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Abstract

This thesis studies the verbal inflection in Cree called the relational form, with a focus on Western Cree dialects, primarily Swampy Cree as spoken in Kinosao Sipi (Norway House), Manitoba. I will overview previous literature on the topic, from early grammarians Horden (1881), Howse (1844) and Lacombe (1874) to more modern accounts from Ellis (1971, 2000, 2004), Junker (2003) and Wolfart (1973). As well, textual evidence will be discussed for the relational paradigm in Cree dialects from text collections and publications by Ahenakew (1987a), Bloomfield (1930, 1934), Ellis (1995), Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw (1998), Minde (1997) and Wolfart & Ahenakew (1992, 2000). Following a discussion of the textual evidence that exists on the relational construction, some of the outcomes of fieldwork research will be shared and uses of the relational form in the Cree community of Kinosao Sipi will be discussed. Furthermore, this thesis includes a typological survey of constructions which are related to the relational form, namely the ProtoAlgonquian /-em/ in Kickapoo, Cree and Ojibwa, and External Possessor Constructions (EPCs) in Romance languages such as French, Italian, Spanish and Rumanian (Lamiroy 2003), West Germanic languages of English, Dutch and German (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms), as well as Lillooet from the Salish language family (Van Eijk, 1997), and Mandarin Chinese from the Sino-Tibetan language family (Kusmer, 2010). I will demonstrate how these constructions are extremely similar in function to the relational form, as they may be conditioned by the level of affectedness of the possessor and the Speaker’s empathy towards him or her.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digit</th>
<th>Actor or Possessor</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>first person plural exclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>first person singular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>first and second person plural inclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>second person plural exclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>second person singular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>animate third person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>animate third person plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>animate third person singular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>animate third person obviative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3''</td>
<td>animate third person further obviative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>inanimate third person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0p</td>
<td>inanimate third person plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0s</td>
<td>inanimate third person singular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0'</td>
<td>inanimate third person obviative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>unspecified actor or possessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>direction of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abs</td>
<td>Absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An</td>
<td>Animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appl</td>
<td>Applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caus</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmpl</td>
<td>Complementizer/conjunct marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compl</td>
<td>Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>Conjunct Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>Definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del</td>
<td>Delayed (Imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>Direct (vs. inverse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disj</td>
<td>Disjoint referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dst</td>
<td>Distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excl</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Imperative Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incl</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Independent Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indf</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Indirect Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masc</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv</td>
<td>Obviative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox</td>
<td>Proximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pst</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refl</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (V)AI: Animate Intransitive verb
- (V)II: Inanimate Intransitive verb
- (V)TA: Transitive Animate verb
- (V)TI: Transitive Inanimate verb
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0. Introduction

The existence in the Cree language of what Bloomfield (1928:329) dubbed the relational form has been documented in the early grammars of Horden (1881:28-9; 175), Howse (1844:123-5; 265-9) and Lacombe (1874: 49-50), and in more recent accounts of the Cree verb from Ellis (1971:81; 90; 94, 2000 & 2004: 356; 499-500; 526), Junker (2003) and Wolfart (1973:60). The relational form has been attested in Eastern Cree dialects, such as Innu (Drapeau, 2013) and East Cree (Junker, 2003), as well as Moose Cree (Ellis, 1971; 1995), Plains Cree (Ahenakew, 1987a & Lacombe, 1874), Woods Cree (Howse, 1844), and in Eastern Swampy Cree (Ellis, 1995). This thesis aspires to encompass all previous research done on the relational construction, a survey of its occurrences in various text collections in many dialects of Cree as well as a study of the use of the relational form in a dialect of Western Swampy Cree, namely that of the community of Kinosao Sipi (Norway House), a research project approved by the Research Ethics Board (REB) on May 2nd, 2013 (File # 80S1213) (cf. Appendix 1). Furthermore, I will also discuss other constructions similar in function to the relational form, namely the morpheme /-im/ which exists in Cree and other Algonquian languages such as Kickapoo and Ojibwa, and External Possessor Constructions, which occur for instance in Romance and West Germanic languages. A study of these two forms will yield a greater understanding of the limitations as well as the functions of the relational form: I will show how the notions of affectedness and empathy relate to the use of the
relational form, and how both External Possessor and relational constructions are ‘intermediate’ and mark equal involvement of the possessor and its possessee.

1.1. **Introduction to the Cree language**

1.1.1. **Cree Dialect Continuum**

Cree is part of the Algonquian language family, often grouped with the Montagnais (Innu) and Naskapi languages in a Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi continuum. The Algonquian family also includes Ojibwa, Cheyenne, Blackfoot, Mi’kmaq, Abenaki, etc., which have evolved from Proto-Algonquian. For a complete survey of Algonquian languages, please see Campbell (2000: 152-5; 361). Cree is spoken across Canada, from Alberta to Québec. As it spreads across such a large territory, the language is fragmented into dialects which are classified in two broad categories: Western and Eastern Cree dialects. Eastern Cree dialects include Montagnais (Innu), Naskapi and East Cree. Western Cree includes Attikamek (R dialect), Moose Cree (L dialect), Eastern and Western Swampy Cree (N dialect), Woods Cree (TH dialect) and Northern and Southern Plains Cree (Y dialect). Table 1.1 illustrates western dialect distribution.

**Table 1.1: Dialectal map**

![Dialect Map](image)
These ‘letter’ distinctions are relevant, as they refer to the main feature used to distinguish between different dialects of Western Cree. Indeed, in certain words, there is an alternation between the sounds mentioned (R, L, N, Y and voiced /ð/), according to dialect. Thus, to say ‘I/me’, one would say:

**Table 1.2: Dialectal differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘I / me’</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nîna</td>
<td>Swampy Cree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyâ</td>
<td>Plains Cree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nîdâ</td>
<td>Woods Cree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nîla</td>
<td>Moose Cree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nîrâ</td>
<td>Attikamek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that only the second /n/ alternates between dialects, as this alternation does not happen for every /j/ and /n/ in the language, (which are sounds that exist across dialects; /l/, /r/ and /ð/ are dialect-specific). There are other distinctions, namely the merger of Cree vowel phonemes /e:/ and /i:/ in Woods Cree as only one sound, /i:/ A distinction can be made between Southern and Northern Plains Cree, as the Northern dialect, although it keeps the Y alternation, collapses /i:/ and /e:/ to one phoneme (/i:/) like in Woods Cree. Furthermore, Eastern Swampy Cree, compared to Western Swampy Cree, has one additional phoneme, distinguishing between /ʃ/ and /s/, as do Moose Cree and Attikamek.

### 1.1.2. Cree Phoneme Inventory

In Tables 1.3 and 1.4, I include consonant and vowel phoneme charts for all dialects given in Standard Roman Orthography (SRO) spelling. If the SRO spelling
differs from the IPA symbols, the latter are given in square brackets. Phonemes in parentheses are dialect specific. Length of vowels in Cree is distinctive.

Table 1.3: Cree consonant phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of articulation</th>
<th>Place of articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bilabial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td>c /ts/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>s (ʃ) /f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(th) /ð/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonorants</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhotics</td>
<td>(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4: Cree vowel phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>î /iː/</td>
<td></td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i /i/</td>
<td>o /o/</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>ê /eː/</td>
<td>ð /oː/</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a /ʌ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>â /aː/</td>
<td></td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3. Cree Nouns

Important features of Algonquian languages include an animate and inanimate gender distinction. In Cree, all nouns are classified for animacy: Wolfart (1973:22) outlines a few patterns, namely that all nouns referring to persons, animals, spirits or trees are animate. Some body parts are animate, as well as animal hides, certain plants and tobacco (and their derivatives or related objects). Finally, natural entities, certain household items and some articles of clothing are animate, especially those used for survival in winter. Animate and inanimate nouns are distinguished in the plural, -ak.
being the plural for animate nouns as in *napêw-ak* ‘men’, and -*a* for inanimate nouns, such as *cîmân-a* ‘boats’.

Nouns may be possessed in Algonquian languages. There are two broad types of noun stems in Cree, free and bound noun stems. Bound stems are obligatorily possessed and have to occur with possessive affixes. These obligatorily possessed noun stems encompass body parts and kinship terms and some articles of clothing, which correspond to semantic categories of inalienable possession. Thus, I will refer to Cree possession as alienable and inalienable possession. Both free and bound stems are generally marked by the same possessive affixes. The following table summarizes in general terms how possession is marked in Cree. The prefix *mi-* is used with some dependent stems such as body parts, when there is no specific possessor, such as *mi-cîhciy* ‘hand’ and *mi-stîkwàn* ‘head’. Kinship terms do not occur without possession marking. Animate inalienable 3 forms end in the obviative marker -*a*.

**Table 1.5: Possessive marking in Cree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Inalienable stem: <em>-stêš</em> ‘older brother’</th>
<th>Alienable stem: <em>cîmân</em> ‘boat’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nîstêš</td>
<td>ničîmân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kîstêš</td>
<td>kîčîmân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>-inân</td>
<td></td>
<td>nîstêšinân</td>
<td>ničîmâninân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(^1)</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>-inaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>kîstêšinaw</td>
<td>kîčîmâninaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>-iwâw</td>
<td></td>
<td>kîstêšiwâw</td>
<td>kîčîmâniwâw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oستêš</td>
<td>očîmân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>-iwâw</td>
<td></td>
<td>oстêšiwâw</td>
<td>očîmâniwâw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>-iyiw</td>
<td></td>
<td>oстêšiyîwa</td>
<td>očîmânîyîw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td><strong>mi-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Please see Abbreviations and subsection 1.1.4 for a discussion on these abbreviations for Algonquian.
Algonquian languages are polysynthetic, and thus the verb is of essential importance to the structure of the language. The Cree language is comprised primarily of verbs, nouns, pronouns, and various types of particles: a separate class of adjectives in the sense of Indo-European languages does not exist in Cree, as adjectival notions are generally coded as verbs.

1.1.4. Cree Verbs

The Cree verb can be classified into four categories based on animacy and transitivity: Inanimate Intransitive (VII) verbs, which are intransitive verbs with an inanimate actor (e.g. ăhkwakihtêw ‘it is expensive’), Animate Intransitive (VAI) verbs which are intransitive verbs with an animate actor (e.g. nipâw ‘s/he is sleeping’), Transitive Inanimate (VTI) verbs, with an animate actor and an inanimate patient (e.g. wâpahtam ‘s/he sees it’), and Transitive Animate (VTA) verbs, with both an animate actor and goal (e.g. wâpamêw ‘he/she sees him/her’).

The verb may be inflected for eight persons: first (1), second (2) and third (3) singular, first person plural exclusive (1p) and inclusive (21), second person plural (2p) as well as third person plural (3p) and third person obviative (3’). There are also a number of possible valency-changing operations, namely an inflection which backgrounds the actor, known as the indefinite or unspecified actor construction. A number of terms have been given to this type of construction, as Algonquianists have generally not wanted to call it a passive. Although the actor is sometimes definite, sometimes specific within the discourse, it cannot be referred to. Thus, in this

---

2 Obviation is discussed in section 2.0 in Chapter 2.
construction, the actor is obligatorily unspecified. Table 1.6 gives the unspecified actor (X) form with Animate Intransitive and Transitive Inanimate verbs in Plains Cree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>X Inflection</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>X Inflection</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAI nipâ- ‘sleep’</td>
<td>-niwiw</td>
<td>nipâniwiw</td>
<td>-hk</td>
<td>è-nipâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTI misk- ‘find’</td>
<td>-ikâtêw</td>
<td>miskikâtêw</td>
<td>-amihk</td>
<td>è-miskamihk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ahenakew, 1987b:137-8)

The verb is inflected in three orders: the Independent order, which appears in independent clauses, the Conjunct order, which appears primarily in dependent clauses, and the Imperative order, which is used for commands. It is important to note that the Cree Conjunct order does not only encompass contexts where the conjunct is syntactically licensed as an embedded clause, but also includes discourse situations where there is an established context to which the conjunct clause refers or relates. The term dependent or “anaphoric” (Cook, 2008:6) is used to define the Conjunct since it may not appear in out-of-the-blue contexts: it requires either a previously established context or a main clause to which it is subordinate. For an excellent discussion on the Conjunct order, please see Cook (2008). For the Independent order, there are two modes, which are the Indicative, used to make objective statements, and the Dubitative, used to express doubt or questioning. The Conjunct order has three modes, the Indicative and the Dubitative, as well as the Subjunctive, and two submodes, which encompass the Changed verb (a verb preceded by a process of initial change or vowel mutation) and the Unchanged verb. Furthermore, the Independent and the Conjunct share two tenses, the neutral and the preterit. The latter, which is falling out of use in the Western dialects,
generally signals a completed action. The Imperative order also has two tenses, the Immediate and the Delayed, the latter expressing a command to be obeyed later rather than immediately. As well as tense markers, the Cree verb can hold two inflections, the relational inflection and the basic nonrelational (see Appendix 2 for a summary of the paradigmatic forms).

1.2. Introduction to the Relational Inflection

Relatively little recent work has been done on the relational verb paradigms in Cree. Thus, it has been for the most part poorly understood and rarely if ever taught in Cree courses or discussed in teaching resources. And yet, it is an example of how important it is in Cree to “acknowledge the Other” (Junker, 2003:327). It is represented by the morpheme -w, which may be attached to Animate Intransitive and Transitive Inanimate verb stems and marks the presence of a third person participant which is neither the actor or goal of the action, more specifically:

“Relational verbs are one-goal verbs, resulting from inflectional morphology, where the person affected by the event is in the background. […] The relational construction does not increase the syntactic valency of verbs. Rather, it registers the presence, in the universe of discourse, of additional third person participants.” (Junker, 2003:319).

Many researchers have mentioned its existence in their works, including early missionaries and explorers such as Joseph Howse (1844:123-5; 265-9), Père Lacombe (1874: 49-50) and Reverend Horden (1881:28-9; 175). Bloomfield (1928:329) and Wolfart (1973:60) have also both briefly discussed the matter, and Ellis (1971:81; 90; 94, 2000: 358-9; 383; 485-9, 2004: 354; 499-500; 526) has provided a full paradigm for the form. Recently, Junker (2003) and Drapeau (2013) have done the most extensive
research on the characteristics of the form, on its meaning and on its contexts of appearance.

Bloomfield (1928:329) refers to the relational form as a peculiarity of the Cree language stating that it does not exist in this form in any other Algonquian language. Consequently, one may conclude it to be a Cree innovation. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the link which exists between the relational morpheme -\(w\) and the suffix -\(im\) (*-em in Proto-Algonquian) that has been previously suggested by Ellis (2004:499). Then, going beyond the Algonquian family, I will demonstrate how the relational inflection seems to function and have the same purpose as constructions known as External Possessor Constructions, which exist to various degrees in many languages of the world.

Junker (2003:323) mentions the existence of External Possession Constructions (EPCs) in other languages. These constructions, although similar to the relational form, differ from it on two crucial points. Firstly, the External Possessor not only refers to a third person, to which the relational form is restricted, but to all persons. Secondly, the relational form is not limited or restricted to contexts of possession as are EPCs.

Example (1) is a prototypical example of EPCs in Dutch:

(1) Zij rukte mi\(j\) een been af.
    she tore me a leg off.
    ‘She tore my leg off.’ (Van de Velde, 2013:160)

External Possessor Constructions are extensively discussed in External Possession edited by Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi (1999). They are defined as “constructions in which a semantic possessor-possessum relation is expressed by coding the possessor (PR) as a core grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent
separate from that which contains the possessum (PM)” (Payne & Barshi, 1999:3). What researchers have found intriguing about the possessor is that, although it is expressed as a direct and governed argument of either an intransitive, transitive or ditransitive verb, it “is not licensed by the argument frame of the verb root itself” (Payne & Barshi, 1999:3). More simply, Payne and Barshi suggest that the defining characteristic of External Possession Constructions is that they have “another participant; the possessor is treated as an additional argument of the clause” (Payne & Barshi, 1999:5). This characteristic is reminiscent of the relational form, which also accounts for an extra participant. It is important to note, however that the relational form can only apply to animate intransitive and transitive inanimate Cree verbs (Wolfart, 1973:60), contrary to the EPCs which can apply to intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verbs. In this aspect, the relational verb is also more restrictive than EPCs.

1.3. Organization of Thesis

This thesis is organized as follows: In Chapter 2, I will fully examine the meaning of the relational form through each researcher’s work and the definitions and classifications they offer for the form. I will also compare the relational inflection to the obviative form, another inflection with which it has been confused in early research. Furthermore, I will study the formal aspects of the relational paradigm for both the Animate Intransitive verb and the Transitive Inanimate verb. Finally, the study of the formal aspects of the relational paradigm raises the issue of transitivity. In fact, this construction seems to take into account an additional animate participant without
increasing syntactic valency. I will further discuss this question, as it is essential to a proper understanding of the inner workings of this form.


In Chapter 4, I will discuss fieldwork done in a Western Swampy Cree dialect, specifically that of the community of Norway House or Kinosao Sipi (SRO spelling: *kinosêw sîpiy*). The name Norway House has been given to the community to commemorate the eight Norwegian labourers who were hired by the Hudson’s Bay Company to clear land in the area, while the Cree name given to the place is Kinosao Sipi, or ‘fish river’. To honor the Cree identity of the community, I will refer to it by that
name. The different names are, however, a small indication that many peoples have passed through the community.

In Chapter 5, I will review the Algonquian -im and its relationship to the relational construction. In Chapter 6, I will discuss the External Possessor Construction as found in Romance and West Germanic languages, Lillooet and Mandarin and discuss pragmatic and semantic factors which motivate the use of EPCs, namely Possessor Affectedness, Empathy of Possessor and Topicality. These are extremely interesting in light of the study of the relational form, as these do also seem to be motivating factors for the use of this construction.

1.4. **Introduction to the community of Kinosao Sipi**

In order to set the context for research, I will conclude this chapter in section 1.3 by introducing the community of Kinosao Sipi and its rich history heavily inspired from Raymond Beaumont’s (1993) account of the community, with certain major points referenced by specific page numbers, published by the Frontier School Division.

1.4.1. **Kinosao Sipi before Treaty 5**

The foundation of the actual settlement of Kinosao Sipi is closely connected to the development of the nearby York Factory (Beaumont, 1993). Long before the settlement, the Cree, Dëne sųliné and Nakota lived and traveled through the area. They were hunters and fishermen, either travelling up north in the winter for caribou hunting, or down to the prairies in the spring and fall for buffalo hunts. The Cree travelled in this way, and traded with different groups, including for corn with the Mandan farming communities in Missouri. Although there unfortunately is not much information
available for the history of the community prior to the arrival of Europeans, the community, north of Lake Winnipeg and the Hayes River, before the beginnings of European trade, was a hub where many people met and joined.

The first European contact the First Nations communities living in the area had was with the North-West Company (NWC). The Cree first traded for French goods through Ojibwa middlemen, but quickly started, along with the Nakota, to trade directly with the French and eventually became middlemen themselves for the Blackfoot and the Tsuu T’ina. After trading furs at the trading post of York Factory, they would use the goods for several months before trading them again. To challenge the NWC, the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) established a series of posts, namely a house at Jack River in an area known to the Cree as kinosêw sîpiy, near the outlet of Lake Winnipeg and at the upper end of the Hayes River. This, as explained by Beaumont (1993), a member of the community, was the beginning of Kinosao Sipi’s written history.

James Sutherland was chief trader in Kinosao Sipi from 1814. If he did not deem Jack River a good trading post, namely because the beaver and muskrat were almost extinct in the area, he did think it an ideal transportation centre: three trips would be done to York Factory every summer, without any interference from the NWC. In 1816, in response to the intensified rivalry between the NWC, the Métis and the HBC, the HBC invested in bettering their transportation system, building five depots where portages were most difficult, including most crucially one at the Lake Winnipeg outlet (Beaumont, 1993:17).
Eight Norwegian labourers, reputed as very strong axemen, were contracted to clear approximately fifty acres of land at the first depot near the Lake Winnipeg outlet and plant potatoes, then move on to the second depot to clear land and plant rye, which came to about fifteen acres each, at which point the requirements of their three-year contracts would be met. They arrived on September 3rd 1814 at York Factory led by Swedish Naval officer Ennel Holte. Unfortunately, the process did not go the way the HBC had hoped. On July 15 1815, it was recorded that only one acre had been cleared and two small huts erected. Indeed, since their departure from York Factory, the Irishmen and Norwegians travelling to the depot had complained about the food. The Norwegians had also complained about the work conditions and provisions, even refusing to work (Beaumont, 1993:17-8).

When the NWC and the HBC merged in 1820, the HBC abandoned NWC’s Fort William on Lake Superior in favor of its interior routes. Thus, 1821 was a year of expansion for York Factory and consequently, Kinosao Sipi, at which was built a new canoe house and store. George Simpson, who arrived at York Factory in 1820, made Kinosao Sipi a depot for goods headed to New Caledonia and Mackenzie River. This was a great location for passing supplies and information to both ends of the country (Beaumont, 1993:23).

There were beginnings of plans to assimilate the First Nations people under Simpson. The idea was to bring the Natives to the European culture by ‘distracting’ them with the art of agriculture. Donald Ross, who was chief trader at Kinosao Sipi for twenty years, followed that train of thought and wanted to invest in the “moral and religious
instruction and education of the Indians and the people of the establishment” (Beaumont, 1993:32). Simpson wrote to the London Offices in 1840 to ask for a missionary in Kinosao Sipi, as company employees saw opportunities for their children elsewhere, namely in the Red River mission schools. He judged that the Native people were also ready for a change and open to the Christian religion, as they were unsettled, having suffered much from poverty, disease and starvation. When the first missionary, Robert Rundle, arrived in Kinosao Sipi, six chiefs from York Factory apparently came to inquire. Rundle also expanded the depot in the 1830s and 40s and built eight new boats, a new store, a powder magazine and a stable, the powder magazine being still up today. He was one of the three missionaries ordained in 1840 and placed under Methodist missionary James Evans’ leadership, who worked for years with the Ojibwa people and developed a written form of the language. Peter Jacobs and Henry Steinhauer were assistants chosen by Evans to help him establish a mission, Rossville, two miles from the fort. Within a month of his arrival, James Evans apparently developed the Cree syllabary which was quickly adopted from all around. “By the mid 1840s, syllabics were in common use as far away as York Factory where they appeared regularly in Church records from that date” (Beaumont, 1993:34). Their mission attracted many people to Kinosao Sipi, whose population increased substantially in the 1840s. Freight passing through the community increased (Beaumont, 1993:35).

Unfortunately, in the 1870s, HBC decided to send its supplies for the inland trade through Winnipeg instead of York Factory. This was a blow to the local economy, for Kinosao Sipi and surrounding communities. The loss of business triggered interest for
some in obtaining a treaty with the government, as resources were depleted and the land was not used for farming (Beaumont, 1993:40).

1.4.2. Treaty Five

In 1875, a treaty was signed with the government, and consequently, many people moved to Kinosao Sipi to receive some of that protection. In 1908, two hundred and seventy names were added to the treaty pay list. Treaty No. 5 was signed on September 20th 1875 at Beren’s River and on September 24th 1875 in Kinosao Sipi between the Queen (Dominion of Canada) and the Saulteaux and Swampy Cree. In the treaty, chiefs and councillors Nah-wee-kee-sick-quah-yash, Kah-nah-wah-kee-wee-win, Nah-kee-quan-nay-yash and Pee-wah-roo-wee-win of Beren’s River region, and chiefs and councillors David Rundle, Tapastatum (Donald William Sinclair Ross), James Cochrane, Harry Constatag, Charles Pisequinip, James Garrioch and Proud McKay of Kinosao Sipi signed on behalf of their bands ceding all rights title and privileges for Treaty 5 territory in exchange for various ‘privileges’ including farming land up to 160 acres per family of five, free navigation of all lakes, rivers and shores, hunting and fishing throughout the tract. Today the Treaty is still celebrated in the community during Treaty and York Boat Days.

1.4.3. Conclusion

Kinosao Sipi’s history is important, as it has affected the evolution of the language and the perception that the people of the community have on their dialect. The area of the Kinosao Sipi community has always been a meeting place of different peoples, first with the Cree, Nakota and Ojibwa, then of the French, English, Irish,
Scottish and Norwegians. It has been a trading hub, transportation centre and freighting depot. Many people lived and came through it. Thus, the constant interactions between the peoples have influenced the evolution of the languages, and the people of the community perceive their language as very different from the East and West because of the historical interactions between various peoples. In Chapter 4, I will thus discuss the use of the relational form in the community’s dialect. As I have mentioned in my Acknowledgements, for this part of my work I am heavily indebted to members of the Kinosao Sipi community. I hope that this work may be useful to them and their children.
Chapter 2: On Defining the Relational Form – Literature Review

2.0. Introduction

Early missionaries were the first to document the use of the relational construction, emphasizing its uniqueness and the fact that it is “very puzzling to beginners” (Horden, 1881:28), and “one of the leading difficulties in the Algonquian dialects, [which] therefore demands particular attention” (Howse, 1844:265). This ‘special’ paradigm is marked by the morpheme -w which is added to the stem, followed by the VTA theme sign and the VTI person marker in the Independent order, and, in the Conjunct, by the VTA verb inflection. The relational form is a way to acknowledge the participation, or at least the presence, of an additional third person which benefits or not from the action.

This ‘special’ paradigm proved difficult to define and missionaries documented it as a variation of the obviative form. The third person proximate versus obviative, as Wolfart notes (1973:17), is a distinction used in Cree and other Algonquian languages in cases where there are two or more third person (non-speech-act participant) referents. The obviative is a pragmatic marker of non-topic: in English, there is no grammatical marker that denotes to whom he refers in the following example:

(2) Fred saw his father. He cried.

Was it Fred or his father who cried? Or indeed, do Fred and ‘his’ have the same referent? Cree makes this distinction by opposing an unmarked third person, i.e. the proximate (3), and a marked third person, i.e. the obviative (3’). The third person which is highly topical (i.e. the possessor) will be unmarked or proximate, and the third person
the least topical (i.e. the possessee) will be marked as the obviative, as in *John o-tânis-*a

‘John’s$_{\text{prox}}$ daughter$_{\text{obv}}$’. In example (3b), for instance, the obviative suffix -*a* on the
animate noun *atimw-* ‘dog’ indicates that *atimwa* is less topical than *cân* ‘John’.

(3) Examples of obviation and the relational form (author’s examples$^3$):

(3a) Mary o- tânis -a 
    nipâ -ni -w -a.
    Mary 3.Poss- daughter -Obv.An sleep.AI -Obv -3 -Obv.An
    ‘Mary’s daughter sleeps’

(3b) cân wâpam-ê -w atimw -a.
    John see.TA-Dir -3>3 dog -Obv.An
    ‘John sees the dog’

(3c) cân wâpaht -am o- cîmân -ini -w$^5$.
    John see -TI 3.Poss- boat -Obv -3
    ‘John sees his boat’ (his own or someone else’s).

The relational form is not attested with an obviative subject. However, it is
attested as a possible alternative to (3c) only when the possessor and actor are *not* co-
referential, as in (3d):

(3d) John wâpaht -am -w -ê -w o- cîmân -ini -w.
    John saw -TI -REL -Dir -3 3.Poss- boat -Obv -3
    John saw (someone else’s) boat/ *John saw his own boat. (author’s example)

Thus, the obviative serves to differentiate between two third persons, with marking on
the lower-ranking, less topical or salient, third person.

Wolfart (1973:60) remarks that one factor that led early Cree grammarians to
confuse the relational and obviative forms is that the relational inflection frequently
occurs with possessed nouns, a context where the obviative also occurs. There are indeed

---

$^3$ Examples created by the author have been checked with a native speaker of Cree.
$^4$ Unless otherwise noted, examples given are in the Swampy Cree (‘N’) dialect.
$^5$ The first -i in -ini is epenthetic. In Plains Cree, -iyiw functions differently and marks disjoint reference.
many similarities between both forms. They both refer exclusively to “another” third
person which appears as an additional participant to the action. The obviative, as
illustrated by Mühlbauer (2008:179-80), will ‘force’ the existence of a proximate third
person, or a higher ranking third person. The relational inflection also always indicates
the presence of a higher ranking third person. Although the actor is always more topical
than the relational participant, in the case of VTI relationals, the relational participant is
always more salient or topical than the inanimate goal. In effect, both forms provide
proof for the lower end of the person hierarchy based on topicality in Cree: second
persons outrank first, which both outrank third persons proximate and obviative

However, there are also important differences. Most notably, the obviative
marking serves to signal a hierarchy when third persons are interacting: It distinguishes
between the proximate and the obviative third persons, while the relational form
accounts for the action of any person (first, second or third) in relation to a third person.
Also, as I have mentioned, the relational form marks a more topical third person: in
contexts of possession, for example, it marks the presence of the possessor, not the
possessee. In the case of the obviative, it is the less topical participant which is marked.

Furthermore, relational inflections can only apply to the Animate Intransitive and
Transitive Inanimate verbs. It marks the presence of a third person which is neither the
actor nor goal of the action, but an additional reference point.

Some of the important differences between the obviative and relational forms are
summarized in Table 2.1:
Table 2.1: Comparative table: The obviative and relational forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obviative</th>
<th>Relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marker of non-topic</td>
<td>Marker of a salient 3 person participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is used in contexts where two third persons interact:</td>
<td>It occurs when an animate third person is involved without being the actor or goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g. 3 actor and 3 goal</td>
<td>- e.g. disjoint 3 person possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g. 3 possessor and 3 possessee</td>
<td>- e.g. 3 actor in subordinate clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These two contexts of occurrence coincide at disjoint third person possession, when the actor and third person possessor (of the inanimate entity) are not coreferential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1. Definitions

To further define the relational form, I shall take into account previous research and definitions given of the relational form, in chronological order. I further discuss paradigms of the relational inflection in section 2.2.

2.1.1. Howse, 1844. *A Grammar of the Cree Language; with it is combined an analysis of the Chippeway dialect.*

Joseph Howse (1774-1852), was a fur-trader and explorer for the Hudson’s Bay Company. He wrote the first grammar of Cree, based on his knowledge of the Woods Cree (TH) dialect, which he compared to the Chippeway (Ojibwa - Anishinaabemowin) language. In Howse’s grammar, the relational form and the obviative, although two different forms, are both subsumed under the “Possessive or Accessory Case” or a relational form. The Possessive or Accessory Case, which Howse characterizes as an oblique case, applies to third persons which act as “end” or goal, or recipient (Howse, 1844:123). Howse further specifies that “thus limited in its application, it is nevertheless of very extensive use” (Howse, 1844:123).
The Accessory or Possessive case is defined as an expression of the relationship between subject [actor] and object [goal], by distinguishing between what we call today the proximate and the obviative. Thus, it serves to clarify “the ambiguity which would otherwise arise from the meeting of several third persons in the sentence” (Howse, 1844:125). Although they seemingly constitute a single category as suggested by the use of or rather than the connective and in the label of Possessor or Accessory Case, Howse does ultimately distinguish between the Possessive and Accessory cases. The Possessive Case is “always used when in connexion with a noun preceded by the Possessive Pronoun of the third person oo- or oot-” (Howse, 1844:265). The Accessory Case is meant for a more extensive use, implying ‘in relation to him’. Howse adds: “This additional oblique case refers exclusively to a third person as the ‘End’, and signifies or implies, generally, ‘his’ or ‘in relation to him, her or them’” (Howse, 1844:266). These two cases do illustrate the similarities between the contexts of occurrence for the relational and the obviative forms. They may both occur in contexts of third person possession and in other more general cases, as we will discuss in subsequent sections. If Howse (1844:123) gives -ethú [-ithiw]⁶, which is the obviative marking, as the simplest form for the Accessory Case, he also gives full paradigms of the relational form as examples of the Accessory, thus indicating that similarities between both inflections have led to confusing them as a single case.

Howse (1844:167) also offers a description of Relational Expressions and Terms, which, he explains, are similar to the so-called definitive and connectives of the English

---

⁶ Following older transcriptions, the Standard Roman Orthography equivalent is offered in square brackets.
language, which include definite articles, as well as relative, demonstrative and personal pronouns, etc. and are not to be confused with the relational form discussed above.

2.1.2. Lacombe, 1874. *Grammaire de la langue des Cris*.

Père Albert Lacombe (1827-1916) was an Oblate father and Roman Catholic priest who ministered to both Métis and First Nations peoples. He spent most of his life in the Red River colony, namely in Saint-Boniface under Monseigneur Taché. In his *Grammaire*, which focuses on Plains Cree, Lacombe first tackles the topic of what he calls the Relative in nouns, which essentially refers to obviated nouns with the ending -yiw in the singular and -yiwa in the plural (Lacombe, 1874:50). He then elaborates on the relative in adjectives and in verbs, of which he distinguishes three types: the direct relative, the indirect relative and the indefinite relative.

The “relative direct” [direct relative] encompasses both the obviative and the relational form. Lacombe notes that it appears in various contexts, with animate and inanimate adjectives, neutral verbs, indefinite animates and inanimates and indefinite passive forms. He further specifies that it appears in contexts where the subject is in relation with an expressed or implied third person, who acts like an indirect complement (or object), as such:

(4) \( \text{ki mítjuwán wikik.} \)
\( \text{[kimíticoswán wíkihk.]} \)
\( \text{ki- mítico -w -â -n} \quad \text{w- ík -ihk} \)
\( \text{2- eat.AI -REL -Dir -1/2s} \quad 3\text{-Poss- home -Loc} \)
\( \text{‘You eat at his place.’} \) (Lacombe, 1874: 49)

---

\(^7\) One has to note that Cree does not have adjectives in the Indo-European sense. Its adjectives are rather verbal constructions, which would justify why Lacombe associates both ‘adjectives’ and verbs in the same category.

\(^8\) This last refers to the unspecified actor inflection.
Example (5) is a fascinating example, since the relational form occurs with a transitive animate verb in the unspecified actor form. The first person is thus the goal of the action. The TA unspecified actor verb, marked by the morpheme -ikawi, has traditionally been classified as a form of VTA paradigms. Thus, this is a surprising occurrence of the relational form, since it is known to only apply to TI and AI verbs, and never to TA verbs. Therefore, this example seems to provide evidence that a TA unspecified actor verb actually detransitivizes the verb, and that, in these cases, the TA verb takes the form of an AI stem. The relational form occurs in (5) because it is a complex sentence made up of two clauses, the first containing the verb kitimâkêyim- ‘to pity someone’. The second ‘clause’ does not contain a verb, as it is co-referential to the main clause, as in They (unspecified) pity me, but not him [i.e. they do not pity him]. However, the third person wiya may condition the use of the relational inflection in the main clause.

Another condition for the direct relative given by Lacombe is that the subject should be in relation to two third persons, expressed or implied, in double object verbs with one object already being in a relative form. This refers to cases where the subject is in the first or second person, and the object is obviated, implying the existence of another third person, the proximate. Father Lacombe gives a few illustrations of this, including both obviative and relational examples:
(6) Obviative and Relational examples:

(6a) ni sâkihimâtâwâ okosissa, (Obviative)
[nsâkîhimâwâ okosissâ.]
ni- sâkih -im -â -w -a o- kosis -a
1- love.TA -Disj -Dir -3 -Obv 3.Poss- son -Obv.An
I love his son (Lacombe, 1874: 49)

(6b) n’tâbatjihikuwân otchkahigan. (Relational form)
[nitâpacihikowân ocîkahikan.]
nit- âpaciîh -iko -w -â -n o- cîkahikan
1- use.TA -In.Actor -REL -Dir -1/2s 3.Poss- axe.In
His axe is useful to me. (Lacombe, 1874: 49)

He further adds that relational forms also appear in what he considers passive verbs, which are now referred to as TA inanimate actor verbs as in (6b). In this case, the inanimate actor acts on a first person. In fact, there are also examples in more modern research (Drapeau, 2013) on Innu where the relational form may occur with a TA inanimate actor verb, such as in (7).

(7) ni- kâshtau -ku -u -ân u- utâpân
1- hit.TA -In.Actor -REL -1 3.Poss- car
‘His car hit me’ (Drapeau, 2013).

Thus, both VTA unspecified actor and VTA inanimate actor forms are quite interesting: they are not typical TA verbs, as they concern only one specified animate participant rather than two. These cases will be further discussed with data from Ellis (1971:94) and Junker (2003).

Lastly, Lacombe discusses the direct relative in transitive animate verbs in direct construction, which strictly concerns the obviative form.

Lacombe’s (1874: 50) second type, the “relatif indirect” [indirect relative], refers solely to the obviative form: it occurs when the verb shows agreement with a noun,
expressed or implied, already in a relative (i.e. obviative) form, or by a noun preceded by the possessive pronoun ‘his/her’ (or by a subject pronoun replacing such a noun). In this example, an obviative (3’) actor acts on another obviative, which is secondary and less topical (3’’):

(8)  **okosissa nipah**yiwa mustuswa.  
     [**okosissa nipah**yiwa mostoswa.]  
     o- kosis -a nipah -ê -yiwa mostosw -a  
     ‘His son (3’) kills<sub>Obv</sub> a cow/buffalo(3’’).’ (Lacombe, 1874: 50)

Finally, Lacombe elaborates on what he calls the “relatif indéfini” [indefinite relative] (Lacombe, 1874: 50), where the subject is undetermined or unspecified. This refers to what we know as the relational inflection in the unspecified actor form. It is interesting that Lacombe distinguishes this “relative” form as a separate one, since in his research and in other literature such as *Stories of the Sweet Grass Cree* (1930) and *Plains Cree Texts* (1934) edited by Bloomfield, there are a considerable number of examples of the relational form with an unspecified actor.

**2.1.3. Horden, 1881. A Grammar of the Cree Language.**

Reverend John Horden (1828-1893) worked in Moose Factory, studying Moose Cree (L dialect) and was an accomplished linguist: among other feats, he translated many religious writings in the Cree syllabary. His *Grammar of the Cree Language* also merges the relational form with the obviative, explaining that “verbs have two cases, the Relative and Possessive” (Horden, 1881:28). Even though Horden (1881:29) gives the obviative ending as the simplest form of the Relative Verbal Case (-lew [-liw] and -lik) as did Howse, his definition of the Relative Verbal Case applies to both the obviative and
the relational form: “Its meaning is, relative to him or them […]. There is no relative case in a sentence, unless there be in it a verb in the third person. The relative case is used where either of the persons, first, second, or third, performs an action relatively to another person” (Horden, 1881:29). We can divide this definition into three parts, one sentence per part: the first part encompasses both the obviative and relational, the second refers to the obviative, as it is restricted to third person interactions. The third describes the relational form, since it is defined as a subject acting in relation to an additional third person participant. The Relative Verbal Case is further divided into a subcategory of the Relative of the intransitive, referring to the relational form with Animat Intransitive Verbs, such as in “ni-nip-ow-an [ninipâwân], I sleep in relation to him” (Horden, 1881:175). The Possessive Case refers exclusively to the obviative form in contexts with obviated nouns and possessive verbs, and has a subcategory that Horden calls the Transitive Possessive, which refers to obviated Transitive Animate (TA) verbs. There is no specific mention, however, to the relational form in TI verbs.


Leonard Bloomfield did extensive work on Plains Cree (Y dialect) and was the first to officially introduce the term ‘relational’ to describe the form, namely at a conference held in Rome, where he states that “A peculiarity of the Cree verb is what we may call the relational form. It exists in intransitive verbs and in transitive verbs with an inanimate object; it relates the action to a third person” (Bloomfield, 1928: 429). This is a clear summary of what constitutes the relational form, which he further distinguishes from what he calls “secondary derivatives” such as the locative, causative and
applicative forms. Unfortunately, Bloomfield offered no further discussions in this short paper.


Mary Edwards also briefly speaks of the relational form, simply stating that both AI and TI verbs “have a set of forms which relate the action (without making it transitive) to a third person”, admitting that further research has to be conducted in order to fully understand the form (Edwards, 1954:59).


C. Douglas Ellis has worked extensively on Moose Cree or James Bay Cree (L dialect), as well as on Swampy Cree (N dialect). He defines the relational form in terms similar to those previously seen, explaining that AI and TI verbs, contrary to II and TA verbs, can be further distinguished between relational and nonrelational inflections. He states that the relational form signals “the involvement of a party other than actor or subject, who is beneficiary or recipient of the action, or is in some way interested in it, but give[s] no indication as to gender⁹, person or number” (Ellis, 1971:81). Indeed, it seems that, contrary to TA verb inflections, the relational inflection makes no distinction between third person singular or plural participants.

Ellis (1971:81) also states that the additional party can be explicitly referred to by a noun phrase. This is nuanced by Junker (2003:318), whose research in East Cree shows that an overt noun phrase can only be licensed by a relational form in possession contexts, illustrated in the examples in (9):

---

⁹ In this case, gender undoubtedly refers to biological gender rather than grammatical, since the individual must be animate.
Overt noun phrase licensing:

(9a) *Mary ni- wâpaht -am -w -â -n
Mary 1- see -TI -REL  -Dir -1/2s
I see it, in relation to Mary. (Junker, 2003:318)

(9b) ni- wâpaht -am -w -â -n Mary u- muhkumân
l- see -TI -REL  -Dir -1/2s Mary 3.Poss- knife
I see Mary’s knife. (Junker, 2003:318)

(9a) is ungrammatical, but (9b) is correct, as Mary is licensed by the third person pronominal prefix u-. Thus, the relational inflection alone cannot serve to licence a noun phrase such as ‘Mary’.

Ellis gives the most complete paradigm of the relational form, first in his earlier work Cree Verb Paradigms (1971), but also later in Spoken Cree, Levels I & II (2000, 2004). He also elaborates on less frequent tenses and moods of the relational verb such as the dubitative, the preterit and the delayed imperative paradigms.

Ellis (2004) notes that for the unspecified actor form to take on the relational suffix, the third person needs to appear as the subject of the main clause, as in:

(10) kî- ihtâ -w nâ ê- nîmi -w -iht?
Pst- be.present -3 Q Conj- dance.AI -REL -X
‘Was he present while they (unspecified) were dancing?’ (Ellis, 2004: 354)

Again, special notice of the relational inflection with the unspecified actor seems to be an indication of its particular frequency.


Hans Christoph Wolfart has done extensive work on Plains Cree and gives the relational form the following definition: “Relational forms indicate that the action relates to a person other than the actor in a way which is not specified; there is no concord, nor is the ‘related’ person specified by the verb form as to gender, person or number”
He also adds that the person does not necessarily benefit from the action and that the form may appear in complex phrases or without any adjuncts, the most frequent single relational form being the “indefinite actor [unspecified actor] form” (Wolfart, 1973: 60). This is a phenomenon which has also been observed in Lacombe’s research, as we may recall, as he places the relational unspecified actor in a separate category that he refers to as the indefinite relative. Wolfart also underlines the difference between the relational form and TA benefactive verbs in -amaw, the simplest criterion to distinguish them being that the latter may undergo further derivation, but not the former: the relational form thus closes the verb construction.


Junker’s research on East Cree dialects shines a great deal of light on the relational verb form, offering a detailed study of its traits and characteristics. She defines the relational form in the following terms (repeated from section 1.2):

“Relational verbs are one-goal verbs, resulting from inflectional morphology, where the person affected by the event is in the background. […] The relational construction does not increase the syntactic valency of verbs. Rather, it registers the presence, in the universe of discourse, of additional third person participants.” (Junker, 2003:319).

Junker (2003:312) also cites similar morphemes to the relational form in Cree, the causative form (-ih), and the applicative form (-âu [-âw]), meaning ‘doing something for someone’, both valency-increasing forms, as a base for defining the uses and applications specific to the relational form. A few important differences include that the applicative form results from derivational morphology, while the relational form results from inflectional morphology. Also, if both the causative and applicative exist in the
inverse form, the relational form does not at all. It only allows a direct construction. This can be nuanced by Ellis’ findings (cf. 2.1.6.), which bring to light TA inanimate actor verb constructions where an *inanimate* subject, and possessee of an additional animate third person, acts on a first person, namely in (11):

(11) ni- sâmiškâw -iko -w -ân o- skât.
1- touch.with.foot.TA-Inv -REL -1s 3.Poss- leg
‘his leg is touching me/ I am being touched by his leg’ (Ellis, 2004:526).

This is another example supporting the fact that the TA unspecified actor and inanimate actor verbs, normally analyzed as TA verb stems, are treated as AI verb stems, just like reflexives and reciprocals. In (11), *sâmiskaw*- is a TA verb stem, meaning to ‘touch someone with a foot’ and while the stem *sâmisk*- would be the TI verb stem, which means to ‘touch something with a foot’. Only the VTA stem can be marked by -iko- for inanimate actor. Thus, we could clarify Junker’s statement in that the relational form cannot appear in constructions involving two *specified* animate participants.

According to Junker’s research, the relational form has three main uses, namely: it appears in contexts of possession, of presentative interpretation, and it can also occur in complex sentences. Firstly, in the context of possession, as we have previously seen, the relational inflection does not license overt noun phrases. It is also obligatory in AI and TI verbs when there is disjoint reference between the subject and the possessor of the inanimate object and does not occur in cases of coreference, where the subject and the object’s possessor are the same. Thus, it is correct to use the relational form in (12) and (14) with disjoint reference, but the relational form is not allowed in (13) and (15a) with coreference:
The second use for the relational form is to increase the number of discourse participants in an action, as to “do it in the presence of someone else” (Junker, 2003:324). This occurs especially in negative clauses (i.e. ‘I see a stick but s/he does not’). It could also refer to the additional participant’s spatiality, as “I see a stick where he is standing” (Junker, 2003:325).

Lastly, Junker has recorded the relational verb appearing in complex sentences, such as when “the subject of an embedded verb triggers the appearance of the relational form on the main TI verb” (Junker, 2003:326), taking for example,
Thus, the child, subject of the second clause, becomes the *additional participant* to which the first action relates. Through Junker’s work, we gain insight into how the relational form functions and this leads to a better understanding of its uses and its limitations.

### 2.2. Paradigms

Ellis (1971) has observed the presence of the relational form in the Independent, Conjunct and Imperative orders for both Transitive Inanimate Verbs (VTI) and Animate Intransitive Verbs (VAI). The relational form is marked by the morpheme -*w*. Since the relational inflection is not found in other Algonquian languages, we can hypothesize that Cree has innovated the relational form within its own system: -*w* is a third person marker, as in *mîciso-w* (‘s/he eats’) or *wâpam-ê-w* (‘s/he sees him/her’). This will further be discussed in Chapter 5. The relational form is thus also marked by the morpheme -*w*, signalling the presence of *another* third person participant, which would give us forms such as *mîciso-w-ê-w* (‘s/he eats, in relation to him or her’), the first -*w* marking the relational participant and the final -*w*, the third person actor. However, the relational inflection is more complex than simply suffixing the morpheme -*w* to the verb stem (the -*ê* is a direct theme sign). In the following section, I will outline in detail the formal aspects of the relational inflection in all three orders of the Cree verb.
2.2.1. The Independent Order

2.2.1.1. The Relational TI verb in the Independent

In the case of TI class 1 verbs, the relational morpheme -\(w\) is attached to the VTI theme sign -\(am\) (usually only present in Independent order third person inflections) generalized throughout the entire paradigm. Wolfart (1973:60), also elaborating on the construction of the relational form, suggests that there could be two theme possibilities for the TI verb: we could talk of /am/ or /am\(w\)/. The latter, according to Wolfart (1973:60), is just as possible as the former since in the relational construction, a /\(w\)/ followed by another /\(w\)/ would simply become /\(w\)/.

Nevertheless, -\(am\)-\(w\) is then followed by what Junker qualifies as the VTA theme sign, which is an -\(\text{â}\) for the first and second persons and -\(\text{ê}\) for the third persons. Wolfart also links this theme vowel to the TA verb construction, suggesting that the Independent relational is modeled on the Transitive Animate paradigm. To this theme vowel is then attached the person inflection, such as -\(n\) for first and second person singular, -\(w\) for third person singular, -\(n\text{ân}\) for first person plural exclusive, -\((n\text{â})n\text{aw}\) for inclusive, -\(n\text{wâw}\) for second person plural, -\(wak\) for the third person plural. The relational form does not seem to appear with obviative form actors, except in Ellis (cf. 2.2.3). An example of a TI verb in the relational form follows, compared to its nonrelational independent form:

---

10 TI verbs Class 2 and 3 will not be discussed as they are formally equivalent to AI verb stems (cf. 2.2.1.2).
Table 2.2: Independent wâpaht- nonrelational and relational paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Actor)</th>
<th>Independent Neutral Nonrelational</th>
<th>wâpaht- (see it)</th>
<th>Independent Neutral Relational</th>
<th>wâpaht- (see it in relation to him)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>niwâpahtén ‘I see it’</td>
<td>niwâpahtamwân</td>
<td>‘I see it in relation to him/her/them’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>kiwâpahtén</td>
<td>kiwâpahtamwân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>niwâpahténân</td>
<td>kiwâpahtamwânân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>kiwâpahtén(nâ)aw</td>
<td>kiwâpahtamwâ(nâ)aw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>kiwâpahténâwâw</td>
<td>kiwâpahtamwânâwâw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>wâpahtam</td>
<td>wâpahtamwêw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>wâpahtamwak</td>
<td>wâpahtamwêwak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>wâpahtaminiwa</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>wâpahciwikâtêw</td>
<td>wâpahtamwân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1.2. The Relational AI verb in the Independent

As for the formation of the relational verb in the Independent Neutral AI verb\(^\text{11}\), the process is similar. The main difference is that, in this case, the -\(w\) is attached directly onto the stem (without the theme sign -\(am\) which is restricted to TI verbs), and then similarly followed by the VTA theme sign and person inflections. This can be illustrated with the verb nipâ (‘sleep’):

Table 2.3: Independent nipâ- nonrelational and relational paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Actor)</th>
<th>Independent Neutral Nonrelational</th>
<th>nipâ- (sleep)</th>
<th>Independent Neutral Relational</th>
<th>nipâ- (sleep in relation to him)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>ninipân ‘I sleep’</td>
<td>ninipâwân</td>
<td>‘I sleep in relation to him/her/them’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>kinipân</td>
<td>kinipâwân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ninipânân</td>
<td>ninipâwânân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>kinipânânwâw</td>
<td>kinipâwâ(nâ)aw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>kinipânâwâw</td>
<td>kinipâwânâwâw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>nipâw</td>
<td>nipâwêw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>nipâwak</td>
<td>nipâwêwak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>nipâniwa</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>nipâniwiw</td>
<td>nipâwân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) This also applies to TI class 2 and 3 verbs.
2.2.2. The Conjunct Order

As for the Conjunct order, Wolfart (1973) and Horden (1881) both arrive at similar conclusions: for both TI and AI verbs, the person inflections which follow the -w relational morpheme are identical to the inflections for Transitive Animate (TA) verbs. Horden explains: “This is perhaps the most perplexing verbal puzzle in the language – the relative case of an intransitive verb, when in the subjunctive [conjunct] mood, necessitating transitive terminations to be given to the first and second person, making the verb, in fact, a semi-transitive one” (Horden, 1881: 29-30). This is indeed a very intriguing phenomenon: while the Independent neutral relational simply takes on the VTA theme vowel, the Conjunct takes on the entire ending of a Transitive Animate verb.

Wolfart (1973:60) makes the same observations, that there is an obvious equivalence between the Conjunct relational forms and VTA endings and concludes that the former was modeled after the latter. This can clearly be demonstrated by an example. Tables 2.4 and 2.5 give both verbs nipâ- and wâpaht- respectively, this time comparing the Conjunct relational, nonrelational and a semantically equivalent TA verb, namely: nipêh- (‘make someone sleep’) and wâpam- (‘see him/her’).
Table 2.4: Conjunct nipâ- nonrelational, relational and TA equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Actor</th>
<th>nipâ- (VAI)</th>
<th>nipâ- (VAI rel.)</th>
<th>nipêh- (VTA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjugate Neutral Changed Nonrelational</td>
<td>Conjugate Neutral Changed Relational</td>
<td>Conjugate Neutral Changed Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>é-nipâyân ‘…I sleep’</td>
<td>é-nipâwâk ‘…I sleep in relation to him/her/ them’</td>
<td>é-nipêhak ‘I make him/her sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>é-nipâyan</td>
<td>é-nipâwat</td>
<td>é-nipêhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>é-nipâyâhk</td>
<td>é-nipâwâhk</td>
<td>é-nipêhâyâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>é-nipâyahk</td>
<td>é-nipâwahk</td>
<td>é-nipêhâyahk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>é-nipâyêk</td>
<td>é-nipâwêk</td>
<td>é-nipêhâyêk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>é-nipât</td>
<td>é-nipâwât</td>
<td>é-nipêhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>é-nipâcik</td>
<td>é-nipâwâcik</td>
<td>é-nipêhâcik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>é-nipânit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>é-nipêhânit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>é-nipâhk</td>
<td>é-nipâwiht</td>
<td>é-nipêhiht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Conjunct wâpaht- nonrelational, relational and TA equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>wâpaht- (VTI)</th>
<th>wâpaht- (VTI rel.)</th>
<th>wâpam- (VTA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjugate Neutral Changed Nonrelational</td>
<td>Conjugate Neutral Changed Relational</td>
<td>Conjugate Neutral Changed Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamân ‘…I see it’</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwâk ‘…I see it in relation to him’</td>
<td>é-wâpamâk ‘…I see him/her’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>é-wâpahtaman</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwat</td>
<td>é-wâpamat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamâhk</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwâhk</td>
<td>é-wâpamâyâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamahk</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwahk</td>
<td>é-wâpamâyahk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamêk</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwêk</td>
<td>é-wâpamâyêk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>é-wâpahtaĥk</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwât</td>
<td>é-wâpamât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>é-wâpahtahcik</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamwâcik</td>
<td>é-wâpamâcik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>é-wâpahtahnit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>é-wâpamânit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>é-wâpahtahihk</td>
<td>é-wâpahtamohî</td>
<td>é-wâpamâhiht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no mention of the relational form in the 3’ (obviative) person. Ellis does give -iliwa and -amiliwa as the Independent relational ending for AI and TI verbs respectively and -(i)lici and -amilici for the Conjunct relational form. However, it is hard to tell by the format whether it refers to the relational or to the nonrelational ending,

---

12 Underlying form : *é-wâpahtamwiht – the sequence ‘wi’ in Cree becomes ‘o’ after an ‘m’ or any consonant.
especially as it does not include the relational morpheme -w and that they are then identical to the nonrelational forms.

2.2.3. The Imperative Order

The only information available on the relational form in the imperative is the paradigm Ellis provides, first in “Cree Verb Paradigms” (1971), then in the series Spoken Cree Level I & II (2000; 2004). The two relational inflection paradigms actually differ. In Cree Verb Paradigms (1971), the immediate relational Imperative is given as:

Table 2.6: Ellis’ 1971 Imperative relational endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Relational Inflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-âtâ(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-âhk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of the relational morpheme -w is noteworthy in this paradigm. These are inflections meant to follow the relational morpheme -w. The -w is reintroduced in Ellis’ more recent work, Spoken Cree (2000). He also underlines the difference between the VTI and VAI inflections, as the VTI paradigm calls for the addition of -am-w to the root of the verb, as is the case for the Independent and Conjunct forms. In the following tables, Ellis’ more recent relational paradigms are compared to the nonrelational inflections for both AI and TI verbs.
Table 2.7: Ellis’ 2000 VAI Imperative relational endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>VAI Nonrelational</th>
<th>VAI Relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-tâ(k)/-tân</td>
<td>-wâtâ(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>-wâhk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8: Ellis’ 2000 VTI Imperative relational endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>VTI Nonrelational</th>
<th>VTI Relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-(ê)tâ(k)/-(ê)tân</td>
<td>-amwâtâ(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-mok</td>
<td>-amwâhk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Imperative relational form, although well documented by Ellis, is rather scarce in other research. Only Lacombe gives VTI and VAI Imperative relational paradigms, illustrating them with the verbs ‘kaskeyihttam’ [kaskêyihtam] ‘be bored’ and ‘abatjittâ’ [âpacihtâ] ‘use it’, which is a TI class 2 verb, whose stem inflects exactly like an AI verb stem. Notwithstanding the non-standardized spelling, Lacombe’s paradigms (Lacombe, 1874: 90-1) concur with Ellis’ preceding paradigms.

Table 2.9: Lacombe’s Imperative relational paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>‘Be bored of it’ (in relation to him)</th>
<th>‘Use’ (in relation to him)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>Kaskeyittam</td>
<td>Abatjittâwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kaskeyittamwâtâk or tân</td>
<td>Abatjittâwâtâk or tân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>Kaskêyittamwâk</td>
<td>Abatjittawâk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy that the relational form also appears in the subjunctive mode, the dubitative mode as well as the preterit aspect. For further information, Ellis (1971:94) gives the relational inflections for these other tenses and modes, as does Lacombe.
These additional modes will not be addressed further in this work, but please see Appendix 2 for a chart of paradigms to be explored.

2.2.4. Cree Phonological Changes

One Cree phonological change in particular is perhaps contributing to the suppression of the relational form, specifically in the 1, 21 (inclusive) and 2 persons plural: there is a tendency in some Cree speech communities to pronounce the initial /y/ of Conjunct endings as [w] when preceded by a back vowel (/o/ or /ô/), making the nonrelational and the relational inflection in this context completely indistinguishable.

There are examples of this in the text kôhkominawak otâcimowiniwâwa: *Our Grandmothers’ Lives as Told in their Own Words* (Ahenakew & Wolfart, 1992), where the editors have chosen to honour this pronunciation change:

(18) “êkwa mînâ mân ê-kiskisîyân, kâ-pê-ohpikihikiyâhk nîstanân ôma, tahtokîkisîpâyâw mpan ê-kî-ayamihâyâhk, tahtwâw ê-mwayê-kawisimowâhk ê-kî-ayamihâyâhk;”

“And I also remember, as we ourselves were being brought up, each morning we used to pray, and every night before we went to bed we used to pray;”

(Ahenakew & Wolfart, 1992: 94)

(18i) ê-mwayê-kawisimowâhk  
ê- mwayê- kawismo -yâhk  
Conj- before- go.to.bed.AI -1p

(18ii) ê-mwayê-kawisimowâhk  
ê- mwayê- kawismo -w -âhk  
Conj- before- go.to.bed.AI -REL -1>3

In example (18), once we are aware of the phonological change \( y > w \) following a back vowel (in these cases, \( o \)), it is impossible to tell whether the verb is relational (18ii) or nonrelational (18i). There is absolutely no reference to any animate third person, so ê-mwayê-kawisimowâhk is not relational, although it is formally identical to it. Notice
the other verbs in the sentence, all in [y] form, which are preceded by vowels other than /o/ or /ô/ (specifically i, â or i). The SRO spelling, which incorporates structural meanings as well as phonology, should demonstrate and maintain the difference in meaning between both relational and nonrelational endings, as it is designed as a teaching and reference tool for language learners and speakers alike.

2.3. The Question of Transitivity

As described earlier in 1.1.4, the Algonquian languages’ verbs can be separated into four classes, based on transitivity and animacy: the Inanimate Intransitive Verb (VII), with an inanimate actor and no goal; the Animate Intransitive Verb (VAI), with an animate actor and no goal; the Transitive Inanimate Verb (VTI), with an animate actor and an inanimate goal; and, finally, the Transitive Animate Verb (VTA), where two animate participants interact, one as actor and the other, as goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTOR</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INANIMATE</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMATE</td>
<td>VAI</td>
<td>VTI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relational form somewhat complicates matters. As Horden indicates, “the relative case of an intransitive verb, when in the subjunctive mood [conjunct order], necessitat[es] transitive terminations to be given to the first and second persons making the verb, in fact, a semi-transitive one” (Horden, 1881: 29-30) (cf. 2.2.2.). This ‘middle ground’ is also demonstrated in the relational independent form: it combines the VTA theme sign (â/ê) and the person marker for the Animate Intransitive and Transitive
Inanimate verbs, as such: *kinipân* (‘you sleep’) becomes *kinipâwân* (‘you sleep in relation to him’).

(19)  

\[ \text{ki- nipâ -w -â -n} \]  
\[ 2- \text{sleep.AI -REL -Dir(TA) -1/2s(TI/AI)} \]  

‘you sleep (in relation to him/her/them)’

Junker (2003:313-9) remarks, in a similar manner, that the VAI relational is not a real transitive verb and the VTI relational is not a real ditransitive verb, for the following reasons: the relational form results from inflectional morphology, not derivational, as is the case for the applicative verbs (to do something for someone), which are derivational and true double-goal verbs. This is not the view taken by all academics, and I will discuss Drapeau’s (2013) opposing view in section 6.2. Table 2.11 summarizes the cline of transitivity for which I argue:

**Table 2.11: Cline of transitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitivity</th>
<th>Transitivity</th>
<th>Ditransitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAI nonrelational</td>
<td>VAI relational</td>
<td>VTI nonrelational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We could thus consider a second classification, which takes into account the fact that the Cree language seems to privilege the presence of animate participants rather than inanimate ones’ and the verb’s transitivity features. Instead of the four category distinction of II, AI, TI and TA verbs, one could classify Cree verbs into the following Animacy-based Verbal Classification, as proposed by Wolvengrey (2011: 414-30 for full classification): on a first class, verbs with no animate participants (\(V_\varnothing\), i.e. Inanimate Intransitive verbs, VAI unspecified actor and VTI unspecified actor), in a second, verbs with only one animate participant (\(V_1\), i.e. Animate Intransitive verbs, Transitive...
Inanimate verbs, TA inanimate actor, TA unspecified actor) and, finally in a third, verbs with two or more animate participants (V₂, i.e. Transitive Animate verbs direct and inverse). The Animacy-based Verbal Classification can be diagrammed as follows, with the transitivity-based terminology retained only for exposition (Wolvengrey, 2011: 154):

**Table 2.12: Animacy-based verbal classification**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Animate Participant (VAI &amp; VTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Animate Participants (VTA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The animate category is generally recognized as the marked category in Cree, which leads us to think that what truly matters in Cree verbs is the number of animate participants involved, not whether it is transitive or not. Thus, it is possible to say that the relational form only applies to the second category, where there is only one animate participant. And, more interestingly, a classification based on animacy rather than transitivity would justify why the relational form takes on a special marking to specifically acknowledge the participation of a second animate being, however distant he or she may be. An intermediate category 2 verb (V₁) would then be transformed inflectionally, but not derivationally, as a type of category 3 verb (V₂). Perhaps, in such a framework, we could place the relational form and the transitive animate verb in the same category, one that involves two or more animate participants. However, they remain distinct from VTA applicatives.
The relational form has interesting effects on transitivity: by acknowledging a second *animate* participant in the discourse, the relational verb takes on some *transitive animate* (mono- or ditransitive) properties, without being fully transformed into one.

2.4. **Conclusion**

This has been an overview of the cumulative research on the relational form, a verbal inflection which contributes to the uniqueness, the complexity and the beauty of the Cree language. This ‘special’ paradigm is marked by the morpheme *-w* which is added to the stem, followed by the VTA theme sign and the VTI (V₁) person marker in the Independent order, and, in the Conjunct, by the VTA (V₂) verb inflection. The relational form does not allow coreference nor (generally) inverse constructions between two animate participants. It is obligatory in cases of disjoint reference and does not licence overt noun phrases as referents. It results from inflectional morphology, not derivational: as Junker (2003) has found, it increases discourse valency not syntactic valency. Thus, it does not change the transitivity of a verb: an intransitive verb stays so, just as a transitive inanimate verb does not become ditransitive. However, the resemblance between the relational and VTA paradigms is another argument in favor of an animacy-based verbal classification instead of the classic II, AI, TI and TA verb distinction. There are other questions which arise surrounding the relational form, such as: What may condition its use? What is the importance of context? How present or involved does the additional participant have to be in the discourse to warrant the use of the form? These questions will be explored in the next chapters.
Chapter 3: The Use of the Relational Form – Textual Evidence

3.0. Introduction

In Chapter 2, I presented some paradigms of the relational verb given by Ellis (1971:94, 2000:383). I also briefly discussed Junker’s (2003) article which outlines some of the contexts of use and limitations of the relational inflection in East Cree, namely that it occurs in contexts of possession, contexts of ‘presentative interpretation’ and in complex sentences or cross-clausal syntax. By cross-clausal syntax, I mean that not only may a third person actor in a subordinate clause prompt the relational form in the main clause (or vice versa), but this third person actor could also be introduced sentences away. However, if syntactic contexts for the occurrence of the relational form have already been explored in previous literature, possible semantic and pragmatic factors have not yet been explored.

First, I will discuss possession as a condition for the use of the relational inflection. Secondly, I will survey contexts of ‘presentative interpretation’ (cf. Junker, 2003) and complex sentences. Finally, I will overview examples of the relational construction in the unspecified actor inflection (also known in literature as the “indefinite actor” (Wolfart, 1973:60)), as Lacombe and Wolfart have both made special mention of the use of the relational form in this context.

Texts present real evidence for the use of the relational form, and a survey of relational form occurrences in Western Cree texts has never been done. Thus, this library research has proved to be a valuable insight on the function of the relational form and has confirmed the syntactic and discoursal contexts which may condition its use. The examples discussed in this chapter are quite lengthy in order to show when the third person participant is introduced in the discourse and to illustrate how it is an integral part of the narratives. In the following examples, the relational verb is bolded, and any mention of the third person prompting its use is underlined.

3.1. Possession

As Junker (2003:319-21) mentions, the relational inflection occurs where the goal of a TI verb is inanimate and possessed by an animate third person possessor. Thus, two conditions have to be filled in order for the possessor to condition the use of the relational construction; firstly, the possessor has to be in the third person (possessive prefix o-) and secondly, if both actor and possessor are in the third person, the relational
form may only occur in cases of *disjoint reference* (where the possessor and actor are not coreferential) (cf. 2.1.8, examples (12)-(15)). In the following subsections, I will discuss instances of the relational form conditioned by a third person possessor.

What seems to prevail in the examples found in texts is that the inanimate possessee must be very close, essential or linked to its possessor in an intimate way. In other words, if the possessee is the predicate’s goal, it would imply that the possessor is also especially affected by the action or involved in some way. In fact, most instances of the relational form found in texts occurring with possession refer to one of the possessor’s body parts, such as its head, feet, arms or face, as discussed in section 3.1.1. Sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 survey examples where the possessee is an article of clothing, or a story.

### 3.1.1. Body Parts

A human being and his or her body are one and the same living entity and consequently share a very close relationship. Thus, the importance of acknowledging the presence of the possessor with the use of the relational construction, even without it being a licensed argument of the verb, is justified. In fact, the relationship between a body part and its possessor is so intimate in Cree that it is grammatically marked: body parts are bound noun stems which may not occur independently without a possessive prefix.

Examples (20) and (21) are from the same story, where the verbs in the relational inflection are two TI verbs, namely *titipahpit*- ‘to bind it’ in (20) and *wəwəkahpit*- ‘wrap it’ in (21):
We had nothing to eat, and the first night we felt hungry, towards evening; as my sister wanted to drink, I dug a hole when we reached a muskeg until I found water, and then gave her water to drink with my cupped hands. And so we would travel on some more. Well, at last she simply wore out the rags on her feet, as I kept moving them around, the little slip with which I had bound her feet, she wore it out completely. (Ahenakew & Wolfart, 1992:128)

And now I used my brassiere (the cloth from my breasts, it was much like a bra), now I also used that to bandage her again, tearing it in half and wrapping it around her little feet, barely covering the tips. (Ahenakew & Wolfart, 1992:128)

In both examples, the goals of the TI verbs are the Speaker’s little sister’s feet ‘osita’ or diminutive ‘osicisa’. In (20), the possessor nisîmis ‘my younger sibling’, which conditions the use of the relational form, is introduced in the discourse as the actor of the AI verb ê-nôhtê-minihkwêt ‘she wanted to drink’, and subsequently referred to as an actor of verbs such as sikohtatâw ‘she wore it out’ in (20) and the goal of the TA verb titipahpit-‘to bandage her’ in (21).

Example (22) is also an instance of the relational form occurring with a TI verb, whose goal is the Speaker’s betrothed’s face, which she has never seen:

But it was difficult then, when my father asked me, ‘Are you going to marry this young man?’ was said to me; I did not speak for a long time, because I had not yet even seen his face, it was difficult for me to respond, to marry this Joe Minde as he was called. (Minde, 1997:58).

However, if the relational verbs in (20) and (21) are active, the relational verb in (22) is stative, wâpaht- ‘to see’, where the actor is an Experiencer rather than an Agent. It is the only textual example of the relational form occurring with a stative verb and a third person possessor, while examples (23)- (25) include active verbs:

(23) kwácistak manâ! mèkwac man’ ânt’ ē-nîpawit cahkâpêš, wêhci-nawatinamwât  
    manâ ospitônîniw ē-wîy-at’-otinân’ ci anih’ âmiskwa. nišocihc manâ ocipahtwâw  
    animêniw mispitônîniw, mistâpêwa ospitônîniw.

    Good gracious! While Chahkabesh stood there he suddenly seized the giant’s arm as he was going to reach for that beaver. With both hands he grabbed that arm, the giant’s arm. (Ellis, 1995:96)

(24) "a-h-a-h-a-h-a-h-a", manâ kâ-itwêhkâsot ana wîsakêc… ana maskwa. âşay manâ  
    mina nêtê kotakiya mistasiniya ocipahêw ana wîsakêcâhkh. "pasakwâpi,  
    pasakwâpi," manâ itwêw. "’kâwin’ ohci-tohkâpi."  
    âşay manâ pêcipahêw anihi asiniya. ‘kwani manâ ëši-napakicê-wêpahamwât  
    ostikwânîniw, anihi âsiniya ê-âpacihât.

    "I-y-i-y-i-y-i-y-i," cried Weesakech..., the bear. Then that fellow, Weesakechahk,  
    quickly grabbed other great stones and said [to the bear]: ‘Close your eyes, close your eyes! Don’t open them.’ Then he came running with those stones. Then he threw [them and] flattened out the bear’s head with the stones. (Ellis, 1995:132).

Examples (23) and (24), (from Eastern Swampy Cree), are not only active, but in fact even very forceful, namely nawatin- ‘to seize it’ and wêpah- ‘to flatten it’.

Example (25) is from Moose Cree, and is different from the other examples, as the possessee is a location rather than a theme, as marked by the locative -îhk suffixed to the possessed noun ostikwân ‘his head’:

\[13\] There is no grammatical distinction between active and stative verbs in Algonquian languages.
When Weesakechahk sat there, a single jack-pine grew on his head. But …, those two people went to see him, two people. ‘What do you wish?’ he said to the one person. ‘I just came to ask you that I may be of about average age when I die,’ said that person. So then with that he blew on his head. (Ellis, 1995:170).

In example (25), two third persons interact, and thus the possessor of the head could be ambiguous. However, the obviative marker -iliw on the possessee o-stikwân ‘his head’ marks the fact that Weesakechahk, the third person proximate actor, does not blow on his own head, but on the obviative person’s i.e. an’él’liw ‘that person’. Thus, this example illustrates disjoint reference, which is a requirement for the occurrence of the relational form.

Thus, these examples demonstrate that the relational form may occur with a third person possessor when the possessee is a body part which is the goal of a stative or active TI verb.

3.1.2. Clothing

Other possessees which occur with the relational form in texts are articles of clothing, viz. a dress in (26). Some articles of clothing are also obligatorily possessed, similar to body parts and kinship terms. In (26), the relational construction is prompted by the possessed bound noun stem ‘o-skatâkay’ ‘her dress’, thus showing that this is an item intimately possessed:
(26) wahwâ, piyïs âta wiya kà-tipiskâk, âh, kà-màcí-takwâwahitocik ôk ãyisîyinïwak, këtahtawê pëyak kà-nàkatâpamak aw ôskinîkiskwêw, wâcistakâc, iyikohk è-katawatëyimak, iyikohk è-takahkisîhóth! pâskac è-mihkwâyik ôma sënipânasâkay è-postiskahk, métôni è-ãh-ispâhkwanëyâyikî; wâh-wahwâ, nitakahkinawâw, wâcistakâc! […] èkosi, nitapin èkw ëkota, wahwâ, konit èkwa è-itohtëyân aw ôskinîkiskwêw, oskatâkay ôm è-nitawi-ãh-ãyinamwak; âh, wâcistakâc iyikohk è-katawatëyimak!

Oh my, finally it was night, oh, as groups of people began to arrive, suddenly I noticed one young woman, wow, I thought her so pretty, she was dressed so beautifully! She even wore a red satin dress, and she also had a hat on and she wore pumps with really high heels; oh my oh my, I really thought she looked beautiful, wow! […] So, I sat there, oh my, I just went over to this young woman and kept running my hand over her dress; oh, by gosh, I thought her so pretty! (Ahenakew & Wolfart, 1992:174).

In example (26), it is not a body part which is possessed, but a dress that a young woman ‘ôskinîkiskwêw’ is wearing. Thus, she is still strongly affected by the action of someone touching the dress she is wearing.

3.1.3. To Tell Someone’s Story

Similarly to (26), (27) is not an example of an inalienable possessee, but like the dress in example (26), Piyêsîs’ story is something very personal and intimate to him that the Speaker is sharing on his behalf.

(27) ëwako awa ‘pivësis’ kî-isiyîhkfásow awa kà-wí-âcimak; wiya è-kî-âcîmisot, ôma kà-wí-âtotamwak.

His name was Pivyësîs, the one of whom I will tell; he told it about himself, this story of his which I am going to tell. (Ahenakew, 1987a:78)

Thus, these examples show that the relational inflection is not restricted to cases of inanimate inalienable or obligatory possession, viz. body parts, but to items which are very intimate to the possessor. Consequently, the Speaker judges that it is important to acknowledge the presence of the owner of the story.
3.2. “Presentative Interpretation” (Junker 2003)

Junker (2003) introduces another possible condition for the occurrence of the relational form, namely to acknowledge the physical or spiritual presence of an additional third person present in the discourse. Examples of such interpretations include negative clauses, such as ‘I see (something) but he does not’. This interpretation may also be appropriate for cases which mark the additional participant’s spatial position as a point of reference such as ‘I see (something) where he is sitting’, etc. with the relational inflection again on the verb ‘to see’ (Junker, 2003:324-5). In the text collections surveyed for this study, no equivalent of these examples has been found. There is, however, a very interesting example from Jim Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw’s counselling speeches which does not involve possession nor is part of a complex sentence, but still refers to the presence of a spiritual being.


[...]
êkwa êwak ôma, k-âpihkâtaman ôma, ká-nistwapihkâtaman wihkaskwa, êwakw ânima okisêwâtisiwin k-âpihkâtamwat awa, êwak ôhci, k-ôh-kí-mîyiht ayisiyiniw, kiwâpamâw iskwêw ê-sêkipawtâw, ê-nistwapihkâtaheh ôhî.
Indeed, it is then that the old people, those sitting over there, used to receive the blessing, they used to receive the blessing, well, and then there she is, never to be overlooked, the Old Woman as she is called, that Old Woman dream-spirit. The sun-dance is powerful, for you to watch these women standing crowded over there [on their side of the lodge] as you look over here where the men are few and far between; behold, the women’s chanting is strong, therefore never overlook them, you should always give them something! With that you will make the Old-Woman-Spirit grateful so that she will answer your prayers with something; this is what the old people used to say.

Now when you braid this, when you braid sweetgrass in three strands, you are 

\textbf{braiding that grace of the Sweetgrass-Spirit with respect to her [the Old-Woman-Spirit]}, that is why people used to have it given to them, you see a woman with braids, she braids them in three strands. (Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw, 1998:128)

In example (28), the relational form refers to the Old Woman dream-spirit, and to her 

\textit{spiritual} presence as the hair of a woman is braided in three strands. This is an example where the Old Woman dream-spirit is introduced sentences away from the relational verb. In the English translation, the editors clarify the identity of the referent in square brackets. However, such a clarification is not necessary in the Cree speech, since the Old Woman dream-spirit has such an important presence in the discourse and in the story.

3.3. Complex sentences

As both Wolfart (1973) and Junker (2003) mention, the relational inflection may occur when there are no instances of third person possession. It may occur in complex sentences either in the main or subordinate clause. The relational form may be conditioned in the matrix clause when the actor of the subordinate verb is a third person, and in the subordinate clause when the actor of the main clause is a third person. In section 3.3.1, I give examples where the third person participant which conditions the use of the relational form is the actor of a clause subordinate to the relational verb. In
turn, section 3.3.2 then explores examples of the relational form in a subordinate clause, prompted by the presence of a third person actor in the main clause.

### 3.3.1. Relational Form in the Matrix

Example (29) is an example of a case where the subordinate clause is in fact the object of or complement to the main clause:

(29) êkosi mistahi ninahêyihtên, ê-nitohthawicik, êwak ôma ê-nânskotamwak tânisi wiyawâw ê-isi-nisitohtahkik, mâka miton êkos ê-isi-nisitohtâkocik otôsk-âyimiwâwa.

*Thus I am greatly content that they have listened to me, and I give thanks for it that they, too, understand this, but especially that their young people will understand them* (Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw, 1998:48).

In fact, the verb ê-nânskotamwak ‘to be grateful for it’ is in the relational inflection, to emphasize that the Speaker is grateful for the fact that they understand. Thus, the reason or the cause for the Speaker’s gratefulness is a third person participant’s action or, in this case, state of mind.

### 3.3.2. Relational form in the subordinate clause

The examples in this section show a slightly different pattern, where the relational form does not occur in the matrix, but rather in the subordinate clause.

Example (30) is an instance of a subordinate clause, though not a complement clause (as a purpose clause is not an argument of the main verb):

(30) W1: tântê mâka mâna kê-itwêyahk?
W1: ayami…
GK: ayami ôta ‘ci-nohtâkosiwat ana kâ-a…
W1: n’kî-pêhtâk. Tânî kê-itwêyân?
GK: … kâ-otayânić.
W1: What are you going to do next?
W1: Talk...
GK: Speak here so you can be heard by that, the one who...
W1: He can hear me. What shall I say?
GK: ... who owns it. (Ellis, 1995:270).

This example is slightly awkward, as it is a dialogue, and there is an interruption right in
the middle of the subordinate clause. However, it is a very important example: because
of its dialogal nature, it is one of the few textual examples in text surveyed of the
relational form in the second person singular.

In example (31), there are two occurrences of the relational form, both in the
Conjunct order, with the verb *pimiwatê* ‘to carry’:

(31) âšay manâ kiskisopaniw kê-tôtahk. kospipahaṭaw manâ mistikohk. ‘n’ka-
na’tawâpaṭen askiy,’ manâ itên’tam, ‘ëko mäka n’ka-pimiwatân. wâpamitwaâwê
mâk’ ê-pimiwaték, n’ka-pëci-tëpâwâtkwak,’ itên’tam. ‘ta-wî-kiskên’tamwak
kêkwâniw kâ-pimiwaték, ’ manâ itên’tam.

Now, then, it occurred to him what he would do. He made his way up the bank to
the trees. ‘I’ll go fetch some moss,’ he thought, ‘and then I’ll carry it along. But
when the birds see me carrying it,’ he thought, ‘they’ll come and call out to me.
They’ll want to know what I’m carrying on my back’, he thought. (Ellis,
1995:120).

In both occurrences, the relational verb is the predicate for object or complement clauses
(i.e. the birds see [me carrying it], they’ll want to know [what I’m carrying]). By the
context, it seems that what the Speaker is carrying will have an effect on the birds, at the
very least triggering their curiosity.

Example (32) is an example of the relational verb occurring in an adverbial
clause (i.e. introduced by the particle *mëkwâc* ‘while’).
(32) māka ninanâskomâw; mëkwâc ôta è-ayâwak, ka-kî-wîcôhkamâwâkiw, êkos îs ôma.

But I give thanks to him; so that I might be able to help them while I am still here with him, that is how it will be. (Ahenakew, 1987a:84)

In this case, the relational form seems to occur because the Speaker is able to stay with him (relational third person participant) so that he is able to help others, and for this event he is grateful.

Example (33) includes three occurrences of the relational inflection:


Even though they aren’t giving me rations, just because I don’t sit in a blind as far as they’re concerned, - that’s why they don’t want to give it to me. Sometimes I do go hunting. I wonder what they must think of me that they don’t want to come with me. They keep bothering me, though, mind you, whenever they know that I’m bringing in food. That’s that, my brother. Now my letter is going to…, going, is going to begin… is going to begin to sound snippy. (Ellis, 1995: 268)

The translation for the first occurrence of the relational form in (33) given by the editors of the text is very interesting. They have added the phrase ‘as far as they’re concerned’ to emphasize the fact that the perception of third person they about the Speaker’s activities is their reason for not giving any rations away. The second occurrence, with the AI verb n’taminâh- ‘go on a hunt’ is another example of an adverbial clause, and the third, with the TI Class 2 verb pêtâ- ‘to bring it’, of a complement clause.

These examples show how the relational form extends beyond possession: complex sentences with at least one third person actor may condition the use of the
relational form, especially when there is a reactional or causative effect, i.e. a third person’s actions have caused the Speaker or another to be grateful, or to act in a certain way.

3.4. **Unspecified Actor Form**

As discussed in section 2.1.2, Lacombe (1874: 50) distinguishes between three categories of the ‘relative’, or relational: the direct relative, the indirect relative and the indefinite relative. He recognizes that the relational inflection in the unspecified actor form is fairly common in comparison to other persons, enough for it to be classified as a separate category, namely the indefinite relative. Wolfart also makes special mention of the relational form in the unspecified actor form, stating that “many instances of the relational forms occur without any adjuncts; this is particularly so with a form which seems to be the most frequent single relational form, namely the indefinite [unspecified] actor form” (Wolfart, 1973:60). Wolfart refers to the fact that most relational inflections appear in complex sentences (i.e. contexts with more than one clause in general, whether it be contexts of possession or non possession), but that it is possible in simple clauses, especially in the unspecified actor form. Ellis also mentions the unspecified actor form: according to his research, it may only appear in the relational form when there is a third person goal and, to appear in the conjunct, the “third person must appear as subject of the main clause” (Ellis, 2004:354) (cf. 3.3).

As discussed in section 1.1.4, the unspecified actor inflection is a valency reducing operation, requiring an obligatorily unspecified actor. The unspecified actor
relational inflection in the Conjunct order is -wiht for AI verbs and -amoht\(^{14}\) for TI verbs.

With these points in mind, let us examine the following instances of relational forms in the unspecified actor form, found in Cree texts and testimonies.

Examples (34) and (35) provide further indication that the relational form does not take into account biological gender of participants: it can refer to one animate third person, male or female:

\[\text{(34)}\]
\[\text{êkos êkwa nitaw-âyamihâw, ëkw êtikw ê-mêkwâ-âyamihâwhti, kitahtawê aw âyamihêwiyiminw kà-pasot kikway mmhi, kikway ôma kà-w~ kà-t~ kà-wičêkahk? itwêw. nipihem ana, k-ëtwêt ês âna nôcikwêsiv. êkosi, êkos êsa miton âhkam-âyamihâw awa, ëkw ës êkwa ê-pôn-ât-âyamihâwhti ësa, ôma kiyawâw kà-iskwêwiyêk. mìyâkwâm êkwa kisipêkinihkok kipihêmiwâwak, pâmwayês pê-nitaw-âyamihâyêk!}’ ê-tât.\]

And so she went to church, and it must have been in the midst of the service when suddenly the minister could smell something, ‘Hm, what is that stink?’ he said. ‘That is my prairie-chicken,’ said that old woman. And so he continued to pray, and then, when the prayers had been finished, he said to them, ‘Now those of you who are women, take care in future to wash your prairie-chickens before you come here to church!’ (Wolfart & Ahenakew, 2000:94).

In this example, the third person antecedent triggering the use of the relational form in both instances is ambiguous: there are in fact three animate participants in the discourse: the old woman entering the church, her prairie chicken, and the minister leading the service. Thus, the first occurrence of the relational construction in (34) ê-mêkwâ-âyamihâwht, could refer to the woman interrupting the prayers or the minister praying.

In the second occurrence, however, it is clearer that the relational construction ê-pôn-âyamihâwht to the ‘service’ is triggered by the antecedent minister, who is doing the

\(^{14}\)This is a typical Cree morphophonemic change: the string of wi- following an m or any consonant becomes o. Thus, -am-w-ihr becomes -amoht.
prayers. Consequently, this ambiguity is an indication that the additional third person participant conditioning the relational form could either be a male or female.

Example (35) demonstrates that the additional third person participant which may condition the relational inflection may be a singular or plural referent.


‘At that time, when they gathered here at nipiy kâ-pitihkwêk, where they were going to sell the land, at that time it was used,’ my late father used to say. ‘Well, the situation had everyone speaking with great concern. The old men spoke about this with great concern; they were full of regret that where Our Father had put us down on this earth that we should populate it, that this was going to be sold in their name, that was what they spoke about with great concern.’ That he used to say at that time. (Kâ-Nîpitêh Îtwêw, 1998:106).

In (35), è-wî-atâwâkêwyiht is translated as ‘that this was going to be sold in their name’.

Thus, the third person participant is the plural referent ‘everyone/the old men’, the people in whose name the land would be sold.

In example (36), the relational phrases are translated as ‘how one should live’, ‘when to move camp’, ‘where people live’ etc. They are also examples of complex sentences, where the actor of the main clause kâ-nâpêhkâsocîk aniki ‘those braves’ triggers the use of the relational form in the complement clauses:

There were, of course, people who were responsible for this, just like police when they say something today, and our elders long ago called it a ‘Dance Lodge’ – where the circle of poles stood, the braves decided how one should travel and how one should live, even when to move camp, they made the decisions – and now, the elders, once the decisions had been made, there were men who went around and announced them to all the people. (Ahenakew, 1987a:46-8)

Finally, the relational form occurs in example (37) in a relative clause, i.e. êsa kâ-wâpahtamoht ‘…that was visible’:

(37) ahpô êtokwê ka-kî-âtotamân, pêyak kîkway ayisiyiniwak ê-kî-pâhpicihêk aya. mîy êtokwê nânitaw k-âtotamân pêyak ê-kî-pâhpichiht aya, oskînîkiskwêw ês yà, ê-kî-kihtîmîyihâhêk nânitaw k-âtotamanh anima kâ-~ kâ-sînasîhikâtêyik, sôskwàc ês ôsî kî-ôsîhishêk aya, pîhtawêsâkân aya, maskîmôtêkîn ê-âpachihêt, màk êtokwê mitonî kî-pahpawiwêpinâm, miton êtokwê kî-kâh-kâskahâm kwayask aya, aya, kà-k-~ èkà èkwayîkohk k-ôsîhishêk, èsî ôsî è-kâskikwâtâmamâsot êtokwê pîhtawêsâkân. màk êtokwê aya, è-sâkëkamonîyik èsa, Mac’s Best è-ítastêyik èsa [ê-pâhpîhk].

[FA:] èsî ôsî-îsiyîhkâsot cî pakhwèsikan? pakhwèsikan èsî ôsî-îsiyîhkâsot âna yà k-ôsîhî, èwakw ânim êtokwê è-sâkamonîyik èsa kâ-wâpahtamoht [ê-pâhpîhk].

Perhaps I should tell about one incident people used to laugh about. I guess it’s all right to tell it how one young woman was laughed at, she was too lazy to take the writing off, she simply made a slip like that, using a flour-bag. But she must have shaken it out and properly scraped it off [rather that washing or boiling it] so it would not be so stiff, and she must have sewn a slip just like that. But, I guess, it was hanging out below her dress, and the writing said Mac’s Best [laughter]!

[FA:] Is that the name of the flour? That was the name of the flour, uncooked [i.e., not bannock], and that is what was showing, that was visible [laughter]! (Minde, 1997:82)

Here is an example where the patient/theme ‘the flour’, in the context, is both specific and definite and the actor is demoted and obligatorily unspecified. In this case the use of the relational form is triggered at long distance by the presence in the earlier discourse of the possessor of the dress, i.e. the young woman.
Thus, there is some overlap between the unspecified actor relational and contexts of possession and complex clauses. However, I chose to compile these examples in a separate section, as Wolfart, Ellis and Lacombe have all made special mention of the relational unspecified actor\textsuperscript{15}.

3.5. Conclusion

The study of textual examples of the relational form has demonstrated that the simple occurrence of disjoint third person possessors or third person actors in a subordinate clause are not enough to trigger the use of the relational form. The third person participant is affected in a very intimate way by the relational predicate. I will explore this further in the next Chapter, as I discuss fieldwork, as well as in Chapter 6, where I will discuss External Possessor Constructions.

\textsuperscript{15} Although not mentioned specifically in this paper, there are also many examples of the relational unspecified actor in Bloomfield’s text collections (1930, 1934).
Chapter 4: The Use of the Relational Form – Fieldwork Research

4.0. Introduction

While text collections are comprised of texts in Plains Cree, Swampy Cree and Moose Cree, my fieldwork research has been done in the community of Kinosao Sipi (Norway House), introduced in Chapter 1, where the N dialect is spoken. I met with nine members of the community of Kinosao Sipi to interview them and spoke with them about their language, specifically about the Cree verb. I would like to thank each of them for spending time with me and acknowledge once again the contributions of wâpi-pînësiw, nipîwaskawiskwêw, Byron Apetagon, Sarah Gamblin, Ken, Robert Hart, Reverend Olive Flett, Alex Anderson and Wayne Anderson as well as the guidance and help of Ken Paupanekis. The community has been receptive to the project, and their positiveness and welcome were very touching and made it a pleasure to spend time in the community.

The purpose of this fieldwork research was simply to confirm whether the relational form was still active in one dialect that has not been well documented. Thus this research forms a part of a very wide-scoped project on the relational form which includes a typological survey of constructions similar to the relational form.

In section 4.1, I will describe the methodology of my research and follow this in sections 4.2 to 4.4 with the fieldwork results and a discussion of the contexts in which the relational form seems to be used in the N dialect as spoken in the community of Kinosao Sipi.
4.1. Methodology

This project received approval from the Research Ethics Board of the University of Regina (cf. Appendix 1). I met with one speaker in Winnipeg, and all other speakers in the community of Kinosao Sipi during two fieldtrips to the community, the first one being from June 25 to 28, and the second, from August 5 to 10, 2013. The interviews were all audiorecorded digitally on a TASCAM DR-100mkII, then later transcribed. Interviews lasted from thirty minutes to an hour and a half. Interviews were done either at the speakers’ homes or at their work places. The speakers were aged from forty to seventy years old. They were both men and women, and were all recommended by other members of the community through word-of-mouth.

The first part in the interview consisted of asking speakers to introduce themselves and share some of their life stories. The idea was not only to listen to free and spontaneous Cree speech, but mostly to get to know the speakers and to establish a relationship between speaker and researcher. To work with these recordings might perhaps be pursued in a future project. The second part of the interview consisted of the researcher telling a series of short narratives in English which would establish contexts in which the relational form has been known to occur. For example:

“I went over to my neighbour’s house to visit: she was at home, and invited me to sit down and later stay for lunch. I accepted her invitation.”

Then, the researcher would ask for the translation of one sentence related to the narrative, which might be expected to elicit the relational construction, such as “I sat down in one of her chairs”.
This strategy was used because the relational form has not been known to appear out-of-the-blue, or without any contextualization. Setting up a backstory would provide proper context to favour the occurrence of the relational form. I attempted to create questions which would test the use of the relational form with transitive and intransitive verbs. The first attested context of use of the relational form is possession with an animate third person possessor and inanimate possessee. Possesees within the questions ranged from generic objects such as chair and book, to more personal belongings such as boat or canoe and articles of clothing, to inalienable possession of body parts. These contexts of possession were of disjoint reference, i.e. the possessor was someone other than the actor of the verb. Other than possession, examples also illustrated contexts of presentative interpretation, ‘to do it in presence of someone else’, and various other types of complex sentences, where I hoped the actor of the subordinate clause would prompt the use of the relational form in the main clause, and vice versa. The point of this section of the interviews was to see whether contexts of use already established by other researchers for other dialects of Cree would also produce the relational form in modern Swampy Cree.

The third part of each interview consisted of eliciting paradigms for the intransitive animate verb (VAI) nipâ- ‘to sleep’ and the transitive inanimate verb (VTI) wâpaht- ‘to see something’ for conjunct and independent orders. The verbs nipâ- and wâpaht- were selected since they are high frequency verbs and cited in earlier works. The idea behind eliciting paradigms was to see whether the form could be elicited, and if so, if it appeared with all persons. Given more time, it would have been interesting to
select more than one TI and AI verb, and to include more stative or experiencer type verbs (such as wâpaht- and nipâ-) and dynamic or active verbs, and to see whether the semantics of the verb itself played a role in the use and occurrence of the relational form. However, it is my hope that the paradigms given by the consultants will be able to serve as an interesting comparison to Ellis’ paradigms of the relational form as used in Moose Cree to study any possible variations. Of course, it is extremely important to note that if a form was not given by a speaker, it does not mean that it does not exist at all in the language. After all, although contextualization is an effective strategy to study the relational constructions, it does present some important challenges.

4.1.1. Challenges

As I progressed in my interviews, the questionnaire changed slightly. There were questions that, in the original questionnaire, did not quite get the result I had hoped for. For instance, part of my original questionnaire was to list relational inflections that I had found in written works and ask whether the speakers were familiar with them and if they could put it in a sentence. However, the subtleties of Cree pronunciations made it hard at times for speakers to understand which form exactly I wanted to speak to them about (especially since the relational verb seems to be more marginal) and not everyone was comfortable with SRO spelling. Thus, I quickly changed the questionnaire to focus more on paradigms to be elicited from English and it yielded much more productive results.

Furthermore, there is the obvious barrier of language. As much as I would have liked to be, I am not a fluent speaker of Cree, and certainly not a native speaker of the language. Consultants were aware of this deficiency of mine, and this might have
perhaps influenced their answers. To try and minimize this difference, I made sure to ask for as natural translations as possible, as *they would say it in Cree*. I was at a disadvantage in this sense, and to not be able to discuss their answers on the spot (if anything interesting arose) was definitely a missed opportunity I regret, especially due to the limited time I was able to spend on reserve. However, as I have mentioned, fieldwork was only meant to be a part of a large research project on the relational form, to document whether it is still active in a Western Swampy Cree community.

Furthermore, as much as I would hope to record as natural speech as possible, the observer’s paradox unquestionably arises. My presence as a researcher and the presence of the recorder and microphone might have prompted consultants to somewhat alter their speech. They also did not know me prior to the interview: although everyone was absolutely friendly, welcoming and open, a higher level of comfort might have led to more natural speech and perhaps different answers.

The first result of my consultations is that, indeed, the relational form *is* used and recognized by Swampy Cree speakers of Norway House Cree Nation: it was used at least once by all consultants, no matter their self-evaluated degree of fluency.16 The question of *how* it is used will be explored in the following section, as I will overview results and issues that have arisen.

4.2. **Contexts of Possession**

Textual evidence (cf. 3.1) has shown that the relational form appears most commonly with possession, where the inanimate possessee is possessed by a third person.

---

16 Notwithstanding self-evaluation of fluency, all the consultants were recommended by other members of the community (cf. 4.0).
animate participant who is neither actor or goal of the action. However, the relational form does not occur with all types of possession. Grammatically, Cree marks a distinction between alienable and inalienable possession. The relational form, as I will discuss in section 4.2.1, occurs almost systematically with inalienable inanimate possessees. It also occurs with alienable inanimate possessees, but to varying degrees. In fact, I believe some kind of cline or continuum can be established according to the degree of intimacy between the possessor and possessee. For example, a chair, a book, a boat, a story, a letter or a hat, without being grammatical cases of inalienable possession, can be possessed (and usually are so). However, someone might have a more intimate relationship with his boat, especially in a fishing community like Kinosao Sipi, rather than an ordinary chair or just another book on the bookshelf. Thus, the relational inflection might occur more consistently with a boat possessee rather than a chair. Section 4.2.1 is a compilation of alienable possessees with third person possessors, which range from possessees very close to their possessor to more ‘distant’.

4.2.1. Alienable Possessees

4.2.1.1. AI Verbs

The relational form in contexts of possession usually occurs with TI verbs, the inanimate possessee being the inanimate object of the verb. However, Junker noted that the relational construction may also occur in contexts of disjoint third person possession with AI verbs, when the possessee is a locative:

(38) Nipâ -w-e-u u- nipewin -iyi -hch.
sleep.AI -REL -Dir -3 3.Poss- bed -Obv -Loc
‘S/he sleeps in his/her (someone else’s) bed.’ (Junker, 2003:321)
In example (39), *I sat down in her chair*, the possessed inanimate entity is not the patient of the verb, but a location to an intransitive verb. The complete question presented to consultants follows, which consists of the short narrative which sets the context for the statement up for elicitation. Again, a chair is not an inherently possessed item. In this case, it constitutes the neighbour’s material property, present in her house, and thus is considered as a context of possession.

(39)  I went over to my neighbour’s house to visit: she was at home, and invited me to sit down and later stay for lunch. I accepted her invitation. How would you say… "I sat down in one of her chairs."

Various possible constructions were offered by consultants. Within the scope of this paper, however, (39a) and (39d) are particularly interesting as they are inflected in the relational construction.¹⁷ (39a) is an example of the verb *cîpatapi*- ‘to sit up’, in the Independent Order relational, followed by the relational morpheme -w followed by the direct theme sign -â and the first/second person singular ending -n.

(39a)  n(i)kî-cîpatap(i)wân otêhtapiwinih(k). (K)
     ni- kî- cîpatapi -w -â -n    o- têhtapiwin -ihk
     1- Pst- sit.up.AI -REL -Dir -1/2s  3.Poss- chair -Loc
     ‘I sat up in her chair.’

(39b) is an example of a nonrelational inflection in the Independent Order for the verb *api*- from which *cîpatapi*- is derived.

(39b)  n(i)kî-apin otêhtapiwinihk. (N, WP)
     ni- kî- api -n    o- têhtapiwin -ihk
     1- Pst- sit.AI -1/2s  3.Poss- chair -Loc
     ‘I sat in her chair’

¹⁷ Examples will be followed by the initials of the speaker or speakers who provided them.
Example (39c) is another example of a nonrelational inflection with the verb *nahapi* - ‘to sit down’, another derivative of the verb *api* - ‘to sit’.

(39c) nîkî-nahapin ôtêhtapiwinihk. (WA)
1- Pst- sit.down.AI -1/2s 3.Poss-chair -Loc
‘I sat down in her chair’.

(39d) is a very interesting example:

(39d) ê-kî-itohtêyân (n)tôtêm wîk(i)wâhk ê-kîyokawak mîkwâc kî-apiw awa nî-kakwâcimik kita-apiyân pitamâ kita-wîci-mîcisômak. ëkosi nîkî- /nkî /
1- Pst-sit.AI -1/2s 3. Poss-home -pl -Loc
ni-ka- kakwâcim -ik kita-api -yân while Pst- sit.AI -3 this.An
ni-ka- kakwâcim -ik kita-api-yân pitamâ
1- Fut- ask.TA -3>1 Fut-Conj-sit.AI -ls for.now
kî- wîci-mîcisôm -ak. ëkosi
Fut- have.as.dinner.companion.TA -1>3 so/thus
ni- kî- otin -am -w -â -n ëkosi pakosênîm -it.
1- Pst- take -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s thus wish.of.TA -3
êkotâ ni- kî- ati-api -n pêyak ôho
right.there 1- Pst- begin.to- sit.AI -1/2s one these.In
têhtapiwin -a ê- ayapi -wân18 ëkota
chair -pl.In Conj-be.at.home.AI -1s there
ni- kî- wîci-mîcisôm -â -w.
1- Pst- have.as.dinner.companion.TA -Dir -1>3

---

18 The suffix -wân (which might seem to be the relational suffix for 1s in Independent order) occurring in the Conjunct form of ê-ayapi- is explicable only by vocalic harmony between tôhtapiwina and ê-ayapiwân. It is therefore simply the Conjunct 1 person ending -yân.
‘I went to my friend’s home to visit her while she was at home. She asked me to sit with her and have dinner with her. So I accepted her invitation and sat and had dinner with her.’

Although the verb ayapi ‘sit around, be at home’ (derived from api-) is in the nonrelational in (39d), there is another relational inflection in the consultant’s elicitation. The main verb in the elicitation for I accepted/took her invitation is in the relational form in a complex sentence with a third person actor in the subordinate clause, i.e. niki-otinamwàn, which is an example of a TI verb. This verbal trigger will be discussed again in section 4.2.1.2.

These examples seem to illustrate that in contexts of items which are not particularly intimate to the possessor, the relational form is optional, not obligatory. It would be interesting to ask for judgement values on whether the meaning changes with the use of relational vs. nonrelational inflections in contexts where the relational form is optional.

4.2.1.2. TI Verbs

The examples discussed in this section are TI verbs with a possessed inanimate patient. Following is the narrative given to consultants, followed again by some of the elicitations offered by consultants as a translation of the final sentence ‘You/(I) read (some of) her books’.

(40) You (I) wanted a good book to read at your (my) cottage over the summer. One day, when you were (I was) at your (my) neighbour’s house, you (I) asked her if she had read any good books lately. She suggested a couple of titles, and offered to lend them to you (me). How would you say… “You (I) read some of her books.”
As demonstrated in (40a-c), although the relational form could perhaps occur in this context, as we have a case of disjoint reference and third person possessor, it is not given in any elicitation by any of the consultants. The relational form does occur in other examples of third person disjoint possessors, as we will see in later examples, but not in this instance. There are some variations in the consultants’ elicitations. (40a) is an example of the verb ayamihtâ in the delayed Imperative:

(40a) ayamihtâ(h)kan âtiht ôho omasinahikana. (WP)
ayamihtâ -hkan âtiht ôho o- masinahikan -a
‘Read (2s) some of her books.’

In (40b), however, the main verb is in the changed Conjunct order nonrelational:

(40b) ni(noh)tê-min~ / ni(noh)tê - minêntên ê-ayamihtâyân omasinahikana. (N)
ni- nohtê- minênt -ê -n ê- ayamihtâ -yân o- masinahikan -a
1- want.to- enjoy -TI -1/2s Conj- read.TI -1s 3.Poss- book -pl.In
‘I want to/ enjoy reading her books.’

Finally, (40c) is an instance of the main verb in the Independent Indicative nonrelational:

(40c) âsa(y) nikî-ayamihtân ôma (o)masinahikana. (SG)
âsay ni- kî- ayamihtâ -n ôma o- masinahikan -a.
already 1- Pst- read.TI -1/2s this.In 3.Poss- book -pl.In
‘I read her books.’

These variations notwithstanding, it seems that more than simply syntactic criteria are necessary to determine the use and function of the relational form and that perhaps this is an instance of a third person possessor not really involved or affected by the action, and that the inalienable/alienable possession distinction has an important role to play in the use of the relational form.
The next narrative elicited concerns a sister’s story, either told in written form, in a letter, or in spoken form, on the phone, i.e. *I always enjoyed reading her letters* and *I listened to her stories on the phone*:

(41) My sister went on a trip to Europe. While she was there, she wrote many letters and sent quite a few postcards and pictures.

How would you say… “I always enjoyed reading her letters.”

How would you say… “I listened to her stories on the phone.”

In the case of ‘reading letters’, the use of the relational verb is not systematic, though possible, as is shown in the following examples. In (41a) and (41b), the relational construction is used to mark the presence of the third person possessor:

(41a) niminêntên ê-ayamihtâwak omasinahikana. (SG)
ni- minênt -ê -n ê- ayamihtâ -w -ak
1- like -TI -1/2s Conj- read.TI -REL -1>3s

o- masinahikan -a
‘I like reading her letters.’

(41b) kapê niminêntên ê-ayamihtâwak ani kâ-pê-masinhikêt…. (WP)
kapê ni- minênt -ê -n ê- ayamihtâ -w -ak
always 1- enjoy/like -TI -1/2s Conj- read.TI -REL -1>3s

ani kâ- pê-masinhikê -t,….
that Conj- hither- write.AI -3s
‘I always enjoy reading what she writes.’

Both of these examples are occurrences of the relational form in the Conjunct order with the TI verb *ayamihtâ* ‘read’. In (41a), the relational form is undoubtedly conditioned by the third person possessor marker on *masinahikan*. In (41b) however, ‘letter’ is represented as a verb *masinahikê* ‘what she writes’. So, in this case, what was meant to be an example of the relational form conditioned by possession, is actually an
example of the relational form occurring within a complex sentence where the third person actor in the subordinate clause is the trigger.

In (41c), the nonrelational inflection in the Conjunct order is used:

\[(41c)\] nkí-minêntên kâ-kî- /kâ-kî-ayamihtâyân anihi masinahikana. (N)
\[\text{ni- kî- minênt -ê -n} \quad \text{kâ- kî- ayamihtâ -yân}\]
\[\text{1- Pst- like -TI -1/2s} \quad \text{Conj- Pst- read.TI -1s}\]

anihi masinahikan -a.
those.In letter -pl.In
‘I like reading her letters.’

In the case of eliciting ‘I listen to her stories’, these two examples are given by the same consultant, and are two instances of the relational TI verb natoht- ‘listen to it.TI’. (41d) is in the Conjunct, and (41e) is in the Independent Order:

\[(41d)\] sipwê-ayamihit ēkota måna kâ-natohtamwâk otâcimowina. (WP)
sipwê-ay(a)mih -it ēkota måna kâ-natoht am -w -ak
phone.TA -3>1 right.there usually Conj- listen.to -TI -REL -1>3

ot- âcimowin -a.
3.Poss- story -pl.In
‘I listened to her stories when she phones me.’

\[(41e)\] ni(na)tohta/ (ni)natohtamwân ani(hi) otâcimowina sipwê-ayamihit. (WP)
\[\text{ni- natoht am -w -â -n} \quad \text{anihi} \quad \text{ot- âcimowin -a}\]
\[\text{1- listen.to -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s} \quad \text{those.IN} \quad \text{3.Poss- story -pl.In}\]
sipwê-ay(a)mih -it.
phone.TA -3>1
‘I listen to her stories on the phone.’

Thus, a verbal story is a very important and strong conditioning factor for the use of the relational form (see also example (39d)).

Another question posed to participants concerns a context of occurrence of the relational form which has been noted in the textual evidence discussed earlier. In my
discussions with consultants, I proposed the sentences ‘I saw her hat but she does not’

(42a-c), as well as the question ‘Did you see her hat?’ (42d).

(42) You and your sister are walking in the park, talking, and looking for her new hat, that she lost earlier that day. The sun is setting, and in the shadows, you see something on a nearby bench. Her hat! You see it, but she doesn’t: she is too busy talking. Later, when you are telling the story, how would you say…

“I saw/see her hat but she did/does not” and “Did you see her hat?”

In this context, the use of the relational form seems to be much more systematic.

All four instances shown here make use of the relational form, (42a), (42b) and (42d) in the Independent order, and (42c) in the Conjunct.

(42a) niwapâhtamwân otastotin wîna maka wîna namôna wâpahtam. (AA)
ni- wâpaht -am -w -â -n ot- astotin wîna mâka wîna
1- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s 3.Poss-hat her but her

namôna wâpaht -am.
not see -TI
‘I see her hat but she did not.’

(42b) niwâpahtamwân otastotin, mwâc mâka wîna wâpahtam. (WP)
i- wâpaht -am -w -â -n ot- astotin mwâc mâka wîna
1- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s 3.Poss-hat not but her

wâpaht -am.
see -TI
‘I saw her hat but she did not’

Examples (42a-b) are very similar examples, except for some word order and vocabulary differences. However, the relational verb is exactly the same in both instances, in the first person and Independent Order.

Example (42c) is an example of a relational TI verb in the Conjunct order.
This last example is an instance of the second person relational in the Independent order.

These examples also represent a context triggering empathy. The actor is our sister, or the Speaker’s sister, and we know she is looking for her hat, and thus we are helping her to do so.

4.2.1.3. TI Paradigm

Finally, to conclude the discussion of the relational verb and alienable possession contexts, I also posed the Independent and Conjunct paradigms to consultants for the verb wâpaht-. As the relational form does not appear out-of-the-blue, and only in certain contexts, I could not simply ask ‘I see it’ to elicit the relational form, but had to provide some context. The context I chose to provide was one of third person disjoint possession. The point of eliciting a full paradigm rather than one sentence or narrative at a time was to see whether the relational form was used with all person inflections. It is extremely interesting to note that, although the relational form is fairly common in first and second singular, less so in third person actor, it appears even less common in the plural forms, such as first person inclusive, second person and third person plural. Still, it is difficult to
say anything definitive for the Conjunct order with only a few examples in the plural forms.

A. Independent order

(43) I saw his boat.
(43a) nikî-wâpahtamwân ocîmân. (N, OF)
      ni- kî- wâpaht -am -w -â -n       o- cîmân
      1- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s    3.Poss- boat
      ‘I saw his boat (in relation to him).’

(43b) niwâpahtamwân ocîmân. (SG, K)
      ni- wâpaht -am -w -â -n       o- cîmân
      1- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s    3.Poss-boat
      ‘I see his boat (in relation to him).’

(43c) nikî-wâpahtën ocîmân. (RH)
      ni- kî- wâpaht -ê -n       o- cîmân
      1- Pst- see -TI -1/2s    3.Poss- boat
      ‘I saw his boat.’

(44) You saw his boat. / Did you see her boat?
(44a) (kîna) kikî-wapâhtamwân ocîmân. (N, K)
      (kîna) ki- kî- wâpaht -am -w -â -n       o- cîmân
      you      2- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s    3.Poss- boat
      ‘You saw his boat (in relation to him).’

(44b) kikî-wâpahtamwân nâ ocîmân? (WA, OF)
      ki- kî- wâpaht -am -w -â -n       nâ       o- cîmân
      2- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s    Q    3.Poss- boat
      ‘Did you see his boat (in relation to him)?’

(44c) kikî-wâpahtën ocîmân. (RH)
      ki- kî- wâpaht -ê -n       o- cîmân
      2- Pst- see -TI -1/2s    3.Poss-boat
      ‘You saw his boat.’

(45) We – exclusive – saw his boat.
(45a) nikî-wapâhtamwânân ocîmân. (N, WA)
      ni- kî- wâpaht -am -w -â -nân       o- cîmân
      1- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -1p    3.Poss-boat
      ‘We (excl) saw his boat (in relation to him).’
(45b) nikê-wâpahtênân ocîmân. (K, RH, SG)
   ni- kî- wâpaht -ê -nân o- cîmân
   1- Pst- see -TI -1p  3.Poss- boat
   ‘We (excl) saw his boat.’

(46) We – inclusive – saw his boat.
(46a) kikî-wâpahtamwânâwâw ocîmân. (OF, WA)
   ki- kî- wâpaht -am -w -â -nânaw o- cîmân
   2- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -21  3.Poss- boat
   ‘We (incl) saw his boat (in relation to him).’

(46b) kikî-wâpahtênânaw ocîmân. (N, RH)
   ki- kî- wâpaht -ê -nânaw o- cîmân
   2- Pst- see -TI -21  3.Poss- boat
   ‘We (incl) saw his boat.’

(47) You – plural – saw his boat.
(47a) kikî-wâpahtamwânâwâw nâ ocîmân? (WA)
   ki- kî- wâpaht -am -w -â -nâwâw nâ o- cîmân
   2- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -2p Q  3.Poss- boat
   ‘Did you (pl) see his boat (in relation to him).’

(47b) kîna akwa kitânis kikî-wâpahtênawâw ocîmân. (N)
   kîna akwa kî- tânis ki- kî- wâpaht -ê -nâwâw o- cîmân
   you and  2.Poss- daughter  2- Pst- see -TI -21  3.Poss- boat
   ‘Did you and your daughter see his boat?’

(48) She saw his boat.
(48a) (iskwêw ana) kî-wâpahtamwêw ocîmân. (WA, OF)
   (iskwêw ana) ki- wâpaht -am -w -ê -w o- cîmân
   woman there Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -3  3.Poss- boat
   ‘(The woman there) she saw his boat (in relation to him).’

(48b) (wîna) kî-wâpahtam(w) ocîmân. (N, K)
   (wîna) kî- wâpaht -am -w o- cîmân
   her/him Pst- see -TI -3/REL  3.Poss- boat
   ‘She saw his boat.’

(48c) iskwêw ana wâpahtam ocîman. (RH)
   iskwêw ana wâpaht-am o- cîmân
   woman there see -TI  3.Poss- boat
   ‘The woman there saw his boat.’
Pers. | TI nonrelational | TI relational (Ellis, 1971) | TI relational Kinosao Sipi | TA equivalent |
---|---|---|---|---|
1 | ni-wâpaht-ê-n | ni-wâpaht-am-w-â-n | ni-wâpaht-am-w-â-n | ni-wâpam-â-w |
2 | ki-wâpaht-ê-n | ki-wâpaht-am-w-â-n | ki-wâpaht-am-w-â-n | ki-wâpam-â-w |
1p | ni-wâpaht-ê-nâ-n | ni-wâpaht-am-w-â-nâ-n | ni-wâpaht-am-w-â-nâ-n | ni-wâpam-â-nâ-n |
21 | ki-wâpaht-ê-(nâ)ma-w | ki-wâpaht-am-w-â-(nâ)ma-w | ki-wâpaht-am-w-â-naw | ki-wâpam-â-naw |
2p | ki-wâpaht-ê-nâwâ-w | ki-wâpaht-am-w-â-nâwâ-w | ki-wâpaht-am-w-â-nâwâ-w | ki-wâpam-â-wâw |
3 | Ø-wâpaht-am | Ø-wâpaht-am-w-ê-w | Ø-wâpaht-am-w-ê-w | Ø-wâpam-ê-w |
3p | Ø-wâpaht-am-wa-w | Ø-wâpaht-am-w-ê-wa-w | Ø-wâpaht-am-w-ê-wa-w | Ø-wâpam-ê-wa-w |
3’ | Ø-wâpaht-am-ë-wa | ---- | ---- | Ø-wâpam-ê-wa |

Table 4.1 is a compilation of all elicitations given by speakers. They are compared to the TI nonrelational inflection, and to the relational TI inflection provided by Ellis. As shown in the table, the two sets of relational paradigms from Ellis and from fieldwork research are fairly similar, with the exception of 3s wâpahtamw-. It is very hard to tell whether this example is relational or nonrelational. It might be a contraction of wâpahtamwêw ‘s/he sees it (in relation to him)’ or simply the third person TI theme sign wâpahtam-w-. In the rightmost column is an example of a Transitive Animate verb.
in this case wâpam- ‘to see someone’, to show how the relational verb shares the TA verb’s direct theme sign, -â for 1 and 2 persons, and -ê for 3 (Junker, 2003:311).  

B. Conjunct order

The following elicitations concern the Conjunct order. The speakers with whom I worked used the relational inflection fairly consistently:

(50) **I was walking around when I saw his canoe.**

(50a) nikî-papâmohtân kâ-kî-wâpahtamwak ocîmân.  
i- kî- papâmohtâ -n kâ- kî- wâpaht -am -w -ak o- cîmân  
1- Pst- wander.AI -1/2s Conj- Pst- see -TI -REL -1>3 3.Poss- boat  
‘I was wandering around when I saw his boat (in relation to him).’

(50b) mêkwâc ê-papâmohtêyân kâ-kî-wâpahtamwak ocîmân.  
mêkwâc ê- papâmohtê -yân kâ- kî- wâpaht -am -w -ak o- cîmân  
while Conj- wander.AI -1s Conj- Pst- see -TI -REL -1>3 3.Poss- boat  
‘While I was wandering, I saw his boat (in relation to him).’

(51) **You were walking around by the shore when you saw his canoe.**

(51a) cîkâsk nâ kî-papâmohtân kâ-kî-wâpahtamwat ocîmân?  
cîkâsk nâ kî- papâmohtá -n kâ- kî- wâpaht -am -w -at o- cîmân  
shore Q Pst- wander.AI -1/2s Conj- Pst- see -TI -REL -2>3 3.Poss- boat  
‘Were you wandering on the shore as you saw his boat (in relation to him)?’

(51b) êkota nâ mêkwâc ê-papâmohtêyân cîkipêk kâ-kî-wâpahtamwat ocîmân.  
êkota nâ mêkwâc ê- papâmohtê -yan cîkipêk  
right.there Q while Conj- wander.AI -2s shore  
kâ- kî- wâpaht -am -w -at o- cîmân  
Conj- Pst- see -TI -REL -2>3 3.Poss- boat  
‘Were you wandering on the shore when you saw his boat (in relation to him)?’

---

19 Previous analyses (Wolfart, 1973; Junker, 2003) have been unanimous that the source of -â/-ê alternation in ALL relational verbs is the VTA Inflectional Direct theme sign, which applies to all VTA stems (no exceptions), and not the VAI allomorphic stem variation which applies to -ê final VAI stems only.
We (my mother and I) were walking around when we saw his canoe.

We (you and I) were walking around when we saw his canoe.

Were you (yourself and your cousin) walking around when we saw his canoe.

She was walking around when she saw his canoe.
(55b) kî-papâmohtêw ana iskwêw kâ-kî-wâpahtahk animiniw cîmâniw. (WA)
kî- papâmohtê -w ana iskwêw kâ- kî- wâpaht -ahk
Pst- wander.AI -3 this woman Conj- Pst- see.TI -3s

animiniw cîmân -niw.
this.Obv boat -Obv
‘While this woman was wandering around, she saw his boat.’

(56) They were walking around when they saw his canoe.

(56a) nitôtêmak mêkwêcîk kî-kî-wâpahtamwâcik o-cîmân. (OF)
ni- tôtêm -ak mêkwâc ê- papâmohtê -cik

kâ- kî- wâpaht -am -w -âcik o- cîmân
Conj- Pst- see -TI -REL -3p 3.Poss- boat
‘While my friends were wandering, they saw his boat (in relation to him).’

Although there are, in some instances, only a few elicitations given, they are still an indication of the use of the relational form across the full TI Conjunct Order. Table 4.2 is a compilation of these elicitations compared to paradigms given by Ellis. The TA equivalent wâpam- ‘to see someone’ is also listed and shows how, in the Conjunct Order, the relational inflection and TA person endings are identical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pers.</th>
<th>TI nonrelational</th>
<th>TI relational (Ellis, 1971)</th>
<th>TI relational Kinosao Sipi</th>
<th>TA equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-amân</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-ak</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-ak</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-aman</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-at</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-at</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-amâhk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âhk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âhk</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-âyahk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-amahk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âhk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âyahk</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-âyahk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-amêk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-êk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âyêk</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-âyêk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-ahk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-ât</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-ât</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-ât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-ahkk</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âcik</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-am-w-âcik</td>
<td>ê-wâpam-âcik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>ê-wâpaht-aminit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ê-wâpam-ânit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a few forms in the TI paradigm which seem to differ from the ones given by Ellis. For both first person inclusive (21) -wâyahk and second persons plural (2p) -wâyêk, a more complex form than Ellis’ is given, which incorporates the relational
morpheme -w and the direct theme sign -â as well as the full TA Conjunct ending -yahk and -yêk. This of course would have to be confirmed with many consultants, in order to establish whether this is a common alternative to the endings -wahk and -wêk.

These paradigms provide, I believe, first indications that there can be variation in the relational paradigms. More elicitation will have to be done in order to confirm whether these variations are idiosyncracies or varying morphology used all across the community.

4.2.2. Inalienable Possession

Finally, the relational inflection seems to occur most frequently with inalienable possession. In Cree, both kinship terms and body parts are considered inalienable nouns and constitute bound roots which obligatorily have to occur with a possessive prefix. Within the study of the relational inflection, since it occurs only with transitive verbs with inanimate patients, kinship terms will not be considered. However, most body part terms are inanimate, and thus, these (inanimate body parts) may condition the use of the relational construction.

In the case of the TI verb otin- ‘to take it’ in the sentence I took her arm with care, the use of the relational form seemed to be almost systematic:

(57) All of a sudden, the phone rings. You answer it: it is your wife or husband, and s/he is in distress. S/he thinks they broke their arm in a fall. You come right over, and find her or him waiting for you. You quickly come to her/his aid, and take her/his arm with care. How would you say: “I took her arm with care (and hold it in both my hands.).”

(57a) papêyâhtak nitôtinamwân ospiton. (N)
papêyâhtak ni(t)- otin -am -w -â -n o- spiton slowly/carefully 1- take -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s 3.Poss-arm ‘I carefully take her/his arm.’
Both examples (57a-b) are very similar, apart from some word order differences: in the two cases, the relational form is used in the Independent order.

However, the relational form was not offered by consultants in the following question up for elicitation (*She hadn’t yet seen his face*). It was inspired from a textual example (58) from Minde’s (1997) *kwayask ê-kî-pê-kiskinowâpahtihicik: Their Example Showed Me the Way*:


*I did not speak for a long time, because I had not yet even seen his face, it was difficult for me to respond, to marry this Joe Minde as he was called.* (Minde, 1997:58).

Perhaps there is a difference to be made between the use of the relational form with speech-act participant and third person actors. This phenomenon might be linked to the Speaker’s level of empathy towards the situation, especially towards the actor and the possessor. This might explain the difference between (58), where the relational form is used and (59a-b), where it is not:

(59) She was getting ready to marry a man: the marriage had been arranged by her parents. She hadn’t met him yet. He was a mechanic, she heard that he was a solid thirty year old man from a good family.

How would you say: “She hadn’t yet seen his face.”

(59a) mwâc cêskwa wâpahtam ohkwâkan. (WP)

mwâc cêskwa wâpaht -am o- hkwâkan

not yet see -TI 3.Poss- face

‘She hadn’t yet seen his face.’
(59b) mwâ(c) wâpahtam ocâhp. (SG)
    mwâc  wâpaht-am    o- câhp
    not    see  -TI    3.Poss- face
    ‘She hadn’t seen his face.’

In Minde’s narrative, she is talking about herself and the man to whom she is promised. Thus, it is a very personal situation and she has a very intimate relationship with the possessor. In (59), the actor is a stranger, and the possessor a man she will marry. Thus, her situation does not trigger as much empathy from the Speaker and might explain why, although it is a case of inalienable possession, the relational form is not given. This is a methodological issue, as perhaps if the woman had been presented as the Speaker’s mother rather than a stranger, the relational verb might have been elicited.

Finally, another example of the use of the relational form is the case of the context we tied up its (the deer’s) legs, where the relational form is offered consistently by all consultants:

(60) You are talking to your wife about your hunting trip with one of your friends:
    “We were in the woods for a while, waiting. All of a sudden, we heard a noise. It was a big female deer. We shot it. Then, we tied it by the legs and dragged it out. Boy was it heavy!”
    How would you say… “We tied up its legs.”

(60a) (ni)tahkopitamwânân oskâta. (AA, K)
    ni- tahkopit -am -w -â -nân    o- skât -a
    1- tie.up -TI -REL -Dir -1p    3.Poss- leg -pl.In
    ‘We (excl) tie up its legs.’

(60b) (ni)kî-tahkopitamwânân oskâta. (WP, WA)
    ni- kî- tahkopit -am -w -â -nân    o- skât -a
    1- Pst- tie.up -TI -REL -Dir -1p    3.Poss- leg -pl.In
    ‘We (excl) tied up its legs.’

Thus, exploring the link between inalienable possession and the use of the relational construction is extremely important for the proper understanding of the latter.
Inalienable possession encompasses objects or entities which need an owner, in the case of body parts. An arm or leg must be part of someone’s body, and that intimate link between possessor and possessee demonstrated by the fact that all body parts are not independent but bound roots in Cree. This obligatory link between possessor and body part is also illustrated by the use of the relational form emphasizing the fact that any action to which a body part is subjected also has an undeniable effect on the possessor of the body.

We may conclude that possession is a fruitful context of appearance for the relational form, specifically when the possessor is especially affected by the action on its possessee. Indeed, there seems to be a tendency that the more the possessor shares an intimate relationship with its possessee, the more likely the relational form might be used to emphasize this relationship. The degree of the Speaker’s empathy for the actor and possessor seems to be also very important and needs to be further explored.

4.3. Complex Sentences

The second general context of occurrence of the relational form is when the actor of the subordinate clause prompts the use of the relational form in the main clause, or when the actor of the main clause prompts the use of the relational form in the subordinate or dependent clause. Like in the case of possession, the relational form, at least in Western Cree dialects, does not occur often, thus suggesting that certain specific conditions within the semantics of the clauses have to be met. One particular context which has not surfaced in the textual study of Section 3.2 (with the exception of the Old Woman Spirit in example (28)), but mentioned by Junker (2003) is so-called
‘presentative interpretation’, viz. to do something in the presence of someone else. In this section, I will overview the specific context of ‘presentative interpretation’ and relate questions posed to the consultants, and in the subsequent subsection discuss other complex sentences, and perhaps determine if there is anything to suggest specific conditions within a non-possession context that may condition the use of the relational form.

4.3.1. “Presentative Interpretation”

The first context which I will discuss has been introduced by Junker (2003:325) as in the East Cree examples (61) and (62):

(61) Ni^20- wapaht -am -w-a -n mistiku-yu.  
1- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s wood -Obv  
‘I see a stick (but s/he does not) / (over at her/his place).’ (Junker, 2003:325)

(62) Ni-wapaht -am -w-a -n mistiku -yu mikw namui wapaht -am wi.  
1- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s wood -Obv but not see -TI emphatic  
‘I see a stick, but s/he does not.’ (Junker, 2003:325)

However, the notion of physical presence such as ‘where someone is standing’ does not seem sufficient to condition the use of the relational form in Swampy Cree, based on the elicitations provided by the consultants, which will be discussed below. Interestingly enough, as discussed in Chapter 3, ‘over at his place/where he is standing’ is not a context of occurrence of the relational form in surveyed text collections either. Thus, the relational construction appearing in complex sentences seems harder to elicit than in contexts of possession.

^20 East Cree has a different spelling convention than SRO used in Western Cree dialects which allows for capitalization at the beginning of a sentence.
In fieldwork sessions, I posed two questions relating to the physical presence of a third person participant, namely *I saw the canoe where he (my older brother) was standing* and *Go get the meat where your aunt is standing!*. Examples (63a-c) are fairly similar, with the verb *wâpaht*- ‘to see it’ in the nonrelational Independent order, and the verb *nîpawi* - ‘to stand’ in the Conjunct order. None of the consultants offered a relational form when the boat *cîmân* or the canoe *wâpiski-cîmân* was not possessed.

(63)  
I was looking all over for my canoe. I thought I had tied it up to the dock, but it wasn’t there. My brother was there with me, helping me to look for it. We walked along the bank, trying to see where it had floated off to. Finally, I saw it. It was beside my brother. How would you say “I saw the canoe where he was standing”?

(63a)  
êkota an(im)a wâpiski-cîmân nêta kâ-isi-nîpawit. (AA)  
êkota anima wâpiski-cîmân nêta right.there that.in canoe yonder  
kâ- isi- nîpawi -t  
Conj- this.way- stand.there.AI -3s  
‘There was the canoe where he was standing.’

(63b)  
nêtê niwâpahtên nawât~ / na~ wâpiski-cîmân kâ-isi-nîpawit. (K)  
nêtê ni- wâpaht -ê -n wâpiski-cîmân over.there 1- see -TI -1/2s canoe  
kâ- isi-nîpawi -t  
Conj- this.way- stand.there.AI -3s  
‘I see his canoe over there where he is standing.’

(63c)  
(n)kî-wâpahtên cîmân nêta nistês kâ-nîpawit. (OF, RH)  
ni- kî- wâpaht -ê -n cîmân nêta ni- stês  
1- Pst- see -TI -1/2s boat yonder 1.Poss- older.brother  
kâ- nîpawi -t  
Conj- stand.there.AI -3s  
‘I saw the boat where my older brother was standing.’
In this context, the presence of the third participant does not seem to be enough to trigger the use of the relational construction. However, one elicitation offered by a consultant marks the noun *cîmân* ‘boat’ for possession with the prefix *o-* , and consequently, the verb is relational:

(64) nikî-wâpahtamwân ocîmân kâ-isi-nîpawit. (WA)
    ni- kî- wâpaht am -w -â -n  o- cîmân  kâ- isi- nîpâwi -t
    1- Pst- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s  3.Poss- boat  Conj- hither- stand.AI -3s
    ‘I see his boat where he is standing.’

Thus, it would seem that in this example, it is the third person possessor which conditions the relational form, and not the mention of his spatial location.

Example (65) is another example of ‘presentative interpretation’, where the location of the meat is dependent on the spatial location of the family member:

(65) The whole family got together and are gathered at an old aunt’s house. She was overwhelmed with getting everything ready for supper. The aunt’s brother saw that she was struggling and turned to his kids and told them…“Kids, go get the meat where your aunt/grandmother is standing!”

Example (65a) shows an elicitation which includes the Transitive Inanimate verb *nâtam-* ‘fetch it’ in the Imperative form:

(65a) nâtamok anima wiyâs your aunt kâ-isi-nîpawit. (K)
    nât -am -ok  anima  wiyâs  ‘your aunt’
    fetch -TI -2p.Imp  that.In  meat

    kâ- isi- nîpawi -t
    Conj- this.way- stand.up.AI -3s
    ‘Children, fetch that meat, where your aunt is standing!’

Examples (65b-c) are examples of its TA equivalent *nâtamaw-* , also in the Imperative form, and are both instances of a nonrelational inflection.
Thus, based on these examples, there seems to be a tendency, contrary to East Cree, not to use the relational form in contexts of presentative interpretation. In effect, we have elicitations with a TA verb and a TI verb, but no intermediate relational construction.

4.3.2. Other Complex Sentences

As I have discussed in Chapter 2 and section 3.3, the relational form has also been previously documented appearing in the matrix clause in complex sentences, when the actor of the subordinate clause is a third person. The opposite has also been documented, namely where the actor of the main verb or matrix is a third person actor which prompts the use of the relational form in the subordinate verb.

However, the presence of a third person actor in subordinate or main clauses is not sufficient to condition the use of the relational form, just like the presence of a third person possessor does not necessarily imply the use of the relational form. As it is in the case of third person possessors, there are undoubtedly other semantic or pragmatic
factors conditioning the occurrence of the relational form in complex sentences. Thus, when I composed questions, I tried to consider the notion of affectedness and the degree of influence the third person participant might be perceived to have on the action. In the first question (66), the presence of a stranger is the reason for the actor to speak softly. In the second question (67), the little boy’s excitement is the reason for the parents’ merriment.

Notwithstanding, the relational form is not offered in all elicitations. The first narrative concerns the Speaker’s friend speaking softly to avoid being heard:

(66) You are in a restaurant, talking to your friend. You are having lunch together. He invited you: he wanted to talk to you about something important. There is someone sitting close to you. So your friend lowers his voice… How would you say… “He speaks quietly, because he doesn’t want the other to hear him.”

In (66a), the TA verb ayamih- ‘to speak to someone’ is used in the inverse form (3rd acting on 1st). Thus, as the relational inflection occurs only with AI and TI verbs, it does not occur in this instance:

(66a) pê-kîmōci-(a)ayamihik êkâ tânima pîtos awiya ta-pê(h)ta-kwan. (WP)
  pê- kîmōci- ayamih -it êkâ tânimâ pîtos
  thence- secretly- speak.TA -3>1 not which stranger

  awiya ta- pêhtâkwan.
  person Fut- it.is.audible/heard.II
  ‘He spoke quietly to me so it would not be heard by the stranger.’

In 66b, the nonrelational AI verb ayami- is offered:

(66b) papêyåhtak ayamiw êkâ ta-pêhtât. (SG)
  papêyåhtak ayami -w êkâ ta- pêhtâ -t.
  carefully speak.AI -3 not Conj.Fut- hear.TI -3s
  ‘He spoke quietly not to be heard.’
This construction would have to be further explored, but perhaps the relational construction does not occur in (66a) and (66b) because the friend acts to avoid the effect on the stranger and therefore the stranger is unaffected. Thus, if the stranger has an effect on the friend’s action (i.e. it is because of the stranger’s presence that the friend speaks quietly), the friend’s action does not have an effect on the stranger. The issue of empathy might also be relevant here, as the friends undoubtedly have less empathy for the stranger, than the parents would have for their little boy.

In (68a), the relational form is used and resembles an example given by Junker (2003) in Innu (67):

(67) Ni- minenit -am -u -a -n tshe tshitute -t. (Montagnais)
1- be.happy -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s preverb leave -3s
‘I’m happy (in relation to her) that s/he’s leaving.’ (Junker, 2003:326)

(68) Your little boy wanted a job really badly. He went all over town, asked all the neighbours if they had work for him. He went back one day to the house, telling you, in a very excited voice that the next door neighbour was going to give him a few dollars to cut his grass. Then he went off to his room, all excited. You turned to your wife/husband and you smiled: “I think that we are both happy that he is so excited.”
How would you say… “I think we are both happy that he is so excited.”

(68a) niminêntamwânân ê-cihkênihta(hk). (WP)
ni- minênt -am -w -á -nân ê- cihkêniht -ahk
1- like -TI -REL -Dir -1p Conj- eager.for.TI -3s
‘We like it/are happy that he is eager for it.’

Thus, it seems that to be happy for someone’s actions is perhaps a fruitful syntactic and semantic frame for the appearance of the relational form. Indeed, the consultant offered the relational inflection for the verb minêntê- ‘to like/ enjoy’ or to be happy for something, just as in the example from Innu-Montagnais in (67). When
considering empathy as a condition for the use of the relational form, this is logical, as
to be happy for someone is to feel empathy towards their situation.

4.3.2.1. AI Paradigm

Finally, I attempted to elicit an AI paradigm for the relational form just as I had
done in the case of the TI verb wâpaht- previously discussed. However, my attempts did
not yield comparable results. While the TI relational was readily offered by most
consultants in both the Conjunct and the Independent orders, it was not so for the AI
verb nipâ- ‘to sleep’. These results may not be interpreted as proof that the relational
form is not used at all in the Independent order, as we have seen examples of AI verbs
occurring with the relational inflection in the context of possession, as in nicîpatapiwân
otêhtapiwinihk ‘I sat up straight in her chair’ (cf. 4.2.1.1). Perhaps the link between the
action of sleeping and the third person’s arrival was not one of affectedness and most
consultants interpreted them as actions with no necessary consequences on one another.

A. Independent order

(69) I was sleeping when he arrived from the city.
(69a) nikî-nipân kâ-kî-pê-takosi otênhâk ohci. (WA)
   ni- kî- nipâ -n kâ- kî- pê- takosin -k otênâhk ohci
   1- Pst- sleep.AI -1/2s Conj- Pst- hither- arrive.AI -3s city from
   ‘I slept when he arrived from the city.’

(70) Were you sleeping when he arrived from the city?
(70a) kikî-nipân nâ kâ-kî-takosihk otênâh(k) ohci? (WA)
   ki- kî- nipâ -n nâ kâ- kî- takosin -k otênâhk ohci
   2- Pst- sleep.AI -1/2s Q Conj- Pst- arrive.AI -3s city from
   ‘Were you sleeping when he arrived from the city?’
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We – exclusive – were sleeping when he arrived from the city.

You and I were sleeping when he arrived from the city.

Were you – pl – sleeping when he arrived from the city?

They (my parents) were sleeping when he arrived from the city.

She was sleeping when he arrived from the city.

Table 4.3 again compares nonrelational and relational inflections as given by Ellis in his (1971) article to the relational forms as elicited through fieldwork sessions this time for the AI verb nipâ- ‘to sleep’. In the Independent order, there were no results for the relational form. These are all compared to the TA equivalent nipêh- ‘to put’.
someone to sleep’. As we have seen, it seems that the use of the relational construction varies from consultant to consultant.

**Table 4.3: Animate intransitive nipâ- Independent order**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AI nonrelational</th>
<th>AI relational (Ellis, 1971)</th>
<th>AI relational as elicited</th>
<th>TA equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>nipâ-</td>
<td>nipâ-</td>
<td>nipâ-</td>
<td>nipêh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni-nipâ-n</td>
<td>ni-nipâ-w-â-n</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>ni-nipêh-âw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ki-nipâ-n</td>
<td>ki-nipâ-w-â-n</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>ki-nipêh-âw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ni-nipâ-nân</td>
<td>ni-nipâ-w-â-nân</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>ni-nipêh-ânân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ki-nipâ-nânaw</td>
<td>ki-nipâ-w-â-nânaw</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>ki-nipêh-ânaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>ki-nipâ-nânaww</td>
<td>ki-nipâ-w-â-nânaww</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>ki-nipêh-ânaww</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ø-nipâ-w</td>
<td>Ø-nipâ-w-ê-w</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Ø-nipêh-êw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>Ø-nipâ-wak</td>
<td>Ø-nipâ-w-ê-wak</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Ø-nipêh-êwak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>Ø-nipâ-niwa</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Ø-nipêh-êniwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no form of the Independent relational for nipâ- ‘to sleep’ in the elicitations for consultants, but this does not mean that it does not exist. After all, I have shown and discussed earlier, the relational form occurred at least in the Independent order first person with the AI verb api- ‘to sit’ in a context of possession. What is interesting, however, is the occurrence of the relational form with first person AI in the Conjunct, but not with second or third, as shown in B.

**B. Conjunct order**

Whereas no VAI relational inflections were elicited in the Independent order, some examples of relational inflections were elicited in the 1s of the Conjunct order.

(76) **He (my brother) arrived when I was sleeping.**

(76a) kî-pê- ohtohtêw […] mêkwâc ê-nipâwak. (SG)  
kî- pê- ohtohtê -w […] mêkwâc ê- nipâ -w -ak  
Pst- hither- come.from.there.AI -3s while Conj- sleep.AI -REL -1>3  
‘He came here while I was sleeping (in relation to him).’
(76b) nistês kî-pê-takosin mêkwâc ê-nipâwak. (N)
   ni- stês kî- pê- takosin mêkwâc ê- nipâ -w -ak
1.Poss- older.brother Pst- hither- arrive.AI while Conj- sleep.AI -REL -1>3

   ‘My older brother arrived while I was sleeping (in relation to him).’

(76c) (nistês) kî-(pê)-takosin mêkwâc ê-nipâyân. (K, OF, WA)
   (ni- stês) kî- (pê-) takosin mêkwâc ê- nipâ -yân
1.Poss- older.brother Pst- hither- arrive.AI while Conj- sleep.AI -1s

   ‘My older brother arrived here while I was sleeping.’

(77) **He arrived when you were sleeping.**
(77a) kî-(pê)-takosin nā kistês mēkwâc ê-nipâyân? (WA, OF)
   kî- pê- takosin nā kî- stês mēkwâc ê- nipâ -yan
Pst- hither- arrive.AI Q 2.Poss- older.brother while Conj- sleep.AI -1s

   ‘Did your older brother arrived when you were sleeping?’

(78) **He (our brother) arrived when we (my younger sibling and I) were sleeping.**
(78a) nistêsinân kî-takosin mēkwâc nîna akwa nisîma kâ-nipâyâhk (WA).
   ni- stês -inân kî- takosin mēkwâc nîna akwa
1.Poss- older.brother -1p Pst- arrive.AI while I and

   ni- sim- a kâ- nipâ -yâhk
1.Poss- younger.sibling -Obv.An Conj- sleep.AI -1p

   ‘Our older brother arrived when my younger sibling and I were sleeping.’

(79) **He (your brother) arrived when you and I were sleeping.**
(79a) kî-pê-takosin mēkwâc kîna akwa nîna ê-nipâyahk. (OF)
   kî- pê- takosin mēkwâc kîna akwa nîna ê- nipâ -yahk
Pst- hither- arrive.AI while you and I Conj- sleep.AI -21

   ‘He arrived when you and I were sleeping.’

(79b) kistês kî-pê-ohtohtêw mēkwâc ê-nipâyah(k). (SG)
   ki- stês kî- pê- ohtohtê -w mēkwâc
2.Poss- older.brother Pst- hither- come.from.there.AI -3 while

   ê- nipâ -yahk
Conj- sleep.AI- 21

   ‘Our (incl) older brother came while we (incl) were sleeping.’
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(80) **He (your brother) arrived when you (you and your younger sibling) were sleeping.**

(80a)  
kî-takosin nâ kistêsîwâw mêkwâc kâ-nipâyêk kîna ak(w)a kisîm-~/kisîmak?  
(WA)  
kî- takosin nâ ki- stêš-iwâw mêkwâc  
Pst- arrive.AI Q 2. Poss- older.brother -2p while

kâ- nipâ -yêk kîna akwa ki- sîm -ak  
Conj- sleep.AI -2p you and 2. Poss- younger.sibling -pl.An

‘Did your older brother arrived when you (pl) were sleeping?’

(81) **He (her brother) arrived when she was sleeping.**

(81a)  
östësa kî-takosiniwa mêkwâc ê-nipât. (N, WA, K)  
o- stêš -a kî- (pê-) takosin -iniwa  

mêkwâc ê- nipâ -t  
while Conj- sleep.AI -3s

‘Her older brother arrived while she was sleeping.’

(82) **He (his brother) arrived when they were sleeping.**

(82a)  
östësa kî-takosiniiniwa mêkwâc ê-nipâcik. (K)  
o- stêš -a kî- takosin-iniwa  

mêkwâc ê- nipâ -cik  
while Conj- sleep.AI -3p

‘His older brother arrived when they were sleeping.’

(82b)  
kî-takosin nistês mêkwac (kâhkinaw) kâ-nipâcik. (OF, WA)  
kî- takosin ni- stêš mêkwâc (kâhkinaw) ê/kâ- nipâ -cik  
Pst- arrive.AI 1. Poss- older.brother while all Conj- sleep.AI -3p

‘My older brother arrived when they were all sleeping.’

The following table shows a compilation of the elicitations for the Conjunction order. As shown in the diagram, the relational form was only elicited for the first person singular:
Table 4.4: Animate intransitive *nipâ*- Conjunct order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>AI nonrelational</th>
<th>AI relational (Ellis, 1971)</th>
<th>AI relational as elicited</th>
<th>TA equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>è-nipâ-</td>
<td>è-nipâ-</td>
<td>è-nipâ-</td>
<td>è-nipêh-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>è-nipâ-yân</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-ak</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-ak</td>
<td>è-nipêh-ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>è-nipâ-yâhk</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-âhk</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>è-nipêh-âyâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>è-nipâ-yâhk</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-âhk</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>è-nipêh-âyâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>è-nipâ-yêk</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-êk</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>è-nipêh-âyêk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>è-nipâ-t</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-ât</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>è-nipêh-ât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>è-nipâ-cik</td>
<td>è-nipâ-w-âcik</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>è-nipêh-âcik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>è-nipâ-nit</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>è-nipêh-ânit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results again may not be interpreted as proof that the relational form hardly occurs in the Conjunct order. However, they are also an indication that the relational form is by no means obligatory in cases of Complex Sentences, but perhaps serves as an emphasis of the effect of a third person’s actions on another. However, the fact that it only occurs with the first person singular may be a hint that, within the AI verbal complex, the relational inflection may be falling out of use. However, this is only based on a few examples, and no solid conclusions should be made. Perhaps if an AI verb paradigm was to be presented within a context of possession rather than within a complex clause, the elicitations offered might be different. This continues to be a topic for further research.

4.4. **Unspecified Actor Form**

The final common attested context of occurrence is the relational form occurring with an unspecified actor. It is especially common in Bloomfield’s 1930 and 1934 text collections. All occurrences are too numerous to list, but a few examples are given here:
(83)  awá ká-kíh-mátsít wíkih yáyíkisamwán, misiwá áh-píkusamuht. upáškisikan utinamwán.”
The tent of the one who had hunted would be cut into strips, and all his property cut up. His gun would be taken from him.” (Bloomfield, 1934:21)

(84)  pâhtam; wäwákistikwânäw; kuntah ká-pä-pâhpiyiht pâhtam.”
He heard it; he wrapped up his head; he heard someone come near to him, gaily laughing.” (Bloomfield, 1930:87)

The following questions were an attempt to see whether the relational form would occur in the unspecified actor in the dialect of Kinosao Sipi. In the first question, There was storytelling all night, the expletive there is used, thus the action has no specific actor.

(85)  There is a visitor in the community. He is visiting for a couple of weeks. The visitor was taken to a dance one night and there was storytelling all night. The visitor listened intently. How would you say: “there was storytelling all night”.

In (85a), the verb âcimo- ‘to tell stories’ is in the Independent order and in the third person plural. (85b) is in the reciprocal third person plural, and (85c) is an unspecified form of the verb, but not relational.

(85a)  kapê-tipisk kî-âcimowak. (AA, SG)
kapê-  tipisk  kî- âcimo -wak
throughout  night  Pst- tell.a.story.AI -3p
‘They told stories throughout the night.’

(85b)  âcimóstâtowak kapê-tipisk. (RH)
âcimóstâto -wak  kapê- tipisk
tell.stories.to.one.another.AI -3p  throughout- night
‘They told stories to one another.’

(85c)  kapê-tipisk  kî-âcimonâniwan. (WA)
kapê- tipisk  kî- âcimo -nâniwan.
throughout- night  Pst- tell.stories.AI -X
‘They (unspecified) told stories throughout the night.’
Not only did some speakers translate ‘there was storytelling all night’ with a third person actor, it seems that the presence of the visitor is not enough to trigger the use of the relational form in (85a-c). Again, this is perhaps an issue of empathy, and if the visitor had been presented as being a family member or close friend, the relational construction might have a better chance of occurring.

The second question is inspired from one in the literature, example (36) repeated here:

(86) māka kī-ihtāwak mitoni ē-kanawēyihtahkik ēwako óma, tāpiskoc simâkanisak k-ētwēcik anohc, ēkwa wiyawâw kayas kikēhtē-ayiminawâk ‘nīmihitowikamik’ kī-isiyēhkâtamwak - mitoni ani kā-nápēhkâsocik aniki, pihtēyask ē-cimatēyiki, ēkonīk ōki ē-wiysiwâtahkik tānisī óma kik-ēsi-pimiciwiht mina tānisī kik-ētâcichowiht, ahpō kik-âhtokēwiht tāyispī, ēkonīk ōki kā-kīsasiwâtamoht, kī-ihtakowak mina ēkonik aniki nāpēwak ē-wâsakâhtēcik ē-wihtamawâcik kahkiyaw ayīsiyiniwa.

There were, of course, people who were responsible for this, just like police when they say something today, and our elders long ago called it a ‘Dance Lodge’ – where the circle of poles stood, the braves decided how one should travel and how one should live, even when to move camp, they made the decisions – and now, the elders, once the decisions had been made, there were men who went around and announced them to all the people. (Ahenakew, 1987a:46-8).

In the sentence They decided how one should live, the generic actor ‘one’ is in the subordinate clause. The presence of the third person plural actor they in the main clause might condition the occurrence of the relational form in the subordinate clause:

(87) And so they decided how one should travel, when one should move and how one should live. They decided how decisions were to be made. How would you say: “They decided how one should live.”

In this instance, even if one is given as ‘awiyak’ or someone, the inflection is in the third person nonrelational.
In none of these contexts were relational inflections offered as possible elicitations. Notwithstanding, this does not imply that the relational form is not used at all with the unspecified actor. For instance, when asked to put the unspecified actor form in the Independent order of the verb pêtâ- ‘bring.it’, namely pêtâwân, the consultant recognized the form and the sentence given may be translated as ‘it was brought (to him) from outside’. Thus, this last example is an indication that the unspecified actor in the relational verb may be recognized, but perhaps other sentence types or contexts than those presented would have to be used to elicit it.

This last example, (88), is an example of a sentence which permits the use of a relational form. In this case, the form pêtâwân was translated as ‘it is brought’, in relation to him (i.e. *brought to him*).

The fact that the relational construction was not elicited by narratives is perhaps due to the fact that the unspecified actor is extremely hard to elicit in English. While there are definite and indefinite articles in English, there is no grammatical marking for specificity. Also, as discussed, the issue of Speaker empathy would need to be further explored in these contexts.
4.5. Conclusions

My time with the community of Kinosao Sipi has demonstrated that the relational form is in fact still active within this dialect of Swampy Cree, especially when dealing with contexts of possession in TI verbs. There are many future research projects which result from this fieldwork research, one of the most important being a future study of value judgments on relational and nonrelational inflections. More paradigms, especially active verbs, could be elicited. There may be other ways to elicit the relational form which might also be more productive, such as drawings. As Junker (2003) has demonstrated for East Cree, the relational construction occurs with TI and AI verbs when a third person possessor is concerned, especially in cases of inalienable possession and possessees closely linked to the possessor such as articles of clothing and stories. Indeed, pragmatic factors seem to be essential to the occurrence of the relational form. This is not a connection that has been previously established in literature. Thus, a relational verb marks the possessor, or third person participant, as a reference point. Van de Velde (2013) remarks that reference-point constructions in Cognitive Grammar refer to cases where “one salient entity can be used as a cognitive reference point to establish mental contact with another less salient entity” (Van de Velde, 2013:162). In fact, the third person participant accounted for by the relational inflection is more topical, thus more salient than the object of the verb. The notion of affectedness of the possessor, the empathy he inspires from the Speaker and its topicality, functional factors, will be further discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, emphasizing the importance of the intimate relationship between possessor and possessee.
Chapter 5: Understanding the Relational Form – Algonquian -im

5.0. Introduction

Bloomfield (1928), among others, has believed the relational form to be unique to Cree among Algonquian languages. However, there is a note in a Cree and Ojibwa resource book from the Ontario Ministry of Education about a relational inflection in certain dialects of Ojibwa, at least including Western Ojibwa spoken in Lac Seul, Ontario. Although this might be a borrowing from Cree, it is still worth noting the example given, which is followed by what would be its Plains Cree equivalent:

(89) Ninandawenimig ji-nagamowag.
    Ni- nandawenim -ig j i- nagamo -w -ag
    1- VTA.want -Inv(3>1) Conj- sing.Al -REL -1>3
    ‘He wants me to sing.’ (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002: 46)

(90) Ninitawêyimik ta-nikamowak.
    ni- nitawêyim -ik ta- nikamo -w -ak
    1- want.TA -3>1 Conj- sing.Al -REL -1>3
    ‘He wants me to sing (in relation to him).’

Notwithstanding, this is a fairly extraordinary example, and the relational form is definitely not widespread in the Algonquian languages. Thus, in this Chapter, I propose a typological study of another Algonquian construction, the morpheme -im, which functions very similarly to the relational form.

In section 5.1, I will introduce and define the construction. Section 5.2 will consist of an overview of -im in a few Algonquian languages, namely Cree, Kickapoo (Paul Voorhis, 1967; 1977) and Northern Ojibwa (Rogers, 1964). In section 5.3, I will discuss interpretations of the morpheme -im, namely Wolfart’s interpretation of it as an obviative marker, as well as Mühlbauer’s (2008) and Wolvengrey’s (2011:63-77)
account of -im as a disjunct marker, or marker of separation. Finally, in 5.4, I compare the use of -im to the relational morpheme and show how both forms are in fact very similar in function. Section 5.5 serves as a general conclusion for this chapter.

5.1. The Algonquian Morpheme -im

The morpheme -im (or Proto-Algonquian */-em/) in Algonquian languages is used in two general but overlapping contexts. Firstly, which I will not explore within the scope of this paper, it establishes possession in nouns in situations where possession is not inherent and where it needs to be confirmed or reinforced. For example, to mark the noun sîsîp ‘duck’ for possession, the possessive prefix is not enough: the additional suffix -im is also necessary, as in ni-sîsîp-im ‘my duck’, because ‘ducks’ in Cree culture are not usually possessed. Similarly, nâpêw ‘man’ becomes ni-nâpê-m ‘my man/husband’ and nipi’y ‘water’ becomes ni-nipi-m ‘my water’. Secondly, it establishes disjoint reference in the argument structure of TA verbs when the object is disjunct from another argument in the clause. Wolfart (1973:47) has noted that in Plains Cree, the morpheme /-im/ appears in direct TA verbs and occurs in the first suffixal position.

In Spoken Cree Level II, Ellis (2004:499-500) establishes the link between -im and the relational morpheme, proposing that in fact, -im should perhaps be considered the relational construction of Transitive Animate verbs. Indeed, -im seems to occur in TA verb constructions when another third person is present, as illustrated in the following examples provided by Ellis in Moose Cree (Ellis, 2004: 499) (-im is in boldface):

(91) n’tayâwimâwa alicîmina wîla ohci
nit- ayâw -im -â -w -a alicîmin -a wîla ohci
1- have.TA -Disj -Dir -1>3 -Obv.An bean-Obv.An him for
‘I have some beans_{obv} for him.’
In (91), wîla ('him') is neither the actor nor the goal of the action but the recipient (or object of the prepositional phrase), the actor being n’t ‘I’ and the object, alîcîmina the animate obviative ‘beans’. In (92), napakâhtikwa ('the planks'), an animate (plural) noun, is marked as the obviative, since the actor of the matrix is a third person proximate (he). However, Ellis remarks that the subordinate verb in (92), natawêlimatîpan, ‘to want something animate’, which has a second person singular actor, is marked with -im. He suggests that this could be explained “if the … is regarded as carrying the force of a relational marker the transitive action of the verb may be seen as directed at an object which stands in relation to 3 or 3’ ” (Ellis, 2004:500). He notes that since the morpheme -im occurs in contexts where there are two degrees of separation in the Algonquian person hierarchy between the goal and the actor, the degree in the hierarchy separating the goal and actor is always a third person, whether it be proximate or obviative. Indeed, in both examples above, the suffix -im acknowledges the presence of a proximate third person, who is not directly participating in the action. Thus, the action is always in ‘relation to a third person’, which is higher ranking than the object. Clarke (1982) notes, when referring to -im in TA verbs, that “while TA verbs have no relational forms as such – unlike TI and AI verbs – they do possess a set of forms which, at first glance, might appear to play a role similar to the relational” (Clarke, 1982:80). This would expand the relational pattern to AI, TI and TA verbs. However, -im as a relational morpheme bears no phonological resemblance to the -w, which is recognized as the
relational morpheme for TI and AI verbs. The possible link between both forms -w and -im (in certain verb constructions) as suppletive allomorphs will be further investigated.

5.2. /-im/ in Algonquian Languages

5.2.1. Cree

As established in 5.1, -im occurs when the local speech act participants interact with an obviative, and when a third person acts on a further obviative.\(^{21}\) Thus, these are strictly direct interactions. Following are direct interaction paradigms, subdivided in Mixed Order Set (2,1 persons acting on a third person) and third person set interactions (third persons interacting). For grammatical reasons, there are no Imperative order paradigms for the third person set. The occurrences of -im are in boldface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1 prefix stem</th>
<th>Animate 2</th>
<th>Example ‘to help someone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s- ni-</td>
<td>-āw</td>
<td>niwīcihāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s- ki-</td>
<td>-āw</td>
<td>kiwīcihāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p- ni-</td>
<td>-ānān</td>
<td>niwīcihānān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- ki-</td>
<td>-ānaw</td>
<td>kiwīcihānaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p- ki-</td>
<td>-āwāw</td>
<td>kiwīcihāwāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s- ni-</td>
<td>-āwak</td>
<td>niwīcihāwak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s- ki-</td>
<td>-āwak</td>
<td>kiwīcihāwak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p- ni-</td>
<td>-ānānak</td>
<td>niwīcihānānak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- ki-</td>
<td>-ānawak</td>
<td>kiwīcihānawak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p- ki-</td>
<td>-āwāwak</td>
<td>kiwīcihāwāwak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s- ni-</td>
<td>-imāwa</td>
<td>niwīcihimāwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s- ki-</td>
<td>-imāwa</td>
<td>kiwīcihimāwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p- ni-</td>
<td>-imānāna</td>
<td>niwīcihimānāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- ki-</td>
<td>-imānawā</td>
<td>kiwīcihimānawā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p- ki-</td>
<td>-imāwāwa</td>
<td>kiwīcihimāwāwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) Again, this may not be sufficient to ensure that -im occurs at all though this disjoint scenario is met.
### Table 5.2: VTA Conjunct order mixed set direct interactions
*(Wolvengrey, 2011:70)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1 cmpl stem</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>-3s</th>
<th>-3p</th>
<th>-3’</th>
<th>Example ‘to help someone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s- ē-</td>
<td>-3s</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td>ē-wīcihak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s- ē-</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td>ē-wīcihat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p- ē-</td>
<td>-3s</td>
<td>-āyāhk</td>
<td>ē-wīcihāyāhk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- ē-</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td>ē-wīcihāyahk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p- ē-</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td>ē-wīcihāyēk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1s- ē-        | -3s | -akik | ē-wīcihakik         |
| 2s- ē-        | -3s | -acik | ē-wīcihacik         |
| 1p- ē-        | -3s | -āyāhk | ē-wīcihāyāhk         |
| 21- ē-        | -3p | -āyahk | ē-wīcihāyahk         |
| 2p- ē-        | -3p | -āyēk | ē-wīcihāyēk         |

| 1s- ē-        | -3p | ē-wīcih |         |
| 2s- ē-        | -3p | ē-wīcih |         |
| 1p- ē-        | -3p | ē-wīcih |         |
| 21- ē-        | -3p | ē-wīcih |         |
| 2p- ē-        | -3p | ē-wīcih |         |

### Table 5.3: VTA Imperative order mixed set interactions
*(Wolvengrey, 2011:73)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>-3s</th>
<th>-3p</th>
<th>-3’</th>
<th>Example ‘to help someone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 stem</td>
<td>-3s</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td></td>
<td>wīcih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s- -Ø</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td></td>
<td>wīcihihk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p- -ihk</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td></td>
<td>wīcihihk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- -ātān</td>
<td>-3p</td>
<td>-3’</td>
<td></td>
<td>wīcihihätān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2s- -ik      | -3p | -3’ | wīcihik                  |
| 2p- -ihk     | -3p | -3’ | wīcihihk                  |
| 21- -ātānik  | -3p | -3’ | wīcihihätānik            |

| 2s- -im      | -3p | -3’ | wīcihim                   |
| 2p- -imihk   | -3p | -3’ | wīcihihim                 |
| 21- -imätān  | -3p | -3’ | wīcihihimätān            |
Delayed Imperative

2s-  -āhkan  wīcihāhkan
2p-  -āhkēk  wīcihāhkēk
21-  -āhkahk  wīcihāhkahk

2s-  -āhanik  wīcihāhanik
2p-  -āhkēkōk  wīcihāhkēkōk
21-  -āhkahkōk  wīcihāhkahkōk

2s-  -imāhkan  wīcihimāhkan
2p-  -imāhkēk  wīcihimāhkēk
21-  -imāhkahk  wīcihimāhkahk

Table 5.4: VTA Independent order third person set direct interactions
(Wolvengrey, 2011:76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1 prefix stem</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>Example ‘to help someone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3s-</td>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>wīcihēw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p-</td>
<td>-ēwak</td>
<td>wīcihēwak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’-</td>
<td>-ēyiwa</td>
<td>wīcihēyiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s-</td>
<td>-imēw</td>
<td>wīcihimēw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p-</td>
<td>-imēwak</td>
<td>wīcihimēwak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: VTA Conjunct order third person set direct interactions
(Wolvengrey, 2011:79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1 cmpl stem</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>Example ‘to help someone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3s-</td>
<td>ē-</td>
<td>wīcihāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p-</td>
<td>ē-</td>
<td>wīcihācik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’-</td>
<td>ē-</td>
<td>wīcihāyit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s-</td>
<td>ē-</td>
<td>wīcihimāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p-</td>
<td>ē-</td>
<td>wīcihimācik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’-</td>
<td>ē-</td>
<td>wīcihāýit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These paradigms show how -im indeed occurs with two degrees of separation, in mixed sets in Independent, Conjunct and Imperative orders when a first or second person acts on an obviative person, and in third person sets in Independent and Conjunct orders when a third person acts on a further obviative.
However, Ellis has also noted a recent development in Moose Creek where both
-im and -h seem to mark the obviative in the inverse conjunct order. The morpheme -im
occurs when an obviative acts on a local speech act participant, as shown in the
following table (Ellis, 1971:90):

Table 5.6: -im in Cree VTA Conjoint indicative inverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTA Conjoint Indicative (Inverse)</th>
<th>3s</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>3'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-icik</td>
<td>-emicih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-esk</td>
<td>-eskik</td>
<td>-emeskih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-iyamiht</td>
<td>-iyamihcik</td>
<td>-(em)iyanihcik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-etahkw</td>
<td>-etahkok</td>
<td>-etahkoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-etâkw</td>
<td>-etâkok</td>
<td>-etâkoh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this is highly unusual in Cree, its pattern accords with the rule of two degrees
of separation between the actor and goal, or the participants of the action, as indicated by
Wolvengrey (2011).

5.2.2. Kickapoo (Mesquakie)

-em as a marker of separation is also valid for Kickapoo, a dialect of
Mesquakie, which is an Algonquian language spoken in Kansas, Oklahoma and northern
Mexico. In Kickapoo, -em occurs when the verb is in the “second voice”. Verb stems in
the second voice refer to first and second persons interacting with obviative third
persons, and end in -emaa, -em (Voorhis, 1967: 89). The first voice, on the other hand,
designates instances where the local speech participants (1 & 2) act on a proximate third
person, ending in -aa, -ee, iee, -Ø. Thus in Kickapoo, like in Cree, -em appears in
transitive constructions when there are two degrees of separation between actor and

---

22 PA *e and *i have merged in Cree, but have kept separate in Mesquakie.
patient. However, Voorhis admits that the full distribution of *-em* in Kickapoo TA verbs is not certain.

The following tables contrast the paradigms of the first and second voices in Kickapoo, with the local speech act participants (1 and 2 persons) in thematic position. The voice suffix for the second voice is */-emaa/ (Voorhis, 1967:114). The Conjugate order is shown in Table 5.7 and the Indicative [Independent] Order in Table 5.8.

Although a few forms are missing in these tables (e.g. 2 > 3p, 3p > 2 in Table 5.11), they very well illustrate the use of *-em* in Kickapoo. In the Indicative, Voorhis notes (1967:99) that, in colloquial language, the second voice has fallen out of use.

**Table 5.7: VTA Conjugate order personal inflection** (Voorhis, 1967:125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First voice</th>
<th>Endings</th>
<th>Second voice</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &gt; 3</td>
<td>-aka</td>
<td>1 &gt; 3’</td>
<td>-emakini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &gt; 3p</td>
<td>-akiki</td>
<td>1 &gt; 3’p</td>
<td>-emakiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &gt; 3</td>
<td>-ata</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3’</td>
<td>-emacini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p &gt; 3</td>
<td>-aketa</td>
<td>1p &gt; 3’</td>
<td>-emakecini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p &gt; 3p</td>
<td>-akeciki</td>
<td>1p &gt; 3’p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p &gt; 3</td>
<td>-eekwa</td>
<td>2p &gt; 3’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p &gt; 3p</td>
<td>-eekwiki</td>
<td>2p &gt; 3’p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &gt; 1</td>
<td>-ita</td>
<td>3’ &gt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p &gt; 1</td>
<td>-iciki</td>
<td>3’p &gt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &gt; 2</td>
<td>-ehka</td>
<td>3’ &gt; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.8: VTA Indicative Order personal inflection (Voorhis, 1967:99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First voice</th>
<th>Endings</th>
<th>Second voice</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &gt; 3</td>
<td>n – aã</td>
<td>1 &gt; 3’</td>
<td>n – emaã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &gt; 3p</td>
<td>n – aãki</td>
<td>1 &gt; 3’p</td>
<td>n – emaãki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &gt; 3</td>
<td>k – aã</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3’</td>
<td>*k – emaã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &gt; 3p</td>
<td>*k – aãki</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3’p</td>
<td>*k – emaãki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p &gt; 3(p)</td>
<td>n – aapena</td>
<td>1p &gt; 3’(p)</td>
<td>n – emaapena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 &gt; 3(p)</td>
<td>k – aapena</td>
<td>21 &gt; 3’(p)</td>
<td>*k – emaapena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p &gt; 3(p)</td>
<td>k – aapwa</td>
<td>2p &gt; 3’(p)</td>
<td>*k – emaapwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &gt; 3’</td>
<td>-ea /-ee</td>
<td>3’ &gt; 3’’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p &gt; 3’</td>
<td>-eaki</td>
<td>3’p &gt; 3’’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X &gt; 3(p)</td>
<td>-aapi</td>
<td>X &gt; 3’(p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the use of the morpheme -em seems to somewhat vary from the Independent to the Conjunct, but does confirm the fact that it is indeed a marker of separation, as it is in Cree.

#### 5.2.3. Northern Ojibwa

-im as a marker of separation is also confirmed by Rogers’ (1964) study of Northern Ojibwa. In the Ojibwa Independent order, -im is suffixed to the verb stem preceding the direct or inverse theme sign when “4 objects [i.e. obviative objects] are acted upon by 1 and 2 subjects” (Rogers, 1964:123). However, in Ojibwa, -im does not only occur in direct interactions, but in the Conjunct Order inverse forms as well, like in Moose Cree: “In TA forms, theme sign /-im/, followed by other theme signs (direct /-â/ and inverse /-inin/) indicates 4 objects with 1, 2 and X subjects (direct forms) and 4 subjects with 1 and 2 objects (inverse forms)” (Rogers, 1964:129).

Furthermore, -im is suffixed to TA verbs in the Imperative order when second persons (singular and plural) subjects act on obviative objects, like in Cree.
5.3. **Function and Meaning of -im**

The traditional view of the predicate suffix -im is that it marks obviative objects: Wolfart calls it a “thematic obviative sign” (Wolfart, 1973: 47), and refers to the /-im/ as an obviative marker. Thus, if -im is to be interpreted as an obviative marker, “the obviative category is doubly expressed [or highly marked] in the independent order, namely by /-im/ and /-hl/, the occurrence of /-im/ is its only sign in the conjunct order” (Wolfart, 1973: 54).

However, Wolfart notes that in the context of third person interactions, -im is optional. For instance, examine the following two examples from Wolfart (1973:54).

(93) kêtahtawê êkwah o- cihciy -yiw otin -am;
Presently and.also 3.Poss- hand -Obv.Disj.In took -TI;

oc- âhcanis -iyiw -a otin -im -ê -w.
3- ring -Obv.Disj -Obv.An took.TA -Disj -Dir -1>3
‘Presently, she took his hand; she took his ring’

(94) êkwa êtokê, asawâpi -w êkwa awa nâpêw ê- kî-
then it seems look.around.AI -3 then this man Conj- Pst-

nitawi- mêscih -ât nêhi o- nâpêm -iyiwa õhi w- ìw -a.
‘Then, it seems, this man looked around and then went to annihilate those lovers of his wife…’

In both of these examples, a third person actor is interacting with another third person, a further obviative (3’’), in relation to another third person, an obviated person (i.e. his ring, his wife). However, in (93) -im occurs, and in example (94), it does not, with no apparent pattern, unless the -im in (93) emphasizes that a human is present and outranks the animate (non-human) ring, ocâhcanisïyiwa.
There is evidence that in many contexts, \(-im\) occurs when the patient of the action (in TA verbs) is obviative. However, there are instances where \(-im\) does not appear when there is an obviative object present such as (95) (Mühlbauer, 2008: 128).

\[
\text{êkotê êkwa itohtahêw ana wîwa}
\]
\[
\text{êkotê êkwa itoht -ê -w}
\]
\[
\text{ana w- îw -a}
\]
\[
\text{there then walk.} \text{there.} \text{TA} \text{ -Dir} -3 \text{ Dst.} \text{An 3. Poss} - \text{wife} -\text{Obv.} \text{An}
\]
\[
\text{‘then that}_{\text{prox}} \text{ [man]} \text{ took his}_{\text{prox}} \text{ wife}_{\text{obv}} \text{ there;}\]

According to Mühlbauer’s research, although the appearance of \(-im\) in TA verbs has until recently been interpreted as an obviative marker, it is now clear that the presence of an obviative object may not necessarily condition the use of the morpheme. Observe the following table given by Mühlbauer (2008:127), the checkmarks indicating when the use of \(-im\) is triggered, and the asterixes, when it is not:

**Table 5.9: \(-im\) and the obviative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-im)</th>
<th>\text{INTRANSITIVE}</th>
<th>\text{TRANSITIVE}</th>
<th>\text{X&gt; OBV}</th>
<th>\text{1/2 &gt; OBV}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\text{OBV}</td>
<td>\text{OBV &gt; X}</td>
<td>\text{OBV &gt; OBV}</td>
<td>\text{PROX &gt; OBV}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\text{OBV}</td>
<td>\text{PROX &gt; OBV}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\ast)</td>
<td>(\ast)</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>(\ast/\checkmark)</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mühlbauer’s table indicates that \(-im\) may appear in contexts where an obviative acts on another obviative, but provides no examples to illustrate this\(^{23}\). He also indicates that it occurs when the proximate person acts on certain obviatives and when a second or first person acts on an obviative person.

Thus, can we truly say it is an obviative marker? Contrast the following two examples: in example (96) ‘I saw Wâpastim’s cat’, where the owner of the cat is explicitly mentioned and is in the proximate third person, whereas in example (97), \(-im\)

\(^{23}\) This differs from Wolvengrey’s (2011) Third-person set direct interaction paradigms (cf. 5.1.4), where \(-im\) does not occur when an obviative acts on another obviative.
is absent and the owner is only implied by the presence of the possessive marker o-

prefixed to minôs- and the possessive suffix -im also on the noun:

(96) niwâpamimâwa Wâpastim ominôsima
ni- wâpam -im -â -w -a wâpastim o- minôs -im -a
‘I saw Wâpastim’s prox catobv…’

(97) niwâpamâw ominôsima
ni- wâpam -â -w o- minôs -im -a
l- see.TA -Dir -3 3.Poss- cat -Poss -Obv.An
‘I saw [Wâpastim’s prox] catobv’

In fact, Mühlbauer suggests that, rather than being an obviative object marker,

-im actually marks argument disjunction, since, if there are cases where -im occurs
without marking obviation, in all those contexts, “-im codes that the object is disjoint
from another potential argument in the clause” (Mühlbauer, 2008: 128). Thus, the suffix
-im is understood by him as a “restricctor on arguments, coding that they are disjunct from
some other argument” (Mühlbauer, 2008: 133). Mühlbauer’s interpretation of -im is that
there is a choice involved and the marking is optional if the intermediate third person is
not mentioned. Additionally, it seems that “/-em/ occurs only when the possessum can be
conceived as disjoint from the possessee [sic]24” (Clarke 1982, paraphrased in
Mühlbauer 2008: 136). The actual citation is from Mailhot, who refers specifically to
body parts, where “a part of the body is treated as a detached entity, the noun will take
the possessed suffix /-em/” (Mailhot’s personal communication paraphrased in Clarke
1982:27). Thus, Mühlbauer expands this statement to apply to all uses of the morpheme
-im.

24 ‘possessum’ and ‘possessee’ are synonyms. Clarke (and Mühlbauer) undoubtedly means that the
possessum is disjoint from the possessor.
Wolvengrey (2011: 67) offers an analysis as a disjoint marker of -im similar to Mühlbauer’s, observing that it seems to signal an extra degree of separation on the person hierarchy. This alternative analysis is suggested by the fact that, in mixed and third-person set paradigms, the morpheme only occurs “when the persons interacting are separated by more than a single degree on the Algonquian Person Hierarchy” (Wolvengrey, 2011: 67). The Algonquian Person Hierarchy has been established as such: 2 > 1 > 3 > 3’ > 3’’ (Wolvengrey, 2011:58). However, as one may observe in the following diagram (Table 5.10), the ranking between first and second person is not as important as the one between the third person, obviative, and further obviative. Consequently, it means that -im would occur in contexts where a 1 or 2 person acts on an obviative (3’) or that a 3 acts on a further obviative (3’’):

**Table 5.10: -im as a marker of separation**

![Diagram of Algonquian Person Hierarchy with -im as a marker of separation]

(Wolvengrey, 2011:77)

This interpretation is indeed very interesting as it would explain Ellis’ examples in (91) and (92) above. Both, in effect, show an interaction between the first/second person and the obviative. The actor and goal are separated by two degrees of separation in the hierarchy, since, as mentioned by Mühlbauer, the presence of an obviative marker ‘forces’ the presence of a proximate person, necessarily implying the presence of an
outranking additional third person, the proximate. The same concept may be applied to
cases where a third person proximate acts on a further obviative 3”, the further obviative
implying the presence of an obviative.

There are a few differences in the data gathered by Wolvengrey, Ellis, Mühlbauer
and Wolfart. The data gathered by Wolvengrey and Ellis appear to show that -im is
obligatory in cases of disjoint reference. On the other hand, Wolfart’s and Mühlbauer’s
show that a choice can be made by the Speaker. Consequently, pragmatic factors may
influence the use of the morpheme -im, like it is the case for the relational form.
Thus, Ellis’ interpretation of the -im as a VTA relational is interesting, as the additional
third person participant in VTI and VAI relational constructions always outranks the
inanimate patient. I will discuss this further in 5.4.

5.4. Comparing the Relational Morpheme -w and -im

Indeed, the Cree relational seems to be modelled on TA /-im/ verbs. It marks the
presence of an extra animate participant, exclusively third person, in the context of
possession, presentative interpretation (Junker, 2003:324) and complex sentences. The
following examples (98) and (100) are in the relational form while (99) and (101) are TA
verbs with the morpheme -im:

(98) kwâcistak manâ! mèkwac man’ ânt’ ê-nîpawit cahkâpêš, wêhci-nawatinamîwât
manâ ospitóninîw ê-wîy-at’-otinân’ci anih’ āmiskwa.

Good gracious! While Chahkabesh stood there he suddenly seized the giant’s
arm as he was going to reach for that beaver. (Ellis, 1995:96)

(99) niwâpamîmâwa Wâpastim ominôsima
‘I saw Wâpastim’sPROX catOBV …’ (Mühlbauer, 2008:127)
Thus I am greatly content that they have listened to me, and I give thanks for it that they, too, understand this. (Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw, 1998:48)

He had the planks which you had been wanting. (Ellis, 2004:500)

These examples illustrate two contexts where the relational form appears: (98) and (99) contain a third person possessor and (100) and (101) are complex sentences, where the actor of the subordinate verb may condition the appearance of the relational form (-w or -im) in the main verb (or vice versa). Thus, -im seems to occur in TA verbs in the same circumstances as the relational form in TI and AI verbs, as summarized in Table 5.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>E.g.</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Additional participant</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Goal Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>Cahnâpêš</td>
<td>3 &gt; giant 3’ &gt; ospîtônîniw his arm 0</td>
<td>relational TI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>ni- 1</td>
<td>1 &gt; wâpastim 3 &gt; ominôsîma his cat 3’</td>
<td>-im TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-clausal syntax</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1 &gt; them 3p &gt; it 0</td>
<td>relational TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>you 2 &gt; he 3s &gt; napâkâhtikwa planks 3’</td>
<td>-im TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the relational form also marks a disjoint reference. Junker notes that “relational verbs are disjoint reference devices, often used for expressing possession” (Junker, 2003: 308) and that the “TI relational verb forms are obligatory when there is disjoint reference between the subject of a transitive clause and the object’s possessor” (Junker, 2003: 319). This further supports the similarity between -im and the relational form. These are further indications that the morpheme /-w/ has been drafted in Cree to do
for AI and TI verbs what -im does for TA verbs across the Algonquian family. The morpheme -im in TA verbs potentially served as a model for the relational construction and explains why Cree built the relational inflection in the first place, but rather than using -im, it drafted the third person marker -w.

Positional evidence also supports this hypothesis. In 5.1, I mentioned that -im occurs in first suffixal position in TA verbs, followed by TA theme sign -ā or -ē. The TA theme signs are followed by person suffixes. In TI and AI verbs, the relational morpheme also precedes the TA theme signs. The following table is a very general demonstration of Cree suffix positions\(^\text{25}\), but illustrates the similarities in position between relational AI and TI verbs as well as TA verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.12 Positional similarities between -im and -w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the relational morpheme -w follows the TI theme sign -am in TI relational verbs, it always precedes the TA theme sign and the person endings for speech participants and third persons. This is exactly the case in TA and AI verbs, where the relational form and the -im are in first position, preceding the TA theme sign and person endings, as well as any possible mode signs. It is important to note that the Obviative theme sign -iyi (Plains Cree), does not occur in conjunction with relational verbs.

---

\(^{25}\) For a more detailed table, please consult Wolfart (1973 :47-9).
The following examples demonstrate these positional similarities:

(102) a. TI Independent relational: kiwâpahtamwân
    ki- wâpaht -am -w -â -n
    2- see -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s
    ‘I see it in relation to him/her/them’

    b. TA Independent -im: kiwâpamimâwa
    ki- wâpam -im -â -w -a
    2- see -Disj -Dir -1>3 -Obv
    ‘I see someone’

Thus, positional similarities show additional evidence to support the hypothesis that Cree has drafted the third person marker -w to function like -im in TI and AI verbs.

5.5. Conclusions

If the distribution of -im has puzzled many researchers, a comparative study of its use and distribution in Kickapoo, Ojibwa and Cree suggests that the morpheme -im is not an obviative marker, nor even a marker of separation, but a marker of the presence of a third person more topical than the goal. In fact, there is always the implied or explicit presence of an additional animate third person participant, which is proximate in cases of mixed set interactions; and obviative in third person interactions. The relational form in Cree, which marks the presence of an additional animate third person participant in AI and TI verbs, works in a very similar manner. Like -im in TA verbs, it serves to mark a more topical third person which is not the actor or goal of the clause, and to mark disjoint reference, specifically in contexts of possession, where the actor of the TI clause is disjoint from the object’s possessor. Thus, studying the relational form in light of the existence of -im in the Algonquian languages is a way of understanding the origin and use of the relational construction.
Chapter 6: Understanding the Relational Form – External Possessor Constructions

6.0. Introduction

Junker (2003:322-3) summarizes that the differences between the relational inflection and valency-increasing constructions such as applicatives are that the relational form may only refer to animate third persons which are not “syntactically licensed as overt NPs by the inflectional morphology”, and to possessors in cases of disjoint reference. She also notes that, to further understand this inflection, a comparison with External Possessor Constructions (EPCs) is in fact a fruitful area of study, as these constructions function very similarly to the relational construction. Van de Velde and Lamiro (ms) define EPCs as constructions “in which the possessor is not expressed in the same constituent as the possessee, but functions as a separate constituent at clause level” (Van de Velde & Lamiro, ms:5). Thus, the possessor “takes the role of an ‘unlicensed’ argument, a role for which there is no room in the ‘valency’ of the verb” (Van de Velde, 2013:156). This is a prototypical example of EPCs in Dutch:

(103) Ze heeft hem de keel door-gesneden
she has him the throat through-cut
‘She cut his throat’ (Van de Velde, 2013:161).

Although the relational form is not limited to possession, and EPCs are not limited to third person referents, there are some important similarities between the two constructions. They are both motivated by pragmatic factors: they mark possessor affectedness and topicality, as well as speaker empathy towards the possessor, as demonstrated in 6.1. These constructions are also formally similar, as they are not
syntactically licensed by the verb, and may be considered ‘in-between’ constructions. I will discuss this issue further in section 6.2. However, they are also formally very different: Cree is a nonconfigurational polysynthetic language, thus the grammatical information is carried in the verb. Languages such as Dutch, German, Italian, Spanish and French, which make use of EPCs, are configurational and the possessor is marked as a dative or indirect object. In fact, as provided by Van de Velde and Lamiroy (ms), the range of use of EPCs in European languages is accounted for by the languages’ level of configurationality. They establish clines for Romance and West Germanic languages where the level of configurationality is inversely proportional to the use of EPCs. In section 6.3, I review this and propose to integrate an extremely nonconfigurational language – i.e. Cree – to their cline.

6.1. Functional Similarities: Pragmatic Functions

Authors such as Van de Velde (2013) and O’Connor (2007) agree there are certain pragmatic factors which justify the existence and occurrence of the external possessor construction. Important characteristics include the fact that “(i) the EPC’s possessor is highly affected; (ii) the EPC’s possessor is a focus of empathy; and (iii) the EPC’s possessor is highly topical” (Payne & Barshi, 1999 cited in O’Connor, 2007:579). These motivating factors for the use of the EP constructions are extremely interesting and relevant to the relational form in Cree, and seem to indicate that, indeed, the relational form and EPCs have the same pragmatic meaning and functions.
6.1.1. Possessor Topicality

O’Connor (2007:587) discusses topicality of the possessor as a possible condition for the use of EPCs, i.e. that an External Possessor Construction is chosen by the speaker when the possessor “is highly ranked as a topic in the ongoing discourse” (O’Connor, 2007:587) and is particularly salient. Another possible hypothesis she presents is that the possessor could also be a topic, which is foregrounded, and that the rest of the utterance is simply comment on the topicalized possessor.

Van de Velde notes that EPCs (or his term, Indirect Object External Possessors) follow the topicality hierarchy (Van de Velde, 2013:161) and that examples decrease in acceptability as the possessor moves from left to right on this cline:

Table 6.1: Topicality of possessor\(^\text{26}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Order</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2 person pronoun</td>
<td>Ze heeft hem de keel door-gesneden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 person pronoun</td>
<td>‘She cut his throat’ (Van de Velde, 2013:161).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other animate NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (104) is an example where the possessor is a third person pronoun, and may be considered somewhat of a prototypical example of an EPC in Dutch:

(104) Ze heeft hem de keel door-gesneden
she has him the throat through-cut

This example shows well how EPCs are structured: the possessor and possessee are not part of the same NP, and the possessor takes up the grammatical role of indirect object.

---

\(^{26}\) This is a prototypical and expected hierarchy of topicality, which might be modified in certain discourse-specific examples.
In contrast, the following two examples are questionable in Dutch, and are cases of a non-human NP possessor (*zijn hamster*) in (105) and inanimate NP possessor (*de boom*) in (106):

(105) **Ze heeft zijn hamster een oog uit-gestoken**

she has *his hamster* an eye out-gouged

‘She has gouged out his hamster’s eye’ (Van de Velde, 2013:161).

(106) **Ze heeft de boom de takken door-gezaagd**

she has *the tree* the branches through-sawn

‘She sawed the branches off the tree’

These two examples, although not ungrammatical, are judged questionable in (105) (with a non-human NP possessor), and very questionable in (106) (with an inanimate NP possessor), due to the fact that the possessor is not considered very topical.

In Cree, topicality plays a role in the use of the relational form. The possessor or additional third person participant in Cree has to be animate and thus more prototypically topical than the inanimate possessee or patient. Furthermore, it seems that a highly topical possessor within the discourse, such as the Old-Woman Dream-Spirit in (107) may condition the use of the relational form. This example is repeated from section 3.2 (example (28)):

Indeed, it is then that the old people, those sitting over there, used to receive the blessing, they used to receive the blessing, well, and then there she is, never to be overlooked, the Old Woman as she is called, that Old Woman dream-spirit. The sun-dance is powerful, for you to watch these women standing crowded over there [on their side of the lodge] as you look over here where the men are few and far between; behold, the women’s chanting is strong, therefore never overlook them, you should always give them something! With that you will make the Old-Woman-Spirit grateful so that she will answer your prayers with something: this is what the old people used to say.

Now when you braid this, when you braid sweetgrass in three strands, you are **braiding that grace of the Sweetgrass-Spirit with respect to her [the Old-Woman-Spirit]**, that is why people used to have it given to them, you see a woman with braids, she braids them in three strands. (Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw, 1998:128)

This example shows that a highly topical participant may trigger the use of the relational form. However, topicality is usually not sufficient to condition the use of the relational form, just as it is not always sufficient to trigger the use of EPCs. Two other factors appear even more important, namely possessor affectedness and speaker empathy.

### 6.1.2. Possessor Affectedness

External Possessor Constructions may also be conditioned by how the Speaker perceives the possessor will be affected by the outcome of the action on its possessee. Affectedness can refer to physical affectedness, as well as social or emotional effect. The prototypical EPCs concern physical affectedness on a body-part possessee, and are found in all languages which have External Possessor Constructions.

The prototypical examples of EPCs in Dutch occur with privative verbs involving physical contact. These are cases where the possessor is extremely affected by the action, and, in fact, is at a loss or deprived of something. The possessees, in these examples, are also body parts: the body and its possessor form a part-whole relationship and what affects the part also affects the whole in a very significant way:
As in these examples, Dutch EPCs are restricted to cases where there is a “natural association between the possessor and the possessee”, i.e. to inalienable possession (Van de Velde, 2013:162). Inalienable possession in Dutch includes not only body parts and clothes, but also itineraries and culturally associated objects. Kinship terms are not inalienable in Dutch (Van de Velde, 2013:160).

Lee-Schoenfeld (2006:103) argues that in German, it is also essential that the Possessor Dative have an obligatory relationship with the possessee and that it be an affectee argument of the verb. In fact, the greater the effect, positive or negative, evident on the possessor, the more appropriate is the EPC:

(108) Zij rukte **mij** een been af.
She tore **me** a leg off.
‘She tore my leg off.’ (Van de Velde, 2013:160)

(109) Hij (...) trok **hem** een tand uit.
He pulled **him** a tooth out
‘He pulled one of his teeth out.’ (Van de Velde, 2013:160)

*Tim wohnt Lena im Garten.
Tim lives Lena (Dat) in the garden
‘Tim lives in Lena’s garden.’ (Lee-Schoenfeld, 2006:108)

*?Tim steht Lena im Garten herum.
Tim walks Lena (Dat) in the garden around
‘Tim stands around in Lena’s garden.’ (Lee-Schoenfeld, 2006:108)

**Tim steht Lena den ganzen Tag im Weg.
Tim stands Lena (Dat) the whole day in the way
‘Tim stands in Lena’s way all day.’ (Lee-Schoenfeld, 2006:108)

*Tim ruiniert Lena den schönen Garten.
Tim digs Lena (Dat) the beautiful garden
‘Tim ruins Lena’s beautiful garden.’ (Lee-Schoenfeld, 2006:108)
In examples (110) and (111), the involvement of the possessor is not evident: the fact that Tim lives or stands around in Lena’s garden might have some kind of effect on Lena, but it is not clear. It is only in (112) and (113), where Lena is evidently affected, and in these instances in a negative way, where EPCs are fully acceptable. In (112) Lena’s movements are impeded by Tim’s interference, and in (113) her work in her garden is completely destroyed.

In Mandarin Chinese, there are two constructions which could be considered EPCs: the Double-Unaccusative Construction and the Inalienable Bā-Construction (Kusmer, 2010). The Double-Unaccusative Construction (DUC) is when an accusative verb takes a second Determiner Phrase (DP: i.e. Noun Phrase) argument in a construction such as DP_{Possessor} V DP_{Possessee}. The Possessor shares a whole-part relationship with the Possessee by and is always in a Malaffectee role:

(114) Wǒ sǐ-le mǔqīn
I die -Perf mother
‘My mother died (on me).’ (Kusmer, 2010:6)

This example is an intransitive verb, the mother being the subject of the verb, and the first person is strongly affected by his mother’s death.

In the Inalienable Bā-Construction, or IBC, the Possessor DP is instantiated as a post-bā DP. This construction only occurs with mono-transitive verbs and applies to whole-part relationship between the possessor and possessee, or cases of inalienable possession. IBCs have a negative connotation, and the possessor is also assigned a Malaffectee role, as with DUCs:

\[27\] Like the relational construction in Cree, it may not occur with ditransitive verbs.
Thus, in example (115), the possessor of the leg (disjoint in reference from the subject) is negatively affected by the villain’s action.

The connection between possessor affectedness and inalienable possession are very relevant to the comparative study of the relational form and EPCs. In sections 3.1.1 and 4.2.2, I have demonstrated that the relational form occurs most consistently with body parts, which are inalienable possessees:

(116) (ni)kî- tahkopitamwânân oskâta. (WP, WA)
1- Pst- tie.up -TI -REL -Dir -1p 3.Poss- leg -pl.In
‘We (excl) tied up its legs’

(117) papêyahtak ni(t)- otin -am -w -â -n o- spiton
slowly/carefully 1- take -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s 3.Poss-arm
‘I carefully take her/his (my wife/husband’s) arm’

Example (117) is not only an instance of the husband or wife being particularly affected by the action (as their arm is hurt and might be broken), but the speaker might also undoubtedly feel empathy for his or her partner, who is in pain and distress. Thus, the level of empathy the speaker feels towards the relational participant may also motivate him or her to use the relational inflection.

6.1.3. Possessor as a Focus of Empathy

Thus, the third pragmatic factor motivating the use of EPCs (and the relational form) is the fact that the Speaker feels empathy for the possessor. O’Connor (2007:592-3) has discussed External Possessor Constructions in Spanish and how they can be
accounted for by Speaker empathy. For example, using an EPC in example (118) is very strange when it is in the context of an autopsy:

(118) ???Ahora le cortamos los pies.
    now him.Dat cut.1p the feet
    ‘We now cut his feet’ (O’Connor, 2007:592)

The judgement value given by the Speaker is that this statement is exceedingly strange because it feels as “you’re putting human feeling into it”. If the possessor has passed on, he feels nothing, and thus the Speaker does not necessarily feel empathy for him. This shows how in fact possessor affectedness and Speaker empathy are closely related concepts. The possessor, in this context, feels no pain from his feet being cut, and the Speaker thus feels that it is strange to be empathetic towards him.

O’Connor (2007:593) notes that the difference between the Internal Possession in (119) and the External Possession in (120) is that (120) is much more sympathetic.

Internal possession in Spanish is expressed when the possessor and possessee are part of the same NP (tu gata ‘your cat’) as in (119):

(119) Internal possession
    Si se meure tu gata, la enterramos.
    If Refl die.Cond your cat her bury.Fut.1p
    ‘If your cat dies, we’ll bury it.’ (O’Connor, 2007:593)

(120) External possession
    Si se te meure la gata, la enterramos.
    If Refl 2.Dat die.Cond the.Fem cat her bury.Fut.1p
    ‘If your cat dies on you, we’ll bury it.’ (O’Connor, 2007:593)

External possession, on the other hand, as in (120), separates the possessor and possessee into separate NPs, where the possessee is the direct object, and the possessor, the indirect object. In fact, (120) implies a reading like “Ohh, if your dear cat dies, we’ll help you
bury it (said softly and sympathetically)” (O’Connor, 2007:593). In this case, using Internal possession may even imply that there is absence or even rejection of any feeling of empathy. Thus, in Spanish, Speaker empathy is a potential trigger or condition for the use of EPCs when there is a choice between Internal and External possessor constructions.

O’Connor has shown (2007: 593) that using the indirect object or dative pronoun in Spanish rather than a possessive pronoun is a way of expressing empathy towards the possessor. Spanish EPCs as a manner of expression of empathy are extremely interesting in light of a comparative study with Cree in sections 3.1.1 and 4.2.2, where I have discussed Speaker empathy as a possible condition for the occurrence of the relational construction. In this example, for instance, the parents feel great empathy for their child who is so excited for getting his first job.

(121) niminêntamwânân ê-cihkênihta(hk). (WP)
   ni- minênt -am -w -â -nân ê- cihkêniht -ahk
   1- like -TI -REL -Dir -1p Conj eager.for.TI -3s
   ‘We (the parents) like it/are happy that he (our son) is eager for it.’

Thus, their child’s excitement and joy provoke in the parents a great happiness.

Another example relevant to the question of empathy is (122), repeated from section 3.1.1:


*But it was difficult then, when my father asked me, ‘Are you going to marry this young man?’ was said to me; I did not speak for a long time, because I had not yet even seen his face, it was difficult for me to respond, to marry this Joe Minde as he was called.* (Minde, 1997:58).
This example is an instance where the speaker feels great empathy towards the possessor of the face, i.e. Joe Minde, since he is the man she is meant to marry, but who she has never met before. As he will become a very significant person in her life, she feels empathy for him, and it is him, not just his face, that she is thinking of. However my elicitations of a similar context failed to yield relational examples quite possibly due to lack of similar empathy in the context presented, as both the woman and her betrothed were presented as strangers.

Consequently, topicality, perceived affectedness and empathy are pragmatic motivations for the use of the External Possessor Constructions. This is relevant in the study of the relational form and shows that both constructions are in fact functionally very similar. These brief examples illustrate that the relational form is not necessarily used obligatorily but may be a choice made by the speaker to mark the relational participant’s involvement, and support the fact that, like EPCs, pragmatic factors motivate its use.

6.2. **Formal Similarities: Intermediate Constructions**

Apart from being functionally similar, the EPCs and relational form are also formally similar in the sense that they may be considered as “in-between” constructions, where the part and the whole are equally involved and affected by the action. In effect, EPCs do not solely mark possessor affectedness but also the fact that both possesseees and possessors are equally involved and important to the action.
Lamiroy (2003) gives a hierarchy for involvement of the possessor of inalienable possessee. Marking the possessor as the accusative or direct object implies the greatest degree of possessor involvement and affectedness, as in (123).

(123) Paul a mordu Marie (au bras).
Paul has bitten Mary (in. the arm)
‘Paul bit Mary (in the arm)’. (Lamiroy, 2003:5)

In this instance, the possessor Marie is a direct argument of the verb, and Marie’s arm, the possessed entity, does not even have to be mentioned for the sentence to be grammatical. The same can be said for Dutch, in the case of split-possessor constructions. According to Payne and Barshi, possessor splitting constructions would be grammatical with (124) or without (125) the expression of the possessee, and thus the possessor would be a licensed argument of the verb.

(124) Balthasar stompte hem (in de rug).
Balthasar punched him (in the back).
‘Balthasar punched him in the back.’ (Van de Velde, 2013:157)

(125) Balthasar stompte hem.
Balthasar punched him.
‘Balthasar punched him’.

In these constructions, the possessor is a direct object, although Dutch does not distinguish grammatically between the dative and accusative case.

Similar constructions in German display accusative marking ((126) and (127)) as opposed to the dative or EPC (cf. example (133) which will be discussed subsequently):

(126) Er hat ihn in den Hals gebissen.
He has he.Acc in the neck bitten
‘He bit him in his neck.’ (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms: 5)
Thus, this clause would also be grammatical without the prepositional phrase or possessee:

(127) Er hat **ihn** gebissen.
He has **he.Acc** bitten.

‘He bit him.’

These constructions show greater possessor involvement, backgrounding the possessee to an optional role.

At the other end of the cline, genitive constructions mark the least involvement on the part of the possessor. The genitive can be marked by case, by a possessive marker, or with a preposition, such as *de* in French, which makes the possessor a prepositional complement of the noun phrase, rather than of the verb:

(128) Le médecin examine **le bras de Luc.**
The.Masc doctor examines **the.Masc arm of Luke**

‘The doctor is examining Luke’s arm’

With a possessive determiner in Internal Possessor constructions (IPC), the possessor does not even have to be mentioned outside the sole Noun Phrase:

(129) Le médecin examine **son bras.**
The.Masc doctor examines **his arm.**

‘The doctor is examining his arm’.

This is also the case in Dutch Internal Possession, where the possessor is relegated to a very minor role.

(130) De tranen sprongen in **zijn ogen.**
the tears jumped in **his eyes.**

‘The tears came to his eyes.’ (Van de Velde, 2013:164)
Thus, accusative constructions express the highest possessor involvement with less
attention given to the possessee. On the other hand, genitive or Internal Possessor
Constructions show the least involvement from the possessor.

Dative Possessor constructions, or EPCs, are in between in an intermediate
position, meaning that the “possessor and possessee together play an equally important
role: the part as well as the whole are affected by the process” (Lamiroy, 2003:6):

(131) Le médecin lui examine le bras.
the.Masc doctor him.Dat examines the.Masc arm.

(132) De tranen sprongen hem in de ogen.
the tears jumped him(IO) in the eyes.
‘The tears came to his eyes.’ (Van de Velde, 2013:164)

In German, instead of being assigned an accusative role (c.f (126) and (127)), the
possessor is in the dative case:

(133) Er hat ihm in den Hals gebissen.
he has he.Dat in the neck bitten
‘He bit him in the neck’. (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms:6)

Thus, in French, Dutch and German, the dative possessor marks equal
involvement of both possessor and possessee, and that they form a whole affected by the
action. Not one or the other is backgrounded. This might be represented with a cline of
affectedness, as shown in Table 6.2.
Table 6.2: Cline of affectedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect on Possessor</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Germanic &amp; Romance</td>
<td>ACC (Direct object) (non-obligatory possessee)</td>
<td>DAT (Indirect object) EPC</td>
<td>GEN IPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree</td>
<td>Transitive Animate (TA) Benefactive</td>
<td>Intransitive Animate (AI) &amp; Transitive Inanimate (TI) <strong>Relational</strong> verb</td>
<td>AI &amp; TI <strong>Nonrelational</strong> verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a similar “in between” construction in Lillooet, a Salish language spoken in British Colombia, where there are four categories of transitivizers: plain directive and indirective, as well as relational directive and indirective.

Table 6.3: Verb endings in Lillooet (Van Eijk, 1997: 116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain [full transitivity]</th>
<th>Directive [transitive]</th>
<th>Indirective [ditransitive]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-s; -N; -nun/-nun’; -on-s; -xit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational</strong> [reduced transitivity]</td>
<td>-min/-min’; -min-xit/-min’-xit</td>
<td>-min-xit/-min’-xit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the term ‘relational’ by Van Eijk is actually quite fortuitous, as the Lillooet relational does have some parallels to the Cree relational.

Plain directive transitivizers express control or lack thereof, causitivization, reference to the addressee (*verba declarandi*), expression of a thought (*verba sentiendi*) and non-causative transitivization. Plain indirectives are ditransitive constructions, as the morpheme -xit refers to an indirect object (i.e. beneficiary or recipient).

Lillooet directive relational transitivizers refer to objects that are affected less drastically than objects referred to by directive plain transitivizers. The relational indirective, which is formed with a plain indirective and relational directive implies an
indirect object, “but indicates that this indirect object is affected less drastically or less
directly than when [only] -xit is used” (Van Eijk, 1997:115). Van Eijk notes that, in
particular, this expresses “to do something for somebody with regard to that person’s
possession” (Van Eijk, 1997:115), which is exactly the function of the Cree relational.
For example, *txʷus-min’-xit* can be interpreted as ‘to look out on somebody’s behalf for
something belonging to that person’ (Van Eijk, 1997:115). Van Eijk gives another
example:

(134)  

    txʷus-min’-xi[t]-c-kaxʷ ni_n-c’qáxʔ _a  
    ‘look out for my (n-) horse (c’qáxʔa?) for me (-c), so you can tell me where it is or
    bring it to me’ (Van Eijk, 1997:115).

This four-way division for transitivizers is extremely interesting in regards to the
Cree relational. Indeed, the Cree relational does not increase syntactic valency, contrary
to causatives or applicatives, as well as any other transitive finals. Thus, there is a
division between the Cree relational inflection and types of derivational transitivization.
Similarly, there is a division between plain and relational transitivizers in Lillooet. The
existence of the relational transitivizers in Lillooet illustrates, like the relational form in
Cree, the grey area which exists between intransitive and prototypical transitive verbs.
While the relational forms in Lillooet are less transitive than fully transitive and
ditransitive structures, the relational form in Cree is more transitive than plain AI or TI
verbs but less transitive than monotransitive or ditransitive TA verb stems respectively.
Similarly, EPCs are unlicensed by the verb, and thus intermediate between accusative
and genitive constructions.
Thus, the study of dative, accusative and genitive constructions in European languages, as well as relational constructions in Lillooet might provide insight into the relational form in Cree: if the relational construction was ditransitive or applicative, thus licensing both possessor and possessee as arguments in the verb, the animate possessor would be more important and overshadow the inanimate possessee, as the Cree verb pays more deference to animate rather than inanimate participants. This is exactly what happens in a ditransitive TA verb stem.

(135)  VTA ditransitive: kititohtamawâw (oskotâkay).
       kit- itohtamaw -â -w (o- skotâkay)
       2- take.it.to.TA -Dir -2>3s 3.Poss- jacket
       ‘You take his jacket to him.’ (author)

However, simply using a monotransitive form without the relational inflection hardly acknowledges the presence of the possessor, similarly to genitive constructions in French:

(136)  VTI nonrelational: kitotinên ospiton.
       kit- otin -ê -n o- spiton
       2- take -TI -1/2s 3.Poss- arm
       ‘You take his arm.’ (author)

Consequently, the relational form is an ‘in-between’ form, like the dative possessor, where both possessee and possessor are both acknowledged: the theme sign and person inflection from Transitive Inanimate verbs marks the presence of the inanimate possessee, while the relational morpheme -w and the VTA direct theme sign mark the presence of a second animate entity involved in the action.

(137)  VTI relational: kitotinamwân ospiton.
       kit- otin -am -w -â -n o- spiton.
       2- take -TI -REL -Dir -1/2s 3.Poss- arm
       ‘You take his arm (in relation to him).’ (author)
Notwithstanding the structural differences between Romance and Algonquian languages, there are here functional similarities between EPCs or Possessor datives, and the relational inflection in Cree.

The following tables compare the relational inflection paradigms in the Independent and Conjunct order to the benefactive (applicative) equivalent:

### Table 6.4: Benefactive and relational paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AI/ TI RELATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ki(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ni(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ki(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>wak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA BENEFACTIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ki(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ni(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ki(t)</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>wak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>niwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AI/TI RELATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>āhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ahk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ēk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>iht28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA BENEFACTIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>iht29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 A predictable morphophonemic change in Cree is that -wi- sequence following an -m- becomes -o
29 -awiht- in Cree becomes -āht-, another predictable morphophonemic change in Cree.
The relational form increases discourse, but not syntactic, valency of the verb. Thus, it has not been interpreted as a derivational suffix: the intransitive verbs do not become transitive, and transitive inanimate verbs do not become benefactive (applicative) ditransitive verbs. There have been some arguments against this thought, namely by Drapeau (2013), who argues that the relational form in Innu (which perhaps functions differently than in Western Cree dialects) is in fact a type of applicative construction, which introduces objects without the full properties of ‘direct objects’. These ‘direct objects’ play no precise semantic role in the clause and refer to an already established referent with topic status (Drapeau, 2013:4). However, I argue that relational forms in Cree are in fact very similar to EPCs and that both do not add syntactic arguments to the verb, but do recognize very important semantic and pragmatic roles within the discourse. It is due to the polysynthetic nature of the language that the relational marking is found on the verb.

6.3. Formal Differences: Configurationality

Similarities highlighted in sections 6.1 and 6.2 notwithstanding, the relational inflection and EPCs in European languages are also formally very different. This is largely due to the fact that the languages are so structurally distinct. Van de Velde and Lamiroy (ms) show that EPCs are fairly productive in Spanish and German, less so in Dutch and Italian, more restricted in French and practically non-existent in English. Van de Velde and Lamiroy (ms: 20) propose that, the existence of EPCs and their decline in English and French, is due to the rise of Noun configurationality, with an emergence of specialized slots for determination and modification. Thus, a language’s level of
configurationality is inversely proportional to the productivity of EPCs. However, if Spanish and German are less configurational, they are by no means nonconfigurational in the classic sense of Hale (1983). I propose to add to this cline a truly nonconfigurational language, i.e. Cree (see section 6.3.2.).

6.3.1. Noun Phrase Configurationality

Noun Phrase configurationality may be defined as a process of grammaticalization, or a gradual shift to tighter structures. The rise of NP configurationality is closely related to the inauguration of the determiner slot, as marked by the rise of articles. Thus, the rise of determiners is closely linked to the recession of the EPCs. The article in French and Italian lost part of its autonomy. For example, it cannot license Noun Phrase ellipsis, like it can in Spanish (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms:28):

(138) French: *la de Jean

(139) Italian: *la de Giovanni

(140) Spanish: la de Juan

Another indication of NP configurationality is the grammaticalization of the partitive article. In French, the plural partitive article is used as the plural indefinite article (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms:28). In Italian, the plural partitive can be used as the plural indefinite article. In Spanish, however, it cannot be used as an indefinite article. Take the following examples (author’s examples):

(141) French: Je mange des pommes.

(142) Italian: Mangio (dei) pomodori.
Finally, the Noun Phrase is more configurational when the possessive determiner cannot be combined with the articles (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms: 29):

(144) Old French: un mien fils
    Modern French: *le mon fils (author)

(145) Italian: la mia mamma (author)

(146) Spanish: la hermana mia (author)

Consequently, Spanish is considered a less configurational language than French, and conversely its EPCs are more productive. For example, in French (as in (147)), EPCs may not be used with stative verbs such as voir ‘to see’, and only with dynamic verbs, but in Spanish (148), EPCs with both verb types are grammatical.

(147) Je lui ai maquillé/cassé/*vu la figure.
    I 3s.Dat have made.up/broken/*see the.Fem face.
    ‘I have made up/ broken/ seen her face.’ (Lamiroy, 2003:7)

(148) Le he pintado/roto/visto la cara.
    3s.Dat have made.up/broken/seen the.Fem face.
    ‘I have made up/broken/seen her face.’ (Lamiroy, 2003:7)

This is extremely interesting, as the stative verb ‘to see’ wâpaht- in Cree is a verb with which the relational form frequently occurs (see examples and the paradigms of Chapter 4).

In the case of West Germanic languages, Van de Velde and Lamiroy (ms:26) argue that the English article has become “more ‘specialised’ in the expression of definiteness than the Dutch article, which in addition to definiteness also expresses information about gender and number, and much more so than the German article, which
on top even expresses case”. In fact, in German, definiteness is also marked in the adjective, by a distinction between strong and weak inflections.

Furthermore, a diachronic study of the use of EPCs in English, Dutch and German illustrates how the process of loss in English is the most progressive and German the most conservative. Table 6.5 is a summary of diachronic change of EPCs in West Germanic languages (Van de Velde & Lamiroy, ms: 21-22):

Table 6.5: Diachronic change of EPCs in West Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diachrony of external possessors in West Germanic</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are all indications that the cline of increased configurationality corresponds to the cline of recession of the EP construction, as shown in table 6.6. I have represented the cline in this way because, although they are evident in both families, EPCs are somewhat more productive in Romance.

Table 6.6: Configurationality cline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romance</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Germanic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-EPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+EPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2. Cree as a Non-Configurational Language

Van de Velde and Lamiroy’s theory of noun configurationality is very relevant to the Cree language: if French and English are highly configurational, with a strict and well-established determiner slot, and Italian, German and Dutch reasonably so, and
Spanish even less, they still cannot be considered non-configurational in the sense of Hale (1983). Cree, on the other hand, additionally to not having any articles, is a truly non-configurational language in this sense. According to Hale in his study of Walpiri (1983), there are three main properties associated with the typological label of “non-configurational” including (i) free word order, (ii) use of null anaphora and (iii) use of syntactically discontinuous expressions. Cree has been characterized as a non-configurational language. I will review the evidence here.

6.3.2.1. Word Order

Cree has a relatively free order of major constituents, with discourse-related constraints, as well as syntactic constraints such as the placement of question words, negation and negative polarity items (Reinholtz, 1999:203). All following six possibilities are grammatical in Swampy Cree, with slight changes in meaning (Reinholtz, 1999:203):

(149) This child [awa awâsis] saw [kî-wâpamêw] the animals [pisiskiwa] : 

- SVO: [awa awâsis] [kî-wâpamêw] [pisiskiwa]
- SOV: [awa awâsis] [pisiskiwa] [kî-wâpamêw]
- VSO: [kî-wâpamêw] [awa awâsis] [pisiskiwa]
- VOS: [kî-wâpamêw] [pisiskiwa] [awa awâsis]
- OVS: [pisiskiwa] [kî-wâpamêw] [awa awâsis]
- OSV: [pisiskiwa] [awa awâsis] [kî-wâpamêw]

A similar phenomenon is also possible in East Cree, with the exception of the OSV order in the Direct paradigms (Junker, 2004:349). In the Direct paradigms, the VOS order is unmarked:
This child [Uu awaash] likes [miyeyimeu] this dog [uyuuh atimh]:

SVO: [Uu awaash] [miyeyimeu] [uyuuh atimh]
SOV: [Uu awaash] [uyuuh atimh] [miyeyimeu]
It is this child who likes dogs.
VSO: [miyeyimeu] [Uu awaash] [uyuuh atimh]
VOS: [miyeyimeu] [uyuuh atimh] [Uu awaash]
This child likes this dog (VOS order as more natural).
OVS: [uyuuh atimh] [miyeyimeu] [Uu awaash]
It is dogs that this child likes.
*OSV: [uyuuh atimh] [Uu awaash] [miyeyimeu]
Ungrammatical.

Junker attributes the ungrammaticality of the *OSV order in the Direct paradigms in East Cree to pragmatic functions, namely the topical (or, more specifically, the non-topical) marking of obviative vs. proximate, and that, when there are two preverbal Noun Phrases, the proximate has to be initial in East Cree. Because the proximate third person ranks higher than the obviative in the Algonquian person hierarchy, East Cree pays attention to this rank, and requires that the proximate precedes the obviative. Thus, in East Cree, contrary to Swampy Cree, obviation helps determine word order (Junker, 2004:363). Although this might seem an argument against Cree’s non-configurationality, obviation is a pragmatic and not a syntactic factor determining word order.

6.3.2.2. Zero Anaphora

Jelinek (1984, cited by Reinholtz 1999) proposed that, in non-configurational languages, “subject and object markers within the verbal complex are not simply inflectional markers as we know them from configurational languages with rich agreement. Rather subject and object markers within the verbal complex are pronominal arguments (subjects and objects)” (in Reinholtz, 1999:204). This, known as the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH), states that Noun phrases are not arguments but
adjuncts that are referentially linked to pronominal arguments within the verb. As such, there is a free omission of Noun Phrases in Cree, and all three sentences are possible (Reinholtz, 1999:203-4):

(151) kî- wâpam -ê -w pisîskiw -a.
     Pst- see.TA -Dir -3 animal -Obv
     ‘S/he saw the animals.’

(152) awa awâsis kî- wâpam -ê -w.
     this child Pst- see.TA -Dir -3
     ‘The child saw them.’

(153) kî- wâpam -ê -w.
     Pst- see.TA -Dir -3
     ‘S/he saw them.’

Reinholtz thus argues that the null-anaphora properties of Cree are to be interpreted as a proof of the language’s non-configurationality.

6.3.2.3. Discontinuous Noun Phrases

Discontinuous constituents refer to “cases where several words are understood as a single phrasal constituent, yet appear separately” (Reinholtz, 1999:207). There are modifiers in Swampy Cree, such as kahkinaw ‘every’ and pâh-pêyak ‘each’, which may occur in a discontinuous constituent, but not independently, proving the existence of true discontinuous constituents in Cree (Reinholtz, 1999:212-3)\textsuperscript{30}.

(154) a. kahkinaw awiyak kî- sipwêhtê -w.
     every person Pst- leave.AI -3
     ‘Every person left.’

b. *kahkinaw kî- sipwêhtê -w.
     every Pst- leave.AI -3

\textsuperscript{30} However, kahkiyaw and pâh-pêyak may be used alone in Plains Cree to refer to plural third persons as in kahkiyaw kî-sipwêhtêwak (they all left) and pâh-pêyak kî-sipwêhtêwak (they left one by one).
The use of null anaphora, relatively free word order and discontinuous elements consist of characteristics which allow Cree (or at least Swampy Cree) to be defined as a non-configurational language. According to Van de Velde and Lamiroy’s hypothesis (ms), its non-configurationality may permit Cree to have constructions functioning like EPCs, such as the relational inflection and the morpheme -im. We will add Cree to the cline of configurationality as such:

**Table 6.7: Cree integrated into configurationality cline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-EPC</th>
<th>+EPC</th>
<th>+relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREE</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Cree is a nonconfigurational polysynthetic language, the relational form is not marked as an indirect object pronoun or dative case, but as part of the verb. Furthermore, it has a more extensive use than EPCs as it may apply not only to contexts of possession, but to other cases where a third person participant is affected or a focus of empathy.
6.4. Conclusion

Although Bloomfield (1928) has noted that the relational form does not occur in other Algonquian languages, I have shown in this paper that functionally similar forms exist in many languages of the world. I have not been able to do a whole survey of every language in which EPCs are productive, but I have summarized previous findings on EPCs which highlight similarities with the Cree relational. I refer the reader to Payne and Barshi’s 1999 *External Possessor Constructions* for more languages and cases of EPCs. I have shown that both EPCs and the relational form mark affected possessors which may be the focus of empathy or be highly topical. The two constructions mark the dual involvement of possessee and possessor, where both are taken equally into account. On the other hand, the formal differences can be accounted for by the truly polysynthetic and non-configurational nature of Cree. This is what allows for the -w to appear as part of the verbal complex rather than as an unlicensed dative pronoun. Finally, a comparative study of the relational form and EPCs within a functional framework (e.g. Functional Discourse Grammar) which places a good deal of emphasis on pragmatic factors would also be useful for future research and be extremely insightful.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

Examples from text collections as well as from fieldwork research have demonstrated that the relational form occurs with third person possessors in cases of disjoint reference, but more specifically in cases where the possessor and possessee are closely linked (and thus the possessor is strongly affected by the action on the possessee). The Speaker also needs to be empathetic towards the possessor, or the third person participant in complex sentences.

Furthermore, although the draft of third person \(-w\) to function in AI and TI verbs as \(-im\) does in TA verbs is unique to Cree among Algonquian languages, a typological study of External Possessor Constructions (EPCs) provide valuable insight into key components of the relational form, namely its discourse rather than syntactic valency increasing properties and the pragmatic factors which motivate its use.

I believe that the relational form explained in terms of the degree of intimacy between possessor and possessee, the level at which the third person relational is affected or to which the Speaker feels empathy for him is an extremely important step in understanding its function, which is in fact pragmatic rather than syntactic.

I hope that this research has contributed to the understanding of this fascinating and complex form, and also that it will be useful to speakers and learners of the Cree language, especially in the community of Kinosao Sipi. So far, in many Cree textbooks, if the relational form is even mentioned, it is only done so very briefly and with very few examples. In Ahenakew’s (1987b) pedagogical book Cree Language Structures: A Cree Approach, the relational form is listed under Special Paradigms (1987b:136). Given that
one of the Norway House Cree Nation’s most important priorities is education, it is extremely important for me that the research done there lead to the development of practical resources that will help to preserve the Cree language in all its richness. In Appendix 3, I present teaching tools and resources which might, I hope, be useful for introducing the relational form to the classroom and initiate the discussion with students, speakers and nonspeakers, about this very fascinating form.

However, there are still many aspects of the relational form to be discussed and understood. It would be interesting to not only elicit full stative paradigms, but also active ones with verbs, such as othin- ‘take it’ and atoskê- ‘work’. Furthermore, we could delve deeper into the issue of Speaker empathy towards the participant. This issue is relevant in cases where the actor is either a second or a third person. Would the relational form occur more frequently if the Speaker was talking to or about a loved one rather than a stranger? Another avenue of research would be to present both relational and nonrelational inflections to discuss judgment values on whether both possibilities would be accepted and what meaning differences exist between them.
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### Appendix 2: Cree verb paradigm divisions

Relational paradigms explored (cf. Ellis 1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>SUBMODES</th>
<th>TENSES</th>
<th>INFLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubitative</td>
<td>Dubitative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunct</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubitative</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Nonrelational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>Relational Nonrelational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Pedagogical Tools

For the teaching of the relational form, I would favour a highly collaborative approach, especially in a classroom environment which includes native speakers. As there are variations within dialects, and even within communities, discussions and sharing about individual language use is extremely important and essential to a fuller understanding of any form. Therefore, no matter what activities are presented, discussions within the classroom as well as personal input from the instructor are crucial elements not to be overlooked.

The activities and worksheets suggested in this booklet discuss the relational form within the context of possession, with Transitive Inanimate and Animate Intransitive verbs, based on research discussed in this section. I included both Standard Roman Orthography (SRO) as well as Syllabics, to accommodate for the fact that some instructors prefer to teach with the syllabary rather than the Roman alphabet.
Appendix 3.1.: Relational or Nonrelational? Activity and Discussion

THE RELATIONAL FORM:
...can be used to indicate or to take into account the presence of someone else, a third person. For example, when you or I or a third person does an action which impacts an object possessed by someone else, the relational form can be used to emphasize that the object and the possessor are both affected by the action. So, in the following sentences, which form would you use?

➢ You and a friend are playing soccer during recess. All of a sudden, he falls down and cries out. He has a big cut on his arm. You run to him and you help him up. You carefully take him by the arm.

How would you say, ‘I take his arm carefully?’

A. papêyâhtak nitotinamwân ospiton
   Kikî-nâkatênihtamwân nâ ospiton
   Kikî-nâkatênihtawân nâ ospiton
   Papêyâhtak kâ-otinamwâk ospiton

B. papêyâhtak kâ-otinamwâk ospiton
   Papêyâhtak nitotinêm ospiton
   Papêyâhtak nitotinem ospiton
   Papêyâhtak kâ-otinamwân ospiton

C. papêyâhtak nitotinem ospiton
   Papêyâhtak nitotinem ospiton
   Papêyâhtak nitotinâm ospiton
   Papêyâhtak kâ-otinamwân ospiton

➢ Then you notice that he looks quite worried so you take him to the nurse and she notices that you already found some ice to put on his arm. She turns to you and asks, "Oh, did you take care of his arm already?"

How would you say, "Did you take care of his arm?"?

A. kikî-nâkatênihten nâ ospiton?

B. kikî-nâkatênihtamwân nâ ospiton?

C. kikî-nâkatênihtawân nâ ospiton?
The nurse notices that your friend is also holding his leg and wincing. She urges him to sit while she goes to get more ice and a bandage. She tells your friend to sit in her comfortable chair. Your friend quickly accepts her offer and sits in her chair gratefully while waiting for her to come back. How would you say "He sat on her chair"?

A. kî-apiw otêhtapiwinihk.
B. kî-apiwêw otêhtapiwinihk.

The nurse quickly returns and looks at his leg, which is also hurt. Carefully, she bandages your friend’s leg. How would you say "She bandaged his leg"?

A. kî-sïhwahpitaam oskâtiniw.
B. kâ-kî-sïhwahpitaahk oskâtiniw.
C. kî-sïhwahpitaamwêw oskâtiniw.
D. kâ-kî-sïhwahpitaamwât oskâtiniw.

After she finishes cleaning and bandaging your friend’s wounds, the nurse notices that his coat is stained. So she offers to clean his coat before he goes back out. You offer to help her. How would you say "We (the nurse and I) cleaned (washed) his coat"?

A. nikî-kísipêkinênân oskotâkay
B. nikî-kísipêkinamwânân oskotâkay

We took such good care of him that he feels much better and we are playing together again!!
Appendix 3.2.: Paradigm Charts for the Relational Inflection

PARADIGM CHARTS for the RELATIONAL INFLECTION

1. API- (VAI)  
2. OTIN- (VTI)

### Independent Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>VERB STEM</th>
<th>(VTI)</th>
<th>Relational</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ni-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-â</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ki-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-â</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p ni-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-â</td>
<td>-nán</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ki-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-â</td>
<td>-nânaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p ki-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-â</td>
<td>-nâwâw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ø-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p Ø-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-wak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ospiton  
2. otêhtapiwinihk

### Conjunct Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>changed Conjunct</th>
<th>VERB STEM</th>
<th>(VTI)</th>
<th>Relational</th>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-ak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-âhk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-ahk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-êk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-ât</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p ê-/kâ-</td>
<td>(-am-)</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-âcik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ospiton  
2. otêhtapiwinihk
Appendix 3.3.: Relational Form in the Contexts of Disjoint and Co-Reference Activity

THE RELATIONAL FORM and DISJOINT REFERENCE

In which of these sentences could you use the relational inflection? How would you say "I saw the canoe along the bank"?

.... If it was MY own canoe?

...If it was YOUR canoe?

...If it was OUR FRIEND’S canoe?

And how would you say "John saw the canoe along the bank"?

...If it was his OWN canoe?

...If it was HIS PARENTS’ canoe?

...If it was his GIRLFRIEND’s canoe?

Is the verb used for his girlfriend’s or his parents’ canoe said differently than for his own canoe? What is the difference in the verb?

Suggested answer: The relational inflection (nikî-wâpahtamwân or kâ-kî-wâpahtamwak for ‘I saw it (in relation to him)’ and kî-wâpahtamwêw or kâ-kî-wâpahtamwât for ‘He saw it (in relation to her)’) could be used for our friends’, his parents’ and his girlfriend’s canoe, it could NOT be used for his own canoe, since that is a case where the possessor and the actor are co-referential, nor for my canoe and your canoe, since the relational form can only refer to a third person possessor.
Appendix 3.4.: A Relational Form Cheat Sheet

RELATIONAL FORM CHEAT SHEET

The RELATIONAL CONSTRUCTION is a ‘SPECIAL’ Verb Paradigm in Cree. It can be used with ANIMATE INTRANSITIVE and TRANSITIVE INANIMATE verbs.

- ANIMATE INTRANSITIVE VERB: Animate ACTOR (subject) with an INTRANSITIVE verb (no goal/object).
  Examples: ninipân ‘I sleep’ ....ê-nipàyân ‘I am sleeping’
  kitapin ‘You sit’ ... ê-apiyan ‘You are sitting’

- TRANSITIVE INANIMATE VERB: Animate ACTOR (subject) with a TRANSITIVE verb and an INANIMATE object.
  Examples: niwâpahtên ‘I see it’ ...ê-wâpahtamân ‘I am seeing it’
  kitotinên ‘You take it’ ...ê-otinaman ‘You are taking it’

..... to mark AN EXTRA REFERENCE POINT.

In this way, the ACTION is made ‘IN RELATION’ to a third person, and a THIRD PERSON only.

The third person relational referent is higher than the object but lower than the subject/actor: it is higher in the Cree Person hierarchy (2 > 1 > 3 > 3’ > 0)

The relational form is formally complex: a -w is added to the verb stem. In the Independent Order, the -w is followed by the Transitive Animate verb (VTA) theme sign -â- ~ -ê and the person ending (-n, -w, -nân, ...). In the Conjunct Order, the -w is followed by the VTA person ending (-ak, -at, -ât ...)
The relational form can occur in many CONTEXTS:

- **POSSESSION**
  - When someone acts with an effect on another person’s possession:
    - **TI verb + object:** nitotinamwân ospiton
      ‘I take his/her arm’
    - kiki-wâpahtamwân ocîmân
      ‘You saw his/her boat’
    - **AI verb + locative:** nitapiwân otêhtapiwinihk
      ‘I sat down in her chair’
    - nipâ-w-e-u wîchiyihch
      ‘She slept in his home’
      (East Cree; Junker, 2003: 313)

- **COMPLEX SENTENCES**
  - When someone’s actions or state is influenced by another person’s state or action:
    - **TI + TI verb:** nînimwênihtamwânân
      ê-cîhkênihtahk
      ‘We like it that he is so eager for something’
    - **AI + AI verb:** nîstêş kî-pê-takosin mêkwâc ê-nipâwak
      ‘My brother arrived while I was sleeping’

- **UNSPECIFIED ACTOR**
  - When an Unspecified actor is an unspecified or indefinite third person:
    - kêtahtawê mîna kâ-mêtawêwiht wîkiwâhk.
      *Presently they had games again, in their tent.*
      (adapted from Bloomfield, 1934:126)
Appendix 3.5. Paradigm Exercises

**Paradigm exercises**

**Suggested answer:**

.... take his/ her arm....

**Independent ORDER – TI verb otin-**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>nit-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>kit-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>nit-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wânân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>kit-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wânânaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>kit-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wânâwâw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wêw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td></td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wêwak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conjunct ORDER – TI verb otin-**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wâhk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wahk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wêk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wât</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>...kâ-</td>
<td>otinam</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>ositon.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-wâcik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paradigm exercises

Suggested answer:

.... sit on his/her chair.

Independent ORDER – AI verb api-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Verb Stem</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Conjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>nit-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wân³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>kit-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>nit-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wânân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>kit-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wânânaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>kit-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wânâwâw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wêw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wêwak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conjunct ORDER – TI verb api-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Verb Stem</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Conjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wâhk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wêk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>...kâ-api</td>
<td>otêhtapiwinhk.</td>
<td>-wâcik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³¹ Relational VAI Independent order might not be accepted in every dialect.