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1 Introduction

• This paper both describes and analyzes the wh-scope marking construction in Menominee.

• As first described by Johnson & Macaulay (2013), Menominee has a scope-marking construction in which an embedded wh-word with matrix scope moves only to the specifier of the embedded CP (1). The wh-word tāq sits in the matrix Spec,CP, and marks the scope of the embedded wh-word.1

(1) a. [cp Tāq kenah erānehtaman [cp awāeniq 's aw-māciat]? WH you think.TI.2>0CONJ who AOR IRR-leave.AI.3CONJ

‘Who do you think will leave?’ (SS 12/3/01; Johnson and Macaulay 2013)

b. [cp Tāq aic Mānih [cp wāekiq 's pas WH say.so.AI.3CONJ,IC Marie what AOR might tepāhah]? buy.TI.3>0CONJ

‘What did Mary say that she’s going to buy?’ (MF, LS 9/19/05; Johnson and Macaulay 2013)

*I am extremely grateful to the Menominee elders that supplied the data presented here: Marie Floring (MF), Margaret King (MK), †Lavina Shawano (LS), †Sarah Skubitz (SS), and Larry Tomaw (LT), as well as the Menominee Language and Culture Commission. Thanks also to Monica Macaulay, Bryan Rosen and Becky Shields for helpful comments on this paper.

1The following abbreviations are used for the Menominee examples: 2 – 2nd person; 3 – 3rd person; 0 – 3rd person inanimate; AI – animate intransitive; AN – animate; AOR – aorist; CNTRFACT – counterfactual; CONJ – conjunct; EPIS – epistemic; HAB – habitual; IC – initial change; IN – inanimate intransitive; INAN – inanimate; IRR – irrealis; NA – animate noun; NEG – negative; NI – inanimate noun; PL – plural; PST – past tense; QUOT – quotative; TA – transitive animate; TI – transitive inanimate; WH – wh-operator. The abbreviations used in the glosses of the Passamaquoddy and Blackfoot data follow the conventions of the authors cited.
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• In this paper, I will show that the Menominee data cannot straightforwardly be accounted for under previous analyses of wh-scope marking.

  – In particular, the diagnostics that Bruening (2001, 2004) uses to distinguish direct and indirect dependency analyses of scope marking in Passamaquoddy lead to contradictory analyses of the Menominee scope marking construction.

  – At the present time, I leave the correct analysis of Menominee scope marking an open question.

• This paper is structured as follows:

  – §2 outlines previous analyses of scope marking constructions in two other Algonquian languages, Passamaquoddy and Blackfoot.

  – §3 provides background information on the scope marking construction in Menominee.

  – in §4 I discuss how the Menominee scope marking data fit into previous analyses.

  – §5 concludes the paper.

2 Scope marking in other Algonquian languages

• Scope marking constructions have been previously analyzed in Passamaquoddy by Bruening (2001, 2004, 2006) and in Blackfoot by Barrie (2013).

• In this section, I overview the descriptions and analyses of the scope marking constructions in these other Algonquian languages.

• In the following section, I describe the Menominee facts, comparing and contrasting them with the Passamaquoddy and Blackfoot data.


  – The first type utilizes the wh-word keq(sey), which is used to question propositions, as in (2a).

  – The second type involves the wh-quantifier tan, and is only possible when questioning relative roots; see (2b).

(2) a. Keq itom wen-il nemiy-ac-il?
   what say.3 wh-OBV IC.see-3CONJ-PART.OBV
   ‘Who did he say he saw?’ (Bruening 2004:239)
b. **Tan kt-oli-wewitaham-a-n tan tuci-molihkikona-n-ess?**

   WH 2-thus-remember.TA-DIR-N WH x.extent-be.strong.3-N-DUB

   ‘How strong do you remember he was?’ (Bruening 2004:241)

- Bruening (2004, 2006) argues that the first type of scope marking construction is best analyzed as an indirect dependency.
- Bruening (2004) analyzes the second type as a direct dependency, while Bruening (2006) instead claims that it is an instance of a *wh*-copy construction.

  - **Direct dependency approach** (van Riemsdijk 1983, McDaniel 1989, Beck & Berman 2000): The scope marker in the matrix Spec,CP is an expletive element that is replaced at LF by the contentful *wh*-word. Thus, scope marking constructions have the same LF representation as long distance questions.

  - **Indirect dependency analysis** (Dayal 1994, 2000; Horvath 1997; Lahiri 2002): Scope marking constructions involve two separate questions: the so-called ‘scope-marker’ questions the propositional content of the matrix verb, and the embedded question serves as the restriction for the matrix question.

  - **Wh-copy construction** (Bruening 2006): The scope marking construction is a form of *wh*-copying. Following Fanselow & Mahajan 2000 and Felser 2004, Bruening argues that *wh*-copying has the same derivation as regular long distance questions, the only difference being that the *wh*-word in spelled out in both the matrix and embedded Spec,CP. In the case of apparent scope marking constructions, the ‘scope-marker’ is actually just a non-identical copy of the *wh*-word in the lower Spec,CP.

**2.1.1 Scope marking with *keq(sey)***

- Bruening (2004) presents four arguments that scope marking constructions with *keq(sey)* should be analyzed as an indirect dependency.
- 1. *Keq(sey)* is used to question propositions, as in (3) below.

  - This is expected under an indirect dependency approach, since the matrix *wh*-word questions the propositional content of the verb.

    (3) _Keq_ Mihku ikonewato-k?

    what M. deny-3CONJ

    ‘What did Mihku deny?’ (Bruening 2004:246)

- 2. There are differences in grammaticality between *keq(sey)* scope marking and long-distance *wh*-questions.
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- The complement of the verb ‘deny’ is an island for long-distance extraction (4a), but scope marking with keq(sey) is grammatical (4b).
  - This difference in grammaticality is readily explained under the indirect dependency analysis: there is no extraction from the complement clause with the scope marking construction. Instead, the propositional content of ‘deny’ is being questioned, which is always possible (5).

(4) a. * Wen-il Mikhu ikonewato-k eli kisi-komutonom-at?
   who-OBV M. deny-3CONJ C PERF-rob-3CONJ
   Intended: ‘Who did Mihku deny that he robbed?’

b. Keq Mikhu ikonewato-k wen-il kisi-komutonom-ac-il?
   what M. deny-3CONJ who-OBV PERF-rob-3CONJ-PART.OBV
   ‘Who did Mikhu deny that he robbed?’ (Bruening 2004:252)

(5) Keq Mikhu ikonewato-k?
   what M. deny-3CONJ
   ‘What did Mihku deny?’ (Bruening 2004:253)

- 3. Long-distance questions and scope marking constructions exhibit differences with respect to the form of the matrix verb.
  - With long-distance questions that target a relative root, the matrix verb has independent order inflection, and a relative root must be added to the matrix verb, as in (6a).
  - In contrast, if keq(sey) is the scope marker for an embedded relative root question, the matrix verb is in conjunct order, and no relative root is added; see (6b).

(6) a. Tama '-totoli-kolahmuw-a-n '-tus-il '-totoli-nomiy-a-n Piyel-ol?
     where 3-there-forbid-DIR-N 3-daughter-OBV 3-there-see-DIR-N P.-OBV
     ‘Where did he forbid his daughter to see Piyel?’

b. Keqsey kisi-gecimul-osk Tolitoli tama k-toli-nomiy-a-n?
     what PERF-ask-2CONJ.INV T. where 2-there-see-DIR-N
     ‘Where did Tolitoli ask you to meet her?’ (Bruening 2004:254)

- The form of the verb with the scope marking construction is the same as when questioning the propositional content: both (6b) and (7) are conjunct order verbs without a relative root.

(7) Keqsey kisi-gecimul-osk Tolitoli?
    what PERF-ask-2CONJ.INV T.
    ‘What did Tolitoli ask you?’ (Bruening 2004:254)
• 4. Long-distance questions and scope marking with *keq(sey)* also show differences with raising-to-object verbs.

• As is the case in other Algonquian languages (see e.g., Dahlstrom 1991, Branigan & MacKenzie 2002), certain TI verbs that can take a clausal complement in Passamaquoddy have a TA counterpart that can agree with an NP in the lower clause.

  – With long-distance *wh*-questions, the matrix verb must be a TA verb that agrees with the *wh*-phrase (8a, 9a). The verb cannot agree with a different NP (8b) or take the TI form (9b).

(8) a. *Wen kil piluwitaham-ot kisi-komutonom-uk*?
   who 2 suspect.TA-2CONJ PERF-rob-1CONJ
   ‘Who do you suspect that I robbed?’

b. * *Wen kil piluwitaham-iyn kisi-komutonom-uk*?
   who 2 suspect.TA-2/1CONJ PERF-rob-1CONJ
   Intended: ‘Who do you suspect (of me) that I robbed?’ (Bruening 2004:256)

(9) a. *Wen mihqitaham-ot kisi-komutonomuw-at Piyel-ol*?
   who remember.TA-2CONJ PERF-steal.from-3CONJ P.-OBV
   ‘Who did you remember stole it from Piyel?’

b. *Wen mihqitatatom-on kisi-komutonomuw-at Piyel-ol*?
   who remember.TI-2CONJ PERF-steal.from-3CONJ P.-OBV
   Intended: ‘Who do you remember stole it from Piyel?’ (Bruening 2004:257)

• Raising-to-object verbs take the TI form in *keq(sey)* scope marking constructions, as in (10a). Similarly, questioning the complement of raising-to-object verbs requires the TI form (10b).

(10) a. *Keqsey Tihtiyas wewitahato-k wen-il mace-wici-yem-ku-n Sipayik?*
   what T. remember.TI-3CONJ who-OBV go-with-to-INV-N
   ‘Who does Tihtiyas remember went with her to Sipayik?’

b. *Keqsey wewitahatom-on?*
   what remember.TI-2CONJ
   ‘What do you remember?’ (Bruening 2004:257-8)

• Lastly, Bruening (2001) makes an additional argument in favor of an indirect dependency analysis of scope marking with *keq(sey)*. As the examples in (11) show, scope marking constructions with perception verbs are ungrammatical. However, matrix (12a), embedded (12b) and long-distance (12c) questions with perception verbs are all grammatical.
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- Bruening suggests that the ungrammaticality of the examples in (11) is due to the semantics of perception verbs: they embed events/situations, not propositions. Since scope marking constructions question the propositional content of the matrix verb under the indirect dependency approach, it is not surprising that scope marking is incompatible with perception verbs.

(11) a. * Keqsey nemiht-uwon wen kisi-komutonato-k man?
   what IC.see.TI-2CONJ who PERF-steal-3CONJ money
   Intended: ‘Who did you see steal the money?’

b. * Keqsey nemiht-uwon keqsey mahtoqehs etoli-komutonato-k?
   what see-2CONJ what rabbit IC.PROG-steal-3CONJ
   Intended: ‘What did you see the rabbit stealing?’ (Bruening 2001:202)

(12) a. Keq nemiht-uwon?
   what IC.see.TI-2CONJ
   ‘What did you see?’

b. Nomihun keqsey etoli-komutonato-k mahtoqehs?
   see.TI what IC.PROG-steal-3CONJ rabbit
   ‘I saw what the rabbit stole.’

c. Keqsey nemiy-ot mahtoqehs etoli-komutonato-k?
   what IC.see-2CONJ rabbit IC.PROG-steal-3CONJ
   ‘What did you see the rabbit stealing?’ (Bruening 2001:202)

2.1.2 Scope marking with tan

- In contrast to constructions with keq(sey), Bruening shows that scope marking constructions with tan cannot be analyzed as an indirect dependency.

  - Bruening (2004) analyzes constructions with tan as a direct dependency; thus tan is an expletive marker, and the contentful wh-phrase undergoes movement to the matrix Spec,CP at LF.
  
  - Bruening (2006) instead analyzes the scope marking construction with tan as a type of wh-copy construction in which distinct forms of the wh-phrase are spelled out in the matrix and embedded Spec,CP.
  
  - Both of these analyses make the prediction that scope marking with tan will obey the same constraints on movement as regular long-distance wh-questions.

- 1. Tan is not used to question propositions; instead it is a general wh-word that is most often used to question relative root complements, as in (13).

  - Bruening analyzes tan as a wh-quantifier, and contends that its underspecified nature makes it a natural candidate for an expletive scope marker.
Since tan cannot question propositions, tan scope marking cannot be analyzed as an indirect dependency.

(13)  
\[ \text{Tan tuc-iya-n automupil?} \]
\[ \text{WH X.extent-go.II-N car} \]
‘How fast is the car?’ (Bruening 2004:237)

- The examples in (14) show that scope marking constructions with tan show the same grammaticality judgments as long distance questions with ‘deny’ (cf. (4)).

(14) a. * Wen-il Mikhu ikonewato-k eli kisi-komutonom-at?
\[ \text{who-OBV M. deny-3CONJ C PERF-rob-3CONJ} \]
Intended: ‘Who did Mihku deny that he robbed?’

b. * Tan 't-oli-kis-ikonewatomo-n tan kehson-ul atomupil-ol
\[ \text{WH 3-thus-PERF-deny.TI-N WH X.many-INAN.P car-INAN.P} \]
\[ \text{kisi-komutonato-k?} \]
PERF-steal-3CONJ
Intended: ‘How many cars did he deny that he stole?’ (Bruening 2004:253)

3. In contrast to scope marking with keq(sey) (6b), the form of the verb with tan scope marking is the same as long-distance extraction (15): the matrix verb in both constructions contains a relative root and has independent order inflection.

(15) a. Tama 'totoli-kolahmuw-a-n 'tus-il 'totoli-nomiya-a-n Piyel-ol?
\[ \text{where 3-there-forbid-DIR-N 3-daughter-OBV 3-there-see-DIR-N P.-OBV} \]
‘Where did he forbid his daughter to see Piyel?’

b. Tan kt-oli-wewitaham-a-n tan tuci-molihkikona-ne-ss?
\[ \text{WH 2-thus-remember.TA-DIR-N WH X.extent-be.strong.3-N-DUB.PRET} \]
‘How strong do you remember he was?’ (Bruening 2004:254-5)

4. Lastly, tan scope marking patterns with long-distance questions involving raising-to-object verbs: they both take the agreeing TA form of the verb (16).

(16) a. Wen mihqitaham-ot kisi-komutonomuw-at Piyel-ol?
\[ \text{who remember.TA-2CONJ PERF-steal.from-3CONJ P.-OBV} \]
‘Who did you remember stole it from Piyel?’

b. Tan kt-oli-wewitaham-a-n tan tuci-molihkikona-ne-ss?
\[ \text{WH 2-thus-remember.TA-DIR-N WH X.extent-be.strong.3-N-DUB.PRET} \]
‘How strong do you remember he was?’ (Bruening 2004:257-8)
2.2 Blackfoot: Barrie 2013

- Barrie (2013) analyzes a type of scope marking construction in Blackfoot that he dubs ‘pseudo scope marking.’
- In this construction, the scope marker tsa sits in the matrix Spec,CP, while its restriction is a relative root in the embedded clause. Two examples are given in (17).
- Barrie analyzes the scope marker tsa as the bare wh-feature.

(17) a. tsa áánií anná Mary omaanístspitahpi anní John
tsa aanii ann-wa Mary om-aanist-sspita-hp-yi ann-yi John
what say DEM-PROX Mary 3-DEG-tall-NZLR-INANIM.SG DEM-OBV John
‘How tall did Mary say John is?’

b. tsa áánií anná Mary anní John
tsa aanii ann-wa Mary ann-yi John
what say DEM-PROX Mary DEM-OBV John
omaanístsìkkamiyoowatahpi aniskayí
om-aanist-Ikkam-iy-owow-a-hp-yi ann-yi-hka-yi
3-DEG-fast-?-eat.TA-EPEN-NZLR-INANIM.SG DET-OBV-INVIS-INANIM.SG
apastaminam apastaminam
apple
‘How quickly did Mary say that John ate that apple?’ (Barrie 2013:11)

- Barrie argues that the pseudo scope marking construction cannot be analyzed as a direct dependency. Since there is no wh-phrase in the embedded Spec,CP, there is nothing that can move to replace the scope marker at LF.
- Barrie further argues that the pseudo scope marking construction also cannot be an indirect dependency, since island violations are found.
  
  - (18a) illustrates that the complement of factive verbs is an island for extraction, and (18b) shows that scope marking with a factive verb also results in ungrammaticality.
  
  - If the pseudo scope marking construction were an indirect dependency, then island violations would not be expected to occur: there is no wh-movement from the embedded clause under that approach.

(18) a. ? tsanistapi anná John issksinim anní Mary otsowatoo’pi
    what DET John he.knows.it DET Mary she.ate.it
    Intended: ‘What does John know that Mary ate?’
b. * tså anná John issksinin anní Mary
tsa ann-wa John issksinin ann-yi Mary
what DET-PROX John he.knows DET-OBV Mary

omaanistsíkkamiyoowatahpí annískayi
om-aanist-Ikkam-iy-oowat-a-hp-yi ann-yi-ahk-yi
3-DEG-FAST-?-eat.VTA-EPEN-NZLR-INANIM.SG DET-OBV-INVIS-INANIM.SG

apstaminam?
apstaminam
apple

Intended: ‘How fast does John know that Mary ate that one certain apple?’
(Barrie 2013:9-13)

• Instead, Barrie proposes that the pseudo scope marking construction in Blackfoot is simply normal *wh*-movement, but only the *wh*-feature moves to the matrix Spec,CP. Since the *wh*-feature tså is a free morpheme in Blackfoot, it can undergo movement and leave its restriction in situ.

3 Menominee scope marking construction data

• In this section, I present the facts from scope marking in Menominee.
  – First, I give an overview of the properties of the scope marker ŭaq.
  – Next, I provide an overview of the scope marking construction.

3.1 The scope marker ŭaq

• Shields (2008) and Johnson & Macaulay (2013) analyze ŭaq as the bare *wh*-operator.
  – Since it is a bare operator, ŭaq requires a restriction elsewhere in the clause.

• Pronominals can form the restriction on ŭaq. As the examples in (19) show, ŭaq can combine with a variety of pronominals/adverbials to yield complex *wh*-words.

(19) a. ŭaq-ærs
WH-thus
‘how’
b. ŭaq-enes
WH-there
‘where’
c. ŭaq-peh
WH-distance/time
‘how far, at what point, when’
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d. tāq-nekoh
   WH-so.much
   ‘how much, how many’

e. tāq-enoh
   WH-that.AN
   ‘who, which one (animate)

f. tāq-eneh
   WH-that.INAN
   ‘what, which one, what kind (animate)’ (Johnson & Macaulay 2013:7–8)

- The restriction on tāq can also come from a relative root. As seen in (20), tāq can
  question various relative roots:

(20) a. Relative root aeN- ‘thither, thus’

   Tāq kareh sōh kayeś-enāhkamekah?
   WH so.much entirely 1C.PST-there.are.such.goings.on.11.0CONJ
   ‘What sort of goings-on were there?’ (Shields 2008:225; Johnson & Macaulay
   2013:9)

b. Relative root ahpēht- ‘so much, so far, to such a degree’

   Kawen okārehkenanan tāq aepēhcepāhtok?
   NEG.QUOT know.TL.3>0NEG WH run.so.fast.AI.3CONJ.IC
   ‘He did not know how fast he ran.’ (Shields 2008:225; Johnson & Macaulay
   2013:9)

c. Relative root ahkw- ‘so long, so far’

   Tāq kēs-ahkōset?
   WH PST-be.so.tall.3CONJ
   ‘How tall was he?’ (Johnson & Macaulay 2013:9)

3.2 Properties of the scope marking construction

- As the examples in (21) show, the scope marking construction is available with a wide
  variety of wh-words:

(21) a. Tāq enuñehtaman wañiq kēs-tepāah pakhīsekahsak?
   WH think.TL.2>0CONJ who PST-buy.TL.3>0CONJ cookie.NA.PL
   ‘Who do you think bought the cookies?’ (MF 4/25/13)

b. Tāq enuñehtaman wañkiq Mesāen cew-kēs-tepāah?
   WH think.TL.2>0CONJ what Mesāen EPIS-PST-buy.TL.3>0CONJ
   ‘What do you think Mesāen bought? (MK 3/14/13)
c. Taq kenah enehtaman tåq-nakah Mesäen kēs-esiat?
   WH you think.TI.2>0CONJ WH-direction Mesäen PST-go.there.AI.3CONJ
   ‘Where do you think Mesäen went?’ (MK 9/16/13)

d. Taq kew-enehtaman aq-peh Mesäen kēs-tepāhah
   WH HAB-think.TI.2>0CONJ WH-time Mesäen PST-buy.TI.3>0CONJ
   otācekwan?
   car.NA
   ‘When do you think Mesäen bought a car?’ (MK, MF 9/16/13)

e. Taq enehtaman aq-nekah pakhisekachaksak Mesäen
   WH think.TI.2>0CONJ WH-so.much cookie.AN.PL Mesäen
   kēs-mēcek?
   PST-eat.TA.3’>3CONJ
   ‘How many cookies do you think Mesäen ate?’ (MK, MF 9/16/13)

f. Taq enehtaman waqseh-masénahakan Mesäen
   WH think.TI.2>0CONJ what.kind-book.NI Mesäen
   cew-kēs-wehtah?
   EPIS-PST-read.TI.3>0CONJ
   ‘Which book do you think Mesäen read?’ (MK, MF 9/16/13)

• The examples in (22) show that scope marking constructions are possible with
  numerous verbs that take a clausal complement:

(22) a. Taq kenah enehtaman awēnig ‘s aw-māciat?
   WH you think.TI.2>0CONJ who AOR IRR-leave.AI.3CONJ
   ‘Who do you think will leave?’ (SS 12/3/01; Johnson and Macaulay 2013)

b. Taq uwēc Mānih uwēkiq ‘s pas tepāhah?
   WH say.so.AI.3CONJ.1C Marie what AOR might buy.TI.3>0CONJ
   ‘What did Mary say that she’s going to buy?’ (MF, LS 9/19/05; Johnson and
   Macaulay 2013)

c. Taq kēs-kocēmonat uwēniq ‘s pas nīmit?
   WH PST-ask.TA.2>3CONJ who AOR might dance.AI.3CONJ
   ‘Who did you ask to dance?’ (LT 4/25/13)

d. Taq natawēnenehtaman uwēkiq pas tepāhah Mesäen?
   WH want.TI.2>0CONJ what CNTRFACT buy.3>0CONJ Mesäen
   ‘What do you want Mesäen to buy?’ (LT, MF, MK 10/7/13)

• As mentioned in 3.1, tāq is used to question relative roots. The verbs in (22a) and (b)
  both contain the relative root aeN- ‘thither, thus’, and (23a) and (b) show that the
  propositional content of these verbs is questioned by tāq.
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In contrast, the verbs in (22c) and (d) do not contain relative roots, and so the propositional content of these verbs is questioned by wækiq ‘what’ (23c-d).

(23) a. Taq kenah enænehtaman?
   WH you think.TI.2>0CONJ
   ‘What do you think?’ (LT, MF 5/23/13)
b. T̩aq əe c Sāpatis?
   WH say.so.AI.3CONJ.1C John
   ‘What did John say?’ (LF, MF 5/23/13)
c. Wækiq kēs-kocēmonat Mānīh?
   what PST-ask.a.question.TA.2>3CONJ Mary
   ‘What did you ask Mary?’ (MF, MK 2/7/13)
d. Wækiq natāwænehtaman?
   what want.TI.2>0CONJ
   ‘What do you want?’ (LT, MF 9/16/13)

The examples in (24) and (25) show that the scope marking construction shows different constraints on the form of the matrix verb than long distance questions.

– Either the TI or the TA form of raising-to-object verbs may be used with long distance questions, as in (24). (Note that this is different than Passamaquoddy: Bruening reports that only the TA form can be used with long distance questions.)

– In contrast, the TI form of the matrix verb is the only one that is possible with the scope marking construction (25a). (25b) shows that the TA form results in ungrammaticality.

(24) a. Wækiq natāwænehtaman pas tepāhah Mesāen?
   what want.TI.2>0CONJ CNTRFACT buy.3>0CONJ Mesāen
   ‘What do you want Mesāen to buy?’
b. Wækiq natāwænenemats pas tepāhah Mesāen?
   what want.TA.2>3CONJ CNTRFACT buy.3>0CONJ Mesāen
   ‘What do you want Mesāen to buy?’ (LT, MF, MK 10/7/13)

(25) a. T̩aq natāwænehtaman wækiq pas tepāhah Mesāen?
   WH want.TI.2>0CONJ what CNTRFACT buy.3>0CONJ Mesāen
   ‘What do you want Mesāen to buy?’
b. * T̩aq natāwænenemats wækiq pas tepāhah Mesāen?
   WH want.TA.2>3CONJ what CNTRFACT buy.3>0CONJ Mesāen
   Intended: ‘What do you want Mesāen to buy?’ (LT, MF, MK 10/7/13)
Like Passamaquoddy, scope marking is ungrammatical with perception verbs in Menominee (26).

- The examples in (27) show that the corresponding long-distance questions are grammatical.
- Both matrix (28a) and embedded (28b) questions are also grammatical with perception verbs.

(26) a. * $\text{Taq kēs-načwat uēniq 's kēs-muacen}$

\begin{align*}
&\text{WH PST-see.TA.2$>$3CONJ who AOR PST-eat.TA.3$>$3CONJ} \\
&\text{pahkisēkačhsak?}
\end{align*}

cookie.NA.PL

Intended: ‘Who did you see eat the cookies?’

b. * $\text{Taq kēs-načman wēkeiq 's kēs-mēcek Mēsāen?}$

\begin{align*}
&\text{WH PST-see.TI.2$>$0CONJ what AOR PST-eat.TI.3$>$0CONJ Mēsāen} \\
&\text{pahkisēkačhsak?}
\end{align*}

cookie.NA.PL

Intended: ‘What did you see Mēsāen eat?’ (MK, MF 9/16/13)

(27) a. $\text{Wēniq kēs-načwat 's kēs-muacen pahkisēkačhsak?}$

\begin{align*}
&\text{who PST-see.TA.2$>$3CONJ AOR PST-eat.TA.3$>$3CONJ cookie.NA.PL} \\
&\text{Who did you see eat the cookies?}
\end{align*}

b. $\text{Wēkeiq kēs-načman 's kēs-mēcek Mēsāen?}$

\begin{align*}
&\text{what PST-see.TI.2$>$0CONJ AOR PST-eat.TI.3$>$0CONJ Mēsāen} \\
&\text{What did you see Mēsāen eat?} \text{ (LT, MF, MK 9/16/13)}
\end{align*}

(28) a. $\text{Wēkeiq kēs-načman?}$

\begin{align*}
&\text{what PST-see.TI.2$>$0CONJ} \\
&\text{What did you see?} \text{ (LT, MF 9/16/13)}
\end{align*}

b. $\text{Nēkēs-načmen wēkeiq kēs-mēcek Mēsāen.}$

\begin{align*}
&\text{1PST-see.TI.1$>$0 what PST-eat.TI.3$>$0CONJ Mēsāen} \\
&\text{I saw what Mēsāen ate.} \text{ (MF, MK 9/16/13)}
\end{align*}

Lastly, the examples in (29) show that Menominee also has the ‘pseudo scope marking construction’ that Barrie (2013) describes for Blackfoot.

- (29a) shows that the relative root $\text{akhw-}‘\text{so long, so far}’$ is questioned by $\text{Taq}$.
- In (29b), we see a pseudo scope marking construction: $\text{Taq}$ is in the matrix Spec,CP, while its restriction, the relative root, is in the embedded clause.
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(29) Relative root ahkw- ‘so long, so far’

a. Tąq ahköset Sąpatís?
   WH be.so.tall.A1.3CONJ.1C Sąpatís
   ‘How tall is Sąpatís?’

b. Tąq kenahe néenahénatamah ahköset Sąpatís?
   WH you think.TI.2>0CONJ be.so.tall.A1.3CONJ.1C Sąpatís
   ‘How tall do you think Sąpatís is?’ (MF, MK 10/7/13)

4 Menominee scope marking and previous analyses

• In this section, I demonstrate that the Menominee facts are not easily explained under any of the three approaches to scope marking constructions: the direct dependency approach, indirect dependency approach, or wh-copy approach.

• The scope marker tąq is the bare wh-operator, which is inconsistent with an indirect dependency analysis.
  – As we saw in (23) above, tąq can only be used to question the propositional content of verbs that contain a relative root. The propositional content of other verbs is questioned by wënciq ‘what.’
  – However tąq is used as the scope marker regardless of whether the matrix verb contains a relative root that can be questioned by tąq (see (22) above).

• In contrast, a direct dependency or wh-copy analysis of scope marking predicts that there should be no differences in grammaticality between scope marking constructions and long distance questions. This prediction is not borne out in Menominee.
  – It is possible to have long distance questions with the TA form of raising-to-object verbs with long distance questions (24b), but not with scope marking constructions (25b).
  – Long distance questions with a matrix perception verb are grammatical (27), while the corresponding scope marking questions are not (26).

• A direct dependency analysis of the Menominee data could be salvaged if it could be shown that the raising-to-object and perception verb facts can be attributed to the difference between overt and covert movement.
  – The direct dependency approach could account for the fact that the scope marker is the bare wh-operator, since the scope marker is an expletive under that analysis.
– Under the direct dependency approach, scope marking constructions have the same LF representation as long-distance questions, since the contentful *wh*-word replaces the scope marker at LF. However, unlike the *wh*-copy analysis, the direct dependency approach does not postulate an identical *derivation* of scope marking constructions and long distance questions.

– At the present time, I leave it an open question whether the distinction between overt and covert movement can explain the differences between long distance questions and scope marking constructions with raising-to-object and perception verbs.

5 Conclusion

• To conclude, I presented new data from the scope marking construction in Menominee.

• I discussed how the data it into theories of scope marking both cross-linguistically and within Algonquian languages in particular, and concluded that the Menominee data cannot straightforwardly be accounted by previous analyses.
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