

On raising to object in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd
Indiana University

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, like many Algonquian languages, employs a construction in which a dependent of a complement clause appears to be raised to object position in the matrix. The Maliseet-Passamaquoddy construction is unusually free, however. Not only complement subjects, but objects, possessors, and even dependents of clauses embedded within the complement can be raised. I consider two accounts of this construction here. The first, due to Bruening (2001), takes the raised NP to be located in Spec of Comp within the complement. The raised NP is moved to this location from within the complement in some cases and directly generated there in others. The second analysis postulates direct generation of the raised NP in object position in the matrix. I argue that the latter analysis is superior, showing that predictions that follow from Bruening's proposal are not borne out.

1 Introduction

A syntactic construction in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, an Eastern Algonquian language of New Brunswick and Maine, appears to involve raising of a dependent of a complement clause to object position in the matrix, where it triggers agreement with the matrix verb.¹ Verbs occurring in this construction include 'know', 'remember', 'wonder about', and 'suspect'. An example from a Passamaquoddy text is given in (1).²

¹ Examples not attributed to other sources are taken from my field notes. I am grateful to Passamaquoddy speakers Estelle Neptune, Wayne Newell, and especially the late Anna Harnois for their assistance with the research on which this paper is based. Thanks are also due to Paul D. Kroeber and Rex A. Sprouse for comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

² Examples are given in a modified version of a widely used standard orthography: *o* represents /ə/; *u* is /o/; *c* is /č/; *q* is /k^w/. Phonemic /h/ before a consonant at the beginning of a word is written as an apostrophe. The acute accent indicates a distinctively high-pitched stressed vowel, the grave accent a distinctively low-pitched stressed vowel; phonologically "weak" vowels are marked with a breve. These are ignored in stress assignment, which yields an alternating pattern of nondistinctive stresses to the left of the distinctively accented syllable in a word.

The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; 3/2, etc., third-person subject with second-person object, etc.; AN animate; COMP complementizer; DIR direct; EMPH emphatic; exc. exclusive; II inanimate intransitive; IN inanimate; INV inverse; MPL multi-plural; NEG negative; OBJ object; OBV obviative; PL

- (1) Complement subject raised to object position in the matrix
'Kosicíy-a-l=yaq uhsimís-ol_i
 (3)-know-DIR-OBV.SG=REPORT (3)-younger.sibling-OBV.SG
 [*eli kéka e_i peciyá-li-t*].
 COMP almost arrive-OBV-3AN
 'She knew that her younger brother had almost arrived.'
 (Gabriel 1979:7, retranscribed, my translation; cited by
 Bruening (2001:255))

Here *uhsimísol* 'her younger brother' is understood as the subject of the subordinate verb *peciyálit* 'he arrived', but appears to occupy a position in the matrix clause, since it triggers object agreement on the matrix verb *'kosicíyal* 'she knew him', which is reflected by the suffix *-l*. This suffix indicates that the agreeing nominal is not only third-person and singular but also obviative, meaning that its referent has a status in discourse that is secondary to that of another third person.

The phrase structure position of the seemingly raised nominal in examples like (1) is a principal focus of this paper: is this NP actually an object of the matrix verb, or is it instead a constituent of the complement clause? I consider but reject an analysis of raising in Passamaquoddy proposed by Bruening (2001), one that postulates NP movement, but only to a peripheral position within the complement. I argue for the superiority of an analysis that takes the ostensibly raised NP to be directly generated as an object in the matrix clause.

Constructions analogous to the one discussed here have been reported for a number of other Algonquian languages, including Blackfoot (Frantz 1978), Cree (Dahlstrom 1991), Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 1996), and Innu-aimûn (Branigan and MacKenzie 2002), but raising in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is unusually unconstrained. A wide range of constituents may be raised, including not only complement subjects, but objects, possessors, and even dependents of clauses embedded within the complement. A few of the possibilities are illustrated in (2)–(4).³

plural; PRET preterite; PROX proximate; REPORT reportative; SG singular; TH thematic suffix (indicates inanimate object). Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape and for the third-person prefix (underlying /w-/) where this is realized as a surface *h* that is written as an apostrophe.

³ Not discussed here is a construction, clearly related to raising, that involves apparent long-distance agreement. Corresponding to (4), for example, there is also (i), where matrix 'know' agrees with *nikt ehpicik* 'those women', even though the latter is deeply embedded within the complement.

- (i) *N-kosicíy-a-k [eli Píyel litahási-t*
 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL COMP Peter think-3AN
 [*eli kis-ankum-i-hti-t*
 COMP past-sell-1OBJ-PROX.PL-3AN
nikt ehpic-ik posõnúti-yil].
 those.PROX woman-PROX.PL basket-IN.PL
 'I know that Peter thinks that those women sold me the baskets.'

- (2) Complement object raised
N-wewitahám-a-k *skinuhsís-ok_i* [*eli* *peciptúw-a-t*
 1-remember-DIR-PROX.PL boy-PROX.PL COMP bring-DIR-3AN
n-hésis *e_i akòm*].
 1-older.brother snowshoe-(OBV.PL)
 ‘I remember about the boys that my older brother brought
 snowshoes for them.’
- (3) Possessor of complement subject raised
Assélõma ‘*kocicý-a-l*’ *Piyél-ol_i* *tõké*
 Samuel (3)-know-DIR-OBV.SG Peter-OBV.SG now
 [*eli* *ksinuhká-li-t* [_{NP} *e_i hésis-ol*]
 COMP be.sick-OBV-3AN (3)-older.brother-OBV.SG
wolakù].
 yesterday
 ‘Samuel knows now that Peter’s older brother was sick yesterday.’
- (4) Raising from a deeply embedded position
N-kosicý-a-k *níkt* *ehpíc-ik_i*
 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL those.PROX woman-PROX.PL
 [*eli* *Piyel litahási-t*
 COMP Peter think-3AN
 [*eli* *kis-ankum-í-hti-t* *e_i posõnúť-yil*]].
 COMP past-sell-1OBJ-PROX.PL-3AN basket-IN.PL
 ‘I know about those women that Peter thinks that they sold me the
 baskets.’

In (2) the raised NP *skinuhsísok* ‘boys’ is interpreted as the primary object of the embedded verb *peciptúwat* ‘he brought them for them’. This NP is proximate (that is, not secondary in status) and triggers proximate plural marking on the matrix verb, reflected by the suffix *-k*. In (3), the raised NP *Piyélol* ‘Peter (obv.)’ is the possessor of the subject of the embedded clause. In (4), the NP that controls matrix object agreement, *níkt ehpicik* ‘those women (prox.)’, appears to have been raised from a position within a complement to the subordinate verb: it is interpreted as the subject of *kisankumíhtit* ‘they sold them to me’.

Raising can target an NP in a range of types of complement clauses. Of particular interest to us here is the fact that raising may take place from within an embedded question, as illustrated in (5). Note that the raised NP cooccurs with the *wh*-word *kèq* ‘what’.

- (5) Raising out of a *wh*-question
N-kosicý-a-k *nuhúw-ok* *muwinúw-ok_i*
 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL three-PROX.PL bear-PROX.PL
 [*kèq* *e_i kis-õt-om-úhti-t*].
 what past-eat-TH-PROX.PL-3AN
 ‘I know what the three bears ate.’ (after Bruening 2001:259)

It should also be noted that the verb of the clause from which raising appears to remove an NP is an inflected form in all of the examples given here. Thus raising takes place from a finite clause. In fact, there are no nonfinite verbs in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, as is typical for an Algonquian language.

A word is in order, too, about the translations of the examples. In its context, the sentence in (1) seems to be simply a statement that the matrix subject had knowledge of a proposition, namely, that the subject's younger brother had almost arrived. The sentence in (2), on the other hand, is reported to have a dual force. It is said to mean, at one and the same time, 'I remember the boys' and 'I remember that my older brother brought snowshoes for the boys'. Consultants typically reject translations like the one I have given, with 'I remember *about* the boys', although some construction of this type seems to be required if we are to render the sense of the sentence into grammatical English. Moreover, consultants maintain that sentences in which different NPs are raised from identical complement clauses are not equivalent: if 'snowshoes' is raised in (2) instead of 'boys', the effect is different. I will have more to say about these matters below.

2 A raising analysis

Bruening's analysis of raising in Passamaquoddy is formulated in the Minimalist framework, but adapts a Government-Binding approach to such phenomena that was developed by Massam (1985), who took apparent raising to reflect exceptional case marking. Under Bruening's proposal, raising sometimes involves extraction from the complement to a raising verb and sometimes does not. Whether extraction takes place depends on the inflection of the matrix verb. In particular it depends on whether the matrix verb form is direct (with suffix *-a*) or inverse (with suffix *-oku* and variants of this). The choice between these two types of forms depends upon the relative position of the subject and object of the verb on a hierarchy involving person, animacy, and obviation: if the subject outranks the object, the form is direct; if the object outranks the subject, the form is inverse. (I leave aside here the analysis of forms involving first or second persons as both subject and object, which are neither direct nor inverse.) For Bruening, the contrast between direct and inverse forms is a voice distinction, to be analyzed in terms of argument-movement or A-movement (of which passive is an example), as opposed to non-argument or A-bar movement (which includes movement into Spec of Comp). In the derivation of clauses with inverse forms, according to Bruening, the object moves to a functional head above the subject, a type of A-movement.

So according to Bruening's proposal, if the matrix verb in a raising construction is a direct form, extraction from the complement clause takes place. The extracted NP does not move to matrix object position, however, as in traditional movement accounts of raising, but moves instead to the position of a specifier of Comp (sometimes to a second such specifier position), remaining within the complement clause. This position is assumed to be close enough to the matrix verb to permit the establishment of an Agree relation with it, since it is at

the edge of a Phase (Chomsky 1998). Example (6) shows a more articulated structure for (5) along the lines specified by Bruening’s proposal.

- (6) Structure of (5) under Bruening’s analysis
- | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>N-kosicȳ-a-k</i> | [CP [SPEC2 | <i>nuhúw-ok</i> | <i>muwinúw-ok_i</i> |
| 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL | | three-PROX.PL | bear-PROX.PL |
| | [SPEC1 <i>kèq</i>] | [C Ø] <i>t_i</i> | <i>kis-õt-om-úhti-t</i>]. |
| | what | | past-eat-TH-PROX.PL-3AN |
- ‘I know what the three bears ate.’

We can see here why Bruening postulates a second Spec of Comp as the landing site for raising in such examples: the first Spec of Comp is occupied in this structure by the *wh*-word *kèq* ‘what’, so the raised NP goes into a second Spec position.

The examples we have looked at so far involve direct forms in the matrix. For such cases, as we have seen, Bruening postulates raising by movement of an NP to Spec of Comp, a position in which the raised NP controls matrix agreement and thus acts like the object of the matrix verb, even though it remains a constituent of the complement clause. Where the raising verb is an inverse form, however, a derivation involving extraction from within the complement clause is impossible, according to Bruening (2001:275). Raising to Spec of Comp is A-bar movement. Further moving the raised NP to form a matrix inverse structure would involve A-movement. Moving an NP first by A-bar movement and then by A-movement would constitute a case of so-called “improper movement.” As Chomsky (1973) and May (1979) have noted, such movement is ruled out.

But structures in which the raised NP is treated like the object of an inverse verb are indeed possible, as shown in (7). Here the subject of the matrix is obviative, but the raised NP is proximate. Obviatives rank below proximates on the hierarchy that governs the choice between direct and inverse forms, so the matrix verb is inverse.

- (7) Raised NP functioning as the object of an inverse verb
- | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Mihtáqs-ol</i> | <i>'kocicȳ-úku-l</i> | <i>skinúhsis_i</i> |
| (3)-father-OBV.SG | (3)-know-INV-OBV.SG | boy |
| | [<i>eli e_i pecipt-a-q</i> | <i>micŭwákon</i>]. |
| | COMP | bring-TH-3AN food |
- ‘His_i father (obv.) knows about the boy_i (prox.) that he_i brought food.’

Bruening (2001:284) proposes to solve the problem raised by examples with inverse forms in the matrix by directly generating the seemingly raised NP in Spec of Comp (or a comparable position) in just this class of cases. No extraction takes place. Instead, the NP in Spec of Comp is simply coindexed with a null pronominal within the complement clause. Since this NP has not reached its position by A-bar movement, it is free to undergo the A-movement process

involved in deriving the inverse, which moves it into the matrix clause.⁴ (The position of this NP is assumed to be accessible to inverse formation, just as Spec position is accessible to object agreement.)

3 Problems for the raising analysis

Bruening offers a number of arguments in favor of his analysis of raising. I cannot do justice in a short paper to the full range of matters that he considers, so I focus instead on two of his central claims. First, he maintains that a raised NP always occupies a position at the periphery of the matrix clause. Second, he asserts that raising respects island constraints in the class of cases where his analysis postulates raising by extraction. I argue that neither of these claims finds empirical support.

Consider first the assertion that a raised NP can only occupy a position at the periphery of the matrix clause (Bruening 2001:270–271). Bruening claims in particular that examples in which the raised NP comes between the matrix verb and other matrix material are ungrammatical. He notes that his analysis would account for this alleged fact: setting aside structures involving movement to sentence-initial position, the raised NP always occupies a Spec position in the complement, so it will necessarily follow all matrix material. However, my consultants find examples that violate this restriction, like (8) and (9), to be fully acceptable. Sentence (3) above is also an example of this type.

- (8) Raised NP comes between the matrix verb and its subject

'Kosiciy-a-l Piyél-ol_i Assélōma
 (3)-know-DIR-OBV.SG Peter-OBV.SG Samuel
 [*eli e_i kisi='pakōtúw-ih_t*].
 COMP past=lie.to-OBV/PROX
 'Samuel knows that Peter (obv.) lied to him.'

- (9) Raised NP precedes a matrix adverb

N-wewitahám-a-k ákōm-ok_i tōké
 1-remember-DIR-PROX.PL snowshoe-PROX.PL now
 [*eli Piyel kis-ōnuhmuwéw-a-t skinuhsis e_i*].
 COMP Peter past-buy.for-DIR-3AN boy-(OBV.PL)
 'I remember now that Peter bought snowshoes for the boys.'

In (8) the raised NP *Piyélol* 'Peter (obv.)' comes between the matrix verb and its subject, *Assélōma* 'Samuel'. In (9) the raised NP *ákōmok* 'snowshoes' precedes the matrix adverb *tōké* 'now'.

Both (8) and (9) are elicited examples, however; and one might question whether comparable sentences appear in actual discourse. In (10) I give a

⁴ Inverse formation, on Bruening's analysis, would place the object in (7) in a position to the left of the subject. To derive the surface order of words in this example, on such an account, one or more further movement operations must be postulated.

naturally occurring example in which a raised NP is comparably bracketed by main clause material.

(10) Raised NP bracketed by matrix material

Wèn=yaq *'t-iyalípt-u-n* *'kosinuhkewákon,*
 someone=REPORT (3)-carry.around-TH-IN (3)-sickness

naka [*má=te* *wèn* *kèq_i*]
 and not=EMPH someone something

'kociciht-ú-w-on [*tama e_i* *'ci=peciye-wì-w*].
 (3)-know-TH-NEG-IN where from=arrive-II-3

‘They say someone carried a sickness, and no one knows where it came from.’ (Francis and Leavitt 2008:220, accent marking supplied)

The raising verb in this case is the inanimate-object form *'kocicihtúwon* ‘he did not know it’, which is based on a different stem for ‘know’ from the animate-object forms we have seen in other examples, reflecting a general Algonquian pattern of stem specialization for the animacy of the absolutive argument of the verb. The raised NP is the indefinite pronoun *kèq* ‘something’ (identical with the question word ‘what’), which picks up the reference of the preceding nonspecific expression *'kosinuhkewákon* ‘sickness’ (literally ‘someone’s sickness’). The raised NP is located between ‘know’ and its subject (in this case both precede), but is interpreted as the subject of the embedded question ‘where (something) came from’. It seems clear, then, that the predictions of Bruening’s analysis of the structure of sentences with raising are not borne out.

Bruening (2001:265–267) also presents examples that suggest that raising respects island constraints in just the class of cases that he takes to involve extraction, namely, those involving direct forms in the matrix. He takes this situation to confirm his analysis of raising as A-bar movement. For my consultants, however, raising in the relevant class of cases is permitted to violate many of the usual islands, including complex NPs, *wh*-islands, and adjunct islands. There appears to be no difference in this regard between sentences with direct verbs in the matrix and corresponding sentences with inverse forms. Examples are given in (11)–(13).

(11) Raising out of a Complex NP

N-kosicý-a-k *nikihk-únnu-k_i*
 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL (1)-parent-1PL-PROX.PL
 [*eli Pýyel mèt álk-o-k* [_{NP} *utapákon*
 COMP Peter still drive.around-TH-3AN (3)-vehicle
 [_{CP} *e_i kis-õnuhmuwew-a-htí-t-pon*]].
 past-buy.for-DIR-PROX.PL-3AN-PRET

‘I know about our (exc.) parents that Peter is still driving the car that they bought for him.’

- (12) Raising out of a *wh*-question embedded within the complement
N-kosicý-a-k pilsqehsis-ok_i
 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL girl-PROX.PL
 [*eli Píyel kisi=yúh-usk*
 COMP Peter past=tell-3/2
 [_{CP} *kèq Máli koti=peciptúw-a-t e_i*]].
 what Mary future=bring.for-DIR-3AN
 ‘I know about the girls that Peter told you what Mary was going to
 bring for them.’
- (13) Raising out of an adjunct clause
N-ikūwoss ’kosicý-a-l n-itúpi-yil_i
 1-mother (3)-know-DIR-OBV.SG 1-friend-OBV.SG
 [*eli psi=te wèn kisi=macáha-t*
 COMP all=EMPH someone past=leave-3AN
 [_{CP} *mèsq (nékom_i) macéntu-hk*]].
 still.not he/she start.singing-3AN.NEG
 ‘My mother knows about my friend that everyone left before he
 started singing.’

Example (11) illustrates raising out of a complex NP. The raised NP *nikihkúnnuk* ‘our (exc.) parents’ is interpreted as the subject of a relative clause modifying *utapákon* ‘his car’. We noted in connection with (5) above that raising out of a *wh*-question is possible. Example (12) shows, however, that raising may target an NP within a further embedded question of this type, an environment which Bruening takes to form an island to extraction. Example (13) involves raising from an adjunct clause. Here the use of a pronoun at the putative raising site reportedly makes the sentence clearer, but is not required.⁵ In the end, there seems to be no convincing evidence that raising respects islands. Pragmatic factors can interfere with the acceptability of particular examples, however, which may account for the fact that Bruening has found some potential examples to be unacceptable.

I conclude that there are serious empirical problems for Bruening’s approach to raising in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. Moreover, all of the evidence we have seen is consistent with an analysis of the raised NP as a constituent of the matrix clause, namely the matrix object. Such an analysis immediately explains

⁵ Doubling the raised NP with a pronoun is not restricted to cases like (13) where raising takes place from within an island, but is in fact generally possible. In (i) below, for example, a pronoun may appear in the position of the embedded subject with which the raised NP in the matrix is construed.

(i) *N-kosicý-a Píyel_i [eli (nékom_i) koti=nat-húl-a-t Suséhp-ol_i]*
 1-know-DIR Peter COMP he/she future=go-ferry-DIR-3AN Joseph-OBV.SG
 ‘I know that Peter is going to pick up Joseph in a boat.’

Here again, the results I have obtained differ from what Bruening reports. He asserts that the use of a “resumptive” pronoun is impossible in raising sentences (Bruening 2001:270).

why the raised NP triggers object agreement, why it participates in the direct-inverse alternation, and why it can be permuted with matrix material.

4 A non-raising alternative

An alternative to Bruening’s account is to permit the direct generation of the seemingly raised NP as the matrix object, and then to postulate a semantic rule that freely establishes a connection between this object argument and a position within the complement. Davies (2005) argues convincingly for an analysis of this kind for the raising construction in the Austronesian language Madurese. Dahlstrom (1991) suggests a similar analysis for Cree.

Evidence that a semantic approach along these lines may be right for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy comes from examples like (14), from a Maliseet text, in which there is a “raised” NP, but only an implied complement.⁶

- (14) “Raised NP” with implied complement clause
- | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Ma=te</i> | <i>'kociciy-a-wi-wa-l</i> | <i>yúhtol</i> |
| not=EMPH | (3)-know-DIR-NEG-PROX.PL-OBV.SG | this.OBV |
| | <i>ali=kilūwah-á-c-ik.</i> | |
| | around=look.for-DIR-3AN-PROX.PL | |
- ‘The people who were searching for her didn’t know (where she was).’ (lit., ‘the ones looking around for her didn’t know her’) (LeSourd 2007:76)

The context for this example is one in which a group of people have gone back to look for a young woman they have inadvertently left behind on a cranberry-picking expedition. The object NP *yúhtol* ‘this one (obv.)’ refers to the missing young woman. The literal meaning of (14) is ‘the ones who were looking around for her didn’t know her’; but the intended reading is one in which the object of ‘know’ functions as the subject of an understood sentential complement, ‘where she was’, which is pragmatically determined. Here, then, we have a case of a raised NP with no syntactic source and an understood complement with a pragmatic source. Similar examples from Cree are discussed by Dahlstrom (1991:69–70). Such data pose a challenge to any account of raising as movement.

Consider, then, what information must be specified in the lexical entry of a raising verb like ‘know’ in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. On the syntactic side, we must allow not only for an NP object, but also for a complement clause, and the latter must be optional. Semantically, we must suppose that the lexical entry for

⁶ Paul Kroeber has pointed out a possible alternative parse of example (14) that would take *yúhtol* ‘this one (obv.)’ to be the object of the verb of the headless relative clause *ali=kilūwahácik* ‘the ones who are looking around for her’. This analysis is perhaps less likely than the one assumed in the text, since it would take the focused demonstrative *yúhtol* to be located in a syntactically subordinate position. In any case, even on the alternative analysis, the verb ‘know’ in (14) would take an object (now a null pronoun) that is understood as the subject of a pragmatically determined clausal complement. Thus the force of the example remains.

the verb determines that its object is to be coindexed with a freely chosen position in the complement clause, a position that is normally occupied by a null pronominal.⁷ The object of the matrix verb will then be interpreted as taking on the role of the item with which it coindexed. These features of the lexical entry of ‘know’ are shown schematically in (15).⁸

- (15) Lexical entry for the raising verb *kociciy-* ~ *kosiciy-* ‘know’
Subcategorization: $\overline{\text{NP}}$ ([CP ...])
Semantics: NP1’ KNOW NP2’_i [PROP/Q ... *pro*_i ...]
Associated rule of interpretation: interpret NP2’_i at the site of *pro*_i.

I further propose that the semantic complement of a raising verb is not optional. Thus even when such a verb is used without an overt CP complement, its interpretation will imply a complement proposition or question whose content must be determined from context. This provision will allow us to provide an account of examples like (14), with the young woman who had gone missing. Even though no complement to ‘know’ is syntactically present, the context permits the sense of an interrogative complement ‘where she was’ to be filled in by inference. Thus ‘know’ has an interpretation in such a sentence different from its meaning in a simple transitive clause like (16), where ‘know’ has the sense ‘be acquainted with’. The simple transitive use of ‘know’ presumably reflects a lexical entry distinct from that of the raising verb.

- (16) Simple transitive use of *kociciy-* ~ *kosiciy-* ‘know, be acquainted with’
N-kosiciy-a-k [NP *põmawsuwiniw-ok*
 1-know-DIR-PROX.PL person-PROX.PL
wik-uhiti-c-ik *nihtol* *wikũwám-ol*].
 dwell-MPL-3AN-PROX.PL those.IN house-IN.PL
 ‘I know the people who are living in those houses.’

Given a lexical representation for raising verbs such as ‘know’ and ‘remember’ like that in (15), we can also suggest an account of the fact that

⁷ Clearly a substantive formal problem remains to be solved here: how is a connection to be enforced between the object position in the matrix and a position arbitrarily far away within the complement? It should be noted, however, that Bruening’s account of raising faces a comparable problem in dealing with structures involving inverse forms in the matrix, since he assumes that the “raised” NP that he directly generates in Spec of Comp in such cases is somehow coindexed with a null pronominal in the complement. As he notes in this connection, “it is not clear what forces an argument position in the lower clause to be coindexed with the ‘raised’ NP” (Bruening 2001:283n).

⁸ It may be possible to accommodate the long-distance agreement variant of the raising construction (see note 3) by supposing that the object of the raising verb is syntactically optional, but consistently represented in the matrix in the semantics. When the matrix object is syntactically absent, a mention of the referent in question in the complement will be realized as a full NP, rather than a pronominal.

speakers have the intuition that sentences with such verbs mean both ‘know (or remember) the referent of the object’ and ‘know (or remember) a proposition’. The raised NP is in fact an argument of the raising verb, albeit one that is subject to a special process of interpretation. I propose that this status as a verbal argument carries an implicature—in the case in which the complement represents a proposition—that the referent of the object NP is a source of information that justifies the subject’s claim to know or remember this proposition. The force of this implicature would account for the fact that speakers report that sentences in which different NPs are raised from the same complement clause are not semantically equivalent.

If we return to example (1), however, repeated here as (17), we can see that only an implicature is involved, not an actual part of the meaning of the raising verb.

- (17) *'Kosicý-a-l=yaq* *uhsimís-ol_i*
 (3)-know-DIR-OBV.SG=REPORT (3)-younger.sibling-OBV.SG
eli [*kéka* *e_i* *peciyá-li-t*].
 COMP almost arrive-OBV-3AN
 ‘She knew that her younger brother had almost arrived.’ (Gabriel 1979:7)

From the textual context of this example, we learn that the subject of the sentence knows that her brother is about to arrive because she hears little bells coming toward her, presumably the bells of his sleigh. So ‘her younger brother’, the object of ‘know’, is not the source of her knowledge. The implicature concerning the subject’s source of knowledge is canceled, and the sentence has only the meaning that the subject knows a proposition.

I conclude that a non-movement analysis of raising in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy holds considerable promise. Such an analysis provides an explanation for the facts of agreement and NP distribution in the raising construction and provides a basis for at least a preliminary account of its semantics.

References

- Branigan, Phil, and Marguerite MacKenzie. 2002. Altruism, \bar{A} -movement, and object agreement in Innu-aimûn. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:385–407.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. *Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. A festschrift for Morris Halle, ed. by Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. *Minimalist inquiries: The framework*. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 15. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1991. Plains Cree morphosyntax. New York: Garland Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1996. Morphology and syntax of the Fox (Mesquakie) Language. MS, University of Chicago.
- Davies, William D. 2005. Madurese prolepsis and its implications for a typology of raising. *Language* 81:645–665.
- Francis, David A., and Robert M. Leavitt. 2008. *Peskotomuhkati Wolastoqewi latuwewakon / A Passamaquoddy-Maliseet dictionary*. Orono, ME: University of Maine Press.
- Frantz, Donald G. 1978. Copying from complements in Blackfoot. *Linguistic studies of native Canada*, ed. by Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye, 90–109. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Gabriel, Lorraine. 1979. *Ehpit naka 'puwin / The woman and the body*. Indian Township, ME: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 2007. *Tales from Maliseet country: The Maliseet texts of Karl V. Teeter*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Massam, Diane. 1985. *Case theory and the projection principle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- May, Robert. 1979. Must COMP-to-COMP movement be stipulated? *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:719–725.

Philip S. LeSourd
plesourd@indiana.edu