

The Eastern Algonquian Subordinative as Event-Argument Dependency¹

Conor McDonough Quinn
ELDP/MIT
cmquinn@mit.edu

39th Algonquian Conference, York University, Toronto, Ontario, October 18-21, 2007

1. Introduction

- ❖ Simple premise: E. Alg Subordinative (Sbd) is always the complement of some matrix predicate.
- Rich range of possible matrix predicates creates rich range of constructional functions for Sbd:
 - as the complement of overt verbal predicates (\approx control/raising-type constructions)
 - as a freestanding verbal form interpreted as a polite/indirect imperative
 - as the complement in deictic-cleft predicative particle constructions
 - as the verbal form of choice in narrative clause-chaining
 - as the second element in "fusing"-effect coordination of verbal predicates
- ❖ Sbd's role very minimal: to embed its pred under matrix pred; main interpretation from matrix.
- Structural contrast---matrix vs. (Sbd) complement---gives consistent interpretational contrast:
 - Structural independent (IdpIdc) interpreted as independent, freestanding event.
 - Structurally dependent (Sbd) interpreted as dependent on the matrix event.
- = Sbd preds take the event(-arg) reference of their matrix pred as a necessary intermediary point along the path of interpreting their own event(-arg) reference.
- ❖ Predictions galore:
 - Association of Sbd w/(con)sequentiality (LeSourd 2006) is only an inference derived from certain specific types of matrix preds; it is not a basic property of Sbd itself.
 - **Narrative chaining:** Sbds interpreted as linked into a chain of events, only bc embedded under overt/covert sequentializing matrix preds (= 'then..., at that...').
 - In same context, an IdpIdc contrastively interprets as a "freestanding event".
 - 'and'+Sbd: not always (con)sequential...but always read as "fused" (restructured) w/matrix pred.
 - Freestanding Sbd: covert matrix intermediary, buffering assertion → indirect imperative.
- ❖ **Basic** matrix vs. Sbd interpretational contrast parallels **basic** Proximate vs. Obviative contrast:
 - Sbd pred must take matrix pred as necessary intermediary point of reference.
 - Obv referent must take Prox referent as necessary intermediary point of reference.

2. Morphosyntactic properties of the Sbd

2.1 Two identifying morphosyntactic properties of Sbd (after Goddard 1983) [*data omitted for space*]

- Sbd, unlike IdpIdc, *appears* not to permit the presence of Peripheral Endings (PEs).²
- Excepting IIs, Sbd verbs take Secondary Object (SO)-type morphology.

Explanation: Sbd morphosyntactically adds on hierarchically (very) low-ranked argument.

- Adding a low-ranked argument to overall verbal arg structure triggers SO-type morphology.
- *Apparent* PE-blocking is also a feature of SO-type morphology, wherein hierarchically low-ranked args **always** outcompete higher args for indexing via PEs. (cf. Goddard 1974:319 re Unami)
- Sbd arg has a zero-affix PE, which outcompetes possible overt PEs of other args, giving illusion of complete suppression of PEs.

2.2 The Sbd-associated argument: what might it be?

Preliminary speculation: The Sbd-associated arg bears a resumptive/pronominal relationship to the matrix pred event arg.

Possible derivational trajectory: *clefting chain of an event-pronominal argument of the SO-type*

1	argument structure	[verbal predicate]	{at that} _i
	↓		
2	morphological indexing	[verbal predicate]+{SO, ø-affix} _i	{at that} _i
	↓		
3	fronting/clefting	IT'S { at that } _i [THAT [[verbal predicate]+{SO, ø-affix} _i {at that} _i]]	

*{at that}*_i = event-pronominal = Sbd-associated argument
IT'S = clefting predicator
THAT = subordinating element / complementizer

- Specific model not important; crucial feature is just pronominal dependency chain between the Sbd-associated argument and the matrix clause predicate itself.
- This in several ways recapitulates Goddard 1983:358-359's diachronic account for the Sbd...
- ...and is the exact structure suggested for the deictic-cleft predicative particle construction (3.4)

❖ Other Sbd constructions can be accounted for assuming that their matrix preds can substitute in for the clefting predicate above, with the same pronominal reference chain holding between the event arg of the matrix predicate and the Sbd-associated event-pronominal arg.

- Informally, a general schema:

(1) General schema (informal) for matrix-Sbd construction *"e" = event argument*

[verbal predicate & **e**_i] [THAT [[verbal predicate]+{SO, ø-affix}_i {at that/**e**}_i]]
matrix *Sbd*

- ...this captures the morphology; it also captures the intuition that the Sbd-associated arg refers back to a pre-existing and pre-established arg--the event arg of the matrix pred.
- May be the mechanism by which Sbd's structural dependency also entails an interpretational dependency on the matrix pred.
- I.e. while the matrix pred event arg is *ceteris paribus* interpreted as free/independent, the Sbd pred event arg does not interpret without first accessing that same matrix event pred arg.

- Hence surface-freestanding Sbd's interpret only via reference to a covert/implicit matrix pred; this makes possible interpretation as polite/indirect imperatives (3.3) or as chained preds (3.5).
- Same structure very tightly integrates Sbd pred with matrix pred, creating the possibility for a "fused" (=restructured) interpretation of the overall construction (3.7)
- IdpIdc in contrast is predicted to give independent, "freestanding" interpretation (3.7, 3.8).

3. Sbd's as a structurally and interpretationally dependent clause-type

3.1 Overview

(2) Constructional functions of the Sbd³

- a. as the complement of overt verbal predicates (\approx control/raising-type constructions)
- b. as a freestanding verbal form interpreted as a polite/indirect imperative
- c. as the complement in deictic-cleft predicative particle constructions
- d. as the verbal form of choice in narrative clause-chaining
- e. as the second element in "fusing"-effect coordination of verbal predicates
- Whole array of functions is simply an outcome of the Sbd embedding under a matrix pred...
- ...actual distinctive properties of (2a-e) come from the specific type of matrix pred---be it a full verb, a particle, or a comparable covert element.

3.2 Sbd as the complement in control/raising-type constructions

- Most obviously syntax-y use: Sbd as embedded complements of both transitive (3) and intransitive (4) preds of causality/intensionality or judgment/attitude:

(3) Sbd complement of transitive

- a. nihk^wap naya nətahčəwelətamən kəya kkəlöləwewin.

nihk ^w ap	naya	nə-ahčə-el-əm-t.am-əne	kəya	kə-kəlo-l-əw.e-w.i-əne
now	1s	1-must-feel-RP-T.LV ^{NA} -N	2s	2-speak-RP-human.DO ^{NA} -RP.LV ¹ -N

'I want you to propose [marriage] for me.' (Speck 1914:219 [CQ phonemicization:16])

- b. wəsíkətamən, wətálətonkən. wə-sikə-l/m-t.am-əne wə-ətə-l-əton-əhk.e-əne
- 'He hates to talk [in public].' (S:60:102) 3-dislike-RP-T.LV^{NA}-N 3-Xplace-mouth-do.DO^{NA}-N

(4) Sbd complement of intransitive

- a. nəkəmat=te nəčəwahpíkətahin.

nəkəmat=te	nə-čəwahp-kətəh.i-əne
better.rflx ^{NI} -W=INT	1-into_water-jump.LV ^{NA} -N

'I had better jump into the water.' (αpəlfhkəməwe#1:6)

- b. ...ali-péčihle kətəlátahkən.

əl-pet-hl.α-W	kə-əl-ata-əhk.e-əne
---------------	---------------------

Xmanner-arrive-go.LV^{NI} -W 2-thus-act-do.DO^{NA} -N

'...the time has come for you to act.' (k. nàkα tòlape#2:21)

- Regularly translate to infinitival control and raising structures in English, but probably closest to Balkan-area "subjunctives", given retention of most agreement.
- Will assume that these are uncontroversial instances of complement-type embedding.

3.3 Covert matrix predicates: Sbds as polite/indirect imperatives

- Siebert (p.c., 1996): a Penobscot Sbd can be used as freestanding utterance to soften a command, or render it less direct (5):

(5) Sbd as polite/indirect imperative: Penobscot

an ni, nihk^wap kəteh^wi-wəsikítəhəsin...

an ni	nihkwap	kə-ehkw-wəsik-təh.α-əs.i-əne
well then	now	2-stop-sad-feel.LV ^{NA} -rflx.LV ^{NA} -N

'Well then, you are to cease being sad now...' (p. nàkα nàksk^wéhsisak:11)

- Leavitt 1996:42: Passamaquoddy-Maliseet: Sbd alone "can serve as a mild or polite imperative."
- Sherwood 1986:135: Maliseet: "the subordinative may be used as a polite imperative, to convey a suggestion or a request."

(6) Sbd as polite/indirect imperative: Passamaquoddy-Maliseet

a. ktankeyasin k(t)-ankey-as.i-əne
'take care of yourself' (Leavitt 1996:42) 2-take.care.of-rflx.LV^{NA}-N

b. kpeciphan kitapennok k-pet-pVh-^o.a-əne k-it-ape-ən(n)əw-ək
'Bring our friends.' (Sherwood 1986:135) 2-arrive grab-RP.DIR-N 2-fellow-man-1pl-NApl

- Makes sense if Sbd must carry with it the interpretation of some covert/overt matrix predicate...
- ...bc then these instantiate cross-linguistically common politeness strategy of adding a structural "cushion", softening the bluntness of a direct imperative by embedding it under an unspoken matrix predicate---as seen in Japanese:

(7) Indirect imperative in Japanese (Alpatov and Podlesskaya 1995:475)

Kyoo no tokoro wa kangae-sase-te.
today ATTR around TOP think.over-CAUS-CONV
'Let me think [it] over for today.'

- Verbal complex here is marked with *-te*, a converbal element associated with subordination.
- Alpatov and Podlesskaya 1995:475: dropping matrix predicate (*kudasai*) shifts the imperative from an explicitly addressive interpretation to neutral one.
- Sohn 1999: Korean: structurally comparable omission of main clauses serves to elide the speaker's assertion.

→ Omitting the matrix clause in form but retaining its syntactic presence (via the subordinate-clause morphosyntax) allows one to keep the latter pred at a discursively safe distance.⁴

- ❖ Taking freestanding Sbds as covertly embedded not only maintains a consistent account of Sbd distribution, but also links its use as an indirect imperative to cross-linguistically common strategies of using syntactic embedding to blunt the force of pragmatically sensitive assertions.

3.4 Sbd as the complement of particles: deictic-cleft predicative particle constructions

- Sbd can also appear as the complement of uninflectable predicative particle.
- Very very common pattern: Sbd embedded under a deictic-clefting predicative particle generally glossing as '(and) then....'

(8) Deictic-cleft predicative particles

Penobscot:	<i>ni</i> '(and)then...'	(< NI distal <i>ni</i> 'that (NI); there; then')
P-M:	<i>on</i> 'and then, so'	(LeSourd 2006:498; also < reduced NI distal?)
Unami:	<i>ná</i> 'then; it was then that'	(Goddard 1983:356,359)

(9) Deictic-cleft predicative particle constructions

a. Penobscot *ni* '(and)then...'

<i>ni wətalətónkənə.</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>wə-ətal-əton-əhk.e-əne-əwəw</i>
'Then they talked.' (k. <i>nəkə tələpə#2:13</i>)	then	3-Xplace-mouth-do.DO ^{NA} -N-≠1pl

b. PM *on* 'and then, so'

kisi:nt:aq Piyel, on 'kotu:hp'in

<i>kisi:nt:aq</i>	<i>Piyel</i>	<i>on</i>	<i>'kotu:hp'in</i>
past-sing.AI-3sg.ChC	Peter	and.then	3-will-eat.meal.AI-Sub

'after Peter sings, he is hungry' (Leavitt 1996:55)

c. Unami *ná* 'then; it was then that'

<i>ná wəníhəlan</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>wə-nəh_l.ā-N</i>
'then he killed him (or them)' (G83:359)	then	3-kill_RP.DIR-N

- Since these elements themselves indicate (con)sequentiality, it's not necessary to attribute such readings to the Sbd itself.
- Other Sbd-taking particles too show causality and judgment semantics, just like verbal preds:

(10) Sbd-triggering particles (Penobscot)

<i>təpat</i>	'at a certain point in time [...]; consequently, therefore' (PDA:460)
<i>kátaw</i>	'likely, probably, presumably' (PDA:169)
<i>áskaw=əp=eht</i>	'[interjection of grievance, chagrin] Alack! Of Course! O No!' (PDA:79)

- Some in fact verbal in origin: *təpat* < *tep-* 'enough' and *-at* 'NI Final' = *'it is enough [such that]....'

3.5 Deictic-cleft predicative particle constructions and narrative chaining

Claim: The deictic-cleft construction fundamentally underlies the Sbd's narrative clause-chaining use:

(11) *ni* '(and) then...' + Sbd in narrative clause-chaining

ni tɔləpe wəmenənámihkin, nàkα awapénak^wəsin. ni wəmatotawən, nàkα wətəlakk^wən. nanakáyí, ni wəmemíhpínα. ni wətalətónkənα.

ni tɔləpe *wə-menən-ámihk.i-əne* *nàkα a-wape-n-aw.ək^w-əs.i-əne*
 then turtle 3-slow-arise.LV^{NA}-N and 3-busy-view-RP.INV-rflx.LV^{NA}-N

ni wə-matotaw.e-əne *nàkα wə-əl-ək^w-əhk.e-əne* *nanake-iwi*
 then 3-kindle_fire.DO^{NA}-N and 3-Xmanner-cook-do.DO^{NA}-N short_time-IWI

ni wə-mem-ihp.i-əne-əwəw *ni wə-ətal-əton-əhk.e-əne-əwəw*
 then 3-enough-eat.LV^{NA}-N-≠1pl then 3-Xplace-mouth-do.DO^{NA}-N-≠1pl

'Then Turtle got up slowly and was busy about. Then he kindled a fire and cooked. Presently they had enough to eat. Then they talked.' (k. *nàkα tɔləpe*#2:13)

- Closely-sequentially linked series of events, each verb introduced with sequentializers *ni* '(and) then' or *nàkα* 'and'---and each verb is morphologically Sbd.
- Explains if we assume sequentializer particles are the matrix predicates, as per 2.2, 3.3; cf. also Goddard 1983:358.
- A minimal extension: in narrative contexts, Sbd w/no overt matrix chaining particle has covert equivalent---following the analysis of Sbd indirect imperatives (3.3).
- Rough parallel in English narrative chaining with *at that* as an effective event-pronominal:

(12) Chaining with event-pronominal *at that*

Sean pitched a fit.
 → At that, Leslie left the room.
 → (And) at that, Kim walked out too.
 → (And) at that...

- Or, hewing more closely to preliminary claim for Sbd syntax, the above, but clefted:

(13) Chaining with clefted event-pronominal *at that/then*

Sean pitched a fit.
 → It's {then/at that} that Leslie left the room.
 → It's {then/at that} that Kim walked out too.
 → It's {then/at that} that...

- Narrative chaining Sbd is just a specialized outcome of (sequentializer-)pred complementation.

3.6 Sbd narrative chaining: head-parameterization of episodic constituents

- E. Alg. chaining is head-initial: starts w/a structurally and interpretationally independent form (*IdpIdc*), off of which an open-ended series of dependents (*Sbd*) can be cyclically embedded.
- Head-final Altaic-area languages: relentlessly long chains of subordinating converb after subordinating converb, finally terminating in an independent, finite form:

(14) Extended narrative chaining using “contextual” subordinators (Kirghiz, Johanson 1995:329:(25))

Men ertej menen tur-up, zaryadka žas-ap, kiy-in-ip,
I morning with stand.up-CONV gymnastics do-CONV dress-PASS-CONV

žu:n-up, čaj ič-ip, mektep-ke bar-a-žat-am.
wash-PASS-CONV tea drink-CONV school-DAT go-[PRES]-1.SG

'In the morning I stand up, do gymnastics, dress, wash myself, drink tea, and go to school.'

- Typically join up a set of events that together constitute a single episode (\approx English paragraph)
- Difference btw E. Alg *Sbd*-chaining and Altaic-area converbial-chaining of episodic constituent is just head parameterization:

(15) Head parameterization of episodic constituents

- a. Indep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep... (E. Algonquian)
b. ...Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Indep (Altaic-area)

- Episodic constituent marks out one terminal margin via a freestanding element (*IdpIdc*, *finite morph*) and leaves the other edge open as an expandable set of dependent ones (*Sbd*, *converbs*).

3.6 *Sbds* and "fusing" coordination

- Pb *nàkα* 'and' is a trigger of *Sbd* (3.4), also P-M cognate *naka* 'and' (LeSourd 2006:498).
- Sherwood 1986:134: *Sbd* used for the 2nd of two main clauses in conjunction [i.e. w/*naka*].
- *nàkα/naka* etym involves sequentializer: Pb *nàkα* 'and' < *ni àkα* 'then too, then also' (PDA:103)
- LeSourd 2006:498: "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."

Claim: (Con)sequential interpretation of *Sbd* is inherited via structural dependency on sequentializing 'and'; not inherent to *Sbd* itself.

- *Sbd* just gives structural dependency; hence e.g. embedding under predicates of judgement (3.2) does not necessarily imply a sequentiality relationship with thatmatrix event.
- Also: many instances where conjunction via 'and' triggers *Sbd* in the second conjunct despite there being no logical or temporal link between the two predicates:

(16) *Sbd* without (con)sequentiality (Passamaquoddy, after LeSourd 1993:22)

- a. cílċ-ensk-áso náka h-kín-apsk-ási-n.
cilk-ensk-əs.i-W naka w-kin-apsk-əs.i-əne
short-body-reflx.LV^{NA}-W and 3-big-rock-reflx.LV^{NA}-N
'He is short and fat.'

b. kín-apsk-ésó náka h-cílk-ensk-ési-n.
 kin-apsk-əs.i-w naka w-cilk-ensk-əs.i-əne
 big-rock-reflx.LV^{NA}-W and 3-short-body-reflx.LV^{NA}-N
 'He is fat and short.'

- Can see from availability of both orders that there is no logical or temporal link btw being fat and being short.
- Purely syntactic: whichever pred is 2nd conjunct is consistently Sbd, even as the 1st is IdpIdc.
- Exceedingly common pattern in Pb and P-M; is the norm for conjoining descriptive predicates.
- Clausal dependency associated with or even functioning as effective coordination is common:

(17) Clausal dependency with coordination in Japanese (Nakatani 2004:124:(10))

hana-no inoti-wa [mizikaku-te] hakana-i.
 flower-GEN life-TOP short-TE fragile-PRES

'The life of a flower is short and fragile.'

- Two elements that seem to have no particularly strong relative dependency (nor sequentiality) are nonetheless asymmetrically related in syntax, by means of a subordinating element (-te). Similar observations reported for Korean (Chang 1996).
- Present model predicts this possibility of non-sequentiality: sequentiality only a common inferential outcome of event-predicate dependency, but certainly not the only possible one.
- IdpIdc-Sbd construction reads exactly as expected for a pronominally-linked matrix-complement structure: together the two interpret as a single, fused/restructured constituent.
- Predict too that a 2nd conjunct IdpIdc should give rise to a more independent interpretation.
- Borne out:

(18) IdpIdc for 2nd conjunct → more independent interpretation

kàmáč àk^wa k^wənáhkwatol[1] wkàtal, nàkà piwáhkw^səssən[2], nàkà àk^wa kàmáč
 k^wənáhkwatol[3] wpətináhkwemal.

kamáč=akwa kwən-əhkw.at-W-al w-əhkət-al nàkà
 very=QT long-stick.reflx^{NI}-W-NIpl 3-leg-NIpl and

piw-əhkw-əhs-əhs.ən-[?] nàkà=akwa kàmáč
 small-stick-DIM-DIM.LV^{NI}-[?Sbd] and=QT very

kwən-əhkw.at-[w]-al w-əhpətin-əhkwem-al
 long-stick.reflx^{NI}-W-NIpl 3-hand-branch-NIpl

'His legs were very long and of small circumference, and his arms were very long.'
 (p. nàkà nàksk^wəhsisak:10)

[1]	IdpIdc:	has PE matching NIpl <i>wkàtal</i> 'his legs'
[2]	Sbd:	no PE matching NIpl <i>wkàtal</i> 'his legs'
[3]	Idpc:	has PE matching NIpl <i>wpətináhkwemal</i> 'his arms'

- Both [2] and [3] coordinated with *nàkα* 'and', but only [2] is Sbd.
- Present account explains otherwise unexpected IdpIdc [3]:

• [1] and [2] unified: together describe the referent's legs, so form "fused" constituent; [2]nd pred → Sbd.

• [3] is unlinked: shifting to describe referent's arms makes a natural point for a break/parallelism (rather than a continuation); hence predicate [3] is IdpIdc, **despite** being conjoined w/*nàkα* 'and'.

- LeSourd 1993:32: it is possible, but less natural, for both clauses to be IdpIdc, but interpretation changes: sentence with two conjoined IdpIdcs "...makes two independent assertions rather than providing a unitary description: 'he's short and he's fat' rather than 'he's short and fat!'"

❖ For Pb and PM, then, an IdpIdc for 2nd conjunct pred signals an interpretational independence.

- Passamaquoddy consultant confirms syntactic acceptability of 2nd conjunct IdpIdc (19a)...

(19) IdpIdc vs. Sbd after *naka* 'and' (Passamaquoddy, AT:20071012)

a. [IdpIdc *naka* IdpIdc]

<i>apsokilsóssu naka kinapskósu</i>	
aps-ok.il-ohs-ohs.i-W	<i>naka kin-apsk-os.i-W</i>
small-stature.LV ^{NA} -DIM-DIM.LV ^{NA} -W	and large-ball-rflx.LV ^{NA} -W
'she is short and fat'	

b. [IdpIdc *naka* Sbd]

<i>apsokilsóssu naka 'kinapskósin</i>	
aps-ok.il-ohs-ohs.i-W	<i>naka '-kin-apsk-os.i-N</i>
small-stature.LV ^{NA} -DIM-DIM.LV ^{NA} -W	and 3-large-ball-rflx.LV ^{NA} -N
'she is short and fat'	

- ...but also notes: IdpIdc *kinapskósu* 'she is fat' is well-formed and unproblematic as a freestanding utterance, whereas Sbd *'kinapskósin* as a freestanding form is quite odd, and "needs something, to structure it." However, "[i]f you're with somebody and you're talking and it's structured language then it's fine." (AT:20071012)

❖ Matrix~Sbd contrast is interpretational independence vs. interpretational dependence.

- (19b) = the more common pattern, from pragmatic tendency for descriptive language to build coherent mental images rather than just offer disjointed lists of coincidental properties.

3.7 IdpIdcs: freestanding interpretation

- Predict that IdpIdcs, in narrative sea of Sbds, will show the same "freestanding" contrast.
- Borne out: IdpIdcs typically appear on predicates that are:

(20) IdpIdc in narrative texts

- (a) descriptive (unless conjoined)
 - (b) intensified: e.g. w/intensifier Pb *kàμαč*, PM *kəməč* 'very'; Pb *ànsα*, PM *ánsa* 'truly'
 - (c) negated
 - (d) indicating emotional or mental state
 - (e) introduced by a reason/rationale conjunction: Pb *wàsαm(i)*, PM *'sami(w)* 'because'
- Not absolutes, but are categorical contexts where IdpIdcs do appear in narrative discourse, over the general trend of Sbds.
- (a): Often found where characters are introduced (particularly at the beginning of texts): an event that is basic descriptive or background information is, *ceteris paribus*, not linked or linkable to its fellow descriptive events. "Fused" predicates are the obvious and only exception.
 - (b): Intensification often coincides w/freestanding status of events, possibly bc discursive treatment tends to pull such events out of the regular chain of events, giving them greater salience.
 - (c): Same as (b); and while non-happenings can be linked in to another pred (and then are indeed Sbd), in practice, freestanding "failures to occur" are much more common notions to convey.
 - (d): Less immediately obvious. Emotional events tend to be pulled out of the mainline flow of the story---and often intensified---perhaps as a reflection of anthropocentric empathy?
 - (e): Reason preds are sources of consequent events, and rarely if ever dependent on other events.
- General tendencies only, but quite robust, and explain only if we assume that the IdpIdc carries an interpretation corresponding to its syntax: freestanding and independent.

4. The Obviative:Subordinative parallel

- Obv and Sbd: fundamentally just dependents in verbal domain (a) and nominal domain (b) respectively:
- (a) IdpIdc-Sbd contrast is at its base the contrast of event-referential independence vs. dependence.
 - (b) Prox-Obv contrast is at its base the contrast of entity-referential independence vs. dependence.
- What underlies the Prox~Obv contrast is not topicality/salience; this is instead an outcome of *referential-access dependency* (Quinn 2006).
 - Consider the contrast in the paths we travel when interpreting the phrase *my mother* versus the phrase *her mother*:
 - We start with core conversational point of reference, i.e. the referential space delineated by speech act participants **[YOU and ME]**...
 - ...from there, we pick out a 3rd person by how they link a referent from that core, i.e. the *mother* entity links in via *my*:
- (21) Referential-access path to *my mother*
- my mother*
- [YOU and ME] → [(my) mother]

- *her mother* has seemingly identical structure...
- ...but if we start always from the [YOU and ME] core, an intermediate step must be made.
- The reference of the 3rd-person possessor *her* must be accessed first in order to reach the reference of the particular individual denoted by *mother*:

(22) Referential-access path to *her mother*

her mother

[YOU and ME] → [her] → [(her) mother]

- ❖ The presence of this intermediary step is the core feature of the Obv-Prox contrast.
- Obv is obligatory under 3rd person possessor (Rhodes 1993, inter alia), but not w/SAP possessors.
= Precisely reflecting what we see contrasting (21) vs. (22).
- ❖ The presence of this intermediary step is also the source of the discourse-structural contrast associated with Prox vs. Obv status.
- Any Obv carries within it the referential intermediary of its local Prox.
- Now a unified explanation for Goddard 1990's interpretation of a Prox-Obv pattern in one Meskwaki text.
- Therein, a group of supernatural beings engage in all of the main action, while the hero simply watches from the side, yet the beings stay consistently Obv for nearly the whole 34-page passage.
- Sustained "obviative span" (Hasler 2002), "contrasts with the largely backgrounded proximate status of the hero and is an indication that it is the hero's viewing of of the manitous' activity that is significant to the narrative." (Goddard 1990:328)
- Here:** Obv marking is a signal that the "narrative perspective/narrative access" is via the Prox referent; sustained Obviative marking cyclically maintains that sense of mediated access.
- ≈ Goddard 1990 explanation: hero is backgrounded only in the sense of actual activity: for discourse purposes, he is constantly at the forefront, maintained as the essential intermediary, being the Prox through which the Obvs' referential status derives.
- ❖ Now explains as core feature of the Prox-Obv contrast: Obv is referential-access dependent on its Prox, and so in itself carries the implicit reference of that Prox.
- ❖ Same set of properties were claimed for matrix-Sbd contrast: freestanding Sbds interpret as they do only bc they carry the implication of a covert matrix predicate, just as freestanding Obvs carry the implicational presence of the covert Prox.
- In turn, IdpIdcs and Proximates are truly freestanding, first in syntactic structure, and from that, also in interpretation. Hence both are the "salient" players in their respective domains.

5. Notes

1. This work is supported by ELDP post-doctoral fellowship grant *Documentation of Under-Represented Genres of Passamaquoddy-Maliseet Linguistic Practice*. My thanks go to all the native speaker participants at Sipayik, Maine, and particularly to Alice Tomah, who has worked with gusto on matters Sbd.

2. Arguably PE-blocking in the adverbial adjunct use of the Conjunct is the same pattern, where a similar head (temporal, etc.) with zero-affix-type properties is relativized, with consequent PE-blocking effects. Indeed, the IdpIdc distribution of PEs itself may come from relativization, assuming after Goddard 1974 that the IdpIdc may be an insubordination construction. Forms like the Conjunct Iterative (Goddard and Bragdon 1988:548) suggest that temporal Changed Conjuncts do in fact relativize a head which in some instances can be pluralized. Quinn 2003's analysis of the Penobscot Changed Subjunctive is also based on relativizing an absentative temporal head, and is now bolstered by the observation that that the Subordinative II and III reported by LeSourd 1993:23-24 could represent a Sbd parallel to the Changed Subjunctive as an absentative-headed relativization, particularly considering the closeness of these two clause-types' respective semantics.

3. These are for Pb and P-M only; southern E. Alg. languages show further constructional functions, not examined here.

4. Related alternatives might be that the omitted matrix is discourse-deictic, or a judgement predicate.

6. References *available upon request*

7. Abbreviations

AF	Agent Focus	obv	Obviative
AI	Animate Intransitive	P	M-element
Abs	absentative	PASS	passive
arg	argument	PD	Penobscot Dictionary ms. (ca. 1998; PDA = Akins scan)
ATTR	attributive particle	PE	Peripheral Ending
C	Initial Change morpheme	PO	Primary Object
CAUS	causative	pred	predicate
ChC	Changed conjunct	QT	quotative/hearsay evidential
Cj	Conjunct	Rea	Realis mood
CONV	converb	rflx	reflexive
DAT	dative	RP	Relational Predicate (applicative-like, corr. to TA abstract Final)
DIM	diminutive	S:...	Frank T. Siebert, Jr. field notes, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA
DIR	Direct	Sbd, Sub	Subordinative
DO	unergative LV w/'do' semantics	SDMC	Susie Dana Master Cards (Indian Island School, ca. 1970)
GEN	genitive	SO	Secondary Object
II	Innimate Intransitive	T	T-element (forms TI constructions)
IdpIdc	Independent Indicative	TA	Transitive Animate
INT	intensifier	TE	subordinator in <i>-te</i>
INV	inverse	TI	Transitive Inanimate
LV	light verb (intrans abstract Final/trans theme)	TOP	topicalization particle
N	N-element	W	W-element
NA	NA gender class ("inanimate")	X...	Relative Root gloss
NI	NI gender class ("inanimate")		
Nom	nominative		
Obl	oblique		