## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an :mage and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suispected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the aujacent írame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again - beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that tite textuai content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some nages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

## Xerox University Microfilms

## THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF THE CENTRAL, OJIBWA VERB

by<br>Richard Alan Rhodes<br>A dissertation submitted in partial fulf:.1ment of the requirements for the degree r $f^{\circ}$ Doctor of Philosophy (Linguistics)<br>in The University of Michigan 1976<br>\section*{Doctoral Committee:}<br>Associate Professor Kenneth C. ऍi.ll, Chairman Professor John C. Catford<br>Assistant Professor John M. Lawler<br>Associate Professor Thomas F. Storer

# $$
76-27,576
$$ <br> RHODES, Richard Alan, 1946 * <br> THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF THE CE: TRAL OJIBWA VERB. <br> The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1976 Language, iinguistics 

## Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michlgan 48106

$$
\text { (c) Richard Alan Rhodes } \frac{1976}{\text { All Rights Reserved }}
$$

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Him who made both man and language and in Whose service $I$ am, what I have of value is really all His. To Hap McCue who taught me my first Indian and is still a source of strength. To Tom Storer whe upened to me what it means to be an Indian and to see the world through different eyes. To Reta Sands whose time and patience in teaching me Indian is exceeded only by her boundless hospitality and friendship. To Francis Fox who suffered through the outrageous questions $I$ asked and is still my friend. To the other people of Walpole and Wicky espacially Noi a Soney who taught me both about Indian and about being a Christian. To the students in my Ojibwa slass who taught me more Ojibwa than I taught them. T Jen Hill who got me doing Indian in the first place and who has greatly encouraged me throughout my academic career at Michigan. To David Perlmutter who started me writing this thesis. To my typists, Jim Huntley, Larry Krieg, and Mabel Lewis, who treated me and the manuscript bietter than either deserves. And lastly and most especially to Mary, my wife, whose selflessness and love in caring for me while $I$ wrote this are unrepayable. To all these people .I can only acknowledge a debt that $I$ cannot repay; $I$ am indeed grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DFDICATION ..... iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION ..... 1
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND ..... 28
CHAPTER III: VERB AGREEMENT I ..... 80
CHAPTER IV: INTRANSITIVIZATION. ..... 118
CHAPTER V: ADVAÑCEMENT TO OBJECT ..... 129
CHAPTER VI: VERB AGREEMENT II ..... 146
CHAPTER VII: VERB AGREEMENT III ..... 166
CHAPTER VIII: OBVIATION ..... 199
CHAPTER IX: CLAUSE UNION AND STEM STRUCTURE ..... 212
CHAPTER X: NOUN INCORPORATION ..... 260
CHAPTER XI: CONCLUSION ..... 286
APPENDIX ..... 294
BiBLIOGRAPHY ..... 299

| A/ABS | absolutive | PL/pl | plural |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| abl | ablative | POSS | possessor |
| ACC/acc | accusative | PPL | participle |
| ADV | adverb(ial) | PREP | preposition |
| AI | animate intransitive | PRES | present |
| AN | (grammatically) | PRET | preterite |
|  | animate | PRO | indefinite index |
| ANIM | Iogically animate | PT | pseudo-transitive |
| BEN/BENEF | benefactive | R | result (clause) |
| C | consonant | REDUP | reduplication |
| CH | chomeur | REFL | reflexive |
| CL | classifier | SG/sg | singular |
| COM | comitative | SUBJ/subj | subject/subjunctive |
| comp | complement | T | term |
| CU | clause union | TA | transitive animate |
| D | dependent (conjunct) | TI | transitive inanimate |
|  | context/downstairs <br> (clause) | TSA | transitive stem agreement (marker) |
| dat | dative | U | upstairs (clause) |
| DD | dead dependent | v | verb (complex)! vowel |
| DUB | dubitative |  |  |
| DV | dead verb |  |  |
| E/ERG | ergative |  |  |
| EXC/exc | exclusive |  |  |
| FEM/fem | feminine |  |  |
| FUT | future |  |  |
| GEN/gen | genitive |  |  |
| II | inanimate intransitive |  |  |
| INAN/inan | inanimate |  |  |
| INC/inc | inclusive |  |  |
| INF | infinitive |  |  |
| INS/INSTR | instrument(al) |  |  |
| ISA | intransitive stem agreement (marker) |  |  |
| LOC/loc | locative |  |  |
| MASC/masc | masculine |  |  |
| N | noun |  |  |
| NEG | negative |  |  |
| NOM/nom | nominative |  |  |
| NP | noun phrase |  |  |
| NT | non-term |  |  |
| OA I/OAI | object agt coment I (marker) |  |  |
| OA II/OAII | object agreement II (marker) |  |  |
| OBJ/obj | object |  |  |
| OBV/obv | obviative |  |  |
| PASS | passive |  |  |
| PERF | perfect |  |  |

## CHAPTER I

 INTRODUCTION1.0. Introduction. Central Ojibwa is a dialect of the Central Algonkian language known variously as Ojibwa, Chippewa, Salteaux, Algonquin, and Ottawa. The different dialects of this language are spoken in the states of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and in the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. The dialect that forms the topic of this work is spoken in the lower peninsula of Michigan and in the adjacent area of southern Ontario by people of Ojibwa (or Chippewa), Ottawa and Potawatomi descent. The dialect itself is the same one recorded ly Bloomfield (1957), but recent research (Rhodes 1976) has shown that this dialect is the historical development of the dialect Baraga (1878) called Ottawa. We will call it Central Ojibwa because many speakers are of Ojibwa descent and say they speak Ojibwa (or Chippewa), while most speakers of Ottawa descent say they speak a "mixture" of Ottawa and Ojibwa. We do not use Bloomfield's term Eastern Ojibwa because further to the east there is another dialect of the same language for which we reserve the name Eastern Ojibwa.
1.O.1. Estimates on the number of speakers of this dialect are difficult to make. We suspect that there may be as many as 7,000 speakers and 2.00 monolinguals. ${ }^{1}$ The language is strongest on the Wikwemikong reserve on Manitoulin Island which (with the Bruce peninsula)
separates Georgian Bay from Lake Huron. There the language is spoken regularly at home and on the street. Our data indicate that the dialect is unified. For example, as much variation can be found going from speaker to speaker on the same reserve as can be found in going from one reserve to another, with the exreption of very minor localisms.
1.0.2 Data for this thesis comes from numerous speakers from Walpole Island, Ontario and from Wikwemikong, Ontario. Our principal language consultants are Reta Sands of Walpole Island and Francis Fox, originally from Wikwemikong. We have also elicited and checked significant amounts of data from Nora Soney, Lavina Day, and Gerald Osage, all of Walpole Island. We have used some of Bloomfield's (1957) data in addition, but we have rechecked it against current usage and have retranscribed it according to current pronunciation and our representation. Irving "Hap" McCue, originally from Curve Lake, Ontario, supplied the data from the eastern dialect.
1.1 The sound system. The phonemes ${ }^{2}$ of Central Ojibwa will be represented as follows:
(1) Consonents:

| lenis: | $b$ | $d$ | $g$ | $g^{\bar{u}}$ | $j$ | $z$ | ž |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fortis: | $p$ | $t$ | $k$ | $k^{W}$ | $c$ | $s$ | š |
| glides | $w$ | $y$ | $h$ | $h^{W}$ |  |  |  |
| nasals: | $m$ | $n$ | $D$ |  |  |  |  |
| nasalization: | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(2) Vowels
long: $\quad i: e: a: \quad o$ :
short: i a o
For a close description of the positional variants of these sounds we refer the reader to Bloomfield (1957), and we will limit the discussion here to the differences of notation.

We have chosen to write fortis obstruents with unit symbols to emphasize the unit character of these entities. Notice that in this we agree with Bloomfield at the heart of the matter (1957:vi, 3, 8-9), but not with his transcription. We use voiceless symbols to represent fortis obstruents, and voiced symbols to represent lenis obstruents. In addition we have chosen to write h for glottal stop, mostly for convenience sake.

We do not consider $\underline{y}$ and $\underline{w}$ positional variants of $\underline{i}$ and $\underline{o}$.
Because the vowels that were written as reduced $\underline{e}$ and $\underline{u}$ are no longer pronounced, or can be accounted for equally as well by a rule inserting open transitions (Rhodes 1974), we omit them from our representation. This brings about four new contrasts in preconsonantal position: $\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{h}^{\mathrm{w}}$, and $0 .{ }^{3}$
(2) (a) $\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{W}}$

| wa:gzi | It (anim.) is crouked. |
| :--- | :--- |
| na: $g^{W}{ }^{W} i$ | He is visible. |

(b) $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{w}}$

```
no:kbiत̧o:n
Soften it:
```

bo:kwido:n Break it!
(c) $h^{\mathrm{W}}$
ngi:-wžibi:hmawa: I wrote to him. nba:bi:h ${ }^{W}$ mi $\quad$ We (exc.) are waiting.
(d) $n$
nniso-bbo:ngiz I am three years old. gzo:0giz You are strong.
1.1.1 The following contrasts are not uniformly maintained throughout the dialect.

(b) word initial clusters of identical lenes (bb, dd, gg, zz, žž) vs. corresponding single lenes (b, d, g, z, ž ) or vs. corresponding fortes ( $\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{s}$ )
(c) wa vs. o
(d) bm vs. $m$ and dn vs. $n$
(e) h vs. $\emptyset$ before a consonant
(f) w vs. $\varnothing$ before a consonant
(g) word final fortes vs. word final lenes
(h) $h^{W}$ vs. $w$

Nonetheless we will write all these contrasts consistently, even when the speaker from whom the form/sentence was elicited does not make the contrast.
1.1.2 Finally we represent verb forms with a hyphen to mark the location of a major phonological break between the stem and certain kinds of prefixes. This is in keeping with the usage of Bloomfield and other Algonkianists.
(4) bo:zi He embarks.
gi:-bo:zi He embarked.
wi:-bo:zi He wants to embark./He will embark.
da-bo:zi He shall embark.
da:-bo:zi He should embark.
etc.
1.2 Morphophonemics. The total system of Ojibwa morphophonemics is quite complex. In this section we will outline some of the more obvious morphophonemic processes to aid the reader in dealing with the
morphemic analysis of examples in this and later chapters.
1.2.1 Vowel Deletions. Central and Eastern Ojibwa are characterized from other dialects by a system of vowel reduction/deletion. In addition to these deletions, there are deletions of word final vowels and glides which all dialects share. Let us first look at this latter deletion process.
(5) A word final short vowel or glide is deleted.

While the exact process is somewhat more complicated than (5) suggests, this is sufficient for our purposes. Some examples of its operation are given in (6).

| (a) bo:zin | /bo:zi-n/4 | Embark! |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| nbo:z | /n-bo:zi/ | I am embarking. |
| (b) ga:sknozon | /ga:skanozo-n/ | Whisper! |
| nga:sknoz | /n-ga:skanozo/ | I am whispering. |
| (c) kwe: | /akwe:w/ | woman |
| kwe:wag | /akwe:w-ag/ | women |
| (d) mdimo:yẽ: | /midimo:ye:ny/ | old woman |
|  | mdimo:yẽ:yag | /midimo:ye:ny-ag/ |

The second vowel deletion rule is very complex, probably consisting of two processes. Basically, alternate short vowels are deleted. One mechanism for doing this is given in Kaye (1973) involving an abstract stress system and the deletion of unstressed vowels. We are highly skentical of such an approach in spite of its similarity to the overt stress patterns of other dialects. Instead we feel that the evidence from the restructuring of morphemes and from the reactions of native
speakers indicates that the vowels are deleted directly via abstract rules. Informal versions of these rules are given in (7).
(7) (a) If the first vowel of a word is short, it is deleted unless a consonant cluster precedes.
(b) If a vowel follows in the word, a short vowel is deleted unless the vowel of the preceding syllable has been deleted. Some examples of the operation of (7) and its interaction with (5) are given in (8).

| (a) | bwi | /abwi/5 | paddle | ( 7 a ) applies) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ndabwi | /n(d)-abwi/ ${ }^{6}$ | my paddle |  |
| (b) | kik | /akikw/ | kettle | ( 5 ) and (7) |
|  |  |  |  | apply) |
|  | ndakik | /n(d)-akikw/ | my kettle | ( (5) only |
| (c) | mkizin | /makizin/ | shoe | ( 7 la ) applies) |
|  | nmakzin | /n--makizin/ | my shoe | ( (7b) applies |
|  | mkiznan | /makizin-an/ | shoes | ( 7 la ) and (7b) |
|  |  |  |  | apply |
| (d) | wi:snin | /wi:sini-n/ | Eat | ( (7b) applies) |
|  | nwi:sin | /n-wi:sini/ | I eat. | ( (5) applies so |
|  |  |  |  | (7b) can't) |
| (e) | mwi | /mawi-w/ | He is crying. | ( 5 ) and (7a) |
|  |  |  |  | apply) |
|  | nmaw | /n-mawi/ | I am crying. | ( (5) only |
|  |  |  |  | applies) |

In addition to these rules deleting vowels there is also a rule (9).
(9) A short vowel is deleted when it follows a vowel.

Examples of the operation of (9) are given in (10).

| (10) (a) mnido: | /manido:/ | spirits |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | mnido:g | /manido:-ag/ | spirits |
| (b) nwa:bma: | /n-wa:bam-a:/ | I see him. |  |
|  | nwa:bma:g | /n-wa:bam-a:-ag/ | I see them. |
|  | wwa:bma:n | /w-wa:bam-a:-an/ | He see him (obv.) |

Lastly there is a special rule which drops the marker a: '3rd animate object' in conjunct forms of the verb.
(11) The marker a: '3rd animate object' is deleted when immediately preceding vowel initial markers in the conjunct verb.

Examples of (11) are given in (12).
(12) (a) wa:bma:swad /wa:bam-a:-siw-ad/ (that) you don't see
wa:bmad /wa:bam-a:-ad/ (that) you see him
(b) wa:bma:swe:g /wa:bam-a:-siw-e:gw/ (that) you (pl.)
don't see him
wa:bme:g /wa:bam-a:-e:gw/ (that) you (pl.) see
him
(c) wa:bma:swag /wa:bam-a:-siw-ag/ (that) I don't see him
wa:bmag /wa:bam-a:-ag/ (that) I see him
but
(d) nwa:bma:g /n-wa:bam-a:-ag/ I see them
1.2.2 Contraction. Morpheme final w and $\underline{i}$ contract with the following vowels to form $\underline{o}$ or 0 : and $\underline{i}$ or $i$ : respectively. ${ }^{7}$
(13) (a) Postconsonantal w contracts with epenthetic í to give ㅇ.
(b) Postconsonantal w contracts with underlying i to give ㅇ within stems.
(c) Postconsonantal w contracts irregularly with inflectional a to give o:
(d) Postconsonantal w contracts irregularly with e: to give o:
(14) (a) Postconsonartal $\underset{i}{ }$ contracts with a or $\underset{i}{ }$ to give i:. (But the morphemes $\underline{i}$ 'particle' and na:ni 'lst plural' are exceptions to this rule. Instead, a following a deletes by (9).)
(b) Postconsonantal $\underline{i}$ contracts with e: to give i:-

Examples of these contractions are given in (15).
(15) (a) (i) ndakik
/n(d)-akikw/ my kettle
ndakko:g
/n(d)-akikw-ag/ my kettles (13c)
ndakkona:
/n(a)-akikw-(i)na:ni/ our (exc) kettle (13a)
(ii) nninj
/n-ninji/ my hand
nninji:n
/n-ninji-an/ my hands (14a)
nninjna:nin
/n-ninji-na:ni-an/ our (exc) hands
(exception to 14a)
nninji: gg
/n-ninji-ing/ on my hand (14u)
(b) nminta:go:g

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { /n-minw-(i)t-aw-igw-ag/ } & \text { I sound good to them. } \\
& \text { (l3c) }
\end{array}
$$

nminta:goz
/n-minw-(i)t-aw-igw-izi/ I sound good. (l3b)
(c) nbi:mskobtwa:da:n

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { /n-bi:miskw-(i)bah-dwe:-d-am-n/ } \quad & \text { I run around it. (l3a, } \\
& \text { exception to l3d) }
\end{array}
$$

nbi:mskobto:
/n-bi:miskw-(i)bah-dwe:/ I run around. (l3a,d)
(d) nzakwa:da:n /n-zakwe:-d-am-n/ I spit on it. (exception to 13d)
nzakwe: /n-zakwe:/ I spit. (exception to 13d)
(e) gzi:bi:gna:gne:
/gizi:-bi:g-(i)na:gan-e:-w/ He washes the dishes.
gzi:bi:gninji:
/gizi:-bi:g-(i)ninji-e:-w/ He washes (his) hands. (14b)

In addition to the contractions of (13) and (14), there are the contractions of (16) and (17).
(16) The sequence awi contracts to
(a) a: before velars,
(b) 0 : elsewhere.
(17) (a) gno:nda:g /g-no:nd-aw-igw/ He hears you.
(b) gno:ndc:n /g-no:nd-aw-ini/ I hear you.
gno:ndo:sno:n /g-no:nd-aw-isino:ni/ I don't hear you.
1.2.3 Consonant Deletions. One very chacteristic rule of Central Ojibwa that does not appear in other dialects is the rule that deletes $\underline{n}$ off the end of several morphemes word finally.
(8) (a) $\underline{N}$ is deleted word finally off of -min 'lst plural', -na:ni 'lst plural', and -bani 'preterite' leaving no trace.
(b) Word final n is optionally (but normsily) deleted off of -a:n 'lst person' and -e:n 'dubitative' ana -ke:n 'prohibitive' leaving nasalization.
(9) (a) nwa: bmina:dig /n-wa:bi-min-(a:)dig/ We (exc.) supposedly see.
nwa: bmi /n-wa:bi-min/ We (exc.) see. nwa: bma:na:nig /n-wa:bam-a:-na:ni-ag/ We (exc.) see them. nwa:bma:na: /n-wa:bam-a:-na:ni/ We (exc.) see him. nwa: bma:bni:g /n-wa: bam-a:-bani-ag/ I used to see them. nwa: bma:ba /n-wa:bam-a:-bani/ I used to see him.
(b) wa:bminna:n /wa:bam-inin-a:n/ (that) I see you พع:b円i.innã:
wa: bminna:ne:n /wa:bam-inin-a:n-e:n/ (that) I supposedly see you
wa:bminna:ra
wi:snike:n /wi:sini-ke:n/ (Don't) eat!
wi:snikẽ:
Clusters of resonants simplify.
(20) (a) Before $\underline{n}$ non-stem $\underline{m}$ and $\underline{n}$ delete, before $\underline{m}$ non-stem $\underline{m}$ deletes.
(b) Clusters of wW simplify to w.
(21)
(a) bzindam
/bizind-am-w/
He's listening.
bzindan /bizind-am-n/
Listen!
(Stem: /bizind/)
nbi:do:n /n-bi:d-o:-n/ I bring it.
nbi:do:na: /n-bi:d-o:-n-na:ni/ We (exc.) bring it.
but
nkanna:nin /n-kan-(i`na:ni-an/ our (exc.) bones
(stem: /kan/)
dgošnon
/dagos-in-(o)n/
Arrive!
(stem: /dagos-in/)
(b)

| ngi:-bzindam | /n-bi:-bizind-am/ | I listened |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ngi:-bzinda:mi | $/ n-g i:-l, i z i n d-a m-m i n / 9$ | We (exc.) listened. |

(c) (i) wa:bma:wngwẽ:

/wa:bam-a:-(w)angw-e:n/ | (that) we (inc.) |
| :--- | :--- |
| supposedly see him |

wa:bma:wgẽ:

| /wa:bam-a:-(w)ag-e:n/ | (that) I supposedly |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | see him |

wa: bmagwa:
/wa:bant-a:-ag-wa:/ (that) I see them wa:bma:wngwa:yẽ:
/wa:bam-a:-! w)angw-wa:-e:n/ (that) we (inc.) supposedly see them
(ii)

| mskwi | /mskwi/ | blood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| mskwi:wi | /miskwi-w-i-w/ $^{10}$ | He is bloody/bleeding. |
| nini: | /niniw/ | man |
| ninwag | /niniw-ag/ | men |
| nini:wi | /niniw-w-i-w/ | He is a man. |

1.2.4 Consonant Assimilations. Consonants with oral closure and $\underline{h}$ assimilate to the point of articulation of following consonants, irregularly. Obstruent clusters become fortis obstruents. Obstruents
following nasals become lenis. Examples are given in (22).
(22)

| (a) | wa:bma:d <br> wa:bma:pa | /wa:bam-a:-d/ <br> /wa:bam-a:-d-bani/ | (that) he sees him (that) he used to see him |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | nda:bjiha: | /n(d)-a:bid-(i)h-a:/ | I make use of him. |
|  | nda:bjito:n | /n(d)-a:bid-(i)h-d-o:-n/ | I make use of it. |
|  | gi:gdo | /REDUPLICATION-gido-w/ | He speaks. |
|  | kido | /iñ-gido-w/ ${ }^{\text {ll }}$ | He speaks thus. |
| (b) | wi:sniyã: | /wi:sini-a:n/ | (that) I eat |
|  | wi:sniya:mba: | /wi:sini-a:n-bani/ | (that) I used to eat |
|  | nbimo:ma: | /n-bino:m-a:/ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I carry him (on } \\ & \text { my back). } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | nbimo:nda:n | /n-bimo:m-d-am-n/ | I carry it (on my back). |
|  | Emiwan | /gimiwan-w/ | It is raining. |
|  | griwang | /gimiwan-g/ | (that) it is raining |
| (c) | gnawa:bndamã: | /gana-wa: bam-d-am-a:n/ | (that) I look at it |
|  | gnawa: bndajgẽ | : /gana-wa:bam-d-am-ke:n/ | (Don't) look at |

it!
2.2.5 Epenthesis. There are several rules of epenthesis in Ojibwa. Some insert vowels, others consonants.
(23) $i$ is inserted between the final consonant of a stem morpheme and the initial consonant of the following morpheme. (After verb stems ending in nasals ㅇ is used instead of i.)

Some example; are given in (24).
(24)

| (a) nmiši:min | /n-miši:min/ | my apple |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| nmiši:mnina: | /n-miši:min-(i)na:ni/ | our (exc.) apple |
| but |  |  |
| mwa:bnda:n | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n/ | I see it. |
|  | nwa:bnda:na: | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni/ |
|  | We (exc.) see it. |  |
| (b) ngi:-dgošin | /n-gi:-dagos-in/ | (stem:/wa:bam-d-/) |
|  | ngi:-dgošnomi arrived. | /n-gi:-dagos-in-(o)min/ | | We (exc.) arrived. |
| :--- |

There is a partly irregular rule which inserts a:.
(25) In independent verbs $a:$ is inserted between the suffixes -bani
'preterite' and -dig 'dubitative' and a preceding nasal or nasal plus w.

Examples are given in (25).
(26)

| (a) nwa:bnda:n | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n/ | I see it. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| wa:bwiba | /wa:bi-w-(i)bani/ | He used to (be <br> able to) see. |
| nwa:bnca:na:ba | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)bani/ | I used to see <br> it. |
| (b) wa:bwidig | /wa:bi-w-dig/ | He supposedly <br> (can) see. |
|  | wwa:bnda:na:dig | /w-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)dig/ |
|  |  | He supposedly <br> sees it. |

There is a rule inserting $\underline{d}$ between vowels and preceding person markers.
(27) $\underline{d}$ is inserted before a vowel that immediately follows the person markers $\underline{n}$ 'lst person', g '2nd person', and w '3rd person'.

A few obligatorily possessed nouns beginning with $\underline{0}$ : and $\underline{i}$ : are exempt from (27). Some examples are given in (28)
(28) (a) o:de:to: /o:de:to:-w/ He goes to town. ndo:de:to: /n(d)-o:de:to:/ I go to town. ngi:-o:de:to: /n-gi:-o:de:to:/ I went to town.
(b) nmakzin /n-makizin/ my shoe ndo:ski-mkizin /n(d)-oski-makizin/ my new shoe but
no:s /n-o:s/ my father
(29) A $\underline{Y}$ is epenthesized between vowels.

Examples of (2.9) are given in (30), including examples of the two morphemes which begin with short vowels but which are exceptionally exempt from deletion by (7), given in (30b).
(30)


There are two more highly restricted rules inserting consonants in grammatical environments.
(31) An I inserted between the modal suffixes -bani 'preterite' and -dig 'dubitative' and a preceding vowel in
(a) intransitive verbs
(b) transitive verbs involving interactions of lst and and person.

Examples of (31), which feeds (25) are given in (32).
(32) (a) ngi:we: ngi:we:na:ba /n-gi:we:(n)-(a:)bani/ I used to go home. ngi:we:na:dig /n-gi:we:(n)-(a:)dig/ I supposedly go home.

You see me. You used to see me.
gwa:bmina:dig /g-wa:bam-i(n)-(a:)dig/ You supposedly see me. I see you. gwa:bminna:ba /g-wa:bam-ini(n)-(a:)bani/ I used to see you. Ewa:bminna:dig /g-wa:bam-ini(n)-(a:)dig/ I supposedly see you.
(33) A w is inserted in conjunct verbs after the object marker in dubitative forms if the following marker begins with a vowel. (These w's are normally deleted after -in(in) - '2nd person object'.)
(34) wa:bma:wagẽ: /wa:bam-a:-(w)ag-e:n/ (that) I supposedly see him
wa:bmag /wa:bam-a:-ag/ (that) I see him wa:bmiyan /wa:bam-i-an/ (that) you see me wa:bmiwnẽ: /wa:bam-i-(w)an-e:n/ (that) you supposedly see me
1.2.6 Palatalization. There are three rules of palatalization.

All are somewhat irregular.
(35) $\underline{t}$ and $\underline{d}$ become $\underline{s}$ and $\underline{z}$ respectively before certain morphemes
(many of which begin with w).
Examples follow.
(36)

| gtizi | /git-izi-w/ | He is old. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gsina: $\mathrm{g}^{\text {z }} \mathrm{zi}$ | /git-wina:gw-izi-w/ | He look old. |
| ngi: $-\mathrm{g}^{\text {W }}$ dina: | /n-gi:-god-(i)n-a:/ | I tried him. |
| ngi:-gWzikwa: | /n-gi:-god-(i)k-aw-a | I tested him |

(37) $\underline{t}$ and $\underline{d}$ become $\underline{c}$ and $\mathcal{1}$ respestively before certain $\underline{i}$ 's.
(38) a:bdad /a:bid-ad-w/ It is useful.
nda:bjito:n $\quad / n(d)-a: b i d-(i) h-t-o:-n / \quad I$ make use of it.
but

| a:bdizi | /a:bid-izi-n/ | It (anim.) is useful. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ngi:-bi:nto:n | /n-gi:-bi:n-(i)h-d-o:-n/ | I cleaned it. |
| ngi:-bi:ncige: | /n-gi:-bi:n-(i)h-d-ige:/ | I cleaned up. |
| gtizi | /git-izi-w/ | He's old. |
| gci- | /git-i-/ | big |

(39) $\underline{s}$ and $\check{\underline{n}}$ become $\underline{\underline{s}}$ and $\underline{z}$ before certain $\underline{i}^{\prime} s$.
(40) gmi:na: /g-mi:n-a:/ You give it to him.
gmi:ž /g-mi:ñ-i/ You give it to me.
but
gmi:nig /g-mi:ñ-igw/ He gives it to you.
gmi:nin $\quad / g-m i=n ̃-i n i / \quad$ give it to you.
gdasa: /g(d)-as-a:/ You put him down.
gdaši $/ \mathrm{g}(\mathrm{d})-\mathrm{as}-\mathrm{i} / \quad$ You put me down.
but
gdasig $/ \mathrm{g}(\mathrm{d})$-as-igw/ He puts you down.
gdasin $/ \mathrm{g}(\mathrm{d})$-as-ini/ I put you down.
cf. also
gdo:da:pna: /g(d)-oda:pin-a:/ You pick him up.
gdo:da:pin /g(d)-oda:pin-i/ You pickme up.

### 1.2.7 Nasalization.

(41) The sequence vowel-nasal-fricative becomes nasalized vowel-fricative.
(42) nbi:do:n

| /n-bi:d-o:-n/ | I bring it. |
| :--- | :--- |
| /n-bi:d-o:-si:-n/ | I don't bring it. |
| /n-wa:bam-d-am-n/ | I see it. |
| /n-wa:bam-d-am-si:-n/ | I don't see it. |

1.2.8 Lengthening. Vowels are lengthened irregularly in morphemic environments.
(43) Vowels are lengthened before certain morphemes.

| (a) -magad 'inanimate (singular) subject' |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ngamo | /nagamo-w/ | He's singing. |
|  | ngamo:mgad | /nagamo-magad-w/ | It's singing.

(b) -ka:zo 'pretend'
wi:sni /wi:sini-w/ He's eating. wi:sni:ka:zo /wi:sini-ka:zo-w/ He's pretending to eat.
(c) -ns 'diminutive'

| na:gan | /ona:gan/ | dish |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| na:gã:s | /ona:gan-ns/ ${ }^{12}$ | cup |
| ji:ma:n | $/ j i: m e:-n /$ | boat, canoe |
| ji:ma:nẽ:ns | $/ j i: m e:-n-(i) n s /^{13}$ | little boat |

(45) The a of the morpheme am 'inanimate object; intransitive stem augment' is lengthened before certain inflectional affixes.
(46) wa:bndamã: /wa:bam-d-am-a:n/ (that) I see it wa: bndan /wa:bam-d-am-n/ See it!

| nwa:bnda:n | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n/ | I see it. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| bzindmã: | /bizind-am-a:n/ | (that) I listen |
| nbiznda:mi | /n-bizind-am-min/ | We (exc.) listen. |
| gbiznda:m | /g-bizind-am-mw/ | You (pl.) listen. |

(47) If o is the first vowel of a word (after the vowel deletions), it lengthens.

| ški-mkiznan | /oški-makizin-an/ | new shoes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ndo:ški-mkiznan | /n(d)-oš'in-makizin-an/ | my new shoes |
| mbi:gzi | /ombi:g-izi-w/ | He makes noise. |
| ndo:mbi:giz | /n(d)-ombi:g-izi/ | I make noise. |

1.2.9 W-Deletion. The morpheme initial $\underline{\text { U }}$ of some morphemes deletes after a stem consonant.

| nwa: bma: | /n-va: Dam-a:/ | I see him. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nde:ba:bma: | /n-de:b-wa:bam-a:/ | I see him in the |
|  |  | distance. |
| nda: bna: bma: | /n( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ )-a: ban-wa: bam-a: / | I look back at him. |
| gka:wna: ${ }^{\Downarrow} \mathrm{zi}$ | /gika:-wina: ¢w-izi-w/ | He looks old. |
| no: kna: ${ }^{\text {W }} \mathrm{zi}$ | /no:k-wina:nw-izi-w/ | It (anim.) looks |
|  |  | soft. |
| na:bmina: ${ }^{W}{ }^{\text {zi }}$ | /iñ-wa:bam-wina: gw-izi-w/ | He looks like (so). |
| namhe: wgamig | /anamihe:-wigamigw/ | church (pray-house) |
| a:smigmig | /a:sam-wigamigw/ | on (the side of) the |
|  |  | house |
| ji:ggamig | /ji:g-wigami¢w/ | near the house |
| 1.2. 10 E:-Mutation. The vowel e: becomes a: before certain |  |  |
| hemes. |  |  |
| gtige: | /gitige:-w/ He' | planting/gardening. |

(49) gtige: /gitige:-w/ He's planting/gardening.

| gtige: n | /gitige:-n/ | Plant: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gtiga: $n$ | /gitige:-n/ | (a) garden |
| wgi:-gtiga:na:n | /w-gi:-gitige:-n-a:-an/ | He planted it (anim.) |
| wgi:-gtiga:da:n | /w-gi:-gitige:-d.-am-n/ | He planted it. |
| ji:me: | /ji:me:-w/ | He's paddling. |
| ji:ma:n | /ji:me:-n/ | canoe |
| bmose: | /bimose:-w/ | He's walking (along). |
| gi:-mko-briosa:ma: | /gi:-makw-i-bimose:-m-a:/ | He got bearwalked. (He was put under a spe?....) |
| 1.2.11 Change. There is a morpheme change which affects the |  |  |
| plain changed |  | - |
| i e: |  |  |
| a e: |  |  |
| - we: |  |  |
| $i: \quad a:$ |  |  |
| e: ye: |  |  |
| $\mathrm{a}: \quad \mathrm{ya}$ |  |  |
| o: wa: |  |  |

Some examples are given in (51).
(51) (a) ndižcige:
/n(d)-iñ-(i)h-t-ige:/
I do (thus)./I cause things (to be) thus.

| žicge:d | /iň-(i)h-ige:-d/ | (that) he does <br> (thus) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $e: z ̌ c i g e: d ~$ | /change-iñ-(ǐh-ige:-d/ | (the one) who does <br> (thus) |


on in the examples in the rest of the work.
1.3 Categories of inflection. There are five surface classes of words, i.e. parts of speech: noun, verb, pronoun, adverb, and partjcle. Of these only nouns, pronouns, and verbs are inflected.

The categories for which nouns and verbs are inflected include: person, number, gender, and obviation.

There are two numbers: singular and plural.
There are three persons: first (speaker), second (addressee) and third. In the plural a distinction is made between exclusive and inclusive for first person. In subject agreement for person the first person inclusive plural is treated like a second person, the first person exclusive like a first person. This fact is prohably related to the person ranking system in which second person ranks higher than first person and both rank above third person. This systcm will become important for certain aspects of verb marking in later chapters.

There are two genders: animatce and inanimate.
Finally there is an opposition of third fercon nouns of nroyjrate versus obviative. Only animate nouns are marked overtly as ohviatives, although verbal o.creement shows that inanimate nouns may also be obviated. Obviation marks non-coreferentiality of third persons. Nouns marked for obviation are unmarked for number.
1.3.1 Noun inflection. Nouns belong to one of two genders, animate or inanimate. The gender of most nouns follows from their meaning. Those things that grow or are self-propelling (including energized vehicles and heavenly bodies) are aninate; all others are inonimate with the exception of a few household items, some items of
cultural importance and some body parts as well as some foods. Nouns are inflected for number, obviation, location, and possessor. Obviatives and locatives are unmarked for number.

Some examples of nouns inflected for number, obviation, and location are given in (52).
(52) (a) animates

| singular | plural | obviative | locative | stem | gloss |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e:sban | e:sbanag | e:sbanan | e:sbaning | /e:saban/ | raccoon |
| mik | mikwag | mikwan | mikong | /amikw/ | beaver |
| mtig | mtigo:g | mtigo:n | mtigo:Dg | /mitigw/ | tree |
| sab | sabi:g | sabi:n | sabi:Dg | /asabi/ | net |
| nini | ninwag | ninwan | nini:Dg | /niniw/ | man |

(b) inanimates

|  | ji:ma:nan | ji:ma: $\mathrm{n}^{14}$ | DE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mtigo:n | mtig | mtigo:Dg | /mitigw/ | wood, st |
| mškiki | škikwan | mškik | mškiki: gg | 'maškikiw/ | medicine |
| sin | ini | sin | sini: DB | /asini/ | stone |

Noun inflections for possessor are the same as those used in the verb agreement system.
ji:ma:n 'canoe' ji:ma:nan 'canoes'
your
gji:ma:n
gJi:ma:nan
/g-ji:ma:n/
/g-ji:ma:n-an/
my nji:ma:n
nji:ma:nan
/n-ji:ma:n/
/n-ji:ma:n-an/
his wji:ma:n wji:ma:nan
/w-ji:ma:n/ /w-ji:ma:n-an/
your (pI) gji:ma:nwa: gji:ma:nwa:n
/g-ji:ma:n-(i)wa:/ /g-ji:ma:n-(i)wa:-an/
our (inc) gji:ma:nna: gji:ma:nna:nin
/g-ji:ma:n-(i)na:ni/ /g-ji:ma:n-(i)na:ni-an/
our (exc) nji:ma:nna: nji:ma:nna:nin
/n-ji:ma:n-(i)na:ni/ /n-ji:ma:n-(i)na:ni-an/
their wji:ma:nwa: wji:ma:nwa:n
/w-ji:ma:n-(i)wa:/ /w-ji:ma:n-(i)wa:-mn/

Animate nouns with third person possessers are maihed for obviation. Many nouns (mostly animate) take a possessed suffix im.

|  | go:ko:š 'pig' | go:ko:šag 'pigs' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| your | ggo:ko:šim | ggo:ko:šmag |
|  | /g-go:ko:š-im/ | /g-go:ko:š-im-ag/ |
| my | ngo:ko:šim | ngo:ko:šmag |
|  | /n-go:ko:š-im/ | /n-go:ko:š-im-ag/ |
| his | wgo:ko:šman | wgo:ko:šman |
|  | /w-go:ko:š-im-an/ | /w-go:ko:š-im-ani |
| your (pl) | ggo:ko:šmiwa | ggo:ko:šmiwa:g |
|  | /g-go:ko:š-im-(i)wa:/ | /g-go:ko:š-im-(i)wa:-ag/ |
| our (inc) | ggo:ko:šmina: | ggo:ko:šmina:nig |
|  | /g-go:ko:š-im-(i)na:ni/ | /g-go:ko:š-im-(i)na:ni-ag/ |
| our (exc) | ngo:kc:šmina: | ngo:ko:šmina:nig |
|  | /n-go:ko:š-im-(i)na:ni/ | /n-go:ko:š-im-(i)na:ni-ag/ |
| their | wgo:ko:šmiwa:n | wgo:ko:šmiwa:n |
|  | /w-go:ko:š-im-(i)wa:-an/ | /w-go:ko:š-im-(i)wa:-an/ |

In addition to these inflectional forms, most nouns have diminutive and derogatory forms that can be inflected themselves. Finally, a few nouns have vocative forms.
1.3.2 Pronoun inflection. Pronouns are inflected for person, number, gender, and, in demonstrative pronouns, deictic reference.

The personal pronouns are: ni:n 'I', i:n 'you', wi:n 'he', ni:nwi 'we (exc.)', gi:nwi 'we (inc.)', gi:nwa: 'you (pl.)', and wi:nwa: 'they'. The singular forms all have unstressed variants without the final $\underline{n}$. The third person forms wi:n and wi:nwa: are used only in emphatic contexts. Normally, demonstratives are used as third person pronouns.

The demonstrative pronouns are given in (55). Three deictic distinctions are made by some speakers, aithough the system seems to be breaking down for most.

| (55) (a) | animates: | this | that | that over there |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | singular plural obviative | ma:ba gonda ninda | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aw (wa) } \\ & \text { giw (giwi) } \\ & \text { niw (niwi) } \end{aligned}$ | we: di <br> giwe:di <br> niwe:di |
| (b) | inanimates: |  |  |  |
|  | singular plural | ma:nda <br> ninda | iw (wi) <br> niw (niwi) | we:di <br> niwe:di |
|  |  | here | there | over there |
|  | locative | ma:mpi : | ma: | widi |

The interrogative pronouns are: we:ne:n 'who, what?' and a:ni:n 'which, how?'. Only the most conservative speakers still use we:g ${ }^{W}$ ne:n 'what? (inan.)' in contrast to we:ne:n 'who, what? (anim.)'. All of these contract with daš 'so, then' as we:ne:š, a:ni:š, and we:g ${ }^{W}$ ne:š. All are often heard without their final $\underline{n}$.

The indefinite pronouns are: waya 'someone' and ge:go:n 'something'. Both are uninflected.
1.3.3 Verb inflection. Verbs are of two types, transitive and intransitive. Transitive verbs are inflected to agree with their subjects and objects in person, number, gender, and obviation. Intransitive verbs are inflected to agree with their subjects in person, number, obviation, and gender. In addition, there are a few morphologically intransitive verbs that are used transitively and have some special inflections for object. We will call these pseudo-transitive verbs (henceforth PT) after Bloomfield (1957). 16 Intransitive verb stems are marked for agreement with their subjects. Those stems that have animate subjects are called animate intransitive stems (henceforth AI). Those that have inanimate subjects are called inanimate intransitive stems (henceforth II). Transitive stems are marked for agreement
with their objects. Those with animate objects are called transitive animate stems (henceforth TA). Those with inanimate objects are called transitive inanimate stems (henceforth TJ.). All PT verbs have AI stems.

Verbs are inflected for order and mode.
There are three orders: independent, conjunct, and imperative. Independent verb forms are used in independent clauses, conjuncti verbs in dependent clauses, and imperative verbs in commands.

There are three modes: preterite, dubitative, and negative. The three modes are independent of one another. All or none may be present in any verb. Preterite verbs refer to actions or states in the remote past, or in the past but not extending into the present. Dubitative verbs form part of an evidential system indicating how direct the speaker considers his evidence to be for making an essertion. Verbs in negative clauses are inflected as negative whether or not the negation is marked elsewhere in the clause. In conjunct verbs, the preverb bwa:- 'lest' is now in normal use in place of the negative inflection in the verb, although all speakers are able to produce the negative forms on request.

Conjunct verbs may be inflected as iterative and participial. Iterative forms are exceedingly rare. Participles are used as relative clauses.

Examples of the different types of verbal inflection will be giver: as we develop our analysis of the verbal morphology in the following chapters.

## CHAPTER I

FOOTNOTES
$l_{\text {Simpete }}$ ourveys and interviews do not, in my experience, ever give accurate inàications of the situation. For example, I worked on Walpole visiting often over a period of three years before I discovered that there were still monolinguals there. My experience has been that a field worker doesn't really find out the situation until he has started to establish relationships with the people on other than a working basis. Then one discovers that many estimates and observations of the "untrained" people with whom one works are precise and accurate.
${ }^{2}$ These units are in fact what Daniel Jones (1962) calls diaphones. No single speaker maintains all the contrasts that we write in all the relevant environments, but within the dialect there are some speakers who maintain each of the contrasts we write.
 cept when g or k precedes in underlying form is crucial in leading us to the conclusion that the vowels are phonemically absent. This is all the more convincing when we notice that there is an independently needed rule rounding $g, \underline{k}$, and $h$ before $0:$, $ㅇ$, and $w$.
go:n
[gwo:n]
nda:koz
[nda: $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}}{ }_{0}$ ]
[Jुi:ba:k ${ }^{W}$ we:]
[ba:bi:h ${ }^{W}$ o]
He is waiting.
4
We enclose underlying forms with their morphemic analysis where relevant in slashes.
${ }^{5}$ Rule (5) does not generally apply to two syllable nouns.
$\sigma_{\text {The }}$ d that: appears in this form is due to a regular rule of consonant epenthesis which we will discuss below in 1.2.5. We
indicate epenthesis in the underlying form by the use of parentheses. They mean that the enclosed segment will be added during the course of the derivation. We include them for the convenience of the reader. Their location relative to the hyphen separating morphemes is absolutely meaningless.

7 Our analysis agrees neither with the historical approach of Bloomfield (1957) nor with the patterning approach of Daniel Jones (1971). In particular we find neither the historical evidence nor the synchronic patterning sufficient to postulate an abstract $y$ and (for Jones) an abstract 으.
${ }^{8}$ Our definition of stem is different from traditional definition. Our definition involves the stem agreement markers. We will discuss the problem in Chapter IX.
$9_{\text {We will discuss the lengthening process in 1.2.8. }}$
${ }^{10}$ We will discuss the lengthening process in 1.2.8.
${ }^{11}$ Historically $\check{n}$ was an obstruent, probably a lateral affricate * $\$$ (not a * $\theta$ as is traditionally assumed). Morphophonemically it acts as an obstruent.
${ }^{12}$ The first $\underline{n}$ deletes (irregularly) by (20) and the vowel nasalizes by (41).

13 Epenthetic í lengthens to e:. Historically epenthetic $\underline{i}$ was *e.
${ }^{14}$ We will argue in Chapter VIII that inanimates have obviative forms, but that no mark is put on the noun. It only appears in the verb agreement. The same thing happens with regard to plural in English in the class of nouns referring to (mostly) game animals: fish, deer, moose, elk, etc.
${ }^{15}$ The parenthesized forms are heard in Wikwemikong.
${ }^{16}$ Not all verbs that Bloomfield called pseudo-transitive are in this group. Some of the verbs he treated as pseudo-transitive are regular transitive verbs. The differences will become clear in later chapters.
2.0 In this work we will need to draw on two bodies of theory, neither of which is well represented in the literature. The first is a theory of morphology, the second a theory of relational granmar.

The theory of morphology touches on issues regarding the meaning of morphemes, the nature of morpheme concatenation and morpheme insertion, and the nature of rules spelling morphemes out in morphophonemes. To the best of our knowledge there has been no attempt to build a unified generative theory which deals with all these quest.ions. ${ }^{1}$

The theory of relational grammar is a gencrative theory of clause structure which takes the grammatical relations, subject, of, direct object of, indirect object of, and possessor of, as well as structural relations like dominate, as basic. Our approach to this theory will be essentially that or Postal and Perlmutter (n.d.). This theory distinguishes between rules that adjust grammatical relations and those that simply reorder words/morphemes. The focus of relational grammar is on rules of the former type.
2.1 Theory of Morphology. In this work we will be taking the view that if a word is polymorphemic, it got to be that way through one or more syntactic processes. This seems to us to be a reasonable assumption becairer -rosslinguistically one can find examples of languages that treat: as separate words every kind of morpherue that can appear as bouná, even things like plural (la) and tense (lb).
(1) (a) (i) Korean
cip tul
HOUSE PL
(ii) Vietnamese những ngươ people PL PERSON
(b) (i) Samoan sa sogi
cut (past)

PAST CU'I
(ii) Vietnamese đã lai PAST COME
came

Our second assumption is that there are no syntactic rules that reorder morphemes within words. This is eguivalent to the structural morphologist's assumption that the same morpheme may not appear in two different morpheme slots. We take this to be the crucial assumption of morpholoEy. The one soft spot in this assumption has to do with the term word which we will not attempt to define. Nonetheless it seems clear to us that there are such units as words which are identifiablc (ji. only fuzzily) by syntactic, morphological, phonological, and psycholinguistic criteria.

Our last assumption has two parts to it. The assumption is that morphology is concrete. The two aspects of this are: first, that we will treat morphemes as simple strings of morphophonemes, unless there is reason to do otherwise, and second, that if a morpheme is associated with the operation of a rule, we will treat the rule as including both the creation and attachment of that morpheme. In more straightforwardterms we wil.l. assume that morpheme order equals rule ordcr. ${ }^{2,3}$

### 2.1.1 Morphosyntax. There are four kinds of morphosyntactic

 process, those that attach morphemes to other morphemes, those thatcreate (and attach) morphemes, those that delete morphemes, and those that change morphemes.
2.1.1.1 Attachment processes. One way in which polymorphemic constructions arise is through a kind of syntactic process which takes two syntactic units and joins them as a single word. 4 We do not mean by this those simple cliticization processes which are only phonological in nature. Rather we are refering to abstract syntactic processes, possibly cyclical, which attach morphemes to one another to form words. An example of what we mean is given by Turkish potential verbs which show that the order of morphemes reflects the scope of the morphemes.


The fact that the scope is reflected in the relative order of the morphemes we take as evidence that the processes attaching the negative and the potential to verbal constructions are cyclic.

We will write attachments in notation such as that in (3), where V represents the verbal constuction and the hyphen represents the attachment.
(3) Negative Attachment (Turkish)

$$
V \text { me } \Rightarrow V-m e
$$

2.1.1.2 Morpheme Creating processes. The second way in which polymorphemic constructions arise is through a kind of syntactic nrocess which creates morphemes. There are three kinds of such
processes: agreementrules, marked rules, and linking rules. While we are aware of the fact that there are rules, especially marked rules, which create morphemes but do not attach them, we will remain with our assumption that if a created morpheme is attached, the attachment is an integral part of the rule which created the morpheme.

Agreement rules are the best known of this type. They copy some pragmatic, semantic, or morphological feature of one syntactic unit as a morpheme added to some other syntactic unit. For example the data in (4) show that the third person singular agreement marker in Latin is $\underline{t}$.
(4) amat
ama: bat
ama:bit
ama: werat ama:werit

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { /am-a:-t/ } \\
& \text { /am-a:-ba:-t/ } \\
& \text { /am-a:-b-t/ } \\
& \text { /am-a:-w-era:-t/ } \\
& \text { /am-a:-w-er-t/ }
\end{aligned}
$$

he loves
he was loving he will love he had loved he will have loved

We will write this and other such rules as in (5).
(5) Subject Agreement - 3rd Person Clause (Latin)

$$
\mathrm{v}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{t} / \quad-1:[3]^{7}
$$

We also consider case marking rules as a type of agreement rule. Case markers are not only sensitive to the properties of the noun to which they are attached, but may also be governed by properties of the verb which the noun they mark bears a grammatical relation to. An example of this in Latin is given in (6). Verbs like those in (6a) goveri the accusative for marking their direct object. This is the normal case. But there are also verbs that govern the dative, as in (6b), and the genitive, as in (6c).
(6) (a) puer puellam amat The boy loves the girl. BOY-nom GIRL-acc LOVE-3
(b) kaesar puellae peperkit Caesar spared the girl. GIRL-dat SPARE-perf-3
(c) praeterito:rum meminit He remembers the past. PAST-(THINGS)-gen REMEMBER-3

The second type of rule that creates morphemes we call marked rules. These are rules whose operation leaves a mark in the sentence. Most rules of passive are of this sort.
(7) (a) Turkish
iši yapiyor He is doing the work.

WORK-acc /yap - iyor/
DO PROG
is yapiliyor The work is being done.
WORK /yap - il - iyor/
DO PASS PROG
(b) Indonesian

| kan | buku itu kepa | jono | Ali gave |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALI /men - ber - i - kan/ <br> trans GIVE suff suff | BOOK THE TO | JOHN | book to John. |
| ku itu diberikan /di - ber - i PASS GIVE suff s | kepada jono n/ |  | The book was given to John. |

(c) Latin

```
ro:mam winket. He will conquer Rome.
ROME-acc /wik - n - e: - t/
CONQUER PRES FUT 3
                                    STEM
ro:ma winke:tur. Rome will be conquered.
ROME-nom /wik - n - e: - tur/
    CONQUER PRES FUT 3-PASS
                                    STEM
```

Also there are languages which mark the advancement of indirect objects to direct object, or the advancement of benefactives, locatives, etc. to direct object.
(8) (a) Yokuts (benefactive becomes direct object)
xiphiyKa Make a rubbing motion!
/xip - wiy - Ka/ RUB DO IMPERATIVE
xiphi.ysitka nan $\quad$ Make a rubbing motion for me!
/xip - wiy - sit - ka/ nan
RUB DO BENEF IMPER ME-acc
(b) Sayula Popoluca (instrunent becomes direct object)
ti?u:kp mit popote I drink with a straw.
/tí - Pu:k - p/ mit popote
1 DRINK PRES WI'CH STRAW

## tintu?u:kp popote <br> I drink with a straw

/tin- tu - ?u:k - p/
l-3 WI'H DRIINK PRES
We will write such rules in a notation such as that for the Yokuts rule given in (9).
(9) Yokuts Benefactive Advancement

V BEN: NP $\Rightarrow$ V-sit 2:NP
The last type of rule which creates morphemes we call linking rules. A linking rule creates and attaches a morpheme which has no semantic function of any kind but only a structure filling function. This is a systematic exception to the principle that morpheme order equals rule order. Linking rules inser.t morphemes into points in morphemic constructions, where the new morpheme is needed as a link. The created morpheme may be either a morpheme that has a meaning when used elscwhere as in the Ojibwa example in (l0a), or it may be unique to the construction as in the Latin example in (10b).

```
(10) (a) ndanki:twa: I work for him.
    /n(d) - anoki: - h - d-aw - a:/
    I WORK (CAUSE) BEN }
                        link
(b) moneo:
/mon - e: - o:/
WARI (?) 1
link
```

```
cf. monui: I have warned (no link vowel)
```

cf. monui: I have warned (no link vowel)
/mon - w - i:/
/mon - w - i:/
WARN PERF I

```
    WARN PERF I
```

The argument that these morphemes are inserted rather than being simply added in order is complex. The basic form of argument is that link morphemes are associated with whole constructions but not with individual morphemes. But a strongly suggestive piece of evidence is given by Latin. In Latin there are three allomorphs representing first person singular: -i: follows the PERFECT morpheme, elsewhere -O: follows consonants and -m follows vowels with the sole exception of the vowels we call link vowels, which -o: follows. If we treat the rule inserting the link vowels as following the agreement rule that supplies the person/number suffixes, and following the spelling of the first person singular suffix, then the distribution of the allomorphs $-0:$ and $-\underline{m}$ follows since there are no verb roots that end in vowels. 8
2.1.1.3 Morpheme Deletion. Morphemes may be deleted out of polymorphemic constructions. While this is somewhat rare and often controversial, we feel that it is a real type of process. An example of this is the Turkish potential exemplified in (2) above. There we claimed in a footnote that the potential morpheme had two allomorphs: -ye- before negative and -yebil- elsewhere. However this is probably not the correct analysis. The correct analysis treats bil as a separate morpheme. In other constructions bil means 'know (how)'; here it means 'possible'. This analysis is supported by the fact that bil in the sequence -yebil- does not undergo vowel harmony, its vowel always remains i. If we accept this analysis, then the negative construction is a case of morpheme deletion. The derivation of the form gelemez 'he cannot come' includes the stages in (ll).
(11) $U F{ }^{9}$

Gerund Formation Potential Attachment Clause Union ${ }^{10}$
Negative Attachment bil-Deletion
(((gel) bil) me)
CCMM ABLE NO'T
(( gel-ye bil) me)
(( gel-ye-bil) me)
( gel-ye-bil me)
( gel-ye-bil-ne )
( gel-ye- $\varnothing$-me )

We will write deletions in a notation such as that in (12).
(12) bil-Deletion
bil $\Rightarrow \emptyset$ / ys-___-me
2.1.1.4 Morpheme Changing Processes. Morphemes may be changed in certain contexts. By this we mean that one morpheme can be replaced by another morpheme under limited circumstances. The only examples we know about involve the replacement of one agreement marker with another, or the replacement of one case marker with another. For example, in Latin the rule of passive has the cffect of both making the logical direct object the subject and (by a universal principle re will discuss later) leaving the logical subject bearing no grammatical relation to the verb. When this happens the logical subject appears in the ablative (with the preposition a: if the logical subject is human).
(13) (a) puer puellam amat The boy loves the girl. BOY-nom GIRI-acc LOVE-3 subject object
(b) puella ama:tur a: puero: GIRL-nom LOVE-3-PASS BY BOY-abl subject

Now it looks like we could simply wait to assign case marks until af'ter the rule of passive has applied. But consider what happens when a direct object is replaced by an indirect object (by a rule of dative advancement). The deposed object appears in the accusative.


| (b) doke:bam | puero:s | grammatikam <br> TEACH-PAST-1 <br> BOY-pl-acc <br> GRAMMAR-acc |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | direct object |  |

Thus if we assigned case after rules like passive and dative advancement we would have to make case marking global to determine where the deposed NP (called chomeurs) came from. Instead we propose that there are two kinds of case marking in Latin. Case is assigned to underlying (actually cycle initial) NP's by one process, ${ }^{l l}$ and then is reassigned cycle finally (or postcyclically). A sketch of the derivation of (13b) is given in (15).
(15) UF ${ }^{12}$

1:puer BOY

2:puell GIRL l:puer-abl

2: puell-acc
puer-abl l:puell-acc am-PASSIVE a: puer-abl l:puell-nom am-PASSIVE a: puer-abl l:puell-nom am-PASSIVE-3 a: puero: puella am-tur a: puero: puella ama:tur

| Semantic case assign. | l:puer-abl | 2:puell-acc | am- |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Passive | puer-abl | l:puell-acc | am-PASSIVE |
| Syntactic case 13 | a: puer-abl | l:puell-nom | am-PASSIVE |
| Agreement | a: puer-abl | l:puell-nom | am-PASSIVE-3 |
| Spellings | a: puero: | puella | am-tur |
| Link Vowel | a: puero: | puella | ama:tur |

Word Order \& puella ama:tur a: puero: Morphophonemics

We will write morpheme changing processes in a notation like that in (16), using an abstract symbol (in this example CASE) to stand for the class of morphemes to be replaced.
(16) Nominative Assignment (Latin)

CASE $\Rightarrow$ nom / 1:N-
2.1.2 Morpheme spelling. In spite of the fact that we have
chosen to do our morphology concretely, there are still many instances in which we need to consider that an abstract morpheme exists and
needs to be spelled. The major reason for positing an abstract morpheme is that a particular morpheme has suppletive allomorphs. We included in the term suppletion the case where a morpheme has a zero realization that does not arise either from the action of phonological rules or from morphemic deletion (§2.1.1.3).

There are two aspects to the spelling of morphemes. First there are the issues relating to how the morpheme is spelled out, and second there are the issues relating to the kinds of conditioning that can affect the spelling of difierent allomorphs.
2.1.2.1 Spelling. There are four ways that a morpheme can be realized. It can appear as a string of morphophonemes. It can appear as a phonological mutation of another morpheme. It can appear as both a string of morphemes and a phonological mutation of an adjacent morpheme. Or it can "appear" as nothing, its presence being known by whet semantically should have been at a point in a structure where nothing appears. German plurals provide an excellent example of all four types. The spelled plural in these examples is -e, the rule fronts a to $\underline{\text { ä. }}$
(17) (a) spelling \& rule sing plu
Fall Fälle Schlag Schläge
case strokes
(b) spelling only

| Jahr | Jahre | year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tag | Tage | day |

(c) rule only

| Schaden | Schäden <br> Gärten | damage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| garden |  |  |

(d) neither spelling nor rule

| Wagen | Wagen | car |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Schatten | Schatten | shadow |

We will treat these four types of spelling as the simple product of the interaction of two independent modes of morpheme realization: 1) a morpheme is spelled as a string of morphophonemes, or not, and 2) the morpheme triggers a phonological rule or not. In all cases where a triggered rule applies we will assume that the morpheme remains and is not "eaten" by the phonological rule. Therefore if there are othe allomorphs, a clause must be added to specify zero allomorphy in those cases where the rule applies but no spelling appears. While it appears that this assumption should lead to ad hoc rules specifying zero allomorphs, our experience has been consistently the opposite. Even if there appear at first to be cases in which the only realization of a morpheme is the triggering of a rule, closer inspection of the data has consistently shown otherwise.

There is one instance of the application of triggered phonological rules that is not widely recognized as such. This has to do with languages that have different stem forms used in different contexts. For example Yokuts has several different stem forms for each root depending, in part, on the construction it appears in as shown in (18). (Not all root classes are exemplified.)

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { aorist } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { desiderative } \\
\text { aorist }
\end{array} & \text { agentive } \tag{18}
\end{array}
$$

(he)...ed (he) wanted to... one who ...s
(a) eat xat-hin xat-hatin-hin xata:-?ic care for gop-hin gop-hotin-hin gopo:-9ic touch swear
giy'-hin
muṭ-hun
giy-hatin-hin
mut-hatin-hin
giye:-"ic muṭo:-?uc'


The roots in (18a) have two stem forms, one in the aorist and desiderative, and the other in the agentive. The forms in (18b) have two stems too, but the one used in the aorist is the same as the one in the agentive, the desiderative stem being the different one. We analyze these stems as all being of the form CVC underlyinet. Before "neutral" suffixes like the aorist one class of these (those in (.l8b)) undergoes a rule of Echo (19).
(19) Echo

$$
\emptyset \Rightarrow \underset{[\alpha F]}{\mathrm{V}: / \underset{[\alpha F]}{ } \quad \# \mathrm{C} \quad \mathrm{C}}
$$

The other class remajns unaffected (those in (18a)). Before certain other affixes like the desiderative, Echo does not apply regardless of the stem class. And finally before the agentive all stem classes undergo Echo (19). The stems in (10c) and (l8d) all have the form CVCC basically. The forms in (18c) are like the forms in (18a); only becausc of a rule that epenthesizes an $\underline{i}$ between the first two consonants of a consonant cluster the basic sjmilarj.ty is a little haider to see. 'The forms in (18d) are like the forms in (18b), but
because of a rule shortening long vowels in closed syllables that similarity is also not so immediately apparent.

The point of this example, however, is that we analyze Echo (and other rules that generate stem forms) as the same type of phonological rule as the rule that changes $a$ to $\underset{a}{a}$ in the German exampies in (17), even though such stem formation rules may be triggered by the morpheme class of the morpheme they affect. We will call all phonological rules that have morphemic contexts stem formation rules. ${ }^{15}$

Now let us look at some examples of spelling rules to give some instances of the notation that we will be using. First let us look at the Latin perfect morpheme which will supply us with an example of all but one type of spelling rule. The Latin perfect morpheme may be realized in five different ways, as $\underline{W}$, as $\underline{S}$, as vowel length, as reduplication, or as a zero morpheme. Examples of each type of realization are given in (20). Link morphemes are enclosed in parentheses.
present
I ...
(a) amo: /am-(a:)-o:/ moneo: /mon-(e:)-o:/ audio: /aud-(i:)-o:/
(b) lu:keo: /lu:k-(e:)-o:/ karpo: /karp-o:/ saepio: /saep-(i:)-o:/
(c) sedeo: /sed-(e:)-o:/ emo: /em-o:/
(d) pendeo: /pend-(e:)-o:/ kano: /kan-o:/
perfect
I have ...ed
ama:wi: /am-(a:)-w-i:/ love
monui: /mon-w-i:/ warn
audi:wi: /aud-(i:)-w-i:/ hear
lu:ksi: /lu:k-s-i:/ be light karpsi: /karp-s-i:/ pluck saepsi: /saep-s-i:/ hedge in pario: /par-(i)-o:/
se:di: /sed-PERF-i:/ sit
e:mi: /em-PERF-i:/ buy
we:ni: /wen-PERF-i:/ come
pependi: /REDUP-pend-PERF-i:/ hang kekini:16 /REDUP-kan-PERF-i:/ fall peperi: /REDUP-per-PERF-i:/ bring forth

| (e) prandeo: /prand-(e:)-o:/ | prandi: | /prand-PERF-i:/ lunch |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| findo: | /fid-(n)-o:// | fidi: | /fid-PERF-i:/ split |
| askendo: /askend-o:/ | askendi: | /askend-PERF-i:/ climb |  |

The phonological rule that is involved in the derivation of the forms in (30c) is given in (21).
(21) Perfect Lengthening

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow[+ \text { long }] /\left[\frac{C_{0}}{\text { Lengthening }}\right]-\text { PET.. }
$$

The rule that interchanges the perfect morpheme for reduplication is given in (22).
(22) Perfect Reduplication

$$
V \Rightarrow \text { RLDUP-V } /[\text { Reduplicating }] \text {-PERF }
$$

We will not formulate the rule of reduplication here because it is complex and those complexities are irrelevant to the point of the example. Finally the rule that spells the perfect morpheme out in morphophonemes is given in (23).
(23) Perfect Spelling

```
PERF => w / [w-Perfect]-
```

$\qquad$
s / [s-Perfect]- $\qquad$
$\emptyset$
The last clause of (23) applies in the forms in (20c-e).
There is one further type of spelling rule that we have not yet mentioned. This involves cases in which two (or more) morphemes are spelled as one indivisible string of morphophonemes. We call this portmanteau spelling. An example of this in Latin is given in (24).
(24) present

I ...
fero: /fer-o:/
affero: /ad-fer-o:/ aufero: /ab-fer-o:/ konfero: /kon-fer-o:/ etc.
perfect
I have ...ed
tuli: /fer+PERF-i:/ bear attuli: /ad-fer+PERF-i:/ bring toward abtuli: /ab-fer+PERF-i:/ take away kontuli: /kon-fer+PERF-i:/ compare

We will write such portmanteau spelling rules as in (25).
(25) tul-Spelling
fer-PERF $\Rightarrow$ tul
2.1.2.2 Conditions affecting the spelling of morphemes. There
are five kinds of conditions that can affect the spelling of morphemes or the triggering of stem formation rules. These conditions can be semantic/pragmatic, syntactic, morphemic, constructional, or phonological.

In order to write rules involving certain kinds of conditioning it will be necessary to resort to the device of marking with features. There are features corresponding to each sort of conditioning except syntactic, but in each case the status of the feature is different. Except in the case of phonological features all other features occur only in rules. In the case of semantic/pragmatic features, like [l] (i.e. first person) or [PL] (plural) the rule refers to the referential situation of the crucial index to establish whether it is applicable. In the case of morphemic or constructional features like [a:-Class] or [s-Perfect] the reference is to the lexical properties of the morphemes or contructions involved. We will write features into rules freely with the understanding that such features do not exist in the syntactic structures to which those rules apply. ${ }^{17}$

Semantic/pragmatic conditioning of a spelling rule is illustrated
by the Luiseño data in (26). A different allomorph of the morpheme meaning 'run' is used when the subject is plural.
sg. subj. pl. subj.
(a) he:laq /he:la-q/ he:la:n /he:la-an/ sing ?owo?aq / ?owo?a-q/ ?owo?a:n / ${ }^{\text {?owo?a-an/ work }}$
(b) pokwaq /pokwa-q/ 乃o:ra:n /乃o:ra-an/ run

We will write the spelling rule as in (27).
(27) RUN ==> no:ra / 1:[PL]
pokwa
Syntactic conditioning of a spelling rule is illustrated by the English allomorphs $I$ and me. For speakers that have no trouble with this morpheme after conjunctions, the rule is:
(28) $\mathrm{ME} \Rightarrow$ ay / 1 : $\qquad$
mi:
Morphemic conditioning of a spelling rule may be of two types. Either a morpheme is spelled in a certain way in a certain context because of the morpheme class of an adjacent morpheme, or they are spelled a certain way because of the interaction of their own morpheme class properties with an external context. The former situation is more common with inflectional and derivational morphemes, the latter with lexical morphemes. An example of the former situation is given by the Latin perfect morpheme in (20) above. The spelling rule is given in (23). Examples of the latter situation in which class properties of the morpheme itself are involved most commonly relate to the application of stem formation rules. Such a case is given in (18) where the forms in (18b) and (18d) are marked to undergo Echo (19) except in certain morphemic contexts, desider-
ative being the example given.
Conitruction conditioning of a spelling rule is somewhat rare and problematic but nonetheless exists. An example of a complex of morphemes determining the spelling of a morpheme is given in the Latin forms in (29) where the spelling of the perfect morpheme is different for different constructions involving the same lexical morpheme.

| present |  |  | perfect |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I |  | I have ...e |  |
| (a) | lego: | /leg-o:/ | le:gi: | /leg-PERF-i:/gather, read |
|  | kolligo: | /kon-leg-o:/ | kolle:gi: | /kon-leg-PERF-i:/collect |
|  | de:ligo: | /de:-leg-o:/ | de:le:gi: | /de:-leg-PERF-i:/choose |
|  | perlego: | /per-leg-o:/ | perle:gi: | /per-leg-PERF-i:/read |
|  |  |  |  | through |
| (b) | di:ligo: | /di:-leg-o:/ | di:le:ksi: | /di:-leg-s-i:/ love |
|  | intellego: | /inter-leg-o:/ | intelle:ksi | :/inter-leg-s-i:/ under- |
|  | neglego: | /neg-leg-o:/ | negle:ksi: | /neg-leg-s-i:/ neglect |

It is possible that these constructions could be considered lexical units, but the rule that is responsible for the $\underline{i}$ that appears in place of the $e$ in the present forms crucially refers to the morpheme boundary before the root.

Finally we come to the phonological conditioning of allomorphs. Examples of this are easy to come by, even exciuding all those instances that structural morphologists called phonologically conditioned allomorphy but which are actually instances of the operation of phonological rules. An example of what we mean is given by the allomorphs of Yawelmani Yokuts future morpheme, illustrated in (30). There are two allomorphs -? after vowels and -i:n after consonants.

| (a) lage? | Jlaga: - ? ${ }^{18}$ | will spend the night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| yo? ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ? | /yo?ki: - ?/ | will return |
| ko?o:lo? | /kb? - a:la: - ?/ | will cause to throw |
| ?ohyoxo? | /?ohyo: - xo: - ?/ | (will) be searching |
| 'ohemta? | /?ohi:m - ta: - ?/ | will make vanish (lit. become not) |
| (b) xaten | /xat - i:n/ | will eat |
| paxa:ten | /paxa:t' - i:n/ | will mourn |
| doshotnen | /dos - hatn - i:n/ | will want/try to tell |
| tansiten | /tan - sit - i:n/ | will go to |
| soxwisen | /ṣox - wis - i:n/ | will exterminate one another |

We will write the rule spelling Yawelmani future as in (31).
(31) FUT $==>$ i:n / C $\qquad$
;
To the best of our knowledge it has not been previously noticed that the existence of phonological conditioning of suppletive allomorphs implies that spelling (or lexical insertion, to use a more traditional but less descriptive term) happens in stages. The morpheme in these cases that precedes the future must be spelled before the future is spelled. Most interesting are forms like laga? which are spelled without the second vowel, then undergo Echo (19), before the future is spelled.

Generally phonological conditioning works from the stem out. But there is the interesting Latin case mentioned above in §2.1.1.2 regarding link vowels in Latin. A look at that case in detail would be worthwhile at this point. The case regards the spelling of the morpheme meaning 'lst person singular' which is supplied by the rule of subject agreement, lST-SG. The examples in (32) show the complete distribution of allomorphs except for the passive, but one can easily show that the passive distribution is exactly parallel to that of the active. Link vowels are in parentheses.
(32) present stem forms
(a) present

| moneo: | /mon-(e:)-o:/19 | I warn |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:ko: | $/$ di:k-o:/ | I say |
| wenio: | /wen-(i:)-o:/ | I come |
| werto: | /wert-o:/ | I turn |
| tango: | $/$ tag-n-o:/ |  |

(b) past
mone:bam /mon-(e:)-e:ba:-m/ ${ }^{2 l}$ I warned
di:ke:bam /di:k-e:ba:-m/ I said
wenie:bam /wen-(i:)-e:ba:-m/ I came
werte:bam /wert-e:ba:-m/ I turned
tange:bam /tag-n-e:ba:-m/ I touched
(c) future

| mone:bo: | /mon-(e:)-b-a:/ | I will warn |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:kam | /di:k-a:-m/ | I will say |
| weniam | /wen-(i:)-a:-m/ | I will come |
| wertam | /wert-a:-m/ | I will turn |
| tangam | /tag-n-a:-m/ | I will touch |

(d) subjunctive
moneam /mon-(e:)-a:-m/ I may warn
di:kam /di:k-a:-m/ I may say
weniam
wertam
/wen-(i:)-a:‥m/
I may come
tangam
/wert-a:-m/ I may turn
/tag-n-a:-m/ I may touch
(e) past subjunctive

| mone:rem | /mon-(e:)-se:-m/ | I would warn |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:kerem | /di:k-se:-m/22 | I would say |
| weni:rem | /wen-(i:)-se:-m/ | I would come |
| werterem | /wert-se:-m/ | I would turn |
| tangerem | /tag-n-se:-m/ | I would touch |
| perfect stem forms |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| present perfect |  |  |
| monui: | /mon-w-i:/ |  |
| di:ksi: | /di:k-s-i:/ | I have warned |
| we:ni: | /wen-PERF-i:/ | I have said |
| werti: | /wert-PERF-i:/ | I have come |
| tetigi: | /REDUP-tag-PERF-i:/ | I have turned |

(g) past perfect

| monueram | /mon-w-era:-m/ | I had warned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:kseram | /di:k-s-era:-m/ | I had come |
| we:neram | /wen-PERF-era:-m/ | I had come |


| werteram | /wert-PERF-era;-m/ I had turned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| tetigeram | /REDUP-tag-PERF-era:-m/ I had touched |

(h) future perfect

| monuero: | /non-w-is-o:/ | I will have warned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:ksero: | /di:k-s-is-o:/ | I will have said |
| we:nero: | /ven-PERF-is-o:/ | I will have come |
| wertero: | /wert-PERF-is-o:/ | I will have turned |
| tetigero: | /REDUP-tag-PEFF-is-o:/ | I will have touched |

(i) perfect subjunctive

| monuerim | /mon-w-is-i:-m/ | I may have warned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:kserim | /di:k-s-is-i:-m/ | I may have said |
| we:nerim | /wen-PERF-is-i:-m/ | I may have come |
| werterim | /wert-PERF-is-i:-m/ | I may have turned |
| tetigerim | /REDUP-tag-PERF-is-i:-m/ I may have touched |  |

(j) past perfect subjunctive

| monuisscm | /mon-w-is-se:-m/ | I would have warned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| di:ksissem | /di:k-s-is-se:-m/ | I would have said |
| we:nissenn | /wen-PERF-is-se:-m/ | I would have come |
| wertissem | /wert-PERF-is-se:-m/ | I would have turned |
| teticj.ssem | /REDUP-tag-PERF-is-se:-m/ I would have touched |  |

Notice that except in the present perfect and in the present of the two forms with link vowels, moneo: and wenio:, the distribution of o: and $\underline{m}$ is straightforward: o : follows consoriants, $\underline{m}$ follows vowels. This includes the place in the future where, based on stem class, different allomorphs spell the future. Further along that line, the future can be spelled in four ways: -b- after a certain class of morphemes, -is- after the morpheme PERF (even when it appears as a link morpheme itself in the subjunctive), -a:- before lST-SG, and -e:- elscwhere (not exemplified here). But the spelling of lST-SG following the future morpheme depends on the spelling of the future morpheme. We take this as strong evidence that these are phonologically conditioned allomorphs. But there remains the problem of the allomorph following ling vowels. Either we can compl.icate the phonological statement by saying that $m$ follows non-link vowels, or we can simply
order link vowel insertion after the spelling of lST-SG, which is what we chose to do. Finally there is the problera of the spelling of lST-SG in the present perfect (f). Notice that the ending is the same regardless of how the morpheme PERF is spelled, even when it has no realization as in werti: 'I have turned'. We take this to mean that the rule spelling lST-SG procedes the rule spelling PERF (23). Now we are ready to write the rule.
(33) 1ST-SG Spelling

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { ISTI-SG } \Rightarrow \text { i: / PERF } \\
0: ~ / ~ C ~
\end{aligned}
$$

m
Notice that we have used an ordering convention, the subparts of (33) must apply in the order they are given. This is for convenience, although we suspect that it will turn out to be theoretically necessary.

T'o conclude this section we will write out the morpholocy of the examples in (32) and give the rules necessary for their realization to show what we conceive a morphology to look like.
(34) (a) present

ROOT ${ }^{\text {中 }}$ IST-SG ${ }^{23}$
(b) past

ROOT \$ PAET - IS'T-SG
(c) future

ROOI' \$ FUT - ISTP-SG
(d) subjunctive

ROOT \$ SUB.J - IST-SG
(e) past subjuncti.ve

ROOT \# SUBJ - PAS' - ISTP-SG
(f) present perfect

ROOT - PERF' \$ IST'-SG
(g) past perfect

ROOT - PERF \$ PAST - 1ST-SG
(h) future perfect

ROOT - PERF' \$ FU'T - 1ST-SC
(i) perfect subjunctive

ROOT - PERF \$ SUBJ - IST-SG
(j) past perfect subjunctive ROOT - PERF $\$$ SUBJ - PAST - 1ST-SG
(35) (a) Future link

$$
\emptyset \Rightarrow \text { FUT / PERF___SUBJ }
$$

(b) Past Subjunctive

$$
\text { SUBJ-PAS'「 }=\Rightarrow \text { se: }
$$

(c) Subjunctiv: Spelling

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { SUBJ } \Rightarrow & i: / \text { FUT- } \\
& e: / \text { [o: class]- } \\
& a:
\end{aligned}
$$

(d) PAST Spelling

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { PAST => era: / PERF-_ } \\
\text { e:ba: }
\end{gathered}
$$

(e) FUT Spelling FUT $\Rightarrow$ is / PERF-_
b / [b Future]-
a: / __IST-SG
e:
(f) 1ST-SG Spelling (= (33))

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { IST-SG }=\Rightarrow & i: ~ / ~ P E R F-~ \\
& 0: / \text { C. } \\
m &
\end{aligned}
$$

(g) Link Vowel ${ }^{24}$
(i) $\varnothing \Rightarrow$
LV / ROOT- $\$$
(ii) LV $\Rightarrow$ e: / [e: Class]- $\qquad$
i: / [e: Class]- $\qquad$
i / [í Class]-
a:
(h) PERF Spelling

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) } \mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \text { [long] } /\left[\frac{\mathrm{C}_{\circ}}{\text { Lengthening }}\right]-\text { PERF } \quad(=(21)) \\
& \text { (ii) } \mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \text { REDUP-V } /[\text { Reवuplicating }]-\text { PERF } \quad(=(22))
\end{aligned}
$$


2.1.3 The Semantics of Morphology. We would like to conclude this section on morphology with a brief, informal discussion on the topic of the relationship between morphology and semantics. We feel that a complete theory of morphology should include a portion that delimits what possible "meanings" a morpheme can have. So for example the theory should be able to predict certain things about how morphemes can change meaning diachronically.

To talk about this we need to distinguish two aspects of the meaning of morphemes. One is the literal meaning(s), the other the implied meaning(s). For example there are synonyms like face and mug (in the intended sense) which have the same literal meaning but whose implied meanings are different. Another example (involving complex lexicalizations) would be illegible versus unreadable. Both mean that the text (or whatever) cannot be read, but illegible implies unintelligibility because of form. Unreadable is general, but often implies unintelligibility because of content or style. While this discussion of the difference between literal and implied meanings is very informal we hope that the reader can see the distinction we are driving at.

We feel that the theory of morpho-semantics should be addressed primarily to the issue of what can constitute the literal meaning of a morpheme. We feel that it is impossible in principle to define the potential implied meanings because such meanings arise from the competition of other morphemes in the same semantic field (in the
sense of Pike (1959). Or from even historical accidents as in the case of French face which came to have tabu implications because it was used in the punchline of a risqué joke, and was replaced by visage for normal use.

Having outlined to some extent the things we wịh to consider in the theory of morpho-semantics, let us turn to presenting a brief typology of morphemes according to the type of literal meaning they have. Morphemes may be either referential or metacommunicative. Referential morphemes carry the content of the message. Metacommunicative morphemes convey information about the structure of the message, the speaker's attitudes towards the message, his intentions in conveying the message, and possibly other such things.

Referential morphemes are of two types--indexical and lexical. Indexical morphemes are pronouns, deictic morphemes, and the like. Lexical morphemes are ordinary verbs and nouns. (It is important to notice that though nouns are frequently used indexically, they only have such meanings as a result of their use. This is the point of McCawley (1970).)

Metacommunicative morphemes have a richer typology. There are two basic types--structural and attitudinal. Structural morphemes are of four subtypes--rule morphemes (the morphemes created by marked rules §2.l.l.2), agreement morphemes, function morphemes (which mark dependency, mood, illocutionary t'orce), and disccurse morphemes (which mark paragraphing, topicalization, focus, contrast, coordination). Attitudinal morphemes include interjections, evidentials (in languages which have them), most intonational morphemes (but not question intonation, listing intonation, or contrastive stress), and
many discourse level morphemes (marking such things as the counterexpectancy of the content of the linguistic unit with which they are associated, and emphasis).

At this point it appears that the theory should severely limit the number of literal meanings associated with single morphemes. 'This is clearest in the case of structural morphemes which may have only one literal meaning up to the point that the language distinguishes between the structures involved. So, for example, in some languages three different rules may advance NP's to direct object and all mark the verb with the same morpheme, but that does not mean that that morpheme has three meanings. Another problem that arises in this line has to do with morphemes that have differert spellings in different contexts. For example in the cose of Latin lST-sg in (3.3) above, all three allomorphs mean simply 'first person singular' even where the allomorphy is the sole sign of some other contrast (as in werto: 'I. turn' versus werti: 'I have turned') we still say that the literal meaning of each is 'first person singular'. In a case where conditioned allomorphy is the thine that bears the surface contrast for that condition, we recognize that that "meaning" of that allomorph is an implied meaning in that context. This notion regarding the limitation on the semantics of structural morphemes is very important because it distinguishes among possible solutions to morphological problems.
2.2 Relational Grammar. In this work we will use a version of the theory of relational grammar being developed by Postal and Perlmutter (n.d.). Basically this is a theory of clause structure which takes the relations subject of, direct object of, indirect object of,
and possessor of as theoretical primes. ${ }^{25}$ This enables us to write rules by direct reference to these primes. The obvious place to want to do this is in rules of subject and object agreement, and rules of case assignment. So, for example, Latin verbs agree with their subjects in person and number as shown in (36).
(36) ego te: video: /vid-(e:)-o:/ I see you. tu: me: vide:s /vid-(e:)-si You see me. is no:s videt /vid-(e:)-t/ He sees us.
no:s eum vide:mus /vid-(e:)-mus/ We see him. vo:s eo:s vide:tis /vid-(e:)-tis/ You (pl) see them. ej: vo:s vident /vid-(e:)-unt/ They see you (pl).
ego curro: /curr-o:/ I am running. tu: curris /curr-s/ You are running. is currit /curr-t/ He is running.
no:s currimus /curr-mus/ We are running. vo:s curritis /curr-tis/ You (pl) are running. ei: currunt /curr-unt/ They are running.

Having as a grammatical prime the relation subject, we can write the six rules of person/number agreement directly, without reference to an arbitrary structural condition. ${ }^{26}$ The first person singular rule would look like (37). The notation 1: means subject of.
(37) Subject Agreement (first person clause)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V}-1 \mathrm{ST}-\mathrm{SG} /{ }^{1}[1, \mathrm{SG}]^{27}
$$

What (37) says is that if the referent of the subject of a verb is first person singular, create and attach the morpheme lST-SG to the right of the verb.

As an example of object agreement consider the Sayula Popoluca data in (38).
(38) (a) tine?pw aye hayaw /tinn-? ${ }^{?}$ p-w/ I saw the man.

(b) ine? pw aye hayaw /in-?e?p-w/ You saw the man. iše?pw í:h /iš-?e?p-w/ You saw me.
$\begin{array}{cll}\text { (c) tinše?pw aye hayaw /tinšn-n } e^{n} p-w / ~ T h e ~ m a n ~ s a w ~ m e . ~ \\ \text { išenpw aye hayaw /iš- } e^{n} p-w / & \text { The man saw you }\end{array}$
Here the agreement markers are portmanteau marking both the subject and the object. While there is some neutralization of forms (iše?pw means either 'you saw me' or 'he saw you'), the fact of object agreement is clear. Once again we write this agreement by refering directly to the objecthood of the direct object index, and combine the subject and object agreement markers by a later complex of protmanteau spelling rules.
(39) Object Agreement - first person clause (exclusive)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \text { IST-V / 2:[i] }
$$

As an example of case marking we refer the reader to the Latin rule given in (16) above.

The rest of the system of relational grammar is based on empirically derived generalizations, called laws, which are statements of limitations on the form that a rule in a human language can take, using these grammatical relations mentioned above: subject of, object of, indirect object of, and possessor of.

In the following sections we will discuss and exemplify different aspects of the theory of relational grammar more by way of laying it out than of arguing in detail for the various points in it.
2.2.1 Ergativity. There are some languages which treat the subject of an intransitive clause and the object of a transitive clause in the same way, in opposition to languages that treat subjects uniformly regardless of the transitivity of the clause. Languages of the former type are called ergative languages, the others accusative. Some examples of ergative languages are given in (40).
(40) ( $\bar{a}$ ) Hindi (past tense)

(b) Copainalá Zoque
huan kenba Juan sees (= can see).
JUAN SEEH-PRES
huan?is kyenba te? libru Juan sees the book. JUAN-GEN 3-SEE-PRES 'RHE BOOK

We will treat ergativity as a secondary phenomenon, i.e. we will define the relations of ergativity in terms of the grammatical relations subject of, object of. The relations of ergativity are ergative and absolutive. Prgative is the subject in a transitive clause. Absolutive is the object in a transitive clause or the sobject in an intransitj.ve clause. Notice carefully that we are not sayinc, that accusative constructions are turned into ergative constructions. In fact, as we will see in a later chapter Ojibwa has agrecments of both ergative and accusative nature intertwined, first agrement with the absolutive, then subject and object person agreement, and finally ergative and absolutive number agreement. To make matters worse, some of the internal structure of Ojibwa stems arises from accusative type syntax. An example is given in (41). (BENEF marlis the advancement of a benefactive to object..)

2.2.2 Hierarchy of Gramuatical Relations. The grammatical relations subject of, dircct object of, and indirect object of are the
central notions of relational grammar. The NP's in a clause bearing these relations are called terms. All other NP's appearing in a clause are non-terms. All terms and non-terms in a clause are called dependents of the verb of the clause. In this work we will use dependency trees with relationally labeled nodes to represent abstract syntactic structures. Often we will reduce these to equivalent one dimensional bracketed strings.

There exists a syntactic hierarchy anong dependents with subject having the highest rank.
(42) Subject

Direct Object
Indirect Object
Non-terms

This hierarchy is empirically determined on the basis of cross linguistic evidence regarding how rules that are sensitive to termhood operate. Keenan and Comrie (1972) argue that relative clause formation follows the hierarchy in (42). If a language can relativize a non-term, then it can also relativize all terms. If a language can relativize an indirect object then it can relativize direct objects and subjects. If it can relativize a direct object, then it can relativize subjects. Similarly Johnson (to appear) presents evidence that rules making NP's into direct objects also follow the hierarchy (except that subjects cannot be "demoted" to objects as we will discuss below). Finally he argues that reflexivization and probably coreferential deletion also follow the hierarchy.

Therefore we will label subjects 1 , direct objects 2 , and indirect objects 3 .

In addition there appears to be a hierarchy based in ergativity.

For example the -ee nominalization in English operates on absolutives only (Swinburn (1974)).
(43) (a) from intransitive clauses
retiree
returnee
escapee
(b) from transitive clauses
addressee
employee
draftee
Similarly -ing nominalizations can have incorporated absolutives only (Swinburn (1974)).
(44) (a) from intransitive clauses
dog barking
bird chirping
baby crying
(b) from transitive clauses
lion hunting
people watching wife swapping

Notice in particular that on semantic grounds only it appears that the forms in (44b) should be ambiguous between a subject reading for the incorporated noun and an object reading, but they have only object readings. Whereas the forms in (44a) show that subject incorporations are possible (if somewhat unusual), therefore the correct generalization is that absolutives are incorporated. Thus there appears to be a hierarchy of ergativity:
(45) absolutive
ergative
Notice in particular that this hierarchy runs against the hierarchy of (42). What the meaning of this is is unclear at this point; however we will see below in the section on clause union that there
is another place where this conflict of the hierarchies appears.
We will label absolutives $\underset{A}{A}$ and ergatives $\underline{E}$, remembering that an $\underline{E}$ is simultaneously a $\underline{l}$, and that an $\underline{A}$ is simultaneously either a $\underline{1}$ or a 2 depending upon the transitivity of the clause it appears in.

Now let us lay out a summary of nominal dependents, with the labels we will use to refer to them. The label will express the grammatical function of the dependent. In addition we will group them by two non-congruent classifications: termhood and syntacticity. Termhood we have mentioned above. Syntacticity refers to whether the function of a dependent is purely syntactic or not. All terms are purely syntactic entities, their grammatical function being determined by the semantics of the verb and a set of universal function assignment principles. For example if a verb refers to an agent acting on a goal, the agent will be assigned subjecthood and the goal objecthood. Most non-terms, however, have their function assigned by "internal" semantic properties. For example, instrumentals are instrumental because they refer to instruments, not because the verb they appear with assigns them instrumentality. However, there are three types of non-terms which arise solely through syntactic means. These are chomeurs, dead dependents, and dead verbs. These entities are crucial to the theory, but we are not yet in a position to discuss them. The summary is given in (46). Notice that relational grammar makes no claim about the source of semantic dependents. They could either be derived from higher predicates or could be present in place in underlying forms; neither would affect the theory.
2.2.3 Rules. Rules in natural languages fall into two distinct groups with respect to grammatical relations. There are those that
(46) Subject (1) $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Direct Object (2) } \\ \text { Indirect Object (3) }\end{array}\right\}$ Terms
Chomeur (CH)
Dead Dependent (DD)
Dead Verb (DV)

Instrument (INTS)
Benefactive (BEN) $\quad$ Non-terms (NT) Comitative (COM) Locative (LOC) Adverb (ADV) etc.

affect the grammatical relations of the cluase(s) involved and those that, while they may refer to grammatical relations, do not change them. For example the rules of English fall into these two groups: (47)

| A. relation changing rules $\quad$ B. other rules |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| passive ( 2 becomes l) | Question/relative word movement |
| dative ( 3 becomes 2) | Topicalization <br> subject to subject raising <br> subject to object raising <br> there insertion |
| Relative clause extraposition  <br> it insertion (extraposition) Particle movement <br> et al. Subject-auxiliary inversion <br> et al.  |  |

Rules in group A interact freely with rules in both groups. That is, they both feed and bleed rules in both group A and group B. But rules in group B never affect rules in group A; they neither feed nor bleed them. In relational grammar we are primarily coiscerned with relation changing rules, although we will refer to the action of other rules when sucin rules are sensitive to termhood.

Relation changing rules are of three types: promotions deletions, and clause unions. Let us give some examples of each.
(48) Promotions
(a) passive (2 becomes 1)
(i) People grow oranges in Florida.
(ii) Oranges are grown in Florida.
(b) subject to object raising (downstairs clause 1 becomes upstairs 2)
(i) I found that literature was a bore.
(ii) I found literature to be a bore.
(c) it insertion (it becomes l)
(i) for Max to Jose his job would be a shame. (ii) It would be a shame for Max to lose his job.
(49) Deletions
(a) Equi (downstairs 1 deletes)
(i) $\mathrm{He}_{i}$ wants $\mathrm{him}_{j}$ to leave
(ii) $\mathrm{He}_{i}$ wants $\emptyset_{i}$ to leave.
(b) Indefinite object deletion (inderinite 2 deJetes)
(i) Francis drinks $\varnothing$.
(ii) George smokes $\varnothing$.
(50) Clause Unions (clause boundaries are erased) ${ }^{29}$
(a) Downstairs intransitive
(i) I saw that he left.
(ii) I saw him leave.
(b) Downstairs transitive
(i) (no ununited form)
(ii) I let him eat mangocs.

We will discuss pronotions and deletions in the remainder of this section, but we will deal with the theory of clause unions in a separate section.

There are three types of promotions: advancements, ascensions, and insertions. The three examples of (48) represent each of these: (48a) exemplifjes an advancement, (48わ) exemplifies an ascension, and (48c) exemplifies an insertion. $\Lambda$ dvancements take a dependent and raise its rank in the hisrarchy, e.g. passive takes a 2 and makes it a l, dative takes a 3 and makes it a 2. Other languages have rules
advancing non-terms to 1 or to 2. English rather freely adyances BEN to 2. Some Englich examples are given in (5l).
(51) (a) passive ( 2 becomes 1 )
(i) Alicia rejected Fcrdinand's advances.
(ii) Ferdinand's advances were rejected by Alicia.
(b) psych movement (a kind of passive, 2 becomes l)
(i) Uscar tasted Felix's quiche.
(ii) Felix's quiche tasted awful to Oscar.
(c) dative ( 3 becomes 2)
(i) Laverne gave a parakeet to Shirley.
(ii) Laverne gave Shirley a parakcet.
(d) benefactive (BEN becomes 2)
(i) Lebeau baked a pie for Schultz.
(ii) Lebeau baked Schultz a pie.

Ascensions promote a part of a structure out of that structure.
(52) (a) possessor ascension
(i) Irene pirched Archic's tush.
(ii) Irenc pinched Archic on the tush.
(b) subject to subject raising
(i) It seems Frank is visiting Margaret (it insertion has applied here)
(ii) Frank seems to be visiting Margaret.
(c) subject to object raising
(i) Jeke knows that Quint is a bully.
(ii) Jake knows Quint to be a bully.
(d) non-subject raising
(i) It's expensive to repair Rocky's truck. (j.t insertion has applied here)
(ii) Rocky's truck is expensive to repair.

Insertions place a dumpry (in English there and it) in a clause as a term.
(53) (a) there insertion
(i) A dozen girls are waiting for the Fonz outside of Arnold's.
(ii) There are a dozen girls waiting for the Fonz outside of Arnold's.
(b) it insertion
(i) For Ed to call Ann again would bother David.
(ii) It would bother David for Ed to call Ann again.

Deletions are fairly straightforward. The examples in (49) are representative. However there are two cases of apparent deletions that are not so immediately clear. Occasionally dummies appear to be deleted; in English this is common after fronted adverbs.
(54) (a) (i) Outside of Arnold's there are a dozen girls waiting for the Fonz. (cf. (53a))
(ii) Outside of Arnold's are a dozen girls waiting for the Fonz.
(b) (i) My birthday is today.
(ii) It's my birthday today. (it insertion)
(iii) Today it's my birthday
(iv) T'oday is my birthday.

A similar kind of thing happens in languages with zero pronominalization. For example in Latin pronouns need not be spelled. In fact, they normally are not. Nonetheless they trigger verb agreement and coreferential deletion as in (55), and other rules.
(55) (a) (i) ea te: vi:sit She saw you SHE YOU-acc SEE-PERF-3
(ii) te: vi:sit

He/She saw you. YOU-acc SEE-PERF-3
(b) (i) is opo:rtuit veni:re He ought to have come. HE OUGHT-PERF- 3 COME-INF
(ii) opo:rtuit veni:re He/She ought to have come. OUGH'-PERF-3 COME-TNH
V'e will treat these two cases (zero dummies and zero pronouns) as syntactically or pragmatically conditioned zero spelling (§2.1.2.1), not as cases of deletion at all.

[^0]possible rules in relational grammar. These laws are empirically derived entities. A clear counterexample to any of them would show that relational grammar as it is now done is unworkable.
(56) The Reranking Law

A rule that alters the status of an NP with respect to termhood must increase the rank of that NP.

This law uses the hierarchy given in (42). 30 It says that there can be rules like passive which make $2^{\prime}$ s into l's or dative which make $3^{\prime} s$ into $2^{\prime} s, ~ e t c . ~ b u t ~ t h e r e ~ c a n ' t ~ b e ~ a n y ~ r u l e s ~ t h a t ~ d e m o t e ~ l ' s ~ o r ~$ $2^{\prime} s$ or $3^{\prime} s$. As we shall see below, a rule can have a secondary effect of demoting a term, but that effect is limited and automatic-it may only be the consequence of the promotion of some other term. One of the subtler claims implicit in the Reranking Law is that the only way a clause can lose its subject is via deletion.
(57) The Relational Armihilation Law

When one IVP, NP ${ }_{i}$, assumes the grammatical relation borne by another NP, NP ${ }_{j}(i \neq j)$, then $N P_{j}$ becomes a non-term of the sort called chomeur.

This law boils down to a statement that no clause can have two INP's in the same grammatical relation to the verb. Some examples of the effect of (57) are given in (58).
(58) (a) passive ( 2 becomes 1)
(i) Lt. Diehl arrested Jimbo.
(ii) Jimbo was arrested by Lt. Diehl. (I,t. Di.ehl is a chomeur)
(b) dative (3 becomes 2)
(i) Fonzie gave some good advice to Joani.e.
(ii) Fonzie gave Joanic some good advice. (some good edvice is a choneur)

Notice that there may be clauses with multiple instances of non-terms
bearing the same function as in (59).
(59) (a) The girls live in downtown Milwaukee in a flat. (two locatives)
(b) Edith bought a present for Mike f'or Gloria. (two benefactives)
(c) Joanie was given some good advice by the Fonz. (two chomeurs)

Because there has bcen some confusion regarding chomeurs, we want to note here that chomeurs are not syntactically dead but may be readvancing without violating (57).
(60) The Motivated Chomeur Law

Chomeurs arise only as a result of the Relational Annihilation Law.

This law, (60), guarantees the special status of chomeurs. 'The selection of these three laws as crucial to relational grannar is ours, not Postal and Ferlmutter's. It is our opinion that the theory would not change substantially unless one of these laws wos shown to be false.

In addition to the four laws just listed there are several other laws which we consider important among the numerous laws proposed.
(61) The Relational Succession Law

If an ascensior rulc promotes an NP out of a structure, then the ascending NP assumes the grammatical relation borne by the siructure.

This law governs ascensions. It says that an NP that ascends out of a subject becomes a subject (the rest of the old subject becomes a chomeur by (57)) and an INP ascending out of an object becomes an object (the old object again becoming a chomeur).
(62) (a) possessor ascension
(i) Laverne's money ran out. (ii) Laverne ran out of money. (Laverne is subject and

## money is a chomeur.)

(b) subject to object raising
(i) Mike knows that Archie is an imbecile
(ii) Mike knows Archie to be an imbecile. (Archie is object and to be an imbecile is a chomeur.?
(63) The Cyclicity Law

If a rule creates or destroys termhood, it is a cyclic rule.
This law is based on the observation made at the beginning of $\$ 2.2 .3$ that relation changing rixles interact freely with themselves and other rules, whilc other rules do not interact freely with relation changing rules. ${ }^{31}$
(64) The Aereenent Law

Only terme can trieger verbal agrecment.
There are several related laws specifying further limitations on a.greements, and further refinements, but we will not go into them here.
(65) The Reflcxivization Iaw

Only terms can trigger reflexivization.
(66) The Coreferential Deletion Law

Only terms can trigger coreferential deletion.
2.2.5 Clause Unions. Clause unions (henceforth CU's) are the relational grammar correspondent of predicate raising, but they have a much stricter form and their effect is not always to produce morphemically complex verbs. Basically a CU erases the boundary between clauses. This means in structural terms that a clause that is in a complement relation with another clause loses that relationship and has its verb and trie nominal dependents of its verb reassigned as dependents of the verb of the matrix clause. In general CU's
are not optional, so joany of the preliminary examples depend on their semantic reading as an indication of their underlying structure. Some examples of clause unions are given in (67).
(67) (a) English
(i) He left.
(i.i) I saw that he left. (Without CU)
(iii) I saw him leave. (With CU)
(b) Thurkish
(i) Hasan öldü. Hasan died.
/öl - di - $\varnothing /$
DIE PAST 3
(ii) Ahmet Hasani öldürdü. $\Lambda$ hmet killed Hasan. (With CU)

HASAN-ace /Öl - dir - di - あ/
DIE CAUSE PAST 3
(c) French
(i) Claude boira le vin. Claude will drink the wine.
(ii) Je laisserai Claude boire I will let Claude drirk the le vin. wine (Without CU)
(iii) Je laisserai boire l.e vin I will let Claude drink the à Claude. wine (With CU)
(d) Sayula Popoluca
(i) minw He carne.
$1 \phi-\mathrm{mi}^{9} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{w} /$
3 COME PAST
(ii) tinakminw I made him come.
/tin - ak - mi.?n - w /
$1 \rightarrow 3$ CAUSE COME PAST
To talk about CU's let us define some terms. First we will call the embedded clausc the domstairs clause. Similarly we will call the matrix clause the upstairs clause. And the clause we end up with we will call the result clausc. Secondly the effect of clause union on the downstairs verb is to render it a dead verb. Similarly any downstairs dependents which are not reassigned termhood by the process
of CU are called dead dependents. Notice that like chomeurs dead verbs and other dead dependents are non-terms but are pure syntactic entiries. However, unlike chomeurs, their syntactic interaction is almost nil. The only ruies that we know of which apply to dead dependents are rules that attach dead verbs to live verbs. ${ }^{32}$

There are four cases of simple clause unions: two in which the upstairs clause is intransitive and the downstairs clause is the subject complement of the upstairs verb, the first involving a downstairs intransitive and the second involving a downstairs transitive; and two in which the upstairs clause is transitive and the downstairs clause is the object complement, the first involving a dowstairs intransitive and the second involving a downstairs transitive. The following table lays out the reassignment of termhood.


The following are examples of each of these cases in Turkish. Verbs agree with their subjects, which are themselves unmarked. Definite direct objects are marked accusative. Indirect objects are marked dative.
(69) (a) Case I
(i) geldim
I came.
/gel - di - m/
COMF PAS'I l
(ii) gelmedim
/gel - me - di $-m /$
COME NOT PAS'1 1
(b) Case II

> (i) $\begin{aligned} & \text { kit,abj okudum } \\ & \text { BOOK-acc /oku - di }- \text { In/ read the book. } \\ & \text { READ PAST } 1\end{aligned}$ (ii) kitabi okumaditm $\quad$ I didn't read the book. BOOK-acc /oku - me - di $-\mathrm{m} /$ READ NO'r PAST 1
(c) Case III


(ii) Ahnet rakibini öldürdü Ahnet ki.lled his rival.
RIVAL-3-acc /Öl - dir - di - \$/
DIE CAUSE PAST: 3
(d) Case IV


| (ii) | ben daktiloya | mektubu yazdirdim | I got the typist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I TYPIST-dat | LETY'EPR-ice | to writie the |
|  |  | /yaz - dir - dj - m/ <br> WRII' CAUSE PAST I | letter. |

The pattern for reassignment is universal, even where the superficial form is different. For example in Yokuts the superficial pattern appears to be different. The downstairs subject appears as the result object (in the accusative) and the downstairs object appears marked with the indirect object casc.
(70) comla? na? țan hi" xata;ni I'll make him deyour the food. /ch:m- la: - I/ I-nom THAT-ONE-acc FUTURE /xat - ni/ DEVOUR CAUSE FUI FOOD dat

But as it turns out, Yokuts obligatorily advarices indirect objects and marks object chomeurs with -ni 'dative', leaving the verb unmarked. In (7].a) is an example of an advanced indirect object, while (7lb) has evidence concerning object chomeurs.
(71) (a) ?ama? tan kay'iw wana:?an he:xa:ni ?amin

AND TILAT-ONE-acc COYOTE-nom /war - ?an/ /he:xa: - ni/ HIS-gen gIVE DURAIIVE FAT dat
And (then) Coyote gives him his fat.
(b) (i) di?iṣhin ṭala:pa yow thyo:su /di?s - hin/ BOW-acc AHD ARROW-acc MAKE PAST
(Hic) made a bow and arrows.
(ii) di ${ }^{?}$ iṣsithin nan t'alapni yow tuyosnu /di?ṣ - sit - hin/ ME-ace BON-dat AND ARROW-dat MAKE BEIV FAST
(He) made me a bow and arrows.
At this point we would like to comment briefly on the pattern of reassignment of ternhood. The result of a CU is always a dead verb (the downstairs verb) and normally other dependents which are a.ssigned termhood according to (68). In addition there may be dependents that become dead dependents. But the pattern in (68) is the heart of the theory of CU's. Superficially it appears not to rel.ate clearly to the rest of the theory, especially to the hierarchy frem subject, to ron-term. We would like to note, however, that the pattern of (68) can easily be given an ergative explanation. The table in (72) lays out the pattern of (68) in terms of ergativjity. ( $E=$ ereative, $\Lambda=$ absolutive, $I O=$ indirect object; $D A=$ dometairs absolutive, $\mathrm{RE}=$ resull ergative, etc.) Here it becones clearer that the pattern of (69) is not arbitrary. Nbsolutives remain abso-

DA becomes RA JE UE

UE becomes RE DE becomes RIO
lutive, ergatives remain ergative, except where there are too many, and then the lowest ranking ergative does the only thing it can do to remain a term, it becomes an indirect object.

In addition to simple clause unions there are more complicated cases. In Frantz (19'6) arcunents are presented to the efrect that there are clause unions which in addition to reassigning termhood delete terms on the basis of coreferentiality. For example in Yokuts there are no rules deleting subjects out of embedded clauses but when an upstairs and a downstairs clause with coreferential subjects unite, there is only one instance of the index in the result clase.

```
(73) li`hatinhin na?
    /li? - hatn - hin/ I
    SINK WAITI PASI'
```

A clause with two instances of the same index is reflexivized.
(74) ?ilewsa:hin moxlo? The old one fanncd himself.
/’il - wsa: - hin/ OLD-ONE FAN REFE PAST

In the clearest instances the noin-subject term is simply missing in the output. Frantz (1976) claims that there are also instances in which the clause union renders the upstairs rather than the downstairs verb dead.

In the chapter on Clause Union we will discuss instances of CU's invloving non-term complernents.
2.2.6 Word Order. There are three basically different wo.ys that grammatical function can be expressed in d. Janguage: by marks on verbs,
marks on nouns, and by word order. There appear to be strict limitations on verb marking which we express by the Agreement Law (64). Verb marking can only mark the function of terms (underlying or derived). Of course verbs may come to be marked by rules that change grammatical relations and thus come to bear marks that imply the function of underlying non-terms. Nonetheless verbal marking is limited. Nominal marking is much freer. Either case marks or prepositions or both may be used to indicate grammatical function. Cases of nominal and verbal markings are quite familiar. Howeve: , word order is often used to mark grammatical function also. This is less true of languages with more nominal and/or verbal marking, but even for these languages those describing the language give a basic or unmarked order.

In relational grammar we treat word order as a derivative fact about language. Abstract syntactic structures are viewed as dependency trees with nodes labeled by grammatical function but without order. At some relatively late (certainly postcyclic) stage of derivation word order is assigned on the basis of grammatical function. For example the English pattern is given in (75). ${ }^{33}$ Notice that dead verbs (DV) and chomeurs (CH) have a place in the word order.
(75)


Patterns like those in (75) are common in descriptions of languages. But there is evidence that such simple patterns are not the correct mechanism for given word order. The following Czech sentences involving CU's show that a simple pattern cannot be laid out. ${ }^{35}$
(76) (a) Karel dal Petrovi knihou. $1 \quad \mathrm{~V} \quad 3 \quad 2$
(b) Karel musel pracovat. $1 \quad \mathrm{~V}$ DV
(c) Karel musel Petra udat. l V 2 DV

Karl gave Peter a book.

Karl had to work.

Karl had to denounce Peter.
(d) Karel musel Petrovi přinést pivo. 1 V 3 DV 2 Karl had to bring beer to Peter.

The conflict in (76) between the order $\underline{2}$ DV in (c) and DV 2 is clear. This shows that a simple pattern giving the word order is not workable. Present thinking is that ordering rules discussing only terms and rules treating other entities may be separate. The rules for the Czech example are given in (77).
(77) (a) Terms are ordered 132
(b) The verb follows the first term.
(c) A dead verb follows the second term.

It has been suggested (Swinburn (1974)) that there are only two possible rules ordering chomeurs relative to terms. They must either precede all terms or follow all terms. Ojibwa is an example of the former type, English an example of the latter type.

The fact that word order depends on grammatical function makes it a valuable tool in determining grammatical function in cases where that function is otherwise not evident. In particular since chomeurs and especially dead verbs have little syntactic activity, word order is of ten the main tool for arguing that one exists in a construction.
2.2.] Notation of Rules. The operation of a rule may have as many as six syntactic reflexcs. These are listed in (78).
(78) (a) The change in termhood of the promoted NP or the appearance of a dummy.
(b) The appearance of a mark on the verb.
(c) The demotion of an NP.
(d) The appearance of a mark on the demoted NP.
(e) A change in word order.
(f) A change in verb agreement.

For example consider the English pair of active and passive sentences in (79).
(79) (a) I am watching Harry.
(b) Harry is being watched by me.

Assuming that the same structure underlies both of the sentences in (79), we can say that (79b) differs from (79a) in all of the ways listed in (78). In (79b) Harry has been promoted (=(78a)). A mark, be -ed, has appeared on the verb $(=(78 \mathrm{~b}))$. Me is no longer a subject $(=:(78 \mathrm{c}))$. Me, the demoted subject, is marked with by (=(78d)). The order of me and Harry and the verb has changed ( $=(78 \mathrm{e})$ ). And the verb now shows third person agreement instead of first (=(78f)).

So the question arises: which of the things listed in (78) is the defining part of a rule? Almost immediately we see that the changes listed in (78) fall into two groups. The changes of (78a) and 78b) are peculiar to the rule, while the other changes ('78c-f) folloow from general properties of the lanfuage, or, in the case of ( 78 c ) from f universal characteristic of human language (given as the Relational Annihilation Law (57)!. Since not all rules that promote NP's mark
the verb, ( 78 b ) cannot be the defining characteristic of the rule. Therefore we will treat the change in termhood, or the insertion of a dumay as the defining characteristic of a rule. However because of the fact that a mark appearing on the verb is an ad ho characteristic of a rule, we will write both the change in termhood and the marking of the verb as a part of the rule. Thus we write English Passive as (80), including only the termhood change and the marking of the verb. (80) Passive (English)
v $2 \Rightarrow$ be V-EN 1
In fact, relational grammar allows us to write rules even more simply. It appears that languages fall into one of two kinds: ones that advance dependents to direct object (English, Ojibwa, Indonesian, etc.) and those that advance dependents directly to subject (Cebuano, Japanese, etc.). Languages of the former type may also have rules advancing direct objects to subject, hut in such languages anything that appears as a subject as a result of advancement would have been advanced to direct object first (if it was not an initial direct object) and then advanced to subject. ${ }^{36}$ Thus defining which of these two types of languages we are describing, we need only specify which dependent is advancing and we know to what it advances. Therefore passive could be written for English as in (81), (81) Advance 2, mark verb be V-EN
or Dative as in (82).
(82) Advance 3

However, for clarity's sake we will notate advancements as in (80) with the redundancy to aid the reader.

We will write insertions as in the example in (83), which is

English there-insertion.
(83) there $\Rightarrow 1$

Because of the Relational Succession Law (61), we will write ascensions as in (84), which is English Subject Raising.
(84) Raise 1

Finally we will write doubling rules like the one that accounts for the difference between (85a) and (85b) as in (86). Doubling rules look like raising but leave a copy behind.
(85) (a) It locks like Jack is still on the wagon.
(b) Jack looks like he's still on the wagon.
(86) Double 1

The form of (86) works for a reason that is not immediately clear. Sentence ( 85 a ) has undergone it insertion, hiding the fact that the embedded clause is the initial subject. Double means copy and raise. The result of that is in (85b). In Ojibwa there are no ascension rules, only doubling rules.

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER II

${ }^{1}$ Matthews (1971) is a possible exception. We feel, however, that his scope, in dealing only with inflection, is too narrow.
'We are aware of one difficult analysis with respect to this assumption. In Latin passives it looks possible to divide the endings, given in (la) into person endings, given in (lb), plus -r/-ur with portmanteau morphemes in the second person only.

$$
\text { (b) } \begin{array}{lll}
1 & \text {-or/-r } & \text {-mur } \\
2 & \text {-ris } & \text {-mini: } \\
3 & \text {-tur } & \text {-(u)ntur } \\
1 & -o: /-m & \text {-mus } \\
2 & -s & \text {-tis } \\
3 & -t & \text {-(u)nt }
\end{array}
$$

This is especially tempting because in the first person singular the -or allomorph of the passive has exactly the same distribution as the -o: allomorph of the active. But our assumption makes this analysis impossible, because that would make the morpheme order PERSON/NUMBER plus PASSIVE, but since the subject came to be the subject as a result of the operation of passive the logical order must be PASSIVE plus PERSON/NUMBER. This means that all the morphemes in (la) must be treated as portmanteaus.

Even if it turns out that there is further evidence in favor of the analysis of (la) into PERSON/NUMBER plus PASSIVE, it seems clear to us that this is a very unusual case and that cases like it will be highly constrained. Therefore we will stick to our assumption as it stands until such a time as it is shown to be totally untenable.
$3_{\text {The }}$ one systematic exception involves linking rules which insert nonce morphemes in the middle of structures to satisfy demands of structural patterns. See 52.1.1.2.
${ }^{4}$ We realize that such attachment could be viewed as a phonological process "degrading" a word boundary to a morpheme boundary. However, we agree with Pyle (1972) that phonological boundaries are all derivative from syntactic structures, so we treat these processes as syntactic.
${ }^{5}$ The form -mez- is a portmanteau for -me- 'negative' plus -ir'aorist'.
${ }^{6}$ The potential has two allomorphs: - ye- before the negative and -yebil- elsewhere.
$7_{\text {The notation 1:[3] }}$, which will be explained later, means 3rd singular subject.
$8_{\text {There }}$ are seven verb stems in the class that take e: as a link
yowel that look like they might end in e: rather than in a consonant. Three are compounds of the same root. All except one (whose compounds act like they are consonant final) admit easily of a consonant final interpretation.

9 We have left out the NP's and tense because they are irrelevant to the point we are making.
${ }^{10}$ We will explain the proces: of Clause Union in §2.2.5. Basically it has the effect of erasing clause boundaries, although the effect on the NP's involved is more intricate.
${ }^{l l}$ In this we agree with the traditional Latin grammarian's approach. For example, Bennett (1918) tried to assign case on semantic grounds; however, his system seems inappropriate because of his failure to distinguish between underlying case which is assigned on semantic grounds, and superficial case which is assigned on syntactic grounds.

12
The notation 1: means subject, 2: means direct object.
$13_{\text {Human }}$ (and occasionally animate) nouns in the ablative normally add the preposition a: $/ \mathrm{ab}$.
${ }^{14}$ There is a later rule which lowers $i$ : and $u$ : to e : and o : respectively.
${ }^{15}$ Anderson (1974) calls such rules morpholexical rules, a term we find misleading.
${ }^{16}$ The vowel changes from a to $\underline{e}$ or $\underline{i}$ are due to the action of an independent pair of rules.
${ }^{17}$ A similar thing happens in phonology. Pyle (1972) showed that boundary markers $\pm$, morpheme boundary; \#, word boundary; $\&$, phrase boundary; etc., do not exist in phonological strings. But the need for them in phonological rules is easily demonstrated. What such markers mean in phonological rules is that the rule refers to syntactic structure.

18
Some stem formation rules have applied.
${ }^{19}$ Long vowels are shortened before vowels.
${ }^{20}$ There is a rule of metathesis that moves the $\underline{n}$ into the stem. The $\underline{n}$ is a stem marking morpheme.
${ }^{21}$ Long vowels are shortened before word final resonants.
${ }^{22}$ There is an epenthesis rule.
(2) $\emptyset \rightarrow$ i / C+C

There are some restrictions on (2). Either the first $\underline{C}$ must be a stem consonant, or the last $\underline{C}$ must be word final (or part of a word final
cluster). (2) only operates in verbs, and follows metathesis (fn. 20). There are also tiwe other rules.
$(3) s \rightarrow r / V_{y} y$
$(4) \mathrm{i} \rightarrow \mathrm{e} / \underset{r}{r}$
$23_{\text {The }} \$$ represents the stem boundary. It is important for describing, among other things, link yowels.

24
There is more to the Link Vowel rule complex than is shown here, but this is sufficient for our purposes.
${ }^{25}$ The relation possessor or is our addition. Postal and Perlmutter do not, to the best of our knowledge, use it.
${ }^{26}$ It is possible that there is only one rule of subject agreement which creates all six morphemes from the pragmatic and scmantic content of the referent of the subject index. At this point we think that this is a notational variant of the approach we are using.
${ }^{2} 7_{\text {We remind }}$ our reader that features like [l] 'first person' and [SG] 'singular' are only devices in rules to enable the rule to reier to the pracmatic/semantic situation. These features do not exist in the inder itself. Thus 1:[I, SG] is satisfied if the index which bears the relation subject of to the verb refers to the speaker (first person) alone (singular).
${ }^{28}$ Postal and Perlmutter use the term impure syntactje dependents which we do not like.
${ }^{29}$ A certain amount of controversy exists regarding English clause unions. In particular there are a number of complications with even the more straightforward cases. Nonetheless we will use Fnglish examples here because of their immediate accessibility.

30 The hierarchy in ( 42 ) does not mention the terms of clauscis other than the clause under consideration. The terms of such clauses have zero rank in the clause in hand, i.e. they are the same as non-terms in rank.
${ }^{31}$ This statement is not quite accurate. There are occasional rules of agreement, reflexivization, and the like that do not change grammatical relations, but are cyclic and do interact with relation changing rules.
${ }^{32}$ See §2.]. 1.1 for a discussion of such rules, and an argunnent that such rules may be cyclic. What is left unsaid in that argunent is that CU is involved in the derivation of the crucial forms.
$33_{\text {Notice that dead verbs (DV) and chomeurs (CH) have a place in }}$ the word order. 'The symbols represent the functions summarized in (46). l-Cll means subject chomeur. 2-Ch means object chomeur.

34 There is an alternate word order with the dead verb precedinf,
the direct object. The rule that accounts for this is the familiar Particle Shift (not to be confused with the separate rule Heavy NP Shift which roves non-subjects rightward). There is also a poorly understood rule that moves subject chomeurs rightward.
${ }^{35}$ The data are irom Perlmutter (1975).
$36_{\text {For }}$ a sentence like I was fiven a book, I was an initial indirect object, ond became a subject by two steps, first advancing to direct object and then passivizing.

## VERB AGREEMENT .I

3.0 The inflection of verbs in Ojibwa is very complex. Verbs are inflected in three orders: independent, conjunct, and imperative. For every independent form there is a corresponding conjunct form that is used in dependent clauses and in construction with certain adverbs. In this chapter we will begin to examine the inflection of the independent order verb.

As we discussed in Chapter I, l.l.3, verbs are of two morphological types, transitive and intransitive. Transitive verbs appear in transitive clauses, and are inflected to agree with their subjects and objects in person, number, gender, and obviation. Intransitive verbs appear in intransitive clauses and are inflected to agree with their subject in person, number, gender, and obviation. In addition there are a few morphologically intransitive verbs that appear in transitive clauses and show only part of the inflection for agreement with their object. We will call these verbs pseudo-transitive (henceforth PT) after Bloomfield (1957) ${ }^{\text {l }}$.

Verbs show several layers of agreement. The innermost layer is stem agreement. The stem agrees (sometimes suppletively) with the absolutive of the clause in gender. Traditionally stems are divided into four types according their transitivity and whether they show the animate or inanimate stem agreement marker. The four types are:
(I) Inanimate Intransitive (II) an irtransitive verb marked for inanimate agreement
Animate Intransitive
(AI) an intransitive verb marked for animate agrcement
Transitive Inanimate
(TI) a transitive verb marked for inanimate agreement
Transitive Animate
(TA) a transitive verb marked for animate agreement

Henceforth we will refer to these stems by the abbreviations given in (1). We will call a verbal construction that ends with the stem agreement marker (minus any prefixes) a stem. PI verbs all have AI stems.
3.1 The Traditional Analysis. In this section we will outline briefly a traditional analysis of Ojibwa, similar to the one presented in Bloomefield (1957). The reader should realize that the traditional analysis or an Algonkian language is aimed only at identifying morphemes and grouping them into orders of mutually exclusive occurancc. Little attempt is made to relate the morphology of the verb to the syntax of the sentence in which it occurs except where that is necessary to identify the meaning of a morpheme. While it is this morphosyritax of the Ojibwa verb that we will focus on ultimately, we present a traditional analysis here to give the reader an overview of the agreement morphology of the verb.
3.1.1 II Verbs. II stems show conditional inflection for number and obviation. The example in (2) gives the independent forms of the II. stem wi:nad- 'dirty' which is comprised of the root wi:n- 'dirty' plus the inanimate stem agreement marker -ad-.

| (2) wi:nad | /wi:n-ad -w/ | It is dirty. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| wi:ndo:n | /wi:n-ad -w - an/ | They (inan.) are dirty. |
| wi:ndini | /wi:n-ad - ini - w/ | It/they (obv.) is/are |
|  |  |  |

A chart summarizing the morphology of the II verb is given in (3).
(3)

Stem

| Position 1 | Position 2 | Position 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -ini- | -w | -an |
| 'obviative' | '3' | 'plural' |

In addition stems that end in vowels show augments as in (4).
(4) Stem: miskwa:- Root: miskw- Stem Agreement Narker: -ya:$\begin{array}{lll}\text { mskwa: } & \text { /miskw-ya: - w/ } & \text { It is red. } \\ \text { mskwa:mgad } & \text { /miskw-ya: -magad - w/ } & \\ \text { mskwa:no:n } & \text { /miskw-ya: - n -w - an/ } & \text { They (inan.) are } \\ & & \text { red. } \\ \text { mskwa:ni } & \text { /miskw-ya: - ini - w/ } & \text { It/they (obv) are } \\ \text { mskwamgadni } & \text { /miskw-ya: - magad -ini - w/ } & \text { red. }\end{array}$

The augment -magrad- in the singular only is optional (in this dialect). The augment -n- in the plural only is obligatory (in this dialect).
3.1.2 AI Verbs. AI verbs show additional inflection for person, number, and obviation. The example in (5) frives the independent forms of the AI stem wi:nizi. 'dirty' which is comprised of the root wi:n'dirty' plus the animatc stem agreement marker -jzi.
(5) gwi:niz nwi:niz wi:nzi
gwi:nzi /g - wi:n-izi - mw/
gwi:nzimi nwi:nzimi wi:nzirag
wi:nziwan

```
/g - wi:n-izi/
/n - wi:n-izi/
/ wi:n-izi - w/
```

/g - wi:n-izi - mw/
/g - wi:n-izi - min/
/n - wi:n-izi - min/
/ wi:n-izi - w - ag/
/ wi:n-izi - w - an/ He/they (obv.) isjare dirty.

A chart summarizing the morphology of the A.T verbs is given in (6).
(6) Prefix

Stem Position I
Position 2

| g- | -w | -ag |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| n- | '3' | '3 plural' |
| 'l' | -min |  |
|  | 'l plural' | 'an |
|  | -mwiative' |  |
|  | '2 plural' |  |

Because the point of this section is to expose the reader to an overview of Ojibwa verb morphology, we will make no attempt to line up suffix positions among the various stem types (as Bloomficld did) or to give indications on the cooccurence restrictions between morphemes.
3.1.3 TI Verbs. TI stems show additional inflection for person, number, and optionally for obviation of their subjects. In addition $\mathbb{T I}$ stems show inflection for person and number of their objects. Their example in (7) gives the independent forms of the TI stem bi:d- 'bring' which is comprised of the root bi:- 'bring' plus the inanimate stem agreement marker - $\underline{\alpha}-$. The person of the object of a T.I stem is always 3, as there are no linguistically inanimate speakers or addressees in Ojibwa. The independent forms of TT verbs are unusual in that they show two markers for object agreement.


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gbi:do:na:wa:n /g - bi:-d - o: - n - (a:)wa: -an/ } \\
& \text { You (pl.) bring them (inan.). } \\
& \text { gbi:bo:na:nin /g - bi:-d - o: - n - na:ni - an/ } \\
& \text { We (inc.) bring them (inan.). } \\
& \text { nbi:do:na:nin /n - bi:-d - o: - n - na:ni - an/ } \\
& \text { We (exc.) bring them (inan.). } \\
& \text { wbi:do:na:wa:n /w - bi:-d - o: - n - (a:)wa: - an/ } \\
& \text { They bring them (inan.). }
\end{aligned}
$$

A chart summarizing the morphology of the $T I$ verb is given in (8).
(8) Prefix Stem Position 1 Position 2 Position 3 Position 4

| g- | -o:- <br> 'inan.' <br> (object) | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-n } \\ & \text { 'inan.' } \\ & \text { (object) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-na:ni } \\ & \text { 'l plural' } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-an } \\ & \text { 'plural' } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n- |  |  | -wa: |  |
| '1' |  |  | '2 plural/ |  |
|  |  |  | 3 plural' |  |
| - |  |  | -ini |  |
| '3' |  |  | 'obviative' |  |

The morpheme 'inanimate (object)' represented by -0:- in (7) and (8) has three allomorphs: - 0 :-, -am-, and -i-. Examples of the latter two allomorphs are given in (9).
(9) (a) nwa:bnda:n /n - wa:bam-d - am - n/ I see it. ngitga:da:n /n - gitige:-d - am - n/ I plant it. ngiža:da:n /n - giža:-d - am-n/ I take care of it.
(b) nna:din /n - na:-d - i - n/ I fetch it. nmi:jin $\quad / n-m i: j-\emptyset-i-n / \quad I$ eat it.
3.1.4 TA Verbs. TA stems show additional inflection for person, number, and obviation of both suijject and object. This inflection is carried in a complex system involving four subparadigns each of which is characterized by its own theme sign. The four theme signs are: $\mathrm{a}:$, igw, i, and ini. The subparadigms may be divided into two groups of two according to whether or not a third person is involved. Those forms in which a third person is not involved are called local forms.

The two local theme signs are $\underline{i}$ and ini. Those forms in which a third person is involved are called non-local forms. The two non-local theme signs are a: and igw. The four subparadigms may also be divided into two groups of two according to whether the person prefix on the forms in that paradigm represents the logical subject of the verb or the logical object. The forms in which the person prefix represents the logical subject of the verb are called direct forms. The two direct theme signs are $\underline{i}$ and a:. The forms in which the person prefix represents the logical object of the verbs are called inverse forms. The two inverse theme signs are ini and igw. The choice between direct and inverse is not optional but is based on a hierarchy of person. The hierarchy is given in (10), with second person having the highest rank, and third person the lowest. 4
(10) 2

1
3
The verb forms are marked in such a way that if the object is of higher rank than the subject, the inverse form is used. Otherwise, the direct form is used. The four subparadigms are: direct local, theme sign: $\underline{i}$; inverse local, theme sign: ini; direct non-local, theme sign: a:; and inverse non-local, theme sign: igw. The example in (ll) gives the independent forms of the TA stem bi:n-'bring' which is comprised of the root bi:- 'bring' plus the animate stem agreement marker -n-.
(11) (a) Direct Local forms

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { gbi:ž } & \text { lg - bi:-n - i/ } & \text { You bring me. } \\
\text { gbi:žim } & \text { lg-bi:-n-i -mw/ } & \text { You (pl.) bring me. } \\
\text { gbi:žmi } & \text { /g-bi:-n-i - min/ } & \text { You (sg./pl.) bring } \\
& & \text { me. }
\end{array}
$$

(b) Inverse Locel forms

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gbi:nin /g - bi:-n - ini/ I bring you. } \\
& \text { gbi:nnim /g - bi:-n - ini - mw/ } \\
& \text { I bring you (pl.). } \\
& \text { gbi:ngo: } / \text { g - bi:-n - igw - i/ } \\
& \text { We bring you. }{ }^{5} \\
& \text { gbi:ngo:mi /g - bi:-n - igw - i - mw/ } \\
& \text { We bring you (pl.). } \\
& \text { (c) Direct Non-local forms }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gbi:na: /g - bi:-n - a:/ You bring him. } \\
& \text { nbi:na: /n - bi:n - a:/ I bring him. } \\
& \text { wbi:na:n /w - bi:-n - a: - an/ } \\
& \text { He brings him (obv.). } \\
& \text { gbi:na:wa: /g - bi:-n - a: - wa:/ You (pl.) brine him. } \\
& \text { gbi:na:na: /g - bj::-n - a: - na:ni/ } \\
& \text { We (inc.) bring him. } \\
& \text { nbi:na:na: /n - bi:-n - a: - na:ni/ } \\
& \text { We (exc.) bring him. } \\
& \text { wbi:nə: wa:n } \\
& \text { /w - bi:-n - a: - wa: - an/ } \\
& \text { They bring him/them } \\
& \text { (obv.) }
\end{aligned}
$$

gbi:na:g /g - bi:-n - a: - ag/
nbi:na:c /n - bi:-n - a: - ag/
You bring them.
I bring them.
wbj:na:n /w - bi:-n - a: - an/
He brings him/them (obv.)
gbi:na:wa:c /g - bi:-n - a: - wa: - ag/
gbi:na:na:nig /c - bi:-n - a: - na:nj - af!
We (exc.) bring them.
wbi:na:wa:n /w - bi:-n - a: - wa: - an/
(d) Inverse Non-l.ocal forms

They bring him/thein (obv.)

| gbi:nig | /g - bi:-n - igw/ He brings you |
| :---: | :---: |
| nbi: nig | /n - bi:-n - igw/ He brings me. |
| vbi:ngo:n | /w - bi:-n - igw - an/ <br> He (obv.) brings him. |
| gbi | /g - bi:-n - igw - (i)wa:/ |
| gbi:ngona: | /g - bi:-n-igw - (i)na:ni/ $\begin{aligned} & \text { He brings you (pl.). }\end{aligned}$ |
| nhi:ngona: | /n - bi:-n-igw - (i)ne brings us (inc.). |
| ni:ngona: | ( He brimes us (exc.) |
| wbi:ngowa:n | /w - bj:-n - igw - (i)wa:/ |

```
gbi:ngowa:g /g - bi:-n - igw - (i)wa: - ag/
    They bring you (pl.).
gbi:ngona:nig /g - bi:-n - igw - (i)na:ni - ag/
    They bring us (inc.).
nbi:ngona:nig /n - bi:-n - igw - (i)na:ni - ag/
    They bring us (exc.).
wbi:ngowa:g /w - bi:-n - igw - (i)wa: - ag/
    He/they (obv.) uring
    them.
```

A chart summarizing the morphology of the TA verb is given in (12).


There are two more paradigms built on TA stems. The first are the forms with indefinite logical subject. This paradigm is given in (13).
(13)


This is clearly an intransitive paradigm (cf. 15), with an unusual allomorphy involving theme signs igw and a:.

The last paradigm built on TA stems comprise the forms with inanimate logical subject and animate logical object. An example paradigm is given in (14).

```
gbiska:gon /g - bisik-aw - iģw - (i)n/
    It strikes you.
nbiska:gon /n - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n/
    It strikes me.
wbiska:gon /w - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n/
    It strikes him.
gbiska:gWna:wa: /g - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - (a:)wa:/
    It strikes you (pl.)
gbiska:g\mp@subsup{}{}{W}na: /g - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - na:ni/
    It strikes us (inc.).
nbiska:gWna: /n - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - na:ni/
    It strikes us (exc.).
wbiska:gWna:wa: /w - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - (a:)wa:/
    It strikes them.
wbiska:gWnini /w - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - ini/
    It strikes him (obv.).
gbiska:g\mp@subsup{}{}{W}nan /g - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - an/
    They (inan.) strike you.
nbiska:g}\mp@subsup{}{}{W}nan /n - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - an
    They (inan.) strike me.
wbiska:g\mp@subsup{}{}{W}nan /w - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - an/
    They (inan.) strike him.
gbiska:gWna:wa:n /g- bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - (a:)wa: - an/
    They (inan.) strike you (pl.)
gbiska:g\mp@subsup{}{}{W}na:nin /g - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - na:ni - an/
    They (inan.) strike us (inc.).
nbiska:gWna:nin /n - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - na:ni - an/
    They (inan.) strike us (exc.).
wbiska:g\mp@subsup{}{}{W}na:wa:n /w - bisik-aw - igw - (i)n - (a:)wa: - an/
    They (inan.) strike them.
```

In addition to the morphemes displayed in the paradigms shown above there are four more morphemes that we would like to exemplify here. These are the negative -si:, the preterite -bani, and the two dubitative morphemes - dig and -e:n. We give forms that show where in
the structure these morphemes fall.
(15) (a) AI
wi:nziwag
wi:nzisi:wag
wi:nzibani: ${ }^{6}$
wi:nzidige:nag

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { /wi:n-izi - w - ag/ } \\
& \text { They are dirty. } \\
& \text { /wi:n-izi - si: - w-ag/ } \\
& \text { They are(n't) dirty. } \\
& \text { /wi:n-izi - w- (i)bani - ag/ } \\
& \text { /wi:n-izi - w- (i)dig - e:n - ag/ } \\
& \text { They are supposedly dirty. }
\end{aligned}
$$

(b) TI
wbi:do:na:wa:n /w - bi:-d - o: - n - (a:)wa: - an/
They bring them.
wbi:do:si:na:wa:n /w - bi:-d - o: - si: - n - (a:)wa: - an/
They (don't) bring them.
wbi:do:na:wa:bni:n /w - bi:-d - o: - n - (a:)wa: - bani - an/
They brought them.
wbi:do:na:wa:dge:nan /w - bi:-d-o: - n - (a:)wa: - dig - e:n

- an/ They supposedly bring them.

$$
\text { (c) } \mathrm{TA}
$$

gbi:na:wa:g
gbi:na:si:wa:g
bi:na:wa:bni:g

> /g - bi:-n - a: - wa: - ag/
> You bring them.
/g - bi:-n - a: - si: - wa: - ag/
You (don't) bring them.
/g - bi:-n - a: - wa: - bani - ag/
You brought them.
gbi:na:wa:dge:nag
/g - bi:-n - a: - wa: - dig - e:n - ag/
You supposedly bring them.
gbi:ngowa:g
/g - bi:-n - igw - (i)wa: - ag/
They bring you (pl.).
gbi:ngosi:wa:g
gbi:ngowa:bni:g
/g - bi:-n - igw - (i)si: - wa: - ag/
They (don't) bring you.
/g - bi:-n - igw - (i)wa: - bani - ag/
They brought you.
/g - bi:-n - igw - (i)wa: - dig - e:n - ag/
They supposedly bring you (pl.).
These morphemes will be discussed in later sections, in detail. They will be important for helping to group morphemes as allomorphs, and for showing the relative order morphemes.

To end this brief introduction to the inflectional morphology of the independent verb, we would like to point out several facts that will serve as a spring board into the analysis we will be proposing here.

First, the analysis presented above reflects a type of focus on the morphology of the verb that makes it somewhat difficult to view the verb as a syntactic unit in a larger construction which itself imposes the morphology on the verb, by agreements of various sorts. But looked at from the point of view that we will be taking from now on in this work, each of the forms listed above represents a kind of field stripped èlause, a full clause minus overt arguments.

Secondly, traditional type analyses are little more than a description of verbal inflections. What little they do to relate the structure of the verb to its meaning derives solely from the assignment of meaning to the morphemes. There is no attempt to relate facts about morpheme order or similarities in paradigmatic construction like the striking resemblance between (14) and (7). In our analysis we will relate the morphologies of the different paradigms to one another by developing a rule system for describing the agreement processes. We will show that only one unified rule system is all that is necessary for the description of all verb forms. The explanatory power of our analysis derives from the fact that it shows that the numerous paradigms of the Ojibwa verb form a unified system rather than several disjoint systems.
3.2 Intransitive Verbs. We will start our analysis of the Ojibwa verb system by looking at the intransitive verbs.
3.2.1 Person-number Agreement. Person and number agreements in intransitive verbs are quite straightforward. A summary of the morphemes involved is given in (3) and (6), which we repeat here as a unified chart in (16).
(16) Prefix Stem Position 1 Position 2 Position 3

| g- | -ini | -w | -ag |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| '2' | 'obviative' <br> (inanimate) | '3' | $\begin{aligned} & \text { '3 plural' } \\ & \text { (animate) } \end{aligned}$ |
| - |  | -min |  |
| 'I' |  | 'l piural' | -an |
|  |  |  | '3 plural' |
|  |  | -mw | (inanimate)/ |
|  |  | '2 plural' | 'obviative' |
|  |  |  | (animate) |

We have given no evidence yet for our grouping of -min 'l plural' and -mw '2 plural' in Position 2. rather than Position 3. That evidence is given in (17) the plural part of the preterite paradiem of wi:njzi.
'dirty (A.T)'.
(17) gwi:nzimwa:ba /g - wi:n-izi - mw - (a:)bani/

You (pl.) were dirty.
gwi:nzimna:ba /g - wi:n-izi - min - (a: bani/
We (inc.) were dinty.
nwi:nzimna:ba /n - wi:n-izi - min - (a: bani/
We (exc.) were dirty. wi:nzibani:g / wi:n-izi - w - (i)bani - af/

They were dirty.
We can now write our own person and number afreement rules.
(18) Inanimate Obviation

V = $\Rightarrow$ V-ini / I_ [INAN, OBV]
(19) Person Agreement
(a) V $\Rightarrow \mathrm{g}-\mathrm{V} / \ldots \quad 1:[2 / 21]^{8}$
(b) $V \Rightarrow n-V / \ldots \quad 1:[1]$
(c) $V \Rightarrow V-w / \ldots \quad 1:[3]$
(20) Non-third Plural Agreement
(a) $V=\Rightarrow V-\min / \ldots 1:[]$ PI $]$
(b) $V=\Rightarrow V-m w / \ldots \quad 1:[2 \mathrm{PL}$,
(21) Third Plural Agreement
(a) $V=\Rightarrow$ V-ag / 1:[3 PL, AN $]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (b) V = }=>\text { V-en / _ l:[3 PL, INAN] } \\
& \text { 1:[AN, OBV] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Some comments on these rules are in order. The rule of modal attachment which attaches the preterite and/or the dubitative morphemes applies in the middle of these rules. Thus the last form in (17), wi:nzibani:g /wi:n-izi - w - (i)bani - ag/, reflects the order modal attachment precedes Third Plural Agreement (2l). We will write the modal attachment rules as in (22) and (23). [Note the evidence in (15).]
(22) Modal Attachment
(a) V bani $\Rightarrow$ V-bani
(b) V $\quad=$ V-djeg / _ e:n
(23) Dubitative Attachment
$V \mathrm{e}: \mathrm{n}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{c}: \mathrm{n}$
The exact form of these rules has not been argued for here. It is beside the pojnt. We only need these rules to give the order of rules correctly. The order of the rules is given in (2l).
(24) Inanimate Obviation (18)

Person Agrecment (19)
Non-Third Plural Agreement (20)
Moda.l Attachment (2.2)
Dubitative Attachment (23)
Third Plural Agreement (2l)

The evidence for this order is scattered among the various paradiems given above, therefore we will give derivations that show the ordering. We wj.ll derive wi:ndini [from (2)], nwi:nzimna:ba [from (.l7)], and wi:nzidjge:nag [from (15a)] in (25) [on the next page]. There is one further comment. As pointed out be Delislc (1973), the animate obviative marking is exactly the same as the inanimate plural both in nouns

| (25) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I:[OBV] | ivi:nizi bani DIRTY PRETSRITE | $\begin{aligned} & 1:[11] \\ & \mathrm{WE}(\mathrm{E}) \end{aligned}$ | wi:nizi DIRTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { e:n } \\ \text { DUBITATI } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Inanimate Obivation (18) wi:nadini | 1:[OBV] | -- | 1:[11] | --- | $\mathrm{e}: \mathrm{n}$ | 1:[3PL] |
| Person Agreement (19) wi:nadiniw | 1:[OBV] | nwi:nizi bani | 1:[11] | wi:niziw |  |  |
| İon-thira Plural Agr. (20) |  | nwi:nizimin bani | 1:[11] | -- | e:n | I: [3PL] |
| Wodal Attachment (23) |  | nwi:niziminbani | 1:[11] | wi:niziwaig |  | 1:[3PL] |
| Duoitative Attachment (23) |  | -- |  | wi:niziwdige | nag | 1:[3PL] |
| Third Plural Agreement (21) |  | -- |  | wi:niziwdige | nag |  |
| Morphophonemics wi:ndini |  | nwi:nzimna:ba |  | wi:nzidige:n |  |  |

and in verbs. Therefore we will treat [AN, OBV] as [INAN, PL] with no further note to that effect. This means that we will simply drop the second environment of (2lb).
3.2.2 Stem Atsement. As mentioned in 3.0, the final morpheme of a stem is an agreement marker which reflects the gender of the absolutive of the stem. Thus the stem agreement markers on intransitive verbs reflect the gender of the subject of the verb. There are several sets of stem agreement markers. Wrich set is used is determined by the ad hoc class of the preceding morpheme. Six of the more productive sets of intransitive stem agreement markers are given in (26).
(26) Inanimate (subject) Animate (subject)
Set I -ya: -izi

Set II -ad -izi
Set I.I.I -an -izi
Set IV -de: -izi
Set V -in -i
Set V.T. - - $\quad$ -
Examples of these are given in (2.7).
(27) (a) Set I
špa: /ašp-ya:-w/ špjzi |č̌p-izi-v/
is high
bgone:ya: /bagone:-ya:-w/ bgone:zi /bagone:-izi-w/
(b) Set II
wi:nad /wi:n-ad-w/ wi:nzi /wj.:n-izi-w/
ma:na:dad /ma:na:d-ad-w/9
ma:na:dzi /ma:na:d-izi-w/ is ugly
mnogwad /minopogw-ad-w/ mnopgozi /minopogw-izi-w/ is good tasting
(c) Set I.II

| wi:sgan | /wi:sag,-an-w/ | wi:sgizi | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wi:sag-izi-w/ } \\ \text { is bitter } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| na: ng an | /na:nf-an-w/ | na:ogzi |  |
|  |  |  | is licht (w |

(d) Set IV

(f) Set VI
ja:gse: /ja:gise:- $\varnothing-w /$ ja:gse: /ja:gise:- $\not$ ( - w/
bskane: /biskane:- $\varnothing$-w/ bskane: /biskane:- $\varnothing$-w/
catches fire
Because of the ad hoc allomorphy of these markers we will write the intransitive stem agreement rule using an absiract agreement morpheme ISA (for intransitive stem agreement), ISA[I] marks inanimate agreement, and ISA[A] marks animate agreement. In glosses we will only use ISA. The rule is given in (28).
(28) Intransitive Stem Agreement
(a) V $\Rightarrow=\operatorname{V-ISA}[A] / \ldots \quad(A) 1:[A N]^{10}$
(b) $V=\Rightarrow$ V-ISA[I] / ___(A)l:[.TNAN]

The spelling of the ISA morphemes is done by reference to the ad hon stem class of the preceding morpheme. For our purposes the content of that spelling rule is given by the chart in (26), although (26) does not give all the morphemes involved. Since our interest here is in describing the morphology of the verb and not giving a detailed description of all the allomorphies we will let (26) suffice.

Now we are ready to show that Intransitive Stem Agreement (28) is ordered before all other agreement rules that we have examined. The crucial form is wi:ndini which we derive in (29).

| (29) | Input to Agreements | wi:n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ISA (28) | l:[INAN, OBV] |  |
| Spelling (26) | wi:n-ISA[I] | l:[INAN, OBV] |
| Inanimate Obviation (18) | wi:nad | wi:nadini |
| I:[INAN, OBV] | l:[INAN, OBV] |  |
| Person Agreement (19) | wi:nadiniw | $1:[$ INAN, OEV] |
| Mophophonemics | wi:ndini | $1:[$ INAN, OBV] |

At this point there is an issue of morpheme classification that must be faced. Bloomfield grouped the morphemes presented in (26) with another class of morphemes called finals (e.g. [1957] §13.8, 13.40, 13.42, 13.44, et al.). We distinguish between agreement markers and finals. Finals arise as part of a verbal construction through Clause Union. Agreement markers arise through agreement rules. This means that finals are lexical morphemes, i.e. they have an underlying represertation, while agreement markers are created morphemes, i.e. they have no underlying representation. The recognition of this distinction totally dispenses with the need to set up a class of profinals. A further point must be added. One of the reasons that agreement markers have been confused with finals is that there are a number of finals which take Sct VI agreement markers, i.e. $\emptyset$ for both animate and inanimate agreement, and therefore it is not obvious that two morphemes are present. In addition there are some finals that show suppletive allomorphy in association with agreement markers.
3.2.3 Negation. Thus far we have established five rules which describe the agreements of intransitive verbs. In addition we have presented two rules attaching modals. We will close this section on intransitive morphology with a brief examination of negative marking.

In sentences containing negatives 0jibwa verbs show negative concord.

```
(30) ga: wi: nška:dzisi:wag They're not angry.
```



```
    ga: wi: gi:na:sno:nni bi:ye:n wno:kma:n Peter's knife isn't sharp.
    NOT /gi:n - ya: - isino:n - ini - w/ PETER HIS-KNIFE
        SHARP ISA NEG OBV 3
    ga: msi ngi:-ni-ma:ja:si:mi We (exc.) haven't left yet.
    NOT YET /n - gi: - ni-ma:ja: - \(\varnothing\) - si: - min/
        1 PAST LEAVE ISA NEG IPL
    ga: waya gi:-gi:gdosi: No one spoke.
    NOT SOMEONE /gi: - gi:gido - \(\emptyset\) - si: - w/
        PAST SPEAK ISA NEG 3
We write the rule for negative concord as in (31).
(31) Negative Concord
\(\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow\) V-NEG / ___ [NEG]
(32) Negative Spelling
NEG \(==\underset{\substack{\text { isino:n } \\ \text { si: }}}{ }\) TSA[I]-
```

The order of (31) is established by the form gi:na:sno:nni /gi:n-ya:-
isino:n-ini-w/ given in (30) which we derive in (33).
(33) Input to Agreements $\quad$ l:[INAN, OBV]

ISA (28) NEG gi:n-ISA[I] l:[INAN, OBV]
ISA Spelling (26) $\quad$ NEG gi:nya: [INAN, OBV]
Negative Concord (31) NEG gi:nya:isino:n l:[INAN, OBV]
Inanimate Obviation (18) NEG gi:nya:isino:nini l:[INAN, OBV]
Person Agreement (19) NEG gi:nya:isino:niniw l:[INAN, OBV]
Morphophonemics gi:na:sno:nni
Now we surmarize the order of the rules thus far established.
(34) ISA (28)

ISA Spelling (26)
Negative Concord (31)
Negative Spelling (32)
Inanimate Obviation (18)
Person Agreement (19)
Non-third Plural Agreement (20)
Modal Attachment (22)
Dubitative Attachment (23)
Third Plural Agreement (21)
3.3 Transitive Verbs. Transitive verbs are inflected for agreement with their object as well as for agreement with their subject. In this section we will develop our analysis further to account for these agreements. Because of the complexities of TA verbs we will examine $T I$ verbs and $T A$ verbs separately.
3.3.1 TI Verbs. In this section we will develop an analysis of TI verbs. The TI paradigm given in (7) is repeated here for convenient reference.

3.3.1.1 Person-number Agreement of Subject. In the paradigm in
(7) we notice that we will need to revise our agreement rules to get the correct allomorphies. First we will revise Person Agreement (19) to account for the prefixal allomorph of third person which appears in intransitive verbs [cf. (ll)].
(35) Person Agreement (revised)
(a) V $=\Rightarrow$ g-V / 1:[2/21]
(b) $\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{V}$ / $1:[1]$
(c) $V=\Rightarrow$ w-V / E:[3]

V-w / _ $:[3]$
Second we will revise Non-third Plural Agreement (20) to account for all the allomorphs that appear in transitive verbs [cf.(1)].
(36) Non-Third Plural Agreement (revised)
(a) V $\Rightarrow$ V-MIN / _l:[1 PL]
(b) $\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{MW} / \mathrm{l}:[2 \mathrm{PL}]$
(c) MIN $\Rightarrow \underset{\min }{\operatorname{na}: n i} / \ldots \mathrm{E}$
(d) MW $=\underset{\text { mw }}{\text { wa }} \quad / \ldots$ E

Now let us consider the third person plural and obviative. The forms of (7) with plural object show that an which is supplied by Third Plural Agreement (2l) is used to mark plurality of object. Similarly
ini and not an is used to mark obviation of the subject, and wa: not ag is used to mark plurality of the third person subject. Therefore we will analyze third person plural marking as an ergative system. The morphemes wa: and ini mark the ergative plural and obviative respectively. The morphemes ag and an mark the absolutive plural and obviative respectively. Therefore the rule of Third Plural Agreement (21) is revised as (38) and (39).
(38) Ergative Third Plural Agreement
(a) V = V-ini / E:[OBV]
(b) V =-> V-wa / E:[3PL]
(39) Absolutive Third Plural Agreement
(a) $\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}$-an $/$ A:[INAN, PL]
(b) $V==$ V-ag / A:[3PL]

The last form in (7), wbi:do:na:wa:n /w-bi:-d-o:-n-(a:)wa:-an/, shows that Ergative Plural Agreement (38) is ordered before Absolutive Plural Agreement (39).

A comment about the mechanics of the rules (35) through (39) is in order. In Chapter II we mentioned, but did not emphasize, that we would use a disjunctive ordering convention in formulating our rules. All the above rules use that convention. For example (35c) uses the convention to avoid putting w's on both ends of a verb. But most importantly we use disjunctive ordering to account for the fact that obviatives do not show number agreement. By setting up (38) and (39) the way we have the obviative clause (a) in each bieeds the plural clause (b). (Remember that [AN, OBV] = [INAN, PL].) Disjunctive ordering will also be important in Non-third Plural Agreement (36) but we are not yet to the point of the analysis where that becomes clear.
3.3.1.2 Person-number Agreement of Object. In the paradigm in (7) we see that two markers, 0 : and $n$, have been isolated following the stem, bi:d-, and preceding the subject number markers, na:ni and wa:. These can be shown to be separate markers by the negative morpheme which appears between them.
(40) gbi:do:si:n /g - bi:-d - o: - si: - n/ You (didn!t) bring it.

In traditional analyses the marker 0 : has been treated as part of the stem agreement marker for various reasons of allomorphy, but we treat it as a separate morpheme because of the existence of forms that show the stem agreement marker $\underline{d}$ but do not show object agreement markers.

| (a) | ngi:škbo:do:n ngi:škbo:jec: | $\begin{align*} & \text { /n - gi:škibo:-d - o: - n/ }  \tag{41}\\ & \text { I saw it./I cut it with a saw. } \end{align*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ngi:skbo:jec: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n - gi:škibo:-d - ige:/ } \\ & \text { I saw./I cut with a saw. } \end{aligned}$ |
| (b) | nge:sbisdo:n | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n - ge:sibisi-d - o: - n/ } \\ & \text { I tidy it up. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | nge:sbisjige: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /n - ge:sibisi-d - ige:/ } \\ \text { I tidy up. } \end{gathered}$ |
| (c) | nda:te:bdo:n | $\begin{aligned} & \ln (\mathrm{d})-\mathrm{a}: \mathrm{te} \mathrm{~b} \mathrm{bi}-\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{o}:-\mathrm{n} / \\ & \quad \text { I put it out./I extinguish it } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | nda:te:bjige: | $\begin{gathered} \ln (\mathrm{d}) \text { - a:te:bi-d - ige:/ } \\ \text { I put out (the lights). } \end{gathered}$ |

The object agreement marker 0 : has an allomorph am which appears in a large number of 'RT verbs, and an allomorph i which appears in two verbs. Examples were given in (9) which we repeat here.


We formulate the rules of Object Agreement I (42) and Object Agreement II (43) as follows.
(1,2) Object Agreement I (OA I)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \text { V-OA.T } / \ldots \_ \text {2:[JNMiU] }
$$

(43) Object Agreement II (OA II)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{n} \quad / \ldots \quad 2:[\text { Ivan }]
$$

We will discuss the rule spellints the morpheme OA.I when we discuss transitive stem agreements.

The rule Abscilutive I'hird Flural Agreement (39) accounts for the
plural -an which marks the number of the object in the $T I$ paradigm.
We are now ready to summarize the order of the rules developed thus far in this chapter. The forms gbi:do:si:n /g-bi:-d-o:-si:-n/ in (40) and wbi:do:na:wa:dge:nan /w-bi:-d-o:-n-(a:)wa:-dig-e:n-an/ in (15b) given the new crucial orderings. We derive them in (44) [on the next page].

A summary of the order of the rules is given in (45)
(45) ISA (28)

ISA Spelling (26)
OA I (42)
Negative Concord (31)
Negative Spelling (32)
OA II (43)
Inanimate Obviation (18)
Person Agreement (35)
Non-Third Plural (36)
Ergative Plural (38)
Modal Attachment (22)
Dubitative Attachment (23)
Absolutive Plural (39)
3.3.2 Transitive Stem Agreement. In this section we will discuss transitive stem agreement. We will treat both TI and TA stems agreements together. As with the intransitive stem the final morpheme of the transitive stem is an agreement marker which reflects the gender of the absolutive. Thus the stem agreement markers on transitive verbs reflect the gender of the object of the verb. As with the intransitive stem agreement markers, there are several sets of transitive stem agrement markers. Which set is used is determined by the class of the preceding markers. Which set is used is determined by the class of the preceding morpheme. In TI verbs that class also determines which allomorph of OAI, the first object agreement markers, appears. The seven productive sets are given in (46).
(44)

| Input to Agreements | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NEG } \\ & \text { NOT } \end{aligned}$ | bi:d BRING | $\underset{\text { IT }}{2:[\text { INAN }]}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1:[2] \\ \text { YOU } \end{gathered}$ | bi:d BRING | $\begin{gathered} \text { e:n } \\ \text { DUBITATIVE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:[INAN, TL] } \\ & \text { THEM(inan.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:[3PL] } \\ \text { THEY } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Object Agreement I (42) | NEG | bi:do: | 2:[INAN] | 1:[2] | bi:do: | n | 2:[INAN, PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Negative Concord (31) | NEG | bi:do:-NEG | 2:[INAN] | 1:[2] | -- |  |  |  |
| Negative Spelling (32) | NEG | bi:do:si: | 2:[INAN] | 1:[2] | -- |  |  |  |
| Object Agreement II (43) | NEG | bi:do:si:n | 2:[INAN] | 1:[2] | bi:do:n | :n | 2:[INAN, PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Person Agreement (35) | NEG | gbi:do:si:n | 2:[INAN] | 1:[2] | wbi:do:n | e:n | 2:[INAN, PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Ergative Plural (38) |  | -- |  |  | wbi: do:nw | a: e:n | 2:[INAN, PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Modal Attachment (22) |  | -- |  |  | wbi: do:nw | adig e:n | 2:[INAN, PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Dubitative Attachment (23) |  | -- |  |  | wbi: do:nw | a:dige:n | 2:[INAN, PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Absolutive Plural (39) |  | -- |  |  | wbi:do:nw | adige:nan | 2:[INAN,PL] | 1:[3PL] |
| Morphophonemics |  | gbi: do:si:n |  |  | wbi:do:na | wa:dge:nan |  |  |

```
(46)
Inanimate (object) Animate (object)
(with OAI)
Set I d(o:) n
Set II d(am) n
Set III d(o:) \emptyset
Set IV d(am) \emptyset
Set V \emptyset(am) aw
Set VI \emptyset(am) w
Set VII \emptyset(am) \emptyset
Examples of these are given in (47)
(47) (a) Set I
ngi:škbo:do:n /n-gi:škibo:-d-o:-n/
    I cut it with a saw. ngi:škbo:na: /n-gi:Škibo:-n-a:/
                                    I cut him with a saw.
nbimwido:n /n-bimiwi-d-o:-n/
    I carry it around. nbimwina: /n-bimiwi-n-a.:/
                            I carry him around.
(b) Set II
nbimda:ba:da:n /n-bimida:bye:-d-am-n/
    I drag it along. nbimda:ba:na:/n-bimida:bye:-n-a:/
                                    I drag him along.
ndupgida:n
    I throw it.
    /n(d)-apagi-d-am-n/
                                    ndapgina: /n(d)-apagi-n-a:/
                                    I throw him.
(c) Set III
nba:bi:to:n /n-ba:bi:h-d-o:-n/
    I wait for it. nba:bi:ha: /n-ba:bi:h-\emptyset-a:/
                                I wait for him.
(d) Set IV
nbimo:nda:n in-bimo:m-d-am-n/
    I carry it on my back. nbimo:ma: /n-bimo:m-\emptyset-a:/
                                I carry it on my back.
nwa:bnda:n
    I see it.
/n-wa:bam-d-am-n/
    nwa:bma: /n-wa:bam-\emptyset-a:/
                                I see him
(e) Set V
nno:nda:n /n-no:nd- }\varnothing\mathrm{ -am-n/
    I hear it. nno:ndwa: /n-no:nd-aw-a:/
                                    I hear him.
ndangška:n
/n-dangišk-\emptyset-am-n/
ndangškawa: /n-dangišk-aw-a:/
                                    I kick him.
```


## (f) Set VI

```
nminza:n /n-minoz- }\varnothing\mathrm{ -am-n/
    I cook it. nminzwa: /n-minoz-w-a:/
    I cook him.
ndibha:n /n-dibah-\emptyset-am-n/
    I pay for it. ndibwa: /n-dibah-w-a:/
    I pay for him.
(g) Set VI
nwe:bna:n /n-we:bin- }\varnothing\mathrm{ -am-n/
    I abandon it. nwe:bna: /n-we:bin-\emptyset-a:/
    I abandon him.
ndinna:n /n(d)-inin-\emptyset-am-n/
    I pass it along. ndinna: /n(d)-inin-\emptyset-a:/
    I pass him along.
```

The allomorphy of the transitive stem agreement marker (henceforth TSA) is partly determined by phonological considerations and partly determined by ad hoc classification of the preceding morpheme. Set II appears after roots endine in e: and rarely elsewhere. Set III appears after some roots ending in $\underline{h}$ and $\underline{s}$. Set IV appears after roots ending in $\underline{m}$, and Set VII appears after stems ending in $\underline{n}$. Because the allomorphy of TSA is so complex wc will again leave (46) stand as the TSA spelling rule and also as the ONI spelling rule. TSA[I] marks inanj. mate agreement; TSA[A] marks onimate agreement. In glosses we will use only TSA. Before giving the rule surplying TSA, we will give evidence that TGA is not the same rule as ISA. This evidence comes from passive forms. I'here are three passive constructions (although no verb shows more than two). All these constructions show both a TSA and an TS (49) (a)
ngaška:bkah ${ }^{\text {h }}$ go: /n-gaska: bikah-w-igw-i/ I am iocked up. 1 LOCK-UP TISA ISA (b)
mnopgozi $/$ minop - w - igw - izi - w/ He tasties good. TASTE-TSA ISA 3 GOOD
(c)

Now we are ready to write the rule of TSA.
(50) Transitive Stem Agreement
(a) $V==>V-T S A[A] /$ 2: [AN]
(b) $\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow$ V-TSA[I] $\qquad$ 2:[INAN]

The forms in (49) show that TSA (50) is ordered before ISA (28).
3.3.3. TA Verbs. In this section we will begin to develop our analysis of TA verbs. Because of the complexity of TA inflection we will only analyze the non-local paradigms.
3.3.3.1 Direct Non-local Forms. The direct non-local forms given in (llc) are presented again here for convenience.
(llc) gbi:n /g-bi:-n-a:/ You bring them. nbi:na: /n-bi:-n-a:/ I bring him. wbi:na:n /w-bi:-n-a:-an/ He brings him/them (obv.).
gbi:na:wa: /g-bi:-n-a:-wa:/ You (pl.) bring him. gbi:na:na: /g-bi:-n-a:-na:ni/ We (inc.) bring him. nbi:na:na: /n-bi:-n-a:-na:ni/ We (exc.) bring him.
wbi:na:wa:n /w-bi:-n-a:-wa:-an/
They bring him/them (obv.).
gbi:na:g /g-bi:-n-a:-ag/ You bring them.
nbi:na:g /n-bi:-n-a:-ag/ I bring them.
wbi:na:n /w-bi:-n-a:-an/ He bring him/them (obv.).
gbi:na:wa:g /g-bi:-n-a:-wa:-ag/
You (pl.) bring them.
gbi:na:na:nig /g-bi:-n-a:-na:ni-ag/
We (inc.) bring them.
nbi:na:na:nig /n-bi:-n-a:-na:ni-ag/
We (exc.) bring them.
wbi:na:wa:n /w-bi:-n-a:-wa:-an/
They bring him/them (obv.)
A comparison of these forms with the forms in (7) (given again in
53.3.1) shows that we need only identify which of the two object agree-
ment rules supplies a: to extend our existing analysis to account for the direct non-local paradigm. The appearance of obviative markings in the third person verb forms follows from a general syntactic process assigning obviation which will be discussed in Chapter V.III and does not have to be accounted for in this paradigm. The forms in (5l) give evidence that a: is supplied by Object Agreement I as shown by the rela tive order of the morphemes involved.
(5l) (a) gbi:na:si:wa: /g - bi: - n - a: - si: - wa:/
You (pl) (don't) bring him. gbi:do:si:na:wa: /g - bi: - d - o: - si: - n - (a:)wa:/ TSA OAS NEG OAII

You (pl.) (don't) bring it.
Now we are ready to revise Object Agreement I.
(52) Object Agreement I (revised)
(a) $\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{a}: 1 / \ldots 2:[\mathrm{AN}]$
(b) $\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}$-OAI $/$ _ $2:[$ INAN]
3.3.3.2 Inverse Non-local Forms. The inverse non-local forms
given in (lld) are presented again here for convenience.

| gbi:nig <br> nbi:nig <br> wbi:ngo:n | /g-bi:-n-igw/ <br> /n-bi:-n-igw/ <br> /w-bi:-n-igw.an/ | He brings you. <br> He brings me. <br> He/they (obv.) bring(s) him. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| gbi:ngowa: | /g-bi:-n-igw-wa:/ |  |$\quad$| He brings you (pl.). |
| :--- |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { gbi:ngowa:g } & \text { /g-bi:-n-igw-wa:-ag/ They bring you (pl.). } \\
\text { gbi:ngona:nig } & \text { /g-bi:-n-igw-na:ni-ag/ They bring us (inc.). } \\
\text { nbi:ngona:nig } & \text { /n-bi:-n-igw-na:ni-ag/ They bring us (exc.). } \\
\text { wbi:ngowa:n } & \text { /w-bi:-n-igw-wa:-an/ He/they (obv.) bring(s) them. }
\end{array}
$$

These forms at first appear to be problematic in that the prefixes signal agreement with the logical object. Similarly the plural agreements are exactly backwards. The logical subject triggers absolutive plural marking. The logical object triggers non-third plural marking and ergative plural marking. However, there are two further kinds of evidence that show that the logical object of inverse non-local forms is the superficial subject. The first evidence has to do with obviation. Many speakers optionally obviate the inanimate subject of dependent clauses (marked by -ini) when the subject of the main clause is third person animate.
(a) (i) na:gši(*ni)g nvi:-gi:ve:

I'll go home in the evening.
(ii) na:ǧ̌i(ni)g wi:-gi:we:

He'll go home in the evenirg.
(b) (i) na:gši(*ni)g nwi:-mneza:n

I'll cook it in the evening.
(ii) na:gši (ni)g wi:-mnoza:n

He'll cook it in the evening.
(c) (i) na:gצi(*ni)g nwi:-nkwe:skwa:

I'll meet him in the evening.
(ii) na:gši(ni)g wini-nkwotma:n

He'll meet him in the evening.
Notice especially that third person objects do not trigger this obviation, as (53c (i.)) shows. The examples in (54) show that the inverse forms only have a third person subject when they have a third person logical subject.
(54) (a) na:gši(*~ni)g nwi:-nkwe:ška:g

He'll meet me in the evening.
(b) na:gši(*ni)g gwi:-nkwe:ška:g

He'll meet you in the evening.
(c) na:gši(ni)g wwi:-nkwe:ška:go:n

He'll (obv.) meet him in the evening.
Iike the agreement evidence this evidence indicates that the superficial subject of inverse forms is the logical object. The second evidence is more indirect. The marker -igw- which appears in inverse non-local forms also appears in two kinds of indefinite subject constructions which it can be argued are passive constructions. Examples are given in (55).
(55)

```
            (a) ngi:-wa:bmigo:
        ngi:-ba:škzogo:
        I was seen.
                            /n-gi:ba:škiz-w-igw-i/
                            I was shot.
        nei:-bsika:go:mi /n-gi:bisik-aw-iew-i-min/
            We (exc.) got run over.
            (b) ediba:jmigoz
                            /g-diba:jim- \(\emptyset\)-igw-izi/
        You are notorious./You are talked obout.
                            /minop-w-igw-izi-w/ll
                            He tastes good.
        mnopgozi
```


They were heard in the distance.

These forms have their logical objects as subject as can be shown by the raising evidence. In Ojibwa mly subjects can be raised. ${ }^{1}$ ?
(56) (a)
(i) gejike:nda:n na gi:-gno:naf? Do you know that I spoke to him? 2-KNOW-IT
(THAT)-PAST-SPEAK-TO-1-3
(ii) Egike:nim na gi:-gno:nag? Do you know that I spoke to him? 2-KNOW-1 (THAT)-PAS'-SPEAK-TC)-]-3
(iii) \%geike:nma: na gi:-gro:nag? Do you know that I spoke to him? 2-KNOW-HIM (THAT)-PAS'I-SPEAK-TO-1-3
(b)
(i) ggike:nda:n na gi:-gno:žid ${ }^{13}$ Do you know that he spoke to me? 2-KNOW-IT. (THAT)-PASI'-SPEAK-TO-3-1
(ii) *ggike:nim na gi:--gno:žid? Do you know that he spoke to me? 2-KNOW-1 (THAT)-PAST'SPEAK-'TO-3-1
(iii) ggike:nma: na gi:-cno:žid? Do you know that he spoke to me? 2-KNOW-HTM (THAT)-PAST-SPEAK-TO-3-1

The logical object of the forms in (55) also raise, showing that they
are superficial subjects.
(57) (a)
(i) ggike:nda:n na gi:-wa:bmigo:ya:n? 2-KNOW-IT (THAT)-SHE-PASS.IVE-1

Do you know that I was seen?
(ii) ggike:nim na gi:-wa:bmigo:ya:n? 2-K.NOW-1 (THAT)-SEE-PASSIVE-1

Do you know that I was seen?
(b)
(i) ggike:nda:n na gi:-mnopgozid aw gi:gõ:?

2-KNOW-IT (THAT)-TASTE-GOOD-PASSTVE-3
Do you know that the fish tastes good?
(ii) ggike:nma: na gi:-mnopgozid aw gi:gõ: ${ }^{14}$

2-KNOW-HIM (THAT)-TASTE-GOOD-PASS.IVE-3
Do you know that the fish tastes good?
Frantz (1976) gives more evidence for considering the forms in (55a) passives, but we consider the evidence given sufficient.

Now since -igw- marks passivization in the forms of (55), and there is reason to suspect that inverse forms have their logical object as their subject, then the presence of -igw- in inverse forms certainly marks passivization there too.

While there remain a number of syntactic and morphological problems with the passive analysis of inverse forms we will not be able to solve those problems until we have examined more of the syntax of Ojibwa in the following chapters, but we will give here a tentative formulation of the rule of passive
(58) Passive

$$
\text { v } 2 \Rightarrow \text { v-igw } 1
$$

One of the problems that arise is the failure of ISA (28), which supplies ISA markers in the forms of (55), to operate in inverse forms. Ignoring this problem which will be solved by a general syntactic process of Ojibwa discussed in Chapter V we can outline the derivations of the
forms nbi:na: /n-bi:-n-a:/ and nbi:nig /n-bi:-n-igw/ to show the interaction of Passive (58) with other rules. The derivation is given in (59) [on the next page]. Notice that Passive blecds OAI, and feeds Person Agreement. Similarly TS $\cap$ markers precede the passive marker, therefore TSA precedes Passive. Now we can summarize the order of rules developed in this chapter [cf. (45)].
(60) TSA (50)

Passive (58)
ISA (28)
ISA Spelling (26)
OA I (52)
TSA Spelling (46)
Negative Concord (31)
Negative Spelling (32)
OA I.I (43)
Inanimate Obviation (18)
Person $\Lambda$ greement (35)
Non-third Plural (36)
Ergative PJural (38)
Modal $\Lambda$ ttachment (22)
Dubitative Attachment (23)
Absolutive Plural (39)
3.3.3.3 Passivization. There are two important kinds of objections that could be raised against the analysis of inverse TA verb forms as passives. While one of these potential objections has to do with linguistic theory and the other with jssues that have to do with Algonkian languages, both have this in common: inverse forms are, in general, not optional variants of some other form, but are the only possible expression of the meaning they encode in the syntactic environments in which they appear. The determining factor in the choice between direct and inverse forms is the person hierarchy: $2>1>3$. In our analysis passive is governed by this person hierarchy. If the object is of higher rank than the subject, paissive must apply. The theoretical objection is: can passive be a non-optional rule? Our

| (59) Input to Rules | bi: | 1:[1] | 2:[3] | bi: | 1: [3] | 2:[1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BRING | [ | $\mathrm{HE}^{\text {H }}$ | BRING | HE |  |
| TSA (50) | bi:n | 1: [1] | 2:[3] | bi:n | 1: [3] | $2:[0]$ |
| Passive (58) | -- |  |  | bi:nigw | $\mathrm{CH}:[3]$ | 1:[1] |
| ISA (28) | -- |  |  | -- |  |  |
| OA I (52) | bi: na: | 1: [1] | 2:[3] | -- |  |  |
| Person Agreement (35) | noi:na: | 1:[1] | 2:[3] | nbi:nigw | $\mathrm{CH}:[3]$ | 1:[1] |
| Morphophonemics | nbi:na: |  |  | nvi:nig |  |  |

answer is, of course, yes. In §2.2.7 we argued that the advancement of direct objėct to subject was the defining syntactic characteristic of passive. We reel that j.t is totally reasonable to use the term passive to any rule advancing direct object to subjoct regardless of what syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic factors are involved. That is to say, we feel it appropriate to use the term passive to name rule (58) because rule (58) has what we consider to be the defining characteristic of passive. The conditions for its application, its frequency of application, the fact that j.t is obligatory are all irrelevant. Passive is syntactically defined.

The Algonkianist's objection to our analysis is that it oversimplifies the situations in which forms containing the marker -ifw- are used. The hierarchy we have usied $(2>1 .>3)$ is too simple. While that objection may at first appear to be correct, it turns out to be specious. There are six kinds of conditions that we can isolate which affect the appearance of forms containing -igw-. Only one of these refers to the hierarchy at all. I'he six conditions are outlined in (61).
(61) (a) If a clause has a frammatically animate object and a grammatically inanimate subject, passive must apply.
(b) If a transitive clause has an indefinite (PRO) subject, passive must apply.
(c) If a clause has an object of higher rank in the person hierarchy than its subject, passive must apply.
(d) If. a clause has a logically animate object and a lcgica.lly inanimate subject, passive must apply.
(e) In any clause containing a logically animate subject and a logically animate object, both third persons, passive is governed by discourse condjtions regardless of the obviation of the terms EXCEPT. . .
(f) In any clause containing a logically animate third person subject and a logically animate third person object, if the subject is also possessor of the object passive may not apply, but if the object is possessor of the subject passive must apply.

Examples of each case follow.

(f) (i) bi:ye:n wgi:-wi:dbima:n wgwisan Peter $_{i}$ sat with
(ii) *bi:ye:n wgwisan wgi:-wi:dbimgo:n
(iii) *bi:ye:n wgwisan wgi:-wi:dbima:n ${ }^{16}$
(iv) bi:ye:n wgi:-wi:dbimgo:n wgwisan /w-gi:-wi:dabim- $\varnothing$-igw-an/ 3-PAST-SIT-WITH-PASSIVE
his ${ }_{i}$ son.

Peter's ${ }_{i}$ son sat with him $_{i}$.

Of the conditions on Passive (58) listed in (61), only (6lc) refers to the person hierarchy. Furthermore condition (6lc) is different from all the other conditions in that all the others operate identically in both constructions involving endependent and conjunct verb forms, but condition (6lc) holds ONLY for independent constructions. We will dis-
cuss this at length in a later chapter on agreement. What is jmportant here is that the uses of passive are complex and disjoint. Therefore it would be incorrect to try to treat passive as being triggered by a single complex hierarchy. But more importantly, the existence of this disjoint set of uses for passive strengthens our claim that we should treat passive as a syntactic phenomenon.

FOOTNOTES
CHAPTER III
$l_{\text {There }}$ are also some verbs that Bloomfield analyzed as being morphologically transitive which occur in intransitive clauses. We have reanalyzed these cases as a simple subclass of morphological intransitives.
${ }^{2}$ Third person forms refer equally to masculine or feminine. Because older speakers consistently use only the forms of he in English, we will translate using the forms of he unless there is reason to do otherwise.
${ }^{3}$ The morpheme ini is exempt from final vowel deletion §l.2.1, (4).

4 This hierarchy may appear to be oversimplified to the Algonkianist. We will discuss it in $\S 3.3$.3.3 below.
${ }^{5}$ The forms gbi:ngo: and gbi:ngo:m are borrowed from another paradigm. They are strictly speaking ambiguous between their literal meanings 'You are brought.' and 'You (pl.) are brought.', respectively, and their meanings as part of the inverse local paradigm. The expected form gbi:nnimin is found in eastern dialects.
$6_{\text {There }}$ is a late rule deleting the w from this form which we would expect to be *wi:nziwbani:g.
$7_{\text {See footnote }} 6$.
$\theta_{\text {We will use }} \underline{21}$ and 11 to indicate inclusive and exclusive first plural respectively.
$9_{\text {The morphemic stracture of rets is not indicated in these }}$ root amples.
${ }^{10}$ We use the notation (A)1: to indicate absolutive subject, i.e. subject of an intransitive clause. It is not clear whether this amounts to a notational "trick" to enable us to isolate intransitive subjects.
${ }^{1 l_{\text {The }}}$ basic verb mnopwa:d means 'taste good to s.o.', e.g. nminpwa: /n-minop-w-a:/ 'He tastes good to me.' (lit. I taste him good). Ojibwa does not have Psyche Advancement (nee Psyche Movement).
${ }^{12}$ Raising in 0jibwa is in fact a doubling rule which generates a copy of the victim and raises the copy leaving the "victim" behind. It is also not exactly true that only subjects may be raised. There is one class of constructions that raise objects.
${ }^{13}$ Conjunct verbs do not show inverse forms in these meanings. We will discuss this in Chapter 10.
${ }^{14}$ The word order is Vcij- ${ }^{\text {- }}$ - Chomeur - Object - Subject so that the raising does not cause any change in word order.
${ }^{15}$ Compare the form gwa:bam /g-wa:bam- $\boldsymbol{h}_{\text {-i/ }}$ 'You see me.'
${ }^{16}$ This is only bad in the intended reading. It means only 'Peter'si son sat with him ${ }_{j}$ '

## CHAPTER IV

## INTRANS.ITIV.IZATION

4.0 In this chapter we will discuss three rules that have the effect of rendering a transitive clause intransitive. These rules are passive, noun incorporation, and medialization. We will look only briefly at noun incorporation here, deferring a fuller discussion of it until Chapter IX, but it is important here because the reflexjve/reciprocal morpheme -idi and the indefinite object morpheme -ige: represent productively incorporated objects. We examine these incorporations here because they interact with a number of other interesting syntactic processes that we need to look at before we are ready to examine noun incorporation in detail.
4.1 Passive. There are two forms of agent deleting passives. They are exemplified in (1).

```
(l) (a) (i) dba:jmigwzi He is notorious./He is talked about.
                /diba:jim - \emptyset - igw - izi - w/
            TALK-ABOUTTSA PASSIVE ISA 3
```

(ii) me tastes good. (e.g. a fish)
/minop - w-igw-izi - w/
TASTE-GOOD TSA PASSIVE ISA 3
(iii) de:bta: $\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{zi} \quad$ He is heard in the distance. /de:bit - aw - igw - izi - w/ HEAR-AFAR TSA PASSIVE ISA 3
(b) (i) nganwa:bmigo: I am being watched.
/n - ganawa:bam - $\varnothing$ - içw - i/
1 WATCH ISA PASSIVE ISA
(ii) ngi:-ba:škzogo: I got shot. /n - gi: -ba:škiz - w - igw - i/
1 PAST SHOOT TSA PASS.IVE ISA
(iii) ngi:-dngiška:go: I got kicked. /n - gi: - dangišk - aw - igw - i/
1 PAST K.ICK TSA PASS.IVE .ISA
The difference between these two types of passives is that they select different spellings of ISA. There are several other differences. The class of verbs that form passives adding the ISA marker izi (henceforth izi passives) is limited mostly to verbs of perception including no:nd- 'hear' and verbs ending in the morphemes -p- 'taste,' -t- 'hear,' -m- 'smell,' -n- 'resemble,' -a:jim- 'talk about,' and -e:nd- 'think of as. ${ }^{1}$ Other verbs form passives freely adding the ISA marker $\underset{i}{ }$ (henceforth i passives). ${ }^{2}$ Another difference between izi passives and í passives is that there are izi passives from clauses with logical inanimate objects, but nothing like that is possible with $\underset{i}{ }$ passives.
(2) (a) mnopgwad It tastes good. /minop - w - igw - ad - w/ TASTE-GOOD TSA PASS.IVE TSA 3
(b) mnoma:gwad It smells good. /minom - aw - igw - ad - w/ SMELL-GOOD TSA PASS.IVE ISA 3

These forms of (2), however, are morphologically anomalous. They show animate TSA markings ( $\underline{w}$ and aw) while they have logical inanimate objects which appear as superficial subjects and trigger inanimate ISA marking (ad). We will analyze this by positing a rule of morpheme substitution which changes the morpheme TSA[.I] to TSA[A] before the passive marker.
(3) TSA Neutralization

$$
\operatorname{TSA}[. \mathrm{I}] \Rightarrow \mathrm{TSA}[\mathrm{~A}] / \ldots \quad-\mathrm{Z}
$$

While at this point this approach may seem a bit ad hoc, it turns out
that there are a number of complex constructions which neutra.lize the animacy contrast of their TSA markings. It seems to us that this is a reasonable thing to be happening with markers that are buried several layers deep.

Now there is one final quirk regarding the morphology of i passives. The third person forms of $\underline{i}$ passives show an irregular allomorphy in both the independent and conjunct forms.
(4)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { gwo:bmigo: } \\ & \text { wa:bmigo:yan } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i/ } \\ & \text { / wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-an/ } \end{aligned}$ | (that) | you are seer you are seen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nwa:bmigo: | /n-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-igw-i/ |  | I am seen |
| wa:bmigo:ya:n | / wa:bam-Ø-igw-i-a:n/ | (that) | I am seen |
| wa: bma: | / wa:ham-ф-a:-w/ |  | he is seen |
| wa: bmind | / wa:bam-ф-ind/ | (that) | he is scen |
| gwa:bmiço:m | /g-wa: bam-ด̆-i gW-i-mv/ |  | you (pl.) are |
| wa:bmigo:m | / wa:bam-0-igw-i-e: ¢v | (that) | you (rl.) are |
| gwa:bmico:mi | /g-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-ig |  | we (inc.) are |
| wa:bmigo: yang | / wa:bam-ф-igw-i-a:ng/ | (that) | we (inc.) are |
| nwa: bmigo:mi | /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-i¢¢W-i-min/ |  | we (exc.) are |
| wa:bmigo:ya:ng | / wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-a:ng/ | (that) | we (exc.) are |
| wa: bma:wag | / wa:bamı $\emptyset$-a:-w-ag/ |  | they are seen |
| wa: bmindwa: | / wa:bam-Ø-ind-wa:/ | (that) | they arc seen |

While we will not discuss the analysis of the conjunct marker here, we will analyze the marker $a$ : as a portmanteau of igw+i in the context of third person subject.
(5) a: spelling

$$
\text { igw-i } \Rightarrow a: /]_{[3]}^{-w}
$$

At this point the only thing that we are lacking to complete the analysis of agent deleting passives is the rule deleting a FRO chomeur.
(6) PRO Deletion

$$
\mathrm{NT}: P R O \quad \Rightarrow \emptyset
$$

Now we will give the derivations of the forms mnoprwad /minop-w-iew-ad/ and wa:bmc: /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-w/ to show the orderings and interactions of the rules established in this chapter with each other and with the rules previously established. The derivation is given in (7) [on the next page].
4.2 Noun Incorporation. There are two basically different ways in which nouns get incorporated into verbs. In thj.s chapter we will be concerned only with one type, and of that type we will be concerned only with instances in which the objects of verbs are incoporated. Examples of this type of incorporation are given in (8).
(8) (a) ngi:-na:da:bkwe: I went and got money.
/n - gi: - na: - d - a:bikw - e: - $\varnothing /$
1 PAST FETCH TSA MONEY MEDIAL TSA
(b) bba:-mo:nhaškkiwe: He's out dieging up medicinal herbs. /baba: - mo:nah - $\emptyset$ - askikin - e: - $\emptyset$ - w/ AROUND D.IG TSA MEDICINE MEDTAL ISA 3
(c) ngi:-ginda:bkwe: I counted my money. /n - gi: - agim - d - a:bikw - e: - $\emptyset /$ 1 PAST COUNT TSA MONEY MEDIAL ISA
(d) gi:-na:jmi:jme: He went and got food. /Eri: - res: - d - mi:jim - e: - $\emptyset$ - w/ PAS'I FEI'CH TSA FOOD MEDTAL ISA 3
(e) ngi:-bmo:ma:was I carried the child on my back. /n - gi: - bimo:m - $\emptyset$ - a:wah - $\varnothing$ - zo/ 1 PAST CARRY TSA CHII,D MEDIAL TSA

The forms in (8) show that the incorporation of objects foliows TSA.
Furthermore the forms in (8) show that incoporated nouns generally take on ending -e:- which we call medial. We will discuss the rule in more detail in Chapter $X$ but we formulate it here on the basis of the evidence just presented.
(9) Object Incorforation

$$
\text { V } 2: N \Rightarrow \text { V-N-MEDTAL, }
$$

## (7)

| Input to rules | $\operatorname{minop}_{\text {TASTE }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| TSA (50) (III) ${ }^{3}$ | minop-TSA[I] |
| Passive (58)(III) | minop-TSA[I]-igw |
| PRO Deletion (6) | minop-TSA[I]-igw |
| TSA Neutralization (3) | minop-TSA[A]-igw |
| ISA (28)(III) | minop-TSA[A]-igN-ISA[I] |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { ISA Spelling } \\ (25)(\text { III }) \end{gathered}$ | minop-TSA[A]-igwad |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TSA Spelling } \\ & (4 \overline{)})(\text { III }) \end{aligned}$ | minoprigwad |
| Person Agreement (35)(III) | minopwigwadw |
| a: Spelling (5) | -- |
| Morphophonemics | mnopgwad |


| $2:\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { ITAN } \\ \hline \text { INAN } \end{array}\right.$ | I:[PRO] | wa:bam SEE | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2:[3] } \\ \mathrm{HE} \end{gathered}$ | 1:[PRO] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:[.tinait] | 1:[PRO] | wa:bam-TSA[A] | 2:[3] | 1:[PRO] |
| 1:[INAN] | Ch: [PRO] | wa:bam-TSA[A]-igw | 1:[3] | $\mathrm{CH}:[\mathrm{PRO}]$ |
| 1:[İMAN] | $\emptyset$ | wa: ${ }^{\text {am-TSA[A]-igw }}$ | 1: [3] | $\emptyset$ |
| 1:[IMAN] |  | -- |  |  |
| 1:[INAI!] |  | wa: bam-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | 1:[3] |  |
| 1:[INAH] |  | wa: bam-TSA[A]-igwi | 1: [3] |  |
| 1:[INEN] |  | wa: bmigwi | 1:[3] |  |
| 1:[InAiv] |  | wa:bmigwiw | 1:[3] |  |
|  |  | wa:bma:w | 1:[3] |  |
|  |  | wa: bma: |  |  |

(10) Medial Spelling

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { MEDIAL } \Rightarrow & \emptyset / h \\
& \text { e: }
\end{aligned}
$$

The rule of Object Incorporation (9) is highly irregular in that only a few nouns and a few verbs undergo it. However, there are two productive constructions that we analyze as containing morphemes which represent incorporated nouns. These two constructions are exemplified in (ll). The construction in (lla) shows an incorporated reflexive. The construction in (llb) shows an incorporated indefinite object (PRO).
(ll) (a) (i) ngi:-ba:zgobnidiz I scratched myself. /n - gi: - ba:zagobi - n - idi - zo/ 1 PAST SCRATCH TSA SEIJF TSA
(ii) gi:-ba:škzodzo He shot himself. /gi: - ba:škiz - w - idi - zo - w/ PAS' SHOOT TSA SELT ISA 3
gi:-gžika:dzo He wounded himself.
/gi: - gižik - aw - idi - zo - w/ PAS'I WOUND TSA SELF ISA 3

```
(b) (i) bi:ncige: He's cleaning up.
    /bi:nih - d - ig - e: - \emptyset - w/
    CLEAN TSA PRO MEDIAL ISA 3
    (ii) dkoŋge: He bites
    /dakom - \emptyset - ig - e: - \emptyset - w/
    BTTE T'SA PRO MED.IAL ISA 3
(iii) gi:-na:dma:ge: He helped.
    /gi: - na:dam - aw - ig - e: - \emptyset - w/
    PAST HELP T'SA PRO MEDTAL ISA 3
(iv) ei:-ba:škzowe: He shot someone.
    /gi: - ba:škiz - w - iw - c: - \emptyset - w/
    PAST SHOOT: TSA PRO MEDIAL ISA 3
    (v) gi:-gjibhiwe: He ran away.
    /gi: - gijibah - \emptyset - iw - e: - \emptyset - w/
    PAST RUN-FROM 'ISA PRO MEDIAL ISA 3
(vi) ginda:so He (can) read.
    lagim - d - a:h - \emptyset - zo - w/
        COUNT TSA PRO MEDIAL ISA 3
```

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (vii) gi:-bi:da:so He brought (a lot of) stuff. } \\
& \text { /gi: - bi: - d - a:h - } \varnothing \text { - zo - w/ } \\
& \text { PAST BRTING TSA PRO MEDIAL ISA } 3
\end{aligned}
$$

The first construction exemplified in (ll) shows an incorporated reflexive. Irregularly it contains no medial. We will derive the reflexive construction by reflexivizing an object coreferential with the subject and then incorporating the reflexive and deleting the medial. Two new rules are necessary to do this. They are given in (12) and (13)
(12) Reflexivization
$N P_{i} \Rightarrow$ idi / 2:__l:NP ${ }_{i}$
(13) Medial Deletion

MED.TAL ==> $\quad$ / idi- $\qquad$
Using these rules we give the derivation of gi:-ba:škzodzo /gi:-ba:škiz-w-idi-zo-w/.
(14)

Input to Rules
TSA (50)
Reflexivization (l2)
Object Incorporation (9)
Medial Deletion (13)
ISA (28) (IIT)
ISA Spelling (26) (ITI)
Person Agreement (35) (II.I)
Morphophonomics
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { gi:-ba:škizz } & 2:[3]_{i} \\ \text { PAS'I } & \text { SHOOT } \\ \text { HE } & \text { HE } \\ \text { Hi }\end{array}$
gi:-ba:ك̌kizw 2:[3]i l:[3]i
gi:-ba:škízw 2:jdi $1:[3]$
gi:-ba:škizwidi-MEUTAL 1:[3]
gi:-ba:škizwidi l:[3]
gi:-ba:škizwidi-ISA[A] 1:[3]
gi:-ba:škiそwidizo l:[3]
gi:-ba:škizwidizow l:[3]
gi:-ba:škzodzo

A construction closely related to the reflexive is the reciprocal.
Examples are given in (15).

(b) gi:-ba:škzodwag They shot eac:h other.
/gi: - ba:skiz - w - jdi - $\varnothing$ - w - orf/ PAST SHOOT TSA SELF ISA 3 3PL
(c) gi:-gžika:dwag They wounded each other.
/gi: - gižik -aw - idi $\quad \emptyset-\mathrm{w}-\mathrm{ag} /$
PAST WOUND TSA SELF ISA 3 3PL

The only difference between the reflexive and the reciprocal is the allomorph of ISA that the construction conditions. This means that the allomorphy of ISA must, in part, be conditioned by the semantics of a construction as well as by the morphemes involved.

The second construction exemplified in (11) shows an incorporated indefinite object (PRO). The only thing needed to make our analysis handle these forms is a rule to specify the spelling of PRO when incorporated. The rule is given in (16).
(16) PRO Spelling

PFij $\Rightarrow=\Rightarrow a: h$ / $a: h$ Class]-TSA-
ig / aw-___
ig / m-
iw / TSA[A]- $\qquad$
ig
Now we derive the form bi:ncige: /bi:nih-d-ig-e:- $\varnothing$-w/.

| Input to rules | bi:nih CLEAN | $2: \underset{\mathrm{HE}}{ } \mathrm{f}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1:[3] \\ \mathrm{HE} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSA (50) | bi:nihd | 2:[PRO] | 1:[3] |
| Object Incorporation (9) | bi:nihd-PRO-MED.IAL |  | 1:[3] |
| PRO Spelling (16) | bi:nihdig-MED.IAL |  | 1:[3] |
| Medial Spelling (10) | bi:nihdige: |  | 1:[3] |
| ISA (28) | bi:nihdige:-ISA |  | 1:[3] |
| ISA Spelling (26) | bi:nihdige: |  | 1: [3] |
| Person Agreement (35) | bi:nihdige:w |  | 1:[3] |
| Morphophonemics | bi:ncige: |  |  |

4.3 Medialization. In addition to reflexivization there is another process in Ojibwa that affects objects coreferential with clausemate subjects. This process deletes the object thus rendering the clause intransitive. We will call the process Middling. It happens
only in complex verbal constructions such as those in (18).
(18)
(a) mma:dkwe:ni He's moving his head.
/mama:d - ikw-e: - n - $\varnothing$ - i - w/
MOVE HEAD MEDIAL CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(b) gi:-be: 加wže:ho He dried himself off.
/gi: - be:ngw - waž - e: - ah - w - i - w/
FAST BE-DRY BODY MEDIAL CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(c) gi:-bi:gwška: It broke./It tore. ${ }^{4}$
/gi: - bi:gw - (i)šk - aw - i - w/
PAST BE-TORN CAUSE TSA ISA 3
Because Middling is restricted to causative constructions often with incorporated nouns, we defer formalization of the process until we have handled causatives and noun incorporation. What we need to note here is that we are treating forms like those in (18) as middles, not as reflexives as Bloomfield (1957:86) did.
4.4 Summary of Rules. We would like to summarize the order of the rules that we have established up to this point. Not all the rules we list are crucially ordered with respect to every other rule, but we will list them in an order that is consistent with all crucial orderings. Because the number of rules is so great we have taken the liberty of splitting the rules into three blocks: the main block in (19a), the agreement block in (19b), and the spelling block in (19c). For the spelling rules this mears a deviation from the order laid out in the derivations in this chapter. We can show in some cases that separating the spelling rule from the rule inserting the morpheme is necessary. For example we have shown that TSA (50) (III) precedes Passive (58) (III) which in turn feeds TSA Neutralization (3). But TSA Neutralization (3) affects the operation of TSA Spelling (46) (III), and therefore precedes it. Because of the existence of such ordering chains we will simply assume that we can take all the spelling rules and order
them as a block at the end of the syntactic derivation. In fact we know that such orderings are not always possible, but is seems that for Ojibwa it is possible to do so, and so we will use it for convenience. Within the block of spelling rules we will spell from the stem out.
(19) (a) TSA (50) (III)

Passive (58) (III)
Reflexivization (12)
Object Incorporation (9)
TSA Neutralization (3)
PRO Deletion (6)
Medial Deletion (13)
ISA (28) (I.II)
OA I (52) (III)
Negative Concord (31) (IIIL)
OA II (43) (.III)
(b) Person/number Agreement Block

Inanimate Obviation (18) (.I.I.)
Person Agreement (35) (I.I.I)
Non-third Plural (36) (III)
Ergative Plural (38) (III)
Modal Attachment (22) (.III)
Dubitative Attachment (23) (.I.I.I)
Absolutive Plural (39) (III)
(c) Spelling Block

TSA Spelling (46) (III )
PRO Spelling (16)
Medial Spelling (10)
ISA Spelling (26) (I.II)
OA I Spelling (46) (III. )
Negative Spelling (32) (.II. )
a: Spelling (5)
In derivations we will refer to the blocks of rules when their operation is not crucial to the derivation of the forms under examination.

FOOTNOTES
CHAPTER IV
${ }^{1}$ The last two examples in this list are morpheme complexes.

2 This is not strictly true there is a class of causative verbs that do not form passives this way. We will discuss thoses cases in Chapter V.I.II.
$3_{\text {The second }}$ set of parentheses indicates the chapter in which the current version of the rule is found.
${ }^{4}$ Forms that end in the morpheme sequence -ska: are often virtually impossible to translate in any straightforward way. It means that the state being caused comes about independent of contact with an external agent or instrument. (18c) could be said by a child trying to avoid responsibility for damaging an object. Roosen-Runge and Kaye (1973) consistently mistranslate such forms. Translating such forms as reflexive while often awkward, captures this aspect of the meaning more clearly.

## CHAPTER V

ADVNNCEMENT TO OBJECT
5.0 Ojibwa has a number of rules which advance dependents to direct object. In this chapter we will examine these rules. Included here are two controversial rules, one of which advances indirect objects and one of which advances chomeurs.
5.1 Benefactive Advancement. Beneractives are obligatorily advanced to direct object in Ojibwa. As we discussed in Chapter I.I., Ojibwa verbs agree with their (superficial) objects in person, rumber, gender, and obviation. The examples in (l) show gender and number agreement.

```
(l) (a) (i) ngi:-bi:do:n mzinhican I brought a book.
    /n - gi: - bi: - d - 0: - n/ (inanjmate object)
    l PAST BR.ING TSA ONT OA.T.T
    (ii) ngi:-bi:do:nan mzinhignan .I brought some books.
        /n - gi: - bj: - d - o: - n - an/ (inanimate plural)
            l PAST BR.ING T'SA ONI OA.I.I PL
(b) (i) ngi:-bi:na: kik
        /n - gi: - bi: - n - a:/
            l PAST BRJ.NG TSA OA.T
    (ii) ngi:-bi:na:g kiko:g
                            T. brought some kettles.
        /n - gi: - bi: - n - a: - ag/
        l PAST BR.ING TSA ONT PL
```

I brought a kettle (animate objcct)
T. brought some kettles.

``` /n - gi: - bi: - n - a: - ag/ 1 PAST BRTING TSA ONT PL
```

However, benefactive verbs agree in number with their benefactive but do not agree with their logical object.
(2) (a) (i) nॄi:-bi:dmawa: mzinhigan /n - gi: - bi: - d - amaw - $\mathrm{a}: / \mathrm{l}$
l PAST BRTNG TSA BEN OAT
1 PAST BRI.NG IBA BEI OAT
(ii) ngi:-bi:dmawa: mzinhignan
(b) (i) ngi:-bi:dmawa:g mzinhigan /n - gi: - bi: - d - amaw - a: - ag/ 1 PAST BRTNG TSA BEN OAI PL
(ii) ngi:-bi:dmawa:g mzinhignan I brought them some books. Since it is not possible in Ojibwa to have an inanimate benefactive we cannot show gender agreement with benefactives, but we can show that benefactive verbs do not agree with their logical objects in gender. The TSA that appears in benefactive verbs is always TSA[I].
(3) (a) ngi:-bi:dmawa: mzinhigan I brought him a book.
/n - gi: - bi: - d - amaw - a:/
1 PAST BR.ING TSA BEN OA.I
(b) ngi:-bi:dmawa: kiko: ${ }^{1}$ I brought him a kettle (obv.).

We take these facts as evidence that the benefactives advance to object.

Before formulating the rule we will need to look at the allomorphs of the benefactive marker. There are two allomorphs, amaw and aw. The secondallomorph is optionally used after stems that take Set I and Set III TSA-OAT markings, i.e. the markings d-o:. Some example forms are listed in (4). The citations are given in third singular conjunct.
(4)

TI form Benefactive form
(a) Set I

| bi:do:d | bi:dwa:d | bring s.t. (for s.o.) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| go:do:d | bi:dmawa:d <br> go:dwa:d <br> go:dmawa:d | hang s.t. (for s.o.) |
| Set I.II | wŽitwa:d |  |
| wŽito:d | mzake s.t. (for s.o.) |  |
| za:gjito:d. | za:gjitwa:d | take s.t. out (for s.o.) |

(b) Set I.II
wzito:d
za:gjito:d
I brought him some books. I brought them a book. L
(c) Irregular

| na:did | na:dwa:d | fetch s.t. (for s.o.) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| to:d | na:dmawa:d | idiom: hel.p s.o. |
|  | tawa:d | idiom: bet/challenge s.o. |
|  | tamwa:d | put s.t. down (for s.o.) |

(d) Other Verbs

| škonang | škonmawa:d | leave s.t. (for s.o.) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| wžibi:hang | wžibi:hmawa:d | write s.t.(to/for s.o.) |
| gindang | gindmawa:d | read s.t. (to/for s.o.) |
| bmida:ba:dang | bmida:ba:dmawa:d | haul s.t. (for s.o.) |

We will formulste the rule of benefactive advancement as in (5).
(5) Benefactive Advancement

V BEN: $\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{BEN} 2$ :
We will spell the marker BEN by rule (6).
(6) Benefactive Spelling
BEN ==> aw / [Set I/III]___ (optional)
amaw
In order to get the order of morphemes that we find in benefactive
verbs, as exemplified in (2) and (3), TSA (50) (IIT.) must precede
Benefactive Advancement (5). But then to wipe out the contrast between
TSA[I] and TSA[A], we must invoke another clause of TSA Neutralization
(3) (.IV). We revise that rule as in (7).
(7) TSA Neutralization (revised)
(a) $\operatorname{TSA}[I] \Rightarrow \operatorname{TSA}[A] / \ldots \quad-i g W$
(b) $\operatorname{TSA}[A] \Rightarrow \operatorname{TS}[I] / \ldots-3 E N$

We are now ready to derive the sentence ngi:-bi:dmawa: kjko:n (3b).
The derivation is given in (8) [on the next page].
At this point it is necessary to note that an alternative analysis of benefactive forms is possible. The sequence TSA[T]-amaw which appears in benefactive verbs may be analyzed as TSA[T]-am-TSA[A], because
(8)

| Input to rules | gi:-bi: | BEN: [3] | 2:akikw | 1:[1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PAST BRING | FOR HIM | KETTLE | [ |
| TSA (50) (IIT. ${ }^{\text {( }}$ | gi:-bi:-TSA [A] | BEN: [3] | w: akikw | 1:[1] |
| Benefactive (5) | gi:-bi:-TSA[A]-BEN | 2: [3] | CH:akikw | 1: [1] |
| TSA Neutralization (7) | Ei:-bi:-TSA[I]-BEN | 2:[3] | CH:akikw | 1:[1] |
| Obriation ${ }^{2}$ | gi:-bi:-TSA[.I]-BEN | 2:[3] | CH :akikwan | 1:[1] |
| A.greements | ngi:-bi:-TSA[.I]-BEN-a: | 2:[3] | CH:akikwan | 1:[1]. |
| Spelling | ngi:-bi:damawa: |  | akikwan |  |
| Morphophonemics | ngi:-bi:dmawa: kiko:n |  |  |  |

there is a TSA[A] aw. Similarly the sequence TSA[I]-aw could be analyzed as TSA[.]-TSA[A]. If we do this then the TSA[.I] in the construction is a link morpheme. Thus the choice between these two analyses is the choice between a link morpheme and TSA Neutralization. We have picked the latter solution for two reasons. First we feel that there is motivation for neutralization but none for a link. Second there is a proposed law of agreement which limits agreements to being cycle initial and cycle final. While we have not yet discussed the cycle, we can see that TSA is the earliest ordered rule under our analysis, and is thus consistent with the proposed law. In view of the somewhat open choice between the two analyses we favor the one which is consistent with the proposed law.

Finally we take up the problem of the morphology of the benefactive with basically intransitive verbs. The productive pattern is to base the benefactive on a formation that has a link morpheme, $\underline{h}$ and sometimes also an ISA link morpheme. Some examples are given in (9).
(9) A.I forms Benefactive forms

> noki:d noki:twa:d /anoki: - h-d-aw/ work (for s.o.) ngamod ngamtawa:d /nagamo - h-d-aw/ sing (to/for s.o.) nška:dzid nška:dzi:twa:d /nška:d-izi-h-d-aw/ be angry (at s.o.) ISA TSA BEN

However, there is quite a bit of irregularity associated with the benefactive forms arising from intransitive verbs.
(10) AI forms Benefactive forms

$$
\left.\left.\begin{array}{clc}
\text { (a) wžige:d } & \text { wžigwa:d } & \text { /ožige:-aw-a:d/ } \\
\text { builda house (for s.o.) }
\end{array}\right] \begin{array}{cl}
\text { ji:ba:kwe:d } & \text { ji:ba:kwwa:d }
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\text { /ji:ba:kwe:-aw-a:d/ } \\
\text { cook (for s.o.) }
\end{array}\right]
$$

(b) wa:se:njge:d wa:se:njgamwa:d /wa:se:njige:-amaw-a:d/ shine a light (for s.o.) ni:mid ni:mkawa:d /ni:mi-k-aw-a:d/ dance (for s.o.)

We will not formalize rules to account for these forms. Such details of ad hoc morphology are beyond the scope of this work.

There are a number of other rules promoting dependents to object which are also marked with the BEN morpheme. These include a number of animate non-terms and possessors.
5.2 Animate Advancements. A number of animate non-terms are obligatorily advanced to object.
5.2.1 ABOUT Advancement. There are a few examples of the logical complements of ABOUT advancing to object obligatorily if they are human.

> (a) (i) ngike:nd:n mzinhigan I know (about) the book. /n gikc:n $-\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{am}-\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{I}$ 1 KNOW TSA OAT OA.T.
(b) (i) ngike:nma: žē:bdi:s I know John. /n - gike:nim - $\emptyset$ - a:/
1 KNOW TSA OA.I
(ii) ngike:ndmawa: ža:bdi:s I know about John. /n - gike:n - d - amaw - a:/ 1 KNOW IISA BEN OAT
(c) (i) ngi:-niga:hwe: I made penple sad. / n - gi: - aniga:h - $\varnothing$ - iw - e: - $\emptyset /$ 1 PAST CAUSE-BE-SAD PRO MFDTAL ISA TSA
(ii) ngi:-niga:twa: ma:nĩ: I told a sad story about Mary. /n - gi: - aniga:h - d - aw - a:/ (lit. I made peop.le 1 PAST CAUSE-BE-SAD TSA BEN OA. sad about Mary.)

As far as we know this advancement is only possible if the object of the verb at the time of the advancement is PRO.
5.2.2 Recipient Advancement. The recipient of the object of a verb is obligatorily advanced to object.
(12) (a) (i) ngi:-nina:n mo:kma:n I handed the knife along. /n - gi: - inin - $\emptyset-$ am $-\mathrm{n} /$
I PAST PASS TSA OA.I OA.I.
(ii) ngi:-ninmawa: mo:kma:n ža:bdi:s I handed John the /n - gi: - inin - $\varnothing$ - amaw - a:/ 1 PAST PASS TSA BEN OAT knife.
(b) (i) ngi:-papda:n bkwa:kwad I threw the ball.
/n - gi: - apagi - d - am - n/
1 PAST THROW TSA OA.T OA.II
(ii) ngi:-pagdamwa: bkwa:kwad bi:ye:n I threw the ball to /n - gi: - apagi - d - amaw - a:/ Peter. 1 PAST THROW TSA BEN OA.I
(c) (i) ngi:-dbaha:n zi:sba:kwad I paid for the sugar. /n - gi: - dibah - $\varnothing$ - am - n/
1 PAST PAY-FOR TSA OA.T OA.T.T.
(ii) ngi:-dbahmawa: zi:sba:kwad be:ni:k I paid Veronica for
/n - gi: - dibah - $\emptyset$ - amaw - a:/ the sugar. 1 PAST PAY-FOR TSA BEN OAT
5.2.3 Affectee Advancement. Affectees are obligatorily advanced to object.
(13)
(a) wgi:-ma:ji:wdo:n nmaznahgan He took my book.
/w - gi: - ma:ji:ni - d - o: - n/
3 PAST TAKE TSA OAI OAII
(b) ngi:-ma:ji:wdma:g nmaznahgan He took my book from me. /n - gi: - ma:ji:wi - d - amaw - igw/
1 PAST TAKE TSA F?iv PASS.IVE
All these advancement rules can be collapsed with benefactive advancement.
(14) Non-term Advancement

V NT:[ANTM] $\Rightarrow$ V-BEN $2:[A N . T M]$
This rule is sensitive to logical animacy, not grammatical animacy. This rule precedes the application of Passive (58) (III) as shown by the order of morphemes in (13b)
5.3 Possessor Ascension. While not an advancement rule, posses-
sor ascension is marked by the same morphology as the benefactive. The possessor of a logical object may ascend to object.
(15) (a) ngi:-wa:bnda:n ža:bdi:s wmo:krna:n I saw John's knife.
/n - gi: - wa:bam - d - am - n/ 1 PAST SEE TSA OA.T OA.T.I
(b) ngi:-wa:bndamwa: ža:bdi:s wmo:luna:n $I$ saw Joln's knife. /n - gi: - wa:bam - d - amaw - a:/ 1 PAST SEE TSA BEN OA.I

For many speakers (15a) is ungrammatical, i.e. for such squaker's possessor ascension is obligatory. The exact conditions on possessor ascension are unknown, although it is known that there is a hierarchy of ascendability that runs from full NP possessor through third person pronoun possessor to first and second person possessor. For most speakers ascension of full NP possessors is oblj.gatory. Ascension of pronominal third person possessors is optional. But non-third person possessors do not ascerid. Thus we can distingujsh between Arfectee Advancement §5.2.3, and Possessor Ascerision.
(16) (a) (i) wgi:-wa:bnda:n nmo:kma:n He saw my knife. /w - gi: - wa:b3m - d - am - n/ 3 PAST SEE TSA OAT OA.LI
(ii) *ngi:-wa:undama:e nmo:kma:n He saw my knife. /n - gi: - wa:bam - d - amaw - igw/ 1 PAST SEE TSA BEN PASSIVE
(b) (i) wgi:-ma:ji:wdo:n nmo:kma:n He took away my book. /w - gi: - ma:ji:wi - d - o: - n/ 3 PASI! TAKE-AWAY TSA OAI OA.I.I
(ii) ngi:-ma:ji:wdama:g nmo:kma:n He took my book away from me. /n - gi: - ma:ji:wi - d - amaw - igw/ 1 PAST TAKE-:I!! I'SA BEN PASSIVE

The examples in (lfa) show that non-.third person possessors do not ascend. The examples of (16b) show that non-third person affectecs advance.

Before we formalize the rule we will give evidence that posses-
sors of subjects do not ascend.
(17) (a) wi:nzi ža:bdi:s John is dirty.
/wi:n - izi - w/
D.IRTY .ISA 3
(b) wi:ndini ža:bdi:s wmo:kma:n John's knife is dirty.
/wi:n - ad - ini - w/
D.IRTY ISA OBV 3

While (l7b) shows obviation, the agreement is still inanimate, showing that possessors of subjects do not ascend.

Now we are ready to formalize possessor ascension.
(18) Possessor Ascension

A [3] POSS of 2 ascends, marking the verb V-BEN 3
Like Non-term Advancement (14), Possessor Ascension (18) precedes Passive (58) (III).
(19) bi:ye:n wgit-wa:bndoma:go:n wmo:kma:n wgwisan. Peter'sj son saw /w - gi: - wa:bam - d - amaw - j.gw - an/ hisiknire. 3 PAST SEE TSA BEN PASSIVE OBV

Because of the obviation involired we will not derive this form here but rely on the morpheme order as the indicator of rule order.
5.4 Chomeur Advancement. The rules that we have iscussed thus far in this chapter all have the property of creating chomeurs by the Relational Annihilation Law (57) (III).
(20) (a) Non-term Advancement
(i) ngi:-bi:dmawa: mzinhjegan ža:bdi:s I brought John a book. 1-PAST-BRTNG-FOR-3 BOOK JOHN

CH 2
(ii) ngi:-dbahmawa: mzinhigan ža:bdi:s I paid Tohn for the book. l-PAST-PAY-FOR-TO-3 BOOK JOHN

CH 2
(iii) ngi:-ma:ji:dmawa: mzinhigan ža:bdi:s I took the book from l-PAST-T'AKE-FROM-3 BOOK JOHN John. CH 2
(b) Possessor Ascension ${ }^{4}$
ngi:-wa:bndamwa: ža:bdi:s wmaznahgan I saw John's book. l-PAST-SEE-OF-3 JOHN HIS-BOOK

2 CH
If these chomeurs end up in a sentence that is intransitive they advance to direct object. The resulting verbs show only OA II (43) (.III) agreement markers. The sentences in (21) become intransitive by processes described in Chapter IV.
(21) (a) ngi:-gindma:ge:n mzinhigan I read the book aloud. (lit. I /n - gi: - agim - d - amaw - ig - e: - $\varnothing$ - n/ read-for-PRO 1 PAST READ TSA BEN PRO MEDIAL ISA OAII book.)
(b) ngi:-bi:da:dzon škode:wa:bo: I brought my own booze. (lit. /n - gi: - bi: - d - aw - idi - zo - n/ I brought-for-self 1 PAST BRING TSA BEN SELF ISA OA.II liquor.)
(c) ngi:-gža:dma:ge:nan wji:ma:nan I looked after somebody's boats. /n - gi: - giža: - d - amaw - ig - e: - $\emptyset$ - n - an/
1 PAST CARE-FOR TSA BEN PRO MED.LAL ISA OAII PL
In addition to these situations where chomeurs come to be in intransitive clauses, there is a rule that ascends possessors (generally inalienable) out of the subject of intransitive verbs under very limited circumstances. The chomeurs generated by those ascensions are also in intransitive clauses and advance to direct object.
(21) (a) (i) ?nžo:nya:m gi:-ja:gse: My money ran out. MY-MONEY PAST-RUN-OUT
(ii) ngi:-ja:gse:n žo:nya: I ran out of money /n - gi: - ja:gjse: - $\varnothing$ - n/ 1 PAST RUN-OUT ISA OA.II
(b) nda: $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}_{\text {zin }}}$ nik
I have a pain in (my) arm.
/n(d) -a:kw - izi - n/
1 BE-SICK ISA OAII ARM

We formalize the rule of chomeur advancement as in (23).
(23) Chomeur Advancement

$$
\mathrm{CH} \Rightarrow 2 / \ldots \quad \mathrm{A}(1)
$$

As an example of the qeration and ordering of (23) we derive the sentence (2la) in (24) [on the next page]. This rule is significant because it was thought that chomeurs could not advance except to indirect object [Postal and Perlmutter (n.d.)]. This rule will also have interesting ramifications for the rest of our analysis.

Now let us show that this advancement is peculiar to chomeurs. Non-terms may appear overtly in intransitive sentences as non-terms and may not be advanced.
(25) (a) gbaba: gdižna:goz

You look like your father. YOUR-DAD 2-LOOK-LIKE
(b) gi:-dkamse: mi:kna:ng

He crossed the road. PAST-CROSS-3 ROAD-loc.
(c) ngi:-bo:z ndo:da:ba:ning

I got in my car. l-PAST-GET-II MY-CAR-loc.
(d) gwi:dbiwning gi:-nmadbi He sat on the chair. CHAIR-loc. PAST-SIT-3
(e) gi:-bmose: namhe:wgamig He walked to church. PAST-WALK-3 CHURCH

Only chomeurs are advanced in intransitive clauses.
5.5 Indirect Object Advancement. Logical indirect objects advance to direct object. The verb is left unmarked.
(26) (a) ngi:-mi:na: mzinhigan ža:bdi:s

I gave John a book. /n - gi: - mi:n - $\emptyset$ - a:/ BOOK JOHN 1 PAST GIVE TSA OAI

```
(b) ngi:-šama: wi:ya:s nday
    I fed my dog meat.
    /n - gi: - ašam - O - a:/ MEAT MY-DOG
        l PAST FEED TSA OAI
```

This advancement is obligatory and unmarked. For this reason various analysts [e.g. Rogers (1975b)] have treated these verbs as a special type of verb which has a basic direct object in a semantically dative relation. More simply they treat these verbs as undergoing no derivation. In
(24)
Input to Rules
TSA (50) (ITI)
Non-term Advancement (14)
Ob,ject Incorporation (6) (.IV)
Choineur Advancement (22)
OA II (43) (I.I.)
Agreements
Spellings

| gi:-agim |
| :---: |
| PAST READ |
| gi:-agim-TSA[.T |
| gi:-agim-TSA[I]-BEN |
| gi:-agim-TSA[I]-BEN-PRO-MED.TAL |
| gi:-asim-TSA[.T]-BEN-PRO-MED.TAL |
| gi:-asim-TSA[r]-BEN-PRO-MEDIAL-n |
| ngi - -agim-TSA[I]-BET-PRO-MEDTAL-n |
| ngi:-agimdamawige:n |
| ngi:-gindma:ge:n mzinhigan |


| BEN: PRO | $2:$ mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BOOK | $I$ |
| BEN:PRO | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
| 2:PRO | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | mazinahigan |  |

this section we will present evidence for analyzing these verbs as involving the application of a rule which has no morphological effect. What is at stake here is an important facet of relational grammar. In order to make relational gramnar work, it is necessary to have principles assigning termhood independent of syntactic considerations, i.e. the assignment must be on the basis of the semantic character of the verb. The system is not unlike that of case grammar. The term assignment runs approximately like this. Semantic cases like agent, experiencer, goal, instrument, etc. are defined. A verb that takes an agent and a goal has the agent assigned as a subject and the goal as an object, where the pairings of agent to subject and goal to object are made on the basis of universal principles, probably by the matching of hierarchjes, the term hierarchy with a hicrarchy of subject eligibility for various semantic cases. What all this means to us here is that if we could argue that indirect object is assigned differently in Ojibwa than it is in English, then this would be a problem for relational grammar. So we will now turn to the syntactic evj.dence for positing a rule advancinfs indirect object.

First there is evidence from chomeur advancement. If the indirect object is PRO the NP we want to say is the logical object ends up as the superficial object, with the verb marked only with OA I.T. This is the characteristic of chomeur advancement. The same thing happens with reflexivized and other noun incorporated constructions where an indirect object is present.
(27) (a) ngi:-mi:gwe:n mzinhigan

I gave away the book.
/n - gi: - mi:g - $\varnothing$ - iw - e: - $\emptyset$ - n/
1 PAST GIVE TSA PRO MEDIAL ISA OAII
(b) ngi:-mi:ndizon mzinhigan I gave myself a bcok. /n - gi: - mi:n - $\varnothing$ - idi - zo - n/ 1 PAST G.TVE TSA SELF ISA OAII
(c) ngi:-šajge:n nbo:b I fed people soup. /n - gi: - ašam - $\varnothing$ - ig - e: - $\varnothing$ - n/ 1 PAST FEED TSA PRO MEDIAL ISA OAII
(d) ngi:-šama:wson wi:ya:s I fed (my) children meat. /n - gi: - assam - $\emptyset$ - a:wah - zo - n/
1 PAST FEED TSA CHILD ISA OA.II

We derive (27b) as an example in (28)[on the next page]. Some comments about this derivation are in order. Unless the word mzinhigan 'book' is a chomeur at some time during the derivation there is no independently motivated way to get iu to advance. In order to have it be a chomeur, it must have been a term at some time and have had something advanced to its relation. This is consistent only with the object that treats the direct objecthood of the semantic object as derived.

The second kind of evidence is the evidence from clause union. As discussed in Chapter I.I §2.2.5, clause unions involving transitive clauses both upstairs and downstairs bring the subject of the downstairs clause up as indirect object. While such clause unions are rare in Ojibwa they do occur and they show the same properties as the verbs which take semantic indirect objects.
(29) (a) ngi:-ba:knamo:ha: I made him open the box.
/n - gi:’- ba:kinam(o) - h - $\emptyset$ - a:/
1 PAST OPEN CAUSE TSA OAI
(b) ngi:-mnikwe:cge:n nbi:š I made (my animals) drink water.
/n - gi: - minikwe: - h - d - ig - e: - $\varnothing$ - n/
1 PAST dRTINK CAUSE TSA PRO mEDIAL ISA OAIT
Notice in particular that (29b) is exactly parallel to (27c). If we say that clause union works in the universal way and have a rule advancing indirect objects then the parallelism is explaincd straightforwardly. Any other scilution seems to us unreasonably ad hoc. There-

## (28)

```
Input to rules
Indirect Object Advancement
TSA (50) (I.II)
Reflexivization (12) (IV)
OBject Incorporation (9) (IV)
Medial Deletion (13) (IV)
ISA (28) (.I.II;
Chomeur Advancement (23)
OA I.I (43) (I.I.I)
Afgreement:s
Spelling
```

Morphophonemics
gi:-mi:n
PAST GIVE
gi:-mi:n
gi:-mi:n-TSA[A]
gi:-mi:n-TSA[A]
gi:-mi:n-TSA[A]-idi-MEDIAL
gi:-mi:n-TSA[A]-idi
gí:-mí:n-TSA[A]-iài-ISA[A]
gi:-mi:n-TSA[A]-idi-ISA[A]
gi:-mi:n-TSA[A]-idi-ISA[A]-n
ngi:-mi:n-TSA[A]-idi-ISA[A]-n
ngi:-mi:nidizon

| 3:[l] | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Book | I |
| 2:[l] | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
| 2:[l] | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
| 2:idi | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | CH:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | 2:mazinahigan | $1:[1]$ |
|  | mazinahigan |  |

ngi:-mi:ndizon mzinhigan
fore we formalize the rule of indirect object advancement.
(30) Indirect Object Advancement
$3=\Rightarrow 2$
5.6 Summary of Rules. We summarize the new rules here in their place in the rule order. Only the main block of rules is listed.
(31) Indirect Object Advancement (30)

TSA (50) (III)
Non-term Advancement (14)
Possessor Ascension (18)
Passive (58)(III)
Reflexivization (l2)(IV)
Object Incorporation (9)(IV)
Medial Deletion (13)(IV)
TSA Neutralization (3)(IV)
PRO Deletion (6)(IV)
ISA (28)(III)
OA I (52) (III)
Chomeur Advancement (23)
Negative Concord (3I)(III)
OA II (43) (III)
The most interesting thing about this ordering is that Indirect Object Advancement (30) precedes TSA (50)(III). One of the clauses of the proposed agreement law in relational grammar limits agreements to cycle initial and/or cycle final. Ths Ojibwa data indicates that such a limitation is not possible. Perhaps the best direction in revising the proposed laws would be, given cycle initial or cycle final (including postcyclic) agreements, agreements in mid-cycle are also possible. ${ }^{5}$
$\mathrm{I}_{\text {The }}$ obviation of the logical object is another indication that the benefactive has become the superficial object.
${ }^{2}$ We will discuss the rule(s) of obviation in Chapter VII.
${ }^{3}$ The effects of this rule are summarized in:
V 2:(POSS:[3]) = $=$ V-BEN CH 2:[3].
a b c
a b c

4 The normal order of dependents is Chnmeur - Direct Object Subject, that order is violated here because of the pronoun possessor in the chomeur and antecedent problems. Consider the examples
(1) (a) ngi:-ma:ji:wdmawa: mzinhigan ža:bdi:s I took the book from John.
(b) ?ngi:-ma:ji:wdmawa: ža:bdi:s mzinhigan

I took the book from John.
(2) (a) *ngi:-ma:ji:wdmawa: wmaznahgan ža:bdi:s

I took John's ${ }_{i}$ book from him ${ }_{i}$.
(b) ngi:-ma:ji:wdmawa: ža:bdi:s wmaznahgan

I took John's ${ }_{i}$ book from him ${ }_{i}$.
${ }^{5}$ The recognition that TSA(50)(III) is not cycle initial opens the benefactive marker - (am)aw- to possible reanalysis. This morpheme always follows a TSA marker, but the aw of the benefactive morpheme itself could be considered a TSA marker. Thus the benefactive could be analyzed (3) TSA[I] - (am)aw TSA BEN
(4) TSA[I]-(am) - aw -

BEN TSA
This would change the rule order to
(5) Indirect Object Advancment (30)

Non-term Advancement (14)
Possessor Ascension (18)
TSA (50)(III)
Passive (58)(III)
etc.
We know of no evidence which would require us to change our analysis, so we leave it.
6.0 In this chapter we will discuss the forms of the independent TA paradigm that we did not treat in Chapter III.
6.1 Chomeur Advancement. In analyzing the inflection of the TA inverse forms in Chapter III, we argued that: Passive (58) (III) applies in the derivation of these forms. By the Relationel Annihilation Law (57) (II), chomeurs arise in passivized sentences, fron the logical subject and by advancine the object, passivization at the same time creates intransitive clauses. But in the last chanter we arcued that there is a rule advancing chomeurs in intransitive clauses. Putting these things together we see that our analysis predicts that passivization should have the ultimate effect of invorting the subject and object. We wi.ll argue in this chapter thot this is exactly what happens j.n the case of inverse verb forms. It is easiest to see in the forms that have inanimate logical subjects. Such forms, by our analysis should have animate subjects (from their logical object) and inanimate objects (from their logical subject). Thus these forms should have the same agreement inflection as TT verbs. The paradicn in (l) giving the forms of bsika:cod 'it hits s.o.' and bi:do:d 'bring s.t.' side by side, shows that the agreement inflection for both types of verbs is identical.


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { gbi:do:na:wa:n /g - bi:-d-o: - n - (a:)wa: - an/ } \\
& \text { you (pl.) bring them } \\
& \text { gbiska:g }{ }^{W} \text { na:nin } / g \text { - bisik-aw-igw-i - n - na:ni - an/ } \\
& \text { they hit us (inc.) } \\
& \text { gbi:do:na:nin /g - bi:-d-o: -n - na:ni - an/ } \\
& \text { we (inc.) bring them } \\
& \text { nbiska:g }{ }^{\text {Wha }} \text { :nin /n - bisik-aw-igw-i - n - na:ni - an. } \\
& \text { they hit us (exc.) } \\
& \text { nbi:do:na:nin /n - bi:-d-o: - n - na:ni - an/ } \\
& \text { we (exc.) bring them } \\
& \text { wbiska:gwna:wa:n /w - bisik-aw-igw-i - n - (a:)wa: - an/ } \\
& \text { they hit them } \\
& \text { wbi:do:na:wa:n /w - bi:-d-o: -n-(a:)wa: - an/ } \\
& \text { they bring them }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { it (doesn't) hit you } \\
& \text { gbi:do:si:n /g - bi:-d-o: - si:-n/ } \\
& \text { you (don't) bring it }
\end{aligned}
$$

Chomeur advancement also has the effect of drawing inverse TA verbs into our analysis of number marking. The examples in (2) show the parallelism between the plural marking of direct and inverse $T A$ verbs, which is the expected result of inverting the subject and object of inverse forms by passive plus chomeur advancement.

```
(2) (a) gwa:bma:wa:
    /g - wa:bam-a: - wa:/
                                    you (pl.) see him
gwa:hmig%%a: fig - wa:bam-igw-i - wa:/
                                    he sees you (pl.)
gwa:bma:na: /g - wa:bam-a: - na:ni/
gwa:bmig\mp@subsup{}{}{W}na: /g - wa:bam-igw-i - na:ni/
    he sees us (inc.)
nwa:bma:na: /n - wa:bam-a: - na:ni/
nwa:bmig\mp@subsup{}{}{W}na: /n - wa:bam-igw-i - na:ni/
    he sees us (exc.)
wwa:bma:wa:n /w - wa:bam-a: - wa: - an/
    they see nim/them(obv.)
wwa:bmigwa:n /w - wa:bam-igw-i - wa: - an/
    he/they (obv.) see(s)
                                them
```

| (b) gwa:bma:g gwa:bmigo:g | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { /g - wa:bam-a: } \quad \text { - ag/ } \\ \text { /g - wa:bam-igw-i - ag/ you see them } \\ \text { they see you } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| nwa:bma:g | /n - wa:bam-a: - ag/ I see them |
| nwa: bmigo:g | /n - wa:bam-igw-i - ag/ they see you |
| wwa:bma:n | /w - wa:bam-a: - an/ he sees him/them (obv.) |
| wwa:bmigo:n | $\begin{array}{r} \text { /w - wa:bam-igw-i - an/ } \\ \text { he/they (obv.) see(s) } \\ \text { him } \end{array}$ |
| (c) gwa:bma:wa:g | ```/g - wa:bam-a: - wa: - ag/ you (pl.) see them``` |
| gwa:bmigwa:g | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g - wa:bam-igw-i - wa: - ag/ } \\ & \text { they see you (pl.) } \end{aligned}$ |
| gwa:bma:na:nig | /g - wa:bam-a: - na:ni - ag/ we (inc.) see them |
| gwa:bmigwna:nig | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g - wa:bam-igw-i - na:ni - ag/ } \\ & \text { they see us (inc.) } \end{aligned}$ |
| nwa: bma:na:nig | /n - wa:bam-a: - na:ni - ag/ |
| nwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {na }}$ :nig | /n - wa:bam-igw-i - na:ni - ag/ |
|  | they see us (exc.) |

The analysis that we are proposing claims that both of the members of the pairs of inverse and direct verbs in (2) have the same surface term relationships. Thus the plural markings are the same.

Now we are ready to explain what the $i$ is that appears in our morphemic analysis in the examples in (1) and (2). It is the ISA marker. Our analysis requires that there be an ISA marker in the construction because ISA (28) (III) precedes Chomeur Advancement (23) (V) and so the clause is still intransitive at the time ISA (28) (III) applies. Let us illustrate this by deriving gbiska:gon /g-bisik-aw-igw-i-n/ 'it hits you' in (3) [on the next page].

There are two apparent problems with this extension of our analysis. The first is a morphophonemic problem. Our analysis has two con-

| Input to rules | bisik | 2:[2] | 1: [INAN] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | STRIKE | You | II' |
| TSA (50) (IIT) | bisik-TSA[A] | 2:[2] | 1:[.ITAM] |
| Passive (58) (III) | bisik-TSA[A]-igw | 1:[2] | $\mathrm{CH}:[\mathrm{TNAN}]$ |
| ISA (28) (I.I.I) | bisik-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | I: [2] | CH: [.INAis] |
| Chomeur Advancement (23) (v) | bisik-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | 1:[2] | 2:[ITANA] |
| OA I.I (43) (III) | bisik-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A]-n | 1:[2] | 2:[INAN] |
| Agreements | gbisik-TSA[A]-igw-.TSA[A]-n | 1:[2] | 2:[INAN] |
| Spelling | gbisikawigwin |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | gbiska:gon |  |  |

tractions of igw 'passive' and 'í' ISA, but one of them gives a long vowel output, the other a short vowel output. The forms in (4) illustrate the situation.
(4) (a) gwa:bmig /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i/ gwa:bmigo: /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-j.gw-i/
(b) nwa:bmig /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-iew-i/ nwa:bmigo: /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i/
he sees me I am seen
(c) gwa:bmigwa: /g-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-igw-i-wa:/
they see you (pl.) gwa:bmigo:m /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-mw/ you (pl.) are seen
(d) gwa:bmigwna: /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-na:ni/ they see us (inc.) gwa:bmigo:mi /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-min/ we (inc.) are seen
(e) nwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {Wha }}$ na: /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-na:ni/
they see us (exc.) nwa:bmigo:mi /n-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-iEw-i-min/ we (exc.) are seen

We do not think that this is a particular problem however, because we already have situations in which contractions of the same vowel sequences give different outputs. Some examples are given in (5).
(5) (a) w $+i$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (i) mtico:ng } \\ & \text { ga:gong } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /mitisw-ing/ } \\ & \text { /ga:gw-ing/ } \end{aligned}$ | in the tree like a porcupine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (ii) gne:bgo: ng da:we:wgamgo'ce | /gine:bigw-ing/ <br> /ada:we:wigamigw-ing/ | like a snake at/in the store |
| iii) kiko: ng kikong | !akikw-inej | in the kettle (diff speakers) |
| (i) nbi:na:na:nig nbi:na:bni:c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-bi:na:-na:ni-ag/ } \\ & \text { /n-bi:na:-bani-ag/ } \end{aligned}$ | we (exc.) bring them I brought them |
| (ii) bwi:n <br> e:nki:njin | ```/abwi-an/ /e:noki:-ini-d-i-an/``` | ```paddl.es he (obv.) who works``` |

Furthermore the contraction of igw with the ISA marker izi gives a short vowel,
(6) mnopgozi /minop-w-igw-izi-w/ He tastes good.
which tells us that it is the contraction of the uncontroversjal passive form that needs explaining, not the contraction of the inverse
form, which we are concerned with here. Since we distinguish the long and short contractions by ad hoc marking anyway, we will simply give the lengthening mark to the agent deleted passive construction.

On the opposite side of the ledger, our analysis of inverse forms solves a morphophonemic problem of the they inverse forms, e.g. wbi:ngowa:n 'he (obv.) brings them'. Compare the difference in the treatment of the third person plural marker wa: after suffixes ending in 5w.
(7) (a) (i) bi:na:wgẽ:
/bi:na:-war-e:n/
(that) I supposedly, bring him
(ii) bi:na:wngwẽ:
/bi:na:-wangw-e:n/
(that) we (inc.) supposedly bring him
(b) (i) bi:na:wgwa:yẽ: /bi:na:-wag-wa:-e:n/
(that) I supposedly bring them
(ii) bǐ:na:wngwa:yẽ:
/bi:na:-wangw-wa:-e:n/
(that) we (inc.) supposedly bring them
(c) (i) bi:ngowa:d /bi:n-igw-i-wa:-d/
(that) he (obv.) brings them /w-bi:n-igw-i-wa:-na/
he (obv.) brings them
The forms in (7a) show that the marker (w) angw does in fact end in a w. The form (7b) (i) shows that the third person plural marker begins with a w, and the form in (7b) (ii) shows that adjacent w's contract. But the forms of (7c) show that there must be something between the w's to prevent the contraction. This is right where our analysis predicts there should be an ISA marker, i.

Now let us return to the second apparent problem with our analysis. This has to do with the fact that there is no marking in the inverse forms for the objecthood of the derived object except in the case of forms with inanimate subjects [i.e. those exemplified in (1)]. This boils down to a simple matter of ordering Passive (58) (IIT) before OA I (52) (III) (which supplies the only other mark of objecthood
besides TSA (50) (III) in verbs with animate objects) and ordering Chomeur $\Lambda d v a n c e m e n t$ after OA I (52) (TMi). The plural marking clearly reflects the objecthood of the derived object anyway, so there can be no doubt that Chomeur Advancement has $\supseteq p$ plied. There is a quirk however. In pseudo-transitive verbs markers appear indicating animate objects. Consider the paradigm of the PT verb bwe:d 'roast s.t./s.o.' displaying these markings.
(8) (a) inanimate object

| gdabwe:n | /g(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n/ | You roast it |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ndabwe:n | /n(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n/ | I roast it |
| wdabwe:n | /w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n/ | he roasts it |
| gdabwe:na:wa: | /g(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-(a: wa:/ | You (pl.) roast it |
| gdabwe:na: | /g(d)-abwe:-ø-n-na:ni/ | we (inc.) roast it |
| ndabwe:na: | /n(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-na:ni/ | we (exc.) roast it |
| wdabwe:na:wa: | /w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-(a:)wa:/ | they roast it |
| gdabwe:nan | /g(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-n-an/ | you roast them |
| ndabwe:nan | /n(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-an | I roast them |
| wlabwe:nan | /w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-an/ | he roasts them |
| gdabwe:na:wa:n | /f(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-(a: wa:-an/ | you (pl.) roast them |
| gdabwe:na:nin | /E(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-na:ni-an/ | we (inc.) roast them |
| ndabwe:na:nin | /n(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-na:ni-an/ | we (exc.) roast them |
| wdabwe:na:wa:n | /w(d)-abwe:-ф-n-(a: )wa:-an/ | they roast them |
| (b) animate object |  |  |
| gdabwe: nan | /g(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-an/ | you roast him |
| ndabwe:nan | /n(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-n-an/ | T. roast him |
| wdabwe:nan | /w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-an/ | he roasts him (obv.) |
| gdabwe:na:wa: | /g(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-n-(a: wa: / | you (pl.) roast him |
| gdabwe:na: | /g(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-na:ni/ | we (inc.) roast him |
| ndabwe:na: | /n(d)-abwe:-¢-na:ni/ | we (exc.) roast him |
| wdabwe:na:wa:n | /w(d)-abwe:-\_-n-(a:)wa:-an/ | they roast hin (obv.) |
| gdabwe:nag | /g(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-n-ag/ | you roast thern |
| nd abwe:nag | /n(d)-abwe:- $\alpha-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{ag} /$ | I roast them |
| wdabwe:nan | /w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-an/ | he roasts them (obv.) |
| gdabwe:na:wa:g | /g(d)-abwe:-ø-n-(a:)wn:-ag/ | you (pl.) ronst them |
| gdabwe:na:nif | /E(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-na:ni-ac/ | we (inc.) roast then |
| ndabve:na:nie | /n(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-na:ni-ag/ | we (exc.) roast them |
| wdabwe:na:wa:n | /w(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-n-(a:)wa:-an/ | they roast them (obv.) |

We will treat this paradigm as containing the QDII marker in the cases involving inanimate objects (8a), but in the cases involving animate objects ( 8 b ) there is another option open to us which we will take. There is an $\underline{n}$ that appears in intransitive verbs as a link morpheme when certain suffixes follow a morpheme with a final vowel. Some examples are given in (9). Those in (9a) show the link, those in (9b) do not.
(9) (a) nda:k ${ }^{W}$ zina:ba: $/ n(d)-a: k w-i z i-n-(a:) b a n i /$ I was sick
nda:kwzina:dig
/n(d)-a:kw-izi-n-(a:)dig/ I am supposedly sick
(b) (i) n(d)a:kwimna:ba /n(d)-a:kw-izi-min-(á )bani/ $n(d) a: k^{W}$ zimna:dig $\quad / n(d)-a: k w-i z i-m i n-(a:) d i g /$ We (exc.) are supposedly sick
(ii) $a: k^{W} z i b a$
/ a:kw-izi-w-(i)bani/ he was sick
a: $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}}$ idig
/ a:kw-izi-w-(i)dig! he is supposedly sick

In fact, intransitise verbs are not the only ones that contain this link; local TA forms also show it.

| gwa:bam | /g-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-i/ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | you see me |
| gwa:bmine:ba | /g-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-i-n-(a: )bani/ |
|  | you saw me |
| gwa:bmina:dig | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \emptyset-i-n-(a:) d i g / \\ & \text { you supposedly see me } \end{aligned}$ |
| gwa:bmin | /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-in-i/ |
|  | I see you |
| gwa: bminna:ba | /g-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-in-i-n-(a:)bani/ |
|  | I saw you |
| gwa:bminna:dig | /g-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-in-i-n-(a:)diE/ |
|  | I supposedlysee you |

Of the different paradigms of verbs it is only the non-local TA verb forms that do not show the link. (Because TI verb forms already have an $\underline{n}$, the link cannot be added.)
(11)

| nwa:bma: | /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:/ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | I see him |
| nwa:bma:ba | /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-bani/ |
|  | I saw him |
| nwa:bma:dig | /n-wa:bam-Ø-a:-dig/ |
|  | I supposedly see him |
| nwa: bmig | /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i/ |
|  | he sees me |
| nwa:bmigWba | /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-bani/ |
|  | he saw me |
| nwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {Wadg }}$ | /n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-dig/ |
|  | he supposedly sees me |

So the problem is not one that has to do with our analysis of inverse verb forms as passives, but is a general problem in the morphology of non-local TA forms. This leaves us only with the problem of why forms like the first and second person singular forms of ( 8 b ), gdabwe:nan and ndabwe:nan, contain the morpheme an, while the corresponding forms of the inverse non-local, e.g. gwa:bmig and nwa:bmig, do not. If this fact is a peculiarity of non-local forms then it is a problem for our analysis. But consider the fact that this morpheme does not appear in PT verbs if any other morpheme follows the stem as the examples in (12) show.
(12) (a) gdabwe:nan
(b) gdabwe:na:wa:
gdabwe:na:
gdabwe:nag
gdabwe:na:ba
gdabwe:na:dig

$$
\begin{aligned}
& / \mathrm{g}(\mathrm{~d})-\mathrm{abwe}:-\phi-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{an} / \\
& \text { you roast him }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { /g(d)-abwe:- } \emptyset-n-(a:) w a: /
$$

you (pl.) roast him

$$
\lg (d) \text {-abwe:- } \varnothing \text {-na:ni/ }
$$

we (inc.) roast him

$$
\lg (\mathrm{d})-\mathrm{abwe}:-\varnothing-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{ag} /
$$

you roast them

$$
\text { /g(d)-abwe:- } \varnothing \text {-n-(a:)bani/ }
$$ you roasted him

/g(d)-abwe:- $\emptyset$-n-(a: )dig/ you supposedly roast him

This is in contrast to the an which marks obviation in this paradigm. wdabwe:nan /w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-an/ he roasts him (obv.)
wdabwe:na:bni:n
/w(d)-abwe:- $\varnothing$-n-(a: )bani-an/ he roasted him (obv.)
wdabwe:na:dge:nan /w(d)-abwe:-ø-n-(a:)dig-e:n-an/ he supposedly roasts him (obv.)

We therefore feel that the peculiarity of the disappearing an belongs to PT verbs, and does not, in fact, pose any problem for our analysis.

Having argued that without any modification our analysis handles inverse non-local forms as well as direct non-local forms, let us turn to consider the local paradigms.
6.2 The Local TA Paradigm. We give the local TA paradigm in (14).
(14) (a) Direct forms

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { gbi:ž } & \text { /g - bi:-n - i/ } & \text { you bring me } \\
\text { gbi:žim } & / \mathrm{g}-\mathrm{bi}:-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{mw} / & \text { you (pl.) bring me } \\
\text { gbi:žmi } & \text { /g - bi:-in-i min/ } & \text { you (sg./pl.) bring us }
\end{array}
$$

(b) Inverse forms

| gbi:nin | /g - bi:-n - in - i/ | g you |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gbi:nnim | /g - bi:-n - in - i - mw/ | I bring you (pl.) |
| gbi:ngo: | /g - bi:-n - igw - i/ | we bring you |
| bi:ngo:m | /g - bi:-n - igw - i - mw | we bring you (pl |

6.2.1 Direct Local Forms. The first thing that we notice about the direct local forms is the appearance of the object marker i. This marker appears in exactly the same position in the construction as the object markers $\underline{a m} / \mathrm{o}$ : and a : between the TSA markers [ $\underline{w}$ in (15a), $\underline{n}$ and d in (15b)] and the negative si: as shown by the examples in (15).
(15) (a) gba:škzwisi: /g-ba:škiz-w-i-si:/
you (don't) shoot me
gba:škzwa:si: /g-ba:škiz-w-a:-si:/
you (don't)shoot him
(b) ggi:we:wžisi: /g-gi:we:wi-n-i-si:/
you (don't) take me home
ggi:we:wdo:si:n /g-gi:we:wi-d-o:-si:-n/
you (don't) take it home
We therefore revise $O A . I$ (52) (IIII) as (16).
(16) Object Agreement I (revised)
(a) V $\Rightarrow \begin{array}{r}\text { V-i } /, \\ V-a:[1] \\ 2:[A N]\end{array}$
(b) $\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{OAI} /$ 2:[INAN]

The second thing we notice abuut the direct local paradigm is the number agreement markers. Our current formulation of Non-third Plural Spelling (37) (III) will supply min as a non-ergative first person plural marker, but will not supply mw as the ergative second person p.lural marker. But we notice that the allomorphs na:ni and wa: appear only where there are third person objects. Therefore we revise Nonthird Plural Spelling as (17).
(17) Non-third Plural Spelling (revised)
(a) Min $\Rightarrow \operatorname{nanin}_{\min }^{\operatorname{nan}} / \ldots$ 2:[3]
(b) MW ==> wa: / ___ 2:[3] mw

We also notice that the form gbi:žmi is marked only for the plurality of the first person. This is why we formulated the rule of Non-third plural Agreement (36) (III) as we did. But we have to revise the rule to get the first plural object to trigger agreement.
(18) Non-third Plural Agreement
(a) V $\Rightarrow$ V-MIN / T:[1PL]
(b) $\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{MW} / \ldots \ldots \mathrm{l}$ :[2PL]

Using the disjunctive ordering convention forms showing both first and second person plural will end up being marked only for first person plural.
6.2.1.1 A Historical Note. It may not be clear at this point why we choose to revise Non-third Plural Spelling (17) the way we did.

In particular the MIN clause of the original (37) (III) worked, and yet we changed it. The reason that we did is basically comparative. Therefore let us look at the development of the system in two closely related dialects.

The historical situation as reconstructed by Goddard (1967, personal communication) involves a contrast of two paradigms in transitive verbs, one used when the object is definite--the absolute, and one used when the object is indefinite--the objective.
(19) *newa:pama:hmena elenyiwa 'We look at the man.' (absolute)
*newa:pama:na:na elenyiwa 'We look at a man.' (objective)
For whatever reason the system collapsed and unified into a single paradigm, but the way that happened differs from language to language and even from dialect to dialect of the same language as we shall see.

The relevant parts of the transitive paradigms are given below.
(20) (a) IT 'see it'
absolute
we (exc.) *newa:panta:hmena we (inc.) *kewa:panta:hmena you (pl.) *kewa:panta:hmwa
(2l) (b) TA 'see him' non-local
a.bsolute
we (exc.) *newa:pama:hmena we (inc.) *kewa:pama:hmena you (pl.) *kewa:pama:hmwa
(c) TA local (no objective form)
(i) direct 'see me/us'
*kewa: pami
*kewa: pamihmwa
*kewa: pamihmena
objective
*newa: pante:na:ni
*kewa: pante:nawi
*kewa: pante:пn:wi
objective
*newa:pama:na:na
*kewa: pama:nawa
*kewa: pama:wa:wa
(ii) $\quad \begin{array}{ll}\text { inverse 'see you' } \\ & \text { *kewa:pame\&e } \\ & \text { *kewa:pame申ehmwa } \\ & \text { *kewa: pameđehmena }\end{array}$

Now let us look at how three very closely related dialects treated these forms. The dialects we will look at, fre the Central dialect which is the main topic of this work, the Eastern dialect, spoken east of the Bruce peninsula, and the dialect spoken on Parry Island (data from Rogers 1975a, 1975b), which is essentially on the border between the two dialects. ${ }^{3}$
(22) (a) TI 'see it'

Central Parry Island Eastern

```
we (exc.) nwa:bnda:na
```

we (exc.) nwa:bma:na: nwa:bma:na:n/ nwa:bma:na:n
we (inc) nwa:bma:min
gwa:bma:na:n/ gwa:bma:na:n
gwa:bma:min
gwa:bma:wa:
gwa:bma:wa:
(c) TA local
(i) direct

| gwa:bam | gwa:bam | gwa:bam |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| gwa:bmim | gwa:bmim | gwa::bmim |
| gwa:bmimi | gwa:bmimin | gwa:bmimin |

(ii) inverse

| gwa:bmin | gwa:bmin | gwa:bmin |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| gwa:bminim | gwa:bminim | gwa:bminim |
| gwa:bmigo: | gwa:bmigo: | \}gwi:bminmin |
| gwa:bmigo:m | gwa:bmigo:m |  |

Now notice what the Non-third Plural Spelling rule must be for each of of these dialects.
(23) (a) Central [=(17)]
(i) M.TN $\Rightarrow \underset{\min }{\operatorname{ma}: n i} / \ldots 2:[3]$

$$
\text { (ii) MW }=\underset{\substack{\text { mw } \\ \text { ma: }}}{2:[3]}
$$

(b) Parry Island

(c) Eastern

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) MIN } \Rightarrow \underset{\min }{\operatorname{ma}: n i} / \ldots 2:[3 \text {, ANI }] \\
& \text { (ii) MW } \Rightarrow \underset{\substack{\mathrm{mW}}}{\underset{\mathrm{wa}}{ }} \mathbf{~ 2 : [ 3 ]}
\end{aligned}
$$

This cross dialectal data supports our treatment of the allomorphy of the non-first plural morphemes as being conditioned by the person of the object, an unusual conditioning factor.
6.2.1.2 Modal Environment. There is one more quirk that involves Non-third Plural Spelling (17). When a modal morpheme, bani or dig, follows MIN, it is spelled.min, regardless of the person of the object.
(24)

> (a) nwa:bma:na:
> nwa:bma:mna:ba
> nwa:bma:mna:dig
> (b) nwa:bmig ${ }^{W_{n a}}$ na:
> nwa:bnig $\xi^{W_{m i n a}^{m}}$ :ba
/n-wa: bam- $\varnothing$-a:-na:ni/
we (exc.) sce him
/n-wa: bam- $\varnothing$-a:-min-(a:)bani/
we (exc.) saw him
/n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-na:ni/
he sees us (exc.)
/n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-min-(a:)dig
we (exc.) sunnosedly see him
he sees us (exc.)
/n-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-icw-i-min-(a:)bani/
he saw us (exc.)

| nwa:bmigwina:dig | /n-wa:bam- $\phi$-igw-i-min-(a:)dig/ <br> he supposedly sees us (exc.) |
| :---: | :---: |
| (c) nwa:bnda:na: | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni/ <br> we (exc.) see it |
| nwa:bnda:mna:ba | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n-min-(a:)bani/ <br> we (exc.) see it |
| nwa:bnda:mna:dig | /n-wa:bam-d-am-n-min-(a:)dig/ <br> we (exc.) supposedly see it |

Therefore we revise (17) as (25).
(25) Non-third Plural Spelling
(a) MIN $==>\min / \ldots$ bani
$\underset{\min }{\mathrm{na}: \mathrm{ni}^{2} / \ldots} 2:[3]$
(b) MW ==> wa: / 2:[3]
mw

### 6.2.2 Inverse Local F'orms. J'he inverse local forms appear to

 be somewhat problematic. First there is the matter of the substitution of the forms gbi:ngo: 'you are seen' and gbi.ngo:m 'you (pl.) are seen' for the expected form *gbi:nnimi /g-bi:-n-in-i-min/ (a form which is retained in dialects to the east of the dialect under discussion). We feel that the appearance or these forms in this place in the paradigm is no accident. We would like to suggest that the morpheme in that appears in the forms gbi:nin and gbi:nnim is an allomorph of the passive igw, and that the $\dot{\underline{i}}$ is the ISA $\underline{i}$ that we have discussed above in relation to the non-local inverse forms. If this is correct then the appearance of the substitute forms strengthens our position considerably, because it means that the allomorphy of in and j.gw has broken down at a weak point. The basic allomorph igw has reappeared and taken on a lengthened form, which we claimed was only different for the short contraction by an ad hoc mark. So in fact we are saying that theforms aren't so much borrowed as "rectified".
In order to get this last part of the TA paradigm we add a rule of morpheme substitution which puts in in place of igw when the object is first person singular. We will treat this rule as a spelling rule. (26) in Substitution
igW $m=$ in $/$ 2:[1SG]
Finally we need to get rid of the first person plural morpheme M.IN
In the inverse forms which we do by an at hoc morpheme deletion rule because the contrast is lost in the form allowing the second person plural to appear.
(27) MIN Deletion

MIN $\Rightarrow \emptyset$ / igW-im $\quad$ MW
This approach has one drawback. We now have to split Non-third Plural Agreement (18) into two rules to mark the verb with both MIN and MW and let the disjunctive ordering of the spelling rule (25) take care of eliminating (by not spelling) the second person morpheme MW. The second revision of Non-third Plural Agreement is given in (28) and (29).
(28) First Plural Agreement

$$
V \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{M} . \mathrm{TN} / \ldots[I P L]
$$

(29) Second Plural Agreement

$$
\mathrm{V} \not \approx \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{MW} / \ldots \quad \mathrm{l}:[2 \mathrm{PL}]
$$

The derivations of the forms gbi:nnim 'I bring you (pl.)' and gbi:ngo:m 'we bring you (pl.)' are given in (30) [on the next page] and the derivation of gbi:žmi 'you (pl.) bring us' is given in (31) [on the following page]. These derivations show how the system works.

| (30) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input to Rules | bi: | 1:[1] | 2:[2PL] | bi: | 1:[1PL] | 2:[2PL] |
|  | BRING | I | YOU(PL) | BRING | WE(E) | YOU(PL) |
| TSA (50) (III) | bi:-TSALA] | 1:[1] | 2:[2PL] | bi:-TSA[A] | 1:[1PL] | 2:[2PL] |
| Passive (58)(III) | bi:-TSA[A]-igw | CH :[1] | 1:[2PL] | bi:-TSA[A]-igw | CH:[1PL] | 1:[2PL] |
| ISA (28)(III) | bi:-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | CH:[1] | 1:[2PL] | bi:-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | $\mathrm{CH}:[1 \mathrm{PL}]$ | 1:[2PL] |
| Chomeur Advancement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Agreement (35)(III) | gbi:-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] | gbi:-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A] | 2:[1PL] | 1:[2PL] |
| First Plural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second Plural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agreement (29) | gbi:-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A]-MW | 2:[1] | 1:[2PL] | gbi:-TSA[A]-igw-ISA[A]-MIN-MW | 2:[1PL] | 1:[2PL |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ISA Spelling } \\ & (26)(\text { III }) \end{aligned}$ | gbi:nigwi-MW | 2:[1] | 1:[2PL] | gbi:nigwi-MIN-MW | 2:[1PL] | 1:[2PL] |
| MIN Deletion (27) | - |  |  | gbi:nigwi-MW | 2:[1PL] | 1:[2PL] |
| Non-third Plural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { in Substitution }}{(26)}$ | gbi:ninimw | 2:[1] | 1:[2PL] | gbinigwim |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | gbi:nnill |  |  | gbi:ngo:m |  |  |

(31)
Input to Rules
TSA (50)(III)
OA I (16)
Person Agreement (35)(III)
First Plural Agreement (28)
Second Plural Agreement (29)
TSA Spelling (46)(III)
Non-third Plural Spelling (25)
Morphophonemics

| bi: | $1:[2 P L]$ <br> YOU(PL) | WE <br> BRING |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| bi:-TSA $)$ |  |  |

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER V.I

1
The morphemic analysis represented here is slightly different from that given in Chapter III. The reasons for this new analysis will be taken up below.
${ }^{2}$ We depart from the usual reconstruction of the protosegment normally represented as ${ }^{*} \theta$, and give ${ }^{*}$, a lateral affricate, because we feel that ${ }^{*} 4$ makes more phonetic sense in terms of the reflexes of this protosegment than ${ }^{*} \theta$ does. Fe.r example, *q accounts for both the lateral character of some of the reflexes and for the obstruent character (sometimes only morphophonemically obstruent) of other reflexes.
$3^{3}$ It may be worth noting the Eastern dialect compares very closely in many of the following respects with western and northern dialects such as those reported by Baraga (1878) and Piggott and Moosup (1973).

## CHAPTER VITI

VERB AGREEMENT IITI
7.0 In this chapter we will examine and analyze the inflectional morphology of the conjunct verb system of Ojibwa. Ojibwa, like other Algonkian languages, is unusual among the languages of the world in having a dual inflectional system. One set of forms is used in independerit c.lauses and the other used in dependent and other complex constructions. The verb inflection used in the dependent contexts is called conjunct. .

In this chapter we will propose an analysis that is a radical departure from traditional analyses of Algonkian conjunct inflection. Traditionally indcpendent and conjunct verbs have been viewed as comprising two distinct systems. This was necessary because the distribution of inverse forms in the TA paradigm is radically different for independent and conjunct conjugation. However with our discovery of a well motivated passive analysis for inverse forms, we have opened the way to treating the difference between independent and conjunct forms as allomorphy, leaving the distribution of inverse forms as a problem relating to the conditions under which passivization takes place. We will call our analysis the allomorphy hypothesis. Its claims are that the independent and con.junct verb systems of Ojibwa represent a unified system. The differences between corresponding independent and con-

Junct verbs arise either from differing conditions on passivization or from allomorphic differences or both.
7.1 Conjunct Environment. The specification of the environment that triggers conjunct inflection is not simple, because while the most common use of the conjunct is in plainly embedded clauses like those in (1), there are contexts in which embedded clauses (mostly direct quote forms) have independent verb forms, as those in (2), ani there are contexts in which apparently independent clauses have dependent verbs, as those in (3).
(1) (a) ngike:nma: gi:-ni-ma:ja:d I know that he 1-KNOW-3 PAST-LEAVE-3 (conjunct)
(b) e:pi:ci-wi:sniya:ng, gi:-bi-dgošno:g WHILE-EAT-IPL (conjunct) ARR.IVE-COMING-3-PL
(c) ngi:-ža:mi e:nda:d
l-PAST-GO-PL (WHERE)-LIVE-3 (conjunct)
(d) gci-wa:ga:kwad me:njminang aw nini BIG-AXE (WHICH)-HOLD-3 THAT MAN (conjunct)
(2) (a) "gga-wi-wi:snimi," gi:-kido gi:wẽ: 12 FUT-GO-EAT-PL PAST-SAY SO-THE-STORY-GOES (independent) left.

They arrived while we were eating.
We went to his place.
(That's) a big axe that man is holding.
"Let's go eat," he said. (speaker did not personally hear him say it )
(b) bji:nag go gi:-ni-ma:ja: ndine:ndam. EPMH PAST-LEAVE-3 l-THINK

I think he just left.
A-SHORT-TIME-AGO (independent)
(3) (a) we:ne:š ga:-gi:špnado:yan? WHAT-THEN (WHICH)-PAST-BUY-2 (conjunct)

What did you buy?
(b) a:ni:š e:nnoki:d? WHICH-THEN (WHICH)-WAY-WORK-3 (conjunct)
(c) mi: sa wa:bang ji-ma:ja:yang TRULY EMPH TOMORROW FUT-MOVE-12 (conjunct)

What's his job?

We'll (inc.) go tomorrow.
(d) gi:špin daš nini da:ngnang iw, a:bdié wi:-nbod. IF MAN TOUCH-IT-3 THAT NECESSARILY FUT-DIE-3
(e) be:giš na:ji-bo:ni-gmiwang. HOPEFULLY EMPH FUT-STOP-RA.TN 3 (conjunct)
If (any) man [not woman] touches it, he shall die.
I hope it stops raining.

The apparent confusion here can be somewhat sorted out be careful syntactic analysis of the individual cases. For example, ( 2 b ) might be either a case of Slifting, or a case of a verb that requires a direct quote complement. Direct quotes are systematically treated as independent clauses. Similarly the question examples may be handled [as in Truitner and Dunnigan (1972)] as instances of clefting having conjunct verbs by virtue of being relative clauses. The truly sticky ones, however, are the cases of adverbials (and discourse contexts, unexemplified here for want of space) which trigger conjuncts. The adverbial contexts cannot even be rescued by a simple listing of the adverbs involved because next to (3d) with the adverb a:bdig, we have examples like (4) in which independent verbs appear.
(4) (a) a:bdig nwi:-bba:ya:jge: I have to go shopping (and want NECESSARTLY 1-FUT-AROUND-SHOP to).
(b) a:bdig nga-wa-noki: NECESSARTLY l-FUT-GO-WORK

I have to go to work (but don't want to).

Because of this and because of the fact that the discourse conditions which trigger the appearance of conjuncts are only poorly understood, we will simply hide our ignorance under a cover symbol, $D$, which we will use to trigger conjunct agreement, much as early tranformational grammar used $Q$ to trigger question formation.
7.2 I.I Verbs. The subject agreement marker for inanimate subjects in conjunct verbs is $g$. The distinction between singular and plural is not made.

```
(5) mca:g /mica: - }\varnothing\mathrm{ - g/ (that) it is big
    ISA IT (that) they (inan.) are big
    mškawding /miškawad - in - g/ (that) it/they is/are frozen
```

From these examples it can also be seen that the operation of ISA pre-
cedes the conjunct subject agreement rule, and the allomorphs of ISA are not affected by its operation as the examples of (6) show.
independent dependent

| Set I | špa: | /ašp-ya:-w/ | špa:g | /ašp-va,:-g/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | it is high |
| Set .II | ginde: | /agim-de:-w/ | ginde:g | /agim-de:-g/ <br> it is counted |
| Set I.II | wi:nad | /wi :n-ad-w/ | wi:nak | /wi:n-ad-g/ it is dirty |
| Set .IV | mškawdin | /miškawad-in-w/ | mškawding | /miškawad-in-g/ <br> it is frozen |
| Set V | na: ngan | /na:ng-an-w/ | na: ngang | ```/na:ng-an-g/ It is light (of weight)``` |

This fact allows us to treat the difference in the subject agreement rule as a simple allomorphy, in line with our hypothesis.
(7) Person Agreement (third person clause) (revised) [cf. (35) (III)]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{D} \ldots \mathrm{l}:[\text { INAN] } \\
& \text { w-V / E:[3] } \\
& \text { V-w / 1:[3] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore we can restrict the Absolutive Plural Agreement rule (39) (III) from operating in the context of $D$. This move will turn out to have nice consequences later in the analysis.
7.3 A.I Verbs. Below in (8) are given the independent and conjunct paradigms of gi:we:d 'go home, return.' They exemplify the morphology of the conjunct allomorphs.
(8)

| independent |  | dependent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ggi :we: | $\underset{2}{\text { /g-gi:we:/ }}$ | gi:we: yan | /gi:we:-an/ |
| ngi :we: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-gi:we:/ } \\ & \text { l } \end{aligned}$ | gi:we:ya:n | $\begin{aligned} & \text { you go home } \\ & \text { /gi:we:-a:n/ } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| gi:we: | $\begin{array}{r} \text { / gi:we:-w/ } \\ 3 \end{array}$ | gi:we:d | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I go home. } \\ & \text { /gi:we:-d/ } \end{aligned}$ |


| ggi:we:m | $\underset{2}{\lg -g i: w e-m w /} \underset{2 P L}{ } \text { gi:we:ye:g }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { /gi:we:-e:gw/ } \\ \text { 2PL } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ggi:we:mi | /g-gi:we:-min/ gi:we:yang | $\begin{aligned} & \text { you (pl.) go home } \\ & \text { /gi:we:-angw/ } \\ & \text { l(I)PL } \end{aligned}$ |
| ngi:we:mi | /n-gi:we:-min/ gi:we:ya:गg 1 IPL | $\begin{gathered} \text { we (inc.) go home } \\ \text { /gi:we:-a:Dg/ } \\ \text { l(E)PL } \end{gathered}$ |
| gi:we:wag | /gi:we:-w-ag/ gi:we:wa:d | $\begin{aligned} & \text { we (exc.) go home } \\ & \text { /gi:we:-wa:-d/ } \\ & \text { they go home } \end{aligned}$ |

The analysis of these forms seems rather straightforward if the nonthird plural suffixes are treated as portmanteau morphemes including both the subject and the number marker in one indivisible morpheme. However, while this can be made consistent with the allomorphy hypothesis, there is another possible hypothesis regarding the plural marking.
(9) Subject Omission

In conjunct environments and in the presence of non-third person plural markers, subject markers do not appear.

In fact an examination of $T A$ verbs, which we will undertake below, will show that (9) is an important principle of Ojibwa conjunct inflection. ${ }^{l}$

Now let us look at the third person plural forms. These forms appear at first to be for the allomorphy hypothesis, because in the independent form the order of morphemes is $W$ 'third subject' followed by ag 'animate plural,' but in the conjunct form the order is wa: 'third plural' followed by d 'third subject.' Clearly either the allomorphy hypothesis is wrong or one of these pairs are not allomorphs. There are several kinds of evidence independent of the allomorphy hypothesis that suggest that $a g$ and wa: are not allomorphs. First there are more complex inflectional forms which show that $\underline{d}$ and $\underline{w}$ can
be considered to fall in the same slot, and that wa: and ag do not. (10) (a) negative

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { gi:we:si:wag } & \text { /gi:we:-si:-w-ag/ } & \text { They (don't) go home. } \\
\text { gi:we:swa:d } & \text { /gi:we:-siw-wa:-d// } & \text { (that) they don't go home }
\end{array}
$$

(b) preterite

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { gi:we:bani:g } & \text { /gi:we:-w-bani-ag/ } & \text { They went home. } \\
\text { gi:we:wa:pa } & \text { /gi:we:-wa:-d-bani/ } & \text { (that) they went home }
\end{array}
$$

Second we noted in the treatment of II verbs above that the marker an 'inanimate plural' does not appear in any conjunct forms, nor does anything else appear to mark plurality. At that time we simply brushed over that fact by stating that we would ad hocly constraint the relevant part of the Absolutive Plural rule (39) (III) from applying. But now remember that both an and ag are allomorphs, assigned by the Ab solutive Plural (39) (III). Thus the treatment of ag and wa: as independent of one another allows us to say that the whole rule (39) (III) which assigns third plurals in independent forms does not operate in conjunct environments. Instead, there is a special, independent (and independently ordered) rule which assigns wa: as '3rd plural' in the context of D. 3,4
(11) Third Plural Conjunct Agreement

$$
V \Rightarrow V-w a: \quad / D^{l} \quad l:[3 P L, A N]
$$

Now we can revise Person Agreement (35) (III) and (7) as (12).
(12) Person Agreement (revised)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (a) } V=\Rightarrow \text { V-an / D_l:[2] }{ }^{5} \\
& \text { g-V / ...:[2] } \\
& \text { (b) } V=\Rightarrow \text { V-a:n / D_l:[l] } \\
& \text { n-V / _1:[1] }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (c) } \mathrm{V}=\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{D} \ldots \text { 1:[.INAN] } \\
& \text { V-d / D 1:[3] } \\
& \text { w-v / E:[3] } \\
& \text { V-w / 1:[3] }
\end{aligned}
$$

We can still use first Plural (28) (VI) and Second Plurnl (29) (VI) as they stand by simply revising Non-third Plural Spelling (25) (VI) as (13).
(13) Non-third Plural Spelling (revised)

(b) MW == e:gw /D
wa: / 2:[3]
mw
Finally we attempt a preliminary formalization of Subject Omission (9).
(14) Subject Omission
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{an} \\ \mathrm{a}: \mathrm{n}\end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow \varnothing / \ldots 1:[1 / 2 \mathrm{PL}]$
Now let us recap the order in the block of agreement rules adding the new rules and new versions of old rules [cf. (19c) (.IV)].
(15) Inanimate Obviation (18) (III)

Third Plural Conjunct (11)
Person Agreement (12)
First Plural (28) (VI)
Second Plural (29) (VI)
Ergative Plural (38) (I.II)
Modal Attachment (22) (I.II)
Dubitative Attachment (23) (IIf)
Absolutive Plural (39) (.II. )

The rule Third Plural conjunct must precede Person Agreement (12) to get the morpheme order wa:-d which we see in gi:we:wa:d in (8). 7.4 TI Verbs. In (16) are given the independent and conjunct paradigms of wa:bndang 'see s.t.'. They exemplify the morphology of the conjunct allomorphs.
independent

| gwa:bnda:n | /g-wa:bam-d-am-n/ 2 OAI OAII $\quad$ you see it |
| :---: | :---: |
| nwa:bnda:n | $\underset{2}{\text { /n-wa:bam-d-am-n/ OAI OAII }}$ O see it |
| wwa:bnda:n | /w-wa:bam-d-am-n/  <br> 3 OAI OAII he sees it |
| gwa:bnda:na:wa: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)wa:/ you (pl.) see it } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| gwa:bnda:na: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lg-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni/ we (inc.) see it } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| nwa:bnda:na: | ```/n-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni/ we (exc.) see it``` |
| wwa:bnda:na:wa: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /w-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)wa:/ they see it } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| conjunct |  |
| wa:bndaman | /wa:bam-d-am-an/ (that)you see it OAI 2 |
| wa: bndama:n | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /wa:bam-d-am-a:n/ (that) I see it } \\ & \text { OAI } 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| wa: bndang | /wa:bam-d-am-d/ (that)he sees it OAI 3 |
| wa: bndame:g | /wa:bam-d-am-e:gw/ (that) you (pl.) see it |
| wa: bndamang | /wa:bam-d-am-angw/ (that) we (inc.) see it OAI 1 (I)PL |
| wa:bndama:ng | /wa:bam-d-am-a:ng/ (that)we (exc.) see it OAI 1 (E)PL |

wa:bndamwa:d
/wa: bam-d-am-(i)wa:-d/ (that) they see it OAI 3PL 3

The only modification of our system necessary to handle these forms is to limit OA II (43) (III) not to apply in conjunct environments. In addition we note that the allomorph d supplied by Person Agreement (12) marking third person subject has a variant $g$ when it appears in the phonological environment of a preceding consonant. Therefore we propose a rule of $g$ substitution (17).
(17) g substitution
$\mathrm{d} \Rightarrow \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ $\qquad$
It seems like this is a reasonable thing to do as opposed to writing the allomorphy into Person Agreement (12) because some speakers alternate $\underline{d}$ and $g$ freely in the context of the negative plus obviative. (18) nba:swinid /niba:-siw-ini-d/ (that) he (obv.) is not asleep nba:swinig /niba:-siw-ini-g/

Frinally we note froin the forms in (19) that there is no marker in the conjunct to indicate the plurality of the object. This follows from the restriction we placed on Absolutive Plural in $\$ 7.2$ where we limited the application of the rule to non-conjunct environments to account for the neutralization of plurality in conjunct forms of II verbs.
(19)
independent gwa:bnda:nan /g-wa:bam-d-am-n-an/ 2 OAI OAII 3PL
nwa:bnda: nan
/n-wa:bam-d-am-n-an/
$1 \quad$ OAI OAII 3PL
wwa: bnda: nan
/w-wa:bam-d-am-n-an/
33
OAI CAII 3PL
conjunct
wa:bndaman
/wa:bam-d-am-an/
OAI ?
you see them (inan.)
wa: bndama:n
/wa:bam-d-am-a:n/
OAI 1
I see them (inan.)
wa: bndarg
/wa: bam-d-am-d/
OAI 3
he sees them (inan.)

```
gwa:bnda:na:wa:n
/g-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)wa:-an/
    2 OAI OAII 2PL 3PI.
gwa:bnda:na:nin
/g-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni-an/
    2 OAI OAII IPL 3PL
nwa:bnda:na:nin
/n-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni-an/
/n-wa:bam-d-am-n-na:ni-an/
wwa:bnda:na:wa:n
/w-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)wa:-an/
Mw-wa:bam-d-am-n-(a:)wa:-an/
gwa: bnda:na:wa:n
```

wa: bndame:g
/wa:bam-d-am-e:gw/ OAI 2PL
you (pl.) see them (inan.)
wa: bndamajg
/wa:bam-d-am-angw/ OAI l(I)PL
we (inc.) see them (inan.)
wa: badama: गg
/wa:bam-d-am-a:ng/ OAI l(E)PL
we (exc.) see them (inan.)
wa: bndamwa:d
/wa:bam-d-am-(i)wa:-d/ OAI 3PL 3
they see them (inan.)
7.5 TA Verbs. In this section we will work our way through the conjunct paradigm of an example TA verb wa:bma:d 'see s.o.', examinıng it part by part to see that TA conjunct morphology is also analyzable in an insightful way using the allomorphy hypothesis.
7.5.1 Third Person Object Forms. The forms involving third person singular objects are given in (20).
independent

| ywa:bma: | $\begin{gather*} \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a: / }  \tag{20}\\ 2 \end{gather*}$ | you see him |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nwa:bma: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /n-wa:bam- } \phi \text {-a:/ } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | I see him |
| wwa:bma:n | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /w-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-an/ } \\ & 3 \text { OAI OBV } \end{aligned}$ | he sees him (obv.) |
| gwa:bma:wa: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-wa:/ } \\ & 2 \text { OAI lPL } \end{aligned}$ | you (pl.) see him |
| gwa:bma:na: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-na:ni/ } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | we (inc.) see him |
| nwa: bma:na: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-na:ni/ } \\ & 1 \quad \text { OAT lPL } \end{aligned}$ | we (exc.) see him |
| wwa:bma:wa:n | $\begin{gathered} \text { /w-wa:bam- } \phi-a:-w a:-a n / \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | they see him (obv.) |

conjunct

| wa:bmad | $\begin{gathered} / \text { wa:bam- } \phi-\mathrm{a}:-\mathrm{ad} / \\ \text { OAI } 2 \end{gathered}$ | (that) you see him |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wa:bmad | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \phi-\mathrm{a}:-\mathrm{ag} / \\ \text { OA.I } \end{gathered}$ | (that) I see him |
| wa:bma:d | $\begin{array}{r} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing-\mathrm{a}:-\mathrm{d} / \\ \text { OA.I } 3 \end{array}$ | (that) he sees him |
| wa:bme:g | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-e:Ew/ } \\ \text { OAI 2PL } \end{gathered}$ | (that) you (pl.) see him |
| wa:bmang | $\begin{array}{r} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-angw/ } \\ \text { OAI 1(I)PL } \end{array}$ | (that) we (inc.) see him |
| wa:bmangid | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-angia/ } \\ & \text { OAI l(E)PI } \end{aligned}$ | (that) we (exc.) see him |
| wa:bma:wa:d | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-wa:-d/ } \\ \text { OAI 3PL } 3 \end{gathered}$ | (that) they see him |

The analysis of these forms requires only two minor revisions of our current analysis. The first is the recognition of a hitherto unnoticed morphophonemic proccss which deletes the a: marking third person object when the following morpheme starts with a vowel. The evidence that this is phonological comes from the negative and dubitative versions of the relevant forms. (In the dubitative a $w$ is inserted before vowel initial person/number suffixes.)

| (21) ( $\varepsilon_{1}$ | wa:bmag <br> wa:bma:wgẽ: <br> wa:bma:swag | ```/wa:bam-ø-a:-ag/ (that) I see him /wa: bam- \(\varnothing\)-a:-(w)ag-e:n/ (that) I supposedly see him /wa:bam- \(\varnothing\)-a:-siw-ag/ (that) I don't see him``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (b) | wa:bmad wa:bma:wdẽ: wa:bma:swad | /wa:bam-a-a:-ad/ <br> (that) you see him <br> /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-(w)ad-e:n/ <br> (that) you supposedly see him <br> /wa:bam- $\emptyset-\mathrm{a}:-$ siw-ad/ <br> (that) you don't see him |
| (c) | wa: bmang | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /wa: bam- } \emptyset-a:- \text {-angw/ } \\ & \quad \text { (that) we (inc.) see him } \end{aligned}$ |

> wa:bma:wฤgidẽ: /wa:bam- $\emptyset$-a:-(w)angid-e:n/
> (that) we (exc.) supposedly see him wa:bma:swang /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-siw-angw/
> (that) we (exc.) don't see him
> (d) wa:bmaクgid /wa:bam-ø-a:-angid/
> (that) we (exc.) see him
> wa:bma:wクgidẽ: /wa:bam-Ø-a:-(w)angid-e:n/
> (that) we (exc.) supposedly see him
> wa:bma:swaクgid /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-siw-angid/
> (that) we (exc.) don't see him
> (e) wa:bme:g /wa:bam-ø-a:-e:gw/
> (that) you (pl.) see him
> wa:bma:we:gwẽ: /wa:bam- $\varnothing-\mathrm{a}:-(\mathrm{w}) \mathrm{e}: \mathrm{gw-e}: \mathrm{n} /$
> (that) you (pl.) supposedly see him wa:bma:swe:g /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-siw-e:gw/
> (that) you (pl.) don't see him

The second revision of our analysis involves the allomorphy of $a: n / a g$ ＇first person（subject）＇，an／ad＇second person（subject）＇，and a：ng／angid ＇first person（exc．）plural＇． 7 We postpone until a later section the revision of the affected rules until we have discussed all the instances of each allomorph．

Finally we note that in this paradigm two regularities of the conjunct that we have noted before reappear．First there is no mark for the obviation of objects in the conjunct．This mark in independent forms is an which is supplied by Absolutive Plural（39）（II．I）．We have twice noticed that（39）（III）does not operate in conjunct environments．Here again that restriction explains another difference between independent and conjunct verbs．The sec ond regularity here is that subjects are un－ marked in the we（inc．）and we（exc．）forms and in the you（pl．）form in accordance with Subject Omission（？！）．

The forms involving third person plural objects are given in（२२）． independent
gwa：bma：g
／g－wa：bam－$\varnothing$－a：－ag／you see them
20 OAI 3PL

| nwa:bma:g | $\begin{gathered} \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-ag/ } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | I see them |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wwa:bme:n | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /w-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-an/ } \\ & 30 \text { OAI OBV } \end{aligned}$ | he sees them (obv.) |
| gwa:bma:wa:g | $\begin{gathered} \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-wa•-ag/ } \\ 20 \text { OAI PPL 3PL } \end{gathered}$ | y.ou (pl.) see them |
| gwa:bma:na:nig | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-na:ni-ag/ } \\ & 20 \text { OA.I 1PL 3PL } \end{aligned}$ | we (inc.) see them |
| nwa:bma:na:nig | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-na:ni-ag/ } \\ & \perp \quad \text { OAI 1PL 3PL } \end{aligned}$ | we (exc.) see them |
| wwa:bma:wa:n | /w-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-wa:-an/ 3 OAI 3PL OBV | they see them (obv.) |
| conjunct |  |  |
| wa: bmadwa: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-ad-wa:/ } \\ \text { OAI } 2 \text { 3PL } \end{gathered}$ | (that) you see them |
| wa:bmagwa: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-ag-wa:/ } \\ \text { OA.I l 3PL } \end{gathered}$ | (that) I see them |
| wa:bma:wa:d | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam-ф-a:-wa:-d/ } \\ \text { OAI 3PL } 3 \end{gathered}$ | (that) he sees them |
| wa: bme:gwa: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-e:gw-wa:/ } \\ \text { OAI 2PL 3PL } \end{gathered}$ | (that) you (pl.) see them |
| wa:bma Пgwa: | /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-angw-wa:/ OAI 1(I)PL 3PL | (that) we (inc.) see them |
| wa:bmangdwa: | /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-angid-wa:/ OAI 1(E)PL 3PL | (that) we (exc.) see them |
| wa:bma:wa:d | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-a:-wa:-d/ } \\ \text { OAI 3PL } 3 \end{gathered}$ | (that) they see them |

At this point a substantial revision of the rule of Person Agreement (12) is necessary. In the present version the agreements of first, second, and third person are all clauses of the same rule. But the forms in (22) show that while the first and second person markers appear before the wa: marking third plural, the third person marker appears after the wa:. Thus we have to split Person Agreement (12) into
two rules one ordered before the rule(s) sufplying wa: and one afterwards. Before modifying Person Agreement, we will revise the rules supplying wa:. We currently have two rules, Third Plural Conjunct (ll) and Ergative Plural (38) (.III). We will revise Third Plural Conjunct so that it supplies wa: in the presence of both third plural subjects and third plural objecis. This is the same thing that we did to account for the marking of first plural in First Plural (28) (VI). ${ }^{8}$
(23) Third Plural Conjunct (revised)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V} \text {-wa: / D } \mathrm{T}:[3 \mathrm{PL}, \mathrm{AN}]
$$

Now we are ready to revise and reorder Person Agreement. The revision is given in (24) and (25). In addition we will propose a version of a spelling rule to account for the new allomorphs.
(24) Non-third Person Agreement
(a) $\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{AN} / \mathrm{D}$ $\qquad$ 1:[2] g-V / 1:[2]
(b) $\mathrm{V}==>\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}: \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{D}$ $\qquad$ 1:[1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{V} \text { / } \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\qquad$
(25) Third Person Agreement

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{D} \ldots \mathrm{l}: \text { [INAN] } \\
& \text { V-d / D__1:[3] } \\
& \text { w-V / E:[3] } \\
& \text { V-w / 1:[3] }
\end{aligned}
$$

(26) Non-third Person Spelling

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (a) AN } \Rightarrow \text { ad } / \text { an } \quad 2:[3 \mathrm{AN}] \\
& \text { (b) } A: N \Rightarrow \text { ag } \Rightarrow \quad 2:[3 \mathrm{AN}]
\end{aligned}
$$

$a: n$

It is worth mentioning at this point that Non-third Plural Spelling (13) also has clauses sensitive to third person objects. Even more to the point the version of Non-third Plural Spelling (23c) which appears in the Eastern dialect is also sensitive to the (grammatical) animacy of the object.

Now we are ready to order the rules. The crucial forms for showing the ordering of the new agreement rules contain the morpheme bani attached by Modal Agreement (22) (IIII).
(27) (a) wa:bmagra:ba /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-ag-wa:-bani/ (that) I saw them

OAI 1 3PL $\quad$ (that) he saw them
(b) wa:bma:wa:pa /wa:bam- $\begin{gathered}\text {-a:-wa:-d-bani/ } \\ \text { OAI 3PL } 3\end{gathered}\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { (that) they saw him } \\ \text { (that) they saw them }\end{array}\right.$

These forms show that the order of the agreement rules must be as in
(28) [cf. (15)].
(28) Inanimate Obviation (18) (III)

Non-third Person Agreement (24)
First Plural (28) (VI.)
Second Plural (29) (VI)
Third Plural Conjunct (23)
Ergative Plural (38) (II.I.)
Third Person Agreement (25)
Modal Attachment (2.2) (I.II)
Dubitative Attachment (23) (I.II)
Absolutive Plural (39) (I.II)
Finally notice that our formulation of Third Plural Conjunct (23) accounts for the fact that forms like wa:bma:wa:d /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-wa:-d/ are three ways ambiguous. Such forms refer equally to plural subjects and singular objects, plural objects and singular subjects, and to plural object and plural subject.s. By having only one rule we get the effect of having only one mark appear in the case where both subject and object are plural. In the conjunct forms with plural objects the absolutive plural marker ag does not appear, again due to the restriction on Absolutive Plural (39) (I.II) that it does not operate in conjunct
environments.
At this point there is a construction that we are ready to examine which will be further evidence for the treatment of $\underline{d}$ and suffixal $\underline{w}$ as allomorphs. This construction is called the participle and functions as a kind of relative clause. In this construction plurality and obviation are marked by Absolutive Plural (39) (III) rather than by Third Plural Conjunct (23). Examples are given in (29).
(29) (a) changed conjunct
ga:-wa:bma:wa:d the ones who saw him
/change - gi: - wa:bam - $\emptyset$ - a: - wa: - d/
(b) ga:-wa:bma:jig the ones who saw him
/change - gi: - wa:bam - $\emptyset$ - a: - d - i - ag/
(WHO) PAST SEE TSA $3 \quad 3$ PPL 3PL
The three final morphemes of (29b) exactly parallel the three final morphemes of (30).

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { gi:-go:zwibni:g } & \text { They were hanging/sitting. }  \tag{30}\\
\text { /gi: ago:zo }- \text { w }-(i) \text { bani }- \text { ag/ } \\
\text { PAST HANG } 3 & \text { PRET } 3 P L
\end{array}
$$

Some speakers also get forms like (31) which prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that wa: and ag are not allomorphs.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { ga:-wa:bma:wa:jig the ones who saw them }  \tag{31}\\
& \text { /change - gi: - wa:bam - } \emptyset \text { - a: - wa: - d - i - ag/ }
\end{align*}
$$

In addition most speakers get forms like (32) with explicit obviatives more easily. These show essentially the same thing, assuming that an and ag are supplied by the same rule.
ga:-wa:bma:wa:jin the one(s) (obv.) who saw them
/change - gi: - wa: bam - $\emptyset$ - a: - wa: - d - i - an/
(WHO) PAST SEE TSA $\begin{gathered}3 \\ \text { obj }\end{gathered} \quad 3 \mathrm{PL} \begin{gathered}3 \\ \\ \end{gathered}$

In this study we will not explore the semantic difierences between changed conjuncts and participles, both of which may be used in relative clauses of most types.
7.5.2 First Person Object Forms. Now let us turn to the portion of the TA conjunct paradigm that has first person singular objects.


The major difference between the independent and conjunct forms in this paradigm is that in the independent forms passive must apply as we discussed in Chapter V.I but in the conjunct passivization in such forms is impossible as the forms in (34) show.
(34) (a)

| (i) | ${ }^{*}$ wa:bmig ${ }^{\text {W }}$ yag | */wa: bam- $\emptyset$-igw-i-ag/ | (that) I am seen by him |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PASS ISA 1 |  |
| (ii) | wa:bmag | /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-ag/ | (that) I see him |
| (iii) nwa:bmig |  | /n-we:bam-ดூ-ich-i/ | I am seen by him (=he sees me) |
|  |  | 1 PASS ISA |  |
| (iv)(b) | nwa:bma: | /n-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-a:/ | I see him |
|  |  | 1 OA.T |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| (i) *wa: bmig ${ }^{\text {w }}$ ya厄wa: |  | */wa:bam- $\emptyset$-igw-i-ag-wa:/ | (that) I am seen by them |
|  |  | PASS ISA 1 3PL |  |
| (ii) | wa: bmagwa: | /wa:ban- $\emptyset-\mathrm{a}=-\mathrm{ag}-\mathrm{wa}$ / | (that) I see them |
|  |  | DA.T 1 3PL |  |


| (iii) nwa:bmigo:g | /n-wa:bam- $\emptyset$-igw-i-ag/ | I am seen by them |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | PASS ISA 3PL |
| (iv) nwa:bma:g | /n-wa:bam- $\emptyset-a:-a g /$ | I see see me) them |
|  | 1 | OAI 3PL |

The ungrammatical conjunct passives in (34) are constructed on a parallel with their independent counterparts but are hopelessly ungrammatical. This difference in passivizability is the only difference between the independent and conjunct forms of (33) outside of the allomorphies which we have already discussed. The agreement morphemes in the conjunct forms in (33) are all supplied straightforwardly by the current versions of the agreement and spelling rules we have. This is shown by the derivations of these forms in (35) [on the next page].

The forms involving first person exclusive plural are given in
(36). The forms in parentheses are used on Walpole.
(36) independent

| gwa:bmimi | /g-wa:bam- $\phi$-i-min/ 2 OAI 1PL $\quad$ you see us |
| :---: | :---: |
| nwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {na }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-na:ni/ he sees us (exc.) } \\ & \text { l } \\ & \text { PASS ISA IPL } \end{aligned}$ |
| gwa:bmimi | /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-i-min/ 2 OAI lPL $\quad$ you (pl.) see us |
| nwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {na }}$ :nig | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-na:ni-ag/ they see us } \\ & \text { l } \quad \text { PASS ISA 1PL 3PL } \\ & \text { (exc.) } \end{aligned}$ |
| conjunct |  |
| wa:bmiya: गg | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /wa: bam- } \varnothing \text {-i-a:ng/ } \\ & \text { OA.I } 1(\mathrm{E}) \mathrm{PL} \\ & \text { (that) you see us (exc.) } \end{aligned}$ |
| wa:bmiyगgid <br> (wa:bmiymingid | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /wa:bam-ด̣-i-angid/ } \\ & \text { OA.I l(E)PL } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \emptyset \text {-i-amingid/) } \\ \text { OAI l(E)PL } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | (that) he sees us (exc.) |

(a)

| Input to rules | wa: bam | 2:[1] | 1: [2] | wa: bam | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEE | I | YOU | SEE | I | YOU (PL) |
| TSA (50) (I.L.L) | wa: bam-TSA[A] | 2:[1] | 1: [2] | wa: bam-TSA[A] | 2:[1] | I: [2PL] |
| OA I (16) (VI) | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i | 2:[1] | 1:[2] | wa:bam-TSA[A]-i | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| Non-third Person (24) | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i-AN | 2:[1] | 1: [2] | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i-AN | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| Second Plural (29) (VII) | -- |  |  | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i-AN-MW | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| TSA Spelling (36) (IIT) | wa: bami-AN | 2:[1] | 1: [2] | wa: bami-AN-MW | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| Subject Omission (14) | -- |  |  | wa:bami-MW | 2:[1] | $1:[2 P L]$ |
| Non-third Person Spelling (26) | wa:bamian | 2:[1] | 1: [2] | -- |  |  |
| Non-third Plural Spelling (13) | -- |  |  | wa: bamie:gw | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| Morphophonemics | wa: bmiyan |  |  | wa:bmiye:g |  |  |
| (b) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Input to rules | wa: bam | 2:[1] | 1: [3] | wa: bam | 2:[1] | I: [3PL] |
|  | SEE | I | HE | SEE | I | THEY |
| TSA (50) (IIT.L) | wa: bam-TSA[A] | 2:[1] | 1: [3] | wa: bam-TSA[A] | 2:[1] | I: [2PL] |
| OA I (16) (VI) | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i | 2:[1] | 1: [3] | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| Third Plural Conjunct (23) | -- |  |  | wa: bam-TSA[A]-iwa: | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| Third Person (25) | wa: bam-TSA[A]-id | 2:[1] | 1: [3] | wa:bam-TSA[A]-iwa:d | 2:[1] | 1: [2PL] |
| TSA Spelling (46) (III) | wa: bamid |  |  | wa: bamiwa: d |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | wa:bmid |  |  | wa:bmiwa:d |  |  |

wa:bmiya:ng
wa:bmiyŋgidwa:
(wa:bmiymingdwa:

> /wa: bam- $\varnothing$-i-a:ng/
> OA.I 1 (E)PL
> (that) you (pl.) see us (exc.)

> /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-i-angid-wa:/ OAI 1(E)PL 3PL
/wa:bam- $\varnothing$-i-amingid-wa:/)
OA.I l(E)PL 3PL
(that) they see us (exc.)

Again our analysis accounts for all the forms in this paradigm with the exception of the allomorphs of the rirst (exc.) plural morpheme. We are finally ready to revise Non-third Plural Spelling (13) as (37') for

Walpole speakers and (37) for other speakers.
(37) Non-third Plural Spelling
(a) MIN $\Rightarrow$ angw $/ \mathrm{D}$
angid / D__T:[3 AN]
a:ng / D _
$\min / \quad-\quad$ bani
na:ni / _ 2:[3]
$\min$
(b) $M W=\Rightarrow$ e:gw / D $\qquad$ wa: / 2:[3]
mw
(37') Non-third Spelling (Walpole version)
(a) M.IN ==> angw / D $\quad$ :[21]
amingid / D _ 1:[3 AN]
angid / D 2:[3 AN]
$\min / \quad=\begin{aligned} & \text { gani } \\ & \text { dig }\end{aligned}$
na:ni / 2:[3]
$\min$
(b) same a: (37b)

The most notable thing about this paradigm in (36) is the application of Subject Omission (14). Until we saw this paradigm we had no crucial evidence for deciding between an analjsis of the markers e:gw 'second plural', angw 'first (inc.) plural', a:ng and angid 'first (exc.) plural' as portmanteau morphemes including the subject marker versus an analysis involving the deletion of the subject marker. Looking ahead to this data we proposed a deletion analysis from the outset, now we have the first evidence for the correctness of this choice. Consider the derivation of the forms wa:bmangid 'we (exc.) see him' and wa:bmiyngid 'he sees us (exc.)' in (38) [on the next page]. Onily an analysis involving the deletion of the subject marker will account for the form wa: bmiyngid.
7.5.3 Second Person Object Forms. Now let us examine the portion of the TA conjunct paradigm involving second person singular objects. As we saw with the conjunct forms involving first person objects, passivization triggered by the person hierarchy does not apply in conjunct environments. Therefore the forms given in (39) are the only forms that have superficial second person objects. Again the forms that are used on Walpole are given in parentheses.
independent

| gwa:bmin | $\begin{align*} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \phi \text {-in-i/ }  \tag{39}\\ & 2 \quad \text { PASS ISA } \end{align*}$ | I see you |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gwa:bmig | $\begin{gathered} \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i/ } \\ 2 \quad \text { PASS ISA } \end{gathered}$ | he sees you |
| gwa:bmigo: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i/ } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | we see you |

(38)

| Input to rules | wa: bam | 1: [1PL] | 2:[3] | wa: bim | 1:[3] 2:[IPL] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEE | WE(E) | HE | SEE | $\mathrm{HE} \mathrm{WE}(\mathrm{E})$ |
| TSA (50) (I.I.I) | wa: bam-TSA[A] | I: [1PL] | 2:[3] | wa:bam-TSA[A] | 1:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| Object Agreement I (16) (VI) | wa: bam-TSA[A]-2: | 1:[1PL] | 2:[3] | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i | 1:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| Non-third Agreement (24) | wa: bam-TSA[A]-a:-A:N | 1:[1PL] | 2:[3] | -- |  |
| First Plural (28) (VI) | wa: ham-TSA[A]-a:-A : N-MTN | 1:[1PL] | 2:[3] | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i-MIN | 1:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| Third Perscn Agreement (25) | -- |  |  | wa: bam-TSA[A]-i-MIN-d | I:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| TSA Spelling (4ó) (III. | wa: hares: - : N-MIN | 1:[1PL] | 2:[3] | wa:bami-M.TN-d | 1:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| Subject Omission (14) | wa: bama: -M.N | 1:[1PL] | 2:[3] | wa: bami-MIN | 1:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| Non-third Plural Spelling (37) | wa: bema: ancid | 1:[1PL] | 2:[3] | wa:bamiangid | 1:[3] 2:[1PL] |
| Morphonemies | wa:bmangid |  |  | wa:bmiymgid |  |



The fact that these forms have second person objects requires us to revise Object Agreement I (16) (VI) to provide the marks of this that we find in the forms of (39). The marking is done by two allomorphs inin and ik. (On Walpole the allomorphs are in and ik.) The allomorph ik is used when there is a third person subject. ${ }^{9}$ What is unusual with this is that when ik is used the third person subject marker d does not appear. Rather than delete it by an ad hoc rule we will resort to an abstract morpheme $\underline{D}$ and bring it in as a zero spelling. In addition we will include the $g$ spelling we had accounted for by $g$ substitution (17). Thus we revise Third Person Agreement (25) slightly as (40), and give the spelling rule (41).
(40) Third Person Agreement (revised)

$$
\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{D} \ldots \mathrm{l}:[\text { INAN }]
$$

$$
\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{D} \text { i D__ l:[3] }
$$

$$
\mathrm{w}-\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{E}:[3]
$$

V-w / 1:[3]
(41) Third Person Spelling


Our revision of Object Agreement I (16) (VI) to include second person object is given in (42).
(42) Object Agreement I (revised)

$$
V \Rightarrow V-O A I \quad / \ldots \quad 2:[\text { INAN }]
$$

V-ININ / ___ 2:[2]

$$
\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{i} \quad / \ldots \quad 2:[1]
$$

$$
\text { V-a: } / \text { ___ } 2:[3]
$$

To get the allomorphy of ININ we give the spelling rule (43) [(43') for Walpole].
(43) ININ Spelling

ININ $\Rightarrow$ inin $/ \ldots$ 2:[2 PL $]^{1 l}$ ik / _ 1:[3] inin
(43') ININ Spelling (Walpole)
ININ $\Rightarrow$ inin $/ \ldots 2:[21]^{12}$
ik
in
Little more need be said regarding the substituted form wa:bmigo:yan. Even if the independent form arose by morphemic pressure to reduce allomorphy as we suspect, synchronically this form funcions as a simple intransitive verb and forms its conjunct accordingly. But let us at least look at the eastern dialect forms which do not have the substitution.
(44)
independent

These forms are exactly what our analysis predicts for these points in the paradigm.

One comment about the morpheme ININ is in order. Bloomfield (1957) and others have treated the morphemes in 'passive' and in(in) 'second person (object)' as allomorphs of the same morpheme. They are almost certainly historically related, but trying to join them synchronically would complicate the analysis considerably. In addition, we would like to point out that in the subdialect which has inin throughout the conjunct, there is no independent form (or variant form) showing inin.

The final part of the TA paradigm left to examine involves those forms with second person plural object. This includes both simple second person plural forms given in (45a(i),b(i)) and first inclusive plural forms given in (45a(ii), b(ii)) which 0jibwa treats as secord person forms in many respects. Again the Walpole data is in parentheses.
(45) (a) independent
(i) gwa:bminim
/g-wa: bam- $\not \mathbf{-}$-in-i-mw/
PASS ISA 2PL /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-wa:/ he sees you
2 PASS ISA 2PL $\begin{array}{cc}\text { /g-wa:bam- } \phi-i g w-i-m w / & \text { we see you } \\ 2 & \text { PASS ISA 2PL }\end{array}$ /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-wa:-ag/ they see you 2 PASS ISA 2PL 3PL (pl.)
(ii) gwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {Wha: }}$
/g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-na:ni/ he see us
PASS ISA IPL
(inc.)
gwa:bmig ${ }^{\text {Wha:nig }}$
/g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-na:ni-ag/ they see us
PASS ISA IPL 3PL
(b) conjunct
(i) wa:bminnagog
/wa:bam- $\varnothing$-inin-agogw/
OA.I 2PL
(wa:bmingog
/wa:bam- $\varnothing$-in-agogw/)
OAI 2PL
(that) I see you (pl.)
wa:bminne:g
/wa:bam- $\varnothing$-inin-e:gw/
OAI 2PL
(wa:bmine:g
/wa:bam- $\varnothing$-in-e:gw/)
OAI 2PL
(that) he sees you (pl.)
wa:bmigo:ye:g /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i-e:gw/
PASS ISA 2PL
(that)we (exc.) see you (pl.)
wa:bminne:gwa: /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-inin-e:gw-wa:/
OAI 2PL 3PL
(wa:bmine:gwa:
(ii) wa:bminnang
/wa:bam- $\varnothing$-inin-angw/
OAI 1(I)PL
(that)he sees us (inc.)
wa:bminnangwa: /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-inin-angw-wa:/
OAI l(I)PL 3PL
(that) they see us (inc.)
These forms require us to modify our analysis slightly in two
ways. First these forms have e:gw marking the plurality of the object. This means that we will have to revise Second Plural Agreement
(29) (VI) to be sensitive to both subjects and objects.
(46) Second Plural Agreement (revised)

$$
\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{MW} / \ldots \quad \mathrm{T}:[2 \mathrm{PL}]
$$

This draw Second Plural Agreement (46) in line with First Plural (28) (VI) and Third Plural Conjunct (23), both of which are triggered by
the plurality of subjects or objects equally.
The second revision involves the allomorph agogw. Rogers (1975b) analyzes it as consisting of two morphemes, ag 'first person (subject)' plus an allomorph of e:gw 'second plural'. This analysis at first seems reasonable until we realize that that would make this the only exception to Subject Omission (14). Since we in any case need to resort to an ad hoc allomorphy to account for the form there is no sense in making it an exception to a well motivated rule too. Therefore we revise Non-third Plural Spelling (37) as (47).
(47) Non-third Plural Spelling
(a) MIN clause same as (37a)
(b) MW ==> agogw / D_1:[1 SG]
e:gw / D
wa: / 2:[3]
mw
Finally to tie up the last loose ends our current formalizetion of Subject Omission (14) does not include the fact that we have revised our analysis in favor of abstract morphemes as the created markers of subject agreement in conjunct verbs. We revise (14) as (48) taking this into account.
(48) Subject Omission (revised)
$\underset{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{AN}} \mathrm{N},\} \Rightarrow \emptyset / \ldots \mathrm{T}:[1 / 2 \mathrm{PL}]$
7.6 Passive Forms. The final paradigm left to consider is the passive paradigm, which we give in (49).
(49) independent
gwa:bmigo: /g-wa:bam- $\varnothing$-igw-i/ you are seen


| nwa:bmigo: | $\begin{gathered} \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i/ } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| wa: bma: | / wa:bam- $\varnothing-\mathrm{a}: \begin{gathered}-w / \\ 3\end{gathered}$ he is seen |
| gwa:bmigo:m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-mw/ } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| gwa:bmigo:mi | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /g-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-min/ we (inc.) are seen } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| nwa:bmigo:mi | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /n-wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-j.gw-i-min/ we (exc.) are seen } \\ & \text { l } \quad \text { PASS ISA 1PL } \end{aligned}$ |
| wa:ba:wag | / wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-w-ag/ they are seen |
| conjunct |  |
| wa:bmigo:yan | /wa: bam- $\emptyset$-igw-i-an/ (that) you are seen PASS ISA 2 |
| wa:bmigo:ya:n | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-a:n/ (that) I am seen } \\ \text { PASS ISA } 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| wa:bmind | /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-ind/ (that) he is seen |
| wa: bmigo:ye:g | $\begin{gathered} \text { /wa: bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-e:gw/ (that) you (pl.) are seen } \\ \text { PASS ISA 2PL } \end{gathered}$ |
| wa:bmigo:yang | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /wa:bam- } \varnothing \text {-igw-i-angw/ (that) we (inc.) are seen } \\ & \text { PASS ISA I(I)PL } \end{aligned}$ |
| wa:bmigo:ya:ng | ```/wa:bam-\emptyset-igw-i-a:ng/ (that) we (exc.) are seen PASS ISA I(E)PL``` |
| , wa: bmindwa | /wa: bam- $\varnothing$-ind-wa:/ (that) they are seen |

These forms are inflected like simple intransitive verbs with the exception of the third person forms which show an unusual allomorphy. The independent allomorphy we handled with a spelling rule a: Spelling (5) (IV). We extend that rule to get the conjunct allomorphy also. (50) a: Spelling (revised)
(a) igw-i $==$ ind $/ D \ldots A(1):[3]$
(b) igw-i $\Rightarrow \mathrm{a}: / \mathrm{A}(\mathrm{l}):[3]$

We specify the environment $A(1)$ to guarantee that the clause is intrans-
itive. This respelling does not happen in transitive clauses.
7.7 Summary. We list the agreement and spelling rules in an order compatible with their order of application in (51).
(51) Agreements

Inanimate Obviation (18)(III)
Non-third Person Agreement (24)
First Plural Agreement (28) (VI)
Second Plural Agreement (46)
Third Plural Conjunct Agreement (23)
Ergative Plural Agreement (38) (III)
Third Person Agreement (40)
Modal Attachment (22) (III)
Dubitative Attachment (23) (III)
Absolutive Plural Agreement (39) (III)
Spelling
TSA Spelling (46)(III)
Benefactive Spelling (6)(V)
PRO Spelling (16)(IV)
Medial Spelling (IO) (IV)
ISA Spelling (26) (III)
OA I Spelling (46)(III)
ININ Spelling (43)
Subject Omission (48)
Non-third Person Spelling (26)
Non-third Plural Spelling (47)
a: Spelling (50)
in Substitution (26)(VI)
Third Person Spelling (41)
Herewith we have exhausted all the agreement morphology of the independent and conjunct order verbs, except for the matter of obviation.

We hope to have shown in these chapters that the inflectional structure of the Ojibwa verb is a highly systematic and tightly knit phenomenon. In particular we hope to have shown that the allomorphy hypothesis is valid--that there is only one pattern for the construction of the agreement forms of both independent and conjunct verb forms. We hope to have shown that the structure of the verbal agreement system
follows from the syntax of Ojibwa, especially in respect to rules like Passive (58) (III). In fact it was the discovery of the applicability of Passive in the agreemert system that made it possible for us to cut through the apparent dissimilarity between the so-called inverse forms and their conjunct counterparts.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER VIII
${ }^{1}$ In the TA paradigm there is one apparent exception to (9), but that one exception (if it is an exception) is notivated in that it is in the only place where homophonous forms would arise as the result of (9).
${ }^{2}$ The negative has two allomorphs si: in independent constructions, and siw in conjunct constructions. Some subdialects have si:w, since in the dialect under consideration there is need for an ad hoc rule deleting the w off of the dependent form in the context / _ just to account for forms ending in si(:)w+d which sound as si(:) g.
$3^{3}$ This point of analysis has long been a problem. Bloomfield (1957) set up two wa:'s ( $\$ 4.10$, position 4 and position 6). Our solution is similar to his. We have a wa: marking third plural supplied by Ergative Plural (38) (.III), (= Bloomfield's position 4 wa:) and one supplied in conjuncts by (ll) below (= Bloomfield's position 6 wa:). In addition we have a third wa: arising as an allomorph of MW by Nonthird Plural Spelling (25) ( $\overline{\mathrm{VI}})$.

4 Some cross linguistic evidence that strongly suggests the correctness of this approach is found in Menominee wa:? the cognate of Ojibwa wa: occurs in the correct order to be treated as an allomorph of ak 'animate plural', the cognate of Ojibwa ag.

Menominee Ojibwa
po:sewak /po:se-w-ak/ bo:zwag /bo:zi-w-ag/ they embark po:setua? /po:se-t-wa:?/ bo:zwa:d /bo:zi-wa:-d/ (that) they embark
In addition Menominee marks the plurality of I.I verbs in the conjunct, which our analysis links to the allomorphic treatment of third plural markers wa: ${ }^{9}$ and ak for animates.

Menominee

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
a^{\wedge} t \varepsilon k & \text { /a`t } \varepsilon:-k / & \text { te:g } \\
a^{\wedge} t \varepsilon k e n ~ / a t e:-g / ~ i t ~ i s ~ t h e r e ~ \\
\text { /a } t \varepsilon:-k-e n / ~ t e: g ~ / a t e:-g / ~ t h e y ~(i n a n .) ~ a r e ~
\end{array}
$$

What makes this even more striking is the fact that this marking of plurality is an innovation of Menominee from PCA.
${ }^{5}$ By using disjunctive ordering we can get the effect that [21] is a kind of [2] without special mention. Subject Omission (9) will take care of eliminating an in this circumstance.
$\sigma_{\text {We }}$ use the function label $T$ (term) because it will turn out that this allomorph of MIN is governed both by subjects and objects [as is the creation of MIN (28) (III)]. We anticipate the evidence which shows us that to avoid a minor revision of a long rule.

7other analysts [including Bloomfield (195T) and Rogers (1975b)] have treated angid as being composed of two morphemes ang 'first (exc.) plural' plus d 'third person'. We reject this analysis on several grounds. In this form there is no motivated source to trigger the appearance of the d, except perhaps the third person that is implicit in the concept of third person (exc.) plural. Secondly if this d were in fact a separate morpheme, it could not be the same as the d marking third person (subject), because as the following forms show, the din angid PRECEDES the third person plural marker wa: while the d marking third person FOLLOWS the marker wa:
wa:bmangdwa: /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-angid-wa:/ (that) we (exc.) see them wa:bma:wa:d /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a: -wa:/ (that) he sees them (obv.)

Finally the $\underline{d}$ marking third person (subject) undergoes an irregular contraction with the following marker bani 'preterite'. The $\underline{d}$ in angid does not.
wa:bma:pa /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-d-bani/ (that) he saw him (obv.) wa:bmangdiba /wa:bam- $\varnothing$-a:-angid-(i)bani/
(that) we (exc.) saw him
Thus we feel it is highly unlikely that we should identify the d of angid with the third person subject agreement marker d.
$8_{\text {This }}$ revision was made in the version of the rule given in (18) (VI).
$9^{\text {With ik, as with angid, other analysts have separated out a d }}$ third subject marker. This seems somewhat attractive because all the phonological rules for contracting in+d to ik are independently available. [The route is in-d to in-g by ( $\overline{\mathrm{I} 7}$ ) to ik.] However, we reject this analysis as having synchronic validity on the same kind of grounds that we rejected the division of angid. First if ik were really composed of in $+\underline{d}$ the third plural marker should intercede giving *wa:bminwa:d. */wa:bam- $\varnothing$-in-(i)wa:-d/ '(that) they see you'. Secondly, in those dialects which have innovated the long form of the second person (object) agreement marker inin, there is no innovated form *wa:bminik or *wa:bmining */wa:bam- $\varnothing$-inin-d/ next to the actual form wa:bmik '(that) he sees you'. This makes it highly unlikely that ik is still produced productively from in + d. The unfortunate consequence of this unit analysis is that we must posit an ad hoc rule whose effect is to delete the third person morpheme $\frac{d}{}$ in the presence of a second person object, but we consider the evidence in favor of a unit analysis very strong, especially the evidence regarding morpheme order.
${ }^{10}$ The restriction of this to second person singular is important
to avoid problems with first (inc.) plural which is triggered by [2].
$l_{\text {We haven't }}$ seen the crucial data for this clause yet. We provide it here to avoid yet another minor revision.
$12_{\text {We }}$ have not discussed the crucial data yet, but the Walpole rule gives us the insight into the prover way to characterize (43).
8.0 One of the more unique and distinguishing facets of Algonkian languages is the appearance of a so-called fourth person in addition to the normal first, second, and third persons. This fourth person is referred to as obviative, in contrast to the normal third person, which is called proximate. Delisle (1973) argues that fourth persons are syntactically derived from third persons. We agree with his approach. Fourth person forms trigger agreements like third persons, and in many contexts they trigger additional obviative agreements.

Ojibwa uses two markers to signal obviative agreement, an and ini. An is used to mark agreement with animate obviatives bearing an absolutive relationship to an independenti verb. Ini is used elsewhere. On nouns, an is used to mark obviation of animates. The obviation of inanimates is left unmarked. Ini is used to mark the obviation of the possessor of a noun. An and ini are never used together. If both are called for, only ini appears.
8.1 The Process of Obviation. Obviation occurs in Ojibwa when two third persons appear in the same sentence. There are three basic situations in which third person nouns become obviative. First, any third person noun possessed by a third person is obviated.

| (1) wewisan | /w - gwis - an/ | his son (obv.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | SON OBV |  |
| newis | /n -Eris $/$ <br> 1 | my son |

Second, any third person that appears in a sentence with a third person
subject becomes obviative.
(2) ža:bdi:s wgi:-wa:bma:n bi:ye:nan John saw Peter (obv.).

JOHN 3-PAST-SF:E-3-OBV PETER-OBV
Third a third person noun becomes obviated if it is not logically animate but appears in a stretch of discourse that is organized around a third person topic. ${ }^{1}$
(3) mi:nwa: gi:-we:bi-wi:sni Again he started eating. mi:nwa: gi:-mdwe:ska:wan niw mtigo:n Again the tree (ouv) made AGAIN PAST-MAKE-NOISE-3-OBV I'HAT TFEE-OBV noise. (BI T35)?

Since this third situation in which Ojibwa nouns appear as obviatives is hard to talk about in the absence of a more complete understanding both of the process of sentence level obviatjon and of the structure of Ojibwa discourse, we will not discuss this type of obviation further.

In tinds にhater ne vily ecnecntruta on the process of obviation in the speech of the most conservative speakers, because the range of environments in which obviation takes place is becomine more and more restricted in the speech of younger people.
8.2 Obviation of Possessed Nouns. Third person nouns possessed by third persons are obviated. This is true both of animate nouns, on which the obviation is directly marked, and of inanimate nouns, which though unmarked, trigger obviative agreement on verbs whose subject they are.
(4) (a) animate obviative

```
    wi:nnowan wo:san His father is fat.
```

/wi:nino-w-an/ /w-o:s-an/
FAT 3 OBV 3 FATHEER OBV
(b) inanimate obviative

```
gi:na:ni wmo:kma:n His knife is sharp.
```

/gi:na:-ini-w/ /w-mo:koma:n/ SHARP OBV 3 KNIFE

In (4a) the obviation is marked on both the noun and the vert. In (40)
the obviation is anly marked on the verb by the agreement marker ini。 To mak': it clear that it is the third person possessor which triggers the obviation, let us look at the possessive paradigm of gwis 'son'.
(5) ggwis /g-gwis/
ngwis
wguisan
gewiswa:
ggwisna:
ngwisna:
wgwiswa:n
*wgwis
*wgwiswa:
/n-gwis/
/w-gwis-an/
/g-gwis-(i)wa:/
/g-gwis-(i)na:ni/
/n-gwis-(i)na:ni/
/w-gwis-(i)wa:-an!
/w-gwis/
/v-gwis-(i)wa:/
your son my son his son (obv.)
your (pl.) son
our (inc.) son
our (exc。) son
their son (obv.)
his son
their son

In (5) we see that first and second persons do not require obviation (although such forms may be obviated under other circumstances like any unpossessed third person noun). But when the possessor is third person, obviation is required. A similar paradiem can be constructed for an inanimate noun, but since the obviation of inanirate nouns is only aparent in the verb agreement the obviated noun triggers, we have to deal in whole clauses. The possessive paradigm of mo:tma:n 'knife' follows.
(G) gmo:rma:n gi:na:
nmo:kma:n gi:na:
wmo:kma:n gi:na:ni
gmo:kma:nwa: gi:na:
gmo:kma:nna: gi:na:
nmo:kma:nna: gi:na:
wmo:kma:nwa: gi:na:ni
*vmo:kma:n gi:na:
*wmo:kma:nwa: gi:na:

Your knife is sharp. My knife is sharp. His knife (obv.) is sharp.
Your (pl.) knife is sharp. Our (inc.) knife is sharp. Our (exc.) knife is sharp. Their knife (obv.) is sharp.
His knife is sharp.
Their knife is sharp.

The examples in (6) show that the situation with inanimates is identical to the situation with animates. Nouns possessed by first and second person possessors remain unobviated. Nouns possessed by third persons on the other hand must be obviated. To account for this we write (7).
(7) Obviation of Possessee

$$
[3] \Rightarrow[O B V] /(\text { POSS:[3] }]
$$

It appears to us that because of the parallelism in the obviation of inanimates and animates, we should account for obviation with the same rule for both.
8.3 Obviation of Clausemates. The second condition under which nouns are obviated is if they appear in a sentence with a third person subject. In this section we will look at instances of obviatives appearing within the clause containing a third person subject or object.
(8) (a) (i) aw nini wgi:-wa:bma:n niw kwe:wan The man saw the THAT MAN 3-PAST-SEE-3-OBV THAT WOMAN-OBV woman (obv.).
(ii) aw kwe: wgi:-wa:bmigo:n niw ninwan The woman was seen THAT WOMAN 3 -PAST-SEE-PASS-OBV THAT MAN-OBV by the man (obv.).
(b) žina: ${ }^{\text {W}}{ }^{\text {zi no }}$ no:san He looks like my father (obv.). LOOK-LIKE-3 1-FATHER-OBV
(c) ža:bdi:s wgi:-wa:bnda:n bj:ye:nan w,ji:ma:nni John saw Peter's JOHN 3-PAST-SEE-I'T PETER-OBV 3-CANOE-OBV (obv.) canoe. These examples show obviation appearing on the superficial object ( 0 a), on non-terms ( 8 b ), and on possessors of clausemates ( 8 c ).

Closely related to the situation in which subjects trieger obviation in dependents of lower rank is the situation in which objects trigger obviation in dependents of lower rank.
(9) (a) ngi:-mi:na: se:ma:n nmišo:mis I gave my grandfather l-PAST-GJVE-3 TOBACCO-OBV l-GRANDFATHER tobacco (obv.).
(b) ngi:-ma:ji:dwa: wmaznaheanni bi:ye:n ${ }^{-}$I took his (obv.) book 1-PAST-TAKE-FROM-3 3-BOOK-OBV PETER from Pcter ${ }_{j}$.

It seems certain that the facts of (8) and (9) are not independent. Therefore using the term hierarchy, subject outranks direct object outranks indirect object outranks non-terms, we can write a rule of obviation (10).
(10) Clausemate Obviation
[3] $\Rightarrow$ [OBV] / B: A:[3] Condition: A outranks B.
In the case of inanimates the operation of (10) is harder to see because
there is no agreement marker on the verb indicating the obviation. But by associating a relative clause with an inanimate ncun we can see where it is obviated. (The ini marking obviation is underlined.)
(11) (a) ža:bdi:s wdiya:n mo:kma:n ga:na:nig John has a sharp knife JOHN 3-HAVE-IT FNIFE WHICH-SHARP-OBV-3 (obv.).
(b) nci:-mi:na: mc:kma:n ga:na:nif nmišo:mis I gave my grandfather l-PAST-GIVE-3 KNIFE WHICH-SHARP-OBV-3 a sharp knife(obv.). l-GRANDFATHER

The sentences in (ll) show that a third person subject triggers the obviation of an inanimate object (lla) and that a third person object triggers the obviation of an inanimate non-term (llb).
8.4 Obviation of Non-clausemates. In the speech of conservative speakers, third person dependents in subordinate clauses are obviated. The examples in (12) show this happening in several different types of subordinate clauses.
(12) (a) object complement

> wgike:nda:n wj:-bi-dgošninid bi:ye:nan He knows that Peter 3-KIO:IT-IT FUT-COME-ARRIVE-OBV-3 PETER-OBV (obv.) will come.
(b) non-term complement
gi:-goski:wag wi:-za:gdo:de:nid They were afraid he
PASI-AFRAID-3-PL FUT-CRAWI.-OUTT-OBV-3 (obv.) would crawl out. (BI T37)
(c) relative clause
wgi:-a:bjito:n iw ga:-wžito:nid mo:kma:n He ${ }_{i}$ put to use the 3-PAST-USE-IT THAT WHICH-PAST-MAKE-IT-OBV-3 knife which he KNIFE (obv.) made.
(d) adverbial clause
(i) na:g'šinie wi:-gi:we: He will go home in EVENING-O.BV-3 FUT-CO-HOME-3 the evening. (lit. when it (obv.) is evening.)
(ii) gi:-bo:ni: daš ma: dbe:w mtigõ:ska:nig So she landed in the PAST-LAND-3 THEN THERE SHORE BUSHY-OBV-3 the bushes by the shore. (lit. where there (obv.) are bushes.) (Bl T35)
the dependents of dependents as equal to non-terms.
8.4 Obviative Weight. The obviatives produced by the two different rules (7) and (10) have different "weights". While both are marked jdentically on the noun, they trigger different verbal agreements. In particular nouns functioning as objects only triEger obviative agreements if they are obviated by Clausemate Obviation (10). Consider the following pairs of forms. One of each pair has a simple animate object, the other an animate object obviated by Obviation of Possessee (7). The agreement pattern is identical.
(13) ggi:-ra:bma: nini
ggi:-wa:bma: wgwisan
2-PAST-SEE-3
ngi:-wa:bma: nini
ngi:-wa:bma: Werisan
1-PAST-SEE-3
wgi:-wa: bma:n ninwan
wgi:-wa:bma:n wgwisni
3-PAST-SEE-3-OBV
ggi:-wa:bma:wa: nini
ggi:-wa:tma:wa: vewisan
2-PAST-SEE-3-2PL
ggi:-wa:bma:na: nini
ggi:-wa:bma:na: wgwisan
2-PAST-SEE-3-1.PL
ngi:-va:bma:na: nini
ngi:-wa:bma:na: wgwisan
1-PAST-SEE-3-1.PL
wgi:-wa:bma:wa:n ninvan
wgi:-wa:bma:wa:n wgwisni
3-PAST-SEE-3-3PL-OPV

```
You saw a man.
You saw his son (obv.).
I saw a man.
I saw his son (obv.).
He saw a man (obv.).
He i saw his j (obv.) son.
You (pl.) saw a man.
You (pl.) saw his son (obv.).
We (inc.) saw a man.
We (inc.) saw his son.(obv.).
We (exc.) saw a man.
We (exc.) saw his son (obv.).
They saw a man (obv.).
They saw his (obv.) son.
```

In fact the forms that contain the obviative an with first and second person subjects are hopelessly ungrammatical.

| (14) | *ngi:-wa:bma:n | */n-gi:-wa:bam- - -a :-an/ | I saw him (obv.). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | *ggi:-wa:bma:n | */E-gi:-wa: bam- $\varnothing$-a:-an/ | You saw him (obv.). |
|  | *ggi:-wa:bma:wa:n | */g-gi:-wa: bam-(b-a:-an/ | You ( pl. ) saw him (obv.). |
|  | ggi:-wa:bma:na:n | */g-gi :-wa: bam-ф-a:-n | We (inc.) saw him (obv.). |

Furthermore obviation usually wipes out the contrast of singular/plural, as in (15), but nouns obviated by Obviation of Possessee (7) still trigger normal number agreement, as the forms in (16) show.
(15) (a) be:žig ngi:-wa:bma: nini I saw one man. ONE l-PAST-SEE-3 MAN ni:žngi:-wa:bma:g ninwag I saw two men. TWO 1-PAST-SEE-3-PL MAN-PL
(b) be:žig wgi:-wa:bma:n ninwan He saw one man (obv.). ONE 3-PAST-SEE-3-OBV MAN-OBV ni:ž wgi:-wa:bma:n ninwan He saw two men (obv.). TWO 3-PAST-SEE-3-OBV MAN-CBV
(a) be:be:žig ngi:-wa:bma: wgwisan I saw one of his sons ONE-OF l-PAST-SEE-3 3-SON-OBV (obv.).
(b) ne:ni:ž ngi:-wa:bma:g wgwisan I saw two of his sons TWO-OF l-PAST-SEE-3-PL 3-SON-OBV (obv.).

Finally a noun obviated by (7) does not count as an obviative when it is a possessor.
(17) (a) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wdayan
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { JOHN } & \text { 3-SON-OBV 3-PET-OBV }\end{array}$
(b) *ža:bdi:s wgwisan wdayni John's son's dog JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-OBV-PET
We take this data regarding Obviation of Possessee (7) to mean that that rule follows every rule with which it could interact, except the rule spelling an and ini. In particular the crucial ordering is
(1.8) Clausemate Obviation (10)

Absolutive Plural (39)(III)
Obviation of Possessee (7)
to get the forms in (15) and (16). But an important problem arises in the case of absolutive subjects. For example the sentence (4a) can only be gotten if Obviation of Possessee (7) applies BEFORE Absolutive Plural (39)(III). Even worse to get the obviative agreement marker ini before the person agreement marker w in (4b), Obviation of Possessee (7) must precede Inanimate Obviation (18)(III) which precedes Third Person Agreement (40)íVII) which in turn precedes Absolutive Plural (39)iIII).

This dilenma suggests to us that rule ordering is the wrong device to use for accounting for the behavior of forms obviated by (7). Instead we will make Absolutive PIural. (39)(III) globally sensitive to the source of the obviation on the noun in its structural description. So Absolutive Plural (39)(III) will only apply if the noun has been obviated uy Clausemate Obviation (10) (or is plural).
8.5 Obviative Marking. Obviation is marked on verbs by an and ini. The following table lays out the environments in which obviation triggers an obviative agreement marker on the verb.
(19)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Independent } & \text { Conjunct } \\
\text {-an } & \text {-ini }
\end{array}
$$

Animate Absolutive Sub,ject

Animate unmarked or
Absolutive -an (with unmarked Object third subject)

Animate Frgative -ini -ini (Subject)
Inanimate
Absolutive -ini -ini

Suhject
Inanimate
Absolutive unmarked unmarked Object
Inanimate
Frgative unmarked unmarked (Subject)

In our present system both instances of an are supplied by Absolutive Plural (39)(III) with the global restriction. Inanimate obviation is supplied by Inanimate Obviation (18)(III) and animate ergative obviation by Ergative Plural (38)(III). But we do not currently have a rule which supplies ini to mark animate absolutive subject in conjunct verbs. Therefore we propose (20).
(20) Conjunct Obviation
$\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}$-ini / D _ $\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{I}):[\mathrm{CAN}, \mathrm{OBV}]$
In order to get the correct morpheme order, (20) is ordered adjacent to Inanimate Obviation (18)(III). We formulated (20) with the environment A(1) (absolutive subject) to avoid getting two markers ini on verbs in conjunct environments with ergative subjects--one ini from Conjunct Obviation (20) and a secord ini from Ergative Plural (38)(III). In support of our general approach, we note that there are younger speakers who do not have forms showing agreement with obviated animate ergatives.
(21) (a) conservative speakers
(i) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bma:ni bi:ye:nan

JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-OBV-PAST-SEE-3 PETER-OBV John's son (obv.) saw Peter (obv.).
(ii) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bnda:nni mo:kma:n JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-OBV-PAST-SEE-IT KNIFE John's son (obv.) saw a knife.
(b) younger speakers
(i) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bma:n bi:ye:nan JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-PAST-SEE-3-OBV PETER-OBV

John's son (obv.) saw Peter (obv.).
(ii) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bnda:n mo:kma:n JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-PAST-SEE-IT KNIFE

John's son (obv.) saw a knife.
Younger speakers find the sentences in (2la) ungrammatical. In our analysis this amounts to deleting the ini clause from Ergative Plural (38) (III). But such speakers still mark obviative agreement with ergatives in conjunct environments. In our analysis this means that they have simply loosened the environment of Conjunct Obviation (20) to apply to all subjects, not just absolutive subjects.
8.6 Obviation of Possessors. In the preceding sections we have brought forth evidence which indicates that Clausemate Obviation (10)
supplies the obviative mark appearing on the possessor of a low ranking dependent. While we believe that this is the correct way to account for the facts, there are some subtilties that bear mentioning. First, for even the most conservative speakers, the obviation of a possessor triggered by a subject is optional. ${ }^{3}$
(22) wgi:--va:bnda:n wji:man(ni)
3-PAST-SEE-IT 3-(OBV)-CANOE
$\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ saw his ${ }_{j}$ canoe.

But only when both the subject and the object are potential triggers is the obviation obligatory, so one gets paradigms like that in (23).
(a) wgi:-ma:\{i:dwa:n wmaznahgan 3-PAST-TAKE-FROM-3-OBV 3-BOOK
He ${ }_{i_{\text {him }}^{j}}$ took his $i_{i}$ book from
(h) wgi:-ma:ji:dwa:n wmaznahgan(ni) 3-PAST-TAKE-FROM-3-OBV 3-(OBV)-BOOK
${ }^{\mathrm{He}} \mathrm{i}_{\text {him }}$ took his ${ }_{j}$ book from
(c) wgi:-ma:ji:dwa:n wmaznahganni
3-PAST-TAKE-FROM-3-OBV 3-OBV-BNOK
$\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}_{\text {him }_{k}} \text {. }} \mathrm{took}_{\mathrm{j}}$ book from

In (23a) the possessor of mzjnhigan 'book' cannot be obviated be case it is coreferential with the subject of the clause. $I_{n}(23 b)$ the obviation of the possessor of mzinhigan 'book' is only optionally obviated in spite of the fact that it is coreferential with the object which is obligatorily obviated by Clausemate Obviation (10). Here only the subject is a potential obvjation trjgger. But in (23c) neither the subject nor the object is coreferential with the possessor of mzinhigan 'book' so both are potential triggers and the obviation is obligatory.
8.7 Passive and Obviation. In §3.3.3.3 of Chapter III we discussed the fact that the application of passive in sentences containing third person objects and third person subjects is controlled by discourse considerations. This fact interacts with the facts of obviation in two ways. First Passive (58)(III) must apply before Clausemate Obviation (10) because it is the superficial object of a clriuse that is obviated.
(This fact was first pointed out by Delisle (1973).)
(2.4) (a) ža:bdi:s wgi:-wa:bma:n bi:ye:nan JOHN 3-PAST-SEE-3-OBV PETER-OBV
(h) bi:ye:n wgi:-wa:bmigo:n ža:badi:san Peter was seen by John PETER 3-PAST-SEE-PASS-(OBV JOHN-OBV

John saw Peter (obv.). (obv.).

Second, contrary to the apparent opinion of many Algonkianists, e.g. Rogers (1976), obviation by Obviation of Possessee (7) has no effect on the applicability of Passive (58)(III) as shown in (25).
(25) (a) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bma:ni bi:ye:nan JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-OBV-PAST-SEE-3 PETER-OBV John's son (obv.) 'sav Peter (obv.).
(b) bi:ye:n wgi:-wa:bmigo:n ža:bdi:s wgwisan PETER 3-PAST-SEE-PASS-OBV JOHIN 3-SON-OBV

Peter was seen by John's son (obv.).
The one place where there is some effect involving possessors and passive is in the case in which the possessor of one term is coreferential with the other term. This was mentioned above in §3.3.3.3. Examples are given in (26) and (27).
(26) (a) ža:bdi:s wgi:-wa:bma:n wewisan John ${ }_{i}$ saw his ${ }_{i}$ son. (obv.). JOHN 3-PAST-SEF-3-OBV 3-SONT-OBV
(b) *ža:bdi:s wgwisan wEi:-wa:bmice ${ }_{n i}{ }^{4}$ John's ${ }_{i}$ son (obv.) was
JOHN $\quad$ 3-SON-OBV 3-OBV-PAST-SFE-PASS (obv.).

(b) ža:bdj:s wgi:-wa:bmigo:n wgwisan $\mathrm{John}_{i}$ was seen by his JOHN 3-PAST-SER-FASS-OBV 3-SON-OBV i son (obv.). i

We feel at this point that this restriction on passivization has to do with pronominalization and obviation, not passive and obviation. In the two starred sentences (26b) and (27a) there is a conflict between the obviation of the superficial object and the coreferent possessor of the subject. We are not yet ready to offer a full explanation because there are two potential difficulties with an obviation conflict approach.

First, this conflict "counts" only when it happens within a single clause. Speakers have no trouble getting (?8) as ambiguous. ${ }^{6}$
(28) ža:bdi:s wȩwisan ngi:-mi:na: iw mo:kna:n ga:-wžito:nid JOHN 3-SON-OBV 1-PAST-GIVE-3 THAT KNIFE WHICH-PAST-MAKE-OBV-3

I gave John's son, (ohv.) the knife that he ${ }_{i}$ (obv.) had made.
or I gave John's ${ }_{i}$ son $_{j}^{j}$ (obv.) the knife that he ${ }_{k}$ (obv.) had made. And speakers find (29) unambiguous.
(29) ža:bdi:s wgwisan nGi:-mi:na: iw mo:kma:n ga:-wžito:d JOFin 3-SON-OBV I-PAST-GIVE-3 THAT KNIFE WHICH-PAST-MAKE-3

I gave John's ${ }_{i} s^{\prime}{ }_{j}$ (obv.) the knife that he ${ }_{j}$ had made.
A similar argument can be made for the case in which the possessor is associated with the subject of the main clause, as the examples in (30) show.
(30) (a) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bnda:nni iv mo:kma:n ga:-wžito:nid JOHN 3-SON-OBV 3-OBV-PAST-SEE-IT THAT KNIFE WHICH-PAST-MAKE-OBV-3

John's ${ }^{\prime}$ son, (obv.) saw the knife that he (obv.) had made. or John's ${ }_{i}^{i}$ son $_{j}^{j}$ (obv.) saw the knife that he ${ }_{k}^{i}$ (obv.) had made.
(b) ža:bdi:s wgwisan wgi:-wa:bnda:nni iv mo:rma:n ga:-wžito:d JOHN 3-SON-OEV 3-OBV-PAST-SEE-IT THAT KIJIFE WHICH-PAST-MAKE-

John's ${ }_{i}$ son $_{j}$ (obv.) saw the knife that he ${ }_{j}$ had made.
The second problem is that speakers can drop the obviation off of the possessors of non-terms even if there is a coreferential obviated ncun in the same clause. An example of this is (23b). We will not attempt to solve the problem of (26) and (27) here. What we hope to have shown is that obviation plays only a minor role, if any, in conditioning passivization, and that obviative has no place on the person hicrarchy that triggers Passive (58)(.III) as we argued in Chapter III.

FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER VIII

${ }^{1}$ While topic is a poorly defined notion, it seems useful in discribing certain aspects of Ojibwa discourse structure.
${ }^{2}$ Citations of sentences from Bloomfield (1957) are labelled. (Bl T35) means Bloomfield (1957), text 35. (Bl S359) means Bloomfield (1957), examples sentence 359.
$3^{\text {However, obviation }}$ in locative possessed nouns is not optional. (l) (a) wgi:-wa:bnda:n wji:ma:n(ni) $\quad \mathrm{He}_{i}$ saw his ${ }_{j}$ canoe. 3-PAST-SEE-IT 3-(OBV)-CANOE
(b) wgi:-wa:bnda: $\underset{\substack{\text { w } \\ \text { 3-OBV-CANOE-LOC }}}{ } \mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ saw it in his ${ }_{j}$ canoe.
${ }^{4}$ This sentence is grammatical in the meaning 'John's ${ }_{i}$ son (obv.) was seen by him (obv.).'
${ }^{5}$ As in the case of (26b), this sentence is grammatical in another meaning: 'John's son (obv.) saw him (obv.).'

6
$\sigma_{\text {This }}$ class of sentences was first pointed out in Rogers (1975b). She used inverse forms in the main clause, but as we have argued, direct and inverse forms mark the same superficial grammatical relations for any two persons.

## CHAPTER IX

CLAUSE UNION AND STEM STRUCTURE
9.0 In preceding chapters we have discussed, either directly oiv incidentally, the inflectional morphology of Ojibwa verbs. In addition we have examined rules which add certain markers indicating various advancements. However, we have not so far looked at the internal structure of verb stem. Since many of the advancement markers follow stem agreement markers, let us call a verb stem the portion of a verb which follows (or potentially follows) the tense marker and which precedes the stem agreement marker.

In Ojibwa there are simple stems, as in (l)
(1) $\begin{array}{r}\text { mskozi } \\ \text { /miskw }- \\ \\ \\ \text { ISA }- \\ \text { ISA }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { wgie-bi:do:n } & \text { He brought it. } \\ \text { /w - gi: - bi: - d - 0: - n/ } & \text { stem: /bi:-/ 'bring' }\end{array}$ 3 PAST TSA OAI OAII
wgi:-šama:n
/w - gi:-ašam - $\emptyset$ - a: - an/ 3 PAST TSA OAI OBV

He's red.
stem: /miskw-/ 'be red'

He fed him.
stem: /ašam-/ 'feed'
but far more cormon are complex stems, as in (2).
(2) (a) mskoji:zi

| /miskw $-(i) j i:-i z i-w / ~$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RED | BODY | ISA |

nde:wkwe:
/n - de:w $-(i) k w e:-\emptyset /$
1 THROB

He's red all over.
stem: /miskw-iji:-/

I've got a headache. stem: /de:w-ikwe:-/
(b) ngi:-bo:kbido:n I broke it (off.)/n - gi: - bo:kw - (i)bi - d - o: - n/ stem: /bo:kw-ibi-/1 PAST BREAK CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.I.I
ma:da:dga: He's starting to swim.
/ma:d - a:daga: - $\varnothing$ - w/ stem: /ma:d-a:daga:-/
START SW.IM ISA 3
wgi:-bskigwa:da:n She hemmed it.
/w - gi: - bisk - (i)gwa: - d - am - ni stem: /bisk-igwa:-/
3 PAST FOLDED SEW TSA OA.I OA.IT
(c) wgi:-zginke:na:n He held her harid.
/w - gi: - zag - (i)nike: - n- $\varnothing$-a: -an/ stem: /zag-inike:
3 PAST ATTACHED ARM CAUSE TSA OAT OBV. -n-/
wgi:-bkwa:ndbe:bna:n He scalped him,
/w - gi: - bakwe: - ndibe: - bi - n - a: - an/ stem:/bakwe:
3 PAST PARTIALLY HEAD CAUSE TSA OAT OBV. .ndibe:-bi-/
GONE

In traditional analyses of Algonkian Languages these stem types have been summarized in formulae like
(3) (a) Initial Medial [ = forms in (2a)]
(b) Initial Final $[=$ forms in (2b)]
(c) Initial Medial Final [ = forms in (2c)]
where the terms initial, medial, and final are names for classes of morphemes. The particular version of (3) that appears in any traditional analysis depends on the details of that analysis. For exampie Bloomfield (1957) confused true finals with stem agreement markers which has led to overly complex fommulations, including positing a class of prefinals, all of which is unnecessary, as we will see.

In our analysis initials and finals arise from verbal sources by various derivational routes. But the vast majority of medials are nominal in origin. In this chapter we will concentrate on stems of the form summarized by the formula of ( 3 b ), exemplified in ( 2 b ). We will discuss medials in Chapter $X$.

The stems which we will be looking at in this chapter fall into three basic classes: (l) verbal initials - causative inchoative finals, (2) non-verbal initials - verbal finals, and (3) verbal initials verbal finals. These different types of verb stem constructions are exemplified in (4).
(4) (a) verbal initials - causative/inchoative finals

```
    ngi:-gi:we:ha
    I sent him home.
/n - gi: - gi:we: - h - \emptyset - a:/
    l PAST GO-HOME CAUSE TSA OAT
    zi:wsin
/zi: - (i)s - in - w/
    SOUR FALL TSA 3
    wgi:-bi:gWkoda:n
/w - gi: - bi:gw - (i)ko - d - am - n/
    3 PAST BE-TN- CAUSE- TSA OA.T OA.T.T
        PIECES BY-
                                    CUTTT.NG
```

(b) non-verbal initials - verbal finals
ngi:-za:m刀gwa:m I overslept.
/n - gi: - oza:m - ingwa:m - $\varnothing /$
stem: /oza:m-ingwa:m-/
1 PAST TOO-MUCH SLEEP ISA
gi:-ma:da::dga: He started to swim.
/gi: - ma:d - a:daga: - $\varnothing$ - w/
PAS'I STPART SWIM ISA 3
gi:bi:jbato:
/gi: - bi:d - (i)bato: - $\emptyset$ - w/
PAST HITHER RUN ISA 3
ngi:-žiwna: e:nda:nid
/n - gi: - in - (i)wi - n - a:/
1 PAST TO TAKE TSA OAI
(c) verbal initials - verbal finals

```
    ngi:-gi:we:bto:
/n - gj: - gi:we: - bato: - \emptyset/
    l PAS'T GO-HOME RUN ISA
```

    I ran home.
    stem: /ma:d-a:daga:-/
He came running.
stem: /in-iwi-/
(c) verbal initials - verbal finals
stem: /gi:we:-bato:-/
wgi:bskigwa:da:n She hemmed it.
/w - gi: - bisk - (i)ewa: - d - am - n/ stem: /bisk-igwa:-/
3 PAET FOLDED SEW TSA OAT OAIT
9.0.1 Clause Union. Now let us review the process of clause union in relational grammar. Clause unions may only apply to sentences with obsolutive emplements. (That is intransitive sentences with subject complements, and transitive sentences with object complements.) Clause union erases the complement relation leaving a dead verb and reassigns termhood to the dependents of the downstairs verb. This happens by a strict pattern which is summarized in (5).

Upstairs clause | Downstairs clause |
| :---: |
| Reassignments |

| Case I | intransitive | ```intransitive D subject -- R subject``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Case II | intransitive | ```transitive D subject -- R subject D direct object -- R direct object``` |
| Case I.II | transitive | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intransitive } \\ & \quad \text { U subject -- } R \text { subject } \\ & D \text { subject -- R direct object } \end{aligned}$ |
| Case IV | transitive | ```transitive U subject -- R subject D direct object -- R direct object D subject .-- R indirect object``` |

In Ojibwa there is a general restriction on the transitivity of the downstairs clause. Only downstairs intransitive clauses may undergo clause union in general. We will discuss the few exceptions at the end of this section. But for the time being we will concentrate on Case I and Case III clause unions.

In addition to the process of clause union there is a process of dead verb attachment which obligatorily attaches the dead verbs created by clause union to the left of the live verb. We write the rule as (6). (6) Dead Verb Attachment

| V | $\mathrm{DV}: \mathrm{V}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| a | b |$\quad$| $=$ |
| ---: |
| $\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{V}$ |
| a |

In addition to attaching dead verbs from clause union, a number of other entities are attached to the left of the live verb. We will treat all such entities as dead verbs and use (6) to attach them. Such entities include tense markers and adverbs. There are two degrees of attachmert of dead verbs. These two kinds of attached dead verbs are called preverbs and initials in traditional analyses of Ojibwa. The difference between them has to do with their abstract phonological behavior. We will discuss the difference in detail in §9.2. For now suffice it say that all dead verbs from clause union are attached as initials. Live verbs constitute the class of finals.
9.1 Causative/Inchoative Stems. In this first section we will propose an analysis of the causative/inchoative constructions. The analyses involves positing underlying structures of a form like those in (7), which undergo clause union to give structures like those exemplified in (4a).
(7) (a) COME-ABOUT/BE-TN-A-STATE

(b)


There is a restriction in Ojibwa that clause union may not, in general, apply if the complement clause is transitive. This restriction provides us with a semantic argument for proposing this type of underlying structure. The forms in (8) are close paraphrases of one another.
(8) (a) ngi:-gi:we:ha: I seni him home.

$$
/ \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{gi}:-\mathrm{gi}: w e:-\mathrm{h}-\emptyset-\mathrm{a}: /
$$

1 PAST GO-HOME CAUSE TSA OAI
(b) ngi:-žiha: wi:-gi:we:d $I$ made him go home. /n - gi: - in - (i)h - $\varnothing$ - a:/ /wi: - gi:we: - $\emptyset$ - a/
1 PAST THUS CAUSE TSA OAT FUT GO-HOME ISA 3
But the second is much stronger in implication. For example, if I had threatened him, I could only say (8b), not (8a). Similarly (8b) is a little strange if I had simply asked him to go home, but (8a) is not. The difference between English have causatives (I had him go home) and make causatives (I made him go home.) is somewhat similar. But when the downstairs clause is transitive there is no clause united form [corresponding to (8a)]. There is only a two clause form (corresponding to ( 8 b )].
ngi:-žiha: wi:-mwa:d nimšan. I made him eat dog. /n - gi: - in - h - $\varnothing$ - a:/ /wi: - am - w-a: - d/
1 PAST THUS CAUSE TSA OAI FUT EAT TSA OAI 3
/animw - iš -an/
DOG DEROG OBV
But the sentence in (9) can mean either I made him eat dog. or I had him eat dog. Therefore it seems likely that sentences ( 8 a ) and ( 8 b ) are derived from the same underlying structure, but clause union is blocked and/or triggered both by a condition on the transitivity of the downstairs clause and by a condition on the implication about the forcefulness of the causation. ${ }^{2}$
9.1.1 Stative/inchoative constructions. There are tive mirphemes in Ojibwa hich mean 'be come to be in a state'. These morphemes appear in constructions which undergo Case I clause unions. So sentences like those in (9) are derived as in (10).

(b) gi:-gba:kwse: It closed.
/gi: - giba:kw - (i)se: - $\varnothing$ - w/ PAST CLOSE MOVE TSA 3
(11)

| (a) | Underlying Form | ${ }_{\text {s }}$ | 1:comp(zi:w | l:iw) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FALL | SOUR | IT |
|  | Clause Union (5) | s | 1:iw |  |
|  | Dead Verb Attachment (6) | zi:wa | l:iw |  |
|  | ISA (28) (.t.I. ) | zi:wa-ISA[I] | l:iw |  |
|  | Agreements | zi:wa-ISA[I]-w | l:iw |  |
|  | Spelling | zi:wsinw | l:iw |  |
|  | Morphophonemics | zi:wsin |  |  |
| (b) | Underlying Form | gi: se: l:comp(giba:kw l:[INAN]  <br> PAST MOVE CLOSED <br> TT  |  |  |
|  | Clause Union (5) | gi:se: DV:gib | ba:kw l:[ | [.tnan] |
|  | Dead Verb Attachment (6) | gi:-gi.ba:kwse: |  | [INAN] |
|  | ISA (28) (I.I. ) | gi:-giba:kwse: | -TSA[I] 1:[ | [ InAN] |
|  | Agreements | gi:-giba:kwse:- | -TSA[I]-w l: | [ infan] |
|  | Spelling | gi:-giba:kwse:w |  |  |
|  | Morphophonemics | gi:-gba:k ${ }^{\text {We }}$ se: |  |  |

9.1.2 Causative Constructions. There are two kinds of causative constructions in Ojibwa--simple causatives and instrumental causatives. There are a relatively large number of morphemes involved in these constructions. The causative morphemes themselves have been traditionally referred to as finals. The dead verbs that arise as the result of the clause union wi.th a causative are traditionally referred to as initials. A list of the most common causative finals (cited with both animate and inanimate TSA markers and inanimate OAT) is given in (12).
(12) (a) simple causative finals

| root | I'A forlii | T.I form | Closs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| -h- | -h- | -to:- | cause |
| -in- | -in- | -inam- | cause |
| -bi- | -bin- | -bido:- | cause |
| -sah- | -sah- | -sato:- | cause |

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text {-s- } & \text {-šim- } & \text {-sido:- } & \text { cause (to lie/be in a state)/ } \\
\text {-šk- } & \text {-škaw- } & \text {-škam- } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { cause to fall/cause (by accident) } \\
\text {-k- }
\end{array} \text {-kaw- } \\
\text {-kam- } & \text { cause (in the body) }
\end{array}
$$

(b) instrumental causative finals

| -bi- | -bin- | -bido:- | cause using force/using the <br> hand |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| -ail- | -ahw- | -aham- | cause using an instrument |
| -gah- | -gahw- | -gaham- | cause using an axe/instrument |
| -sk- | -skaw- | -skam- | cause using foot/body |
| -k- | -kaw- | -kam- | cause using body |
| -iz- | -izw- | -izam- | cause using heat |
| -a:kiz- | -a:kizw- | -a:kizam- | cause using fire |
| -m- | -m- | -ndam- | cause using speech |
| -am- | -am- | -andam- | cause using the mouth/teeth |
| -agana:m- -agana:m- -agana:ndam- cause using violent action |  |  |  |
| -bo:- | -bo:n- | -bo:do:- | cause using a sawing motion |
| -ko- | -kon- | -kodam- | cause using a cutting action |
| -iz- | -izw- | -izam- | cause using a cutting edge |

A few examples follow.
(13) (a) simple causatives

Stative: nbaga: ..... It is flat./nabag - ya: - w/FLAT ISA 3
(v) Causative: ngi:-a: $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{i}:$ :ška:gon It made me sick./n - gi: - a:kozi - šk - aw - igo - n/Stative: ngi:-a:koz I was sick./n - gi: - a:kw - izi/1 PAST SICK ISA
(vi) Causative: nmogska:ji:ka:g He bothers me./n - mogosk - a:d - (i)k - aw - igo/1 BOTHER BE CAUSE TSA PASS
Stative: nmogska:diz I am unsettied./n - mogosk - a:d - izi/
1 BOTHER BE ISA
(b) Instrumental Causatives

| (i) | Simple: | ```ngi:-a:žgidna:n I turned it face up. /n-gi: - a:žigid - in - \emptyset - am - n/ l PAST FACE-UP CAUSE TSA OAI OA.II``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instrumentals |  |  |
| ngi:-a:žgijbido:n I turned it over (with my |  |  |
| /n - gi: - a:žigid - (i)bi - d - o: - n/ |  |  |
| 1 PAST FACE-UP CAUSE TSA OAT OA.I. |  |  |
|  |  | W.ITH-HANDS |
| ngi:-a:žgižka:n İ turned it over (with |  |  |
|  |  | /n - gi: - a:žigid - (i)k-Ø-am-n/ |
|  |  | 1 PAST FACE-UP CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.IT |
|  |  | WITH-FOOT |
| (ii) Simple: |  | ngi:-dko:na:n <br> I shortened it. <br> /n |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 PAST SHORT CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.II |
|  | Instrumentals |  |
| ngi:-dko:kwda:n I cut it shorter. |  |  |
| /n - gi: - dakw - (i)ko - d - am - n/ |  |  |
| 1 PAST SHORT CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.II |  |  |
|  |  | BY-CUTT.ING |

ngi:-dko:bo:do:n I sawed it off shorter.
/n-gi: - dakw - (i)bo: - d-o:-n/
I PAST SHORT CAUSE-BY TSA OA.I OATI.
SAWING
(iii) Simple:
ngi:-nbagsido:n I flattened it. /n - gi: - nabag - (i)s - (i)d - o: - n/
1 PAST FLAT CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.I.
Instrumentals

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { ngi:-nbaghan } & \text { I flattened it (with an } \\
\text { instrument). }
\end{array}
$$

ngi:-nbaggana:nda:n I pounded it flat. /n - gi: - nabag - agana:m - d - am - n/
1 PAST FLAT CAUSE- TSA OAI OA.IT

| (iv) Simple: | ngi:-da:škna:n I divided |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | /n - gi: da:šk - in - $\emptyset$ - am - $\mathrm{n} /$ |
|  | 1 PAST IN-TWO CAUSE TSA OAI OAITI |

Instrumentals

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { ngi:-da:skgaha:n split it (with an axe). } \\
\text { /n - gi: - da:sk (i)gah - } \varnothing-\text { am }- \text { n/ } \\
\text { l PAST IN-TWO CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.T. } \\
\text { W.TTH-AXE }
\end{gathered}
$$

(v) Simple: ngi:-bkwe:na:n I removed part of it.
/n - gi: - bakwe: - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n/
1 PAST PAST- CAUSE TSA OAI OA.I.
GONE
Instrumentals

$$
\text { ngi:-bkwe:ža:n } \quad \text { I sliced a piece off of it. }
$$

$$
\text { /n - gi: - bakwe: - iž- } \varnothing \text {-am - n/ }
$$

$$
1 \text { PAST PAST- CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.IT }
$$ GONE BY-CUTTTING



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ngi:-da:škška:n I split it (with my body). } \\
& \text { /n - gi: - da:šk - (i)šk - } \emptyset \text { - am - n/ } \\
& 1 \text { PAST IN-TWO CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.IT } \\
& \text { WITH-BODY }
\end{aligned}
$$

(vi) Simple: ngi:-wi:k ${ }^{W}$ bido:n I drew it towards me. /n - gi: - wi:kw - (i)bi - d-o: - n/
1 PAST DRAWN CAUSE TSA OAT OAII

Instrumentals

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ngi:-wi: } \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{ma} \text { : I invited him. } \\
& \text { /n - gi: - wi:kw - (i)m - } \emptyset \text { - a:/ } \\
& 1 \text { PAST DRAWN- CAUSE TSA OA.I } \\
& \text { TOWARDS WITTH-SPEECH } \\
& \text { ngi:-wi: } \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}} \text { nda:n } \quad \text { I sucked it into my mouth. } \\
& \text { /n - gi: - wi:kw - am - d - am - n/ } \\
& 1 \text { PAST DRAWN CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.I.I } \\
& \text { TOWARDS WITH-MOUTH }
\end{aligned}
$$

(vii) Two instrumentals that do not have obvious constrasts simple causatives

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { ngi:-mnoza:n } & \text { I cooked it. } \\
\text { /n -gi: - minw - iz - } \emptyset-a m-n / \\
\text { I PAST COOKED CAUSE TSA OAT OA.II } \\
\text { WITH-HEAT }
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ngi:-gi:ska:kza:n I cut it with a blowtorch. } \\
& \text { /n - gi: - gi:šk - a:kiz - } \emptyset \text { - am - n/ } \\
& 1 \text { PAST CUT CAUSE TSA OAI OAII } \\
& \text { WITH-FIRE }
\end{aligned}
$$

All the examples in (13) are derived via Case III clause unions from structures like that given in (7b). For example the simple causative in (13a, i) ngi:-ze:gha: is derived as in (14).

| Underlying Form |  | h CAUSE |  | 2:comp | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{ze}: \mathrm{g} 1:[3]) \\ \text { AFRA.ID } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clause Union (5) | gi: | h | 1:[1] | 2:[3] | DV:ze:g |
| TSA (50) (III) |  | $\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{TSA}$ [A] | 1:[1] | 2:[3] | DV:ze:g |
| Dead Verb Attachment (6) | gi:- | ze:gh-TSA[A] | 1:[1] | 2:[3] |  |
| OA I (42) (VII) | gi:- | ze:gh-TSA ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ] | 1:[1] | 2:[3] |  |
| Agreements | ngi:- | ze:gh-TSA[A] | 1:[1] | 2:[3] |  |
| Spelling | ngi:- | e:gha: |  |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | ngi:- | ze:gha : |  |  |  | Ojibwa stem structure analysis. The first has to do with the process of middling, i.e. the deletion of a reflexive pronoun mentioned in

Chapter IV. This process is used ridely with two morphemes, šk 'cause (in/with the body)' and $\underline{k}$ 'cause (in/with the body)', yeilding morpheme complexes ending in -ška: /-šk-aw-i/ and -ka: /-k-aw-i/ respectively. Some examples of sush constructions are given in (15). (15) (a) (i) begone:ška: It has a hole in it. /bagone: - šk - aw - i - w/ HAVE-HOLE CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(ii) zswe:ška: It is scattered.
/zaswe: - šk - aw - i - w/ SCATUSERED CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(iii) da:pška: He has/is having convulsions. /oda:p - (i)šk - aw - i - w/ PICKED-UP CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(b) (i) bskika: It is bert. /bisk - (i)k - aw - i - w/ FOLDED CAUSS I'SA TSA 3
(ii) gi:wa:zka: It is off schedule (e.g. a bus) /gi:wa:d - (i)k - aw - i - w/ WANDER CAUSE TSA ISA 3

Constructions involving s.ska: and ka: show two peculiarities, one semantic the other syntactic. The semantic peculiarity is that the meanings of the causative morpheme complexes are often somewhat specialized as -ška: 'be/come to be (in/with the body)' and -ka: 'be (in the body) move (oneself')'. The syntactic peculiarity is that these morpheme complexes are constructed on the basis of animate objects (i.e. the marker aw is an animate TSA marker) recordless of whether the object is animate or inanimate. This is reminiscent of the syntactic property of igw discussed in Chapter IV. Almost certainly these two facts indicate that the complexes -ska: and -ka: are lexicalized as units, and are treated as inchoatives as per 39.1.1.

The second interesting feature of the clause union analysis is that there is implicit in it the claim that all morphemes that function
as initials in this type of construction aie logically intransitive i.e. medio-passive. This follows from the restriction against clause union when the downstairs clause is transitive. To the best of my knowledge all previous analysts of Ojibwa, and for that matter of Algonkian, have treated some initials as transitive, e.g. Bloomfield (1944) treats PA *kiišk- as 'cut through, sever' citing the form *kiiškahamwa which gives OJibwa wgi:šlcha:n 'he cuts it down off' /w-gi:šk-ah- $\emptyset-a m-n /$ (with inflectional restructuring). But in this analysis ah means 'cause using an instrument' thus gi:sk- must mean 'be cut through, be severed'. But even in his own work (1944) he lists *kiiskaape日kyaawi it is a cut-off rock.' which requires the medio-passive (intransitive) meaning. 4 If it is not at this point totally clear why such a form requires an intransitive meaning for the initial, it is because the medial *-aape $\theta \mathrm{k}$ - represents the subject as will be explained in Chapter $X$ on noun incorporation.

As regards the claim that all verbal initials are intransitive, there are three groups of initials according to the obviousness of logical intransitivity. In the first group are those which have simple intransitive forms. Examples of this sort have been given in (12 (i-v). It is on the basis of the direct evidence from this group that the analysis is developed. The second group are those initials which do not have simple intransitive forms, but for which there is indirect evidence, either in the form of a stative construction as those initials in (16) have,
(16)
(a) ja:g- 'be used up'
no simple intransitive: *ja:ga:, *ja:gad, *ja:gan, etc.
stative/inchoative: ja:gse: It is used up./It runs out.
/ja:g - (i)se: - $\downarrow$ - w/
USED-UP MOVE ISA 3
(b) zi;g- 'pour out (intransitive)'
no simple intransitive: *zi:ga:, ${ }^{5}{ }^{2} \mathrm{zi}: \mathrm{gad},{ }^{*} z i: g a n$, etc.
stative/inchoative: zi:gse: It pours out.
/zi:g - (i)se: - $\emptyset$ - w/
POUR-OUT MOVE ISA 3
(c) bi:gw-
'be in pieces'
or in the form of medial cc..structions where the medial represents all or part of an incorporated subject, as in (17).


The last group of initials are those for which there is neither evidence for considering them intransitive nor against considering them intransitive. Because the analysis of initials as intransitive works in other cases, and the analysis of the last group as transitive would severely complicate the analysis as a whole, we take the null hypothesis. Lacking evidence, we assume this group of verbal initials works like the other two groups. Examples of this group are given in (18).
(18) (a) zi:n- 'be squeezed'

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { causative only: wgi:-zi:nbido:n He squeezed it. } \\
& \text { /w - gi: - zi:n-(i)bi }-\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{o}:-\mathrm{n} / \\
& \text { HE PAST SQUEEZED CAUSE TSA OAT OA.TI }
\end{aligned}
$$

(b) bakwe:- 'be part gone'
causative only: wgi:-bkwe:na:n He took away part of it. /w - gi: - bakwe: - in - $\emptyset$ - am - n/ 3 PAST PART-GONE CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.I.I
(c) nawad- 'be grabbed'

> causative only: wgi:-nwadna:n He grabbed it.
> /w - gi: nawad - in - $\varnothing$-am - n/ 3 PAST GRABBED CAUSE TSA OA.I OA.II

Members of this last group of initials are very hard to render in English, most are probably inchoatives in their root meaning, rather than statives so for example nawad- (18c) probably means more like 'come to be grabbed', than simply 'be grabbed'. The inherent rarity of appropriate non-causative contexts for expressing such ideas may be, in part, responsible for the initials expressing those ideas appearing in the third group. Nonetheless it seems that there is a lexical (ad hoc) aspect to the grouping, because ja:g- 'be used up', and bakwe:- 'be part gone' seem to be in the same semantic area, the former being, however, in the second group, and the latter in the third group.

There are a number of semantic regularities among these different groups of initials. We will mention a few here, before turning to the next topic.

At present we only have some tentative generalizations regarding initials in the second and third group. Morphemes in the second group include most, if not all, morphemes which refer to orientations in space, as in (19a) and many that refer to positions relative to implied points of reference, as in (19b). All of these appear embedded under $s$
'fall, lie' or se: 'move', or both. In addition there are a number of morphemes which refer to the interruption of the structural integrity of objects, as in (19c). All of these appear embedded under ska: or ka: or occasionally in medial constructions.

| (a) | /a:žigid-/ | be face up |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | /a:tawa:-/ | be right side up |
|  | /animiko:-/ | be faced away |
|  | /bisk-/ | be folded (over) |
|  | /ašawe:-/ | be tilted |
|  | /gwe:k-/ | be turned around |
|  | /gaw-/ | be fallen (over) |
| (b) | /zag-/ | be attached |
|  | /a:niko:-/ | be linked |
|  | /agwa:-/ | be outside of water/fire |
|  | /na:b-/ | fit in/on |
|  | /ne:gw-/ | be injon |
|  | /Ec:b-1 | be fallen off |
|  | /za: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ bw-/ | penetrate |
| (c) | /bo:kw-/ | be broken (stick-like things) |
|  | /bak-/ | be broken (string-like things) |
|  | /ba.s-/ | be broken/cracked |
|  | /ba:k-/ | br: (broken) open |
|  | /ba:šk-/ | be burst |
|  | /da:šk-/ | be (split.) (in two) |
|  | /bakwe:-/ | be partly cone |
|  | /bi:gw-/ | be in pieces |
|  | /gi:šk-/ | be cut off |

Morphemes in the third group for which there is no direct eviZence of intransitivity include many morphemes which mean be in (temporary) contact with (s.t.), as those in (20).

| /da:ng-/ | touch |
| :--- | :--- |
| /zanigw-/ | be rubbed |
| /ga:nd-/ | be met |
| /ji:b-/ | be nudged |
| /gizi:-/ | be wiped |
| /ba:zagw-/ | be scratched |
| /ga:šk-/ | be seraped |
| /zi:n-/ | be squeezed |
| /dakw-/ | be siezcd |
| /nawad-/ | be grabbed |

9.1.3. We:b-. There is a very interesting initial we:b- that
refers to motion through air. The peculiarity associated with this morpheme is that it is used as a kind of final as well as an initial. Some examples of its use are given in (21). Since it is not a true causative itself the whole construction involving we:b as a final must appear embedded under a causative.
(21) (a) we:we:bzo He is swinging. /REDUP - we:b - (i)zo - w/
(b) (i) wgi:-bgjjwe:bna:n He dropped it. /w - gi: - bagid - (i)we:b - in - $\quad$ - am - n/ 3 r. 3 R RELEASED FLY CAUSE TSA OAI OAII
(ii) wgi:-bgidna:n He released it./He put it down. /w - gi: - bacid - in - $\vec{\varphi}$ - am - n/
3 PAST REIJEASED CAIJSE TSA OAT OAII
(c) (i) ngi:-ga:njwe:bha:n I pushed it (with an instrument). /n - gi: - ga:nd - (i)we:b - ah - $\emptyset$ - am - n/
1 PAST PUSH FLY CAUSE TSA OAI OAII W/INS'TR
(ii) ngi:-ga:ndha:n I pushed against it (with an instrument).
/n - gi: - £a:nd - ah - Ø - am - n/
1 PAST PUSH CAUSE TSA OAI OAII W/INSTR
(d) (i) n¢j:-bke:we:bška:n I knocked it aside (with my foot; body).
/n - gi: - bake: - we:b - (i)šk - $\emptyset$ - am - n/
1 PAST ASIDE FLY CAUSE TSA OAI OAIIT
W/FOOT/BODY
(ii) ngi:-bke:ška:n I left it aside./T abandoned it. /n - gi: - bake: - šk - $\emptyset$ - $a m_{i}-n /$
1 PAS'I' $\Lambda$ SIDE CAUSE 'ISA OAI OA:II IN BODY

The derivation of (2lb(i)) is g.jven to illustrate [on the next page].

The forms containing the morpheme we:b were problematic in traditional analysis because they represented one of the few instances of constructions containing two finals. In the clause union analysis we:b is an interestinf morphome but not problematic.

| Underlying Form | $\begin{array}{r} \text { gi: } \\ \text { PAST } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { CAUSE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ¿: comp(we:b } \\ \text { FLY } \end{gathered}$ | 1:comp(bagid RELEASED | $\begin{gathered} 1:(\text { INANJ) }) \\ \text { IT } \end{gathered}$ | 1:[1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clause Union (5) |  |  | (we: b | DV:bagid | 1:[INAN] ) |  |
| Dead Verb Attachment (6) |  |  | (bagi |  | 1:[INAN] ) |  |
| Clause Union (5) | gi: | in | DV:bagi |  | 2:[INAN] | 1:[1] |
| Dead Verb Attachment (6) | gi: | bagidwe |  |  | 2:[INAN] | 1:[1] |
| TSA (50)(III) | gi:- | bagidwe |  |  | 2:[INAN] | 1:[1] |
| OA I (42)(VII) | gi:- | bagidwe | -OAI |  | 2:[INAN] | 1:[1] |
| Agreements | ngi:- | bagidwe | -OAI-n |  | 2:[INAN] | 1:51] |
| Spelling | ngi:- | bagidwe |  |  |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | ngi:- | bijwe: |  |  |  |  |

9.1.3 Causative of Transitives. As we have mentioned above there is a general ban in Oiibwa against clause unions involving downstairs transitive clauses. The normal realization of causatives of transitive clauses is a two clause structure with a copy of the subject of the downstairs clause as the superficial object of the causative verb.
(23) ngi:-žiha: wi:-ba:knang mkak I made him open the box. /n - gi: - in - (i)h - $\emptyset$ - a:/ /wi: - ba:k - in - $\varnothing$ - am - d/ 1 PAST LIKE ${ }^{6}$ CAUSE TSA OAI FUT OPEN CPUSE TSA OAI 3

However some speakers allow clause union of downstairs transitive clause with a few verbs (most of them causative constructions themselves).
(24) (a) ngi:-ba:knamo:ha: mkak I made him open the box. /n - gi: - ba:k - in - $\emptyset$ - am - (o)h - $\emptyset$ - a:/ BOX 1 PAST OPEN CAUSE TSA OAI CAUSE TSA OAI
(b) ngi:-da:pnamo:ha: mo: گwe:nan $I$ made him pick up the scarf. /n - gi: - oda:p - in - $\emptyset$ - am - (o)h - $\emptyset$ - a:/ SCARF-obv 1 PAST PICKED-UP CAUSE TSA OAI CAUSE TSA OAI

The TSA and OAI markers of the downstairs transitive verb are both neutralized to inanimate as the example in (24b), with the animate mo:šwe:n 'scarf' as the initial object of the downstairs transitive clause. Notice too that the derivation of forms such as those in (24) involves an application to Indirect Object Advancement (30) (v) as discussed in §5.5.
9.1.4 Weather Causatives. There are several causative morphemes that refer. to ambient conditions as agents of causation. Some examples are given in (25).
(25) (a) gža:te: It's hot (out).
/giž - a:h - de: - w/
HOT CAUSE ISA 3 BY-SUN


We have little more to say about these morphemes besides the fact that they exist and appear to undergo clause union as though they have an upstairs intransitive verb. We have no motivated analysis for the conversion of the logical transitivity that these morphemes have into the intransitivity necessary to account for the structures they appear in.
9.2 Non-Verbal initials. In this second section we will discuss and propose an analysis for handling verbal constructions with non-verbal initials. There sre three different types of such constructions: modal constructions. lverbial constructions, and quantificational constructions (whicr. : will not discuss in this chaptcr). All these constructions have in common the fact that there are closely related constructions involving what is called a preverb in traditional analysis in place of the initial. Some examples of these constructions are given in (26).
(26) (a) modal constructions
(i) initials
gi:-ma:ji:bto: He started running.
/gi: - ma:d - (i)bato: - $\quad$ - w/ PAST STAR'T RUN TSA 3

```
    gi:-bo:na:dga: He stopped wading/swimming.
/gi: - bo:n - a:daga: - \emptyset - w/
    PAST STOP WADE/ ISA 3
        SW.TM
```

(ii) preverbs

```
    gi:-ma:ji:-gmiwan .It started to rain.
/gi: - ma:d - i - gimiwan - w/
    PAST START ADV RAIN 3
    gi:-bo:ni-noki: He stopped work.
/gi: - bo:n - i - anoki: - \emptyset - w/
    PAST STOP ADV WORK ISA 3
```

(b) adverbial constructions
(i) initials
gi:-bba:mse: He went for a walk.
igi: - baba:m - ose: - $\emptyset$-- w/
PAST AROUND WALK ISA 3
ngi:-a:pda:p I laughed and laughed.
/n - gi: - a:pid - a:pi - $\varnothing /$
1 PAST REALLY IAUGGH ISA
(ii) preverbs
gi:-bba:-ndawe:njice:wag
They went off hinting
/gi: - baba: - andawe:ndige: - $\varnothing$ - w - ag/ PAST AROUND HUIP ISA 3 3PL
ngi:-a:pji-g ${ }^{\text {W̌skoz }} \quad$ I (finally) woke up completely.
/n - gi: - a:pid - i - goš̌kw - jzi - w/
1 PAST REALLY ADV WAKE ISA 3
(c) quantifier constructions
(i) initials
gi:-nj:wo:bhidwag There were four of thom running together.
/gi: - ni:wo - bah - idi - $\emptyset$ - w - ag/
PAS'1 FOUR RUN SEIF TSA 3 3PL
be:žgo:ga:bwi He's standing alone.
/be:žígw - (i)ga:bawi - \$ - w/
ONE ST'AND ISA 3
(ii) preverb

```
ni:wo-bbo:ngizi He's four years old.
/ni:wo - bibo:n - ag - izi - w/
FOUR WINTER OLD ISA 3
```

9.2.1 Modal Initials. We will start by examining modal constructions involving both initials and preverbs. The modal morphemes of Ojibwa include those in (27).

| /ma:d-/ | start, begin |
| :--- | :--- |
| /we:b-/ | start, begin |
| /bo:n-/ | stop |
| /askwa:-/ | finish (rare as initial, used to mean 'after') |
| /gi:zz-/ | finish |
| /gask-/ | be possible (preverb very rare) |
| /a:naw-/ | be unable |
| /god-/ | try, test |
| /api:t-/ | be in the process of, continue |
| /gagwe:d-/ | try (preverb form /gagwe:-/) |
| /da:-/ | can, may; should (preverb only) |

Some of these have full verb. forms, as in (28).

| ma:jta:d | start, begin |
| :---: | :---: |
| we:bta:d | start, begin |
| bo:nta:d | stop |
| škwa:ta:d | finish, quit |
| gi:ži : ta:d | finish, be ready |
| gškiha:d | control, manage (TA) |
| gškito:d | control, manaia (TI), be able to (AI) |
| a:nwiha:d | be unable to manage (TA) |
| a:nwito:d | be unable to manage (TI), be unable to (AI) |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{jiha}$ : ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | test, try to get s.o. to (TA) |
| g jito:d | test, try to get s.t. to (TI), try to (TI) |

We will discuss constructions involving full modal verbs in detail
later. For now let us consider the following sentences involving
/ma:d-/ 'start'.
(29) (a) ngı:-ma:jta: gi:-noki:ya:n I started working.
/n - gi: - ma:d - (i)ta: - $\emptyset /$ /gi: - anoki: - $\varnothing$ - a:n/ 1 PAST START HAPPEN ISA PAST WORK ISA 1
(b) gi:-ma:ji:-gmiwan It started to rain.
/gi: - ma:d - i - gimiwan - w/ PAST START ADV RAIN 3

```
(c) gi:-ma:da:pi
/gi: - ma:d - a:pi - w/ PAST START LAUGH 3
```

He started to laugh.

It seems clear on semantic grounds that these three constructions, though superficially different, are closely related. There is no reason to suspect that these sentences are not derived from structures of a form like (30), especially because sentences of the form of (29a) retain, in outline anyway, such a structure.


Even more to the point, most sentences with the form of (29c) have paraphrases of the form of (29a).
(31)
(a) ngi:-ma:jta: gi:-ba:pya:n I started to laugh. /n - gi: - ma:d - (i)ta: - $\varnothing /$ /'gi: - ba:pi - $\varnothing$ - a:n/ 1 PAST START HAPPEN TSA PAST LAUGH ISA 1
(b) ngi:-ma:da:p I started to laugh. /n-gi: - ma:d - a:pi- $\varnothing /$
1 PAS'P START LAUGH ISA

Notice that the verb ngi:-ma:jta: in (3la) is intransitive. Because of the Reranking Law (56) (II) and the Motivated Chomeur Liw (; ; ) (II), there is no way to detransitivize a clause except by incorporation, deletion, or advancement of the object. None of these things seems to have happened in (3la), leading us to the conclusion that the ma:d clause must be underlyingly intransitive. The sentence of (3la) has undergone a rule raising a copy of the downstairs subject. The sentence of (3lb) has undergone some sort of clause union. In (3lb) ma:d, the upstairs verb is in the dead verb position, while -a:pi the downstairs verb is in the live verb position. This construction sug-
gests that there is a second type of clause union process besides the causative/inchoative Clause Union (5). The evidence from Ojibwa is not sufficient to fill out a clear picture of how this type of clause union works. All the Ojibwa examples involve upstairs intransitives and amount simply to rendering the upstairs verb dead. Frantz (2976) suggests that there is a type of clause union which deletes subjects under coreference and renders the upstairs verbs dead. ${ }^{7}$ His may be another case of this type of union, but we cannot tell at present. Our formulation for this clause union is written as (32).
(32) Lowering Union

```
V l:comp ( V ) =# DV:V V
    a b a b
```

It is not totally clear to us at this point, but we consider it possible that (32) is the basic form for a rule of adverb lowering. We will discuss that possibility more in the next section.

For now we will derive the sentence of (3lb) to show the application of (32).
(33) Underlying Form

| gi: | ma:d | l:comp(ba:pi | l: [l] |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| PAST | START | LAUGH | I |

Lowering Union (32)
Dead Verb Attachment (6) ISA (28) (III)
Agreements
Spelling
Morphophonemics
gi: DV:ma:d ba:pi l:[I]
gi:-ma:dba:pi $\quad$ l:[I]
Ei:-ma:dba:pi-TSA[A] $1:[1]$
ngi.-ma:dba:pi-ISA[A] $1:[1]$
ngi:-ma:da:pi
ngi:-ma:da:p

Now let us turn to the analysis of the surface two clause forms like that in (3ia). More examples are given in (34).

```
(34)8 (a)/ma:d/ start
    (i) ngi:-ma: jta: wi:-noki:ya:n. 9 I started working (egg.
                                    a new job).
    /n - gi: - maid - (i)ta:- \(\varnothing /\) /wi: - anoki: - \(\varnothing\) - ain/
    1 PAST START HAPPEN ISA FUT WORK ISA l
    (ii) gi:-ma:jta:mgad wi:-ni:mhiding. The dance started./There
                        is going to being start
                                    dances.
    /gi: -ma:d-(i)ta:- magad-w//wi.: - ni:mi -h - ide ...in -g /
        PAST START HAPPEN ISA 3 FUT DANCE CAUSE SELF 3
                                    INDEF
                                    ACTOR
(iii) gi:-ma:jta:mgad wi:-bmijwajg. It started to flow (unexpectediy).
/wi: - bim - (i)jiw - an - g/
FUT ALONG FLOW ASA 3
(b)
(i) ngi:-bo:nta: wi:-noki:ya:n
I (suddenly) stopped working.
/n - gi: - boon - (i)ta: - \(\varnothing /\)
1 PAST STOP HAPPEN ISM
(ii) gi:-bo:nta:mgad wi:-ni:mhiding
There are going to be any more dances.
/gi: - bo:n - (i)ta: - magad - w/
PAST STOP HAPPEN USA 3
(iii) gi:-bo:nta:mgad wi:-ba:ping. The laughter (suddenly) stopped.
/wi: - ba:pi - \(\varnothing\) - m - g/
PUT LAUGH ASA INDEF 3 ACTOR
```

The problem in these forms is where does the ta: 'happen' (consistently mistranslated as 'do', 'work'; or 'act') come from? At this point it appears that the most consistent way of dealing with $t a$ : is to posit it as an underlying higher predicate in those clauses in which it appears. The derivation of ( $34 \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{i})$ ) is given in (35) [on the next page].
9.2.2 Adverbial Initials. Now let us turn to a discussion of adverbial initials. We have seen a few examples in (26b) above. Fur-
(35)

ther examples are given in (35). Exemplified are the three types of adverbial initial constructions: those involving simple adverbs, those involving directional adverbials, and those involving prepositions.
(36) (a) simple adverbs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) mno-gi:žgad It's a nice day. } \\
& \text { /minw - i - gi:žig - ad - w/ } \\
& \text { GOOD ADV DAY ISA } 3 \\
& \text { ngi:-a:pji-gwskoz I (finally) woke up completely. } \\
& \text { /n - gi: - a:pid - i - goškw - izi/- } \\
& 1 \text { PAS'T REALLY ADV WAKE ISA }
\end{aligned}
$$

```
gi:-nimbato: He ran off.
/gi: - nim - bato: - \emptyset - w/
PAST AWAY RUN ISA 3
```

(c) prepositions
(i) preverbs
a:pi:š e:-wnji-ba:yan? Where do you come from? WHERE/CHANGE - a - wnd - i - ba: - $\emptyset$ - an/ WHICH FROM ADV COME ISA 2
a:ni:š e:ži-ya:yan? What's the matter with you?
HOW /CHANGE - in - i - aya: - $\varnothing$ - an/ WHICH LIKE ADV BE ISA 2
mi: e:ndži-noki:ya:n That's where I work.
TRULY /CHANGE - a - ndan - i - anoki: - $\varnothing$ - a:n/ WHICH A'C ADV WORK ISA 1
nwi:ji-noki:ma: I work with him.
/n - wi:d - i - anoki: - m - $\varnothing$ - a:/
1 WITH ADV WORK TSA OAI
(ii) initials
gi:-wndago:jin He fell off.
/gi: - whd - ago:d - in - w/
PAST FROM FALL ISA 3
ngi:-žiwna: o:de:na:ng I took him to town.
/n - gi: - in - (i)wi - n - a:/ TOINN-loc
1 PAST TO TAKE TSA OAT
wwi:dbima:n He's sitting with her.
/w - wi:d - abi - m - $\varnothing$ - a: - an/
3 WITH SIT TSA OAI OBV
gi:-dni Dgwa:m ma:mpi: Washington
Washington slept here.
/gi: - ndan - ingwa:m - $\varnothing$ - w/
PAST AT SLEEP ISA 3
9.2.2.1 Simple Adverbs. While most adverbs appear either totally unincorporated or as preverb/initials exclusively, there are a number of adverbs that occur in all forms. Some examples are given in (37).
(37) (a) /oza:m/ 'too (much)'
(i) za:m gža:te: goji:ng It's too hot out. TOO BE-HOT-3 OUTSIDE
(ii)
za:mi-mDgide:zi It's too wide. TOO BE-WIDE-3
(iii) ndo:za:mškine: $\quad$ I too full. ( = I overate.) /n(d) - oza:m - oskine: - $\emptyset /$ 1 TOO FULL ISA
(b) /a:pid/ 'very (much), completely'
(i) a:pji go nde:wkwe: I have a bad headache. VERY EMP 1-HEADACHE
(ii) ngi:-a:pji-gwskoz I (finally) woke up completely. /n - gi: - a:pid - i - goskw - izi/
l PAST REALLY ADV WAKE ISA
(iii) gi:-a:pde:ndi He was gone a long time.
/gi: - a:piu - Eindi - $\neq$ - w' PAST REALLY BE-AWAY ISA 3

For most adverbs there are only unincorporated forms, like ne:ya:b
'back (again)', ge:ya:bi 'still', be:giš/a:mbe:giš 'hopefully', no:j 'variously', po:j; surely', we:we:ni 'carefully', etc. Some examples are given in (38).
(38) (a) ge:ya:bi nama:mpi: gbiba:-ya:? Are you still hanging around here?
STILL HERE 2-BE-AROUND
(b) ne:ya:b ngi:-gi:we:wna: BACK l-TOOK-HOME-3
(c) no:j go na: gi:-bmite: All sorts (of things) were there.
VARIOUSLY BE-ALONG-THERE EMP
(d) ga: wi: we:we:ni gdikdosi: You didn't say it right.
(BI S429)
NOT CAREFULLY 2-SAY-THUS
In addition there are some adverbs (sometimes varying from locale to locale) that may occur only as preverbs of initials, like minw- 'good, well', git- 'big, very (much)', wi:nge: 'thoroughly', (may occur unin-
corporated on Walpole), and a few others. Som examples are given in (39).
(39) (a) nmino-bma:diz. I'm fine. (answer to a:ni:š na: e:ži-bma: dziyan? How are you doing?)
/n - minw - i - bim-a:d - izi/
1 WELL ADV I.IVE ISA
mnwa:bi. He's got good etesight.
/minw - wa:bi - $\emptyset$ - w/
WELL SEE ISA 2
(b) za:m ggici-noki: You work too harà.

TOO /g - git - i - anoki: - $\varnothing /$
2 VERY ADV WORK ISA
MUCH
(c) wgi:-wi:nge:-ggwe: jma:wa:n

They questioned him closely. (Odawa use)
/w - gi: - wi:nge: - gagwe:d-m - $\varnothing$ - a: - wa: - an/
3 PAST FYOROUGHLY ASK 'ISA OAT 3PL OBV
The syntax of adverbs is not well understood at this point. We suspect that there are semantic conditions on the incorporation of adverbs as preverbs (and initials) but the conditions are not well understood. Most interestingly, there are somstimes slightly meaning differences between incorporated and unincorporated adverbs, e.g. a:pid 'very, completely', seems to have oaly the meaning 'completely' when incorporated. Nonetheless we can talk in a rough way about the mechanisms of incorporation. We choose to account for adverb incorporation via Dead Verb Attachment (6). The basic rule setting up incorporation adverbs is given as (40).
(40) Adverb Deadening

$$
\text { ADV } \Rightarrow D V: A D V
$$

This rule labels adverbs as dead verbs, and since there is already a rule of Dead Verb Attachment (6), this will have the desired effect. In fact this rule alone is sufficient to account for both the preverb and initial forms of adverbs, because the choice of preverb versus ini-
tial is made largely on the basis of the morphological properties of the following morpheme. ${ }^{l l}$ Some examples of morphemes having both root and final forms are given in (41).
(41) (a) 'laugh' root form /ba:pi/ final form /-a;pi/
(i) ba:pi He's laughing.
(ii) a:pda:pi He's laughing very hard. /a:pid - a:pi - $\varnothing$ - w/ REALLY ISA 3
(b) 'see' root form /wa:bi/ final form /-wa;bi/
(i) wa:bi He (can) see.
(ii) mnwa:bi He (can) see well./He has good eyes. /minw - wa:bi - $\emptyset$ - w/
G@OD ISA 3
(c) 'stand' root form /(na:)ni:bawi/ final form /-ga:bawi/
(i) na:ni:bwi
He's standing up.
(ii) ntamga:bwi He's standing first (in line). /nitam - (i)ga:bawi - $\varnothing$ - w/ FIRST ISA 3

But many verbal morphemes do not have final forms, in these cases the preverb form of the adverb appears. Some examples are given in (42).


In addition there are a number of adverbial morphemes that do not have initial forms, these of course only appear as proverbs. Some examples
are given in (43).
(43) (a) 'often' (by implication 'be good at/know how') /nita:/
(i) wa:bi-mno:min nnita:-mnoza:n $I$ know how to cook rice. I often cook rice.
WHITE RICE /n - nita: - mincz - $力$ - am - n/ 1 OFTEN COOK TSA OAI OAII
(ii) wa:bi-mno:min ngi:-za:mza:n I burrt the rice. WHITE RICE /n - gi: - oza:m - z - $\varnothing$ - am - $\mathrm{n} / 12$ 1 PAST TOO COOK TSA OA.I OA.II
(b) 'that not' /bwa:/
(i) e:-bwa:-wi:snijig the ones who do not eat /CHANGE - a - bwa: - wi:sini - $\emptyset$ - d - i - ag/ WHICH EAT ISA 3 PPL 3PL
(ii) ngi:-de:bsini: I ate my fill. /n - gi: - de:b - isini - i/ 1 PAST ENOUGH EAT ISA
9.2.2.1 Adverb Lowering. We feel that there is an affinity in Ojibwa between modals and adverbs. In fact there are a number of superficial adverbs in Ojibwa that have meanings that one would classify as modal. Some examples are given in (44).
(44) (a) nama: da-bi-dgošjin POSSIBLY FUT-COME-ARRIVE-3
(b) abdig gi:-wa-noki: NECESSARILY PAST-GO-WORK-3
(c) na:bwi na: ni-ma:ja:yan PREFERABLY EMP LEAVE-2

Although a clear argument cannot be made on the basis of the Ojibwa data alone, we feel that the data suggest that Lowering Union (32) is an appropriate mechanism for accounting for some of the adverbial phenomena of 0 fibwa. Thus we are suggesting that (45a) and (45b) have the same underlying, construction, a one place modal verb upstairs. And that they are diffrornt. onl.y in that (45a) undergoes Adverb Deadening (40) while (4ヶ) does not.

```
(45) (a) nda:-noki:
    /n - da: - anoki: - \emptyset/
    l SHOULD WORK ISA
(b) a:bdig nga-noki: I have to work.
    NECESSARILY /n - ga - anoki: - \emptyset/
        l FU'T WORK ISA
```

This type of analysis will require a minor revision of Lowering Union (32) so that it generates adverbs, rather than dead verbs. While we are in favor of such a revision, we have neither an appropriate idea of what it means syntactically to be an adverb, not a motivated mechanism for notating the conversion of a verb to an adverb, Therefore, we let our rule (32) stand as is.
9.2.2.3 Directional Adverbs. Directional adverbs are syntactically very similar to simple adverbs. However there are interesting semantic (and as a consequence morphological) facts that regard direntional adverbs. There are four basic directional adverbs in Ojibwa: bi:d- 'come', anim- 'away', bim- 'along', and biba:m- 'around'. They are exemplified in (46).
(46) (a) bi:jbato: He's coming running. /bi:d - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/ COME RUN ISA 3
(b) nimbato: $\quad H=' s$ running off. /anim - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/ AWAY RUN ISA 3
(c) bmibto: He 's running (along).
/bim - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/ ALONG RUN ISA 3
(d) bba:mbato: He's ruuning around./He's (out) running. /biba:m - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/ AROUND RUN ISA 3

There are a relatively large number of morphemes which express some basic notion of movement or motion that must cooccur with at least some incorporated adverb. I'he most semantically neutral adverbs for
motion verbs are directionals. A partial list of the motion morphemes involved is given in (47).
(47) (a) intransitive

| -(h)ose: | walk |
| :--- | :--- |
| -a:daga: | wade, swim, move through water |
| -akožiwe: | paddle |
| -ska: | move, canoe |
| -bizo/-bide: | fly, speed |
| -kawe: | make tracks |
| -se: | move |
| -a:ndawe: | climb |
| -o:de: | crawl |
| -a:ši/-a:sin | be blown (by the wind), sail |
| -jiwan | flow |
| etc. |  |

(b) transitive

```
-win-/-wido:- transport
-na:skaw-
chase
-0:m-/-o:ndam- carry on the back
-da:ba:n-/-da:ba:dam-
    drag
    -da:bi: drag (intr.)
-bo:n-/-bo:do:- plov (idiom from: cause by sawing motion)
-bah-
    run from
-bato: run (/bah-d-we:/)
```

None of the morphemes in (47) have root forms, i.e. none of them can be used alone. They must be used as a part of a complex construction involving some sort of initial. The generalization that "explains" this fact seems to be the following.
(48) No underlying structure containing a reference to motion is a well formed structure of Ojibwa, unless it also contains an adverbial element specifying the path, or manner of the action.

Thus one can say any of the following
(49) (a) bmibto: $\mathrm{He}^{\prime}$ s running (along). /bim - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/ ALONG RUN ISA 3
(b) bba:mbato: He's running around.
/baba:m - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/
AROUND FUN ISA 3
(c) pato: He runs to (somewhere)./He's running like (so).
/in - bato - $\emptyset$ - w/
LIKE/TO RUN ISA 3
(d) bi:jbato: He's running this way.
/bi:d - bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/
COME RUN ISA 3
(e) wa:nnibto: He's running in circles.
/wa:nin-bato: - $\emptyset$ - w/
CIRCLE RUN ISA 3
(f) $\underset{z}{2}$ : bto: He's running backwards.
/aze: - bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/
BACKWARDS RUN ISA 3
and many others but one cannot simply say
(50) *bto: He's running.
/bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/
RUN ISA 3
The same can be said for the other morphemes listed in (47). The generalization in (48) gets additional support from the fact that morphemes like bim- 'along (passing) be' and biba:m- 'around' also occur with verbs that only secondarily imply motion as in (51) and in situations that imply motion, even though the verb doesn't as in (52).
(51) (a) gi:-bba:-ndawe:njge:
/gi - biba:m - andawe:ndige: - $\emptyset$ - w/ PAST AROUND HUNT ISA 3

He went out hunting.
(b) ??gi:-ndawe:ngje:
(52) (a)
(i) me:gwa: bmina:žhige:ya:n, ge:ga: go na: ngi:-bmi-nba:.
mitLE DRIVE-1 ALMOST EMPH/n-gi:-bim-niba:- $\varnothing$ /
1 PAST AROUND ADV SLEEP
ISA
(ii) ??me:gwa: bmina:žhige:ya:n, ge:ga: go na: ngi:-nba:.

While driving home, I almost fell asleep.
(b) (i) škini:šan wgi:-bba:-wi:ji:wgo:n bba:-ndane:wa:wa:d niwi mkon. YOUNG-MAN /w - gi: - biba: - wi:ji:w - $\varnothing$ - igw - i - an/ 3 PAST AROUND ACCOMPANY TSA PASS ISA OBV AROUND-LOOK-FOR-3-3PL THAT-OBV BEAR-OBV
(ii) ??škini:šan wgi:-wi: ji:wgo:n bba:-ndane:wa:wa:d niwi mkon His young men joined him in hunting for that bear.

Now the formulation of the principle governing underlying structures in Ojibwa given in (48) is not yet sufficiently refined, both in regard to the fact that the defining terms (like "reference to motion") are not adequately defined themselves, and in regard to the fact that there are a few (but very few) counterexamples. The three that are known are listed in (53).

```
(53) iža:-
    go (AI)
    ma:ma:- move (AI, II)
    a:wan-/a:wado:- haul (TM,TI)
```

Of these the first two are historically not counterexamples being made up of in- 'to' and ma:d- 'away' plus a now defunct final -ya: 'move'. Even so, these words are rarely used with out a morpheme indicating path, usually bi_ 'come' or ni- 'away' or a locative indicating the goal of the action. Thus sentences like
(54) (a) ža:

He's going.
(b) ma:ja: He's moving.
are strange, although it is worth noting the semi-idiomatic use of ma:ja: in
(55) ma:ja:n Come here.

The final resolution of these problems is beside the point of this work, and I therefore leave them aside with this mention for later investigation.
9.2.2.4 Prepositional Initials. Let us now turn to a discussion of initials that represent prepositions. Some examples are given
in (56).
(a) /in-/ 'to, like'
(i) nini:ng š go na: wgi:-na:bma:n niwi mnido: $\mathrm{n}^{13}$ MAN-LOC THEN EMP THAT-OBV SPIRIT-OBV
/w - gi: - in - wa:bam - $\varnothing$ - a: - an/ 3 PAST LIKE SEE TSA OAI OBV Then the (evil) spirit appeared to her in the form of of a man.
(ii) gida:ki gi:-ni-pato: He ran up the hill. HILL /gi: - ni - in - bato: - $\varnothing$ / - w/ PAST AWAY TO RLN ISA 3
(b) /wnd-/
'from, because of'
(i) ga: wi: ngike:nma:si: ma: e:-wnji-ya:d NOT l-NOT-KNOW-3 THERE /CHANGE-a-wnd-i-iya:- $\varnothing$ - d/ I don't know why she's there.WHITCH BECAUSE BE ISA 3 OF/ADV
(ii) gi:-wndago:de: nmaznahgan do:pwining
MY-BOOK TABLE-LOC
/gi: - wnd - ago:d - e: - w/ PAST FROM FALL ISA 3
(c) /ndan-/
'at'
gi:-dningwa:m ma:mpi: Washington
/gi: - ndan - ingwa:m - $\emptyset$ - w/ HERE
PAST AT SLEEP ISA 3
Washington slept here.
(d) /wi:d-/ 'with (animate logical object)'

> ngi:-wi:dse:ma:
/n - gi: - wi:d - ose: - m - $\emptyset$ - a:/
1 PAST W.TTH WALK TSA OA.I
I walked with him.

In traditional analysis verbs containing these prepositional morphemes are called relative roots. ${ }^{14}$ In our analysis we will treat these constructions as consisting of a preposition floated off its logical object attached to the verb. We choose to write this float as (57), in which we are claiming that a preposition takes on the status of an adverb.
(57) Preposition Float PREP ==>ADV

Then incorporation of the resultant prepositional adverb occurs through Adverb Deaden:ng (40) and Dead Verb Attachment (6). We derive (56b, ii) in (58) to show the mechanism.

One further comment on the syntax of prepositions is in order. Very commonly the logical object of a preposition which is left stranded by Preposition Float (57) is marked with the locative /-ing/. The clearest examples of this in (56) are (56a, i) and (56b, ii). ${ }^{15}$ However with /wi:d-/ 'with' the logical object of the preposition is obligatorily advanced to direct object. (56d) is an example of this. The marker of advancement is $\underline{m}$. We did not discuss this rule of advancement in Chapter V.

Finally if the logical object of a preposition is pronominal it is deleted.

```
            (a) gi:-ni-pato: He ran there.
        /gi: - ni - in - bato: - \(\varnothing\) - w/
        PAST AWAY TO RUN ISA 3
    (b) pato:
                            He runs like so.
        /in - bato: - \(\varnothing\) - w/
        LIKE RUN ISA 3
    (c) gi:-wndago:de: It fell from there./It fell off.
        /gi: - wnd - ago:d - e: - w/
        PAST FROM FALL ISA 3
    (d) bi-wi:dbin Come sit with (me).
        /bi - wi:d - abi - \(\emptyset\) - n/
        COME WITH SIT ISA IMPER
```

9.2.2.5 Comments on Adverbs. The preceding analysis of the syntax of Ojibwa adverbials is very sketchy. It is intended to be suggestive of the kind of analysis we think will ultimately be shown to be correct. But the amount of work that needs to be done in this area warrants a thesis or two of its own. There is a significant amount of semantic/pragmatic interaction here and possibly it will take a
(58)

| Underlying Form | $\begin{array}{r} \text { gi: } \\ \text { PAST } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ago:d } \\ & \text { FALL } \end{aligned}$ | l:(POSS:[1]) mazinahigan |  | (wnd) do:piwin <br> FROM TABLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preposition Float (57) | gi: | ago:d | 1:(POSS:[1]) mazinahigan | wnd | LOC:do:piwin |
| Adverb Deadening (40) | gi: | ago:d | 1:(POSS:[1]) mazinahigan | Dv:wnd | LOC:do:piwin |
| Dead Verb Attachment (6) | gi: | dago:d | 1:(POSS:[1]) mazinahigan |  | LOC:do:piwin |
| ISA. (28)(III) | gi: | dago:d-ISA[I] | 1:(POSS:[1]) mazinahigan |  | LOC:do:piwin |
| Agreements | gi: | dago: d-ISA[I]-w | 1:(POSS:[1]) mazinahigan |  | LOC: do:piwining |
| Spelling | gi: | dago: de:w | nmazinahigan |  | do:piwining |
| Morphophonemics | gi:w | ago:de: nmaznah | an do:pwinigg |  |  |

native speaking linguist to sort all the factors out. We hope, on our part, to have indicated some of the basic mechanisms by which we feel adverbial morphemes come to appear in verb stems.
9.3 Non-causative Constructions with Verbal Initials. In this section we will argue that there is a third source of initials (and preverbs) that arise as the result of a clause union type process which affects non-term clauses. Some examples are given in (60).
(60) (a) (i) dkami: He goes across. (usually a bridge) /dakami - i - w/ CROSS ISA 3
(ii) dkamse: He walks across. (name of the Shawnee /dakami - ose: - $\emptyset$ - w/ leader spelled in CROSS WALK ISA 3 English Tecumseh)
(iii) drama:dga: He swims across.
/dakami - a:daga: - $\emptyset$ - w/ CROSS SWIM ISA 3
(b) (i) bi: ndge: He enters (usually a room or house). /bi:ndige: - $\varnothing$ - w/ ENTER ISA 3
(ii) bi:ndge:bto: He runs inside.
/bi:ndige: - bato: - $\varnothing$ - w/
ENTER RUN ISA 3
(iii) bi:ndge:ya:de: He crawls inside.
/bi:ndige: - o:de: - $\varnothing$ - w/
ENTER CRAWL ISA 3
(c) (i) ye: $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{zi}}} \mathrm{He}$ 's tired.
/iye:kw - izi - w/
TIRED ISA 3
(ii) ye:k ${ }^{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{ga}:$ bwi $\quad \mathrm{He}$ 's tired from standing.
/iye:kw - (i) ga:bawi - $\varnothing$ - w/ TIRED STAND ISA 3
(iii) ye: $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{W}}$ gwa:so He 's tired of sewing.
liye:kw - (i)gwa:h - zo - w/ TIRED SEW ISA 3
(d) (i) za:gji:tam He goes out.
/za:gid - (i)h-d-am - $\varnothing$ - w/ EXIT ISA 3

```
    (ii) za:gjiga:bwi He's standing outside.
    /za:gid - (i)ga:bawi - \(\emptyset\) - w/
    EXIT STAND ISA 3
```

(iii) gi:-za:gdo:de:bto: He crawled out and ran. /gi: - za:gid - o:de: - bato: - $\quad$ - w/ PAST EXIT CRAWL RUN ISA 3

The variety of semantic relationships between the two (or more) verbal ideas expressed in the constructions of (60) is rather wide. The most common relationship expressed is simultaneity, e.g. bi:ndge:bto: 'he enters running.' In addition there are three morphemes that participate in this type of clause union but often express a relationship of purpose. Examples of these are given in (61).
(61) (a) /wa-/ (dialectal wi-, owa-) 'go (in order) to, go and...'
gi:-wi-wi:sni He went to eat./He went and ate.
/gi: - wi - wi:sini - $\emptyset$ - w/
PAST GO EAT ISA 3
wgi:-wa-šama:n wdayan. He went to feed his dog.
/w - gi: - wa - ašam - $\emptyset$ - a: - an/
3 PAST GO FEED TSA OA.I OBV
(b) /bi-/ Come (in order) to, come and... ${ }^{16}$
gi:-bi-wi:sni. $\quad \mathrm{He}$ came to eat.
/gi: - bi - wi:sini - $\emptyset$ - w/
PAST COME EAT TSA 3
ngi:-bi-wa:bma: bino:jĩ:s
I came to see the baby.
/n - gi: - bi - wa:bam - $\varnothing$ - a:/
1 PAST COME SEE TSA OAI
(c) /anda-/ 'look for (something) to... (it)'
wbiba:-ndawa:bma:n mškiki:wninwan.
He's looking for e doctor.
/w - biba: - nda - wa:bam - Ø-a: - an/
3 AROUND SEEK SEE TSA OAI OBV
ngi:-bi-nda-wi:sin. I came looking (for something) to eat.
/n - gi: - bi - nda - wi:sini - $\emptyset /$
1 PAST COME SEEK EAT TSA

The clearest evidence we have regarding the underlying structure of the various complex verb construrtions exemplified in (60) and (61) is semantic. Speakers accept paraphrases of some of the constructions in (60) and (61) as exemplified in (62).
(62) (a) (i) gi:-bi:ndge:bto: He ran insjde.
/gi: - bi:ndige: - vato: - Ø - w/ PAST ENTER RUN ISA 3
(ii) gi:-bi:ndge: bmibto:d

He entered running. $[=a(i)]$
/gi: - bi:ndige: - $\quad$ - w/ /bim - (i)bato: - $\varnothing$ - d/ PAST ENTERS ISA 3 ILONG RUN ISA 3
(b) (i) gi:-wi-wi:sni He went to eat.
/gi: - wi - wi:sini - $\varnothing$ - w/
PAST GO EAT ISA 3
(ii) gi:-ža: wi:-wi:snid

He went in order to eat. [has one sense = b(i) ]
/gi: - ža: - Ø - w/ /wi: - wi:sini - $\varnothing$ - d/
PAST GO ISA 3 FUT EAT ISA 3

Consistently such paraphrases have the dead verb of the complex construction as the upstairs verb in the paraphrase. Attempts to find paraphrases with the live verb of the complex construction upstairs have uniformly failed. We take this to mean that the complex constructions like those of (60) and (61) derive from structures with the dead verb upstairs as their paraphrases (and translations) suggest. To handle the clause union we will draw on Frantz's (1976) observation that there are clause unions which simultaneously delete the subject of the verb that shows lip dead. We formalize trie rule as in (63).
(ó3). Equi Subject Union

This is particularly interesting because (63) looks very much like Low-
ering Union (32).
(32) Lowering Union

```
V l:comp ( V ) \(\Rightarrow D V: V \quad V\)
```

But because of the lack of clear internal evidence in Ojibwa on the analysis of adverbs, particularly regarding the structures underlyirg them and the conditions that trigger the various rules which affect them, we can only speculate on the potential relatedness between (63) and (32). While we suggested that (32) might be crucially involved in the derivation of one place adverbs, something like (63) would be necessary to account for the derivation of manner adverbs which are logically two place in some sense. For example gi:mo:j 'sneakily' (rela.ted to the verb gmo:did 'steal') prubably undergoes a derivation that involves something like (63) in going from a structure that would be equivalent to $x$ was sneaky in $x$ 's Ving to a structure with a simple adverh $x$ Ved sneakily.
9.4 Morphology of Finals. In this last section of this chapter, we will discuss briefly some very puzzling facts of Ojibwa morphology that have a non-morphological explanation. There are no small number of verbal concepts that are expressed in Ojibws by morphemes that have only a final form. This means that such morphemes may appear only in complex constructions, either being adverbially modified, or with some sort of complement. While an in depth study of the facts relating to such morphemes is material enough for another thesis, we will point out some regularities that have gone totally unnoticed to the best of our knowledge.

There are two general kinds of morphemes that appear only as
finals: motion morphemes and causative murphemes. We discussed motion morphemes in §9.2.2.3 above, but while working with causative morphemes we have not discussed the fact that for all the wide variety of causative morphemes there is no simple morpheme which means 'cause'. Ojibwa requires that if causative is mentioned there must be a specification of the nature of the action that has been caused. In addition, because of the variety of instrumental causatives available the nature or means of the causation must also be specified in most cases. However, there is one very problematic class of constructions involving causative morphemes that seem to be missing morphemes. Examples are given in (64).
(64) (a) a:pi:š ma:nda ga:-wndinman? Where did you get this from? WHERE THIS /CHANGE - gi: - wnd - - in - $\varnothing$ - am - an/ WHICH PAST FROM ? CAUSE TSA OAT 2
(b) a:ni:s e:žcige:yan? What are you doing? WHTCH /CHANGE - in-- (i)h - d - ig - e: - $\emptyset$ - an/ LIKE ? CNUSE TISA PRO MEDTAL ISA 2

The two constructions here have somewhat different explanations. Let us review each briefly. First the construction of (64a). The expression whdinang 'get from' is very unusual semantically. It should be ambiguous between 'cause [be] from' and 'cause [be] because of' (using [be] as the verb to fill the empty spot in the construction). However, the form is not ambiguous. A sentence like ( $6,5 \mathrm{a}$ ) is impossible. To express the idea 'Why did you get that?' one must use a form like one nf those in ( 65 b ) which are explicit as regards the manner in which the object was gottten.

(b) (i) a:ni:S iw ga:-wnji-da:pnaman?

Why did you take that?/pick.that up?
WHICH THAT /CHANGE - gi: - wnd - i - oda:p-in - $\varnothing$-am an/
WHICH PAST BECAUSE ADV PICKED CAUSE OAI 2 OF UP TSA
(ii) a:ni:s iw ga:-wnji-na:dyan?

Why did you fetch that (one)? WHICH THAT /CHANGE - gi: - wnd - i - na: - d - i - an/ WHICH PAST BECAUSE ADV FETCH TSA OAI 2 OF
(iii) a:ni:S iw ga:-wnji-ya:man?

Why did you buy that (one)?
WHICH THAT /CHANGE - gi: - wnd - i aya: - $\emptyset$ - am - an/
WHICH PAST BECAUSE ADV HAVE TSA OAI @ OF

Although we are not certain of the mechanism, it looks like there is an optional elipsis of the complement clause of a causative in where? questions. This is not so ad hoc as it might sound at first. Consider --if one does not know where a person got something from, he could not have seen him do it. Therefore it would be unreasonable to expect the questioner to know a priori the manner in which the thing was gotten. Thus where? questions are exactly the place in which one would expect the elipsis of the complement of a causative, if any where.

Now let us consider the construction in (74b). The explanation of this type of construction will require a somewhat closer look at the two clause causative construction. Examples of this are given in (66).
(66) (a) (i) ngi:-žiha:wi:-gi:we:d I made him go home.
/n - gi: - in - h - $\emptyset$ - a:/ /wi: - gi:we: - $\varnothing$ - d
1 PAST LIKE CAUSE TSA OAI FUT GO-HOME ISA 3
(ii) *ngi:-žito:n wi:-gi:we:d I made him go home.
/n - gi: - in - h - d - o: - n/ /wi: - gi:we: - $\emptyset$ - d/
1 PAST LIKE CAUSE TSA OAI OAII FUT GO-HOME ISA 3
(b) (i) ngi:-žito:n wi:-gtigwse:g I made it roll.
/n - gi: - in - h - d - o: - n/ /wi: - gitigw - (i)se: - $\quad$ - g/
1 PAST LTKE CAUSE TSA OAI OAII FUT ROLL MOVE ISA 3

| $n-(i) h-d-o:-n-a n / / w i:-g i t i g w-(i) s e:-\emptyset-g /$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

These constructions require the raising of a copy of the subject of the downstairs clause, as the sentences in ( $66 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{ii}$ ) and ( 66 b , ii) indicate. This makes the logical object of the causative a chomeur. This chomeur is marked ad hocly with in- 'like', which is then incorporated into the verb by the process discussed in §9.2.2.4 above. The sentence in (64b) is derived in essentially the same way, but with the incorporation of a PRO object which arises as the "raised" subject of a PRO clause. The PRO clause is then questioned using a:nin? 'which, how?' which questions non-terms (in this case a chomeur clause).

## FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IX
$I_{\text {There }}$ is a systematic ambiguity in 0jibwa between stative and inchoative readings for most non-active verb forms. Thus mskozi may mean either 'He is red.' or 'He is turning red.' In particular the morpheme of interest - $\underline{s}-$ means either 'fall' $0 \times$ ' 'lie' ir its most concrete meaning(s). If necessary, the forms may be disambiguated by using the morpheme daš 'then, so' with them in a sentence. Gi:-mskozi daš. 'Then he turned red.', or 'And so he turned red.'
${ }^{2}$ It is not immediately obvious what the route of derivation of sentences like ( 8 b ) and (9) is. In a later section I will discuss forms that traditional analysts have called relative words and show that the in- 'thns' which appears in these sentences is in fact a kind of preposition that marks the chomage of the initial objeci clause after subject copying.
${ }^{3}$ The lengthened $o$ is an ad hoc lengthening that several morphemes show: dkonang /dakw-in-am-d/ 'sieze' vs. dko:nang 'shorten'
${ }^{4}$ Bloomfield (1944) claims there is an Ojibwa cognate gi:ška:bka: but it is not found in the dialect under study.

5zi:ga: is a form of another (possibly historically related) stem, ' It is wrinkled, dried out.'
$6_{\text {We will }}$ discuss the morpheme /in-/ 'like' in §9.2.2.4. It is in part the result of the chomage of the logical object complement.
$7_{\text {Frantz's formulation }}$ is somewhat different. He is concerned more with the fact that one of two coreferential indices is lost in the process of the union.
${ }^{8}$ All the forms in (34) have correspondingpreverbor initial constructions. The basic semantic difference between the two constructions is that the two clause construction "focuses" on the modal concept, especially where that aspect is more unusual, unnatural, or unexpected. An especially clear example is the contrast between (34b, iii) and gi:-bo:na:pim, 'People stopped laughing'. One is appropriate in describing the course of events after a joke, but the other is appropriate to describe what happened in the theater after the comedian told a joke, a shot rang out and comedian fell dead.
$9_{\text {We have not }}$ discussed complementation in detail. Older speakers copy the tense of the upstairs clause into the downstairs clause. Younger speakers cannot, and must use wi: as the complementizer. Older speakers also use wi: forms occasionally but it is not known if there is any distinction in meaning expressed by doing so.
${ }^{10}$ Notice that we are not positing identical underlying forms for the one clause and two clause modal constructions.
${ }^{1 l_{\text {This }}}$ is not strictly true. Occasionally in- 'to, like' is attached as an initial to morphemes that start with a, even though the form should otherwise require a preverb, e.g. /inanoki:-/, 'worklike'; /inagim-/ 'count-like'; /inašp-/, 'high-like'; and even /inaškwa:-/, 'finish-like'. Occasionally semantic factors influence the choice of preverbs over initials.
${ }^{12}$ There are a number of morphemes that have specialized meanings in certain contexts, -iz-, which normally means 'cause 'xsing heat', also stands as the final forms of minoz- 'cook'.
$13_{\text {This }}$ sentence is taken from the text "How a woman helped the Thunderers" in Piggot and Kaye (1973).
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There are other types of relative words, both nouns and verbs. These contain quantificational morphemes like ndasw- '(so) many', akw'(so) long/far', api:t- 'to (such) an extent', etc. We will not discuss these constructions in this work.
${ }^{15}$ Some words do not add any suffix to form their locative. The word gida:ki 'hill' is an examples. Thus (56a(ii)) is also an example of a stranded NP being in the locative.
$16_{\text {There }}$ is a homophonous morpheme bi-, a direciional adverb, which means 'come' whose opposite is ni-. The opposite of this bi- is wa-. The adverbial bi- has an initial form bi:d-. Thus (la) and (lb) are opposities, ai are ('己a) and (2b).
(1) (a) gi:-bi-wi:sni . He came to eat.
(b) gi:-wa-wi:sni He went to eat.
(2) (a) za:m wi:ka: gi:-bi-dgošin He got here too late. TOO LATE PAST-COME-ARRIVE-3
(b) za:m wi:ka: gi:-ni-dgošin He got there too late.

NOUN INCORPORATION
10.0 In Ojibwa nominal elements are incorporated into verbal constructions in two basically different ways. The first way results in a class of morphemes called medials in traditional analysis. Some examples of these are given in (1).
(1) (a) gi:-na:jmi:jme: He went after some food.
/gi: - na:d - (i)mi:jim - e: - $\varnothing$-w/
PAST FETCH FOOD MEDIAL ISA 3
(b) ndaka:knj.nji:waj

My hands are very cold.
/n - dak - a:kw-(i)ninigi-e: - wad - i/ (lit. My hands are I COLD SOLID HAND MEDIAL CAUSE ISA like a cold solid medial medial from the cold.)
(a) rgi:-gzi:hi:gna:gne: I washed the dishes.
/n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - (i)na:gan- e: - $\varnothing /$ (lit. I wiped 1 PAST WIPE WATER DISH MEDIAL ISA the dishes with medial medial water.)
(d) gnwa:bi:gzi sab
/gənw - a:bi:g - izi - w/ LONG ROPE ISA 3 medial
(e) nde:wkwe:
/n - de:w - ikw - e: - $\varnothing /$ 1 ACHE HEAD MEDIAL ISA medial

There is a second type of nominal incorporation that is limited to a rew verbal morphemes, most commonly: w 'be', $\underset{\text { i }}{ }$ 'have', ke: 'get;', and ag 'be (so) old'.' This type is not much discussed in traditional analyses. Some examples are given in (2).
(2) (a) bino:jĨ:hwi He is a child.
/abino:ji:nh - w - i - w/
CHILD BE ISA 3
(2) (a) (continued)
škihi:wan It is a new thing.
/oškihi: - w - an - w/
NEW-THING BE ISA 3
(b) no:sna:

He is our father. (lit. We
/n - o-o:s - $\varnothing$ - $\varnothing$ - na:ni/ have his as a father.)(PT 1 aug FATHER HAVE ISA 1PL construction)
žo:nya:mi
He has money.
/o - žo:niya: - m - $\varnothing$ - i - w/ aug MONEY POSS HAVE ISA 3
(c) nbo:bi:ke: He's making soup.
/nibo:bi - ke: - $\varnothing$ - w/
SOUP GET ISA 3
mno:mnike:wag
They're gathering rice.
/mano:min - (i)ke: - $\varnothing$ - w - ag/ RICE GET ISA 3 3PL
(d) nso-bbo:ngizi He's three years old.
/nisw - i - bibo:n - ag - izi - w/
THREE ADV WINTER BE-OLD ISA 3
na:no-gi:zswagzi He's five months old.
/na:nw - i - gi:zisw - ag - izi - w/
FIVE ADV MOON BE-OLD ISA 3
In this chapter we will discuss the several rules which account for the incorporation of the various kinds of nominal elements into verbal constructions.
10.1 Medials. In this section we will look at the derivation of constructions involving that class of morphemes which are called medials. There are two distinct kinds of medial constructions, based on whether an entire noun has been incorporated or not. Examples of constructions in which an entire noun has been incorporated are given in (3).
(3) (a) ndakninji: My hands are cold.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { In - dak- (i)ninji-e:- } \varnothing / \text { (lit. I am cold-handed.) } \\
1 \text { COLD HAND MEDIAL ISA } \\
\text { medial }
\end{gathered}
$$

(3)
(b) ngi:-be: $\cap \mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{W}}$ na:gne:
I dried the dishes.
/n - gi: - be:ngw - (i)na:gan - e: - $\varnothing /$
1 PAST DRY DISH MEDIAL ISA
medial
(c) ngi:-bo: $\mathrm{K}^{\text {W}}$ nike:wa: I broke his arm.
/n - gi: - bo:kw - (i)nik - e: - ah - w - a:/ 1 PAST BREAK ARM MEDIAL CAUSE TSA OAI medial W/INSTR

We will call these medials boay part medials after the semantic class which provides the most productive and wide spread source for whole noun incorporations. Note however, that there are numerous other nouns which also, under limited circumstances, undergo this type of incorporation.

The second type of medial construction is that in which only a "copy" of the noun is incorporated into the verbal construction. These "copies" are the remnants of a near defunct classifier system, so we will refer to these medials as classificatory medials. Examples of verbal constructions containing classificatory medials are given in (4).
(4) (a) gnw:bi:gad saba:b The rope is long.
/ginw - a:bi:g - ad - w/ LONG ROPE ISA 3
(b) ngi:-dkwe:gkoda:n mzinhigan I cut the paper shorter.
/n - gi: - dakw - e:g - (i)ko - d - am - n/
1 PAST SHORT SHEET CAUSE TSA OAI OAII W/CUTTING
(c) (i) ngi:-gzi:bi:gna:nan ndagwnan I washed my clothes. (lit. /n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n - an/ I wiped
1 PAST BE-WIPED LIQUID CAUSE TSA OAI OAII PL my clothes with water.)
(ii) ngi:-wmba:bi:gna:n I hoisted it up. (lit. I /n - gi: - wmb - a:bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - $n /$ raised it 1 PAST BISE ROPE CAUSE TAS OAI OAII on a rope.)
(iii) kajgabi:sin It reflects on the water. /akaiiga - bi:g - (i)s - in - w/ REFLECT/ LIQUID LIE ISA 3 CAST-A-SHADOW

The forms in (4c) do not have corresponding versions that have an explicit noun in the clause from which the medial comes, but we treat these types of medials the same as those in which a full noun phrase may be left behind for two reasons. First they use the same morphemes, and second they show the same (potential) ambiguities, this bi:g LiqUID means water in the examples of (4c), but in other constructions it can mean liquor, e.g. gi:wškwe:bi: 'he's drunk' (lit. he's dizzy from liquor).
10.1.1 Body Part Medials. First let us examine the syntax of body part medials in detail. Body part medials may represent either incorporated subject, as in (3a), or incorporated objects, as in (3b) and (3c). Also the incorporation may be launched from a noun phrase containing a possessor, leaving the possessee behind bearing the grammatical relation of the original noun phrase, as in (3a) and (3c). However, the noun incorporated undergoes a process of medialization by which a suffix e : is added to the noun as shown in (6). In addition sume nouns lose initial $\underline{m}^{\prime} s$ and $\underline{w}^{\prime} s$ as the exainples in (6) show.

```
(5)
    (a) na:gan
        ngi:-be:林na:gne: I dried the dishes.
                                    'dish'
        /n - gi: - be:ngw - (i)na:gan - e: - \emptyset/
        l PAST DRY DISH MEDIAL ISA
    (b) pin 'potato'
        ngi:-mo:nhapni: I harvested potatces.
        /n - gi: - mo:nah - \emptyset - apini - e: - \emptyset/
        l PAST DIG TSA POTATO MEDIAL ISA
    (c)mi:jim 'food'
    ngi:-na:jmi:jme: I went and got food
    /n - gi: - na: - d - (i)mi:jim - e: - \emptyset/
        l PAST FETCH TSA FOOD MEDIAL ISA
```

(6)
(a) wi:wkwa:n
'hat'
ngi:-gi:ci:whwa:ne: I took off my hat.
/n - gi: - gi:t - wi:wikwa:n - e: - $\varnothing /$ 1 PAST REMOVE HAT MEDI: ISA (CLOTHES)
(b) mkizin
'shoe'
ngi:-ba:pi:wkizne:šin I brushed off my shoes.
/n - gi: - REDUP - bi:w - makizin - e: - š - in/
1 PAST BRUSH SHOE MEDIAL FALL ISA
(c) mskiki
'medicine'
ngi:-mo:nhaškkiwe: I dug up some medicinal /n - gi: - mo:nah - $\varnothing$ - maškikiw - e: - $\varnothing /$ herbs. 1 PAST DIG TSA MEDICINE MEDIAL ISA

Then finally there are a few nouns which have special allomorphs when they appear as medials. Some of these are listed in (7).
(7) Citation form Underlying form Underlying form Citation Medial

| žo:nya: | žo:niya: | -a:bikw-e: | money |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| mi:žškõ:s | mi:žaškwe:ns | -aškw-e:/ | grass, hay; herbs |

jã:ž ja:nž -ja:n-e: nose
ndib ndiu -ndib-e:/-ikw-e: head
škĩ:žig ški:nžigw -škj:nžigw-e:/ eye(s)
-i:ngw-e:
de:ngway de:ngway -de:ngw-e:/ face
-i:ngw-e:
tawag tawag
wi:yaw
ka:d
ni:ja:nis
wi:yaw
-tawag-e:/-š-e: ear(s) -waž-e: body
-ga:d-e: $\quad \operatorname{leg}(s)$
msan (an)
ni:ja:nis
-a:waso (one's own) child(ren)
10.1.1.l Object Incorporation. Now let us turn to an examination of the syntactic mechanism of incorporation. In the simplest cases, incorporation simply attaches the object of a verb plus the morpheme MEDIAL to the right end of a verb stem plus TSA marker, as the examples in (8) show.
(8)
(a) (i)
ngi:-na:din žo:،ya:
/n - gi: - na: - d - i - n/
1 PAST FETCI I.SA OAI OAII

I went and got money.
(8) (a) (ii) ngi:-na:da:bkwe: I went and got money./I /n - gi: - na: - d - a:bikw - e: - $\varnothing /$ picked up my 1 PAST FETCH TSA MONEY MEDIAL ISA pay.
(b) (i) wbiba:-mo:nha:n mškiki He's (out) gathering /w - biba: - mo:nah - $\varnothing$ - am - n/ medicinal herbs. 3 AROUND DIG TSA OAI OAII
(ii) bba:-mo:nhaškkiwe: He's (out) gaihering /biba: - mo:nah - $\varnothing$ - maškikiw - e: - $\varnothing$ - w/ medicinal AROUND DJ.G TSA MEDICINE MEDIAL ISA 3 herbs
(c) (i) ngi:-bmo:ma: nni:ja:nis I carried my child on /n - gi: - bimo:m- - a:/ MY-CHILl my back.
1 PAST CARRY ALONG TSA OAI ( ON-TYE-BACK)
(ii) ngi:-bmo:ma:was I carried the child on /n - gi: - bimo:m - $\varnothing$ - a:wah - $\varnothing$ - zo/ my back. 1 PAST CARRY-ALONG TSA CHILD MEDIAL ISA ( ON-TME-BACK)

In $\S 4.2$ we discussed the process by which objects get incorporated.
We repeat the rule here as (9).
(9) Object Incorporation (= (9)(IV))

$$
\text { V } 2: N \Rightarrow V-N-M E D I A L
$$

The morpheme MEDIAL is spelled by (10).
(10) Medial Spelling ${ }^{2} \quad(=$ (10)(IV))

$$
\text { MEDIAL } \Rightarrow \emptyset / \mathrm{h}
$$

e:
As we djscussed in $\S 4.2$ Object Incorporation (9) follows TSA
(50)(III). The evidence is given in (8) where the (i) examples show the unincorporated versions of the verb stem plus TSA marker.

The constructions involving Object Incorporation (9) are somewhat rare. There are limitations both on which verbs may incorporate their objects and on which objects can be incorporated. It is not clear to us whether the nature of the limitations are semantic or lexical or both.
(ll) (a) verb limitation
(i) ngi:-mo:nhapni: I harvested potatoes.
/n - gi: - mo:nah - $\varnothing$ - apin:i - e: . $\varnothing /$
1 PAST DIG TSA POTATO MEDIAL ISA

(b) noun limitation
(i) ngi:-na:jmi:jme: I went and got food. /n - gi: - na: - d - (i)mi:jim - e: - $\emptyset /$
1 PAST FETCH TSA FOOD MEDIAL ISA
(ii) *ngi:-na:jbimde:we: I went and got oil
/n - gi: - na: - d - (i)bimide:(w) - e: - $\varnothing /$
1 PAST FETCH TSA OIL MEDIAL ISA
(c) futher restricted
(i) ngi:-mo:nhaškkiwe: I dug up medicinal herbs. /n - gi: - mo:nah - $\varnothing$ - maškikiw - e: - $\varnothing /$ 1 PAST DIG TSA MEDICINE IEDIAL ISA
(i.i) ngi:-na:jmi:jme: I went and got food. (=b(i))
(iii) *ngi:-na:dškikwe: I went and got medicine. /n - gi: - na: - d - maškikiw - e: - $\emptyset$ /
1 PAST FETCH TSA MEDICINE MEDIAL ISA
A further complication is that some verbs have TSA Neutralization
(3)(IV) to inanimate TSA marking.
(12) (a) (i) ngi:-gža:na: nni:ja:nis I took care of my child.
/n - gi: - giža: - n - a:/
1 PAST CARE TSA OAI
(ii) ngi:-cžza:da:was I babysat.
/n - gi: - giža: - d - a:wah - $\emptyset$ - zol
1 PAST CARE TSA CHILD MEDIAL ISA.
(b) (i) wgi:-na:na:n sabi:n He went and got (his)
/w - gi: - na: -n - a: - an/ net(s).
3 PAST FEICH TSA OAI OBV
(ii) gi:-na:dsabi: He went and checked his
/gi: - na: - d - asabi. - e: - $\varnothing$ - w/ nets.
PAS' FETCH TSA NET MEDIAL ISA 3
10.1.1.2 Possessed Noun Incorporation. Now let us look at a more complex process which incorporates possessed nouns. In the case in which the possessed noun is the logical subject of the verb, the noun is incorporated leaving the possessor as subject. In general where the incorporation of a possessed subject is possible, it is obligatory. Some examples are given in (13).
(13) (a) (i) ndakniriji: My hands are cold (for some /n - dak - (i)ninji - e: - $\varnothing /$ unknown reason). 1 COLD HAND MEDIAL ISA/
(ii) *dka:no:n nninji:n My hands are cold. COLD-3-3PL $\mathrm{My}-\mathrm{HANDS}-\mathrm{PL}$
(b) (i) nde:whwe: I have a head ache. /n - de:w - (i)kw - e: - $\emptyset /$ 1 ACIIE HEAD MEDIAL ISA
(ii) ?? (no form exists built on de:w- without a medial) ${ }^{3}$
(c) (i) nbo: ${ }^{W}$ ga:de: I have a broken leg. /n - bo:kw - (i)ga:d-e: - $\varnothing /$ 1 BREAK LEG MEDIAL ISA
(ii) ?? (no form exists built on bo:kw- without either a causative or medial)

Some verbs undergo a process of reduplication when they have a plural subject. Examples are given in (14).
(14) (a) (i) mndido He is big.
/mindido - $\emptyset$ - w/
ISA 3
(ii) mma:nddowag They are big.
/REDUP - mindido - $\emptyset$ - w - ag/
ISA 3 3PL
(iii) mca:mgad

It is big.
/mica: - magad - w/
(iv) mma:ca:no:n They are big. (inan) /REDUP - mica: - n - w - an/ link 3 3PL
(14)

$$
\text { (b) (i) gno:zi } \quad \begin{aligned}
& \text { /ginw -izi - w/ } \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& \text { ISA } \\
&
\end{aligned}
$$

He is tall/loing.

(iii) gnwa:

It is tall/long
/ginw - ya: - w/
ISA 3

```
(iv) gga:nwa:no:n They are tall/long. (inan)
/REDUP - ginw - y.a: - n - w - an/
                                    ISA link 3 3PL
```

This reduplication process is still active before a possessed subject
is incorporated.
(15)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (a) (i) mpgizde: } \\
& \text { /mang - (i) zid -e: - } \emptyset-\text { w/ } \\
& \text { BIG FOOT MEDIAL ISA } 3 \\
& \text { (ii) mma: ogzide: He has big feet. } \\
& \text { /REDUP - mang - (i)zid - e: - } \varnothing \text { - w/ } \\
& \text { BIG FOOT MEDIAL ISA } 3 \\
& \text { (b) (i) mogindue: }{ }^{4} \\
& \text { He has a big head. } \\
& \text { /mang - (i)ndib - e: - } \emptyset \text { - w/ } \\
& \text { BIG HEAD MEDIAL ISA } 3 \\
& \text { (ii) ??mma: ngndibe: } \\
& \text { He has big heads. } \\
& \text { /REDUP - mang - (i)ndib - e: - } \emptyset \text { - w/ } \\
& \text { BIG HEAD MEDIAL ISA } 3 \\
& \text { (c) (i) *gno:ga:de: He has a long leg. } \\
& \text { /ginw - (i)ga:d - e: - } \emptyset \text { - w/ } \\
& \text { LONG LEG MEDIAL ISA } 3 \\
& \text { (ii) gga:no:ga:de: He has long legs. } \\
& \text { /REDUP - ginw - (i)ga:d - e: - } \varnothing \text { - w/ } \\
& \text { LONG LEG MEDIAL ISA } 3
\end{aligned}
$$

The incorporation of possessed subjects is formalized in the rule in (16).
(16) Subject Incorporation

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\mathrm{V} \\
\mathrm{l}:(\mathrm{POSS}: N P) \mathrm{N} & \Rightarrow \\
\mathrm{a} \text { b } & \mathrm{b}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{MEDIAL} \\
\mathrm{~b} & \mathrm{l}: \mathrm{NP} \\
\mathrm{a}
\end{array}
$$

There is a second case in which possessed nouns are incorporated into verbal constructions. These cases at first appear to involve the incorporation of the object of a verb leaving the possessor behind. Some examples of this are given in (17).

```
(l7) (a) ngi:-ga:njga:de:na: I pushed his leg.
    /n - gi: - ga:nd - (i)ga:d - e: - in - \emptyset - a:/
        l PAST PUSH LEG MEDIAL CAUSE TSA OAI
    (b) ngi:-bgone:še:wa: I pierced his ears.
    /n - gi: - bagone: - š - e: - h - w - a:/
        1 ~ P A S T ~ H A V E - A - H O L E ~ M E D I A L ~ T S A ~ O A I ~
                        EAR CAUSE
```

    (c) ngi:-bo:k \({ }^{W}\) nike:bna: I broke his arm.
        /n - gi: - bo:kw - (i)nik - e: - bi - n - a:/
    1 PAST BREAK ARM MEDIAL CAUSE TSA OAI
    All objects that appear incorporated stranding a possessor appear in causative constructions like those in (17). All such constructions arise as the result of Clause Union (5)(IX). This means that the superficial object of the construction began as subject of the downstairs verb and became the object as a result of the reassignment of termhood in the process of clause union. That leaves us the analytic option of incorporating the possessed noun in the cycle of the downstairs clause using Subject Incorporation (16) and then allowing Clause Union (5) to operate normally. This will give the correct morpheme order and term ielationships as the derivation of (17c) given in (18) shows.

There are several further facts in favor of this analysis.
First there is at least one morphemically complex verb that triggers Object Incorporation (9).
(19) ngi:-mo:nhapni: I harrested potatoes. /n - gi: - mo:n - an - $\varnothing$ - apini - e: - $\varnothing /$
l PAST DUG CAUSE TSA POTATO MEDIAL ISA W/INSTR

| Underlying Form | gi: | bi 2: | 2:comp(bo:kw | 1:(POSS:[3])nik) |  | 1:[1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PAST | CAUSE |  | HIS | ARM |  |
| Subject Incorporation (16) |  |  | bo:kwnik-MEDIAL | 1:[3] |  |  |
| Clause Union (5)(IX) | gi: | bi | DV:bo:kwnik-MEDIAL | 2:[3] |  | 1:[1] |
| TSA (50) (III) | gi: | bi-TSA[A] | DV:bo:kwnik-MEDIAL | 2:[3] |  | 1:[1] |
| Dead Verb Attachment (6)(IX) | ) gi:- | :kwnik-MEDI | L-bi-TSA[A] | 2:[3] |  | 1:[1] |
| Object Agreement I (42) (VII) | gi:- | :kwnik-MEDI | L-bi-TSA[A]-a: | 2:[3] |  | 1:[1] |
| Agreements | ngi:- | :kwnik-MEDI | L-bi-TSA[A]-a: | 2:[3] |  | 1:[1] |
| Spelling | ngi:- | :kwnike:bin |  |  |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | ngi:- | : $\mathrm{W}^{\text {W }}$ nike ${ }^{\text {bna }}$ |  |  |  |  |

Notice that in contrast with the morpheme order Initial - Medial Final which the examples in (17) show, the example in (19) has the order Initial - Final - Medial. This is an automatic consequence of our analysis. The morpheme apini 'potato' cannot be incorporated in (19) until it becomes an object because it is not possessed and therefore cannot undergo Subject Incorporation (16). Thus the rule order is Clause Union (5)(IX) then Object Incorporation (9), so the morpheme order is Final (causative morpheme) and then Medial (incorporated noun).

The second fact in favor of our analysis has to do with weather causatives discussed in 59.1 .4 of Chapter IX. The causatives act like upstairs intransitives in clause union, bringing the downstairs subject up as result subject. Here again the order of morphemes is Initial - Medial - Final but the Medial is related to the surface subject. These facts follow directly from our analysis. Examples are given in (20) and a derivation in (21).
(20) (a) ndakninji:waj My hands are cold.
/n - dak - (i)ninji - e: - wad - i/
1 COLD HAND MEDIAL CAUSE ISA BY-COLD
(b) mškawja:ne:wji He has a frostbitten nose.
/miskaw - (i)ja:n - e: - wad - i - w/ FIRM NOSE MEDIAL CAUSE ISA 3 BY-COLD

| (21) Underlying Form | wad 1:comp (dak |  | 1:(POSS:[1])ninji) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MY | HAND |
| Subject Incorporation (16) | wad | dakni | jji-MEDIAL | 1:[1] |
| Clause Union (5)(IX) | wad | DV:dakni | ji-MEDIAL | 1:[1] |
| Dead Verb Attachment (6)(IX) | dakninji- | -MEDIAL-wad |  | 1:[1] |
| ISA (28)(IV) | dakninji- | -MEDIAL-wadi |  | 1:[1] |
| Agreements | ndakninji | -MEDIAL-wadi |  | 1:[1] |
| Spelling | ndakninjie | :wadi |  |  |
| Morphophonemics | ndakninji: | :waj |  |  |

Finally there are some forms that undergo both Subject Incorporation (16) and Object Incorporation (9). An example is given in (22). (22) gi:-nsikwe:h ${ }^{\text {W }}$ dizo He combed his hair.
/gi: - nis - ikw - e: - ah - w - idi - $\emptyset$ - zo - w/
PAST LOOSE HEAD MEDIAL TSA SELF MEDIAL ISA 3 CAUSE W/INSTR

This indicates at very least that there are two processes at work incorporating nouns. Again the form is consistent with the analysis we are proposing, being the automatic consequence of the derivation of an underlying form having the possessor of an incorporable noun coreferential with the subject of the causative.
10.1.1.3 Middling. There is a further process that affects a subclass of forms arising from Subject Incorporation (16) and Clause Union (5)(IX). This involves instances in which the clause union generates a clause with a coreferential subject and object, such as the form in (22) abcue. For some forms there is the option of following the normal derivation and ending up with a form lke that in (22), but more commonly, and some times obligatorily the reflexive is lost altogether as in the forms in (23).
(23) (a) mma:dkwe:ni He's moving his head.
/mama: d - ikwe: - in - $\varnothing$ - i - w/ MOVE HEAD CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(b) ga:ci:刀gre:ni He's making faces.
jga:t - i:ngwe: - in - $\varnothing$ - i - w/
EFFACED FACE CAUSE TSA ISA 3
(c) gi:-bo:da:kwe:nnji:ni He put his hands in (the) /gi: - bo:da:kwe: - ninji - e: - in - $\varnothing$ - i - w/ water. PAST BE-IN-WATER HAND MEDIAL TSA ISA 3 CAUSE

The rule involved in deleting the reflexive we call Middling. It was discussed briefly in $\$ 4.3$ of Chapter IV. This rule accounts for a number of forms which Bloomfield (1957) analyzed as containing an
allomorph of the reflexive morpheme. Examples are given in (24).
(24) (a) (i) gi:-nsikwe:h ${ }^{\text {W}}$ dizo He combed his hair. (=(22))
/gi: - nis - ikw - e: - ah - w - idi - $\emptyset$ - zo - w/
PAST LOOSE HEAD MEDIAL TSA SELF MEDIAL ISA 3 CAUSE W/INSTR
(ii) gi:-nsikwe:ho
He combed his hair. (Synonymous /gi: - nis - ikw - e: - ah - w - i - w/ with (a(i))) PAST LOOSE HEAD MEDIAL TSA ISA 3 CAUSE W/INSTR
(b) (i) gi:-be:ng ${ }^{\text {Wreve:h }}{ }^{\text {W }}$ dizo $\quad$ He dried himself off. /gi: - be:ngw - waž - e: - ah - w - idi - $\varnothing$ - zo - w/ PAST DRY BODY MEDIAL TSA SELF MEDIAL ISA 3 CAUSE W/INSTR
(ii) gi:-be:ng ${ }^{W}$ že:ho $\quad$ He dried himself off. (Synony/gi: - be:ngw - waž - e: - ah - w - i - w/ mous with PAST DRY BODY MEDIAL TSA ISA 3 (b(i))) CAUSE W/INSTR

Because the rule of Middling is productive only in cases where Subject Incorporation (16) has applied, we write the rule as (25) triggering the deletion by the presence of the medial.
(25) Middling

$$
\text { idi }=\Rightarrow \varnothing \text { / V-MEDIAL- 2: }
$$

Almost certainly the reference directly to the morpheme MEDIAL in (25) is a trick which happens to work well. But for the time being we do not know what the correct generalization is, only that it appears to be related to Subject Incorporation (16). In a backhanded way, referring to MEDIAL says that. While Middiing (25) seems to be obligatory in most cases, after - ah(w)- 'cause using an instrument', it seems to be optional. Because of its sensitivity to the nature of the causative morpheme, we have written the causative into the rule explicitly. Also since it never seems to happen except where a medial is involved, the medial is written into the rule explicitly.

Finally there is a class of forms that look like they should contain causative morphemes but don't. These forms are limited in number, but cannot be proved to be irregular.


At this stage the analysis of these forms is still in doubt. To the best of our knowledge it is only the morpheme na:gan 'dish' that is involved in this anomaly. However, there is a further irregularity involving a non-productive morpheme -sag- which means 'wood'. This morpheme seems to undergo a derivation involvjng a subject incorporation like (16) rather than an object incorporation.


$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { ngi:-zzo:sgaha:n } & \text { I painted it. } \\
/ \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{gi}:-\mathrm{zazo}:-\operatorname{sag}-\mathrm{ah}-\emptyset-a m-\mathrm{n} / \\
\text { I PAST RUBBED VOOD } \quad \text { TSA OAI OAII } \\
& \\
& \\
& \text { CAUSE W/INSTR }
\end{array}
$$

(b) ngi:-gzi:sgahge: I washed the floor. /n - gi: - gizi: - sag - ah - $\varnothing$ - ige: - $\emptyset /$
1 PAST WIPED WOOD TSA PRO-MEDIAL ISA CAUSE W/INSTR

Only the subject derivation route will account for the observed order of morphemes (Medial preceding Final). Apparently there was a time when only subject incorporation was possible, and forms of this sort are lexicalized remnants of that. This suggests that the forms of (26) might also be lexicalizeà remnants which have undergone a further elipsis of a final causative morpheme. Such a suggestion may seem a little ad hoc at this point, but in the following sections of this chapter we shall see more examples of this elipsis, also non-productive.
10.1.2 Classificatory Medials. In this section we shall look
in some detail at the syntax of classificatory medials. Classificatory medials represent incorporated subjects as in (28a), incoipor_ ated objects as in (28b), and also incorporated non-terms as in (28c-d).
(28) (a) (i) gnwa:bi:gad It is long (a rope).
/ginw - a:bi:g - ad - w/ LONG ROPE ISA 3
(ii) mnga: ckad
/mang - a:bik - ad - w/ BIG METAL ISA 3
(b) (i) ngi:-gnwa:bi:gna:n I lengthened it (rope).
/n - gi: - ginw - a:bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n/ 1 PAST LONG ROPE CAUSE TSA OAI OAII
(ii) ngi:-dkwa:k ${ }^{W}$ bo:do:n I cut it (wood) shorter.
/n - gi: - dakw - a:kw - (i)bo: - d - o: - n/
1 PAST SHORT SOLID CAUSE TSA OAI OAII BY-SAWING
(c) (i) ngi:-gba:bi:gna:nan niw gbo:jgana.

I closed the curtains. (lit. close with a rope)
/n - gi: - gib - a:bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - $n$ - an/
1 PAST CLOSED ROPE CAUSE TSA OAI OAII PL
(ii) ngi:-gzi:bi:gna:n I washed it. (lit. wipe w/water)
/n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n/
1 PAST WIPE WATER CAUSE TSA OAI QAII
(d) (i) gi:-kajgibi:sin It (the scenery) relected on the water.
/gi: - akajig - (i)bi:g - (i)s - in - w/
PAST REFLECT LIQUID LIE ISA 3
(ii) ngi:-ža:ša:bkisin I fell on stone.
/n -- gi: - ža:š - a: bik - (i)s - in/
1 PAST SLIDE STONE FALL ISA

The situation with classificatory medials is currently in a state of flux. These morphemes are the remnants of a once strong classifier system that is dying. In the Ojibwa of Baraga's time these classifiers were obligatory in counting.
(29) Baraga's Ojibwa
(a) ni:žwa:bik žo:niya: two dollars TWO-METAL MONEY
(29) (b) niswe:g bapagiwaya: nan
three shirts THREE-CLOTH SHIRTS
(c) ni:wa:tig abwi:n
four paddles FOUR-STICK PADDLES
(d) na:nominag opini:g
five potatoes FIVE-BERRY POTATOES
(e) nisimidana daswa:bik žo:niya: aši ni:ž thirty-two dollars THIRTY SO-MANY-METAL MONEY AND TWO

Today all these expressions are ungramnatical; one says instead
(30) (a) ni:žwa:bik
two dollars
TWO-METAL
(b) nso-bbagwaya:nan
three shirts
THREE SHIRTS
(c) ni:wo-bwi:n
four paddles
(d) na:no-pini:g
five potatoes
FIVE POTATOES
(e) nsimdana ši ni:ž
thirty-two (dollars) THIRTY AND TWO

The classifiers are used today as an elaborate pronomiai system.
(31)
(a) a:ni:s mnik ma:nda?
HOW MUCH THIS
How much is this?
ni:wa:bik. FOUR-METAL
(b) wžibi:hean na gdaya:n?

Do you have a pencil? (= Could PENCIL 2-HAVE-IT you please loan me a pencil?)
be:žgwa:tig go e:ta go ndaya:n $I$ only have one. ONE-STICK ONLY l-HAVE-IT
(c) ni:ždana nagnde:. TWENTY LIKE-COST-3

It costs twenty (dollars).
(Classifiers with /dasw-/ have been totally lost.)

However the classification system is still active in verbal construc-
ions, in particular in irtransitive constructions.
(32) (a) ža:ša:k ${ }^{W}$ zi bsaga:k The board is slippery. /ža:š - a:kw - izi - w/ SLIPPERY WOOD ISA 3
(32) (a) continued
*ža:šzi bsaga:k but ža:šzi go:ko:š
The pig is slippery.
(b) gnwa:bi:gzi sab

I'he net is long.
/ginw - a:bi:g - izi - w/ LONG ROPE ISA 3
*gno:zi sab but gno:zi nini The man is tall
(c) nbi:we:gzi mo:žwe:n The handkerchief is wet.
/nibi:w - e:g - izi - w/ WET CLOTH ISA 3
*nbi:wzi mo:žwe:n but nnibi:wiz I'm wet.
We will account for this by positing a rule of subject copy, which puts a pronoun copy of the subject in the verb.
(33) Classifier Incorporation

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{l}: \mathrm{NP}_{\mathrm{i}}
$$

where $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the classifier of $\mathrm{NP}_{\mathrm{i}}$
I'his rule only operates if there exists an "active" classifier for the NP subject. The following are the active and inactive classifiers. (34)
(a) active
a:kw WOOD, SOLID
a:bi:g ROPE
a:bik METAL, STONE
a:gami LIQUID, WATER
bi:g WA'TER, LIQUID
e:g CLOTH, PAPER
(b) inactive
minag ${ }^{5}$ BERRY, ROUND-THING (semiactive)
o:nag CANOE, BOAT a:tigw STICK
e:g CLCTH, PAPER

In addition the rule only operates consistently with certain predicates most of which are listed in (35).
(35)
(a) strongest

| akw- | BE (SO) LONG |
| :--- | :--- |
| dakw- | BE SHORT |
| ginw- | BE LONG |
| ža:š- | BE SLIPFETRY |

(b) weaker

| miskw- | BE |
| :--- | :--- |
| med |  |
| makade:w- | BE BLACK |
| wa:b(iskk)- | BE PALE (WHITE) |
| dak- | BE COLD |
| giž- | BE |
| HOT |  |

(35) (c) weakest

> aga:c- BE SMALL
> mang- BE BIG
> et al.

The data however are not totally clear. More investigation is needed. The system is falling into disuse, so younger speakers only consistently incorporate the most active classifiers with the stronger predicates.

In transitive constructions, the use of medials marking the superficial object is limited to constructions involving the predicates listed in (35). This result can be gotten by employing Classifier Incorporation (33) in the way we used Subject Incorporation (16) to get causative constructions involving body part medials. This way the restrictions on Classifier Incorporation will be reflected in the causative medial constructions. Thus the forms in (36) undergo Classifier Incorporation (33) and then Clause Union (5)(IX).
(36) (a) ngi:-gnwa:bi:gna:n iw saba:b I lengthened that rope. /n - gi: - ginw - a:bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n/ (=(25b(i)))
1 PAST LONG ROPE CAUSE RSA OAI OAII
(b) ngi:-dkwa:k ${ }^{W}$ bo:na: aw bsaga:k I cut the board shorter.
/n - gi: - dakw - a:kw - (i)bo: - n - a:/ (=(25b(ii)))
1 PAST SHORT WOOD CAUSE-BY-SAWING TSA OAI
10.1.2.1 Adverbial Medials. Medials may be used adverbially. Adverbial medials are of three kinds, simulative, locative, and instrumental. Looking at the various examples of these constructions, one notices that simulative constructions are rare. All contain e:g 'cloth'. Locative constructions are the most common. They contain a:kw 'solid', and, rarely a:bi:g 'rope' and bi:g 'water'. Instrumental constructions contain a:bi:g 'rope' and bi:g 'water'. Examples of each
kind of adverbial medial are given in (37).
(37) (a) simulative
(i) ngi:-ži:bi:gbido:n saba:b I stretched the rope. /n - gi: - ži:b - e:g - (i)bi - d - o: - n/
l PAST STRETCH CLOTH CAUSE TSA OAI OAII
(ii) ngi:-ge:zbi:gna: ndasab I folded my net. /n - gi: - ge:zib - e:g - in - $\emptyset$ - a:/
1 PAST TIDY CLOTH CAUSE TSA OAI
(b) locative
(i) ngi:-na:ža:bi:gnige: I played the violin. /n - gi: - na:ž - a:bi:g - in - $\emptyset$ - ige: - $\emptyset i$
1 PAST RUBBED STRING CAUSE TSA ISA
PRO-MEDIAL
(ii) ngi:-zga:k ha:n mzinhigan I nailed up the poster. /n - gi: - zag - a:kw - ah - $\emptyset$ - am - n/ 1 PAST ATTACHED SOLID TSA OAI OAII CAUSE W/INSTR

(c) instrumental
(i) ngi:-gba:bi:gna:nan gbo:jganan I closed the curtains. /n - gi: - gib - a:bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n - an/
1 PAST CLOSED ROPE CAUSE TSA OAI OAII 3PL
(ii) ngi:-gzi:bi:gna:nan ndagwnan. I washed my clothes. /n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n - an/ 1 PAST WIPED WATER CAUSE TSA OAI OAII 3PL

The examples in (37) also show that the medials in the constructions cited are not simply copied in from the NP's that appear ultimately as objects; if they were copied from the NP's that ultimately appear as the objects they would give the ungrammatical sentences of (38).
(38) (a) (i) *ngi:-zi:ba:bi:gbido:n saba:b I stretched the rope */n - gi: - zi:b - a:bi:g - (i)bi - d - o: - n/ 1 PAST STRETCH ROPE CAUSE TSA OAI OAII
(38) (a) (ii) *ngi:-ge:zba:bi:gna: ndasab I folded my net.
*/n - gi: - ge:zibi - a:bi:g - in - $\varnothing$ - a:/
1 PAST TIDY ROPE CAUSE TSA 3
(b) (ii) *ngi:-zgi:gha:n mzinhigan I nailed up the poster.
*/n - gi: - zag - e:g - ah - $\emptyset$ - am - n/ 1 PAST ATTACHED CLOTH TSA OAI OAJI CAUSE W/INSTR
(c) (i) *ngi:-gbi:gna:nan gbo:jgana I closed the curtains. */n - gi: - gib - e:g - in - $\emptyset$ - am - n - an/

1 PAST CLOSE CLOTH CAUSE TSA OAI OAII PL
(ii) *ngi:-gzi:we:gna:nan ndagwnan I washed my clothes. */n - gi: - gizi: - e:g - in - $\varnothing$ - am - n - an/ 1 PAST WIPED CLOTH CAUSE TSA OAI OAII PL

Instead there is a rule (39) which copies the classifiers of locatives and simulatives into the verbs of intransitive clauses (We will discuss intrumentals below.)
(39) Non-term Incorporation

$$
V \text { NT:CL } \Rightarrow \text { Y-CL } / \quad A(1)
$$

where NT is simulative or locative
This analysis follows from the logic of the sentences, i.e. the simulative and the locative modify the action on the ultimate object, not the causation of that action. For example, (37b(ii)) means (CAUSE 1:I 2:(BE-ATTACHED 1:PAPER NT:ON-À-SOLID)), not (CAUSE l:I 2:(BE-ATTACHED 1:PAPER) NT:ON-A-SOLID). Given this analysis the observed morpheme order follows by the same kind of derivation that gave us the forms of (17) and (36). The most questionable point of this analysis involves the use of PRO, i.e. underlying classificatory medials. However, this is not so strange when we consider that classificatory medials appear on the surface in a number of non-term constructions ir place of rull $\mathrm{Ni}^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ (40).

This leaves us with only the instrumental constructions to

| (40) noun |  | prepositional expression |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mtig | branch | ```gida:tig on the branch /agid - a:tigw - i/ ON WOOD ADV``` |
| nbi | water | ```ji:gbi:g near the water /ji:g - (i)bi:g - i/ NEAR WATER ADV``` |
| $\sin$ | rock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { na:ma:bik under the rock } \\ & \text { /ana:m - a:bik - i/ } \\ & \text { UNDER METAL/STONE ADV } \end{aligned}$ |

explain. These are a problem in that the logic seems to demand that the instrumental be associated with the causative rather than with the action, e.g. (37c(i)) appears to have the logic (CAUSE 1:I 2: (CLOSE 1:CURTAINS NT:WITH-ROPE), in which case one would expect the classificatory medial after the causative, as in *(41). (41) *ngi:-gbina:bi.g... ${ }^{6}$

However, if we look carefully we notice that there are two types of instrumental mediad constructions: those that have a possible locative analysis, like (37c(i)), and those that have a possible downstairs instrumental analysis like (3'7c(ii). (37c(i)) can have a logicol analysis (CAUSE 1:I 2:(CLOSE l:CURT'AINS NI: OIN-ROPE)) because curtains "ride" on the cord which opens and closes them. (37c(ii)) really does not have an upstairs instrument reading, but only the reading (CAUSE 1:I 2: (WIPED 1:CLOTHES NT:WITH-WATER)) or possibly the reading (CAUSE 1:I 2:(BE-WIPED 1:CLOTHES NT:IN-WATER)). Given these analyses of the logic of instrumental sentences only a slight revision of (39) to include instruments as well as locatives and simulatives as incorporable CL's is necessary. The morpheme order will then follow as before.

At this point it is possible to raise the question of lexical-
ization. Are the form involving adverbial medials simply complex lexical items? Or perhaps idioms? We have no way of telling if that is the case. The system seems to be moderately productive in terms of the number of forms involving such medials that exist. The closest thing to clear evidence that is available is the recent appearance of the morpheme -a:kw- 'solid/wood' as an intensifier. (42) (a) (i) gga:no:ga:de: ${ }^{7}$ He has long legs /REDUP - giriw - (i)ga:d - e: - $\emptyset$ - w/ LONG LEG MEDIAL ISA 3

(b) (i) ndakninji:waj My hands are cold.
/n - dak - (i)ninji - e: - wad - i/
1 COLD HAND MEDIAL ISA
BY-COLD
(ii) ndaka: ${ }^{W}{ }^{W}$ ninji:waj My hands are freezing. (figurative)
/n - dak - a:kw - (i)ninji - e: - wad - i/
l COLD SOLID HAND̄ MEDIAL BY-COLD ISA
The logic behind this probably follows aroute like: LIKE-A-SOLID > SOLIDLY > THOROUGHLY > VERY, but the mechanism of incorporation is almost certainly that of a simulative non-term, which would indicate that (39) is still a live rule.

There are a few constructions which involve the incorporation of both adverbial classificatory medials and the incorporation of bocy part medials in the same form. In addition to the forms in (42a(i)) and (42b(ii)) there are forms like those in (43).
(43) (a) ngi:-gzi:bi:gninji I washed my hands. /n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - (i)ninji - e: - $\varnothing /$
1 PAST WIPED WATER HAND MEDIAL ISA
(b) ngi:-bdagwa: ${ }^{W}{ }^{W}$ ninji: $\quad$ I clenched my fists.
/n - gi: - badagw - a:kw - (i)ninji - e: - $\emptyset /$
1 PAST COVERED SOLID HAND MEDIAL ISA

All these forms indicate that the order of application of (16) and (39) is (39) first followed by (16) as the derivation of (42a(ii)) shows. 8


We would like to conlude this section by mentioning again the rule of causative deletion that was mentioned above in §l0.1.1.3. Notive that this rule operates in the following forms involving gizi:bi:E-.
(45) (a) ngi:-gzi:bi:gi: I washed.
/n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - i: - $\varnothing /$
1 PAST WIPED WAI'ER ? ISA
(b) ngi:-gzi:bi:gninji: I washed my hands. /n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - (i)ninji - e: - $\emptyset /$
1 PAST WIPED WATER HAHD MEDIAL ISA
(c) ngi:-gzi:bi:gna:gne: I weched the dishes. /n - gi: - gizi: - bi:g - na:gan -e: - $\varnothing /$ 1 PAST WIPED WAI'ER DISH MEDIAL ISA

This indicates that the rule is not totally ad hoc, but the infrequercy of its application and its highly restricted nature make it a rule that we will simply note here and not discuss in detail.
10.2 Non-medial Incorporation. There is a second type of noun incorporation besides that which yields medials. Some examples are given in (46). The syntax of this type of incorporation is poorly understood at this point. The clearer examples such as (46b-d)
(46) (a) ngi:bino:jĩ:hiw I was a child
/n - gi: - abino:ji:nh - (i)w - i/
1 PAST CHILD BE ISA
(b) ndo:žo:nya:m I have money. in' ${ }^{\prime}$ ) - o - žo:niya: - m - $\varnothing$ - i/ 1 aug MONEY POSS HAVE ISA
(c) zi:sba:k ${ }^{W}$ doke:

He's making sugar.
/zi:siba:kwadw - (i)ke: - $\varnothing$ - w/ SUGAR GET ISA 3
(d) ža:gnaši:mo He speaks English.
/ža:gana:ši - mo - $\varnothing$ - w/ ENGLISH SPEAK ISA 3
(e) nwi:-bbo:niš Florida I'm going to spend the winter in
/n - wi: - bibo:n - iš - i/ Florida. 1 FUT WINTER SPEND ISA
$(f)$ nso-bbo:ngizi He's three years old. /nisw - i - bibo:n - ag - izi - w/ THREE ADV WINTER OLD ISA 3
suggest that the mechanism is a type of object incorporation. However, (46a) especially does not seem to be susceptible to such a treatment. In addition the incorporation of (46f) is limited to the three nouns gi:žgad 'day', gi:zis 'moon, month', and bbo:n 'winter, year'. Similarly the incorporation of (46e) is limited to the names of the seasons. Of the remaining incorporations only those of (46c) and (46d) are really productive. Because of these complications and the fact that we can find no motivated mechanism for relating and accounting for these incorporations, we will simply leave this area open for further investigation.

## FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER X
$l_{\text {Others }}$ include -iši- 'spend...(season)' and -imo- 'speak... (languages)'.
${ }^{2}$ There are a few morphemes ending in nasals which optionally take a zero spelling of MEDIAL, e.g. do:n 'mouth'. (l) (a) za:mdo:n He talks too much. /oza:m - (i)do:n - $\varnothing$ - $\varnothing$ - w/ (lit. He has too much mouth.) TOO-MUCH MOUTH MEDIAL ISA 3
(b) mi:šdo:ne: He has a beard. /mi:š - (i)do:n - e: - $\varnothing$ - w/ (lit. He has a hairy mouth.) HAIRY MOUTH MEDIAL ISA 3
(c) mngido:n / mngido:ne: He has a big mouth. (literal only) /mang - (i)do:n - $\emptyset$ - $\varnothing$ - w/ /mang - (i)do:n - e: - $\varnothing$ - w/ BIG MOUTH MEDIAL ISA 3 BIG MOUTH MEDIAL ISA 3
$3_{\text {We cculd construct one, e.g. *de:wad ndib, but there's no way }}$ to tell if the ungramaticality comes from the use of the wrong ISA marker. Therefore the "proof" that no form of de:w- exists is to list all the possible combinations of de:w- plus ISA marker. We simply think that is not worth doing here.

4
'The morpheme mang is the premedial allomoriph of 'big'. The other allomorphs are mindido (animate subject) and mica: (inanimate subject).
$5_{\text {The form minag }}$ is now used predicationally to mean 'round'.
${ }^{6}$ Since such constructions are totally impossible, there's no way of telling what the TSA marker would be.
${ }^{7}$ Some speakers only have (42a(ii)).
$8_{\text {One apparent exception }}$ is the form gi:wške:bi: /gi:w - aškw e: - bi:g - $\varnothing$ - w/ AROUND - HEAD - MEDIAL - WATER - ISA - 3 'He is drunk' (lit. His hear goes around by liquid). But I would contend that this analysis, while historically correct is no longer productive. There are two reasons for this: first gi:w- is not productively used to mean 'around' in Ojibwa. Its major occurance is in idioms like gi:wse: /gi:w - ose: - $\varnothing$ - w/ AROUND - WALKS - ISA - 3 'He hunts'. The second reason is that this is the only place the allomorph -aškwe:'head' occurs; elsewhere the most similar allomorph is -ikwe:-. Therefore we will treat the morpheme complex gi:waškwe:- as a lexical unit meaning 'dizzy'.
11.0 Because of the complexity of the morphology of the Ojibwa vert, we review here in a brief way the things that we have covered in this work, and what we feel we have accomplished.

We have presented an analysis of the Ojibwa verb based on the syntax of the language. We have used rules to create and/or attach morphemes to verbs to build up the complex verbal constructions that appear on the surface. These morphemes reflect the syntactic processes of the language and the nature of the terms involved in particular clauses. We feel that we have presented a viable analysis of an Algonkian language in a relational grammar model which shows that the verbal morphology of such a language can be insightfully accounted for in a single, unified pattern. The heart of our analysis can be summed up in structuralist's terms in a chart like that in (1) which lays out the pattern of all the verbal suffixes in one pattern regardless of transitivity or order. But we can proposc a chart like (l) only because we have used an abstract, rule oriented analysis which wirites the cooccurence restrictions among morphemes into the rules as conditions on their application. In addition, two inportant principles, Passive (58)(III), which gives inverse forms, and Subject Omission (48)(VII), are necessary to complete the analysis.
ll. 1 Loose ends. In presenting our analysis of the verbal morphology of Central Ojibwa, we have systematically omitted from our discussion

several areas of potential interest and importance. These include areas of syntactic and semantic analysis that have no direct bearing on the morphological structure of the verb. In the following sections we mention briefly and open-endedly some of these topics that we are aware may be of interest and w:ich deserve study in themselves.
11.1.1 Semantics. There are two semantic areas that may be of some interest. First there is the question of the modals, bani 'preterite' and dig/e:n 'dubitative'. While we presented the morphosyntax of these, we did not $\dot{\text { aiscuss }}$ the use of them. This is mostly because their use is but poorly understood. For example, it is known that preterite forms are used to refer to situaiions of action continuing in the past, as that in (2).
(2) gmiwniba ngi:-ni-ma:ja:mi It was raining when we left. RAIN-3-PRET l-PAST-LEAVE-1PL

But little more than that is known. We understand the dubitative somewhat better. It is part of a well developed system of evidentials. A paradigm of these is given in (3).
$\left.\begin{array}{rl}\text { (a) gi:-gi:we: } & \\ \text { PAST-GO-HOME-3 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { He went home. } \\ \text { (direct evidence) }\end{array} \\ \text { (b) gi:-gi:we: i:dig } & \\ \text { SUPPOSEDLY } & \\ \text { He went home. } \\ \text { (c) gindirect evidence) }\end{array}\right)$

The form i:dig and the suffixes dig and e:n are usually translated 'supposedly'. The form gi:wẽ: is usually translated 'so they say, so the story goes'.

The second area of potential interest has to do with the semantic conditioning of the rule of raising, which doubles subject out of complement clauses. In certain modal constructions (including those mention-
ed in §9.2.1) the operation of raising is obligatory.
(4) (a) ngi:-ma:jta: wi:-noki:ya:n
I started working. 1-PAST-START-HAPPEN FUT-WORK-1
*gi:-ma:jta:(mgad) wi:-noki:ya:n PAST-START-HAPPEN-3
(b) ngaškto: wi:-bmose:ya:n I can walk./It is possible for l-POSSIBLE FUT-WALK-1 me to walk.
*gškito:(mgad) wi:-brnose:ya:n FOSSIBLE-3
(c) ngi:-g ${ }^{\text {h/ }}$ jha: wi:-ni:mid $\quad$ I tried to get him to dance.
l-PAST-TRY-3 FUT-DANCE-3
$*_{n g i}:-g^{W}$ jito:n wi:-ni:mid I tried to get him to dance. l-PAST-TRY-IT

But with many verbs containing the morpheme e:n(im) 'think/use the rind' raising is optional.
(5) (a) ngike:nda:n ma:mpi: gi:-ya:d I know he was here.
l-KNOW-THINK-IT HERE PAST-BE-AT-3
(b) ngike:nma: ma:mpi: gi:-ya:d I know he was here. 1-KNOW-THINK-3 HERE FAST-BE-AT-3

Linguistically sensitive speakers say that the saised form indicates a more personal involvement in the knowing. We do not yet totally understand what they intend by that, especially because the unraised form is rare in normal usage.

Closely relcited to this problem is the startling construction in which both subjects and objects are obligatorily raising (doubled).
(6) (a) ngaškto:n wi:-wmbinma:n l-POSSIBLE-IT FUT-LIFT-IT-1
*ngaškto: wi:-wmbinma:n (cf.(4b)) l-POSSIBLE
(b) ngaškha: wi:-wmbinag 1-POSSIBLE-j FUT-LIFT-3-1
*ngaškto:(n) wi:-wmbinag 1-POSSIBLE (-IT)

We have little more to say about this here except to report that it happens. It does appear to be a ptoential problem for the Jaws of
relational grammar relating to ascensions. Such constructions are underlying intransitve and there does not seem to re any motivated way to get the embedded clause to be an object at any stage of the derivation. So the question then is how to get a downstairs object to be an upstairs object in the forms in (6). The hope of invoking chomew. advancement to get the chomeur clause to be an object is dashed when we notice that not only is the rule ordering wrong, but that chomeur clauses are systematically exempt from chomeur advancement.
(7) (a) ngaškto: wi:-bmose:ya:n I can walk. 1-POSEIBLE FUT-WALK-1
(b) *ngaškto:n wi:-bmose:ya:n l-POSSIBLE-IT

We will not attempt to solve the problem of object raising here. We mere merely raise it.

A final semantic quirk of raising is that raising is not possible when the downstairs subject is identical to the upstairs subject.
(8) (a) ngike:nda:n a:k ${ }^{W}$ ziya:n

I know that $I$ am sick. l-KNOW-THINK-IT SICK-1
*ngike:nndiz a: ${ }^{W}$ ziya:n 1-KNOW-THINK-SELF
(b) ngi:- ${ }^{\text {w }}$ jto:n wi:-ngamya:n I tried to sing. l-PAST-TRY-IT FUT-SING-1
*ngi:-g ${ }^{\text {w }}$ jihdiz wi:-ngamya:n 1-PAST-TRY-SELF

Why this restriction should exist, and how it should be enforced, we do not know.
11.1.2 Syntax. There are two areas of syntax that we have not touch upon in this work and which deserve some mention. First, there are numerous rules of Ojibwa which reorder words without changing grammatical relations. They include adverb fronting, stressed pronoun fronting, rules that place particles following the first major constituent of a clause, etc.

Most of these rules function to move new or contrastive information to the left. (This is the opposite of English in which new or contrastive information is moved right.) Consider the relative order of old and new information in the examples in (9) and in their translations.
(a) Q: we:ne:š ma:nda?
What's this?
A: (i) mo:kma:n iw
*A knife is that. KNIFE THAT
(ii) *iw mo:kma:n That's a knife. THAT KNIFE
(b) Q: a:ni:š pi: ea:-ni-ma:ja:d? When did he leave?
A: (i) bji:nz:go gi:-ni-ma:ja: ??Yesterday he left. YESTERDAY PAST-LEAVE-3
(ii) ??gi:-ni-ma:ja: bji:na:go He left yesterday. PAST-LEAVE-3 YESTERDAY

We consider the rules reordering words to be more properly in the study of discourse. So, having noted that Djibwa handles information flow in a way different from that of English, we move on to the other significant syntactic area which we have not dealt with in this work.

This area is the cycle. It is relatively difficult to argue about the cycle in Ojibwa without making several very strong assumptions about the non-existence of precyclic and last-cyclic rules. To the best of our knowledge only six rules can be shown to be cyclic directly, Passive (58) (III), Raising, Clause Union (5)(IX), TSA (50)(III), OAI (42)(VII), and ISA (28)(III). The crucial sentences are given in (10) for the reader who wishes to work them out.
(10) (a) Passive - Raising - Passive
ža:bdi:s wgike:nmig wgwisan gi:-bsika:god mtigo:n
$\mathrm{JOHN}_{i} \quad 3_{i}-\mathrm{SON}_{j}-\mathrm{OBV} \quad \mathrm{TREE}_{\mathrm{k}}-\mathrm{OBV}$ $3_{i}-K N O W-T H I N K-P A S S-\left(3_{j}\right) \quad$ PAST-HIT-PASS- $\left(3_{k}\right)-3_{i}$ subj. obj. obj. subj. John's ${ }_{i}$ son ${ }_{j}$ knows that a tree ${ }_{k}$ fell on him ${ }_{i}$.
(lit. John is known by his son to have been hit by a tree.)
(b) Raising - Passive - Raising
ngike:nma: ža:bdi:s bgose:nmigod wgwisan wi:-mno-ya:d l-KNOW-THINK-3 ${ }_{i} \mathrm{JOHN}_{i} \quad 3_{i}-\mathrm{SON}_{j}-\mathrm{OBV}$ HOPE-THINK-PASS- $\left(3_{j}\right)-3_{i}$ FUT-GOOD-BE-AT- $3_{i}$ obj. subj.

I know that John's ${ }_{i}$ son $_{j}$ hopes that he ${ }_{i}$ will be better. (lit. I know of John that he is hoped by his son to be netter.)
(c) Clause Union - TSA - OAI - Clause Union - TSA - OAI
ngi:-ba:knamo:ha: mkak I made him open the box.
/n - gi: - ba:k - in - $\varnothing$ - ani - (o) h - $\varnothing$ - a:/
1 PAST OPEN CAIJSE TSA OAI CAUSE TSA OAI
(d) ISA - Clause Union - ISA

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ngi:-a: }{ }^{W}{ }_{z 1} \text { :ška:gon It made me sick. } \\
& \text { /n - gi: - a:kw - izi - šk - aw - igw - i - nl } \\
& 1 \text { PAST SICK ISA CAUSE U'SA PASS ISA OAII }
\end{aligned}
$$

Our opinion is that there are no pre-cyclic rules nor any last-cyclic rules and the last of the cyclic rules is Chomeur Advancement (23)(v). All rules preceding that are cyclic and all following are post-cyclic.
11.2 Theoretical Implications. As our final section we summarize some areas mentioned in the text in which our analysis touches on things relevant to the theory of relational grammar. First there is the issue of whether it is useful to study languages using a model which treats syntactic mechanisms as independent of the semantic and pragmatic factors which motivate the syntactic change. Relational grammar is clearly such a model. Our analysis involves a rule of passive, which is put to several clearly independent uses, both semantic and pragmatic. This suggests strongly that it is not only useful but correct to study syntactic mechanisms independently. Secondly, there is the issue of obligatory rules, both regarding passivization and indirect object advancment. Our analysis has shown that such things are possible and
provide motivated analyses. In the case of indirect object advancement, we have shown that Ojibwa does not constitute a counterexample to the claim that termhood can be assigned by universal principles. Thirdly our analysis points to some weaknesses in the laws of agreement. While all agreements in Ojibwa are triggered by terms, some of the agreement rules are ordered midway in the cycle, most noticeably TSA (50)(III). Therefore the law limiting agreement to referencing only cycle initial or cycle final structure will have to have an added wrinkle that given such agreements, cycle medial agreements are possible. One thing related to the agreement laws that our analysis raises, but which was not mentioned in the text, is that there are numerous spellings of morphemes in Ojibwa which are sensitive to the presence of morphemes other than the ones which trigger their insertion. But in every case in which such secondary conditioning of allomorphs is due to a dependent, that dependent is also a term. We therefore suspect that there is an allomorphy law parallel to the agreement law which limits agreements to being triggered only by terms. In the allomorphy law, terms are the only dependents which may trigger allomorphies. Also all allomorphies are triggered by cycle final structure.

## APPENDIX

## SUMMARY OF RULES

Clause Union (5)(IX) (not formalized in text)
V A:comp(V A (E) )
$(E) \Rightarrow V$ DV:V $A\left\{\begin{array}{ll}(E) & \\ (3) & E\end{array}\right\}$
a bc de
a
c d

Equi Subject Union (63)(IX)
V l: NP ${ }_{i}$ NT:comp(V l: NP $\left.{ }_{i}\right) \Rightarrow D V: V \quad \mathrm{~V} \quad 1: \mathrm{NP}_{\mathrm{i}}$
ab
c d
ab c d

Lowering Union (32)(IX)
V l:comp(V) ==> DV:V V
a ba b
Preposition Float (57)(IX)
PREP ==>ADV
Adverb Deadening (40)(IX)
ADV $=\Rightarrow$ DV:ADV
Dead Verb Attachment (6)(IX)
V DV:V = $\quad$ VV
ab ba
Indirect Object Advancement (30)(v)
3 = 2
Raising (not formalized in text)
A copy of 1 ascends.
Transitive Stem Agreement (TSA) (50)(III)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{TSA}[\mathrm{~A}] / \\
& \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{TSA}[I] / \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

Non-term Advancement (14)(v)
V NT:[ANIM] ==> V-BEN 2:[ANIM] (does not affect the objects of prepositions)
Possessor Ascension (18)(v)
A [3] POSS of 2 ascends, marking the verb V-BEN.
Passive (58)(III)
V 2 ==> V-igw l
Reflexivization (12)(IV)
$N P_{i} \Rightarrow$ midi / 2:_ $\quad 1:$ NP $_{i}$

Middling (25)(X)
idi $=\Rightarrow \emptyset$ / V-MEDIAL- $2:$ $\qquad$
Object Incorporation (9)(IV)
V 2:N = $=$ V-N-MEDIAL
Medial Deletion (13)(IV)
ME:DIAL $\Rightarrow \varnothing$ / idi- $\qquad$
TSA Neutralization (7)(V)
(a) TSA[I] $\Rightarrow$ TSA[A] / _igw
(b) TSA[A] $=\Rightarrow$ TSA[I] / $\quad$ - - BEN
(c) TSA[A] $:==T \mathrm{TSA}[\mathrm{I}] / \square^{-N}$ (irregularly)
(. .c) clause not formalized in text)

PRO Deletion (6)(IV)
NT:PRO $\Rightarrow \emptyset$
Non-term Incorporation (39) (X)
V NT:CL $\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{CL} /$ A(l)
where NT is simulative or locative
Classifier Incorporation (33) (X)
$\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{i}} / \quad \mathrm{l}: \mathrm{NP}_{\mathrm{i}}$ where $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the classifier of $\mathrm{NP}_{\mathrm{i}}$
Subject Incorporation (16)(X)

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
\text { V } 1:(\text { POSS:NP }) N & \Rightarrow \text { V-N-MEDIAL } & \mathrm{l}: \mathrm{NP} \\
\mathrm{a} \text { b } & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{a}
\end{array}
$$

Intransitive Stem A Arreement (28) (III)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{ISA}[\mathrm{~A}] / \mathrm{A}(\mathrm{i}):[A N] \\
& \text { V-ISA[I] / - A(l):[INAN] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Object Agreement I (42)(VII)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V} \text {-OAI / 2:[INAN] } \\
& \text { V-ININ / - 2:[2] } \\
& \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{i} / \text { 2: } 2 \text { [1] } \\
& \text { V-a: / - 2:[3] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Negative Concord (31)(III)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{NEG} / \text { ___ [NEG] }
$$

Chomeur Advancement (23)(v)

$$
\mathrm{CH} \Rightarrow 2 / \ldots \mathrm{A}(\mathrm{l})
$$

Object Agreement II (43)(III)
$\mathrm{V}=\Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{n} /$ 2:[INAN] (not in conjunct environment)
Clausemate Obviation (10) (VIII)
[3] $\Rightarrow$ [OBV] $/ B: \quad A:[3]$ Condition:A outranks B.

Obviation of Possessee (7)(VIII)
[3] $\Rightarrow[O B V] /(P O S S:[3])$
AGREEMENTS
Inanimate Obivation (18)(III)
$\mathrm{V}==\mathrm{V}$-ini / l:[INAN,OBV]
Conjunct Obviation (20) (VIII)
V $=\Rightarrow$ V-ini / D ...... A(l):[AN,OBV]
Non-third Person Agreement (24)(VII)

(b) $V \underset{n-V}{\Rightarrow} V-A: N / D \ldots \begin{aligned} & 1:[1] \\ & 1:[1]\end{aligned}$

First Person Plural Agreement (28)(VI)
$\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{MIN} / \ldots \mathrm{T}:[1 P L]$
Second Person Plural Agreement (46)(VII)
$\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{V}-\mathrm{MW} / \mathrm{T}:[2 \mathrm{PL}]$
Third Plural Conjunct Agreement (23)(VII)

$$
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V} \text {-wa: / D _ T:[3PL, AN] }]
$$

Ergative Plural Agreement (38)(III)

Third Person Agreement (40)(VII)

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\mathrm{V} \Rightarrow \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{g} & \mathrm{D} \\
\mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{D} & \mathrm{D} \\
\mathrm{~W}-\mathrm{V} & \mathrm{l}:[\text { INAN] } \\
\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{w} & \mathrm{l}=[3] \\
\mathrm{E}:[3] \\
1:[3]
\end{array}
$$

Modal Attachment (22)(III)
(a) V bani $\Rightarrow$ V-bani
(b) V $\quad=>$ V-dig / e:n (not in conjunct environment)

Dubitative Attachment (23)(IIT)
V e:n = $\Rightarrow$ V-e:n
Dubitative Deletion (not discussed in text)
e:n $\Rightarrow \varnothing$ / -dig____
Absolutive Plural Agreement (39)(III) (not in conjunct environment)
(a) $V=A \mathrm{~V}$-an $/$ A:[INAN,PL] ([AN, OBV] = [INAN, PL])
(b) $V==\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{ag} /$ A:[3PL]

SPEILIN:
TSA Spelling (46)(III)


Benefactive Spelling (6)(v)

$$
\text { BEN }=\underset{\substack{\text { amaw }}}{\underset{\text { aw }}{ } \text { /[SetI/III]___ (optional) }}
$$

PRO Spelling (16)(IV)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { PRO } \Rightarrow & \Rightarrow \text { a:h } /[a: h \text { Class }]-T S A-~ \\
& \text { ig } / \overline{a w-} \\
& \text { ig } / m- \\
& \text { iw } / \overline{T S A[A]-} \\
& \text { ig }
\end{aligned}
$$

Medial Spelling (10)(v)

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { MEDIAL }
\end{gathered} \Rightarrow \emptyset_{\mathrm{e}:}^{\varnothing} / \mathrm{h}
$$

ISA Spelling (26)(III)

$$
\begin{array}{cll}
\text { ISA[A] } & \Rightarrow \underset{\text { izi }}{\text { jin }} & \text { /[SetI/II/III/IV]- } \\
& \text { ([SetV]- }
\end{array}
$$

```
ISA[I] ==> ya: /[SetI]-
```

        ad /[SetII]-
        an /[SetIII]-_
        de: /[SetIV]-
        in /[SetV]-
        \(\emptyset\)
    OAI Spelling (46)(III)

```
OAI ==> O: /[SetI/III]-
```

    am
    ININ Spelling (43)(VII)

$$
\text { ININ } \Rightarrow \operatorname{inin}_{\substack{\text { ik } \\
\text { inin }}}^{2:[2 P L]} \begin{aligned}
& \text { l:[3] }
\end{aligned}
$$

NEG Spelling (32)(III)

```
NEG => siw / D / (not discussed in text)
    si:
```

Subject Omission (48) (VII)

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{AN} \\
\mathrm{~A}: \mathrm{N} \\
\mathrm{D}
\end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow \varnothing / \quad \mathrm{T}:[1 / 2 \mathrm{PL}]
$$

Non-third Ferson Spelling (26)(VII)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (a) } \mathrm{AN} \Rightarrow \text { ad } / \Rightarrow \text { an } 2:[3 \mathrm{ANJ} \\
& \text { (b) } A: N=\Rightarrow \operatorname{ag}_{a: n} / \text { 2:[3AN] }
\end{aligned}
$$

MIN Deletion (27)(VI)

$$
\text { MIN } \Rightarrow \text { igw-i-__MW }
$$

Non-third Plural Spelling (47)(VII)

a: Spelling (50)(VTI)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (a) igw-i }=\Rightarrow \text { ind } / \quad D \\
& \text { (b) igw-i } \Rightarrow a: ~
\end{aligned}
$$

in Substitution (26)(VI)

$$
\text { igw } \Rightarrow \text { in } / \text { 2:[2SG] }
$$

Third Person Spelling (4l)(VII)


```
    gw / __-e:n (not discussed in text)
    g ! C
    d
```
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[^0]:    2.2.4 Laws. There are three basic laws governing the form of

