130

701 E. Kirkwood Avenue

Bloomington, IN 47405–7100

plesourd@indiana.edu

Problems for the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Abstract. According to the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis, the characteristic features of many so-called non-configurational languages may be accounted for on the assumption that affixes of verbs or auxiliaries in such languages either function as syntactic arguments or identify null pronouns that fill this role. Overt NP's then stand as adjuncts to clauses that are formally complete without them. Several studies have proposed analyses of Algonquian languages that incorporate versions this hypothesis. This article explores data from several areas of the morphology and syntax of the Eastern Algonquian language Maliseet-Passamaquoddy that suggest that it is not such a pronominal argument language.

1. Introduction

Jelinek (1984) has argued that we can account for many of the characteristic features of at least one class of so-called non-configurational languages if we analyze the affixes that index the subjects and objects of verbs or auxiliaries in these languages as pronouns, rather than as agreement markers. We can then take these ‘pronominal affixes’ to function in and of themselves as syntactic arguments, she suggests, and analyze apparent full noun phrase (NP) arguments in such languages as adjuncts to clauses that are formally complete without them. Since adjuncts may typically be added either to the beginning or to the end of a clause, and since they need not occur in any particular relative order, it follows that NP’s in a language with pronominal affixes will not be syntactically constrained to occur in any given order, either with respect to each other or with respect to the verb of a clause. This proposal has come to be known as the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH).¹

A non-configurational language, in the sense of this term that is relevant here, is one that exhibits the following properties (Hale 1983): (i) the order of the constituents of a clause is extremely flexible (or ‘free’); (ii) the language makes extensive use of ‘null anaphora’, in the sense that overt NP’s are typically optional under appropriate discourse conditions; and (iii) the language permits a variety of apparently discontinuous syntactic constituents, including in particular discontinuous NP’s.

Jelinek (1984) reasons that all of these properties are to be expected of a language in which pronominal affixes function as syntactic arguments. The free order of constituents follows immediately from the status of NP’s as adjuncts. Null anaphora need not be seen as involving either null or deleted pronouns, but is simply a reflection of the fact that adjuncts are systematically optional. Apparently discontinuous NP’s need not be derived by movement operations that split phrases into non-adjacent segments (or by the analogues of such operations

in non-derivational frameworks), but will inevitably arise if non-adjacent adjunct NP's may be construed with the same pronominal affix.

Baker (1991, 1996) has proposed a modified version of the PAH. He suggests that the characteristic features of some non-configurational languages are due to a difference between such languages and familiar 'configurational' languages in the way in which abstract Case is assigned. In non-configurational languages, he argues, verbs do not assign Case to their NP arguments. Instead, Case is assigned to argument-indexing affixes, or is in some other sense 'absorbed' by them. Since overt argument NP's must receive Case, all such NP's are ruled out in languages of this type by a version of the Case Filter that has been postulated in work within the Government-Binding or Principles and Parameters framework. As under Jelinek's proposal, then, any overt NP's that appear in a clause must be generated as adjuncts. Unlike Jelinek, however, Baker proposes that null NP's, rather than nothing at all, occupy argument positions in syntactic structure in non-configurational languages of the relevant type.

Both Jelinek and Baker have been careful to point out that their proposals will not necessarily prove applicable to ALL non-configurational languages. Moreover, Austin and Bresnan (1996) have raised serious questions about the appropriateness of the pronominal argument approach to the analysis of non-configurationality in Australian languages, including Warlpiri, one of the languages on which Jelinek based her original proposal. They note in particular that the argument-indexing clitics that she takes to be syntactic arguments in Warlpiri are not found in all Australian languages that display comparable non-configurational properties, but are instead an areal feature specific to the region in which Warlpiri is located. Thus it is not necessary for a language to have such clitics (or other potential pronominal arguments) in order to display non-configurational properties.

It has nonetheless become routine to assume one or another version of the PAH in analyses of highly inflected languages that exhibit the properties listed as (i)–(iii) above. In particular, several

studies of Algonquian languages published during the last decade or so have taken Jelinek's proposal as their point of departure. Thus Junker (1994) analyzes quantification in the Algonquin dialect of Ojibwe in a framework that incorporates the PAH, while Russell and Reinholtz (1995) and Reinholtz (1995, 1999) assume that the PAH holds in Swampy Cree.

My purpose in this article is to sound a note of caution concerning such analyses. I examine data from several areas of the morphology and syntax of the Eastern Algonquian language Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, spoken in New Brunswick and Maine, that seem to me to raise serious problems for any account of the structure of this language that incorporates the PAH.²

First, while subjects and up to two objects are indexed by affixes in the verb word in forms of the set used in most types of independent clauses, verbal complements of one type (so-called secondary objects) systematically receive no expression in verbal inflection in other paradigms. In clauses in which the verb is inflected in one of these paradigms, secondary objects are presumably not represented by any verbal affix—not even by a zero morpheme. Yet the syntactic treatment of such complements does not distinguish them from NP's that are indexed by verbal affixes: they may be null under appropriate discourse conditions, and their order with respect to the verb of a clause is free. This situation is unexpected under the terms of the PAH, which attributes these properties of NP's in non-configurational languages to the fact that such phrases are coindexed with pronominal affixes (or with null syntactic arguments that are licensed by verbal affixes).

The properties of one type of comitative construction in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy present a second problem for the PAH. The verbs that appear in this construction are inflected in a typologically unusual fashion: affixes in the verb word that index the subject and object arguments of the verb overlap in reference. This situation arises because subject marking in these forms corresponds to the person and number of the whole set of participants in the event named by the verb, while object marking indexes the semantically backgrounded member or members of

the same set. Here the inflectional affixes of verbs, if interpreted as syntactic arguments, violate an otherwise general constraint in the language that disallows arguments with identical or overlapping reference within a clause, a constraint that can perhaps be identified with Condition C of the Binding Theory of Chomsky (1981) and much subsequent work.³

Finally, I argue that discontinuous NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy fail to conform to the predictions of an analysis that incorporates the PAH. The material that constitutes each of the segments of a discontinuous NP is tightly constrained. In discontinuous NP's of one common type, the first segment of the expression consists of a demonstrative determiner, while the second consists of the material that would follow the determiner in an uninterrupted NP. The relative order of these segments is fixed: the determiner always precedes the remainder of the NP. This array of facts is surprising if the segments of discontinuous NP's are independently generated as adjuncts, since the segments of such an NP are not in fact independent.

Discontinuous NP's with comparable properties have been reported in a number of Algonquian languages, including Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 1987), Cree (Russell and Reinholtz 1995), and Ojibwe (Kathol and Rhodes 2000). Even though she assumes that the PAH holds in Swampy Cree, under a formulation of the type postulated by Baker, Reinholtz (1995, 1999) argues that the segments of discontinuous NP's in this language are not generated independently as adjuncts, but are separated by movement. Indeed, Russell and Reinholtz (1995) advance a variety of arguments against the generation of argument NP's in adjunct positions in Cree, suggesting instead that such NP's are specifiers in the projections of functional heads reflecting their status as focused or topical constituents. The PAH actually appears to play virtually no role in the resulting analysis. Since neither the seemingly free word order of the language nor the possibility of discontinuous constituents is attributed to the PAH, their use of this hypothesis would seem to reduce to the observation that Cree routinely permits the null expression of verbal arguments.

I argue here that the PAH is simply untenable for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. Thus my conclusions support the caution that Jelinek and Baker have urged in connection with proposals that seek to identify the PAH as an explanation for apparent non-configurational structure in all languages in which such surface syntax is correlated with complex argument-indexing inflection. In order to reach these conclusions, I first describe the system of verb inflection in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, thus setting the stage for discussion of the language's non-configurational properties, especially its discontinuous NP's. I examine also the syntactic behavior of complements that are not indexed in verbal inflection, demonstrating that such unindexed nominals are accorded no special syntactic treatment, and analyze the comitative construction that has briefly been described above, arguing that the inflectional morphology of the verbs that appear in this construction is inconsistent with the PAH. Finally, I return to the subject of discontinuous NP's, demonstrating that the relative order of the segments of such NP's is fixed, even though their position with respect to other material in a clause is essentially free.

2. The inflectional system

Algonquian languages are renowned for the complexity of their morphology, and Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is no exception. Nouns are inflected for their own grammatical features and may also be inflected in agreement with a possessor. Verbs agree with their subjects and up to two objects. Each verb may be inflected in nineteen paradigms or MODES, each with corresponding sets of positive and negative forms. The various modes reflect three distinct inflectional systems or ORDERS, which employ partly different sets of affixes (Bloomfield 1946; Goddard 1979).

The inflected forms determined by these three systems have distinct, but overlapping, syntactic distributions. Forms inflected in the Independent Order are used in most types of main clauses, in purpose clauses, in complements to certain verbs, and in clauses introduced by various

particles. Forms of the Conjunct Order are used primarily (but not exclusively) in subordinate clauses. Forms of the Imperative Order are used in commands.

The Independent Order consists in turn of two subsystems, the Indicative and the Subordinative. There are several modes in each subsystem, including a set of preterite (anterior tense) forms and a set of dubitative (non–personal knowledge) forms. The Conjunct Order likewise consists of several modes, including preterite and dubitative forms made much like their Independent counterparts, although with somewhat different allomorphs of the relevant affixes. There is also a set of Conjunct forms known as PARTICIPLES that occur as the verbs of relative clauses, taking affixes that indicate properties of the relativized constituent. The Imperative Order consists of a single mode.

Naturally, the description of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy morphology provided here is far from complete. Only a few aspects of the system that are directly relevant to the discussion to follow are surveyed in this section. For a detailed description of the morphology of the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy verb, the reader should consult Sherwood 1986.⁴

2.1 Patterns of verbal inflection

In Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, as in other Algonquian languages, each verb stem imposes a restriction on the grammatical gender of one argument of the verb, where gender is animate or inanimate. Animate Intransitive (AI) verbs accept only animate subjects, while Inanimate Intransitive (II) verbs accept only inanimate subjects. Correspondingly, Transitive Animate (TA) verbs take animate objects, while Transitive Inanimate (TI) verbs take inanimate objects.

Some verbs based on AI stems and some based on TA stems may be used with a type of complement known as a secondary object, which receives expression in verbal inflection distinct from that for the primary object of an ordinary transitive verb. Verbs of these classes are termed AI+O (for Animate Intransitive plus object) and TA+O (for Transitive Animate plus object), respectively. A secondary object may be of either gender, but is always third person.

In both noun and verb inflection, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy distinguishes only two numbers, singular and non-singular. Dual and plural subjects are distinguished for AI (and AI+O) verbs, however, through the use of specifically plural stems. Plural stems are derived from stems not inherently specified for number through the addition of various pluralizers. Corresponding to wiki- ‘dwell’, for example, there is a plural stem wik-ulti-: k-wikí-pa ‘you (two) dwell’, k-wik-ulti-pa ‘you (three or more) dwell’. (The inflectional affixes are second-person k- and second-person non-singular -pa.) This system by which dual and plural number are distinguished (just for subjects of AI and AI+O verbs) provides a useful probe for the investigation of apparent mismatches in agreement and thus is relevant for our investigation of comitative verbs in section 5.

In addition to number, the categories of verbal agreement include gender, obviation, and absentativity. Gender, as already noted, is animate or inanimate. Obviation is a matter of the relative prominence of third persons within a discourse context. Roughly speaking, a third-person expression that refers to the most topical individual or group within a particular span of discourse is proximate; expressions referring to any other third person in the same context are obviative (although this distinction is reflected in noun inflection only for animates). The relevant span of discourse is often as short as a clause, but frequently consists of one or a few complete sentences,

and may be longer. Absentative marking indicates reference to an entity that was formerly present but is now absent, was formerly living but has now died, or was formerly possessed.

In paradigms of the Independent Order, both prefixes and suffixes are used to indicate properties of the arguments of a verb. Only suffixes are used in inflection in the Conjunct and Imperative Orders. The first verb in 1 is a Conjunct form, while the second verb in this sentence is inflected in the Indicative subsystem of the Independent Order. The subject of the first verb is accordingly indexed only by the Conjunct suffix -ehq ‘second person non-singular’. (This allomorph is used only in negative forms; the corresponding positive form is -eq.) The subject of the second verb, however, is indexed both by the prefix k- ‘second person’ and by the suffix -nnu- ‘first person non-singular’. This combination of affixes serves to specify that the argument in question is first person non-singular inclusive, i.e. that it refers to a set of individuals that includes both the speaker and the addressee.⁵

(1) Skàt wōlam-sot-ūw-i-w-**èhq**,

k-nat-sak-iy-á-**nnu**-k.

not true-understand-TA-2/1-NEG-2NS.NEG-(SUBJ) 2-go-look-TA-DIR-1NS-PROX.NS

‘If you (non-sg.) don’t believe me, we’ll go and look at them (an.).’ (Mal., TMC 4:7)

The prefixes that are used in Independent inflection indicate the person of the subject or the object of the verb, depending on the form: first person n(t)-, second person k(t)-, third person w(t)-. The allomorphs without t are used before consonant-initial stems, while the allomorphs with t are used before vowel-initial stems: n-wik ‘I dwell’, but nt-òp ‘I sit’. The third-person

prefix is not used with intransitive verbs, however, in modes of the Indicative type: kt-òp ‘you (sg.) sit’, but opú ‘he or she sits’. Except among the most elderly speakers, the *w* of the third-person prefix is usually reduced to h before an obstruent consonant and deleted altogether before a sonorant consonant.⁶ Word-initial h before a consonant is written as an apostrophe, however, in the practical orthography employed here: ’t-ópi-n ‘he or she sits (Subordinative)’ (older wt-ópi-n).

The positions occupied by argument-indexing verb suffixes form several ‘layers’ of inflection. It is useful to distinguish between an inner layer of theme-forming suffixes or THEME SIGNS and two outer layers, consisting of CENTRAL ENDINGS and PERIPHERAL ENDINGS, respectively. Consider, for example, the verb in 2.

(2) Boys ’t-assok-itah-am-**á-wa-l**.

INTERJ 3-surprised-thought-TA-DIR-PROX.NS-OBV.SG

‘Boys, they were amazed at him.’⁷ (Mal., TMC 20:18)

All three layers of argument-indexing suffixes are represented in the verb in 2, an Independent Indicative form.

The innermost inflectional suffix in the verb form in 2 is the DIRECT theme sign -a, which designates certain combinations of subject and object arguments, including first or second person acting on third, and third-person proximate acting on third-person obviative. Here this suffix serves the last of these functions: the subject is proximate and the object is obviative. Additional information about these arguments is spelled out by the two suffixes that follow the theme sign.

The central ending -wa specifies that one participant in the situation described by the verb is third-person, proximate, and non-singular. The peripheral suffix -l indicates that the other participant is third-person, obviative, and singular.

Central and peripheral endings index subjects in some forms and objects in others. In 2, however, the participant indexed by -wa must be the subject and the participant indexed by -l must be the object, since the direct theme sign would not have been included in the verb form if the role of these participants were reversed. To indicate the reverse of any of the combinations of participants that are specified by the direct theme sign (e.g. a third subject acting on a first or second person, or an obviative subject acting on a proximate object), a form with the so-called INVERSE theme sign is used instead. Compare 3, where the inverse theme sign occurs as -oku- (one of several shapes in which it may appear).

(3) Yúktok=kahk=ölu wén-il 'kisi=motewölonüw-ihpön-**okú-wa-l**.

these.PROX=EMPH=CONT someone-OBV.SG (3)-past=shaman-fight-INV-PROX.NS-OBV.SG

'Someone (obv.) must truly have used shamanistic power against these people (prox).'

(Mal., SFP 33)

The inverse theme sign is also used in forms with an inanimate subject and an animate object, as in 7b below. No direct forms correspond to this combination of participants, however: to express action by an animate subject on an inanimate object, a TI verb must be used instead. An example is given in 4. The theme sign -u that appears here is characteristic of one class of TI

verbs. Note also the peripheral ending -kòl, which indicates that the object of the verb is inanimate, non-singular, and absentative.

(4) N-koskaht-u-ne-kòl nt-apqasökihikõn-okòl.

1-lose-TH-N-IN.NS.ABS 1-key-IN.NS.ABS

‘I lost my keys (which were here just a little while ago).’

Not all of the suffixal agreement slots are filled in every verb form. Theme signs are used only in TA and TI inflection, not with intransitive or AI+O verbs. The central endings of Independent verbs index only non-singular participants (subjects or objects). Peripheral endings are used in verb inflection only to index third-person participants. The two verbs in 5 bear neither central nor peripheral endings, since their subjects and objects are neither third-person nor non-singular. The theme signs here are -l-, indicating action by first person on second, and -i-, indicating action by second person on first. Note, however, that both forms include the second-person prefix k(t)-, which is always used in Independent inflection if either the subject or the object of the verb makes reference to a second person.

(5) ...kõma nil k-mil-l-úw-on tp-elt-om-űw-ákon k-míh-i-n=na nil.

not I 2-give-1/2-NEG-N consider-by.thought-TH-SE-NOM 2-eat-2/1-N=too me

‘...I do not give you (sg.) permission to eat me, too.’ (Mal., TMC 10:9)

Suffixes marking negation, preterite tense, and evidential status occupy positions among the argument-indexing affixes of the verb. The inanimate object of k-mosk-om-õne-wi-sõpon-il ‘you (sg.) did not find them (in.)’ in 6 is indexed three times: once by the theme sign -om, which occurs in all inflected forms of one class of TI verbs, again by the suffix -õne-, which functions here as an inanimate object marker, and once more by the inanimate non-singular suffix -il.⁸ The negative suffix -wi- and the dubitative suffix -sõpon- occupy intervening positions.

(6) Kõma k-mosk-**om-õne-wi-sõpon-il** piy-aq-ti-h-ikõn-ol...

not 2-find-TH-N-NEG-DUB-IN.NS leftover-wood-strike-TA-NOM-IN.NS

‘Didn’t you (sg.) find some wood chips (in.)...?’ (Mal., TMC 26:16)

Conjunct and Imperative forms are likewise built up with suffixes in various layers of inflection. The theme sign (if one is used) occupies the position adjacent to the stem. It is followed by an ending or sequence of endings that may index either the subject or the object of the verb, on a pattern that largely parallels the way the central endings of the Independent inflectional system are chosen, except that both singular and non-singular participants are indexed. Peripheral endings are not used.⁹ There are additional slots, however, that house suffixes that index third-person participants. In the Conjunct form in 7a, for example, the direct theme sign -a is followed by two additional suffixes that provide information about the subject, the proximate non-singular suffix -hti- and the third-person animate suffix -t. These two affixes index the object of the verb in 7b, where they follow the inverse theme sign -uku-.

(7) a. Nìt etōli=ksoka-hpawōl-**á-hti-t**.

there location=across-frighten-DIR-PROX.NS-3AN

‘That’s where they (prox.) chased him (obv.) across.’ (Mal., TMC 12:11)

b. Nìt etōli=pek-tu-h-**ukú-hti-t** àpc yùt ksinuhkew-ákon,

that.IN location=clean-strike-TA-INV-PROX.NS-3AN again this.IN be.sick-NOM

el-iwiht-ási-k yèy, lahpíhqot.

thus-be.named-II-3IN HES.PRO smallpox

‘That’s where they were all killed afterwards by this disease that’s called, oh, smallpox.’

(Mal., TMC 10:14)

While information about the arguments of a verb is typically spelled out in a series of affixes in Conjunct and Imperative inflection, as in Independent forms, certain combinations of subject and object are represented by portmanteau morphemes in TA inflection in the Conjunct system. The combination of a third-person subject and a second-person singular object, for example, is indicated in Conjunct forms by an unanalyzable suffix -osk, as shown in 8.

(8) N-cócahq nòt yùt yali=wicuhkém-**osk** 'qocí-pun.

1-spirit that.AN here around=help-3/2 one-winter

'It is my spirit that has been going around helping you here all winter.'

(Mal., TMC 15:15)

Overall, then, three kinds of relationships obtain in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy between the argument-indexing affixes of verbs and the corresponding verbal arguments. In some cases, a single affix indexes a single argument. Thus the Conjunct second-person non-singular ending -ehq indexes the subject in 1 and provides no information about any other argument of the verb (although it does also indicate negation). Sometimes a single argument is reflected by more than one affix. In 7, both -hti- and -t indicate properties of proximate non-singular arguments: the subject in 7a, the object in 7b. Finally, a single affix may provide information about more than one verbal argument. The theme signs of TA verbs have this property in most of their occurrences, as does the suffix -osk in 8, since it encodes both the fact that the subject is third person and the fact that the object is second person and singular.

2.2 Primary and secondary objects

Both primary and secondary objects are indexed by inflectional affixes in Independent modes of the Indicative type. To see how the system works, consider the examples given in 9 below.

- (9) a. Kotunke-wìn 'péskh-**a-l** **músűw-ol** ewéhk-e-t pàhq.
 hunt-NOM (3)-shoot-DIR-OBV.SG moose-OBV.SG use-TI-3AN arrow
 'The hunter shot the moose, using an arrow.' (Pass.)
- b. Kotunke-wìn músűw-ol 'péskh-**a-n** **pàhq.**
 hunt-NOM moose-OBV.SG (3)-shoot-DIR-N arrow
 'The hunter shot the moose with an arrow.' (Pass.)
- c. Kotunke-wìn músűw-ol 'peskh-**á-n-ol** **páhqĩ-yil.**
 hunt-NOM moose-OBV.SG (3)-shoot-DIR-N-IN.NS arrow-IN.NS
 'The hunter shot the moose with arrows.' (Pass.)

The verb 'péskh 'he shoots him' in 9a is a TA form with a single, primary object, representing the patient in the clause. The identity of this object is marked twice in the verb: first by the direct theme sign -a, which functions here to indicate that the subject of the verb (kotunkewìn 'hunter') is proximate, while the object (músűwol 'moose') is obviative; and again by the suffix -l (whose basic shape is -ol), which indicates that the object is animate, singular, and obviative. The instrument used to carry out the shooting in 9a is encoded as the object of a subordinated verb ewéhket 'he uses it'.

In 9b and 9c, the verb 'shoot' is used with two objects: the instrument is now encoded as a secondary object. The primary object, músűwol 'moose (obv.)', is again reflected by the use of the direct theme sign -a in both examples. Note, however, that the suffix -ol does not appear in

9b. Peripheral endings are used in TA+O inflection in the Indicative system of the Independent Order to index the secondary object of a verb, rather than its primary object. Since the secondary object in this case is the inanimate singular noun pàhq ‘arrow’, there is no overt peripheral suffix in this form: inflection for inanimate singular objects is null. When the secondary object is inanimate and non-singular, however, as it is in 9c, an overt peripheral ending is used. As it happens, the inanimate non-singular suffix is homophonous with the obviative singular suffix: both are basically -ol. This ending appears in this form in 9c.

Another difference between TA and TA+O inflection is illustrated here as well. Note that the verb forms in 9b and 9c include a suffix -n that does not appear on the verb in 9a. This morpheme serves more than one function. It regularly occurs in Independent Indicative forms that are inflected in agreement with a secondary object. Moreover, it occurs in ALL forms inflected in the Subordinative modes (except, irrelevantly here, those of II verbs).¹⁰ The suffix has several allomorphs, adding an initial o in some morphological contexts and a final e in others. (The added e is phonologically modified before y, appearing in this context as ĩ.) In glossing examples, I represent this affix (in any of its functions) as -N.

AI+O verbs are inflected for secondary object like TA+O verbs, but do not take suffixes in the position occupied by the direct theme sign -a in the examples in 9, since they are not used with primary objects. The examples in 10 illustrate a few of the inflectional possibilities for AI+O stems made with the suffix -ahke- ~ -ahka- ‘cause to move sharply by action of the hand’, i.e. ‘drop’, ‘throw’, etc. The secondary object of ol-ahke- ‘throw (there or thus)’ in 10a is an obviative singular noun, indexed in the verb by the peripheral ending -ol. In 10b, the secondary

added to the stem in this case. Since the pluralizer -ulti- has been added to mokukõn-oti- in 11b, however, the subject there can only be interpreted as referring to three or more individuals.

- (11) a. Mokuk-õn-otí-nĩ-**ya-l** puhtáya-l.
 (3)-seize-by.hand-RECIP-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG bottle-OBV.SG
 ‘They (prox. du.) try to grab the bottle (an., obv.) from each other.’ (Pass.)

- b. Nít=te mokuk-õn-ot-ulti-nĩ-**ya-l** yúhtol,
 then=EMPH (3)-seize-by.hand-RECIP-PL-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG this.OBV

yùkt eh pí-c-ik.
 these.PROX woman-3AN-PROX.NS

‘Then these women (prox. pl.) struggled together over him (obv.), each trying to grab him away from the others.’ (Mal., TMC 7:14)

Notice in particular here the suffixes -ya and -l. The first of these is an allomorph of the central ending -wa that we have already encountered in examples 2 and 3. This affix actually has two functions in verbal inflection. In some forms, as here, it indicates that one argument of the verb is third person, animate, proximate, and non-singular. In others, it indexes a second-person non-singular participant. An example of the latter type is given in 12.

(12) Kt-apenk-at-ōm-ōnī-**ya**=hc kilūwàw.

2-pay-TI-TH-N-2NS=FUT you.NS

‘You (non-sg.) will pay for it.’ (Mal., TMC 11:4)

The suffix *-l* in the forms in 11 is the peripheral ending that indexes an obviative singular argument of the verb.

Note further that the arguments indexed by -ya and -l in both of the examples in 11 are distinct and disjoint in reference: the former affix indexes the subject, representing people who are struggling over something; the latter affix indexes the secondary object, representing the object of their struggle. This is the usual state of affairs in AI+O inflection: if a central ending is used, it agrees with the subject of the verb; if a peripheral ending is used, it agrees with the secondary object. The inflection of one class of AI+O verbs departs from this pattern, however, in the comitative construction discussed in section 5. Just in this construction, a central ending may specify a set of individuals that includes not only the referent of the syntactic subject of the verb, but that of the secondary object as well.

2.3 Distributed agreement

As seen in 2.1, affixes and arguments do not match up in any simple, one-to-one fashion in the inflection of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy verbs. Some arguments are indexed by more than one affix. Some affixes provide information about more than one argument. In many cases, then, it is not at all obvious how we might go about selecting ONE verbal affix to analyze as THE pronoun that instantiates a particular syntactic argument of a verb, either to the exclusion of a

corresponding NP argument, as in Jelinek 1984, or as a locus of Case assignment, as in Baker 1991, 1996.

Recognizing that the same problem arises in Swampy Cree (indeed, in Algonquian languages in general), Reinholtz (1999) adopts a modified version of the PAH in her analysis: since Cree ‘has a distributed verbal agreement morphology’, she reasons, we need to add to this hypothesis ‘the important proviso that agreement markers within the verbal complex are not treated as subjects and objects but rather as agreement markers which identify abstract (phonologically zero) subject and object pronouns’ (p. 204). In effect, then, Reinholtz takes a null subject or object pronoun in Cree to be licensed by the ensemble of information specified in verbal agreement morphology for that argument of the verb, rather than by the occurrence of one or another particular affix.

I argue in section 4 below that even an abstract formulation of the PAH along these lines is inappropriate for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, since null anaphora is permitted in this language for arguments that receive no expression in verbal inflection, even in null morphemes. In section 5.2, however, we also see reason to doubt that the argument-indexing affixes of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy verbs are appropriately analyzed as agreement markers in the usual sense of this term.

3. Non-configurational structure

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is a non-configurational language by all of the usual criteria (Hale 1983). Word order is extremely flexible and largely determined by pragmatic factors. Null anaphora is routine, both for subjects and for objects. Discontinuous NP’s of several types are

common. Since examples illustrating various word-order possibilities and null anaphora are given elsewhere in this article, I do not specifically illustrate these points here, turning instead to the question of discontinuous NP's.

I focus here on NP's that include a demonstrative determiner. Discontinuous subjects of this kind are illustrated in 13, discontinuous objects in 14. In each case, the NP in question consists of two segments, which are given in bofdface. The demonstrative constitutes the first segment of the NP, while the second segment consists of the remainder of the material that would make up an ordinary NP. This is often simply a noun, but structures of some complexity are possible as the second segment of a discontinuous NP, as illustrated in 13a, b.¹¹

(13) a. **Yùkk=ölu** 'sikte-hpawöl-okú-wa-l=öte

these.PROX.AN=CONT (3)-to.death-frighten-INV-PROX.NS-OBV.SG=EMPH

skitápĩ -yik **etöl-amöt-ulti-t-pón-ik.**

man=PROX.NS ongoing-play.game- PL-3AN-PRET-PROX.NS

'He (obv., a dog) really frightened these men (prox.) who had been playing cards.'

(Pass., Anonymous 1975:10)

b. **Wòt=ölu** wöl-íku **yùt** **olöq-ì** **töl-èy** **pilsqéhsis.**

this.PROX.AN=CONT good-be.a.kind-(3) this.IN direction-PF location-NF girl

'This girl from over this way, though, was pretty.' (Mal., TMC 17:2)

c. Àpc **yùt** yal-íye **sqòt**.

again this.IN around-go-(3) fire

‘Again this fireball went around.’ (Mal., TMC 19:9)

d. Kehtól=te wisawi=màn=yaq **wòt** ’cokuhk-àt-òm-on **ahàhs**.

truly=EMPH yellow=money=QUOT this.PROX.AN (3)-defecate-TI-TH-N horse

‘Sure enough, the horse shit gold, they say.’ (Mal., TMC 34:32)

(14) a. Táma **yúhtol** kt-ol-ipt-ú-n-ol **posõnutí-yol?**

where these.IN 2-thus-carry-TH-N-IN.NS basket-IN.NS

‘Where are you taking these baskets?’ (Mal., TMC 35:8)

b. Kèq=al **yúhtol** weci=olõwik-ál-a-t **opõsí-yol?**

what=UNCERTAIN this.OBV from=point-TA-DIR-3AN tree-OBV.SG

‘What is she pointing at this tree (obv.) for, I wonder?’ (Mal., SFP 17)

In textually attested examples, the two segments of a discontinuous NP typically occur on opposite sides of the verb. Other word orders are occasionally attested as well, however, as illustrated in 15. Both segments of a discontinuous NP precede the verb in 15a, while both segments follow the verb in 15b.

(15) a. **Wòt** àpc **pilsqéhsis** məc 't-olöwik-ál-a-l opösí-yol.

this.PROX again girl still 3-point-TA-DIR-OBV.SG tree-OBV.SG

‘Again this young girl still points at a tree.’ (Mal., SFP 16)

c. 'Kisi=wihq-ehť-á-ku-n **yúhtol** àpc **pithopew-isqí-yol**.

(3)-past=take-TI-TA-INV-N this.OBV again pour.drinks-woman-OBV.SG

‘Once again, this tavern lady had stolen it (a sled, in.) from him.’

(Mal., TMC 34:56)

Moreover, the speakers whom I have consulted in this connection readily accept a wide range of possible orders of the segments of discontinuous NP’s with respect to the other constituents in a clause. The relative order of the segments of such NP’s is fixed, however: whether an NP is continuous or discontinuous, a demonstrative always precedes the remainder of the phrase, just as it does in an uninterrupted NP. I return to this matter in section 6 below.

4. The syntax of unindexed arguments

In section 2.2 above, we noted that secondary objects are indexed by peripheral endings in the inflection of AI+O and TA+O verbs in the Indicative subsystem of the Independent Order. As it happens, the peripheral endings that index singular objects that are either inanimate or proximate are null, as shown in 16a, b. Other secondary objects are indexed by phonologically constituted peripheral endings, however, as in 16c.

- (16) a. Nékom 'kis-áhka-n **põnápsq.**
 he/she (3)-past-move.by.hand-N rock
 'He or she threw the rock (in.)' (Pass.)
- b. N-kis-áhka-n **cikòn.**
 1-past-move.by.hand-N apple
 'I threw the apple (an.)' (Pass.)
- c. Nékom 'kis-ahká-n-ol **cikõní-hil.**
 he/she (3)-past-move.by.hand-N-OBV.SG apple-OBV.SG
 'He or she threw the apple (obv.)' (Pass.)

Null agreement of the kind seen here is routine, of course, and presents no special problem for the PAH. Since the absence of an overt affix contrasts with the presence of phonologically constituted affixes in the object inflection of AI+O verbs in the Indicative system, we have grounds to postulate zero peripheral endings for verbs like those in 16a, b. Thus the secondary objects in these sentences are arguably coindexed with null verbal affixes.

In fact, however, secondary objects are indexed in verbal inflection ONLY in the modes of the Indicative subsystem of the Independent Order. In all other verb modes, including those of the Subordinative subsystem, secondary objects systematically receive NO expression in inflection. (The only exceptions are Conjunct participles that appear in relative clauses in which the relativized constituent happens to be a secondary object.)

Consider in this connection the sentences in 17. As we noted in section 2, verbs are ordinarily inflected in a mode of the Subordinative type in clauses introduced by certain particles. Among these are naka ‘and’ and on ‘and then, so’. More generally, the verb in a clause that represents a state of affairs that follows temporally or logically on a previously mentioned state of affairs typically receives Subordinative inflection. Thus both wt-ópi-n ‘he or she (prox.) sits’ in 17a and w-kotsiy-áhka-n ‘he or she (prox.) throws him or her (obv.) into the fire’ in 17b are Subordinative forms. The suffix -n occurs on both of these verbs as a feature of Subordinative inflection, not as a registration of the presence of a secondary object. In fact, the verb öpi- ‘sit, be located’ never takes a secondary object (although a number of its derivatives do).

(17) a. Ksé-he naka wt-ópi-n.

in-go-(3) and 3-sit-N

‘He or she comes in and sits down.’ (Pass.)

b. Kis-öpóte-k sqòt, w-kotsiy-áhka-n **wasís-ol.**

past-be.hot-3IN fire (3)-into.fire-move.by.hand-N child-OBV.SG

‘When the fire was hot, he threw the child into it.’ (Pass., Prince 1921:22–3)

Note further that the peripheral ending -ol has not been added to w-kotsiy-áhka-n ‘he or she throws him or her into the fire’ in 17b, despite the presence of an obviative singular secondary object, wasís-ol ‘child (obv.)’. Indeed, one of the characteristic features of Subordinative inflection, for all classes of verbs, is the absence of peripheral endings. Thus none of the suffixes

that index secondary objects in Independent Indicative forms are used in the Subordinative modes. In 17b, then, we are clearly NOT dealing with a form in which an argument-indexing affix just happens to be null. The secondary object in this sentence is simply not indexed by any affix in the verb word.

What syntactic treatment should we expect such unindexed objects to receive if the PAH is valid for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy? If the possibility of null anaphora arises for a particular syntactic argument either because that argument is actually instantiated by a verbal affix (as in Jelinek 1984), because the Case that would be assigned to that argument is absorbed by a verbal affix (as in Baker 1991, 1996), or because verbal agreement identifies the grammatical features of the argument (as in Reinholtz 1999), then we should presumably expect that an unindexed argument may not be null. If any of these factors is responsible for the ordering possibilities permitted to a particular syntactic argument, then we should also expect to find that the positions in which unindexed objects may occur will be restricted. Neither of these predictions is borne out: null anaphora is routine for unindexed secondary objects in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, and the relative position of such objects with respect to the verb of a clause is subject to no special restrictions.

Consider first the possibility of null anaphora. Both of the verbs in the Maliseet example given in 18a are Subordinative forms, since both occur in clauses introduced by on ‘and then, so’. Thus neither verb here includes a peripheral ending. The (discontinuous) inanimate non-singular object of TI nkiséhtun ‘I finish them’ in the first sentence, yúhtol... posõnutíyol ‘these baskets’, is reflected by the theme sign -u-. The verb natankúwan ‘I go and sell them (in.)’ in the second sentence is an AI+O form, however; nat-ankuwe- ‘go to sell’ is an AI stem. No affix indexes the

secondary object in this case; but null anaphora is nonetheless permitted, since this object is understood as coreferent with the object in the preceding sentence. The situation is similar in the Passamaquoddy example given in 18b. The second verb here is ol-ahke- AI+O ‘throw’. Since this verb occurs in a clause introduced by naka ‘and’, a Subordinative form is used. The form of the verb that appears here, ’tolahkáníya ‘they threw them’, is accordingly made with no peripheral ending. Thus the secondary object of the verb receives no expression in inflection. Yet null anaphora is again permitted here, since the reference of the object (’tahasōwónūwal ‘their hats’) is easily recovered on the basis of the context provided by the preceding clause.

(18) a. Níta, on **yúhtol** n-kis-éht-u-n **posōnutí-yol** tóké.

INTERJ and.then these.IN 1-finish-make-TH-N basket-IN.NS now

On **nat-ankúwa-n.**

and.then go-sell-N

‘Well, I’ve finished these baskets now. So I’m going off to sell them.’

(Mal., TMC 35:1)

b. Skitápí-yik mon-éht-ú-ní-ya-l **’t-ahsōwón-ūwa-l**

man-PROX.NS (3)-off-TI-TH-N-PROX.NS-IN.NS (3)-hat-3NS-IN.NS

naka **'t-ol-ahká-nĩ-ya.**

and 3-thus-move.by.hand--PROX.NS

‘The men took off their hats and threw them.’ (Pass.)

No special ordering restrictions are imposed on unindexed secondary objects. In both 17b above and 19 below, the latter taken from a Maliseet text, a Subordinative verb is used with a secondary object, but bears no affix that indexes this nominal. In the first case, the verb precedes its object; in the second, the object precedes the verb.

(19) Wt-ol-awsì-nĩ-ya-l msi kehkikk-íko-k keq-s-imín-s-ol
 3-thus-live-N-PROX.NS-IN.NS all various-be.a.kind-3IN something-DIM-berry-DIM-IN.NS

pun-ìw, on nípo-k **nõmèhs** **wt-ol-awsì-nĩ-ya.**
 winter-PF and.then be.summer-3IN fish-(OBV.NS) 3-thus-live-N-PROX.NS

‘They lived on all sorts of berries in the winter, and in the summer they lived on fish.’¹²

(Mal., Chamberlain 1899:93)

The word order in 19 probably serves a stylistic purpose: note the chiasmal formulation (first ‘they lived on berries in the winter’, then ‘in the summer fish they lived on’). My consultants find nothing unusual, however, in the object-verb order of the second clause here. The same object-

verb order obtains in 20, an elicited example. A Subordinative form (uskicikapŭwíniya ‘they stand on it’) is used in this case because the verb occurs in the complement of a verb of causation, a context in which the use of the Subordinative is obligatory.

(20) N-kis-éht-ŭw-a-n skitápĭ-hik **putépi-hil** **uskic-ikapŭwí-ni-ya.**

1-past-make-TA-DIR-N man-PROX.NS whale-OBV.SG (3)-surface-stand-N-PROX.NS

‘I made the men stand on the whale (obv.).’ (Pass.)

Like Subordinative forms, verbs inflected in modes of the Conjunct and Imperative orders (with the exception of Conjunct participles) take no suffixes that index secondary objects. Here again, then, we can test what role, if any, the presence of a verbal affix plays in determining the syntactic treatment of the corresponding nominal expression.

The inflection of the AI+O verbs in 21 is exactly like that of their AI counterparts in 22: the proximate non-singular suffix -hti- and the third-person animate suffix -t index only the subjects of the verbs in these sentences, as in example 7a in 2.1 above. Clearly, then, no verbal affix indexes the secondary object in either 21a or 21b. In 21a, this object is overtly expressed by the noun kehtaqsúwol ‘ghost (obv.)’. The secondary object in 21b is null, however, since the context of the narrative from which this example is taken makes it clear that the referent is a character called Turtle. (Since the subject in 21b is proximate, Turtle can only be an obviative referent here.) Clearly, then, the presence of a coindexed affix is not a prerequisite for null expression of a verbal argument.

(21) a. Eci=yaq l-áhke-t **kehtaqsúw-ol.**

extreme=QUOT thus-move.by.hand-3AN ghost-OBV.SG

‘At that point, they say, he let go of the ghost.’ (Mal., TMC 24:11)

b. Nìt etōli=cuwaḥp-ahké-**hti-t.**

there location=into.water-move.by.hand-PROX.NS-3AN

‘There they (prox.) threw him (Turtle, obv.) into the water.’

(Pass., Prince 1921:44–5)

(22) a. Wèn etōli=kakàl-ūwe-t yùt.

someone location=holler-AI-3AN here

‘Someone is hollering around here.’ (Mal., TMC 21:27)

b. Eci=wōl-itah-as-ultí-**hti-t.**

extreme=good-thought-AI-PL-PROX.NS-3AN

‘They (pl.) were very happy.’ (Mal., TMC 2:3)

It seems clear that the absence of an affix in the verb word that indexes a particular argument neither precludes null expression of that argument nor results in the imposition of any special restrictions on the positions that the argument may occupy within a clause. In fact, the presence or absence of putative pronominal arguments appears to have no correlates in the syntactic treatment of nominal expressions. Minimally, then, the treatment of unindexed verbal arguments

in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy appears to offer no support for the PAH. But are the facts in this domain actually incompatible with the PAH?

There are several ways in which we might seek to accommodate the observed treatment of unindexed arguments in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy without abandoning the PAH. We might reasonably suppose, for example, that NP's that correspond to verbal affixes are generated as adjuncts, while just those NP's that instantiate unindexed arguments are generated in argument positions. Note, however, that such an account would require some additional principle or principles to permit null expression for those NP's that do occur in argument positions and to allow such NP's to occupy the same range of syntactic positions as NP's that are generated as adjuncts. But if some set of principles is required to achieve these effects for unindexed arguments, then it is not clear why we need to include the PAH in our analysis to achieve precisely the same effects for NP's that do correspond to verbal affixes.

Alternatively, we might suppose that agreement features encode information about all of the arguments of a verb, but that certain features are simply not spelled out as affixes in some verbal paradigms. On such an account, NP's could be uniformly generated as adjuncts (or in other non-argument positions), and abstract features of the verb, rather than the occurrence of particular affixes, would license the null expression of arguments, much as in Reinholtz's (1999) proposal for Cree. Note, however, that to adopt such an analysis is essentially to abandon the PAH altogether, at least in so far as this proposal embodies any claim that MORPHOLOGICALLY EXPRESSED affixes serve as syntactic arguments in non-configurational languages.

5. A comitative construction

Verb inflection in one type of comitative construction in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy poses a problem of a different kind for an account of the structure of the language that incorporates the PAH, since agreement in this construction appears to be more closely tied to the semantics of the predicates in question than it is to the expression of syntactic arguments. Subject and object markers that appear on the verb in this construction may overlap in reference: subject inflection indicates the entire set of participants in the activity designated by the verb, while object inflection indicates a backgrounded subset of this same set of participants. When overt NP's instantiate the subject and object of the verb, however, they do not overlap in reference, in accord with a general constraint of the language that enforces disjoint reference for any NP's in a clause that represent distinct syntactic arguments of the verb. The typologically unusual pattern of inflection that we find in this construction arises in part as a result of a more general feature of verb inflection in the language: an NP that instantiates a syntactic argument of a verb may designate only a subset of the set indicated by the corresponding verbal affix or affixes.¹³

5.1 Affixes with overlapping reference

The class of verbs that appear in the comitative construction at issue here is semantically restricted in a natural way: it consists of the subset of AI+O verbs that refer to activities like living together, drinking together, fighting, and arguing that are necessarily performed in concert by more than one agent. Several verbs of this type are derivatives of the numeral nis 'two': nis-iní-nĩ-ya-l 'he or she resides with him or her', nis-ossõmí-nĩ-ya-l 'he or she drinks with him or her' (Mal. nisu-hsõmì-nĩ-ya-l). Others are based on the root maw- 'in a group': maw-ossõmí-nĩ-

ya-l ‘they drink (in a group) with him or her’. A few reciprocal derivatives of TA stems are also used in this way: ’kolul-tí-nĩ-ya-l ‘he or she argues with him or her’ (kõlul-ti- ‘argue with each other’), matõn-otí-nĩ-ya-l ‘he or she fights with him or her’ (matõn-oti- ‘fight each other’). I refer to the verbs that participate in the comitative construction as VERBS OF JOINT ACTIVITY.

The comitative construction is used to present a joint activity from the point of view of a subset of the participants, syntactically expressed as the subject of the verb. The verb receives subject inflection, however, according to the person and number of the whole set of participants. At the same time, it agrees with a secondary object that represents the backgrounded member or members of this set. The result is a pattern of inflection in which a subject-marking affix in a verb overlaps in reference with the affix that indicates the grammatical categories to which the object belongs.

The examples in 23 and 24 may serve to give an idea of the way the construction works. The stems of the verbs that appear here are nis-ossõmi- ‘drink together’ and nis-ini- ‘live together’. In each set of examples, the verb is shown first in its basic, intransitive use, then in the comitative construction.

(23) a. N-totõli=nis-ossõmì-pon.

1-ongoing=two-drink-1NS

‘We (du. exc.) are drinking together.’ (Pass.)

b. Kil k-totōli=nis-ossōmí-nī-ya nìl n-itàp.

you.SG 2-ongoing=two-drink-N-2NS me 1-friend

‘You (sg.) are drinking (du.) with my friend.’ (Pass.)

c. Skitàp ’totōli=nis-ossōmí-nī-ya-l ’qóss-ol.

man (3)-ongoing=two-drink-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG (3)-son-OBV.SG

‘The man (prox.) is drinking (du.) with his son (obv.).’ (Pass.)

(24) a. Kilùn k-nis-inì-pon.

we.INC 2-two-reside-1NS

‘We (du. inc.) are living together.’ (Pass.)

b. W-nis-iní-nī-ya-l w-nicálk-ul, assok-ōmáhtū-w-ol.

3-two-reside-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG 3-uncle-OBV.SG strange-have.nature-3-OBV.SG

‘He (prox.) stays (du.) with his uncle (obv.), who has strange ways.’

(Pass., Prince 1921:40–41)

In 23b and 23c, both the subject and the secondary object of nis-ossōmí- ‘drink with’ are expressed by overt NP’s. Both nominals represent participants in the event named by the verb, which involves two people having a drink together. Both verbs are accordingly inflected for non-singular subject, here with the central ending -ya, which indexes either a second-person or a third-person proximate non-singular argument. Note, however, that the SYNTACTICALLY

EXPRESSED subjects in both sentences are singular. These are kìl ‘you (sg.)’ in 23b and skitàp ‘man (prox.)’ in 23c. Thus the syntactically expressed subject in each case represents only a subset of the inflectionally expressed subject of the verb. In fact, the subject-indexing affix on the verb marks not the grammatical categories to which the syntactic subject itself belongs, but those of the subject and object taken together. Yet the verb also takes object inflection in agreement with this complement. As it happens, this inflection is null in 23b, where the object of the verb is proximate and singular. In 23c, on the other hand, the overt object-marking suffix -l appears on the verb in agreement with the obviative singular secondary object ’qóssol ‘his son’. The inflection of the verb in 24b is like that in 23c. Note that no overt nominal instantiates the syntactic subject in this case, however: null anaphora is permitted for either argument of a verb of joint activity.

The verb in 25 is based on the root *maw-* ‘in a group’ and is accordingly used only in reference to situations involving three or more participants. In the case of a verb of joint activity, however, it is the total number of participants named by the subject and object together that counts: a singular subject is permitted, provided that the secondary object is non-singular, as in 25b. Subject inflection for the verb works very much the same way. Note that the verb in 25b is inflected for non-singular subject (suffix -ya), even though the syntactically expressed subject kìl ‘you’ is singular; but it is also inflected for a proximate non-singular object (suffix -k). The suffixes -ya and -k overlap in reference: it is the combined number of the subject and object that is indicated by the non-singular suffix -ya.

- (25) a. Kilūwàw k-totōli=maw-ossōmí-nĩ-**ya** k-itàp?
 you.NS 2-ongoing=group-drink-N-2NS 2-friend
 ‘Are you (two or more) drinking (in a group) with your (sg.) friend?’ (Pass.)
- b. Kìl k-totōli=maw-ossōmí-nĩ-**ya-k** k-itápĩ-hik?
 you.SG 2-ongoing=group-drink-N-2NS-PROX.NS 2-friend-PROX.NS
 ‘Are you (sg.) drinking (in a group) with your friends?’ (Pass.)

The examples in 26 illustrate the use of the reciprocal stem matōn-oti-, a derivative of matōn- TA ‘fight with, beat, punish’ first as an AI verb, then in the comitative construction. Once again, the verb in the comitative example is inflected for non-singular subject in agreement with the combined number of the syntactically expressed subject and the secondary object: the subject-indexing affix -ya overlaps in reference with the object-indexing affix -l.

- (27) a. Kt-ahcūwi=hc mat-ōn-otì-pon.
 2-must=FUT beat-by.hand-RECIP-1NS
 ‘The two of us (inc.) will have to fight (physically).’ (Mal., TMC 34:95)
- b. Kci=Láhkut motewōlòn kci=Sapatoss-ís-ol
 old=Lacote shaman old=Sabattis-DIM-OBV.SG

w-mat-ōn-otí-nĩ-**ya-l**.

3-beat-by.hand-RECIP-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG

‘Old Lacote, the shaman, had a fight with old Sabattis.’ (Pass., Prince 1900:184–5)

The pattern of inflection illustrated in the examples above is obligatory for the verbs in question whenever they are given a comitative reading. Thus 27a is unacceptable with a comitative interpretation, which must instead be expressed as shown in 27b: the presence of the non-singular subject marker -ya is obligatory here, since there are two agents of the activity in question.

(27) a. *Skitàp w-totōli=nisu-hsōmí-n-**ol** w-itapí-yol.

man 3-ongoing=two-drink-N-OBV.SG 3-friend-OBV.SG

‘The man (prox.) is drinking (sg.) with his friend (obv.).’ (Mal.)

b. Skitàp w-totōli=nisu-hsōmì-nĩ-**ya-l** w-itapí-yol.

man 3-ongoing=two-drink-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG 3-friend-OBV.SG

‘The man (prox.) is drinking (du.) with his friend (obv.).’ (Mal.)

Here, then, is the essence of the phenomenon in question. Verbs of joint activity in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy may be inflected in such a fashion that two argument-indexing affixes in the verb word overlap in reference. Affixes that otherwise serve to index the syntactic subject of a

verb in effect function in this construction to index two nominals, the subject and a comitative complement. The subject-indexing affix represents a particular set of individuals, while the object-indexing affix represents a subset of that set.

What, then, does this comitative construction have to tell us about the PAH? As they are expressed in the morphology of the verb, the subject and object arguments in examples like 27b overlap in reference. Quite generally, however, clauses in which the SYNTACTICALLY EXPRESSED subject and object overlap in reference are completely excluded, as one would expect if Condition C or a comparable constraint on binding, holds in this language.¹⁴ Note, in particular, that the syntactically expressed subject and object in an example like 27b do NOT overlap in reference. The syntactically expressed subject refers to one individual, designated as skitàp ‘the man’; the object refers to another individual, witapíyol ‘his friend’. In fact, the referential possibilities found for overt NP’s in the comitative construction are exactly what we expect of subject and object arguments: here, as elsewhere, overt NP’s that represent distinct syntactic arguments of a verb are always disjoint in reference.¹⁵

We see, then, that a general constraint that governs overt NP’s that correspond to verbal arguments fails to apply to the verbal affixes that index those arguments. This situation is unexpected if the PAH holds in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, at least under any formulation of this hypothesis that takes concrete affixal morphemes to be syntactic arguments.

5.2 Other apparent mismatches in agreement

As we have seen, the pattern of inflection that we find for verbs of joint activity arises because a syntactically expressed subject is allowed to represent only a subset of a

morphologically expressed subject. This kind of apparent mismatch in agreement is in fact quite generally allowed in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. The examples given in 28 may serve as illustrations. In 28a, a singular subject núhkōmoss ‘my grandmother’ is construed with a dual-subject verb, ’ci=pecíhhik ‘they come from (there)’. In 28b, a subject that represents only two individuals, nikihkù ‘his or her parents’, is construed with an explicitly plural form, ’ci=peciyawōlótūwok ‘they (pl.) come from (there)’, for which a dual interpretation is impossible. In both cases, the intended interpretation of the sentence as a whole is one in which the overtly expressed subject represents a subset of the individuals who perform the action that the verb denotes.

- (28) a. ’Ci=pec-íh-hik **n-úhkōmoss** Sipayik.
 from=arrive-go-(3)-PROX.NS 1-grandmother Pleasant.Point
 ‘My grandmother is coming (du.) here from Pleasant Point (with someone).’
 (Pass.)

- b. ’Ci=pec-iya-wōlótū-w-ok **nikihkù** Sipayik.
 from=arrive-go-PL-3-PROX.NS (3)-parent-(OBV.NS) Pleasant.Point
 ‘His or her parents are coming (pl.) here from Pleasant Point (with one or more
 others).’ (Pass.)

Expressions of this kind are common in all styles of speech. They are certainly not errors, nor do they reflect recent declines in the use of the language, since they are heard even from older

speakers for whom English is very much a second language. The following Maliseet examples, taken from texts recorded from elders in the 1960's, may serve as illustrations. Note that a third-person singular expression, the name Leksátol 'Alexander' is construed in 29a with the Conjunct suffix -ek, indicating a first-person non-singular exclusive subject. In 29b, the referent of the syntactically expressed subject witapíyol 'his friend' is construed as a subset of the referents of the understood subject of a verb based on the specifically dual stem nute-hkawöti- '(two) walk out'.

- (29) a. Pésqon=al=te etuc-èy-yek **Leksátol**, pésqon.
 one.IN=UNCERTAIN=EMPH extreme-be.an.age-1NS Alexander one.IN
 'Alexander (and I) are (du. exc.) about the same age, the same.' (Mal., TMC 40:1)

- b. On=yaq **w-itapí-yol** nute-hkawöti-nĩ-ya nenhiw miyàw
 then=QUOT 3-friend-OBV.SG (3)-out-du.walk-N-PROX.NS unusually in.particular

 yùt tehk-éyi-k eskehewátqi-k.
 this.IN cold-II-3IN be.Friday-3IN

- 'Then, as he tells it, (he and) his partner just happened to go out (du.) on this particular cold Friday.' (Mal., TMC 41:2)

Examples like those in 28 and 29 suggest that an overtly expressed NP may represent only a subset of the corresponding inflectionally represented argument outside the comitative construction. There is a possible alternative analysis that needs to be considered, however. The relationship between affixes and the corresponding NP's that obtains in examples like those in 28 and 29 is mirrored in the relationship between a pronoun and an associated NP in another construction of the language, which we may call the PLURAL PRONOUN CONSTRUCTION, following Schwartz (1988), who has noted comparable phenomena in a wide range of languages.

In this construction, a pronoun that names a set of individuals is accompanied by an NP that designates a subset of that set, as illustrated in 30. Here the pronoun kilūwàw 'you (non-sg.)' is understood to refer to a set of people that includes the referent of kitàp 'your (sg.) friend'. Since a dual form of the verb is used here, the set in question must contain only a single additional member, which can only be the addressee. Thus 'you (sg.) and your friend' is the only possible reading for the expression kilūwàw kitàp, or in the opposite order kitàp kilūwàw, in 30.

(30) { **Kilūwàw k-itàp** / **k-itàp kilūwàw** } kt-ol-iyá-pa Kelisk.

you.NS 2-friend 2-friend you.NS 2-thus-go-2NS Calais.LOC

'You (sg.) and your friend are going (du.) to Calais.' (Pass.)

As this example illustrates, the NP in this construction may either precede or follow the pronoun with which it is construed, suggesting that this NP is syntactically an adjunct to the pronoun. A possible parallel for this structure is found in Russian, where the corresponding constituents consist of a pronoun and a comitative prepositional phrase, but the pronoun is

arguably the head of the construction as a whole (McNally 1993).¹⁶ Not surprisingly, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy also permits discontinuous expression of the plural pronoun construction, placing no restriction on the order of the segments in such phrases, as shown in 31.

- (31) a. **Kilūwàw** kt-ol-iyá-pa **k-itàp** Kelisk.
 you.NS 2-thus-go-2NS 2-friend Calais.LOC
 ‘You (sg.) and your friend are going (du.) to Calais.’ (Pass.)
- = b. **Kitàp** ktoliyápa **kilūwàw** Kelisk. (Pass.)

Analogues of the sentences in 30 and 31 are also possible in which no pronoun appears, as shown in 32. Here an NP that corresponds to the adjunct NP in those examples occurs on its own. This NP represents only a subset of the verbal argument reflected by the corresponding verbal affix: the second-person non-singular subject marker -pa is construed here with a third-person singular NP, just as non-singular affixes are construed with singular NP’s in 29.

- (32) { **K-itàp** kt-ol-iyá-pa / kt-ol-iyá-pa **k-itàp** } Kelisk.
 2-friend 2-thus-go-2NS 2-thus-go-2NS 2-friend Calais.LOC
 ‘You (sg.) and your friend are going (du.) to Calais.’ (Pass.)

It is possible, then, that examples like these, and by extension examples like those in 28 and 29, involve null anaphora in the plural pronoun construction.

On the other hand, the seeming mismatches in agreement in the comitative construction are not amenable to such an analysis. Consider in this connection the examples in 33.

- (33) a. *Súsehp* 'totōli=nis-ossōmí-nĩ-ya-l 'qóss-ol.
 Joseph (3)-ongoing=two-drink-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG (3)-son-OBV.SG
 'Joseph is drinking with his son.' (Pass.)
- b. *Nekōmàw Súsehp toli=kotunkí-yik Utōqehkik.*
 they Joseph location=hunt-(3)-PROX.NS Grand.Lake.Stream.LOC
 'Joseph is hunting with someone in Grand Lake Stream.'
- c. **Nekōmàw Súsehp* 'totōli=nis-ossōmí-nĩ-ya-l 'qóss-ol.
 they Joseph (3)-ongoing=two-drink-N-PROX.NS-OBV.SG (3)-son-OBV.SG
 'Joseph is drinking with his son.' (Pass.)

In 33a we have an ordinary instance of the comitative construction with a verb of joint activity. The syntactically expressed subject *Súsehp* 'Joseph' represents only a subset of the subject indicated by the proximate non-singular central ending *-ya*. Example 33b includes a case of the plural pronoun construction: *nekōmàw Súsehp*, literally 'they Joseph' is construed as 'Joseph and someone'. The subject in 33a cannot be replaced by an expression of this kind, however, as shown in 33c. The latter example is ruled out, since here a single clause contains two overt NP's that overlap in reference and refer to different arguments of the verb. But then 33a cannot reflect

a structure in which the pronoun of the plural pronoun construction has been omitted in null anaphora.

Clearly at least some cases of apparent mismatches in agreement are real: a syntactically expressed NP may sometimes represent a subset of the corresponding inflectionally expressed argument. Given that such structures occur in the comitative construction, there would seem to be little reason to give a different analysis to apparent analogues in other constructions. There would accordingly appear to be no reason to appeal to null or deleted pronouns to account for the way in which a verb form may be construed with an NP that represents only a subset of an inflectionally expressed argument, whether or not we adopt the PAH in our analysis of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. The alternative, of course, is to suppose that the argument-indexing affixes in a verb word are not agreement markers as such, but instead bear a more general relationship to the NP's that instantiate the corresponding syntactic arguments, one that requires only that an affix may be construed with a syntactically expressed argument in a semantically appropriate fashion.

Note further that to give an account of the use of verbs of joint activity in the comitative construction, we need to distinguish between the way in which the arguments of such verbs are expressed in morphology and the way they are expressed in syntax. The morphological expression of the argument structures of these verbs directly mirrors the superset-subset relationship intrinsic to their comitative semantics. Their syntactic argument structures instead reflect the partitioning of the set of participants encoded in subject agreement morphology into foregrounded and backgrounded subsets. Only their syntactically expressed arguments are subject to a syntactic constraint on binding relationships.

It is crucial here to draw a distinction between the morphologically expressed arguments of a verb and the corresponding syntactic arguments. Yet it is precisely this distinction that the PAH denies. Thus the inflection of verbs in the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy comitative construction would seem to offer strong evidence against an analysis of this language that incorporates the PAH.

6. Discontinuous NP's

One of the original motivations for the PAH was the prospect of explaining why many languages with free word order also permit the discontinuous expression of NP's: if apparent argument NP's are really adjuncts, we might well expect to find that more than one such expression may correspond to a single argument.

Such an analysis initially seems promising for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy as well. An NP may consist of a demonstrative alone, but an NP may lack a demonstrative as well. Thus each of the phrases that I have been calling segments of a single discontinuous NP has the form of a possible NP in its own right. As it turns out, however, the two segments of a discontinuous NP in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy are not independent, as an analysis of these phrases as adjuncts would lead us to expect. Although a demonstrative may be separated from the remainder of an NP, the demonstrative must always precede that remainder, the same order that obtains in uninterrupted NP's. While the order of words in any given utterance is undoubtedly determined in large part by pragmatic factors, this constraint on the relative order of the segments of NP's appears to be syntactic in character. Thus the properties of discontinuous NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy provide no support for an analysis that incorporates the PAH.

6.1 Pragmatic determinants of word order

In Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, as in other languages with highly flexible word order, the surface order of the constituents of a sentence is largely determined by their discourse functions. Focused expressions are typically stationed at the beginning of a clause, for example, while backgrounded material is often placed toward the end. In many cases in which the demonstrative segment of a discontinuous NP is clause-initial, the discourse context suggests that the referent of the demonstrative is focused. Discontinuous expression of an NP, on the other hand, often serves to indicate that the description of the referent provided by the second segment represents old information.

Consider in this connection example 13b in section 3 above, repeated here as 34.

(34) **Wòt=òlu** wòl-íku **yùt** **olòq-ì** **tòl-èy** **pilsqéhsis.**

this.PROX.AN=CONT good-be.a.kind-(3) this.IN direction-PF location-NF girl

‘This girl from over this way, though, was pretty.’ (Mal., TMC 17:2)

At the beginning of the narrative from which this sentence is taken, the speaker describes a situation in which two groups of people are attending a dance, a Mohawk party and a Maliseet party. The latter are described as yùt olòqì tòléyak ‘people from over this way’. Sentence 34 follows several lines later. The narrator has just mentioned one particular member of the Mohawk group. Now he shifts his attention from this Mohawk man to a particular young woman among the Maliseets. The clause-initial position of the demonstrative wòt ‘this one (prox.)’ presumably reflects this shift in focus. Indeed, the use of the postpositive word =òlu ‘but,

however’, which indicates a contrast with some previously mentioned referent, overtly marks the demonstrative as the focus of the sentence. The remainder of the discontinuous NP, yùt olöqi tölèy pilsqéhsis ‘girl from over this way’, on the other hand, echoes the way in which the speaker has already designated the Maliseet participants in the dance. Since this segment of the NP presents old information, it is appropriately stationed at the end of the sentence.

Tomlin and Rhodes (1992) and Kathol and Rhodes (2000) suggest that the position of an NP relative to the verb of its clause functions in Ojibwe to signal the role of the NP in information structure. The fact that the two segments of a discontinuous NP in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy tend to be stationed on opposite sides of the verb may reflect a similar use of word order to indicate discourse functions.¹⁷ No more than a tendency is at work here, however. Although examples with other word orders are less common in natural speech, they are clearly not excluded. Moreover, speakers readily accept a wide range of arrangements of the segments of discontinuous NP’s with respect to other material in a clause.

6.2 Syntactic properties of discontinuous NP’s

In fact, it appears that the segments of a discontinuous NP may be stationed in essentially any order with respect to other material in the same clause. Nonetheless, the relative order of this material must consistently remain the same as it would in a single, uninterrupted NP. Consider sentence 35a, for example, which is a Passamaquoddy analogue of the Maliseet example given above as 14a. The word order here is perfectly routine, of course, since the two segments of the discontinuous NP bracket the verb in this case. Reversing the order of these segments as shown in 35b, however, renders the sentence unacceptable.

(35) a. Táma **yúhtol** kt-ol-ipt-ú-n-ol **posõnúti-hil?**

where these.IN 2-thus-carry-TH-N-IN.NS basket-IN.NS

‘Where are you taking these baskets?’ (Pass.)

b. *Táma **posõnúti-hil** ktoliptúnol **yúhtol?**

The relative order of material following the verb is free, as we might expect. Thus the second segment of a discontinuous NP may either precede or follow a post-verbal adverb, as shown in 36a. Both segments of a discontinuous NP may precede the verb as well, however, as in 36b.

(36) a. **Wòt** ksé-he { àpc **pilsqéhsis** / **pilsqéhsis** àpc. }

this.PROX in-go-(3) again girl girl again

‘This girl came in again.’ (Pass.)

b. **Wòt** àpc **pilsqéhsis** ksé-he lam-ikũwàm.

this.PROX again girl in-go-(3) inside-house-(PF)

‘This girl came into the house again.’ (Pass.)

The segments of a discontinuous NP may even be stationed on opposite sides of another nominal constituent, a situation that is apparently excluded in Ojibwe (Kathol and Rhodes 2000). Demonstratives are frequently employed with proper nouns in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, so there is nothing unusual about the expression wòt Cím ‘this Jim’ in 39a. The noun Cím may be shifted

to the end of the sentence, however, as it has been in 37b. Note that a segment of the subject of the verb in this sentence is now stationed to the right of the object Maliwól 'Mary (obv.)'. As it happens, a monosyllabic noun in sentence-final position may join to the preceding word, forming a single accentual domain with it. The speaker from whom 37b was elicited accorded the name Cím this treatment here, shifting the accent of Maliwól from penultimate position within the word onto the penultimate syllable of whole complex Maliwól=Cím. (The penult is the unmarked location for word accent in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy.) Thus the accentual properties of 37b indicate that the word *Cím* is fully integrated into the sentence in question and has not simply been appended as an afterthought. Note once again, however, that the relative order of a demonstrative and the noun with which it is construed must be maintained.

(37) a. **Wòt** **Cím** 't-ol-ápōm-a-l Malíw-ol.
 this.PROX Jim 3-thus-look.at-DIR-OBV.SG Mary-OBV.SG
 'Jim looked at Mary.' (Pass.)

= b. **Wòt** 'tolápōmal Maliwól=**Cím**. (Pass.)

c. ***Cím** 'tolápōmal Malíwol **wòt**.

The robust character of this generalization is noteworthy, given the general freedom of word order that Maliseet-Passamaquoddy permits. It is particularly striking, then, to find that the generalization fails to hold in the case of the plural pronoun construction that we noted in 5.2.

Demonstratives as well as personal pronouns may appear in this construction, as illustrated in 38, another example taken from a Maliseet text.

(38) **Yùkt=ölu n-míhtaqs** papki toli=kotunki-yok, Susehp=Maliw
 these=CONT 1-father downriver location=hunt-PROX.NS Joseph=Marie-(PROX.ABS.SG)

naka n-míhtaqs nil.

and 1-father me

‘My father and another (man) were hunting (du.) downriver, the late Joseph-Marie and my father.’ (Mal., TMC 40:2)

As we have already noted, no restriction is placed on the relative order of the component phrases that make up the plural pronoun construction, and the construction may be realized in discontinuous fashion. Example 39a is a Passamaquoddy analogue of 38. In 39b and 39c, the phrase yùkt nmíhtaqs ‘my father and another man’ (literally, ‘these my father’) is replaced by a discontinuous NP. Note that the demonstrative yùkt ‘these (prox.)’ is now permitted to follow the noun with which it is construed, an ordering that speakers find unacceptable outside this construction.

- (39) a. **Yùkt** **n-míhtaqs** Utõqehkik toli=kotunkí-hik.
 these.PROX 1-father Grand.Lake.Stream.LOC location=hunt-(3)-PROX.NS
 ‘My father and another (man) are hunting in Grand Lake Stream.’ (Pass.)
- = b. **Yùkt** toli=kotunkí-hik **n-míhtaqs** Utõqehkik. (Pass.)
- = c. **N-míhtaqs** toli=kotunkí-hik **yùkt** Utõqehkik. (Pass.)

It seems unlikely that any account of the distribution of demonstratives can account for this difference between ordinary discontinuous NP’s and discontinuous versions of the plural pronoun construction without making specific reference to the syntactic structure of NP’s of each type. Moreover, the one constraint that Maliseet-Passamaquoddy consistently imposes on word order in ordinary discontinuous NP’s apparently applies without regard to the discourse context of such expressions. I conclude that the constraint that governs the relative order of the segments of discontinuous NP’s (apart from the plural pronoun construction) is fundamentally syntactic in character.

6.3 Implications for the PAH

Restrictions on the order of material in discontinuous NP’s comparable to what we find in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy have been reported for a variety of Algonquian languages. Several kinds of proposals have been advanced to account for these restrictions. Dahlstrom (1987) employs surface syntactic templates to state the order in which material occurs in discontinuous

constituents in Meskwaki. Russell and Reinholtz (1995) and Reinholtz (1999) propose a movement account for Cree, arguing that a determiner may be extracted from an NP and stationed in clause-initial position, which they take to be the specifier position in the projection of a functional head Focus. Kathol and Rhodes (2000) employ the mechanisms of Head-Driven Phrase Structure grammar to permit NP's in Ojibwe to be expressed either in continuous or in discontinuous fashion.

A surface syntactic template for NP's along the lines of Dahlstrom's analysis of Meskwaki would allow us to state the facts of word order in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy succinctly, but would remain essentially stipulative. A proposal analogous to Russell and Reinholtz's would appear to be unworkable for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, since the determiner in a discontinuous NP in this language need not be clause-initial. Kathol and Rhodes' (2000) HPSG account has much to recommend it, however. Word order, on their analysis, is determined not by phrase structure rules but by separate principles of linearization. The fact that certain restrictions on word order hold both for continuous and for discontinuous NP's is therefore unsurprising. A discontinuous NP arises, they suggest, when one or more words belonging to the phrase is designated as 'liberated', so that it appears not within the phrase itself but as an independent constituent. Principles of linearization are nonetheless applicable to all of the material that belongs to a single NP. These principles will accordingly require the words that make up an NP to occur in the same relative order, whether or not they are assigned to a continuous syntactic constituent. This gives just the result that we need for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy: the segments of an NP occur in the same relative order whether the NP is expressed in continuous fashion or discontinuously.¹⁸

No matter how we ultimately decide to analyze the discontinuous NP's of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, however, it seems clear that the segments of such phrases are not syntactically independent. Thus it would appear that no analysis of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy can be maintained under which apparently discontinuous NP's consist of phrases that are independently generated as adjuncts to a clause but are construed with the same pronominal affix in the verb of that clause or with the same null pronominal argument. Thus there appears to be no support for an analysis which attempts to explain the properties of discontinuous NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy on the basis of the PAH.

7. Conclusions

On first acquaintance, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy seems like an excellent candidate for analysis as a pronominal argument language. Verbs agree with their subjects and up to two objects. Word order is extremely flexible, and the choice of one order of constituents or another in any particular utterance is largely determined by discourse factors. Null anaphora is routine for both subjects and objects. Discontinuous NP's are common. When we look more closely at each of these properties of the language, however, the appeal of the PAH sharply recedes.

First, the inflectional system of the language presents us with something of an embarrassment of riches, as we observed in section 2. Often more than one affix indexes a particular argument of the verb, and designating one or another of these affixes as the instantiation of a given argument would appear to be essentially arbitrary. In other cases, however, a single affix simultaneously indexes two arguments and must accordingly be assumed to do double duty.

More seriously still, some verbal arguments receive no morphological expression in a number of inflectional paradigms. We noted in particular, in section 4, that the secondary objects of AI+O verbs are represented by inflectional affixes in the verb word only in the modes of the Indicative subsystem of the Independent Order, the verb forms that appear in most types of independent clauses. In other verbal paradigms, secondary objects receive no expression in the inflectional morphology of the verb.

If the PAH is to do any work in our analysis, we should expect to find syntactic correlates of the distinction between indexed and unindexed arguments; but we do not. Unindexed objects may be null under appropriate discourse conditions and seem to be subject to no special restrictions on word order. We can maintain the PAH in the light of these facts by amending the hypothesis so as to take the ensemble of inflectional information abstractly associated with a verb, rather than any actual morphological material, to constitute its syntactic arguments (in some sense). To adopt a formulation of this kind, however, is to abandon a central claim of the PAH as it was originally formulated in Jelinek (1984).

The properties of the comitative construction discussed in section 5 are also surprising if the PAH holds in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. The inflection of verbs in this construction directly reflects their comitative semantics. Subject inflection is for the person and number of the entire set of participants in the activity that the verb names, while object inflection represents a backgrounded subset of this set. As a result, the inflectional affixes that index subjects and objects in this construction overlap in reference. Overt NP's that instantiate these arguments do not overlap in reference, however, a situation that arises because the syntactically expressed subject of a verb may represent a subset of the corresponding morphologically expressed subject.

It is the NP's that instantiate the arguments of a verb, and not the affixes that index them, that obey a general constraint of the language that enforces disjoint reference for expressions that represent distinct verbal arguments.

Another way to put the same observations is this. The comitative construction provides us with a way to tease semantic structure apart from syntactic argument structure. When we do this, we find that NP's and not affixes are subject to a syntactic constraint. Verbal agreement marking, on the other hand, reflects the semantic structure of the predicate rather than the syntactic properties of the NP's that instantiate its arguments. Since the PAH asserts that the argument-indexing affixes of a verb ARE its syntactic arguments, this hypothesis effectively eliminates the distinction that we need to make in order to analyze the construction.

Finally, we noted in section 6 that the segments of discontinuous NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy are not syntactically independent, as we would expect if they are separately generated as adjuncts. Discontinuous NP's of one common type consist of two segments. The first consists of a demonstrative determiner, while the second includes the remainder of the material that would follow a demonstrative in an ordinary NP. These segments always occur in the same order, whether or not an NP is expressed in discontinuous fashion.

Any analysis of these phenomena must invoke some mechanism that permits us to analyze the segments of a discontinuous NP as components of the same phrase. The PAH provides us with no help here. Suppose, however, that we follow the HPSG analysis of Kathol and Rhodes (2000), briefly noted in 6.3 above, in separating statements of constituent structure from statements of linear order, using principles of linearization to account for the relative order of constituents. If we also follow Kathol and Rhodes by employing the mechanism of liberation to

permit constituents of an NP to appear as sisters rather than dependents of the head noun, then an account of the properties of discontinuous NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy follows immediately.¹⁹ The order of material in such NP's will be constrained to follow the same principles as that in continuously expressed NP's. This is the observed state of affairs.

I conclude that Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is not appropriately analyzed as a pronominal argument language. Thus it appears that non-configurational structure, in and of itself, does not imply that argument-indexing affixes are pronominal arguments. The facts of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy suggest a broader conclusion than this, however. As we have noted, the rich agreement system of this language, together with its non-configurational properties, would appear to make it an excellent candidate for a pronominal argument language. If Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is not to be analyzed in this way, then some skepticism may be in order when considering other possible cases of pronominal argument languages.

Notes

1. Jelinek is not, of course, the first scholar to suggest that the argument-indexing affixes of verbs may appropriately be viewed as bound pronouns. Indeed, such analyses have long been a staple of descriptions of Native American languages, including those of the Algonquian family. Laurent (1884) refers to the person-marking prefixes of Western Abenaki as pronouns, for example, while Jones (1911:815) describes the subject and object markers in Meskwaki verbs as ‘incorporated pronominal elements’
2. Maliseet and Passamaquoddy are mutually intelligible dialects of a single Eastern Algonquian language. Maliseet is spoken on six reserves along the St. John River in New Brunswick and among members of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians in Aroostook Co., Maine. Passamaquoddy is spoken on two reservations in Washington Co., Maine. Current estimates place the combined number of speakers of the two dialects at around 500 (Leavitt 1996:1). Speakers with whom I have worked include Lorraine Gabriel, Anna Harnois, Estelle Neptune, Wayne Newell, and the late Philomene Dana and Simon Gabriel at Indian Township, Me.; Dolly Dana, David A. Francis, Sr., and Joseph Nicholas at Pleasant Point, Me.; Carole Polchies and the late Peter Paul at Woodstock, N.B.; the late Madeline Tomah at Kingsclear, N.B.; and Mary Mitchell at Tobique, N.B.
3. It should be noted, however, that other Condition C effects have proven elusive in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. See Bruening (2001:26–29) for discussion.
4. Maliseet and Passamaquoddy examples are given here in a modified version of the contemporary standard orthography: o is used for /ə/, while u represents /o/, a vowel intermediate in height between [u] and [o]; c is /č/; q is /k^w/. Phonemic /h/ before a consonant at the beginning

of a word is written as an apostrophe. Prosodic distinctions are indicated by diacritics: a stressed vowel bearing distinctive high pitch is marked with an acute accent; a stressed vowel bearing distinctive low pitch is marked with a grave accent; phonologically ‘weak’ vowels are marked with a breve. Weak vowels are ignored in the assignment of stress, which yields an alternating pattern of non-distinctive stresses to the left of the distinctively accented syllable in a word.

5. The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; 1/2, etc. first person subject with second person object, etc.; ABS, abs. absentative; AN, an. animate (grammatical gender); CONT contrast; DIM diminutive; DIR direct; du. dual; DUB dubitative; EMPH emphatic; exc. exclusive; FUT future; IN, in. inanimate (grammatical gender): inc. inclusive; INTERJ interjection; INV inverse; LOC locative; N suffix -(ō)n(e)-, with several functions, as discussed in 2.2; NEG negative; NF noun final (noun-forming suffix); NOM nominalizing suffix; NS non-singular; OBV, obv. obviative; PF particle final (particle-forming suffix); PL, pl. plural; PL.LOC pluralizing suffix of locative-marked nouns; PRET preterite; HES.PRO hesitation pronoun; PROX, prox. proximate; QUOT quotative; RECIP reciprocal; SE stem extension (empty morph); SG singular; SUBJ subjunctive; TH theme sign of TI verb; UNSPEC unspecified subject. Verb-forming suffixes with little or no concrete meaning are glossed only by the abbreviation for the transitivity and gender-selection class of the stems that they form, as discussed in 2.1. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape and for the underlying /w/ of the third-person prefix where it is realized only as a word-initial h that is written as an apostrophe, as discussed below. The double hyphen indicates cliticization: it joins an enclitic word to its host and connects a preverb or prenoun to a following verb or noun, respectively. LeSourd (to appear) is cited as TMC, by text and section number;

Teeter 1963 as SFP, by item number. Forms cited in the text without indication of dialect are Passamaquoddy.

6. I have included several examples taken from nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sources. Forms in these examples have been phonemicized in consultation with speakers of the appropriate dialect, but my transcriptions reflect the pronunciations indicated in the sources, which sometimes differ from current norms. In particular, older material in both Maliseet and Passamaquoddy typically reflects a higher proportion of word-initial, pre-consonantal occurrences of w than one hears in contemporary speech.

7. ‘Boys’ is not a vocative here, but an interjection, reflecting a common use of this expression in Maliseet and Passamaquoddy English.

8. There are three classes of TI verbs: class 1 verbs take the theme sign -ōm, class 2 verbs take the theme sign -u ~ -ūw-, while class 3 verbs take no theme sign. Every inflected form of a TI verb of class 1 or 2 includes the appropriate theme sign. Thus the fact that a theme sign appears in a particular inflected form conveys no information, a situation that raises the possibility that these suffixes might better be analyzed as stem extensions, at least from a synchronic point of view. (See LeSourd 1995 for an argument in favor of such an analysis.) Under an account of this kind, the object of a TI form like that shown in 6a would be indexed only twice by inflectional affixes in the verb word, rather than three times. Such an account would also have the consequence that the objects of TI verbs inflected in the Conjunct system would not be indexed by any verbal affix. Like the unindexed secondary objects discussed in section 4, however, the objects of TI verbs with Conjunct inflection participate in null anaphora and free word order on a par with other NP’s.

9. Conjunct participles (relative clause forms) bear an outer-layer suffix that indexes the relativized constituent.

10. The same suffix is used in Indicative inflection to index the inanimate subject of a TA verb or the inanimate object of a TI verb: wicuhké-m-ku-n ‘it (e.g. medicine) helps him or her’, wicuhké-t-ōm-on ‘he or she helps it (e.g. a plant)’.

¹²Kathol and Rhodes (2000) report that NP’s in Ojibwe consist, at maximum, of a demonstrative, a single quantifier, a noun, and a post-nominal relative clause (although they also note that short relative clauses may occur in pre-nominal position). The structure of NP’s in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is by no means so restricted, however (LeSourd 2004). There are several classes of prenominal modifiers, and conjunctions may be formed at any of several intermediate levels of structure within NP.

12. Chamberlain (1899:93) writes both verbs in 19 with a final <l>, seemingly reflecting the obviative singular suffix -l in both cases. My consultants reject the use of this suffix on the verb in the second clause here, however: the context requires a Subordinative form, so the use of a peripheral ending is excluded; and an obviative singular suffix is incompatible, in any case, with the obviative plural object nōmèhs ‘fish’. I have retranscribed this example in accordance with the judgments of my consultants.

13. Schwartz (1988), who terms agreement patterns of this type ‘verb-coded coordination’, has identified comparable phenomena in a wide range of languages.

14. For extensive discussion of the issues in the theory of anaphora raised by cases involving overlapping reference, see Safir (2004). Safir in fact argues against a treatment of such cases in terms of Condition C and notes that, in English, overlapping reference of nominals is sometimes permitted where such an account would exclude it. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy appears to be

stricter than English in relevant respects.

15. As it happens, reflexive and reciprocal relationships are expressed by intransitive derivatives of the corresponding transitive verbs. Thus even relationships of these types are expressed without recourse to nominals with overlapping reference.

16. An example of the Russian construction in question is given in (i). Here the prepositional phrase s Petej ‘with Peter’ stands syntactically as an adjunct to oni ‘they’, but the referent of Petej is included within the referent of the plural pronoun.

- (i) Oni s Petej pridut.
 they-NOMINATIVE with Peter-INSTRUMENTAL come-3PL
 ‘He and Peter are coming.’ (McNally 1993:359)

17. It should be noted, however, that the discourse principles that determine word order in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy sentences appear to differ in certain respects from the principles at work in Ojibwe. Tomlin and Rhodes report (1992) report, for example, that indefinite NP’s typically precede the verb in Ojibwe, while indefinites frequently (though by no means always) follow the verb in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy sentences.

18. While Kathol and Rhodes’ approach to the analysis of discontinuous NP’s arguably offers an alternative to Jelinek’s (1984) treatment of such phrases as consisting of more than one independently generated adjunct expression, they nonetheless adopt a version of Jelinek’s PAH in their account of Ojibwe syntax. Nothing in their account makes crucial use of this assumption, however.

19. Kathol and Rhodes propose that Ojibwe NP's in fact have a "flat" structure. Thus the only constituents of such phrases that they recognize are words. See LeSourd 2004 for arguments that NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy have a hierarchical internal structure. If these arguments are accepted, then an analysis of discontinuous NP's in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy that follows the outlines of Kathol and Rhodes' approach should be stated in terms of liberated constituents of NP's, not in terms of liberated words.

References

- Anonymous. 1975. Wahant [The devil]. Indian Township, Maine: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.
- Austin, Peter, and Joan Bresnan. 1996. Non-configurationality in Australian Aboriginal languages. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 14.215–268.
- Baker, Mark C. 1991. On some subject/object asymmetries in Mohawk. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 9.537–76.
- Baker, Mark C. 1996. The polysynthesis parameter. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1946. Algonquian. Linguistic structures of native America, ed. by Cornelius Osgood, 85–129. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, no. 6. New York: Viking Fund.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Chamberlain, Montague. 1899. Maliseet vocabulary. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Coöperative Society.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. Lectures on government and binding. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1987. Discontinuous Constituents in Fox. Native American languages and grammatical typology, ed. by Paul D. Kroeber and Robert E. Moore, 53–73. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Gabriel, Lorraine. 1979. Ehpit naka 'puwin: The woman and the body. Indian Township, Maine: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.

- Goddard, Ives. 1979. Delaware verbal morphology: A descriptive and comparative study. New York: Garland.
- Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 1.5–47.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty categories, case, and configurationality. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 2.39–76.
- Jones, William. 1911. Algonquian (Fox). Handbook of American Indian languages, Part I, ed. by Franz Boas, 735–873. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Junker, Marie-Odile. 1994. Syntaxe du quantifieur universel en algonquin. Canadian Journal of Linguistics 39.1–13.
- Kathol, Andreas, and Richard A. Rhodes. 2000. Constituency and linearization of Ojibwe nominals. Proceedings of WSCLA 4: The workshop on structure and constituency in languages of the Americas, ed. by Marion Caldecott, Suzanne Gessner & Eun-Sook Kim. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Laurent, Joseph. 1884. New familiar Abenakis and English dialogues. Québec: Leger Brousseau.
- Leavitt, Robert M. 1996. Passamaquoddy-Maliseet. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 1995. Diminutive verb forms in Passamaquoddy. International Journal of American Linguistics 61.103–34.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 2004. The internal structure of the noun phrase in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. Papers of the thirty-fifth Algonquian conference, ed. by H.C. Wolfart. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

LeSourd, Philip S. to appear. Tales from Maliseet country: The Maliseet texts of Karl V. Teeter.

Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

McNally, Louise. 1993. Comitative coordination: A case study in group formation. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 11.347-379.

Newell, Irene. 1979. Kehtaqs: Ghost stories. Indian Township, Maine: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.

Paul, Peter Lewis. 1976. [Maliseet texts]. Tape recording deposited in the Archives of Traditional Music, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Prince, J. Dyneley. 1900. Some Passamaquoddy witchcraft tales. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 38.181–9.

Prince, J. Dyneley. 1921. Passamaquoddy texts. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, vol. X. New York: G.E. Stechert & Co.

Reinholtz, Charlotte. 1995. Discontinuous constituents in Swampy Cree. Papers of the twenty-sixth Algonquian conference, ed. by David H. Pentland. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Reinholtz, Charlotte. 1999. On the characterization of discontinuous constituents: Evidence from Swampy Cree. International Journal of American Linguistics 65.201–27.

Russell, Kevin, and Charlotte Reinholtz. 1995. Hierarchical structure in a non-configurational language: Asymmetries in Swampy Cree. Proceedings of the fourteenth west coast conference on formal linguistics, 431–45.

Safir, Ken. 2004. The syntax of anaphora. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwartz, Linda. 1988. Asymmetric feature distribution in pronominal ‘ coordinations’.

Agreement in natural languages: Approaches, theories, and descriptions, ed. by M. Barlow

and J. Greenberg, 237–49. Stanford, Calif.: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Sherwood, David Fairchild. 1986. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy verb morphology. Canadian Ethnology Service Paper no. 105. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Teeter, Karl V. 1963. Responses to stick figure pictures. Tape recording, Harvard University.

Tomlin, Russell S., and Richard A. Rhodes. 1992. Information distribution in Ojibwa.

Pragmatics of word order flexibility, ed. by Doris Payne, 117–135. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.