Some notes on Conjunct and Independent Orders in Wampanoag

Norvin Richards
MIT

I argue that Wampanoag Conjunct Order verbs are structurally lower in the tree than Independent Order verbs. I show that Conjunct Order is used in a number of contexts in which verb raising is blocked in other languages, including embedded questions, relative clauses, and questions with *tahwuch* 'why'. One of the contexts I examine involves what I argue to be the Wampanoag equivalent of anti-agreement. Following Ouhalla (1993) and Phillips (to appear), I regard anti-agreement as involving failure of the verb to raise to agreement-bearing heads; the Wampanoag facts force us to an understanding of anti-agreement in these syntactic terms, rather than as a condition on morphology.

1 Introduction

A number of Algonquian languages make a distinction between so-called <u>Conjunct</u> and <u>Independent</u> Orders in their verb morphology; the choice between these verb forms is conditioned by a number of syntactic factors. (1) gives examples of Independent and Conjunct translations of a sentence in Wampanoag, an extinct Algonquian language of eastern Massachusetts:

(1) a. ku-nâw-uq -uwôw-ak [**Independent**]
2 see INV 2PL PL
'They see you (PL)'
b. nâw-uqeey-âk [**Conjunct**]
see INV 2PL
'They see you (PL)'

In this paper I will consider the syntactic conditions determining the choice between Independent and Conjunct verb forms. I will argue that Conjunct verbs are structurally lower than Independent ones; this is the conclusion reached by Halle and Marantz (1994) for Potawatomi, and the opposite of that reached by Campana (1996) for Passamaquoddy-Malecite and by Brittain (1997) for Sheshatshit Montagnais. In principle, of course, the Conjunct/Independent split could have different syntactic correlates in different languages. In what follows I will concentrate specifically on Wampanoag data[1].

2 Independent and Conjunct: Form and Use

Let me begin with a preliminary description of the two orders. The main difference of form has to do with agreement morphology; very roughly, the Conjunct verb has comparatively impoverished morphology, compared to the Independent verb. In the following discussion I will offer a picture of the morphology which is somewhat simplified, though not in ways that are important to the discussion here; for a more careful examination of the agreement morphology, see Bruening and Rackowski (this volume). Let us consider the structure of the Independent verb in (1a):

(2) ku-nâw-uq -uwôw-ak [**Independent**]
2 see INV 2PL PL
'They see you (PL)'

The verb in (2) begins with a prefix *ku-*, which agrees with the highest argument on an animacy hierarchy; in this case, because 2nd person outranks 3rd on the hierarchy, agreement is with the 2nd person direct object. I will refer to the highest argument on the hierarchy as the "central" argument, and the non-central argument (if any) as the "peripheral" argument; thus, in (2), the central argument is the direct object, and the subject is the peripheral argument. After this prefix comes the verb stem *nâw* 'see'. Next comes a

---

Many thanks to Ben Bruening, Ken Hale, Jessie Little Doe Fermino, Andrea Rackowski, and audiences at MIT, WSCLA 5, and the Language for Seven Generations Workshop for helpful comments. Responsibility for any errors is entirely mine.

[1] Biblical citations are from Eliot (1685), except for citations from Psalms and John, which are from Mayhew (1709). In quoted examples I will retain the original orthography; in constructed examples I use the orthography developed by Jessie Little Doe Fermino and Ken Hale. In this orthography â=/a:/, ô=/ã:/, and 8=/u:/.

"theme marker" which indicates the relation of the central and peripheral arguments; in this case, because the central argument is the object and the peripheral argument is the subject, the verb has the Inverse suffix *-uq*. After this comes a suffix which agrees with plural central arguments (in this case, *-uwôw* '2PL'), and finally another suffix which agrees with peripheral plural or obviative arguments (in this case, the animate plural suffix *-ak*, agreeing with the peripheral subject 'they').

Next, let us consider the agreement morphology in the Conjunct equivalent of (2):

(3) nâw-uqeey-âk [**Conjunct**]
see INV 2PL
'They see you (PL)'

The Conjunct differs from the Independent in its relative poverty of agreement morphology; it lacks the Independent's prefix, and the last suffix (the one which agrees with the peripheral argument)[2]. What it has are the first two kinds of suffixes: a theme marker indicating that the object outranks the subject on the animacy hierarchy (*-uqeey*), and a central agreement suffix (*-âk* '2PL'). In the theory to be developed here, as in Halle and Marantz' (1994) approach, this impoverishment of morphology indicates failure of the verb to raise high enough in the tree to pick up the relevant functional heads.

Let us next consider the syntactic conditions on the choice between Conjunct and Independent orders. There are three main syntactic contexts in which Conjunct verbs are used. They are used in relative clauses, quite systematically:

(4) Qut wame yeug **paubuhtanum-ukque-an -eg** weekontamohettich [**Conjunct**]
but all those trust INV 2SG PL let-them-rejoice
'But let all those that put their trust in thee rejoice...' [Psalms 5:11]

Conjunct verbs are also used in certain classes of adjunct clauses:

(5) a. [Tokonogque **nush-ikque-on**], onk onch woh nuppábuhtanum [**Conjunct**]
though kill INV 1SG and yet should I-trust-him
'Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him...' [Job 13:15]

b. [Tohneit kod **pohquttum-on** kah **weogquttum-on**].... [**Conjunct**]
if want declare 1SG and discuss 1SG
'If I would declare and speak of them...' [Psalms 40:5]

Finally, Conjunct verbs are used in some, though not all, wh-questions:

(6) a. Toohkish, tohwaje **kaue-an**, woi Jehovah?... [**Conjunct**]
awake why sleep-2SG o Jehovah
'Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord?...' [Psalms 44:23]

b. Nussontimom, howan **matchese-it**, yeuoh, asuh oochetuongah... [**Conjunct**]
our-master who sin 3SG this or his-parents
'Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents...?' [John 9:2]

Independent verbs seem to be the default form in Wampanoag; they are used in contexts other than the ones listed above.

3 The Conjunct Order and verb height

In this section I will consider more closely the conditions on the distribution of Conjunct verbs. We will see that Conjunct is used in contexts in which verb movement is blocked in other languages, suggesting that Conjunct verbs in Wampanoag are ones which undergo comparatively little verb movement.

[2] Conjunct verbs do have another agreement morpheme when they are used in relative clauses; they agree with the relative clause head. This agreement is like Independent peripheral agreement in being sensitive specifically to number and obviation, but is not necessarily with the peripheral argument (though it can be, if this is the relative clause head).

3.1 Conjunct and failure of I-to-C

The Conjunct occurs in Wampanoag in a number of syntactic contexts in which I-to-C is blocked in other languages. We have already seen one such context: Conjunct is quite regularly used in relative clauses:

(7) kesukod [adt **pohquohwhun-uh -p** wutch matwaut] [**Conjunct**]
day on deliver 3SG PRET from enemy-LOC
'...the day when he delivered them from the enemy' [Psalms 78:42]

(8) kutt8wongash [nish **n8tam-an-ish**], [**Conjunct**]
words which hear 2SG PL
[nish nashpe wuttinneumoh Assyriae ketass8t **blasphem-ukqueh-Ø**]
which with servant Assyria's king blaspheme INV 1SG
'...the words which you have heard, with which the servants of the king of Assyria have blasphemed me' [2 Kings 19:6]

(9) noh quoshodtumwáenin [woh **paon -t** yeu muttaohket] [**Conjunct**]
that prophet should come 3SG this world-LOC
',,,that prophet that should come into the world .' [John 6:14]

I-to-C movement is blocked in relative clauses in languages like English:

(10) a. the day [when he delivered them from the enemy]
b. *the day [when did he deliver them from the enemy]

Conjunct verbs also appear in all embedded wh-questions:

(11) N8wahteomun [teaguas **waussitam-og**] [**Conjunct**]
we-know what worship 1PL
'...we know what we worship...' [John 4:22]

(12) wahteunk nanawanuk week, [ahquompak **peyon-t** komm8towaen] [**Conjunct**]
if-he-knows ruler house when come 3SG thief
'...if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come...' [Matthew 24:43]

(13) matta wahteauoog [toh **ase-hettit**] [**Conjunct**]
not they-know how do 3PL
'...they know not what they do...' [Luke 23:34]

(14) Newutche mehquontash [uttoh waj **penusha-on**] [**Conjunct**]
therefore remember where from fall 2SG
'Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen...' [Revelations 2:5]

Again, this is a context in which I-to-C movement is blocked in standard English:

(15) a. We know [what we worship]
b. *We know [what do we worship]

Finally, Conjunct verbs always appear in wh-questions with *tahwuch* 'why':

(16) Tohwaje **mushshoowa-an** ut woskehhoowaonkanit... [**Conjunct**]
why boast 2SG in mischief
'Why boastest thou thyself in mischief?...' [Psalms 52:1]

(17) Tohwutch mat **pásoo-wó -ôg**? [**Conjunct**]
why not bring NEG 2PL
'Why have ye not brought him?' [John 7:45]

As noted by Rizzi (1990), questions with *pourquoi* 'why' fail to trigger subject-verb inversion in French:

(18) a. De quoi a parlé Jean?
of what has spoken Jean
'Of what has John spoken?'
b. Comment a parlé Jean?
how has spoken Jean
'How has John spoken?'
c. *Pourquoi a parlé Jean?
why has spoken Jean
'Why has John spoken?' [*French*: Rizzi 1990:47-48]

Thus, we have seen that Conjunct verbs appear in Wampanoag in a number of contexts in which verb raising is blocked in other languages. I have nothing new to say about why verb raising fails to occur in these contexts, but if we assume that the verb ordinarily raises rather high in Wampanoag and is prevented from doing so in these contexts, these Wampanoag data might receive a fairly straightforward explanation; the verb is Independent when it raises to its usual position, and Conjunct when it cannot. In the next section we will see another instance in which verb raising has been argued to be blocked in other languages, and I will suggest that this phenomenon is present in Wampanoag as well.

3.2 Conjunct and Anti-agreement

A number of unrelated languages exhibit <u>anti-agreement</u> in wh-questions; the verb fails to agree with wh-words, or exhibits a special type of agreement:

(19) a. mac xc -ach 7il -ni? [*Jacaltec*: Craig 1979, 150]
who ASP-2.ABS see-AC
'Who saw you?'
b. *mac xc -ach **y** -7il -ni?
who ASP-2.ABS 3.ERG-see-AC
'Who saw you?'

(20) a. nó.o o- tEm -írE mote? [*Kikuyu*: Clements 1984, 39]
who-CL1 WH.AGR cut TNS tree
'Who cut a tree?'
b. *nó.o **á**- !tE m -Ér mote?*!
who-CL1 CL1-cut TNS tree
'Who cut a tree?'

(21) a. Quante ragazze gli è venuto con te? [*Fiorentino*: Brandi and Cordin 1989, 124-125]
how-many girls it is come with you
'How many girls came with you?'
b.* Quante ragazze **le** **sono** venut**e** con te?
how-many girls 3.PL.FEM. are come-FEM.PL with you
'How many girls came with you?'

Ouhalla (1993) and Phillips (to appear) analyze anti-agreement as involving failure of the verb to raise high enough to reach the head responsible for agreement with the wh-word. One of their arguments for this conclusion comes from the interaction of anti-agreement with negation in various languages. Berber is one language with anti-agreement, as (22) shows. However, anti-agreement fails when the verb is negated, as we see in (23); in negative questions, the verb must agree with the subject even if it is a wh-word:

(22) a. man tamghart ay yzrin Mohand? [*Berber*: Ouhalla 1993, 479, 499]
which woman COMP see-PART Mohand
'Which woman saw Mohand?'
b. *man tamghart ay **t**- zra Mohand?
which woman COMP 3FEM.SG.-saw Mohand

(23) man tamghart ay ur **t**- ssn Mohand?
which woman COMP NEG 3FEM.SG. know Mohand
'Which woman does not know Mohand?'

According to Ouhalla and Phillips, failure of anti-agreement in (23) is due to the need of the verb to raise to negation; because the negative morpheme is further from the root than agreement (hence, assuming some version of the Mirror Principle, structurally higher), raising of the verb to negation entails raising first to agreement. In (22), then, the verb remains too low to pick up the agreement morpheme and thus fails to agree with the subject, but in (23) this is impossible for independent morphological reasons; the verb must raise high enough to pick up negation, and this forces it to raise through agreement. This account predicts that in languages with anti-agreement in which the relevant agreement morpheme is structurally higher than negation, negated questions will be no different from non-negated questions; the verb can raise to negation without raising high enough to pick up agreement. As Ouhalla and Phillips point out, the Turkish data in (24-25) bear out this prediction:

(24) a. hoca -yi gör -en ög*renciler [*Turkish*: Ouhalla 1993, 484]
lecturer ACC see PART students
'the students who saw the lecturer'
b. *hoca -yi gör -en -**ler** ög*renciler
lecturer ACC see PART PL students
'the students who saw the lecturer'

(25) a. [Hoca -yi gör -me -yen] ögrenciler
lecturer ACC see NEG PART students
'the students who did not see the lecturer'
b.*[Hoca -yi gör -me -yen -**ler**] ögrenciler
lecturer ACC see NEG PART PL students

(24) shows an instance of anti-agreement in a Turkish relative clause. In (25), we can see that negation has no effect on anti-agreement in Turkish; the verb must still fail to agree. This is as we expect, since Turkish negation is quite close to the verb stem, closer than the agreement suffix which is involved in anti-agreement.

Suppose we conclude, then, that Ouhalla and Phillips are right; anti-agreement involves failure of the verb to raise to the syntactic position responsible for agreement. Here I have been defending the claim that Wampanoag Conjunct verbs are lower in the structure than Independent ones. If this is the correct analysis, and if Wampanoag has anti-agreement, then we should expect it to surface as use of the Conjunct. In this section I will try to show that this is the correct conclusion.

A word about the descriptive term "anti-agreement" is probably in order here. Ouhalla and Phillips have argued that anti-agreement involves failure of the verb to raise to an agreement head. If we accept their analysis, we are left with a question about the nature of anti-agreement: is anti-agreement a ban on the verb bearing morphology that agrees with wh-phrases? Or is it a ban on movement of the verb to heads that are in an agreement relation with wh-phrases? In the languages Ouhalla and Phillips study, this question cannot be addressed; failure of the verb to raise is realized as an absence of morphology. In Wampanoag, on the other hand, I am arguing that the verb can remain low in the structure and still bear (Conjunct) agreement morphology with its arguments. We saw above, in section 2, that Conjunct verb agreement morphology is comparatively impoverished, but is not entirely missing. I will try to show in the next few sections that the Conjunct has the distribution that it should have if it involves the Wampanoag equivalent of anti-agreement; that is, I will try to show that the verb is forced to stay low in the structure when there are functional heads above it that agree with wh-phrases. In Wampanoag, then, we have an argument for a particular approach to anti-agreement: anti-agreement involves a requirement that the verb not raise to heads that are in an agreement relation with wh-phrases. In some languages, such as Berber, this failure to raise is realized morphologically as a lack of agreement; in Wampanoag, if I am correct, it is realized as the Conjunct form of the verb, with impoverished but not absent agreement morphology.

The very brief discussion of Wampanoag agreement in section 2 above divided agreement into two types: agreement with the central argument (the highest argument on the animacy hierarchy), and agreement with the peripheral argument (the non-central argument). Let us consider these kinds of agreement in turn, and see how they interact with wh-questions.

3.2.1 Central agreement with wh-phrases

This case is comparatively straightforward; if the verb exhibits central agreement with a wh-phrase, it is in the Conjunct form. In terms of the theory being developed here, central agreement with a wh-phrase forces anti-agreement, which is realized in Wampanoag as the Conjunct.

(26) howan woh **nepau-it** anuhquabean [**Conjunct**]
who can stand 3SG before-you
'Who may stand in thy sight?' [Psalms 76:7]

(27) Howan **masun-uk** nuhhogkoo [**Conjunct**]
who touch 3SG my-clothes
'Who touched my clothes?' [Mark 5:30]

(28) Howan **agqueneunkquss-it** puppinashimwoh? [**Conjunct**]
who is-like 3SG beast
'Who is like unto the beast?' [Revelations 13:4]

3.2.2 Peripheral agreement with wh-phrases

Bruening and Rackowski (this volume) have shown that peripheral agreement in Wampanoag is tied to notions of specificity; specific peripheral arguments control peripheral agreement, while non-specific ones do not. Thus, a specific direct object like the one in (29a) controls peripheral agreement (thus, we get the so-called "Objective" form of the verb), while the non-specific direct object in (29b) does not (and therefore uses an "Absolute" form of the verb):

(29) a. Koshkuhtaukquainnin <u>shanuh</u> **wu-tahtauw-unâsh** mitcheme [**Independent**]
K. these 3 has INAN.PL forever
'Koshkuhtaukquainnin has these (inan.) forever' (Goddard and Bragdon 1988, 74:6-7)
b. **Nu-ssoh -ômun** <u>J8nesognag</u> [**Independent**]
1 send-out 1PL jurymen
'We sent out jurymen' (Goddard and Bragdon 1988, 17:14)

Goddard (1974) and Laurent (1884) draw similar conclusions about the semantic import of peripheral agreement in the related languages Delaware and Western Abenaki, respectively.

In considering the behavior of wh-phrases which might be in a position to control peripheral agreement, then, we need to know whether wh-words are specific or non-specific. In fact, there is some reason to believe that the answer to this question might depend on the wh-word. Macedonian, for instance, allows clitic-doubling with specific nominals, but not with non-specific nominals:

(30) a. Vidov eden čovek [*Macedonian*: Browne 1970, 267]
I-saw a man
'I saw a man'
b. <u>**Go**</u> vidov čovekot
him I-saw the-man
'I saw the man'

By this test, *kogo* 'who' is specific, and *što* 'what' is non-specific:

(31) a. Śto barate? [*Macedonian*: Browne 1970, 269]
what you-seek
'What are you looking for?'
b. Kogo **<u>go</u>** barate?
who him you-seek
'Who are you looking for?'

Similarly, in English, *what* can have either a de dicto or a de re reading in intentional contexts, while *who* seems to only be able to have a de re reading, a standard hallmark of specificity. (32a) is consistent with me thinking that you are looking for any instantiation of some class (for example, that you need a book to hold your window open, and are looking for one, without much caring which book it is). To utter (32b), by contrast, I have to be assuming that you are looking for a specific person:

(32) a. What are you looking for?
b. Who are you looking for?

By these tests, *who* appears to be specific and *what* non-specific. Assuming that this is true in Wampanoag as well, then, we are ready to make a prediction about the distribution of anti-agreement in questions with a wh-phrase in a peripheral argument position. If *what* is non-specific, then there is no need to perform anti-agreement to avoid agreement with the wh-phrase; rather, the Independent form can be used, without agreeing with the peripheral argument (that is, we can use the so-called Independent Absolute form). If the wh-phrase in question is *who*, however, then it is specific and will trigger peripheral agreement; to avoid this, the Conjunct must be used. We predict, then, that *hawân* 'who' in peripheral argument position will force the use of the Conjunct form of the verb, but *tyâqas* 'what' will not. This seems to be correct:

(33) Kah ketassoot wuttinuh, ahque wabesit, teaguas **ke-naum**?… [**Independent**]
and king said-to-her don't be-afraid what 2 see
'And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou?…' [I Samuel 28:13]

(34) Kah yeuyeu Jehovah, teaguas **nu-ppahtissoowontom**? [**Independent**]
and now Jehovah what 1 await
'And now, Lord, what wait I for?' [Psalms 39:7]

(35) ...howan woh **quosh -o -g**? [**Conjunct**]
who shall fear DIR 1SG
'...Whom shall I fear?' [Psalms 27:1]

(36) yeuyeu howan **pabahtanum-adt**, waj ayeuuhkonittue chekehtaiean? [**Conjunct**]
now who trust 2SG that against-me you-rebel
'Now on whom dost thou trust, that thou rebellest against me?' [II Kings 18:20]

The anti-agreement hypothesis seems to be serving us well; when the wh-phrase is in a position to control agreement on the verb, the Conjunct form of the verb is used[3].

3.2.3 No agreement with wh-phrases

Thus far it has always been the case that questions with *hawân* 'who' involve use of the Conjunct, and questions with *tyâqas* 'what' use the Independent. I have offered an account of these facts in terms of anti-agreement, but one could imagine an alternative account, which somehow made reference to the particular choice of wh-phrase. In this section we will see that wh-questions in which the verb does not agree with the wh-phrase always have Independent verbs.

---

[3] Returning to the previous section, we note that the examples of a wh-phrase controlling central agreement all involve *hawân* 'who'; we might wonder what would happen if *tyâqas* 'what' controlled central agreement. Unfortunately, such examples are very difficult to find, and I have not yet found any. Because inanimate nouns are the lowest on the animacy hierarchy, transitive sentences with *tyâqas* invariably have another argument controlling central agreement.

This is true, for instance, in the following ditransitive examples; here the verb agrees with two arguments, neither of which is the wh-phrase:

(37) ...kah howan yeu **ku-ttinnum-unkq-un** kummenuhkesuonk. [**Independent**]
and who this 2 give INV INAN your-authority
'...and who gave thee this authority?' [Matthew 21:23]
central Agr: indirect object (*you*)
peripheral Agr: direct object (*this authority*)

(38) Neit mittamwossis n8wau howan woh **ku-ppaudta-sh**? [**Independent**]
then woman says who shall 2 bring-up 1
'Then said the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee?' [I Samuel 28:11]
central Agr: indirect object (*you*)
peripheral Agr: subject (*I*)

(39) Howan **ku-mmisham-ungq-un** kupposkissuonk? [**Independent**]
who 2 tell INV INAN your-nakedness
'Who told thee that thou wast naked?' [Genesis 3:11]
central Agr: indirect object (*you*)
peripheral Agr: direct object (*your nakedness*)

Thus, it is not always the case that wh-questions with *hawân* 'who' involve the Conjunct; the Independent is used when the verb is in no danger of agreeing with *hawân*.

Adjunct wh-questions also invariably use the Independent; again, this is not surprising, given that the verb does not agree with them[4]:

(40) Toh wuttinne woh **koowé-u** [**Independent**]
how thus should sleep 3SG
'Wherein shall he sleep?' [Exodus 22:27]

(41) Toh utt8che **ku-ssekeneam** hahpáun anaquabeh? [**Independent**]
how long 2 refuse to-be-humble before-me
'How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me?' [Exodus 10:3]

(42) ahquompak woh **nu-tomohke-m**, kah nuhkon mahtiheau? [**Independent**]
when shall 1 arise SG and night be-gone
'When shall I arise, and the night be gone?' [Job 7:4]

(43) uttunkoh **koo-tahtau-un** ne pomantamwae nippe? [**Independent**]
whence 2 have 3INAN that living water
'From whence then hast thou that living water?' [John 4:11]

The only exceptions to this generalization about adjunct wh-questions are those discussed above; questions with *tahwuch* 'why', and embedded questions, always use the Conjunct form of the verb, as discussed in section 3.1 above.

3.2.4 Failure of anti-agreement

As we saw above, anti-agreement in some languages is subject to being overridden by morphological considerations; in Berber, for instance, positive questions show anti-agreement, but negative questions do not. As it happens, the generalizations discussed above, which I have been relating to anti-

[4] Rackowski (2000) defends the conclusion that certain adjuncts can in principle agree with the verb, in the so-called Subordinative construction; she argues that such adjuncts have been incorporated into the verb. Adjunct wh-questions never seem to use the Subordinative; if Rackowski is correct, this is presumably another instance of anti-agreement.

agreement in other languages, have some exceptions, some of which seem explicable in terms of overriding by other morphological factors. The generalizations described in section 3.1, by contrast, have no such counterexamples; these seem to be straightforwardly true in all of the relevant examples. In what follows I will discuss some of the cases in which anti-agreement breaks down.

3.2.4.1 Specific objects

We have seen (in section 2 above) that one morphological difference between Conjunct and Independent has to do with richness of agreement; for example, Independent verbs exhibit peripheral agreement, while Conjunct verbs do not. In section 3.2.2 above I reviewed Bruening and Rackowski's (this volume) conclusions about the semantic properties of peripheral agreement; their claim is that peripheral agreement is forced when the peripheral argument is specific. In principle, then, the conditions on peripheral agreement could come into conflict with the generalizations about anti-agreement discussed above. In sentences with a wh-word as the central argument and a specific peripheral argument, anti-agreement would require the use of the Conjunct, while the requirement that verbs show peripheral agreement with specific peripheral arguments would require the use of the Independent (since only the Independent has peripheral agreement). In fact, this conflict is settled in favor of agreement with specific arguments; although central wh-arguments ordinarily trigger the use of the Conjunct, they do not do so when the peripheral argument is specific. This can be seen in (44-48), which have pronominal peripheral arguments and wh-phrase central arguments:

(44) howan woh **wu-nnanompanwonsh-uh**? [**Independent**]
who shall 3 intreat-for OBV
'Who shall intreat for him?' [I Samuel 2:25]

(45) wunnutcheg summagohteau, kah howan woh **u-kqushkinnum-un**? [**Independent**]
his-hand is-stretched-out and who shall 3 turn-back INAN
'His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?' [Isaiah 14:27]

(46) Metah anne as8kekodteam8wontam onk wame teanteaguasinish
heart more deceitful than all things
kah unkqueneunku8matchetou,
and desperately-wicked
howan woh **8-wahteau-un** [**Independent**]
who can 3 know INAN
'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?' [Jeremiah 17:9]

(47) Wunohteaonk magukish, neit howan **oo-tamehe-uh**, [**Independent**]
quietness gives then who 3 trouble OBV
kah ahtahtunk wuskesuk, neit howan woh **u-mmononneau-oh**? [**Independent**]
and hides his-face then who can 3 behold OBV
'When he giveth quietness, who then can make trouble?
and when he hideth his face, who can then behold him?' [Job 34:29]

(48) Yeu siógkiyeuonk, howan woh **wu-nn8tám-un**? [**Independent**]
this hard-saying who can 3 hear INAN
'This is a hard saying; who can hear it?' [John 6:60]

We find similar kinds of exceptions with demonstrative or topicalized direct objects, presumably for similar reasons:

(49) Howan yeu **wu-tusse-n**? [**Independent**]
who this 3 do INAN
'Who hath done this thing?' [Judges 6:29]

(50) Howan wame yeuh **wu-nnush-uh**? [**Independent**]
who all these-obv 3 kill OBV
'Who slew all these?' [II Kings 10:9]

(51) n8chumwetahhamwe nashauonk howan woh **wu-ttohshinnum-un**? [**Independent**]
wounded spirit who can 3 bear INAN
'But a wounded spirit who can bear?' [Chronicles 18:14]

(52) Neit yeush wame nish quoshauwehtomahpash
then these all which you-have-provided
howan woh **wu-tahtau-unash**? [**Independent**]
who shall 3 have INAN.PL
'Then whose whall those things be, which thou hast provided?' [Luke 12:20]

It is worth emphasizing that this class of counterexamples is restricted to the contexts which I have described here in terms of anti-agreement. The claim being developed in this paper is that Conjunct verbs are unified by their failure to raise as high in the tree as Independent verbs, but this failure to raise can have a number of different causes. In section 3.1 above I suggested that questions with *tahwuch* 'why' and embedded questions, among others, use the Conjunct because verb raising is blocked by the same factors that block it in languages like English and French in these contexts. Section 3.2 has been dedicated to anti-agreement, a phenomenon which is subject to being overridden by other morphological considerations in the other languages that exhibit it, as we have seen. In Wampanoag, if the account given here is correct, anti-agreement can be overridden by a requirement that verbs agree with specific peripheral arguments. The contexts described in section 3.1 above, on the other hand, are not instances of anti-agreement in this theory. It should not be too surprising, then, to discover that the Conjunct is <u>invariably</u> used in these contexts. Questions with *tahwuch* 'why', for instance, use the Conjunct even if the peripheral argument is a pronoun[5]:

(53) tohwutch matta **togkom-o -adt** en ohkeit [**Conjunct**]
why not smite NEG 2SG to ground
'Why didst thou not smite him there to the ground?' [I Samuel 18:11]

(54) tohwutch noh **nooswehtáhwh-ogut** [**Conjunct**]
why him persecute 1PL
'Why persecute we him?' [Job 19:28]

Similarly, embedded questions always use the conjunct, again regardless of the status of the peripheral argument:

(55) numwonkquottou weenauweetuonganash,
he-heaps-up riches
kah matta wahteooo [howane pish nash **muhmoun-uk**] [**Conjunct**]
and not he-knows who will them-INAN gather 3SG
'he heapeth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them' [Psalms 39:6]

(56) Howan namehit nushau...kah matta wahteomuk [howan **nash-on -t**] [**Conjunct**]
one is-found slain and not is-known who slay DIR 3SG
'If one be found slain...and it be not known who hath slain him' [Deuteronomy 21:1]

This theory, then, makes a useful distinction between cases of use of the Conjunct. Those described in section 3.1 above are predicted to be exceptionless, and seem to be. Those described in section 3.2 in terms

---

[5] Use of overt pronouns is rather rare, and usually seems to be reserved for positions of emphasis. It is interesting that some of these questions do have overt pronominal objects (e.g., *nah* 'him' in (54), or *nash* 'them-INAN' in (55)); I have no data on whether such objects are more common in this construction than we would expect, however.

of anti-agreement, on the other hand, seem to have exceptions, of a more or less expected kind; given the cross-linguistically attested "fragility" of anti-agreement, this is no great surprise.

3.2.4.2 Inverse

I claimed above that when *hawân* 'who' is a position to control peripheral agreement, the Conjunct is used. The idea was that *hawân*, being specific, would trigger peripheral agreement, and therefore requires anti-agreement. (57) is one of the examples I used above to show this:

(57) ...howan woh **quosh -o -g**? [**Conjunct**]
who shall fear DIR 1SG
'...Whom shall I fear?' [Psalms 27:1]

However, all of the examples that show this straightforwardly are, like (57), examples with Direct verbs. When the verb is Inverse, the situation is somewhat more complicated, as we will see in this section.

Recall that Inverse verbs are used in Wampanoag when the object outranks the subject on the animacy hierarchy. When the subject (that is, the peripheral argument) is inanimate, then a distinction is made, as it is in Direct verbs, between so-called Objective forms, which bear peripheral agreement, and Absolute forms which do not[6]:

(58) a. nu-weenuhkô-k -umun [**Independent Abs**]
1 encircle INV 1PL
'It/they (inan) is/are around us'
b. nu-weenuhkô-q -unân [**Independent Obj**]
1 encircle INV 1PL
'It is around us'
c. nu-weenuhkô-q -unânôn -ash [**Independent Obj**]
1 encircle INV 1PL INAN.PL
'They (inan) are around us'

When the subject is animate, however, the distinction collapses; only Objective forms are found (unless both arguments are third person, a case which will not be relevant for us):

(59) a. nu-weenuhkô-q -un [**Independent Obj**]
1 encircle INV 1PL
'He is around us'
b. nu-weenuhkô-q -unôn -ak [**Independent Obj**]
1 encircle INV 1PL AN.PL
'They are around us'

Inverse verbs, then, sometimes fail to distinguish between peripheral-agreement-bearing Objective forms and peripheral-agreement-lacking Absolute forms; they have only the first class of forms.

The defective nature of this corner of the paradigm is presumably related to the fact that when *hawân* 'who' is the peripheral argument of an Inverse verb, a number of possible verb forms are attested, with no obvious pattern in their distribution. We do find Conjunct verbs, more or less as we would expect:

(60) howan woh **ayeuuhkon-ukque-og** [**Conjunct**]
who shall be-against INV 1PL
'Who shall come down against us?' [Jeremiah 21:13]

(61) howan woh **pabahtanum-ukque-og** wuñamuhkut w?naehtu??gash? [**Conjunct**]
who shall entrust INV 2PL true riches
'Who will commit to your trust the true riches?' [Luke 16:11]

On the other hand, we also find Independent Objective verb forms:

---

6 Here, again, I am oversimplifying Wampanoag agreement morphology, though not in ways that affect the discussion. See Bruening and Rackowski (this volume) for a more careful discussion of the morphology.

(62) howan pish **ku-ppohquohwhun-ukq-un** wutch wunnutchegan8out [**Independent Obj]**
who will 2 deliver INV 1PL from their-hand
yeug matikkenukeg manitt8og?
these mighty gods
'Who shall deliver us out of the hand of these mighty Gods?' [I Samuel 4:8]

(63) howan woh **ku-tassamh-ukq-un** weyaus, mechinat? [**Independent Obj**]
who shall 2 give INV 1PL meat to-eat
'Who shall give us flesh to eat?' [Numbers 11:4]

And we also find Independent Absolute verb forms; as we saw, these are normally unattested for Inverse verbs with animate subjects and first or second person objects, but they are in fact found in this particular type of wh-question:

(64) Howan **ke-no-gk -umun**? kah howan **k8-wah-ik -umun**? [**Independent Abs**]
who 2 see INV 1PL and who 2 see INV 1PL
'Who seeth us? and who knoweth us?' [Isaiah 29:15]

(65) howan **ku-tann8n -uk-umw8** yeu ayimunat wetu [**Independent Abs**]
who 2 command INV 2PL this to-build house
'Who commanded you to build this house?' [Ezra 5:9]

I hope to develop a better understanding of the factors conditioning the choice among these forms in future work, but at this point the possibility arises that they are simply in free variation. Certainly there are examples in which Conjunct and Independent forms are used in close proximity to each other:

(66) Newutche howan woh **kodtumonteanum-ukque-an** woi Jerusalem? [**Conjunct**]
for who shall have-pity INV 2SG o Jerusalem
kah howan woh **ku-mmauunitteauwansh-ik** [**Independent**]
and who shall 2 bemoan INV
'For who shall have pity upon thee, O Jerusalem?
or who shall bemoan thee?' [Jeremiah 15:5]

It seems reasonable to think that the behavior of Inverse verbs has something to do with the defective nature of the paradigm. Recall that with this particular class of verbs, there is no contrast between forms with peripheral agreement and forms without. How we account for the peculiar behavior of these verbs in questions may depend on how we reflect this kind of property of paradigms in our theory of morphology. For all of the examples that are relevant here, the peripheral argument (that is, the wh-phrase) is singular[7], and agreement morphology with singular nominals is null; these forms have morphology identifying them as Objective, but no actual peripheral agreement morphology. One approach to the defective status of the paradigm might involve regarding these forms as underspecified with respect to their agreement properties. The situation would then be parallel to that of *tyâqas* 'what' in a peripheral argument position; in some sense, the Independent verb does not agree with the wh-word, so the Independent form is used by default. This might be a case, then, in which there is no single "best" solution to the question of how to deal with peripheral agreement with *hawân*. The Conjunct form has the advantage of definitely lacking peripheral agreement, and the disadvantage of being the non-default form (as we can see with questions involving *tyâqas*, the Independent is used when other factors do not force use of the Conjunct). The Independent Absolute form has the advantages of lacking peripheral agreement and being the default, Independent form, but the disadvantage of being normally unattested in this class of Inverse verbs, for reasons that are unclear[8]. The Independent Objective form also has the advantage of being the default, but its status with respect to peripheral agreement is not clear; in some sense, its peripheral agreement might be

---

[7] I have not yet found relevant examples in which the wh-phrase is either plural or obviative; such examples might shed more light on this problem.

[8] I am assuming here that peripheral agreement does not have its usual semantic contribution in this class of Inverse constructions (since the Absolute/Objective contrast has been neutralized), though it is not clear whether this is the case. If Objective and Absolute are still associated with specific and non-specific peripheral arguments, respectively, then the Independent Absolute form in this context has the additional problem that *hawân* ordinarily behaves like a specific nominal, as we have seen.

underspecified. Given this range of more or less unsatisfactory choices, it is perhaps not too surprising that a range of possibilities are attested.

3.2.4.3 Intensional contexts

Intensional contexts are another structure in which the generalizations outlined above seem to break down. We do find instances of *hawân* 'who' in peripheral position triggering the use of the Conjunct, as expected:

(67) Howan **natinneahwh-adt**? [**Conjunct**]
who seek 2SG
'Whom seekest thou?' [John 20:15]

However, we also find instances of the Independent being used:

(68) Howan **ke-natinneahwh-omw8**? [**Independent**]
who 2 seek 2PL
'Whom seek ye?' [John 18:4, 18:7]

Conversely, *tyâqas* 'what', which ordinarily cooccurs with the Independent, sometimes appears with Conjunct verbs in intensional contexts:

(69) Teaguas **natinneahham-an?** [**Conjunct**]
what seek 2SG
'What seekest thou?' [John 4:27]

Ideally, we would probably want to relate these facts to the sensitivity of peripheral agreement to specificity. The account might go as follows: the default readings of *hawân* 'who' and *tyâqas* 'what' are as specific and non-specific NPs, respectively, but in intensional contexts, where the specific/non-specific distinction is more salient, non-default readings for the wh-phrases become possible. The de dicto/de re contrast can then be linked to the Independent/Conjunct contrast; specific wh-phrases, which have the de re reading, require the Conjunct, while non-specific, de dicto wh-phrases can appear with an Independent Absolute verb.

Though reasonably plausible a priori, this account is difficult to find support for. In particular, there is no obvious sense, given the contexts in which they appear, in which the questions in (67) and (69) are de re while the one in (68) is de dicto.

4 Conclusion

In this paper I have tried to show that the Wampanoag Conjunct Order is attested in syntactic contexts in which verbs are comparatively low in the structure in other languages. We saw in section 3.1 above that the Conjunct appears in several contexts involving operator movement in which I-to-C is blocked in languages like English and French, including relative clauses, embedded questions, and questions with *tahwuch* 'why'. In section 3.2 I argued that Wampanoag exhibits a correlate of the widespread phenomenon of anti-agreement; when a wh-phrase is in a position to agree with a verb, the verb is in the Conjunct. We have also seen that Wampanoag anti-agreement, like anti-agreement in other languages, is subject to being overridden by other morphological requirements on the verb. To the extent that the parallel with anti-agreement is compelling, the Wampanoag facts lead us to a particular understanding of the nature of anti-agreement; the relevant condition is not a requirement that verbs fail to bear morphology agreeing with wh-phrases, but rather that they fail to raise to heads that are responsible for agreement with wh-phrases. In many languages, this failure to raise results in a loss of the relevant morphology; in Wampanoag, it sometimes has this effect (for instance, with peripheral agreement), but sometimes does not (as with central agreement).

References

Brandi, L., and P. Cordin. 1989. Two Italian dialects and the null subject parameter. *The Null Subject Parameter*, edited by O. Jaeggli and K. Safir. 111-142. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
Brittain, J. 1997. The Conjunct verb in Sheshatshit Montagnais. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 42, 253-284.

Browne, W. 1970. Noun Phrase definiteness in relatives and questions: evidence from Macedonian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 267-270.

Bruening, B., and A. Rackowski. This volume. Configurationality and object shift in Algonquian. *Proceedings of WSCLA 5*.

Campana, M. 1996. The Conjunct Order in Algonquian. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 41, 201-234.

Clements, G.. 1984. Binding domains in Kikuyu. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 14, 37-56.

Craig, C. 1979. The antipassive and Jacaltec. *Papers in Mayan Linguistics*, edited by Laura Martin. 139-164.

Eliot, J. 1685. *Mamusse wunneetupanatamwe up-Biblum God naneeswe nukkone Testament kah wonk wusku Testament.* Cambridge, MA: Samuel Green.

Goddard, I. 1974. Remarks on the Algonquian Independent Indicative. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40, 317-327.

Goddard, I., and K. Bragdon. 1988. *Native writings in Massachusett*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Halle, M., and A. Marantz. 1994. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. Hale and S. Keyser, eds., *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hockett, C. 1966. What Algonquian is really like. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32, 59-73.

Laurent, J. 1884. *New familiar Abenakis and English dialogues*. Quebec: Leger Brousseau.

Mayhew, E. 1709. *Massachusee Psalter: asuh, Ukkuttoohomaongash David weche Wunnaunchemookaonk ne ansukhogup John.* Microfiche: *Early American Imprints* Series 1, no. 1380.

Ouhalla, J. 1993. Subject-extraction, negation and the anti-agreement effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11, 477-518.

Phillips, C. To appear. Disagreement between adults and children. A. Mendikoetxea and M. Uribe-Etxebarria, eds., *Theoretical Issues on the Morphology-Syntax Interface*. ASJU, San Sebastian.

Rackowski, A. 2000. Wampanoag applicatives. ms., MIT.

Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. MIT Press, Cambridge.