THE INVERSE SYSTEM IN OJIBWE:
A COMPARISON WITH THE PERSON-CASE CONSTRAINT[*]

Bethany Lochbihler
University of Ottawa

1. Introduction

The Inverse System (IS) in Algonquian languages, particularly Ojibwe, has received a range of analyses from grammar external hierarchies to syntactic A-movement. IS has also been placed under analyses developed for the Person-Case Constraint (PCC). It is my proposal that IS is separate from the PCC. IS in Ojibwe, and other Algonquian languages, and PCC effects – traditionally found in Romance languages (but also in other language families) – exhibit similarities and connections which cannot be ignored, but the two phenomena are, in fact, distinct mechanisms in the grammar.[1]

Section 2 is an introduction to the inverse system, arguing that the theme-signs encode grammatical function and not another type of agreement. Section 3 will introduce the PCC, and apparent similarities with IS will be accounted for by a Universal Person Restriction in section 4. However it will be concluded that the two phenomena are separate mechanisms in their respective grammars. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. The Inverse System as argument organization

Languages within the Algonquian family – Ojibwe, Cree and Passamaquoddy, to name a few – are usually said to have inverse systems (although it is a phenomenon found in other languages, such as Georgian, see McGinnis 1999). IS refers to a system of proclitic person agreement on the verb, which is not

---

[1] For a full analysis of IS in Ojibwe see Lochbihler (2007), where I argue that IS is a morpho-syntactic phenomenon.

based on grammatical roles, coupled with a theme-sign suffix which is then used to reflect grammatical function. The proclitic is a single agreement slot (possibly in C^o) bearing the person features of an argument of the clause – either the subject or the object. The choice of proclitic is based on the highest ranking person feature according to the following hierarchy:

(1)   Person Hierarchy: 2 > 1 > 3 proximate > 3 obviative > Inanimate
        (Adapted from Valentine 2001:268)

The proclitic does not give information about grammatical function since it is independently based on the person specification of the arguments. The theme-sign (or voice) is a verbal suffix, which denotes either direct (DIR) or inverse (INV), and relays information about grammatical function within the clause. If the subject is the highest ranked in (1) – which corresponds to proclitic agreement – then the object is lower ranked on the hierarchy and the direct theme-sign appears on the verb. If the reverse relationship occurs with a high ranked object denoted by the proclitic and a low ranked subject, then the inverse theme-sign appears. These relations are shown in the following examples with the simple transitive verb *waabam* 'see':

(2)   a.   n-waabm-aa
               1-see-DIR
               'I see him.'
        b.   n-waabm-ig
               1-see-INV
               'He sees me.' (Valentine 2001:270)

(2a) is an example of the direct voice where the highest ranking argument is the first person subject, here represented by the proclitic *n-*, outranking the 3rd person object resulting in a direct construction marked by *–aa* DIR. (2b) is the inverse case. In considering the surface forms in (2) it is important to note that despite the difference in interpretation the only distinction on the surface is the theme-sign. The agreement is the same in (2a) and (2b), marking the 1st person with *n-*, even though 1st person is the subject and object respectively. Both the direct and inverse voices are morphologically marked in Ojibwe, and neither is ungrammatical. The above example contrasts a speech act participant (SAP), namely 1st person, and a 3rd person argument. Now consider (3) with two SAP arguments:

(3)   a.   g-waabam-i
               2-see-DIR(local)
               'You see me.'
        b.   g-waabm-in
               2-see-INV(local)
               'I see you.'(Valentine 2001:270)

The hierarchy in (1) shows that there is a ranking between SAPs where 2nd outranks 1st person. This fact comes from the evidence in (3) where the 2nd person proclitic *g-* consistently appears, blocking 1st person *n-*, which appeared in (2). What is particularly worthy of mention in (3) is the set of theme-signs used, which are denoted 'local' and have distinct phonological forms from those seen in (2), which are referred to as 'non-local'. Local theme-signs are used when only SAPs are involved, and non-local ones are used when at least one 3rd person argument is involved, displayed in (4).

(4)   Ojibwe theme-signs:

	Direct	Inverse
Local (L)	*-i*	*-in*
Non-local (NL)	*-aa*	*-igw* (also *–igo*, *-ig*)

The traditional literature treats theme-signs as morphemes indicating a direct or inverse relationship between the subject and object (see Bloomfield 1957, deLancey 1981, Klaiman 1992, Aissen 1997, Valentine 2001). However, there are several different views on the precise nature of the theme-signs, which treat them as different kinds of agreement markers. I will give evidence for the claim that the traditional view of theme-signs as encoding grammatical function is correct since it is entirely consistent for these morphemes, where other interpretations of theme-signs face gaps and complications in the paradigm.

    First, McGinnis (1999) departs from the aforementioned tradition and claims that theme-signs (particularly the local set and the non-local DIR) in Ojibwe are simply object agreement on the light verb, giving the correspondence to object person features in (5):

(5)   Object agreement: [+2]   ↔   /-ini/
                            [+1]   ↔   /-i/
                            (else)   ↔   /-aa/ (McGinnis 1999:9)

McGinnis' analysis is felicitous until the non-local inverse theme *–igw* is taken into consideration. With *–igw* the object can be 1st, 2nd or even 3rd proximate and makes no correspondence to the person features of the object. To account for this fact, McGinnis suggests that *–igw* is 3rd agreement associated with a null pronominal logical subject in embedded clauses, but this proposal fails to account for the appearance of *–igw* in the matrix clause, like in (2b). This suggestion is also contradictory considering (5) where 3rd agreement falls into the 'else' category and should be spelled out as *–aa*. If theme-signs were object agreement then McGinnis' proposal postulates unique suffixes denoting 1st and 2nd person objects (*-i* and *–ini* respectively) and another suffix where SAPs are grouped together (*-igw*), and in fact 3 prox would be included with them. To illustrate, consider the distribution of theme-signs with respect to object agreement in (6) and (7).

(6) a. gwaabm-**in**
         'I see **you**.'
     b. gwaabam-**i**
         'You see **me**.' (Valentine 2001:270)

(7) a. nwaabm-**ig**
         'He saw **me**.'
     b. gwaabm-**ig**
         'He sees **you**.'
     c. wwaabm-**igoo**-n
         'He(obv) sees **him(prox)**.' (Valentine 2001:270)

In (6) the 2nd and 1st objects would be uniquely marked while in (7) they are marked by –*igw* alongside 3 prox. Similarly, a 3 prox object would have to be marked with –*igw*, as in (7c) but also with –*aa* when occurring with a SAP subject, as in (2a). The idea that theme-signs are object agreement cannot be adopted because it fails in terms of consistency and correspondence to the person features of the internal argument.

Second, Halle & Marantz (1993) offer another alternative where they treat the theme-sign in Potawatomi (an Algonquian language closely related to Ojibwe) as an agreement slot which agrees in case with a pro 3rd person argument. So DIR –*a* is accusative agreement and INV –*ukO* is nominative agreement. This tentative correspondence is displayed in (8) and (9).

(8) a. k-wapm-**uk**
         '**He** sees you(sg).'
     b. k-wapm-**a**
         'you(sg) see **him**' (Halle & Marantz 1993:148)

(9) a. n-wapm-**uk**
         '**He** sees me.'
     b. n-wapm-**a**
         'I see **him**.' (Halle & Marantz 1993:148)

Looking at the examples in (8) and (9) –*a* corresponds to 3ACC (object) in the b examples and –*ukO* to 3 NOM (subject) in the a examples. Halle & Marantz admittedly leave any further complications of this agreement slot open for investigation. However, their proposal, as it stands, encounters major complications when constructions with either two SAP arguments appear with 3rd case markers, or when two 3rd person arguments appear together such that 3rd is both ACC and NOM, blurring the correspondence between 3rd person and case marking. To solve this problem, stipulations about 1st or 2nd person case would have to be made as well as a distinction between 3prox and 3obv case marking. It seems that 3rd case agreement will not suffice to account for Ojibwe theme-signs and their distribution.

Finally, in a recent paper, Béjar & Rezac (2005) treat the direct theme-sign as default and the inverse as added agreement on the verb, therefore constituting the marked case. This idea seems compatible with Georgian where the 'direct' form is morphologically unmarked, seen in (10). The inverse in (10b) has an extra morpheme –*s* 'tense' which is not present in the direct form in (10a), making the inverse morphologically marked in Georgian.

(10) a. v-xeday   → Direct   (Georgian)
          1.II-see
          'I see him.'
      b. m-xedav-s   → Inverse
          1.I-see-TNS
          'He sees me.' (Béjar & Rezac 2005:20)

However, in Ojibwe, and across Algonquian languages, both the direct and inverse voices are morphologically marked. Thus, it is unlikely that the role of DIR is vacuous in this case so the supposition that INV is added agreement in IS should be rejected.

The three proposals above all try to eliminate the concept of the theme-sign as encoding grammatical function but fail at the descriptive level because they cannot completely account for the distribution of all four theme-signs in (4), and because their predictions are inconsistent. Therefore, it appears optimal to conclude that theme-signs reflect the grammatical relations within the clause with respect to the hierarchy in (1) (at least at the descriptive level) utilized in the selection of the proclitic. The proclitic represents the highest ranked argument in the clause. The theme-sign indicates whether the highest ranked argument is also the subject, giving the direct voice, or the object, giving the inverse voice. But, the theme-sign takes the person specifications of both the subject and object into account as is seen in the use of the local and non-local sets. If a 3rd person is involved the non-local set is used, if only SAPs are involved then the local set is used. Essentially, the grammatical functions in the clause are encoded in terms of person features in the theme-sign providing a phonological cue for the argument organization. The theme-sign works alongside the proclitic, whose form is determined by the hierarchy in (1), so that grammatical function is accessible in the morphology. Therefore the suffixes in question are actually grammatical function encoding theme-signs as the tradition has maintained, and not other agreement contra McGinnis, Halle & Marantz and Béjar & Rezac who argue for object, case or specially added agreement.

In this section it has been argued that the distribution of theme-signs in the independent order is adequately described in encoding grammatical function with respect to the person features of the clausal argument. In the next section I will briefly introduce the Person-Case Constraint so that IS and the PCC can be compared and contrasted.

3. Overview of the Person-Case Constraint

The Person Case-Constraint (PCC) (see Perlmutter 1971, Bonet 1991, 1994) refers to the interaction of person features on the direct and indirect object in a variety of constructions, including ditransitives and causatives, and has been studied extensively, particularly in the Romance languages. This constraint most notably affects clitics or weak pronouns, but can also affect agreement markers, denoting the direct and indirect object where the subject is not involved in the restriction. First, there is the Strong PCC – also referred to as the *me-lui* constraint in reference to the restriction in French (Bonet 1991) – which requires an accusative (direct object) clitic to be 3rd person while the dative (indirect object) clitic can be 1st, 2nd or 3rd person:

(11)   Strong PCC: If DAT then ACC-3rd. (Bonet 1994:36)

The French data below exemplify the case of the Strong PCC:

(12)   a.   *Paul me   **lui**   présentera.   (French)
                 Paul 1-ACC **3-DAT** will.introduce(3rd)
                 'Paul will introduce me to him.'
          b.   Paul me   présentera   **à lui**.
                 Paul 1-ACC will.introduce(3rd) **to him**
                 'Paul will introduce me to him.' (Anagnostopoulou 2005:16)

(12a) violates (11) since a DAT clitic is present but the ACC clitic is not 3rd person. (12b) is a grammatical version of (12a) where the DAT clitic has been removed and the strong pronoun *à lui* is used instead, thus repairing the violation of (11). Second, there is the Weak PCC which allows for the co-occurrence of 1st and 2nd direct and indirect objects, unlike the Strong PCC:

(13)   Weak PCC: If DAT-3rd then ACC-3rd. (Bonet 1994:41)

The Weak PCC can be found in Catalan, as seen in the examples below:

(14)   a.   En Josep, me'   l   va recomanar   la Mireia.(Catalan)
                 the Josep 1st-DAT 3rd-ACC recommended(3rd) the Mireia
                 'She (Mireia) recommended him (Josep) to me.'
          b.   *A en Josep, me   li   va recomanar   la Mireia.
                  to the Josep, 1st-ACC 3rd-DAT recommended(3rd) the Mireia
                   'She (Mireia) recommended me to him (Josep).'
                 (Bonet 1991:178)

(15)   **Te'm** van recomanar   per a la feina.   (Catalan)
          2nd 1st recommended(3rd-pl) for the job
          i) 'They recommended me to you for the job.'
          ii) 'They recommended you to me for the job.' (Bonet 1991:179)

In (14a) there is a 1st-DAT and 3rd-ACC clitic, which obeys the constraint in (13) since the 3rd person is also accusative. But, in (14b) we have the opposite relation where the 3rd person clitic is dative and not accusative, therefore violating (13). For Catalan it is acceptable to have a 1st and 2nd person clitic combination since it is a Weak PCC language, which differs from French, a Strong PCC language where (15) would be ungrammatical.

As briefly mentioned above for French in (12), repair strategies exist in PCC languages, allowing constructions which would otherwise violate the PCC to be expressed in a grammatical form. The repair seen in (12b) for (12a) is the use of a strong pronoun which breaks up the illegal clitic combination thereby destroying the environment for the Strong PCC in (11), giving a grammatical sentence with the same meaning as (12a) (Bonet 1994). Use of a strong pronoun can also be a repair in Weak PCC languages such as Spanish, seen in (16):

(16) a.   *Me   **le**   recomendaron   porque era el (Spanish)
1st-ACC **3rd-DAT** recommended(3rd pl) because was the
más influyente.
most influential
'They recommended me to him/her because s/he was the most influential.'

b.   Me   recomendaron   **a él**   porque era el más
1st-ACC recommended(3rd pl) **to him** because was the most
influyente.
influential
'They recommended me to him/her because s/he was the most influential.' (Bonet 1994:43)

In Spanish *me-le* violates the Weak PCC and is repaired by changing the dative clitic *le* into the strong pronoun *a él*. Note that it is common for such languages to avoid strong pronouns when clitic combinations do not violate the PCC, marking this as a special 'last resort' repair (Bonet 1994). Arguably, this is a syntactic repair (contra Bonet who considers the use of a strong pronoun a kind of morphological repair) since the use of a strong pronoun changes the structure of the sentence (i.e. by introducing a PP).

There are also morphological repairs, such as impoverishment which involves the use of less specified clitics in place of those which trigger PCC violations. For example, in Catalan a dative clitic can be replaced with a less specific (or, in fact, impoverished) locative clitic. (See also Bonet 2006 on morphological repairs and impoverishment):

(17) a.   *Me   **li**   ha recomanat   la senyora Bofill. (Catalan)
1st-ACC **3rd-DAT** has recommended the Mrs.   Bofill
'Mrs. Bofill has recommended me to him/her.'

b.   M'   **hi**   ha recomanat   la senyora Bofill.
1st-ACC **LOC** has recommended the Mrs.   Bofill
'Mrs. Bofill has recommended me to him/her.' (Bonet 1994:48)

(17a) violates the PCC with a 1st-ACC and 3rd-DAT clitic combination, and is repaired in (17b) by the impoverishment of *li* 3rd-DAT to *hi* LOC, which no longer violates the PCC. A notable case of impoverishment is found in Spanish which exhibits quirky person restrictions and "spurious se" effects (see, for example, Perlmutter 1971, Bonet 1991, 1994, Rivero 2006, Nevins 2006). Consider the following "spurious se" effect (which is not the PCC, but a comparable restriction) where two 3rd person clitics are not allowed to appear together:

(18)   a.   *A Pedro, el premio, **le**   lo   dieron ayer. (Spanish)
              to Pedro, the prize,   **3rd-DAT** 3rd-ACC gave-pl yesterday
              'To Pedro, the prize, they gave yesterday.'
       b.   A Pedro, el premio, **se** lo   dieron ayer.
              to Pedro, the prize,   **se** 3rd-ACC gave-pl yesterday
              'To Pedro, the prize, they gave yesterday.' (Nevins 2006:3)

Following earlier proposals by Bonet, Nevins (2006) argues that (18b) is a repair of (18a) because the person features of *le* 3rd-DAT have been deleted, making the impersonal *se* the most appropriate choice for the clitic. Similarly, Rivero (2006) states that the clitic *se* is unspecified for person and so does not clash with other clitics in the cluster, in relation to the quirky person restriction on psychological verbs in Spanish. It is not always the case that a repair strategy exists. Silverstein claims that "Chinook, like many languages, has a restriction on surface forms which prohibits first or second person direct objects from co-occurring in the same verb with indirect objects," (1986:190). This is, in fact, the Strong PCC.

(19)   *č-n-a-l-u-√i-amit   (Chinnook)
          3rdsg.mascERG-1stsgABS-3rdsg.femDAT-to-away-√taking
          'He is taking me for her.' (Silverstein 1986:190)

No grammatical example with the meaning in (19) is possible in Chinook, and so, influenced by recent approaches, it would be concluded that there is no repair for the PCC in distransitives in this language. In the same way, there is also no repair for the Strong PCC in Basque (Bonet 1991, Arregi & Nevins 2006).

Initially the similarities between IS and the PCC are obvious. Both phenomena deal with person specifications of clausal arguments and display hierarchy effects, at least at the descriptive level. For IS, the highest ranking argument, according to (1), occupies the proclitic slot and if the highest ranking argument is also the subject (which is structurally the highest argument in the clause) then the direct voice is used, otherwise the inverse voice is used. For the Strong PCC, the highest ranking internal argument, with respect to person where SAP > 3, must be the indirect object, which is structurally higher (i.e. in an applicative phrase) than the direct object. Similarly the Weak PCC matches up the lowest ranking internal argument with the direct object which is also

structurally low. IS and the PCC both seem to be concerned with matching up person and grammatical function hierarchies in some way. Jelinek & Demers (1983) present an analysis of person restrictions in Lummi Salish using hierarchy alignment. However, this proposal is problematic because it seems that, within the Salish family, different hierarchies are needed in different environments for alignment to account for the data, like for the active and passive (see Wiltschko 2003). Generally the idea of hierarchy alignment is descriptively helpful but does not constitute an adequate account of person restrictions found cross-linguistically. Nonetheless, the relationship between person specification and grammatical function is present with IS in Algonquian as well as the PCC in Romance (and other languages).

In the next section I will discuss similarities between IS and the PCC – found mostly in the comparison of Proto-Algonquian and modern PCC languages – all pointing toward a universal person restriction. However, these similarities do not generalize to the present systems of modern Ojibwe and modern PCC languages since IS and the PCC are crucially different manifestations of the same universal restriction.

4. The Universal Person Restriction

In this section I will discuss the apparent person restriction effects found in IS in Algonquian languages and Ojibwe and argue that such restrictions relate this language to other languages under the effects of the Person-Case Constraint via a Universal Person Restriction, but that IS and the PCC are separate phenomena in the grammars of their respective languages. Silverstein (1986) discusses "global order-class restrictions", mentioned for (19) for ditransitives in Chinook, stating (fn. 19, pg. 228) that restrictions on surface forms are also true of Algonquian languages. Silverstein infers that, historically, a 'pseudo transitive animate' verbal conjugation type is created to get around difficulty in surface forms which potentially violate a universal person restriction, in reference to Goddard's (1967) reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian. Goddard encounters some paradigmatic gaps in his reconstruction of forms missing in all languages in the Algonquian family, and so reconstructs regular forms hypothesizing that the proto-paradigm was regular. One such gap involves transitive animate (TA) verbs in the inverse where there are no absolutive endings (used when the grammatical object is expressed by a noun) for 1st and 2nd person, but only objective endings (used when the grammatical object is not expressed by a noun), even though both sets of endings are attested in the other transitive paradigms.

If there is a 1st or 2nd person with a TA verb in the inverse voice then that 1st or 2nd person is the object with a 3rd subject[2]. The objective conjugation is used when no independent noun phrase doubling an object occurs, which causes extra agreement to appear on the verb. In the absolutive, this agreement appears

---

[2] Goddard deals only with non-local theme signs such that inverse and direct forms involve either an SAP with a 3rd person, or two 3rd person arguments.

on the independent NP instead (as analyzed by Goddard 1967). An example of this marking scheme from Proto-Algonquian (here '*' indicates a reconstructed form) is given in (20):

(20)   a. Objective: *ne-wa·pam-a·-na·n-**a**
                             1-look-DIR-1pl-**OBJ**
                             'We(exclu) look at him.'
       b. Absolutive: *ne-wa·pam-a·-Pena elenyiw-**a**
                             1-look-dir-R.1pl   man-**ABS**
                             'We(exclu) look at the man.' (Goddard 1967:83)

The morpheme of interest in (20) is –*a*, which, according to Goddard (1967), is an objective ending in (20a) which lacks an NP and so suffixes to the verb, and is an absolutive ending in (20b) which has an independent NP to which –*a* attaches. The basic difference between the two conjugations is whether or not there is an object ending on the verb. Again, for TA verbs in the inverse voice in Algonquian there is no absolutive ending for 1st or 2nd person. Goddard proposes that these missing endings should be included in the Proto-Algonquian paradigm to avoid gaps, meaning that they have been dropped in every Algonquian language.

     If this is the case then Silverstein's (1986) remarks can receive the following interpretation. Suppose there is a universal person restriction which prefers to have higher ranked persons (e.g. SAPs) in higher ranked grammatical roles (e.g. subject, indirect object), then the absence of 1st and 2nd TA inverse absolutive endings makes sense. TA inverse with a 1st or 2nd object would be a marked construction violating the universal restriction. Simplifying a section of the paradigm might be considered a repair, either destroying the environment in which the restriction is violated or impoverishing the features represented in the morphology that create the person clash. However, this repair is not really an alternation with a possible ungrammatical form, but is a leveling repair which gets rid of problematic morphology in cases that always violate the universal person restriction. The same situation is present in Basque which is subject to the Strong PCC, where absolutive (direct object) clitics that combine with dative (indirect object) clitics on absolutive-dative auxiliaries (ditransitives) do not have non-third person forms, which would violate the PCC (Arregi & Nevins 2006). The paradigm is leveled like the Proto-Algonquian absolutive endings (as analyzed by Goddard 1967), making it seem like the kind of person restriction motivating the PCC is also involved in the development of IS in Ojibwe.

     My proposal is that all the phenomena around argument person specification – the PCC, IS, quirky person restriction in Spanish as well as quirky subjects in Icelandic (see Sigurðsson 1990-1, 1996, Anagnostopoulou 2005), and various restrictions in Chinook intransitives and psychological verb constructions (see Silverstein 1986) – relate back to a single universal person restriction.

Universal Person Restriction (UPR)
In a local domain where two arguments are present, the most prominent argument corresponds to higher ranked person features.[3]

I will now sketch how the UPR can provide an account of the different types of person restrictions mentioned above. The Strong PCC is a faithful interpretation of the UPR, requiring the direct object to be 3rd person in the presence of the structurally higher indirect object. The Weak PCC is less stringent with respect to the UPR, only requiring the direct object to be 3rd when the indirect object is also 3rd person, and combinations of SAP clitics are licit. Spurious se effects in Spanish (which is also a Weak PCC language) take a different interpretation of the UPR where the direct and indirect object cannot be of the same rank, that is, combinations of two third person clitics are illicit.

IS in Algonquian languages show signs of the UPR in the choice of proclitic in that the higher ranked person features are made prominent by appearing as proclitic agreement. Other agreement slots on the verb in IS do not uniquely match the person features of a particular argument but rather encode person features while also giving another kind of agreement, such as the person specified plural suffixes and the local and non-local theme-sign suffixes which reflect the presence or absence of 3rd person. Therefore, by proclitic agreement a higher ranked argument on the person hierarchy is made more prominent to adhere to the UPR, but other languages are more strict with the UPR, like those with the PCC which can create ungrammatical forms when the highest ranking argument is not structurally prominent.

Languages like English have an even looser tie to the UPR where its effects are not apparent in the current form of the language. There is a range of ways in which the UPR can be expressed in a language creating the spectrum of person effects seen in the PCC, Spurious se and IS. Similarities exist between all the languages and their respective constructions, affected by varying levels of strictness of the UPR. Because of this fact it is tempting to develop unified analyses under which the various phenomena can be accounted for, working towards cross-linguistic uniformity. However, such an attempt may be misguided. Silverstein's mention of Algonquian in the context of the Strong PCC in Chinook does not relate IS in Ojibwe as it is today to the PCC, but rather we see historical similarities with Proto-Algonquian and PCC languages, which are not necessarily maintained in the synchronic grammars of the languages. Rather, separate manifestations of the UPR are found in different languages and constructions.

---

[3] The idea of differing local domains in the PCC and IS is found in Bianchi's (2005) syntactic account of these phenomena. The difference is important since the PCC is an interaction between the direct and indirect objects while IS is between the subject and object. Bianchi claims that this is a difference of parameter setting where IS languages can only have one person licensing field (i.e. a VP external set of projections to which a clitic must raise to license person features) and PCC languages can have recursive person licensing fields, such that there are separate fields for the objects and the subject.

The descriptive aspects of IS and the PCC support the hypothesis that the two phenomena are separate concerns in the grammar. IS is an argument organization strategy whereby the φ-features and grammatical functions of the arguments in a clause are made visible. This is achieved by the proclitic interacting with the choice of theme-sign such that the argument structure of the clause is apparent in the verbal morphology. The PCC is an active restriction in the language barring certain combinations of weak pronouns. The PCC says something about the grammaticality of a construction where IS says something about the grammatical roles, not dictating grammatical form but expressing it in the morphology. At the surface level IS and the PCC are not the same, and I claim that these differences also spread into the domain of the grammar, beyond surface form.

Another difference between the PCC and IS concerns the status of repairs for each. Languages exhibiting the PCC can often use repairs to get around PCC violations by changing something in the construction while maintaining the desired interpretation. It might be the case that the inverse in an IS language is a repair strategy. In such a view, the direct voice would be the default that does not violate the UPR, and the inverse voice would be the reverse case that does violate the UPR, and therefore needs a repair to achieve a grammatical expression. The use of the inverse morpheme would somehow repair the construction, being the marked case in contrast to the direct voice. This is similar to Béjar & Rezac's (2005) analysis which considers INV added agreement and DIR the default marking. It is my claim that this is not what is happening in IS, that the inverse is not a repair but on par with the direct for the following reasons. First, INV is not added agreement since both DIR and INV are morphologically marked in Algonquian. In contexts where theme-signs are found (such as transitive animate verbs in the independent order) both DIR and INV must be appropriately expressed. If DIR marking were default it might be optional, but is instead obligatory just as INV marking is.

Second, PCC repairs actually change something in a sentence, whether it is the syntactic structure like in the strong pronoun repairs seen in (12b) and (16b), or the morphological specification of features like in the impoverishment repairs seen in (17b) and (18b) (for Spurious-se effects). This is not the case in IS where feature specification remains morphologically consistent across the direct and inverse voice, and where, I claim, the underlying syntactic structure is also the same. In terms of morphological agreement, direct and inverse counterparts differ solely in the theme-sign suffix, seen in (21):

(21) a.   g-waabm-aa
           2-see-DIR
           'You see him.'
    b.   g-waabm-ig
           2-see-INV
           'He sees you.' (Valentine 2001:270)

In sum, there is no evidence for a morphological repair. As for a syntactic repair, I claim that sentences like (21a) and (21b) have identical underlying syntactic structure in terms of subject and object merge position and A-movement. Bruening (2001, 2005) argues that the Algonquian inverse system is syntactic, making the difference between the direct and inverse a case of A-movement such that the higher ranked object in the inverse voice raises above the subject to an A-position, constituting actual syntactic inversion. McGinnis (1999) goes over the evidence for syntactic inversion in Ojibwe – such as the status of pronoun doubling, focus movement and reflexive clitics – and concludes that the facts do not correlate with syntactic inversion. Ritter & Rosen (2005) present arguments against A-movement in Algonquian, supported by the lack of A-syntactic phenomena, such as a true passive, indicating that there is only A'-movement in Algonquian. The arguments of McGinnis and Ritter & Rosen significantly weaken Bruening's assertion that IS is the result of syntactic A-movement, meaning the inverse is not a syntactic repair. Both the direct and inverse voices share the same syntactic structure – the differentiation is realized in the morphology. Without underlying differences between the voices, the inverse cannot be a repair for an ungrammatical sentence which violates a strict interpretation of the UPR.

Another superficial difference between IS and the PCC may similarly indicate the existence of two separate mechanisms operating in the grammar. The local domain for IS is the matrix clause, giving the observed interaction between subject and object, and the local domain for the PCC is within the VP phase giving the interaction between direct and indirect object such that the subject is excluded. The domain of application could constitute an actual contrast between IS and the PCC, but could also be a difference in parameter setting, as indicated by Bianchi (2005).

In this section the underlying similarities between IS and the PCC have been accounted for by the UPR, which has effects in many typologically unrelated languages. But these similarities do not necessarily mean different effects stemming from the UPR are related mechanisms in the grammars of the two types of languages. In fact, IS and the PCC are separate elements in the grammar as shown by the morphological and syntactic evidence. They are functionally distinct since IS is an argument organization strategy and the PCC is a constraint which cannot be violated. IS does not involve repairs, unlike the PCC in many languages, and does not result in ungrammatical person combinations. Phenomena related to IS and the PCC also occur in different local domains in the syntactic structure. I conclude that IS and the PCC are distinct mechanisms in their respective grammars, such that an analysis of IS need not be unified with a common analysis for the PCC to account for effects in separate languages.

5. Conclusion

In this paper the facts of the inverse system in Algonquian, and particularly Ojibwe, have been reviewed, ascertaining that theme-signs encode grammatical

function in a clause. An overview of the PCC was given, discussing different repairs that exist to give grammatical forms of constructions that violate the PCC. IS and the PCC were compared and linked through the Universal Person Restriction which motivates different person constraints in different languages. Even though this link exists, Algonquian languages interpret the UPR in a different way than PCC languages, making the two phenomena distinct in the grammar.

References

Aissen, Judith. 1997. On the syntax of obviation. *Language* 75:451-485.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions: a feature checking analysis. In *Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition*, eds. Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordoñez, 49-62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Arregi, Karlos and Andrew Nevins. 2006. Agreement Restrictions and their realization in Basque morphology. To appear in *Agreement Restrictions*, eds. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafnbjargarson. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Béjar, Susana and Milan Rezac. 2005. Cyclic agree and the derivation of PCC effects. To appear in Selected papers from *LSRL* XXXII. John Benjamins.

Bianchi, Valentina. 2005. On the syntax of personal arguments. To appear in *Lingua*.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1957. *Eastern Ojibwa: Grammatical Sketch, Texts and Word List*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bonet, Eulàlia. 1991. Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance Languages. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Bonet, Eulalia. 1994. The Person-Case constraint: a morphological approach. In *The Morphology-Syntax Connection*, eds. Heidi Harley and Colin Phillips, 33-52. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Bonet, Eulàlia. 2006. The Person-Case constraint and repair strategies. To appear in *Agreement Restrictions*, eds. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafnbjargarson. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. *Syntax at the Edge*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2005. The Algonquian inverse is syntactic: binding in Passamaquoddy. Ms., University of Delaware.

DeLancey, Scott. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. *Language* 57:626-657

Goddard, Ives. 1967. The Algonquian independent indicative. In *Contributions the Anthropology: Linguistics, I (Algonquian)*. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 214, Anthropological Series, 78:66-106. Ottawa, ON.

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. *The View from Building 20*, ch. 3. Cambrdige, MA: MIT Press.

Jelinek, Eloise and Demers, Richard. 1983. The agent hierarchy and voice in some Coast Salish languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49:167-185.

Klaiman, Miriam Holly. 1992. Inverse languages. *Lingua* 88:227–261.

Lochbihler, Bethany. 2007. The Inverse System in Ojibwe. MA thesis, University of Ottawa.

McGinnis, Martha. 1999. Is there syntactic inversion in Ojibwa? In Proceedings of the Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Native American Languages, eds.

Leora Bar El, Rose-Marie Déchaine and Charlotte Reinholz. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistcs* 17:101-118.

Nevins, Andrew. 2006. The representation of third person and its consequences for the person case constraint. To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Perlmutter, David M. 1971. Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ritter, Elizabeth and Sara Thomas Rosen. 2005. Agreement without A positions: another look at Algonquian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:648-660.

Rivero, María Luisa. 2006. Oblique subjects and person restrictions in Spanish: A morphological approach. To appear in *Agreement Restrictions*, eds. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafnbjargarson. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sigurðsson, Halldor Armann. 1990-1991. Beygingarsamræmi [Agreement]. *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði* 12-13:31-77.

Sigurðsson, Halldor Armann (1996). Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57, pp. 1-46.

Silverstein, Michael. 1986. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In *Features and Projections*, eds. Pieter Muysken and Henk van Riemsdijk, 163-232. Dordrecht:Foris. (Originally published in R.M.W. Dixon (Ed.). 1976, *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, Canberra: Australian Institutes of Aboriginal Studies.)

Valentine, J. Randolph. 2001. Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Wiltschko, Martina. 2003. Person hierarchy effects without a person hierarchy. Ms., University of British Columbia.