

VERBAL DERIVATION IN MICMAC

John Hewson
Memorial University of Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

In Indo-European languages the most frequent morphosyntactic device for distinguishing verbs that are transitive, intransitive, reflexive, reciprocal, etc., is the addition of nominal or pronominal elements to the Verb Phrase. In Algonkian languages, these differences are handled by the derivational morphology of the verb, several layers of derivation being possible. The ordering of these different layers will be illustrated from the derivational verb morphology of Micmac, an Algonkian language spoken in the five most easterly provinces of Canada, to show how several dozen different verbs can be formed from a single stem, providing rich representational possibilities for the individual speaker. The interplay of the different categories also allows us to draw conclusions about certain aspects of transitivity and the way that it is represented in different languages.

INTRODUCTION

The point of departure for this article is a brief presentation by Father Pacifique (1990: 178-9) of the range of verbs that can be derived from the Micmac root *wel-* 'right', 'suitable', 'good'. The analysis is based on the categories outlined in Bloomfield's *Algonquian* sketch (1946), and on extensive discussion of the data with Bernie Francis, native speaker from Sydney, Nova Scotia, my fellow researcher and collaborator in the translation of Father Pacifique's grammar (1990).

I ALGONKIAN WORD STRUCTURE

In all Algonkian languages there is a fundamental word structure that leads to the following canonical formulation:

(preverb) + INITIAL + (medial) + FINAL + inflections + agreements

The following important features should be noted:

1. Preverbs, as in Indo-European languages, are fundamentally adverbial, and there may be more than one: with Micmac *amalkat* 's/he dances', we may have *kekwi-amalkat* 's/he dances slowly', and *kesi-kekwi-amalkat* 's/he dances very slowly' (Inglis 1986: 57), just as in English we might have 's/he grades the material', then 'upgrades', and even 're-upgrades'. Goddard has claimed (1990: 478) that a 'preverb is a phonologically independent word', but in fact it is simply a cliticised element that may be separated from its host, a phenomenon that was called *tnesis* by the ancient grammarians.
2. The INITIAL is the root or base of the word, and since most words have a FINAL, the combination of I + F is called the STEM, to which the inflections are added. Thus we

may analyse *amalkat* as having INITIAL *amal-* 'variegated, with variation', FINAL *-ka* 'dance', the *-t* inflection of the third person singular being added to the STEM *amalka-*.

3. MEDIALS, like preverbs, tend to have full lexical meaning, and there may be more than one: *pas-altu-kw-a-t* 's/he has thick hair' shows INITIAL *pas-* 'thick', MEDIAL *altu-* 'strands', MEDIAL *-kw* 'head', VERB FINAL *-a* and INFLECTION *-t* (Inglis 1986: 71).
4. The FINAL marks the part of speech, so that there are NOUN FINALS, VERB FINALS, and ADVERBIAL FINALS. For our purposes only VERB FINALS are of interest, and they come in four categories, two transitive, and two intransitive. The two transitive types agree with the gender of the OBJECT: TRANSITIVE ANIMATE (TA), TRANSITIVE INANIMATE (TI); and the two intransitive types agree with the gender of the SUBJECT: ANIMATE INTRANSITIVE (AI), INANIMATE INTRANSITIVE (II).
5. Agreements are of various kinds and found on both transitive verbs, e.g. *nemi'k* 'I see him/her'; *nemi'kik* 'I see them', but also on intransitives: *amalkan* 'you dance'; *amalkanik* 'you dance for them'. In both cases *-ik* marks animate plural.
6. There are a few other morphological elements (such as modal markers) that are ignored here, being irrelevant to the topic.

II MICMAC VERB FINALS

The simplest of all the verbal paradigms of Micmac is of course the II, which obviously has only third person forms because first and second persons, since they represent entities that are required to speak and to understand, are necessarily animate. Impersonal verbs belong to this category of course, so that we can find such examples in Indo-European languages as Latin *licet* 'it is allowed', French *il faut*, or English *it behoves*. The inflection in Micmac is *-k*, which becomes *-q* after II finals that end in *-a*:

- (1) a. *meski'k* it is big (apostrophe indicates long vowel)
 mes + ki' + k = INITIAL + II FINAL + 3 sg. inflection
 big + shape + it
- b. *pemiaq* it moves along
 pem + ia + q = INITIAL + II FINAL + 3 sg. inflection
 along + move + it

The AI verbs have full paradigms, the third person inflections being *-t* after vowels, and *-k* after consonants. They often show finals that are slightly different from their corresponding II finals:

- (2) a. *meskilk* s/he is big
 mes + kil + k = INITIAL + AI FINAL + 3 sg. inflection
 big + shape + 3

- b. pemiet s/he moves along
 pem + iə + t = INITIAL + AI FINAL + 3 sg. inflection
 along + move + 3

The TI paradigms show the same number of forms as the AI, since the object that they represent, being inanimate, is always third person. There are two main conjugations, one in *-m* and one in *-tu*:

(3)	welo'tm	I treat it well	wela'tu	I do good to it
	welo'tmn	You (s) treat it well	wela'tu'n	You do good to it
	welo'tk	3 treats it well	wela'toq	3 does good to it

Here we are looking at two different TI finals: *-o't*, which has the meaning 'care for' and takes the *-m* inflections, and *-a't*, which has the sense of 'carry out' and takes the *-tu* inflections. Both of these finals are attached to the initial *wel-* that we see in *weliet* and *weliaq* below, which comes from a Proto-Algonkian root **wel-* 'right', 'arranged', 'suitable', 'orderly'.

The TA paradigms are the most complex of all since they incorporate reference not only to the the agent of the action, which can be first, second, or third person, but also to the patient of the action, which can also be first, second, or third person. These complexities are neatly handled by the famous direct and inverse forms of the Algonkian TA verb, as illustrated in the following examples. (In these paradigms 's/he' and 'him/her' have been replaced by 3 to indicate the third person animate, both subject and object, and 3' represents the secondary third person or obviative. The formula 1>3 indicates a direct form, with first person acting on third, whereas 1<3 indicates an inverse form with third person acting on first, and so on.)

(4)		DIRECT		INVERSE		
	1>3	wela'lik	I do 3 a favour	1<3	wela'lit	3 does me a favour
	2>3	wela'lit	You do 3 a favour	2<3	wela'lisk	3 does you a favour
	3>3'	wela'latl	3 does 3' a favour	3<3'	wela'litl	3' does 3 a favour

Here again we have the initial *wel-* followed by a TA final *-a'l*, followed by direct and inverse markers, inflections, and agreements.

III SECONDARY DERIVATION: AI'S FROM TA'S

Secondary derivation typically uses a second verb final to modify a stem that is already complete, that already has a final. The TA stem *wela'l-* 'to do a favour or a service for an animate, to favour or benefit someone', may be made intransitive, for example, with a variety of different effects, by the addition of certain AI finals. The most notable of these AI finals are the reflexive *-si*, the reciprocal *-ti*, and the inverse *-uksi*, as the following AI paradigms show.

(5)		AI REFLEXIVE
	wela'lsi	I do myself a favour
	wela'lsin	You do yourself a favour
	wela'lsit	3 does self a favour
	wela'lsimk	One does oneself a favour

wela'lsi'kw	We (2) (inc) do ourselves a favour
wela'lsiyek	We (2) (exc) do ourselves a favour
wela'lsiyok	You (2) do yourselves a favour
wela'lsijik	They (2) do themselves a favour
wela'lsulti'kw	We (all) (inc) do ourselves a favour
wela'lsultiyek	We (all) (exc) do ourselves a favour
wela'lsultiyoq	You (all) do yourselves a favour
wela'lsultijik	They (all) do themselves a favour

The first person inclusive includes the hearer (you and I) whereas the exclusive excludes the hearer (the other(s) and I). The first group of plurals is a group plural, often called the dual, the second group (plural marker *-ulti*) is an individual or atomistic plural. The group plural is a plurality within the unit (unit divided by plural); the atomistic plural is a plurality outside the unit (unit multiplied by plural): *pusi'kw* 'we go off together in one canoe'; *pusulti'kw* 'we go off together in different canoes'.

(6)

AI RECIPROCAL

wela'l'ti'kw	We (inc) do each other a favour
wela'l'tiyek	We (exc) do each other a favour
wela'l'tiyok	You do each other a favour
wela'l'tijik	They do each other a favour
wela'l'tulti'kw	We (inc) do one another a favour
wela'l'tultiyek	We (exc) do one another a favour
wela'l'tultiyoq	You do one another a favour
wela'l'tultijik	They do one another a favour

Since reciprocals always involve the activity of at least two persons, there are no singular forms in the reciprocal paradigm.

(7)

AI INVERSE

wela'luksi	A favour is done to me
wela'luksin	A favour is done to you
wela'luksit	A favour is done to 3
wela'luksimk	A favour is done to someone
wela'luksi'kw	A favour is done to us (inc) both
wela'luksiyek	A favour is done to us (exc) both
wela'luksiyo	A favour is done to you both
wela'luksijik	A favour is done to them both
wela'luksulti'kw	A favour is done to us (inc) all
wela'luksultiyek	A favour is done to us (exc) all
wela'luksultiyoq	A favour is done to you all
wela'luksultijik	A favour is done to them all

All Algonkian languages not only have direct and inverse forms in the paradigms of the TA verb, but also use reflexes of the Proto-Algonkian inverse marker **ekwi* (see Micmac *-uk* above) to derive AI verbs which form passive senses for the TA to which they are added, as in (3) above. In the case of Micmac this inverse marker is not a final by itself but must be

completed by the middle reflexive *-si* (see (5) above), to form the compound AI final *-uksi* (an alternative formation *-kusi* is also found).

This secondary use of *-si* shows clearly that it is primarily a middle voice marker, to mark those verbs where the subject is in some way both agent and patient at the same time, that is somewhere between active and passive in sense. In languages where there is a morphosyntax of middle voice, as in French, for example, it is natural for true reflexives to form a subcategory of the set of middle voice verbs (so called Pronominal Verbs in French). It is also of interest to find Micmac middle voice markers used where French uses pronominal verbs:

(8)	MICMAC	FRENCH	ENGLISH
	teluisi	je m'appelle	my name is
	nestuita'si	je me souviens	I remember
	nikana'si	je m'avance	I go ahead, out front
	kikja'si	je m'approche	I approach
	ejikla'si	je m'en vais	I go off
	winpasi	je me dépêche	I hurry up
	elisma'si	je me couche	I lie down
	epa'si	je m'assieds	I sit down
	lemja'si	je me lève	I get up
	ala'si	je me promène	I walk around
	kesispa'si	je me lave	I get washed
	nenqa'si	je m'arrête	I stop

IV SECONDARY DERIVATION: TA'S FROM TI'S

It is very common for TI verbs to have a secondary TA final added, thus making what are called Two-goal Verbs, which correspond to verbs that in Indo-European languages have both direct and indirect objects. Both *welo'tm* and *wela'tu* (in the Section II above) can be recycled in this way, with interestingly different results. Here we see the TI stem *wela't-* with TA final *-a* (*-u* allomorph in 3rd person) and the TA inflections:

(9)	wela'taq	I do it properly, correctly for him
	wela'tat	You do it properly, correctly for him
	wela'tuatl	3 does it properly, correctly for him

This is the most obvious result, where the Two-goal verb that is produced by the formation INITIAL + TI FINAL + TA FINAL has the sense of 'do something (direct object) for someone' (indirect object).

In the case of *welo'tm*, which has the sense of 'treat something well', the adding of a secondary TA final has the sense of 'treat someone's property, someone's possessions well'; here the indirect object has become a possessor, and consequently a slightly different set of TA inflections is used. We shall call this the Relational paradigm, that comes into play whenever direct objects are possessed by a third person. To translate 'I see the book', for example, we use a TI, since *wi'katikn* 'book', is inanimate, but 'I see his book' will require the use of a Relational TA verb. This is a significantly different result from the Two-goal verbs, however, since the inanimate Direct Object remains the specific focus or goal of the verb, and the resultant morphology uses the inflections of the TA Conjunct (which marks a dependence, and is normally used in subordinate clauses) rather than those of the TA Independent, the normal order for use in main clauses.

This use of a Relational paradigm is not an isolated event, since Ellis reports a Relational paradigm for Cree (1962: 1.14-10), with what appears to have AI inflections, used not only for objects possessed by others but also for actions done by others, and even intransitive actions taken in relation to others. Algonkian languages, in fact typically mark relationships, so that there are many nouns, such as body parts and family relationships, that exist only in their possessed forms: a tooth, for example, is always someone's tooth.

In the case of *welo'tm* the TI theme sign *-m* is maintained, and the TA final and the TA Conject endings are added after it:

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| (10) | welo'tmaq wtui'katikn
welo'tmaj wtui'katikn
welo'tmuaj wtui'katikn | I treat 3's book well
You treat 3's book well
3 treats other's book well |
|------|--|--|

This last form may be contrasted with

- | | | |
|------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| (11) | welo'tk wtui'katikn | He treats his own book well |
|------|---------------------|-----------------------------|

where the verb is a simple TI, because the owner is the same person as the subject of the verb. Consequently there is no sense of relationship to another possessor, as there would be in

- | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (12) | Sa'n welo'tmuaj Mali
wtui'katikn | John treats Mary's book well |
|------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|

where the third person (3) and the obviative (other), implicit in the example above, are named and thereby made explicit.

Such Two-goal and Relational verbs, being regular TA verbs, can now undergo a tertiary derivation by having a middle voice or other AI final added, as in Section III. above:

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| (13) | welo'tmasi
welo'tmasin
welo'tmasit | MIDDLE

I look after it well for myself
You look after well for yourself
3 looks after it well for self |
| (14) | welo'tmati'kw
welo'tmatiyek
welo'tmatiyok
welo'tmatijik | RECIPROCAL

We (inc) look after it well for one another
We (exc) look after it well for one another
You look after it well for one another
They look after it well for one another |
| (15) | welo'tmakuey
welo'tmakuen
welo'tmakuet | INVERSE

It is well looked after for me
It is well looked after for you
It is well looked after for 3 |

In this last example the inverse marker *-ku* has been followed by AI final *-e* rather than by *-si*, probably because I am the owner of what is looked after rather than the beneficiary.

The derivational possibilities are far from over at this point. If one adds *-mk*, the inflection for indefinite subject, to the middle AI above

- (16) *welo'tmasimk* It is well looked after for one

the Noun final *-ewey* (which can be added to any indefinite subject form) may be added to produce a noun:

- (17) *welo'tmasimkewey* stuff for looking after something well (for oneself),
e.g. wax for the car

which, as an inanimate noun, can be made into a plural:

- (18) *welo'tmasimkewe'l* things for looking after something well (for oneself),
e.g. tools for the car

This tremendous range of derivational possibilities gives the language vast representational resources, a derivational richness that is at once the glory and the pleasure of every Algonkian language.

V SECONDARY DERIVATION: AI'S FROM TI'S

There are various ways that TI verbs can be made intransitive. First of all, the AI final *-eke*, which makes the object indefinite, may be added after the TI final:

- (19) *wela'tekey* I do things well
 wela'teken You do things well
 wela'teket 3 does things well

The final result is an AI verb, as may be seen from the inflections, and similar results are obtained with *welo'tm*:

- (20) *welo'tekey* I look after things
 welo'teken You look after things
 welo'teket 3 looks after things

It may be noted that this AI final *-eke* replaces the TI theme sign *-m* of stems like *welo'tm*; it is the only AI final to do so. The probable reason for this is that *-eke* replaces the definite object of the TI verb with an indefinite object.

With TI verbs like *welo'tm* the AI final *-a* can be added to give a generalised intransitive verb. This may be illustrated by TI *nestm* 'I understand it', and AI *nestmay* 'I understand', whereas AI *nestmekey* would mean 'I understand things'. Since *welo'tm* can mean not only 'I treat it well' but also 'I bless it', *welo'tmat* can mean 'He blesses, he gives a blessing', whereas *wela'tat* means 'he is sympathetic, helpful'.

AI *-uksi*, with the inverse marker, may also be added to TI verbs, with the following results:

- (21) *wela'tuksi* Things are going well for me
 wela'tuksin Things are going well for you

wela'tuksit

Things are going well for 3

And with *welo'tm* the theme sign *-m* is of course retained:

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| (22) | welo'tmuksi
welo'tmuksin
welo'tmuksit | I receive favours
You receive favours
3 receives favours |
|------|---|--|

VI AI -UE: SECONDARY OR TERTIARY DERIVATION?

There is also what appears to be an AI final *-ue* that can be added to both TI and TA stems, as shown in the following, where it is added to the TA stem *wela'l-* and the TI stems *wela't-* and *welo'tm*:

- | | | | |
|------|----|--|--|
| (23) | TA | wela'luey
wela'luet
wela'luet | I do a favour, render a service
You do a favour, render a service
3 does a favour, renders a service |
| (24) | TI | wela'tuey
wela'tuet
wela'luet | I am sympathetic towards others
You are sympathetic towards others
3 is sympathetic towards others |
| (25) | TI | welo'tmuey
welo'tmuen
welo'tmuet | I do favours for people
You do favours for people
3 does favours for people |

Here, however, we are undoubtedly looking at two different elements. First of all we can separate out a common AI final *-e*, which has the same functional role throughout. The element *-u* that precedes this final, however, has two different functions. In the case of the TI's, the references to 'people' and 'others' in the translation of these two verbs show quite clearly that the *-u* of *wela'tu-* and *welo'tmu-* is a TA final which creates the Two-goal and Relational stems that we have already seen in *wela'tuatl* '3 does something good for other' and *welo'tmuaj wtui'katikn* '3 treats other's book well', in Section IV above. This *-u* would be historically derived from Proto Algonkian **-aw*, and be cognate with the Cree element described by Denny as occurring in AI benefactives in Cree (1983: 29-33). To this element *-u* the AI final *-e* is added to give a tertiary derivation that we may represent as follows: INITIAL+ TI + TA + AI + Inflections.

No such role can be attributed to the *-u* of *wela'luey*, because the stem to which it is added is already a TA stem: consequently we do not need this *-u* to create a TA stem. It necessarily serves some other function.

This *-u* element, however, is also a reflex of Proto-Algonkian **-aw*, which has a variety of different functions. First of all it may be added to an initial or root to form a so-called extended root (Hockett 1957: 260). It may also be added, as we have seen, to a TI stem to form a Two-goal stem. It may even be added directly to an initial to form a sort of instant Two-goal as in Ojibwa *pimaw* (**pem-aw-e:wa*) 'take away from someone'. It is also used in post-medial position before TA, TI, AI, and II finals. It seems, in short, to be a multi-purpose derivation marker. Consequently, we may interpret the *-u* of *wela'luey* as reshaping the TA stem for the addition of the AI abstract final *-e*, which is not normally added directly to TA stems, but may be added after *-u*, whether this element functions as a TA final or not.

VII INTERPRETING TA WELEYAQ

There are two AI paradigms, one with AI final *-ie*, which represents continual progress or movement (as in *pemiet* '3 moves along'), and one with final *-ei/e'*, which represents a state (as in *mekwei*, *mekwein*, *mekwe'k* 'be red'), as the following paradigms show:

(26)	weliey	I am happy	welei	I am well
	welien	You are happy	welein	You are well
	weliet	3 is happy	wele'k	3 is well

(The *-y* inflection of the 1st sg. is not added when the stem ends in *-i*). Since 'to be happy', in the sense of 'enjoying oneself', is very much a moment to moment process contingent upon external circumstances, whereas 'to be well' represents one's state of corporeal health, it is possible to see the contrastive force of these two finals, even if there are situations in which either one or the other could be used.

The existence of *welei*, however, raises the question of the following TA paradigm:

(27)	weleyaq	I am well-disposed toward 3, treat 3 well
	weleyat	You are well-disposed toward 3, treat 3 well
	weleiwatl	3 is well-disposed toward other, treat other well

The Proto-Algonkian TA final for this verb is the *-aw* that we have already seen, and the evolution to the modern Micmac inflections is as follows (Dawe 1986: 147):

(28)	1 > 3	aw-ak > a:k > ak > aq
	2 > 3	aw-at > a:t > at
	3 > 3'	aw-a:t > ua:t > uat > wat

In short, the Proto-Algonkian TA final **-aw* contracts with a following short vowel to form a long vowel, and this contraction takes place early because the long vowel so produced undergoes the shortening that affects Proto-Algonkian long vowels in Micmac (Hewson 1973: 157). Before a long vowel this contraction does not take place, and *-aw* is reduced to *-u*, which becomes [w] in inter-vocalic position.

It would appear, therefore, that *weleyaq* is a TA that has been derived from AI *welei-* by the addition of the PA element **-aw*, one of whose functions is to create TA Two-goal verbs, which are normally (but not always - see Ojibway *pimaw* above) formed on a TI stem, as in the case of *welo'tmaq* 'I treat 3's property well' (see Section IV), and its AI derivation *welo'tmuey* 'I do favours for people' (see Section VI). The sense of *weleyaq*, therefore, may be paraphrased as 'I act well on behalf of this animate being'; in other words 'I treat 3 well' which has the Two-goal sense of 'doing something good (inan.) to someone (an.)'.

This analysis would in turn explain a further derivation, namely AI *weleiwey*, which Father Pacifique glosses as 'I am well disposed towards others, I am a benefactor'. Here we have AI *welei-*, with TA Two-goal final *-w*, followed by the same AI final *-ey* that we have already seen attached to TA *-u* in the Two-goal *welo'tmuey* 'I do favours for people' (Section VI).

VIII RÉSUMÉ OF THE VERBAL DERIVATIONS

In order to draw all the detailed derivations that we have described into a coherent picture, the forms that we have discussed will be presented here in tabulated form, exactly as they are presented by Father Pacifique in his grammar (1939: 195; 1990: 178). To this presentation we have added a succinct resumé of the verbal categories and processes involved.

I.		STATE OR ATTITUDE		
1.	Wel	ei, iey, iaq	to be well, happy; to become happy, that is good	(AI, AI, II)
2.		eiwey	to be well-disposed toward others, to be a benefactor	(AI + TA Two-goal + AI)
3.		eyaq	to be that towards someone, to consider him good, to treat him well	(AI + TA Two-goal)
4.		eyasi	to consider oneself good, to treat oneself well	(AI + TA Two-goal + AI middle)
5.		eyati'kw	to act thus towards one another, each other	(AI + TA Two-goal + AI reciprocal)
6.		eyuksi, eyaku, eiakuey	to be well treated, blessed, in one's person	(AI + TA Two-goal + AI inverse)
7.		o'tasi	to be that in one's property, in one's affairs	(TI + TA Two-goal + AI middle)
8.		o'tekey	to do well, to profit, to make progress	(TI + AI indefinite object)
9.		o'tm	to treat a thing well, to bless it, to arrange it well	(TI)
10.		o'tmaq	to treat or use well what belongs to someone	(TI + TA Relational)
11.		o'tmay	to bless (in general), to do favors	(TI + AI)
12.		o'tmuey	to do them for neighbors in general	(TI + TA Relational + AI)
13.		o'tmuksi, o'tmaku, o'tmakuey	to receive them, to be blessed in one's affairs	(TI + AI inverse, TI + TA + AI inverse, TI + TA + AI inverse + middle)
14.		o'tmasi	to treat one's own affairs well, to look after one's own interests	(TI + TA Two-goal + AI middle)
15.		o'tmati'kw	to do it for each other	(TI + TA + AI reciprocal)
II.		ACTION OR ACTIVITY		
1.	Wel	a'si	to be well, to act well	(AI)
2.		a'luey	to do good, to do a favor, to render a service	(TA + derivation marker + AI)
3.		a'lik	to do it for a specified person	(TA)
4.		a'lsi	to do it for oneself, to flatter oneself	(TA + AI middle)
5.		a'liti'kw	to do it to oneself reciprocally, to each other	(TA + AI reciprocal)
6.		a'luksi, a'liku	to be favored (in a specific thing), to be a beneficiary	(TA + AI inverse)

7.	a'tasi	to be helped in one's affairs	(TI + TA Two-goal + AI middle)
8.	a'tekey	to do good, to do well, to act good	(TI + AI indefinite object)
9.	a'tu	to do something good, also, to do a thing well	(TI)
10.	a'taq	to favor the interests of another	(TI + TA Two-goal)
11.	a'tay	to favor	(TI + AI)
12.	a'tuey	to favor others, in general	(TI + TA Two-goal + AI)
13.	a'tuksi	to be favored in one's affairs	(TI + TA + AI inverse)
14.	a'tasi	to do good to oneself	(TI + TA Two-goal + AI middle)
15.	a'tati'kw	to do it mutually	(TI + TA Two-goal + AI reciprocal)

IX THE DIRECTION OF MICMAC VERBAL DERIVATIONS

In the above tables we note certain recurring patterns, of which the most frequent are undoubtedly TI + TA and TA + AI. The pattern TI + AI is also feasible, but less common, and AI + TA is limited to the one combination *welai + w* (see end of Section VII), an analysis which is based on indirect rather than direct evidence. There are no examples, as far as we can see, of TA + TI, of II + AI, of AI + TI, or of II + TI, although we must admit that all the possibilities are not exhausted: these are simply the most common and typical examples of Algonkian verbal derivation. Micmac shows, in this respect, the typical patterns of verbal derivation that are found throughout the languages of the Algonkian family. We shall consequently restrict our discussion to the prototypical patterns of TA + AI and TI + TA.

The pattern of TA + AI may in fact be some kind of a linguistic universal in terms of derivational morphosyntax. If we take an unambiguously ergative language such as Inuktitut, we find that middle voice verbs, including reflexives, are formed by adding intransitive inflections to transitive stems. This de-transitivizing of a transitive morphology represents an action that is less than fully transitive, which is precisely the state of affairs that any middle voice morphosyntax attempts to mark. We must understand by this that a reflexive, the most obvious example of middle voice, although it necessarily starts as a transitive notion, ultimately fails to achieve true transitivity.

The most prototypical transitive verbs represent actions that are initiated by an agent (A) and carried out on a patient (P), as in English 'A strikes P'. The action, in a sense goes across (= Latin *trans*) from the agent to the patient. But in reflexives, clearly, the action is returned to the agent rather than passed over to a patient. In short agent and patient are one and the same, which is why we call this construction Middle Voice, because it is neither 100% active (where the Agent is the subject: A strikes P) nor 100% passive (where the Patient is the subject: P is struck by A), but somewhere in between where the subject is both Agent and Patient at the same time. Middle Voice, therefore, is inherently a transitive action that fails to achieve full transitivity, and the Algonkian languages, and Inuktitut as well, give such verbs a transitive base to which they add a secondary intransitive morphology to complete the verbal representation.

The pattern of TI + TA, on the other hand, is by no means universal: here we are dealing with a gender contrast that is not found in Inuktitut, for example. There are also two different morphological patterns: the full Two-goal verb, and the TI Relational. Let us deal first with the full Two-goal verb, which shows by its inflections that it is ultimately a TA verb, based on

a TI stem, and that the primary patient of such a verb is the animate patient, the inanimate patient being secondary, as in (9) above.

- | | | |
|------|------------------------------------|---|
| (29) | wela'taq
wela'tat
wela'tuatl | I do it properly, correctly for him
You do it properly, correctly for him
3 does it properly, correctly for other |
|------|------------------------------------|---|

This construction is in direct contrast with Two-goal verbs in languages such as English and French, where the direct (or primary) object is the inanimate, and the indirect (or secondary) object is animate:

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------|---|
| (30) | I sent him
I sent him the book | (only one object, which is animate)
(two-goal, animate automatically becomes
the indirect object) |
|------|-----------------------------------|---|

Obviously, when there are two goals for a given verb it is possible to make either one the primary one, and the languages of the globe choose now one pattern, now the other.

In the case of the TI Relational the use of the TA Conjunct (i.e., subordinative) inflections (instead of the Independent) indicates that the inanimate object remains the primary object, but that it has a relationship of possession to an animate owner, and is therefore not just a simple inanimate object. This is in line with the normal strategy, in Algonkian languages, of making relationships explicit, so that there is no word for 'father', but only *nujj* 'my father', *kujj* 'thy father', *wujjl* '3's father', and so on. In fact the early missionaries, in order to translate 'God the Father', had to write *Wekwisit Nikskam* 'God who has a Son', and for 'God the Son' wrote *Ewjit Nikskam* 'God who has a Father'. In English the word 'father' only implies a relationship; in Micmac and other Algonkian languages the relationship is made explicit, and a similar explicitness concerning relationships occurs in the verbal morphology when an action is done to an object that is stated to be someone's possession.

X CONCLUSION

The derivational morphology of the verb in Micmac, as in any Algonkian language, is a remarkable illustration of the well-known dictum of Meillet (1937: 475): 'Une langue est un système où tout se tient et a un plan d'une merveilleuse rigueur.'. Certainly everything fits together in a remarkable way: Reflexives and Reciprocals as secondary derivations of transitive stems; TA finals added to TI stems to form Two-goal stems, to which further Reflexives and Reciprocals can be added; the formation of an intransitive inverse on a transitive stem to give a passive sense, a formation that parallels the inverse forms of the TA, with syncretism of the morphology; and finally in the TI Relational forms the same kind of explicit marking of a relationship that is found in the possessed stems of the noun. The whole effect is that of an architecture, where certain elements are constructed on others in a balanced and harmonious fashion.

REFERENCES

- Dawe, Audrey. 1986. *Fundamentals of Micmac Historical Morphology*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Denny, Peter. 1983. Getting rid of AI abstract final *-a*. *Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics* 8: 29-33.

- Goddard, Ives. 1990. Primary and secondary derivation in Algonquian. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56: 449-483.
- Hewson, John. 1973. Proto-Algonkian reflexes in Micmac. *Anthropological Linguistics* 15: 151-164.
- Ellis, C. Douglas. 1962. *Spoken Cree*. Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada.
- Hockett, C.F. 1957. Central Algonquian vocabulary: stems in /k-/. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 23: 247-68.
- Inglis, Stephanie. 1986. *The Fundamentals of Micmac Word Formation*. Unpublished MA thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1937. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues Indo-européennes*. 8th ed., Paris: Hachette.
- Pacifique, Rev. Fr. OFMCAP. 1990. *The Micmac Grammar of Father Pacifique*. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, Memoir 7. (Translation and re-transcription, with Introduction and Index of Father Pacifique's 1939 *Leçons théoriques et pratiques de la langue micmaque*, by John Hewson and Bernie Francis).
- Rand, Rev. Silas T. 1875. *A First Reading Book in the Micmac Language*. Halifax: Nova Scotia Printing Co.