INTRODUCTION

This paper provides a new analysis of the verb position in Potawatomi. Claims about the position of the verb in Algonquian languages have been made for specific languages as well as for the family as a whole. These previous analyses have argued that the verb always moves to at least I/T, and sometimes moves to C. For Potawatomi, Halle and Marantz (1993) argue that the verb moves to C in independent order and to I/T in conjunct order. Richards (2004) proposes a similar analysis for Wampanoag. In contrast, Campana (1996) argues for all Algonquian languages that the conjunct verb moves to C, while the independent verb only moves to I/T (the reverse of what Halle and Marantz and Richards argue). Lastly, Brittain (2001) makes a similar case for Western Naskapi. I argue that the verb in Potawatomi does not move beyond the IP-functional layer; that is, there is no movement to C in EITHER independent or conjunct order. To support my analysis, I draw on new evidence from the positions of negation, tense, and complementizers.

The paper is organized as follows: in the next section I summarize and comment on previous analyses of verb movement in Algonquian languages. In the following section I present my analysis of the syntax of the Potawatomi verb. The last section concludes the paper.
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PREVIOUS ANALYSES OF THE POSITION OF THE VERB IN ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES

Before I present my analysis of the position of the Potawatomi verb, I first review previous approaches to the position of the verb in a variety of Algonquian languages. While only the first two analyses (Halle and Marantz 1993; Campana 1996) explicitly discuss Potawatomi, one might hypothesize that an analysis for a related language could be extended to Potawatomi. Thus, I also explain why I do not adopt Brittain’s (2001) analysis of Western Naskapi or Richards’s (2004) analysis of Wampanoag.

Halle and Marantz (1993)

Halle and Marantz (1993) argue that the Potawatomi independent order verb moves to C. Their argumentation relies primarily on the verbal morphology: they argue that the verb adjoins to both Neg and T to pick up the relevant suffixes. In their analysis, the morphemes in example (1a) occupy the positions shown in (1b): 2

(1) a. g-wabm-a-si-m-waben-en-ek
   2-see.ta-3-Neg-2PL-PRET-3PL
   ‘You (pl.) didn’t see them.’ (Halle and Marantz 1993:140)

   b. 

   \[
   \begin{tikzpicture}
   \node (c) {C};
   \node (tns) [below of=c] {Tns};
   \node (neg) [left of=tns] {Neg};
   \node (ind) [below of=neg] {Ind};
   \node (v) [below of=ind] {V};
   \node (wabm) [right of=ind] {wabm};
   \node (a) [below of=wabm] {\text{Agr}_{1}};
   \node (a2) [right of=a] {\text{Agr}_{2}};
   \node (a3) [right of=a2] {\text{Agr}_{3}};
   \node (neg2) [right of=tns] {Neg \text{-} \text{si}};
   \node (neg3) [right of=c] {C \text{-} \text{Agr}_{3} \text{-} \text{ek}};
   \node (tns2) [right of=neg2] {Tns \text{-} \text{m}};
   \node (tns3) [right of=tns2] {\text{Agr}_{2} \text{-} \text{wabnen}};
   \path (v) edge (ind);
   \path (ind) edge (wabm);
   \path (wabm) edge (a);
   \path (a) edge (a2);
   \path (a2) edge (a3);
   \path (a3) edge (neg2);
   \path (neg2) edge (tns2);
   \path (tns2) edge (neg3);
   \path (neg3) edge (c);
   \end{tikzpicture}
   \]

2. All Potawatomi examples follow the orthographic conventions of the Wisconsin Native American Languages Project (WNALP). The following abbreviations are used for the data from Algonquian languages: 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person; AI = animate
In the tree in (1b), “Ind” is a functional head that is found only in independent order clauses. The second person marker g- is not represented in the tree as Halle and Marantz treat it as a clitic.

Although they are not explicit about where the conjunct verb sits in their analysis, they make some observations that indicate that the conjunct verb must sit lower than C. First, Halle and Marantz note that negation in the conjunct order is expressed as a preverb, as in (2). Since part of their argument for the independent verb moving to C relies on the verb moving through Neg to adjoin to the suffix -si, the fact that the conjunct verb follows negation suggests that the verb is below NegP.

(2) bwa-min-gwa-ben
   NEG-give.TA-2PL>3PL.CONJ-PRET
   ‘You (pl.) didn’t give them (something).’ (Halle and Marantz 1993:139)

Second, they also note that the agreement suffix that follows the preterit morpheme (their “Agr3”) is absent in conjunct order. Under their analysis, this agreement suffix is adjoined to C. Its absence could then be a result of the verb not adjoining to C.

As discussed below, the negation and tense systems in Potawatomi are much more complex than indicated by Halle and Marantz. I argue that the morphological facts do not support their conclusion that the independent verb moves to C.

Campana (1996)

Campana (1996) argues that (in all Algonquian languages) the conjunct verb undergoes I-to-C movement, while the independent order verb only moves to I. To justify his analysis, he argues that certain properties of the conjunct order conform to general properties of I-to-C movement.

intransitive; CONJ = conjunct; DIR = direct; DUB = dubitative; FCT = factive; FUT = future; IC = initial change; II = intransitive inanimate; IMPER = imperative; IN = inanimate; IND = independent; LOC = locative; MOD = modal; NEG = negation; OBV = obviative; NA = animate noun; NI = inanimate noun; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PRET = preterit; PST = past; Q = question particle; SG = singular; TA = transitive animate; TI = transitive inanimate; UNSPEC = unspecified subject. The following abbreviations are used for the data from other languages, which retain the glossing conventions of the original source: COMP = complementizer; COND = conditional; DET = determiner; ERG = ergative; IR = irrealis; R = realis; S = subject.
The first property of I-to-C movement is a change in the surface form of the verb, as exemplified in (3)–(5) for English, French, and Palauan, respectively.

(3) a. What did you think?

(4) a. Il y a des problèmes.
       it there have.3SG of the problems
       ‘There are some problems.’

       b. Y a-t-il des problèmes?
          there have.3SG-t-it of the problems
          ‘Are there any problems?’ (Campana 1996:219)

(5) a. Ng-kileld-ii a sub a Droteo.
       R.3SG-heat.up-3SG soup Droteo
       ‘Droteo heated up the soup.’

       b. Le-kileld-ii a sub a Droteo.
          IR.3-heat.up-3SG soup Droteo
          ‘Droteo will heat up the soup.’ (Campana 1996:219)

The examples in (3) show that the element that undergoes inversion in English questions is not the verb, but instead the inflected form of the auxiliary do. In example (4b), we see that the segment [t] is inserted between the inverted verb a and the subject il. In both English and French, inversion is standardly assumed to involve I-to-C movement. In (5a), the verb takes a realis prefix ng-, while the verb in (5b) has an irrealis prefix le-. Campana cites his previous analysis (Campana 1988), where he argues that irrealis verbs move to C in Palauan. Based on the data from these three languages, Campana concludes that a change in the surface form of a verb can serve as a diagnostic for I-to-C movement. He then extends this diagnostic to the alternation between independent and conjunct order in Algonquian languages: since the conjunct order is characterized by a different set of inflectional markings, Campana argues that the conjunct order verb undergoes I-to-C movement.

Another property is exemplified in Chamorro: in questions, morphological complexity diminishes. As can be seen in (6), the prefix ha- is
replaced by the infix -um-. The infix is invariant across person and number, in contrast to the usual prefix set.

(6) a. Ha-fa′gasi si Juan i kareta.
   ERG.3SG-wash DET Juan DET car
   ‘Juan washed the car.’

   b. Hayi fuma′gasi i karenta?
   who wash(WH/S) DET car
   ‘Who washed the car?’ (Campana 1996:219–20, citing Chung 1982)

Campana likens this alternation in Chamorro inflection to the independent-conjunct alternation in Algonquian languages. As is well known, the preverbal person markers that are present on independent order verbs are missing in the conjunct order. This is exemplified in (7) with data from Passamaquoddy-Maliseet:

   1-hit-DIR-NEG-PRET
   ‘I didn’t hit him.’

   b. Tokom-a-w-an-sopon.
   hit-DIR-NEG-1>3-PRET
   ‘I (would) not have hit him.’
   (Campana 1996:209–210, citing Francis and Leavitt 1992)

Thus, since Chamorro has diminished agreement morphology in the context of wh-questions (which often are associated with I-to-C movement), Campana argues that the lack of preverbal person markers in conjunct order in Algonquian languages is also a result of I-to-C movement.

While Campana claims to have evidence of unifying features of I-to-C movement, I would argue that the data from these languages do not reflect a true crosslinguistic generalization. English I-to-C movement involves do-support, which is not found exclusively with I-to-C movement: it also shows up in verb phrase topicalization and ellipsis, as in (8):

(8) a. Mary said she would wash the car, and wash the car she did.

   b. John bought shoes, and Mary did too.
The example of French inversion in (4b) involves the pronunciation of [t] between the verb and the subject. This process has been analyzed as an instance of liaison, a phenomenon in which normally latent consonants are pronounced when the following word begins with a vowel (e.g., Davis 2000). Thus, the change in surface form is due to a more general phonological process, rather than a direct result of I-to-C movement. As for Palauan, the only difference between (5a) and (5b) is the realis/irrealis distinction. To the best of my knowledge, the movement of all irrealis verbs to C is unique to Palauan, rather than a crosslinguistically robust phenomenon. Thus, if the data from English, French and Palauan in (3)–(5) are not crucially linked to I-to-C movement, then the argument that the independent-conjunct alternation in Algonquian languages is tied to I-to-C movement does not necessarily follow. Finally, while the Chamorro data most closely resemble the independent/conjunct distinction in Algonquian languages, it is not clear that the Chamorro agreement facts can be explained by I-to-C movement. The source that Campana cites—Chung 1982—does not indicate that the verb moves in Chamorro wh-questions. In later work, Chung (1994) argues explicitly that the target of wh-agreement is I rather than C, indicating that the verb does not raise to C in wh-questions.

**Brittain (2001)**

Under Brittain’s (2001) approach, the verb in Western Naskapi moves to C in conjunct order because of the relationship between the conjunct order and the presence of a CP projection. In Western Naskapi, conjunct order is found in four environments: subordinate clauses (9a), clauses containing a wh-phrase (9b), certain negated clauses (9c), and certain main clauses, which Brittain analyzes as focus constructions (9d).

(9) a. Chischâyih-im wiyâpim-itân.
   know.TI-3.IND IC.see.TA-2SG>1SG.CONJ
   ‘S/he knows that I see you (sg.).’ (Brittain 2001:112)

b. Awân pâminuwâ-t wiyâsiyuw?
   who IC.cook.AI-3SG.CONJ meat.OBV
   ‘Who’s cooking the meat?’ (Brittain 2001:131)

c. Utûtuwâw âkâ âmwâpuy-âkinûch.
   boat.POSS neg IC.go.over.falls.AI-UNSPEC
   ‘Their boat did not go over the falls.’ (Brittain 2001:137)
Subordinate clauses, wh-questions, and clauses with focused elements are crosslinguistically associated with a CP-projection. In the case of negated clauses, Brittain argues that the negator sits in the CP domain in Western Naskapi. To formalize the relationship between the conjunct order and a CP projection, Brittain adopts the checking theory of Chomsky 1993, 1995, and proposes that the conjunct verb moves to C to check a conjunct feature [CJ].

The distribution of the conjunct order in Potawatomi is similar to that of Western Naskapi. (10a) shows that conjunct order is used in Potawatomi embedded clauses, and (10b) shows conjunct order with a wh-question.

(10) a. Ndenéndan Mani é-wi-gishnenat niw wdabyanen.
    1. think.TL.IND Mary FCT-FUT-buy.TA.DIR.3.CONJ that.OBV car.OBV
    ‘I think that Mary will buy the car.’

b. Ni pi je éje-bmoséwat?
    where and IC.in.a.certain.direction-walk.AI.3PL.CONJ
    ‘Where are they walking?’ (Buszard 2003:54)

As in many Algonquian languages, conjunct order is not required with negated clauses in Potawatomi; however, Brittain acknowledges that the relation between conjunct order and negation is specific to Western Naskapi. Thus, we see that conjunct order is used in (at least) two environments in Potawatomi that are typically assumed to contain a CP-projection: embedded clauses and wh-questions.

However, there are various alternatives to movement that would maintain the relationship between conjunct order and a CP projection. One could follow Chomsky (2000) and postulate that an Agree relationship between C and the verb triggers conjunct morphology. For example, Lochbihler and Mathieu (2008/2009) use an Agree-based approach to account for both the distribution of independent and conjunct order agreement patterns in Ojibwe and additional characteristics of the conjunct order treated by Brittain, such as initial change and the lack of the preverbal person markers. Thus, since it would be possible to maintain Brittain’s generalizations without verb movement to C, I do not analyze Potawatomi conjunct verbs as sitting in C.
Richards (2004)

Richards (2004) argues that the independent order verb in Wampanoag moves to C, while the conjunct verb only moves to I. This argument is based on the fact that the conjunct verb is used in three environments in which movement to C is blocked in other languages. Since conjunct order signals a lack of movement to C, Richards reasons that independent order is used when the verb does move to C. Conjunct order is used in relative clauses, as exemplified in (11a). (11b) shows that movement to C is blocked in English relative clauses.

(11) a. kesukod adt pohquohwhuh-uh-p wutch matwaut
day on IC.deliver-3SG-PRET.CONJ from enemy.LOC
‘the day when he delivered them from the enemy’

b. *the day when did he deliver them from the enemy (Richards 2004:337)

Conjunct order is also found in embedded wh-questions (12a); again, movement to C is blocked in English embedded wh-questions (12b).

(12) a. wehquetush teaguas anumau-un
ask.IMPER what IC.give-1SG.2.SG.CONJ
‘Ask what I shall give thee.’

b. *We know what do we worship. (Richards 2004:337–8)

Lastly, conjunct order occurs with ‘why’ questions, as in (13a). In French, movement to C is blocked with ‘why’ questions, as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (13b).

(13) a. tohwutch kutchessummuwa-an?
why baptize-2SG.CONJ
‘Why baptizest thou?’

b. *Pourquoi a parlé Jean?
why has spoken Jean
‘Why has John spoken?’ (Richards 2004:338–9)
Because conjunct order is used in these environments, and because movement to C is (sometimes) blocked in these environments, Richards concludes that the conjunct verb must not move to C.

While I agree with Richards that the conjunct verb does not move to C, the argumentation is not conclusive. The conjunct verb is also used in instances in which the verb does move to C in some languages. As noted by Richards, the conjunct order is used with (most) wh-questions in Wampanoag (14). As indicated by the translation, the verb moves to C in English questions.

(14) howan woh quosh-og?
    who MOD ic.fear-DIR.1SG.CONJ
    ‘Whom shall I fear?’ (Richards 2008:348)

Furthermore, while movement to C in embedded wh-questions is blocked in most varieties of English (as shown above in (12b)), this is not the case in at least one variety, Belfast English (Henry 1995). As the examples in (15) show, embedded wh-questions in Belfast English show verb movement to C.

(15) a. She asked who had I seen.
    b. I wondered where were they going. (Henry 1995:106, 116)

Finally, in contrast with French, English questions with why do involve I-to-C movement, as evidenced by the translation of the example in (13b). Thus, the environments in which conjunct order are used do not conclusively point to a failure of movement to C. While the environments Richards cites do involve a lack of I-to-C movement in certain languages, they are not

---

3. Richards claims that wh-questions like the one in (14) do involve a lack of I-to-C movement. He argues that wh-questions with conjunct order verbs are an instance of anti-agreement effects, based on the relative impoverishment of the conjunct order agreement morphology. Following Phillips’s (1998) analysis of anti-agreement in Berber and Turkish, he argues that anti-agreement is due to a lack of verb raising. However, my point here is simply that wh-questions are not always associated with a lack of I-to-C movement.
universal. And if conjunct order does not signal a failure of I-to-C movement, then it no longer follows that independent order is used when the verb does move to C. As we can see, Richards’s diagnostics do not provide conclusive evidence for the position of the verb.

**NEW ANALYSIS OF THE POSITION OF THE POTAWATOMI VERB**

In contrast to all of the approaches just outlined, I propose that the verb in Potawatomi never moves beyond I/T in either independent or conjunct order. In this section, I provide new evidence from the distribution of negation, tense and complementizers to support this claim.

**Evidence from Negation**

Recall from the previous section that Halle and Marantz rely on the position of negation to argue that the independent verb moves to C. As shown in (1) and (2), repeated in (16) below, the independent order negator -si follows the verb, while the conjunct order negator bwa- is a preverb:

(16) a. g-wabm-a-si-m-waben-en-ek
    \[2\text{-see.TA}-3\text{-NEG}-2\text{PL}\text{-PRET}-3\text{PL}\]
    ‘You (pl.) didn’t see them.’

b. bwa-min-gwa-ben
    \[\text{NEG-give.TA}-2\text{PL}>3\text{PL}\text{-CONJ-PRET}\]
    ‘You (pl.) didn’t give them (something).’

The different ordering of the negative markers in (16a) and (16b) could be readily explained if the verb first adjoins to and subsequently moves past NegP in the independent order, but stays below NegP in the conjunct order. However, negation in Potawatomi is actually bipartite. As the examples in (17) show, independent order verbs must be preceded by the negative particle jo.

(17) a. Jo bmosési ow nemosh.
    \[\text{NEG walk.AI.3IND-NEG the.AN dog.NA}\]
    ‘The dog is not walking.’
b. Ow gigabe jo wgi-wabmasin niw nemoshen.
   Ow gigabe jo w-gi-wabma-si-n niw nemosh-en.
   ‘The boy didn’t see the dog.’

c. Jo ngi-gishpnedosin iw mzenegin.
   Jo n-gi-gishpnedo-si-n iw mzenegin.
   ‘I didn’t buy the book.’

The fact that negation in the independent order also precedes the verb is not expected if the verb moves past NegP. *Jo* cannot be analyzed as a verbal prefix or proclitic, as it is possible for subjects to intervene between *jo* and the verbal complex, as in (18):

(18) Jo ow gigyago gi-nimedisi.
    Jo ow gigyago gi-nimi-di-si
    NEG the.AN girl.NA PST-dance.AI.3IND-NEG
    ‘The girl didn’t dance.’

Instead, I propose that *jo* sits in the Neg head, and that the suffix *-si* has the status of agreement morphology. This analysis of *-si* is supported by the fact that *-si* precedes other agreement morphemes. As seen in (17a), *-si* precedes the obviative *-n*, and (17b) shows that *-si* also precedes the inanimate object marker *-n*. Following the spirit of Halle and Marantz 1993, I assume that *-si*, like other agreement morphemes, enters the derivation post-syntactically; however, a Lexicalist approach to morphology would also be compatible with the data shown here.

Thus, since negation precedes both the independent and conjunct order verb, I propose that the verb in Potawatomi never moves as high as C.

**Evidence from Tense**

Halle and Marantz also use the position of the preterit to argue that the independent order verb moves to C: as seen in (16) above, the preterit *-ben* appears as a suffix.\(^4\) However, this analysis overlooks the fact that temporal

---

4. In (16a), the preterit surfaces as *-wabenien*; this allomorph is conditioned by the presence of the plural suffix *-ek*. 
information is located in two positions in the Potawatomi verb. What is called the “preterit” mode in Potawatomi is actually better characterized as habitual aspect. As Buszard (2003) shows, the preterit often co-occurs with the particle *neko* ‘used to’ (19a), although it is not required (19b).

(19) a. Neko nwabmaben.
    used.to 1.see.TA.IND.PRET
    ‘I used to see him.’

  b. Majiben.
    leave.TA.IND.PRET
    ‘He used to leave.’ (Buszard 2003:24–5)

Another verbal suffix in Potawatomi marks the dubitative mode, which, according to Buszard (2003), expresses doubt (20a) or an inference (20b):

(20) a. Gnebech nwabmadek.
    maybe 1.see.TA.IND.DUB
    ‘Maybe I see them.’

  b. Ngi-nwabmadek.
    1.PST-see.TA.IND.DUB
    ‘I must have seen him.’ (Buszard 2003:25)

The true tenses in Potawatomi are expressed by preverbs: *gi-* marks the past tense (21a), *ge-* is future (21b), and *wi-* is what Buszard (2003) calls the “volitional future” (21c).

(21) a. Gi-maji.
    PST-leave.AI.3IND
    ‘He left.’

  b. Ge-maji.
    FUT-leave.AI.3IND
    ‘He will leave, is going to leave.’

  c. Wi-maji.
    FUT.VOL-leave.AI.3IND
    ‘He will leave, wants to leave, intends to leave.’ (Buszard 2003:26)
The distribution of the modes and the preverbs is problematic for all of the previous analyses outlined in the second section. An analysis that predicts that the independent and conjunct order verbs occupy different positions cannot account for the fact that the positions of the tense morphemes remain constant. Preverbs in both independent and conjunct order always precede the verb, and the preterit and dubitative modes are always suffixes.

As pointed out by Lochbihler and Mathieu (2008/2009), any analysis that claims that the verb moves to C in either independent or conjunct order would predict that preverbs would follow the verb in that case, contra to fact. Julien (2002) argues that tense morphemes are prefixes only if the verb has not moved through T. Thus, the distribution of tense morphemes suggests that the verb in Potawatomi never moves past I/T.

**Evidence from Complementizers**

The interaction of the complementizer and verb crosslinguistically has been used as a diagnostic for the position of the verb. Since den Besten (1983), it has been argued that German verb-second (V2) word order derives from V-to-C movement. This analysis is motivated by the contrast between the examples in (22a) and (b):

(22) a. Waltraud **hat** wahrscheinlich das Buch gekauft.
   Waltraud has probably the book bought
   ‘Waltraud has probably bought the book.’

   b. Sigrid glaubt [dass Waltraud wahrscheinlich das Buch gekauft **hat**.]
   Sigrid believes that Waltraud probably the book bought has
   ‘Sigrid believes that Waltraud has probably bought the book.’
   (Diesing 1990:42)

In (22a), the verb *hat* ‘has’ is in second position, indicating that I-to-C raising has taken place. In (22b), verb raising is blocked due the presence of a complementizer; hence, *hat* remains in its base generated position. This complementary distribution is explained if the V2 (raised) verb and complementizer both occupy C.

Diesing (1990) argues that the Yiddish verb does not move to C, since V2 is found in both matrix and embedded clauses (see also Thráínsson 1986 for Icelandic):
(23) a. Max **shikt** avek dos bukh.
Max sends away the book
‘Max sends away the book.’

b. Avrom gloybt [az Max **shikt** avek dos bukh.]
Avrom believes that Max sends away the book.
‘Avrom believes that Max sends away the book.’ (Diesing 1990:42)

Since the verb still raises in the presence of a complementizer, as seen in (23b), Diesing argues that V2 movement does not target the C position. Instead, she suggests that the verb only moves as far as I.

Koopman and Sportiche (1991) and McCloskey (1996) argue that Irish VSO word order is not derived from V-to-C movement based on the fact that verb-initial word order is still possible in the presence of a complementizer, as in (24):

(24) Gheall sé go bhfillfeadh sé ar an bhaile.
promised he COMP return.COND he on home
‘He promised that he would return home.’ (McCloskey 1996:50)

As in Diesing’s analysis, the fact that the complementizer is followed by the verb indicates that the verb does not sit in C.

For Potawatomi, the complementizer **gishpen** ‘if’ provides evidence that the verb does not move to C in conjunct order. **Gishpen** can co-occur with the conjunct verb (25), which should not be possible if the verb occupies C.

(25) a. Ggekéndan ne gishpen é-wi-byat Hunter?
2.know.TL.IND Q if FCT-FUT-come.AI.3CONJ Hunter
‘Do you know if Hunter will come?’

1.FUT-cook.TL.IND the.IN rice.NI if FCT-FUT-run.AI.3CONJ Hunter
‘I will cook the rice if Hunter will come.’

Furthermore, it is clear that **gishpen** ‘if’ and the verb cannot be analyzed as some sort of syntactic unit, since the embedded subject can intervene between the two. This is shown in (26). Note that the examples in (25)
and (26) are identical except for the relative order of the embedded subject and verb.

(26) a. Ggekéndan ne gishpen Hunter é-wi-byat?
   2.know.TL.IND Q if Hunter FCT-FUT-come.AI.3CONJ
   ‘Do you know if Hunter will come?’

      1.FUT-cook.TL.IND the.IN rice.NI if Hunter FCT-FUT-come.AI.3CONJ
      ‘I will cook the rice if Hunter will come.’

A possible alternative analysis could be a CP-recursion structure, as proposed by de Haan and Weerman (1986) for Frisian. As (27) shows, V2 can still occur in the context of a complementizer in Frisian. To account for this, de Haan and Weerman propose that the embedded clause in (27) contains two CPs: one CP is headed by the complementizer dat, and it takes as its complement a second CP whose head is the landing site for V2 movement.

(27) Pyt sei dat hy hic my sjoen.
    Pyt said that he had me seen
    ‘Pyt said that he had seen me.’
    (de Haan and Weerman 1985; cited in Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4)

In contrast with Yiddish, V2 with a complementizer is very restricted in Frisian: it does not occur with “inherently negative verbs” (28a), with verbs taking an irrealis complement (28b), or in adjunct clauses (28c).

      Pyt regrets that he had me seen
      ‘Pyt regrets that he had seen me.’

   b. *Pyt betwivelet dat hy hic my sjoen.
      Pyt doubts that he had me seen
      ‘Pyt doubts that he had seen me.’

   c. *Ik sil fuortgean, at jo wolle dizze film net sjen.
      I will leave if you want this film not see
      ‘I will leave if you don’t want to see this film.’ (Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4–5)
These restrictions lead Iatridou (1991) and Iatridou and Kroch (1992) to argue that CP-recursion is only found when the second CP projection is semantically vacuous.

With this restriction in mind, it is clear that the Potawatomi examples do not fit the criteria for CP-recursion: clauses introduced by complementizer *gishpen* ‘if’ qualify as both irrealis and adjunct clauses. Therefore, I conclude that the clauses introduced by *gishpen* in (26) and (27) contain a single CP projection, and that the verb must be below C.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, I have argued that the verb never moves to C in Potawatomi. Previous analyses of various Algonquian languages have claimed that either independent order or conjunct order verbs move to C; however, I have provided new evidence that neither position is tenable for Potawatomi. Tense and negation morphemes precede the verb in both independent and conjunct order, which is inconsistent with the verb moving past the TP or NegP projections. Additionally, the complementizer *gishpen* co-occurs with conjunct order verbs, which indicates that conjunct order verbs cannot sit in C. Based on these three criteria, I conclude that the verb never moves past I/T in Potawatomi.
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