

Agency, Inversion, and Thematic Alignment in Ojibwe

Author(s): Richard A. Rhodes

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session Dedicated to the Contributions of Charles J. Fillmore (1994), pp. 431-446

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Agency, Inversion, and Thematic Alignment in Ojibwe

Richard A. Rhodes
University of California-Berkeley

1. Preliminaries.¹ In this paper I will explore some problems arising at the syntax-semantics interface in the Ottawa dialect of Ojibwe, an Algonquian language of the Great Lakes area. Algonquian languages are well known for having a construction in which the morphology of the verb suggests a thematic alignment reversed from what is expected. This construction is known as an INVERSE. The following examples contrast the morphology of a normally aligned clause in (1a), known to Algonquianists as DIRECT, with that of an inverse in (1b).

- (1) (a) *Ngii-waabmaanaanig.* 'We excl saw them.'
 ni - gii - waabam - Ø - aa - naan - ig
 1 PAST see AN STEM 3 AN OBJ 1PL 3PL
- (b) *Ngii-waabmignaanig.* 'They saw us excl.'
 ni - gii - waabam - Ø - igo - naan - ig
 1 PAST see AN STEM INVERSE 1PL 3PL

In the direct clause in (1a), the prefix, *ni-* 'first person', indexes the agent of the clause, as does the first of the two plural suffixes, *-naan* 'first person plural', and the theme is indexed by the suffix immediately following the stem, *-aa* 'third person animate', and by the second plural suffix, *-ig* 'third person plural'. But in the inverse clause in (1b), the prefix, *ni-* 'first person', and the first of the two plural suffixes, *-naan* 'first person plural', index the theme, while the agent is indexed only by the second plural suffix, *-ig* 'third person plural'. The suffix immediately following the stem marks that the clause has this inverse alignment (and, by its allomorphy, that a third person is involved).

1.1 Distribution of inverses. The distribution of inverse morphology in transitive clauses is determined by a combination of two independent kinds of conditions. One class of conditions is related to the fact that in Ojibwe, as in Algonquian languages in general, every verb shows two distinct but synonymous agreement forms whose distribution is determined by conditions of external syntax. One of the agreement forms is called INDEPENDENT, occurring in most simple independent clauses. The other is called CONJUNCT, occurring in most kinds of subordinate clauses, in connection with certain adverbials, and in certain discourse environments. Some examples are given in (2).

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|---------------------|
| (2) | Independent | Conjunct |
| | <i>ngiwe</i> | <i>giwewayanh</i> |
| | <i>ni - giwe</i> | <i>giwe - yaanh</i> |
| | 1 go home | go home 1SG-SUBJ |
| | <i>ggiwe</i> | <i>giwewan</i> |
| | <i>gi - giwe</i> | <i>giwe - yan</i> |
| | 2 go home | go home 2SG-SUBJ |

(2) *giiwewag*
giuwe - *w* - *ag*
 go home 3 3PL

nwaabmaa
ni - *waabam* - *aa*
 1 see 3AN OBJ

wwaabmaan
o - *waabam* - *aa* - *an*
 3ERG see 3AN OBJ OBV

gwaabam
gi - *waabam* - *i*
 2 see 1OBJ

nwaabmig
ni - *waabam* - *igo*
 1 see INV

gwaabmin
gi - *waabam* - *ini*
 2 see INV

giiwewaad
giuwe - *waa* - *d*
 go home 3PL 3SUBJ

waabmag
waabam - \emptyset - *ag*
 see 3AN OBJ 1ERG

waabmaad
waabam - *aa* - *d*
 see 3AN OBJ 3SUBJ

waabmiyan
waabm - *i* - *yan*
 see 1OBJ 2SG-SUBJ

waabmid
waabam - *i* - *d*
 see 1OBJ 3SUBJ

waabminaanh
waabam - *in* - *aanh*
 see 2OBJ 1SG-SUBJ

The second class of conditions determining the distribution of inverses depends on the person and animacy of the core participants. Note that in Algonquian languages there is a two gender system of animate/inanimate. There is a three-part grammaticized agency scale, summarized in (3).

(3) Algonquian Agency Scale (AAS)

Part I: Second person > first person > third person

Part II: Animates > inanimates

Part III: High topic rank animates > low topic rank animates

The choice of direct and inverse clauses is determined by the relative position of the core participants on these hierarchies and the agreement type of the verb. The facts are summarized in (4).

	independent	conjunct
1st, 2nd person involved	obligatory	direct only
2nd acts on 1st (AAS Part I)	direct	
1st acts on 2nd (AAS Part I)	inverse	
only 3rd person animates involved	optional	optional
determined by relative topic rank (AAS Part II)		
with inanimate involved	obligatory	obligatory
animate acts on inanimate (AAS Part III)	direct	direct
inanimate acts on animate (AAS Part III)	inverse	inverse
inanimate acts on inanimate	ungrammatical	ungrammatical

Most Algonquianists hold that the different clauses of the AAS are part of a single scale (e.g. Rogers, 1976). The fact that Part I is sensitive to verb agreement type and Parts II and III are not constitutes a strong argument that at least Part I is a separate clause.

1.2. The problem. The syntax of clauses containing inverse verb forms is a matter of significant controversy in Algonquian circles. One camp (Rhodes 1976, Perlmutter and Rhodes 1988 (Ojibwe); LeSourd, 1976 (Fox); Jolley, 1982 (Plains Cree)) holds that the surface grammatical relations of inverse clauses like that in (1b) are reversed from those of (1a). The other (Dahlstrom, 1987 (Plains Cree), Anderson, 1977, 1992 (Potawatomi)) holds that the surface grammatical relations are identical in both direct and inverse clauses, and that the difference is only a matter of morphology.

The purpose of this paper is to throw some light on the syntax of inverse clauses in construction grammar terms. I will show that there are four distinct patterns in the alignment of semantic roles with syntax. They are:

- Pattern I agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike, AND patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse pattern alike.
- Pattern II agent (experiencer) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse pattern alike, AND patient (theme, recipient) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike.
- Pattern III agent (experiencer) of direct, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike, AND patient (theme, recipient) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse pattern alike.
- Pattern IV agent (experiencer) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse pattern alike, AND patient (theme, recipient) of direct and, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike.

The number of syntactic phenomena that manifest each of these patterns is different. In Ottawa, most phenomena uniquely manifest Pattern I, only a few phenomena uniquely manifest Patterns II, III, and IV. There are, however, two phenomena showing a syntactic dialect split. In both splits one dialect has Pattern I and the other Pattern III. Throughout the rest of the paper I will tacitly assume an automatic equivalence of agent and experiencer and of patient, theme, and recipient.² Ojibwe, like all Algonquian languages, has very tightly knit syntactic functions, making such an identification relatively uncontroversial.

2. Pattern I. The position I am taking here is that the patterns we find are a matter of syntax which cannot be accounted for merely by elaborate morphological analysis. In this section I will sketch the syntactic phenomena manifesting Pattern I.³ There are five: 1) a ban on inanimates, 2) control of obviation within a clause, 3) word order, 4) raising and 5) control of obviation in adverbial adjunct clauses.⁴ Also, as suggested by example (1) the morphology of verb agreement manifests Pattern I, but since we are interested in syntax we will not count the morphology.

2.1. Inanimate Ergative Ban. Inanimates are banned from certain syntactic positions in transitive clauses. This ban follows Pattern I.

- (5) (a) the agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive may not be inanimate, AND
 (b) the patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse may be either animate or inanimate.

Examples of banned inanimates are given in (6). (6a) has an example of a banned agent of a direct clause. In this example, the word *mtig* 'tree' is a member of the small class of notionally inanimate grammatically animates, but it is nonetheless banned from this construction.⁵ This shows that however this ban is formulated it cannot depend on the morphology. The synonymous direct form is grammatical, so the ban cannot be simply semantic. (6b) has a parallel banned theme of inverse. But (6c) is perhaps the most interesting. Ojibwe has two distinct passive constructions. One is built on the transitive stem that agrees with animate objects. Let us call it a Type I passive. The other is built on the transitive stem that agrees with inanimate objects. Let us call it a Type II passive. While Type II passives can be freely predicated of both animates and inanimates, Type I passives can only be predicated of animates. (6c) exemplifies this.

- (6) (a) **Wgii-miigshkawaan nJohnan mtig.* 'The tree hit John.'
 o - gii - miigishkaw - aa - an nJohn - an mitigw
 3ERG PAST hit the mark 3AN OBJ OBV John OBV tree
 (but OK in inverse: *Wgii-miigshkaagoon mtigoon nJohn.* 'The tree hit John.')
- (b) **Wgii-miigshkaagoon nJohnan mtig.* 'John hit the tree.'
 o - gii - miigishkaw - igo - an nJohn - an mitigw
 3ERG PAST hit the mark INV OBV John OBV tree
 (but OK in direct: *Wgii-miigshkaan mtigoon nJohn.* 'John hit the tree.')
- (c) **Gii-miigshkawaa mtig.* 'The tree was hit.'
 gii - miigishkaw - aa - w mitigw
 PAST hit the mark PASS 3SUBJ tree
 (but OK as Type II passive: *Gii-miigshkigaazo mtig.* 'The tree was hit.')

Examples of allowed inanimates are given in (7). (7a) has an example of an allowed patient of a direct clause. This is the grammatical synonym of (6b). (7b) has a parallel allowed agent of inverse and is the grammatical synonym of (6a).

- (7) (a) *Wgii-miigshkawaan mtigoon nJohn.* 'John hit the tree.'
 o - gii - miigishkaw - aa - an mitigw - an nJohn
 3ERG PAST hit the mark 3AN OBJ OBV tree OBV John
 (cf. *(6b).)
- (b) *Wgii-miigshkaagoon mtigoon nJohn.* 'The tree hit John.'
 o - gii - miigishkaw - igo - an mitigw - an nJohn
 3ERG PAST hit the mark INV OBV tree OBV John
 (cf. *(6a).)

2.2. Clause internal obviation. Within a clause a third person animate obligatorily triggers the overt mark of disjoint reference known as the **OBVIATIVE** in another third person animate according to Pattern I.

- (8) (a) the agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive control the obviation of all other arguments, AND
 (b) the patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse can only control the obviation of secondary objects.

Only animates show explicit marking for obviation. Any noun that is not obviative is called **PROXIMATE**.

In order to understand the following examples we need to note that Algonquian languages have two distinct kinds of objects, primary objects (= RG 2's) and secondary objects (=RG 3's). Secondary objects are different from indirect objects in that rather than being prototypically animate recipients, they are prototypically inanimate themes of ditransitives. A fuller discussion of the properties of objects in Ojibwe can be found in Rhodes (1991).

Examples of agents of directs controlling the obviation of both the primary object (i.e. the patient/theme/recipient) and secondary objects is given in (9). In all the following examples the overt marking of obviation on the noun is given in boldface for clarity.

- (9) (a) agent of direct proximate, theme of direct obviative

Wgii-zaaghaan nmishoomsan nookmis.
o-gii - zaagih-aa-an ni-mishoomis-an n-ookomis
 3ERG-PAST-love-3AN OBJ-OBV 1-grandfather-OBV 1-grandmother

'My grandmother loved my grandfather.'

- (b) agent of direct proximate, secondary object obviative⁶

Wgii-daawenan semaan nmishoomis.
ni-gii - daawe-n-an asemaa-an ni-mishoomis
 1-PAST-give-N-OBV tobacco-OBV 1-grandfather

'My grandfather sold tobacco.'

An example of a recipient of an inverse controlling the obviation of the agent is given in (10).

- (10) patient of inverse proximate, agent of inverse obviative

Wgii-zaaghigoon nmishoomsan nookmis.
o-gii - zaagih-igo-an ni-mishoomis-an n-ookomis
 3ERG-PAST-love-INV-OBV 1-grandfather-OBV 1-grandmother

'My grandfather loved my grandmother.'

It is impossible to give an unambiguous example of the recipient of an inverse controlling the obviation of a secondary object, because a third person recipient must be in a clause with a third person agent to form a grammatical inverse. In such a case one cannot tell whether it is the recipient or the agent which is triggering the obviation of the secondary object. But the facts are at least consistent with (8a).

An example of a recipient of a passive controlling the obviation of a secondary object is given in (11).

- (11) recipient of passive proximate, secondary object obviative

Gii-miinaa semaan nmishoomis.
ni-gii - miin-aa-w asemaa-an ni-mishoomis
 1-PAST-give-PASS-3 tobacco-OBV 1-grandfather

'My grandfather was given tobacco.'

Examples supporting (8b) are given in (12). In (12a) is an example of a recipient of a direct controlling the obviation of a secondary object, and in (12b) is an example of an agent of an inverse controlling the obviation of a secondary object.

- (12) (a) recipient of direct proximate, secondary object obviative

Ngii-miinaa semaan nmishoomis.
ni-gii - miin-aa asemaa-an ni-mishoomis
 1-PAST-give-3AN tobacco-OBV 1-grandfather

'I gave my grandfather tobacco.'

- (b) agent of inverse proximate, secondary object obviative

Ngii-miinig semaan nmishoomis.
ni-gii - miin-igw asemaa-an ni-mishoomis
 1-PAST-give-INV tobacco-OBV 1-grandfather

'My grandfather gave me tobacco.'

2.3. Neutral word order. Ojibwe, like other Algonquian languages, has what is commonly known as "free" word order. However, closer inspection shows that much of the variability of Ojibwe word order follows from definiteness, (Tomlin and Rhodes (1979 [1992]), Rhodes, 1989). The following examples all contain ditransitive clauses with three NPs, all with definite readings. The relative degree of acceptability of such clauses varies with the word order. The details are complex and the acceptability of a particular order differs depending on the grammatical animacy of the secondary object/theme. But the pattern follows Pattern I, as summarized in (13).

- (13) (a) the agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse occupy the same slot in the neutral word order, AND
 (b) the patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse occupy the same slot in the neutral word order.

The data are laid out in (14) through (17), and summarized in (18) where it can be seen that (13) holds true. To facilitate comparison between examples, the roles of (13a), agent of direct and recipient of inverse, are printed in boldface, and the roles of (13b), recipient of direct and the agent of inverse, are underlined.

(14) Order in direct clauses with (grammatically) inanimate secondary objects

- (a) *Wgii-shamaan miinan kwe binoojiinyan.* [P theme agent recip]
 she fed him blueberries woman child
- (b) *Wgii-shamaan kwe miinan binoojiinyan.* [P agent theme recip]
 (c) *?Wgii-shamaan miinan binoojiinyan kwe.* [P theme recip agent]
 (d) *?Wgii-shamaan binoojiinyan miinan kwe.* [P recip theme agent]
 (e) *?*Wgii-shamaan binoojiinyan kwe miinan.* [P recip agent theme]
 (f) **Wgii-shamaan kwe binoojiinyan miinan.* [P agent recip theme]

'The woman fed the child the blueberries.'

(15) Order in direct clauses with (grammatically) animate secondary objects

- (a) *Wgii-shamaan kwe binoojiinyan mshiimnan.* [P agent recip theme]
 she fed him woman child apple
- (b) *Wgii-shamaan kwe mshiimnan binoojiinyan.* [P agent theme recip]
 (c) *?Wgii-shamaan binoojiinyan kwe mshiimnan.* [P recip agent theme]
 (d) *?Wgii-shamaan binoojiinyan mshiimnan kwe.* [P recip theme agent]
 (e) *?*Wgii-shamaan mshiimnan binoojiinyan kwe.* [P theme recip agent]
 (f) **Wgii-shamaan mshiimnan kwe binoojiinyan.* [P theme agent recip]

'The woman fed the child the apple.'

(16) Order in inverse clauses with (grammatically) inanimate secondary objects

- (a) *Wgii-shamgoon miinan binoojiinh kwewan.* [P theme recip agent]
 she fed him blueberries child woman
- (b) *Wgii-shamgoon binoojiinh miinan kwewan.* [P recip theme agent]
 (c) *?Wgii-shamgoon miinan kwewan binoojiinh.* [P theme agent recip]
 (d) *?Wgii-shamgoon kwewan miinan binoojiinh.* [P agent theme recip]
 (e) *?*Wgii-shamgoon kwewan binoojiinh miinan.* [P agent recip theme]
 (f) **Wgii-shamgoon binoojiinh kwewan miinan.* [P recip agent theme]

'The woman fed the child the blueberries.'

(17) Order in inverse clauses with (grammatically) animate secondary objects

- (a) *Wgii-shamgoon binoojiinh kwewan mshiimnan.* [P recip agent theme]
 she fed him child woman apple
- (b) *Wgii-shamgoon binoojiinh mshiimnan kwewan.* [P recip theme agent]
 (c) *?Wgii-shamgoon kwewan binoojiinh mshiimnan.* [P agent recip theme]
 (d) *?Wgii-shamgoon kwewan mshiimnan binoojiinh.* [P agent theme recip]
 (e) *?*Wgii-shamgoon mshiimnan kwewan binoojiinh.* [P theme agent recip]
 (f) **Wgii-shamgoon mshiimnan binoojiinh kwewan.* [P theme recip agent]

'The woman fed the child the apple.'

(18) (a) inanimate secondary object

	direct	inverse
(i)	[P theme agent <u>recip</u>]	[P theme <u>recip</u> agent]
(ii)	[P agent theme <u>recip</u>]	[P <u>recip</u> theme agent]
(iii)	[P theme <u>recip</u> agent]	[P theme agent <u>recip</u>]
(iv)	[P <u>recip</u> theme agent]	[P agent theme <u>recip</u>]
(v)	[P <u>recip</u> agent theme]	[P agent <u>recip</u> theme]
(vi)	[P agent <u>recip</u> theme]	[P <u>recip</u> agent theme]

(b) animate secondary object

	direct	inverse
(i)	[P agent <u>recip</u> theme]	[P <u>recip</u> agent theme]
(ii)	[P agent theme <u>recip</u>]	[P <u>recip</u> theme agent]
(iii)	[P <u>recip</u> agent theme]	[P agent <u>recip</u> theme]
(iv)	[P <u>recip</u> theme agent]	[P agent theme <u>recip</u>]
(v)	[P theme <u>recip</u> agent]	[P theme agent <u>recip</u>]
(vi)	[P theme agent <u>recip</u>]	[P theme <u>recip</u> agent]

2.4. **Raising.** In Ottawa, as in all Algonquian languages certain verbs of mental activity, including *gkendang* "to know", appear in constructions with a copy of an argument of the embedded clause as the primary object of the verb of the matrix clause. Although I am taking the position that such constructions simply exist and are not derived from any more basic structure, let me nonetheless use the transformational terminology of raising to describe them and their parts. Different Algonquian languages impose different conditions on a potentially raised participant. Ottawa is very restrictive. To be raised, an argument must be: 1) animate, 2) a high-ranked discourse topic, and 3) be an instance of the first clause of Pattern I, as in (19a).

- (19) (a) the agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and the patient (theme, recipient) of passive are raisable, AND
 (b) the patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse are not.

The basic facts summarized in (19) are shown in (20) and (21). In (20a) the agents of the direct verbs in the embedded clauses are raised. In (20b) the patient of an inverse verb is raised as is the patient of the passive in (20c).

(20) (a) agent of direct raised

(i)	<i>Ngikenmaa gii-baashkzok.</i>					
<i>ni</i>	-	<i>gikenim</i>	-	<i>aa</i>	<i>gii</i>	- <i>baashkizw</i> - <i>ik</i>
1		know		3AN OBJ	PAST	shoot 2OBJ-3SUBJ

'I know that he shot you.' (lit. I know him that...)

(ii)	<i>Ggikenmin gii-baashkzwad.</i>					
<i>gi</i>	-	<i>gikenim</i>	-	<i>ini</i>	<i>gii</i>	- <i>baashkizw</i> - \emptyset - <i>ad</i>
2		know		INV	PAST	shoot 3AN OBJ 2SUBJ

'I know that you shot him.' (lit. I know you that ...)

- (20) (a) (iii) *Ngikenmaa; ninwagi gii-baashkzwaawaadi_i→j Maagiiyan_j.*

ni - *gikenim* - *aa_i* - *ag* *aniniw_i* - *ag*
1 know 3AN OBJ 3PL man_i 3PL

gii - *baashkizw* - *aa_j* - *waa* - *d_i* *Maagii_j* - *an*
PAST shoot 3AN OBJ 3PL 3SUBJ Marge_j OBV

'I know that the men shot Marge.' (lit. I know them that ...)

- (b) patient of inverse raised

Ngikenmaa; Maagii_j gii-baashkzogod_j→i ninwan_i.

ni - *gikenim* - *aa_j* *Maagii_j*
1 know 3AN OBJ Marge_j

gii - *baashkizw* - *igo* - *d_j* *aniniw_i* - *an*
PAST shoot INV 3SUBJ man_i OBV

'I know that the men shot Marge.'

- (c) patient of passive raised

Ngikenmaa gii-baashkzond.

ni - *gikenim* - *aa_i* *gii* - *baashkizw* - *ind_i*
1 know 3AN OBJ PAST shoot 3AN PASS

'I know that he was shot.' (lit. I know him that...)

In contrast the sentences of (21), constructed as parallels to those in (20), are ungrammatical. Those in (21a) show that the patients of direct clauses are unraisable, as are the agents of inverses as shown by (21b).

- (21) (a) patient of direct unraisable

(i) **Ggikenmin gii-baashkzok.*

gi - *gikenim* - *ini* *gii* - *baashkizw* - *ik*
2 know INV PAST shoot 2OBJ-3SUBJ

'I know that he shot you.' (lit. I know you that...) (cf. [20a(i)])

(ii) **Ngikenmaa gii-baashkzwad.*

ni - *gikenim* - *aa* *gii* - *baashkizw* - *Ø* - *ad*
1 know 3AN OBJ PAST shoot 3AN OBJ 2SUBJ

'I know that you shot him.' (lit. I know him that...) (cf. [20a(ii)])

(iii) **Ngikenmaa; Maagiiyan_j gii-baashkzwaawaadi_i→j ninwagi.*

ni - *gikenim* - *aa_j* *Maagii_j* - *an*
1 know 3AN OBJ Marge_j OBV

gii - *baashkizw* - *aa_j* - *waa* - *d_i* *aniniw_i* - *ag*
PAST shoot 3AN OBJ 3PL 3SUBJ man_i 3PL

'I know that the men shot Marge.' (lit. I know her that...) (cf. [20a(iii)])

(21) (b) agent of inverse unraisable

**Ngikenmaagi; ninwan; gii-baashkzogod_i→_j Maagii_j.*
ni - *gikenim* - *aa_i* - *ag* *aniniw_i* - *an*
 1 know 3AN OBJ 3PL man_i OBV
gii - *baashkizw* - *igo* - *d_j* *Maagii_j*
 PAST shoot INV 3SUBJ Marge_j

'I know that the men shot Marge.' (cf. [20b])

2.5. Obviation into adjunct clauses. Only third person animate nominals in the roles of the first clause of Pattern I can trigger OBVIATIVE in the subjects of adjunct clauses. This is summarized in (22).

- (22) (a) the agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and the patient (theme, recipient) of passive can trigger obviation in adjunct clauses, AND
 (b) the patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse cannot.

Obviation is marked as optional in the following sentences cited in isolation, because Ottawa triggers of cross-clausal obviation must be construed as high-rank discourse topics. Since these sentences can be read either way, the obviation appears to be optional. In (23) both verb forms are direct by virtue of being conjunct (which is triggered by the adverbial particle *mii*, here translated as 'then'⁷). Note that the third person animate recipient in (23a) cannot trigger obviation, but the third person agent in (23b) can.

- (23) (a) agent of direct controlling obviation

Mii-sh naagshi(ni)g mii gii-shamid. 'Then in the evening, he fed me.'
naagoshi - (*ini*) - *g* *gii* - *asham* - *i* - *d*
 be evening (OBV) 3 INAN PAST feed 1 OBJ 3 SUBJ

- (b) patient of inverse controlling obviation

Naagshi(ni)g wgii-bzikaagon doopwin. 'In the evening, the table fell on him.'
naagoshi - (*ini*) - *g* *o* - *gii* - *bizikaw* - *igo* - *n*
 be evening (OBV) 3 INAN 3ERG PAST strike INV OBJ

- (c) patient of passive controlling obviation

Naagshi(ni)g gii-baashkzwaa. 'Then in the evening, he was shot.'
naagoshi - (*ini*) - *g* *gii* - *baashkizw* - *aa* - *w*
 be evening (OBV) 3 INAN PAST shoot PASS 3 SUBJ

But in contrast to (23b) in the inverse clause in (24b) the third person agent in cannot trigger obviation.

- (24) (a) obviation not triggered by recipient of direct

*Naagshi(*ni)g ngii-shamaa.* 'In the evening, I fed him.'
naagoshi - (**ini*) - *g* *ni* - *gii* - *asham* - *aa*
 be evening (OBV) 3 INAN 1 PAST see 3 AN OBJ

- (b) obviation not triggered by agent of inverse

*Naagshi(*ni)g ngii-shamig.* 'In the evening, he fed me.'
naagoshi - (**ini*) - *g* *ni* - *gii* - *asham* - *igo*
 be evening (OBV) 3 INAN 1 PAST see INVERSE

3. Pattern II. The second pattern is given in (25).

- (25) (a) agent (experiencer) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse pattern alike, AND

- (b) patient (theme, recipient) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike.

To the best of my knowledge there is only one syntactic phenomenon that manifests Pattern II. There is a class of loosely bound verbal prefixes known to Algonquianists as preverbs. One subclass of preverbs have auxiliary-like meanings, at least some of these can only bind agent/experiencers. Examples are given in (26).

- (26) (a) agent of direct bound by an auxiliary preverb

Ngii-booni-gnoona. 'I stopped talking to him.'
ni - *gii* - *booni* - *ganoon* - *aa*
 1 PAST stop converse with 3AN OBJ

- (b) agent of inverse bound by an auxiliary preverb

Ngii-booni-gnoonig. 'He stopped talking to me.'
ni - *gii* - *booni* - *ganoon* - *igo*
 1 PAST stop converse with INV

- (c) patient of passive not bindable by an auxiliary preverb

**Ngii-booni-gnoon'goo.* 'They stopped talking to me.'
ni - *gii* - *booni* - *ganoon* - *igoo*
 1 PAST stop converse with PASS

The data for this pattern are at best only suggestive since there is no clear way to test for the non-bindability of patient/recipient/themes in transitive clauses.

4. Pattern III. On the other hand Pattern III is better attested. There are four phenomena that follow it. Pattern III is given in (27).

- (27) (a) agent (experiencer) of direct, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike, AND

- (b) patient (theme, recipient) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse pattern alike.

The four phenomena that manifest it are the 1) binding of floated

quantifiers, 2) the binding of certain auxiliary preverbs, 3) a variant of raising, and 4) a variant of control of obviation into adjunct clauses.

4.1. Floated Quantifiers. Quantifiers freely float off of certain post-verbal nominals and appear at the front of clauses. The limits on which nominals can be bound to these floated quantifiers is defined by Pattern III.

- (28) (a) agent (experiencer) of direct, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive cannot bind floated quantifiers, AND
 (b) patient (theme, recipient) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse can bind floated quantifiers.

Examples are given in (29).

- (29) (a) agent of direct cannot bind a floated quantifier, patient can

Niizh ngii-nsaanaanig giigoonyag. (i) *'Two of us caught fish.'
 (ii) 'We caught two fish.'

<i>niizh</i>	<i>ni</i>	-	<i>gii</i>	-	<i>nis</i>	-	<i>aa</i>	-	<i>naan</i>	-	<i>ig</i>		<i>giigoony</i>	-	<i>ag</i>
two	1		PAST		kill		3AN OBJ		1PL		3PL		fish		3PL

- (b) agent of inverse cannot bind a floated quantifier, theme can

Niizh ngii-waabmignaanig ninwag. (i) *'Two of the men saw us.'
 (ii) 'The men saw two of us.'

<i>niizh</i>	<i>ni</i>	-	<i>gii</i>	-	<i>waabam</i>	-	<i>igo</i>	-	<i>naan</i>	-	<i>ig</i>		<i>aniniw</i>	-	<i>ag</i>
two	1		PAST		see		INV		1PL		3PL		man		3PL

- (c) patient of passive cannot bind a floated quantifier

Niizh gii-baashkzwaawag ninwag. *'Two of the men were shot.'

<i>niizh</i>	<i>ni</i>	-	<i>gii</i>	-	<i>baashkizw</i>	-	<i>aa</i>	-	<i>w</i>	-	<i>ag</i>		<i>aniniw</i>	-	<i>ag</i>
two	1		PAST		shoot		PASS		3 SUBJ		3PL		man		3PL

This argument parallels one made for Cree quantifiers by Dahlstrom (1987). There is, however, more complexity to this than at first appears. There is some suggestive evidence that this binding is semantically driven. For example, intransitive verbs with implied objects can have their virtual object bound to certain general quantifiers appearing in the floated position, as in (30).

- (30) *Niibna ngii-wiisin.* 'I ate a lot.'

<i>niibina</i>	<i>ni</i>	-	<i>gii</i>	-	<i>wiisini</i>
much	1		PAST		eat

(NB ≠ *Niibna ngii-miijin*. 'I ate a lot of it.' [transitive])

4.2. Auxiliary Preverbs. Some preverbs with auxiliary-like meanings manifest Pattern III rather than Pattern II. This is exemplified in (31). Notice that (31c) is grammatical while the structurally parallel (26c) is not.

- (31) (a) agent of direct bound by an auxiliary preverb

Ngii-bi-gnoonaa. 'I came to talk to him.'

<i>ni</i>	-	<i>gii</i>	-	<i>bi</i>	-	<i>ganoon</i>	-	<i>aa</i>
1		PAST		come		converse with		3AN OBJ

- (31) (b) agent of inverse bound by an auxiliary preverb

Ngii-bi-gnoonig. 'He came to talk to me.'
ni - gii - booni - ganoon - igo
 1 PAST stop converse with INV

- (c) recipient of passive bound by an auxiliary preverb

Ngii-bi-shamgoo. 'I came to be fed.'
ni - gii - bi - asham - igoo
 1 PAST come feed PASS

4.3. Syntactic dialects for raising and obviation. Although many speakers have restrictions on raisability and control of adjunct clause obviation that manifest Pattern I, there are speakers for whom raiseability and/or control of adjunct clause obviation manifests Pattern III. The appearance of Pattern III instead of Pattern I for Raising is independent of its appearance for control of adjunct clause obviation. Thus there are four kinds of Ottawa speakers with respect to raising and adjunct clause obviation:

	Raising	Adjunct Clause Obviation
A Speakers	Pattern I	Pattern I
B Speakers	Pattern I	Pattern III
C Speakers	Pattern III	Pattern I
D Speakers	Pattern III	Pattern III

For speakers of the Pattern III Raising dialect, (20b) is bad and (21b) is good. Dahlstrom (1987) reports this as the raising pattern in Plains Cree.

For speakers of the Pattern III Adjunct clause obviation dialect, (23b) is bad with downstairs clause obviative agreement and (24b) is good with downstairs clause obviative agreement.

5. Pattern IV. Pattern IV is the weakest attested pattern. Only one phenomenon manifests it, and it is morphological. Pattern IV is given in (33).

- (33) (a) agent (experiencer) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse pattern alike, AND
 (b) patient (theme, recipient) of direct and, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive pattern alike.

The phenomenon that manifests it is the suppression of the morpheme *-n(aa)* from transitive verb forms. Verbs with objects all show *-n(aa)* in the independent except where the patient of direct, agent of an inverse, or patient of a passive is animate. Since the data are quite complex, and the pattern is not particularly important, we leave it here with just this mention.

6. Conclusion. Previous works dealing with semantic-syntactic alignments in Algonquian languages, including my own, have suffered from too narrow a focus. Each has concentrated on particular details of morphology or syntax which support their favorite analysis. This paper has two goals: 1) to get as much of the full range of facts out as is possible in this short time frame, which we have already accomplished, and 2) to suggest an alignment system which will allow

for a principled account for each of the patterns.

I suggest that all four patterns can be readily accounted for by assuming that the grammatical relations of inverse clauses are reversed from those of the direct. Under this account the four patterns have the following interpretations:

Pattern I agent (experiencer) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive are SUBJECTS, and patient (theme, recipient) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse are PRIMARY OBJECTS.

Phenomena manifesting Pattern I are sensitive to grammatical relations.

Pattern II agent (experiencer) of direct and agent (experiencer) of inverse are AGENTS, and patient (theme, recipient) of direct, patient (theme, recipient) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive are PATIENTS.

Phenomena manifesting Pattern II appear to be directly sensitive to semantic roles. What is important for construction grammar is that this pattern suggests the need to define role equivalences not only for distinguished argument (agent or experiencer) but also for the second argument (patient, theme, or recipient). In derivational terms these would be called underlying subject and underlying primary object.

Let me skip Pattern III for the moment and look at Pattern IV.

Pattern IV agent (experiencer) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse are ERGATIVES, AND patient (theme, recipient) of direct and, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive are ABSOLUTIVES.

Phenomena manifesting Pattern IV are sensitive to grammatical relations.

Pattern III is more difficult. It was on the basis of the existence of Pattern III that Dahlstrom (1987) claimed that the agent (experiencer) of an inverse is a subject, because it patterns with the unequivocal subjects, agent (experiencer) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of passive. But the existence of Patterns I and IV means that such an interpretation makes less sense. So, taking a cue from relational grammar, let me propose that Pattern III represents a FIRST AVAILABLE SUBJECT, that is, the first argument, as defined above, unless there is none, in which case it is the (surface) subject.

Pattern III agent (experiencer) of direct, agent (experiencer) of inverse, and patient (theme, recipient) of passive are FIRST AVAILABLE SUBJECTS, and patient (theme, recipient) of direct and patient (theme, recipient) of inverse are NON-DISTINGUISHED ARGUMENT-SUBJECTS.

The implications of this analysis for construction grammar is that, in some languages thematic alignments can be made based on a grammaticized scale such as the AAS given in (3), and we can understand why an agent can appear as a syntactic object in an Ojibwe sentence. It also means that there can be no universal thematic alignment in Construction Grammar.

NOTES

¹This paper represents a further development of the non-theoretical parts of Perlmutter and Rhodes (1988), the theoretical line of inquiry of which died for lack

of clear knock-down arguments. But I owe David Perlmutter particular thanks for his input in driving the refinement of the analyses presented here. I would also like to thank Chuck Fillmore, Paul Kay, Eve Sweetser, and Fred Lupke for various discussions that have contributed significantly to this paper. The usual disclaimers apply.

²This is actually somewhat simplified, particularly with respect to objects:

Ngii-dbaajmaa nJohn. 'I talked about John.' (agent-topic)

Nmiswinwaa Maanii. 'Mary turns me on.' (experiencer-stimulus)

Ngii-gmoodmaa mzinhigan mdimoooyenh. 'I stole a knife from the old lady.'
(agent-affected source-theme)

et al.

Nonetheless, all those semantic roles that are realized as the subject of a direct or those that are realized as the primary object of a direct function equivalently with respect to the syntactic phenomena under discussion.

³These patterns form the basis of the arguments in Perlmutter and Rhodes (1988) for the reversal analysis of inverse clauses.

⁴Both raising and the control of obviation in adjunct clauses show variation in syntactic dialects. For now we will explore only one dialect. In §4 below we will discuss the other.

⁵For most speakers this ban is on notional inanimates regardless of grammatical animacy. But for some speakers the ban is based only on grammatical animacy.

⁶The verb *daawed* 'sell s.t.' belongs to a small class of verbs that take a secondary object rather than a primary object. Outside of this class of verbs, secondary objects are only found as the other object of ditransitive verbs.

⁷The syntax of Ottawa requires that if an adjunct clause is preposed the sentence initial *mii* be repeated at the beginning of the main clause. Sentences without the repetition are grammatical but somewhat stilted.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1977. On the formal description of inflection. *CLS* 13:15-44.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1987. *Plains Cree Morphosyntax*. University of California-Berkeley PhD Thesis.
- Jolley, Cathy. 1982. "On the Plains Cree passive: an analysis of syntactic and lexical rules." *Ohio State Working Papers in Linguistics* 26, pp. 1-33.
- LeSourd, Philip. 1976. "Verb Agreement in Fox." *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics* 2:445-528. Cambridge.
- Perlmutter, David and Richard Rhodes. 1988. *Syntactic-Thematic Alignments in Ojibwa* Paper presented to the LSA, December, 1988, New Orleans.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 1976. *The Morphosyntax of the Central Ojibwa Verb*. University of Michigan PhD Thesis.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 1989. "Ottawa word order." Paper presented to the summer meeting of the SSILA, Tucson, July, 1989.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 1991. "Ojibwa Secondary Objects." In *Grammatical Relations: A Cross Theoretical Perspective*. Palo Alto: Stanford Linguistics Association, 401-414.
- Rogers, Jean H.. 1976. "The coding of role information in Ojibwa." Wm. Cowan, ed., *Papers of the Seventh Algonquian Conference*, 257-271.
- Tomlin, Russ and Richard Rhodes. 1979. "An introduction to information distribution in Ojibwa" *CLS* 15:307-320. Also in D. Payne, ed. [1992] *Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 117-136.