CHAPTER 5

The Theoretical Considerations of Valency Increase

5.1 Introduction

In section 5.2 the syntactic analysis proposed by Baker (1988), that applicative formation is, cross-linguistically, in fact Preposition Incorporation, is discussed with respect to the Innu-aimun applicative data presented in this thesis. Following Baker, it will be argued that only transitive verbs can participate in applicative formation because the applied NP receives structural case from the verb; verbs which lack structural case, that is to say intransitive verbs, have no way of licensing an applied NP. In his review of applicative constructions in a number of languages Baker (1988) demonstrates that only transitive verbs form applicatives.

In section 5.3 causative formation in general is discussed, and Baker's analysis of causative formation as Verb Incorporation is contrasted with the view that at least two causative rules must be responsible for cross-linguistic causative variation. Further examples of the Innu-aimun causative construction are presented, and the problem of the ungrammaticality of causativizing transitive verbs is discussed.

5.2 Applicative Formation as Preposition Incorporation

5.2.1 Some Preliminary Remarks

In his model of applicative formation Baker (1988, 250) proposes that an applicative morpheme (for example, Innu-aimun -au) is a preposition lexically marked as an affix. It is generated as head of the prepositional phrase (PP) which also contains an extra NP (the applied object). Before illustrating this with Innu-aimun data, one potential problem with this hypothesis in general should be discussed; the fact that in none of Baker's examples is there a morphological relationship between an independent preposition and its proposed incorporated form. Also, there is a brief discussion of the question of whether independent prepositional forms exist in Algonquian.

5.2.1.1 Lack of Morphological Relationship

Baker (1988) hypothesizes that a large number of grammatical function changing processes should be accounted for by what he calls 'Incorporation' processes. Having argued that in motivated circumstances both nouns and verbs may be incorporated into their governing verbs, Baker states that it would be theoretically desirable to argue that all

lexical heads can participate in the process of

Incorporation:
...we might expect the incorporation process to generalize across categories in languages of the world. In particular, given that verbs and nouns incorporate into governing verbs, there is no reason why prepositions should not do the same. (Baker 1988, 229)

There is, however, one striking difference between what he claims are cases of Preposition Incorporation, and his examples of noun and verb incorporation. There is no morphological relationship between what he proposes to be the incorporated form of a preposition and its independent form. Compare, for example, the independent form of the Chichewa preposition 'to' (kwa) with its incorporated form (-er-).

(72a) Mbidzi zi-na-**perek**-a msampha **kwa** nkhandwe.
zebras SP-PAST-**hand**-ASP trap **to** fox
'The zebras handed the trap to the fox.'

(72b) Mbidzi zi-na-**perek**-**er**-a nkhandwe msampha.
zebras SP-PAST-**hand**-**to**-ASP fox trap
'The zebras handed the fox the trap.'

(Baker 1988, 229)

In the case of Noun Incorporation, on the other hand, there is a clear morphological relationship between the independent and incorporated forms. This is illustrated in

the following Cree examples.

(73a) Noot-**acaaskw**-ii-w. (73b) **wacaaskwa.**
hunt-muskrat-AIfin-SUB3sg:AI 'muskrat'
'He hunts muskrat.'

(Mellow 1989, 255)

Baker (1988, 148) also argues that there is a morphological relationship between the independent verb and its incorporated form in, for example, Chichewa, as the examples in (74) show.

(74a) Mtsikana ana-chit-**its**-a kuti mtsuko u-gw-e
girl AGR-do-**make**-ASP that waterpot AGR-fall-ASP
'The girl made the waterpot fall.'

(74b) Mtsikana anau-gw-**ets**-a mtsuko
girl AGR-fall-**made**-ASP waterpot
'The girl made the waterpot fall.'

(Baker 1988, 148)

The 'independent' verb <u>its</u> 'make' is morphologically related to the incorporated form <u>ets</u> 'made.[i]

Baker acknowledges that Preposition Incorporation is unusual in this respect and accounts for this difference as follows.

[This discrepancy in morphology] simply reflects the fact that the prepositional element is an affix with respect to morphology theory, rather than a full root. As such, in addition to the morphological features of a preposition, it

has morphological subcategorization features, expressing the fact that it must be bound to a verb ... and no direct alternation is observable. (Baker 1988, 231)

A morphological relationship between the independent and incorporated forms might be expected in some cases at least. This point is raised here because it seems to be a possible weakness in Baker's general theory that the process of incorporation may be extended to account for applicative formation. It is not specifically relevant to Innu-aimun, however, since there is no independent prepositional applicative form. Baker (1988, 231) does not regard a lack of either the independent or the incorporated form of a preposition as a problem for his theory, citing French and Italian as examples of languages which only have independent forms, and Tzotzil (Mexican Mayan) as an example of a language which has only prepositional affixes so that Incorporation is obligatory.[ii] Thus, the morpheme -au-, if analyzed according to Baker (1988), is a prepositional affix which has no independent corresponding form.

5.2.1.2 The Question of Independent Prepositions in Innu-aimun

Algonquian languages in general are not considered to have independent prepositions.[iii] There are, for example, no

Innu-aimun particles which correspond to 'in', 'at', 'to', or 'from'. As has already been shown, these are inferred from the locative suffix on the noun and/or the semantics of the verb itself. In (75a) the locative suffix is translated into English as 'at', and in (75b) the verb itself provides the preposition 'on top of'.

(75a) **Niuepimitaau tuuuaan nete tshishtuukaniit.**
ni-uepimit-aa-u-ø tuuuaan-ø
1-throw-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA ball-PROX_SG(an)
nete tshishtuukan-iit
there door-LOC(inan)

'I throw a ball at the door/s.'

(75b) **Maanitenishiit taakutapishtueu umiimiimeu.**
maanitenish-iit taakutapishtu-e-u
sheep_LOC(an) sit_on_top_of-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3'-OBJsg:TA
umiimiimeu-ø
pigeon-PROX_SG(an)

'The pigeon sits on top of the sheep.'

However, there are space, location and time particles which function like prepositions.[iv] Space and location particles appear with locative nouns, making the spatial position more specific. The grammatical status of these 'preposition-like' particles remains to be strictly defined. In (76) there is no spatial particle.

(76) **Naapeu miitshiuaapiit.**
naapeu miitshiuaap-iit
man_PROX_SG(an) house_LOC(inan)
'The man is in the house.'

In (77a) and (77b) the particles kueshte 'on the other side of' and niikaan 'in front (of)' are added, probably as optional specifiers of location.

(77a) **Naapeu kueshte miitshiuaapiit.**
naapeu **kueshte**
man_PROX_SG(an) **on_the_other_side_of**

miitshiuaap-iit
house_LOC(inan)

'The man is on the other side of the house.'

(77b) **Naapeu niikaan miitshiuaapiit.**
naapeu **niikaan** miitshiuaap-iit
man_PROX_SG(an) **in_front_of** house_LOC(inan)
'The man is in front of the house.'

Since the appearance of kueshte and niikaan is semantically rather than grammatically determined, they do not look like prepositions; they may be prepositional specifiers. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt to determine the grammatical status of these particles. Innu-aimun can be accommodated within Baker's theory of applicative formation

as a language which has obligatory incorporation of prepositions. Alternatively, if the 'preposition-like' particles in Innu-aimun are indeed prepositions, Innu-aimun could be classed as a language which has morphologically unrelated independent and incorporated forms. The main point here is that there is no independent prepositional equivalent, either in terms of morphology or grammatical function, to the applicative morpheme -au.

5.2.2 Preposition Incorporation

5.2.2.1 TI-derived Applicative Constructions

In order to discuss Preposition Incorporation in Innu-aimun, the least complex derivation will be looked at first; TI-derived applicative constructions. The TI verb uaauiitam^{u} 'talk about it' is shown in (78).

(78) **Niuaauiiten mashinaikan.**
ni-uaauiit-e-n mashinaikan-ø
1-talk_about-TIth-SUB1sg/OBJ3:TI book-PROX_SG(inan)
'I talk about the book.'

Niuaauiiten agrees in person and number with a first person animate subject. The TI theme sign, in this case the non-third person subject/third object -e, is analyzed as an inanimate nominal affix. ni- represents the subject. -e is

associated with the inanimate adjunct mashinaikan and ni- does not require an adjunct. As complement to the verb, -e is assigned a theme role, and the role of agent is assigned, by the whole VP, to the first person NP the clitic ni-.

(79) ni-uaauiit-e-n

The inflectional suffix -n, which indicates a non-3rd subject, is added to the verb + -e and its affix complement -e. (80) shows the applicative construction derived from (78).

(80) **Niuaauiitamuaat mashinaikaninu naapessat.**
ni-uaauiit-am-**au**-aa-u-at
1-talk_about-TIth-**APP**-TAth-SUB1sg/OBJ3-OBJpl:TA

mashinaikan-inu naapess-at
book-OBV_INAN_SG boy-PROX_AN_PL

'I talk about the book with the boys.'

The TI theme sign -am, which remains associated with the now obviative adjunct mashinaikan(inu), becomes the underlying object.[v] The applicative morpheme -au is a preposition which requires an animate object. This is provided by the TA direct theme sign -aa which follows -au.

There is evidence to suggest that the verb and the head of the PP together assign a theta role to the applied object. In (81), assuming that -au is head of a prepositional phrase, notice that the theta role of ishkueu in (81a) is participant-goal, whereas in (81b) it is benefactive. The only difference between these two examples is the verb.

(81a) **Nitinamuaau aapiuutaana ishkueu**.[vi]
n-itin-am-**au**-aa-u-ø
1-hand-TIth-**APP**-dir-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

aapiuutaakan-a ishkueu-ø
key-OBV_INAN_PL woman-PROX_SG(an)

'I hand that woman the keys.'[vii]

(81b) **Ninakuaatamuaau uaapusha ishkueu.**
ni-nakuaat-am-**au**-aa-u
1-snare-TIth-**APP**-dir-SUBsg/OBJ3:TA

uaapush-a ishkueu-ø
rabbit-OBV_AN woman-PROX_SG(an)

'I snare a rabbit for the woman.'

The subject ni- in (80), (81a) and (81b) receives the role of agent from the VP, and the VP and P together assign the role of recipient-goal or benefactive to -aa, and the verb assigns a theme role to -am. The order of morphemes and the

adjuncts with which they are associated in (80) is as follows:

(82) SUBJECT-VERB-UNDERLYING-PREPOSITION-APPLIED-TA

	OBJECT		OBJECT	INFLECTION
ni	uaauiit	am	**au** aa	u t
[+an, PROX]		[+/-an, OBV]		[+an, PROX]
no adjunct		mashinaikaninu		naapessat

Following Baker (1988), an applicative construction is derived from a transitive verb by the addition of a PP containing the applicative prepositional affix, and its animate complement, the applied object. The properties of the Innu-aimun data are consistent with Baker's hypothesis that the applicative morpheme is a prepositional affix. However, if we keep strictly to a Baker-like analysis, the applied object (the PP complement -aa which is associated with naapess) remains in its base-generated position where it receives structural case from the verb, thereby explaining its object properties.[viii] Its normal Case-assigner P, because it is an affix, has been removed. The underlying object, in Baker's model, is also left in its base-generated position where, he argues, it is assigned Case by means of what he calls Noun Reanalysis (Baker 1988, 268).[ix] However, this thesis now diverges from Baker's

analysis because none of his examples deal with languages which have nominal affixes. I am proposing that the whole PP, that is, the preposition and the applied object are inside the verb. While in Baker (1988) applicative formation is the result of Preposition Incorporation only, in Innu-aimun applicatives are formed by Incorporation of the preposition and its complement; Prepositional Phrase Incorporation as opposed to Preposition Incorporation. Rather than using Baker's analysis, I would prefer to find an alternative explanation for the object-like properties of the applied object.

In Chapters Three and Four I showed that only the applied object behaves like a true object; for example, the verb is sensitive to the animacy and number of the applied object but not the underlying object. This suggests that Innu-aimun verbs assign a maximum of one structural Case. The fact that the underlying object is also licensed indicates that there is some other 'special' means of Case-assignment available. Innu-aimun belongs to Baker's Partial-Double Object class of languages. If Innu-aimun were a Double Accusative language, the applied object and the underlying object would both be true objects. If it

were a Non-Double Object language, applicative constructions would not be permitted at all because there would be no way of licensing the underlying object.

The claim that Innu-aimun verbs, whether compound or simple, have a maximum of one structural Case to assign remains unaffected. Assuming this, in (81) both the TI theme sign -am (mashinaikaninu) and the TA theme sign -aa (naapessat) are possible candidates to receive the single structural Case of uaauiit. It is clear that -aa wins over -am because the applied object naapessat (-aa) displays the object properties, and not the underlying object mashinaikaninu (-am). Why this should be remains to be determined.

Three main questions are posed by TI-derived applicatives: Firstly, why should -am lose its animacy restriction? Up to now it has been described as an inanimate object. Secondly, how does -am receive Case? Thirdly, why should the verb agree with the applied object?

It would seem that along with losing its object status, -am loses its capacity to specify the animacy of its adjunct; the underlying object of an applicative can be

animate or inanimate. It could be that only arguments which receive nominative or accusative Case can specify what type of adjunct they associate with. Structural case is assigned to the outermost argument, in this case the applied object -aa. The position of -am, now deeply within the verb complex, may have something to do with it losing its object status. It is not clear how -am receives Case; without a more extensive study of Case-assignment in Innu-aimun, the exact means by which the underlying object is licensed at S-structure will remain undetermined and this thesis does not argue for any one solution. One possibility is that the prepositional affix -au can assign Case to the left. -am does not receive structural Case and prepositions are not associated with assigning structural case - it could be that for Configurational reasons the applied object receives the structural Case, and its original Case assigner licenses the underlying object. This solution would, however, require violating Baker's Case Frame Preservation Principle which states that the incorporating preposition in an applicative construction, for example, loses its capacity to assign Case. If this principle were to be violated, there would be implications for causative formation; the causative morpheme, analyzed as a verb, would have to be allowed to

assign its Case even although incorporated into the main verb. It would be difficult in this case to account for the restriction preventing Innu-aimun transitive verbs from being causativized (discussed in section 5.3.2.2) - there would be two structural Cases available, and so two non-subject NPs (i.e.a transitivized causative) should be possible. The problem of the source of the 'special' Case is not solved in this thesis.

5.2.2.2 TI^2-derived Applicative Constructions

The proposed order of morphemes for the applicative construction in (83a) is shown in (83b).

(83a) **Ninekaatshipaniituaau utaapaaninu naapeu.**
ni-nekaatshipan-iit-au-aa-u-ø
1-slow_down-CAUS-APP-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA

utaapaan-inu naapeu-ø
car-OBV_INAN_SG man-PROX_SG(an)

'I slow the car down for the man.'

(83b) SUBJECT-VERB-VERB-PREPOSITION-APPLIED-TA

					OBJECT		INFLECTION
ni-nekaatshipan-iit	-	au		-	aa	-	u
[+an, PROX]		[+/-an, OBV]			[+an, PROX]		
no adjunct		uutapaaninu			naapeu		

There remains the problem of the underlying object not being represented within the verb complex. As stated earlier in this thesis, however, it is assumed that three arguments are contained within the verb complex because the adjunct associated with the theme (the unrepresented argument) remains optional.

5.3 Causative Constructions

Baker (1988) proposes that causative constructions are biclausal. The causative morpheme is the verb in the upper clause and embedded within that is the clause which is being causativized. He proposes that the lower verb raises to join the causative verb, thereby satisfying the latter's specifications as an affix, and that the complex verb assigns structural Case, only one in the case of Partial-Double Object languages, to the subject of the lower clause. The object of the embedded clause is licensed by the same special means proposed for the underlying object of an applicative construction.

If Innu-aimun is a Partial-Double Object language, no Innu-aimun verb can assign more than one structural Case, and additional non-subject NPs are assigned Case by whatever

means the underlying object of the applicative construction receives Case. If the set of properties shared by applicative constructions from languages as different from each other as Innu-aimun, Swahili and Chamorro are explainable in terms of Case-assignment parameterization, then other constructions derived by valency-increasing processes should support this theory. Baker (1988) therefore predicts that causative constructions in Partial-Double Object languages will also share a set of properties determined by the requirement to assign case to an additional non-subject NP.

However, transitive verbs in Innu-aimun cannot be causativized (see section 5.3.2.2). Baker (1988, 194-6) proposes that languages which do not permit the causativization of transitive verbs have no Case mechanism to license the second non-subject NP which would appear in, for example, 'I made John eat the cake'. The single accusative Case would, however, license 'John' in 'I made John sleep'. If this were true of Innu-aimun, applicative constructions should not be permitted; there should be no Case available to license the underlying object. Baker's Partial-Double Object theory breaks down here with respect

to Innu-aimun. It should be possible to causativize transitive verbs. Whatever 'special' means of Case-assignment is available to the Innu-aimun applicative underlying object is not available to the object of an Innu-aimun verb embedded within a causative clause.

5.3.1 Causative Formation - Theory

5.3.1.1 Parametrically-determined Causative Variation versus the Causative Rules Theory

Baker (1988, 162) argues that, cross-linguistically, there is no specific rule of causative formation in spite of the fact that two basic types of causative construction are attested. A more widely held view, however, is that of Gibson (1980) and Marantz (1984) who argue in favour of there being at least two types of causative rules in the world's languages.

The following summarizes the two causative rules proposed by Gibson (1980).

CAUSATIVE RULE 1

Transitive clause subject becomes Causative construction indirect object.

Transitive clause object becomes Causative construction object.

```
Tom pushed Sally.    --->      I made Tom push Sally.
 S    V      O                 S  V   IO   V    O
```

Intransitive clause subject becomes Causative construction object.

```
Tom ran.             --->      I made Tom run.
 S   V                         S  V    O   V
```

CAUSATIVE RULE 2

Transitive and intransitive subject becomes Causative construction object.

```
Tom pushed Sally.    --->      I made Tom push Sally.
                               S  V    O   V

Tom ran.             --->      I made Tom run.
 S   V                         S  V    O   V
```

The grammatical function of 'Sally' (the object of the embedded clause) remains undetermined. It does not have the status of 'object'.

Rejecting Gibson's hypothesis that these two types of causative construction are the result of separate rules, Baker proposes that they fall out from the type of Case-assignment parameter selected by the language in question. By arguing that the causative morpheme of a morphological causative construction is a verb lexically marked for affixation, Baker accounts for motivated verb movement out

of the lower clause. If the lower clause is transitive, this movement creates a problem of Case-assignment for the lower clause direct object.[x]

Baker's hypothesis of general Case assigning properties extends beyond applicative and causative constructions and is, for this reason, the more desirable analysis. Rather than postulating two specific rules for a single construction as Gibson has, Baker' hypothsis allows predicitions to be made with respect to any type of construction which is the result of valency change. The syntactic properties of a derived structure in any given language depends directly on the general Case-assigning properties available within that given language.

5.3.1.2 The Biclausal Nature of Causative Constructions

A biclausal analysis of at least some causative constructions is widely accepted within various theoretical frameworks (for example, Aissen 1974, Spencer 1991). Baker argues that both phrasal and morphological causatives are semantically and structurally biclausal. The examples in (74) are repeated here as (84).

(84a) **Mtsikana ana-chit-its-a kuti mtsuko u-gw-e**
girl AGR-do-make-ASP that waterpot AGR-fall-ASP
'The girl made the waterpot fall.'

(84b) **Mtsikana anau-gw-ets-a mtsuko**
girl AGR-fall-made-ASP waterpot
'The girl made the waterpot fall'

(Baker 1988, 148)

The Chichewa sentence in (84a) is clearly biclausal, and yet (84b), on the surface consisting of a single clause predicated of a complex verb, is its paraphrase. Baker proposes a common D-structure for (84a) and (84b), so that the latter is the result of raising fall and incorporating it into make. As they are semantic paraphrases, it would not be unreasonable to propose that D-structure processes remain unaffected, so that theta assignment in (84a) is more or less the same as (84b).

Innu-aimun has phrasal and morphological causatives, although only morphological causatives are considered in this thesis.

5.3.2 Causative Formation - Innu-aimun Data

Two generalisations can be made about Innu-aimun causatives. Firstly, the data collected for this thesis

suggests that it is not possible to causativize a transitive verb. Secondly, the subject of a causative construction must be logically animate. The latter restriction is explained by the fact that there is a general rule in Algonquian such that only logically animate entities seem able to be assigned an agent role, and the subject of a causative construction is always an agent.

5.3.2.1 Intransitive Verbs

Intransitive verbs are causativized by addition of the morpheme -i- or -i(i)t-. In (85b) -i- introduces a new subject ni- 'I' to an AI verb, with the original AI animate subject Penute becoming the object of the causative construction.

(85a) **Penute ueuepiipaniiu.**
Penute-ø ø-ueuepiipani-i-u-ø
Penute-PROX 3-swing-AIfin-SUB3-SUBsg:AI
'Penute swings.'

(85b) **Niueuepiipaniiaau Penute.**
ni-ueuepiipani-**i**-aa-u-ø Penute-ø
1-swing-**CAUS**-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3-OBJsg:TA Penute-PROX
'I swing Penute (cause him to swing).'

The resulting construction has TA morphology, because both the underlying subject and the derived subject are animate.

In (86b) -i(i)t introduces a new subject ni- 'I' to an II verb, with the original inanimate subject metuaakan 'toy' becoming the object of the causative construction. Note that the resultant verb is not TI, as one might expect, but instead is AI, making it a TI^2 verb.

(86a) **Metuaakan ueuepiipanu.**
metuaakan-ø ø-ueuepiipani-u-ø
toy-PROX_SG(inan) 3-swing-SUB3-SUBsg:II
'The toy swings.'

(86b) **Metuaakan niueuepiipanitaan**
metuaakan-ø ni-ueuepiipani-**it**-aa-n-ø
toy-PROX_SG(inan) 1-swing-**CAUS-**AIfin-SUBnon3-SUBsg:AI
'I swing the toy (cause it to swing).'

The two types of causative construction may be summarized as follows.

(87) AI Verb + Causative -> TA morphology

II Verb + Causative -> AI morphology (TI^2)

5.3.2.2 Transitive Verbs

It would seem that transitive verbs cannot be causativized by means of either -i(i)t- or -i-. Example (88) is a TA verb.

(88) **Mueu paakueshikana.**
ø-mu-e-u-ø paakueshikan-a
3-eat-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3'-OBJsg:TA bread-OBV_AN
'S/he eats bread.'

No morphological causative could be derived; the phrasal causative in (89) was elicited instead. The verb tuutueu 'to do something for someone' appears in the main clause, and the subordinate clause is in the conjunct order.

(89) **Nituutuaau tshetshii muaat paakueshikana.**
ni-tuutau-aa-u tshetshii mu-aat
1-make_s.o._do_s.t.-TAth-TA to eat-TAconj3

paakueshikan-a
bread-OBV_AN

'I make him/her eat bread.'

(90) is a TI verb.

(90) **Kaamaakunuesht paassamᵘ utaapaaninu.**
kaamaakunuesht-ø paass-am-u
policeman-PROX_SG(an) shoot-TIth-SUB3/OBJ3':TI

utaapaan-inu
car-OBV_INAN_SG

'The policeman shoots the car.'

(91) was elicited as a causative of (90).

(91) **Naapeu tuutueu tshetshii paassaminitshi utaapaaninu kaamaakunuesht.**
naapeu-ø tuutau-e-u-ø
man-PROX_SG(an) make_s.o._do_s.t.-TAth-SUBsg/OBJ3'-OBJsg:TA

tshetshii paass-am-in-itshi utaapaan-inu
when shoot-TIth-OBV-CONJ3:TI car-OBV_INAN_SG

kaamaakunuesht-ø
policeman-PROX_SG(an)

'The man makes the policeman shoot the car.'

The object of the embedded clause of a causative construction, regardless of animacy, ('bread' in example (89), and 'the car' in example (90)) cannot be licensed because there are no extra Case-assigners. Why there should be Case for the applicative underlying object but not for the object of a transitive verb within a causative construction remains an area for further study.

FOOTNOTES

i.. However, in (75a) the 'independent' form ets is still attached to the pleonastic verb chits.

ii.. For Mellow (1989, 255) the existence of an independent nominal form is crucial to his definition of noun incorporation in Cree: '[These examples] may be considered incorporated because they are paralleled by the [independent] forms'. In the following example, -askw- is not considered to be an incorporated noun because it never appears outside the verb complex as an independent noun.

Pakam-aaskw-ii-w.
hit-wood-AI-3rdSG
'He hits wood.' (Mellow 1989, 255)

However, neither Mellow (1989) nor Baker (1988) propose that nouns incorporate because they are lexically marked as affixes.

iii.. Personal communication, Marguerite MacKenzie. This is not stated in any literature that I am aware of.

iv.. See, for example, Clarke (1986, 17) for discussion of Innu-aimun particles which correspond to prepositions.

v.. The TI theme sign -am appears in (81) in spite of the fact that this is the 3rd subject/obviative object TI theme sign. (81) is a 1st subject/3rd object TA verb. TI theme sign does not agree with the new verb - it is a record of the verb's derivational history, i.e. the applicative verb in (81) is derived from a 1st subject/3rd object TI verb.

vi.. Note that aapiuutaakana is the proposed full form of aapiuutaana.

vii.. In (81a), aapiuutaakana 'key' reduces to aapiuutaana.

viii.. Baker (1988, 64) applies the following principle in his analysis of applicative formation in other languages.

The Government Transparency Corollary (GTC)
A lexical category which has an item incorporated into it governs everything which th ed item governed in its original structural position. (Baker 1988, 64)

ix.. He proposes that the underlying object incorporates into the governing verb at the level of Logical Form and the resultant coindexing allows legitimate government of the NP.

x.. Neither Gibson (1980) nor Baker (1988) account for the fact that in Innu-aimun there appears to be a restriction prohibiting the formation of causatives from transitive verbs.