

For wholly separate reasons, I have claimed that Penobscot transitive stem-agreement for grammatical animates (NA)---what we might call transitive animate (TA) stem-agreement---is not actually agreement, but rather, a constructional/configurational phenomenon.

Specifically, TA "stem-agreement" actually instantiates a head-marking version of dative-accusative syncretism for grammatically animate notional direct objects---this being realized as one of a set of applicative constructions.

TA stems additionally have what can be roughly characterized as possessor-raising constructions rather similar to what is seen in Slavic languages and Modern Hebrew dative-affectee constructions. The pattern in Penobscot languages only appears different/unrelated for two reasons:

(a) the intermediate element, i.e. the possessum of the dative affectee, is typically incorporated into the verb stem; and

(b) again, the dative status of the affectee is not immediately obvious, because that status is reflected only on the verbal complex, and not the freestanding nominal itself, due to the radically head-marking nature of the system

New evidence in favor of the dative-based analysis is this: as Markman 2007 observes, Russian exhibits two distinct types of 'external' possessors: Dative Possessors (PD) and Locative Possessors (PLoc). In some instances the two are interchangeable:

(1) PD and PLoc (after Markman 2007)

a. Dim s'jel nam ves' sup. (PD)
'Dima ate up all our soup on us'

b. Dim s'jel u nas ves' sup. (PLoc)
'Dima ate up all our soup on us'

But only PLocs, and not PDs, are allowed with unaccusatives:

(2) PLoc and PD with unaccusatives (after Markman 2007)

U menja / *mne propal k Ashelek.
'My wallet disappeared on me' (PLoc OK, *PD)

Correspondingly, only PDs, and not PLocs, are allowed with unergatives and with inalienable possession constructions:

(3) PLoc and PD with unergatives (after Markman 2007)

Mne / *u menja Dima sbegal v magazin.
'Dima ran up to the store for me' (*PLoc, PD OK)

(4) PLoc and PD with inalienable possession constructions (after Markman 2007)

Mne / *u menja Dima slomal nogu
'Dima broke my leg' (*PLoc, PD OK)

Here now is the interesting part: Penobscot TA stems have equivalent single polysynthetic forms corresponding to the PD-only constructions in (3) and (4)---but absolutely nothing corresponding to the

PLoc-only forms of the type exemplified in (2).

(5) Penobscot TA stems: inalienable possession constructions in (dative-) transitive forms

a. nətəməsα

nə-təm-əs-^o.α-[w]
1-severed-by_blade-RP.DIR-W

'I sever NA with a knife' (PD:REF)

b. nətəmihptínsə

nə-təm-əhpətin.α-[w]-əs-^o.α-[w]
1-severed-hand.LV^{NA}-W-by_blade-RP.DIR-W

'I cut off NA's hand' (PD:REF)

c. nətəmikátesα

nə-təm-kət.α-[w]-əs-^o.α-[w]
1-severed-leg.LV^{NA}-W-by_blade-RP.DIR-W

'I cut off NA's leg' (PD:REF)

(5a) illustrates a basic TA stem (analyzed to have an RP element that instantiates dative treatment of the notional direct object); (5b) and (5c) illustrate corresponding forms with incorporation of an inalienable possessum, typically a body part.

As one can see from the morphological breakdown, the incorporation of a body part element involves a structure that has a bit more complexity than we may want to deal with here. I.e. not simply the Root naming the body part, but also a light verb $-.α$ (same as that found in intransitive stems characterizing body parts), and an additional W-element. Most Algonquianist analyses treat the resulting $-[body\ part].e-$ component as effectively a single element with a "medializing" $-e$. For present purposes, we can do the same, and leave finer-grained analytical possibilities open.

With that caveat out of the way, one can see that the Penobscot pattern corresponding translationally to the Russian inalienable possession construction in (4) differs only in a few consistent ways:

- (a) The inalienable possessum of the affectee (i.e. the intermediate affectee) is incorporated into the stem by some means.
- (b) Dative status of the affectee is signaled only on the stem, in the form of the Relational Predicate (RP).

As already (hopefully) established in Quinn 2006, the RP is best characterized as a type of Applicative, which, as an adpositional incorporant, is the expected head-marking equivalent to dative marking on a notional direct object.

As expected, then, Penobscot TA stems also have equivalents to the PD unergative constructions in (3). These are uncontroversially Applicatives forms with (what I analyze as the RP) $-aw$ (postvocally, $-w$):

- (6) Applicative -(a)w
- a. álohke
- alohk.e-[w]
- work.DO^{NA}-W
- 'NA works' (PD:REF)
- b. nətalóhkewα
- nə-alohk.e-(a)w.α-[w]
- 1-work.DO^{NA}-RP.DIR-W
- 'I work for NA'

(6a) shows the basic unergative stem; (6b) shows a TA derivation with (RP) Applicative, with a standard benefactive interpretation.

Both the inalienable possession-affectee construction and the unergative-Applicative construction are evidently productive in Penobscot. In short, Penobscot has clear and consistent direct equivalents to the Russian PD-based constructions given in (3) and (4), manifested through the TA stem construction---argued to be based on a general Applicative-dative treatment of the grammatically animate notional direct object.

In contrast, Penobscot evidently systematically lacks TA-stem constructions corresponding to the Russian PLoc pattern exemplified in (2). More work needs to be done to absolutely confirm this, but the basic observation seems solid. The motivation for this absence is a question in itself; for now, it simply strongly supports the claim that the categorical divisions holding in Russian case/adpositional syntax are also applying in Penobscot.

If this holds, then, it is interesting on two fronts. First, it supplies additional evidence that the head-marking-dative-based analysis of TA "stem-agreement" is correct. Second, it establishes a connection---however still unclear---between the dative-based constructions of otherwise genetically/areally/contact-unrelated languages. This of course suggests that further and closer comparison of dative and applicative constructions between these two languages could reveal much more about universal properties of datives, applicatives, and argument structure in general.