

Using Every Tool in the Box: Case Studies Highlighting the Mutual Support of Practical Learning and Formal Linguistics in the Ojibwe Language

Zoe Brown, Aandeg Muldrew, and Mskwaankwad Rice

1. Introduction

Our range of experiences in Ojibwe language acquisition and revitalization has led us to identify aspects of the language that prove challenging in acquisition. As we all now study formal linguistics, these concepts have become specific research interests that in turn support analyses of Ojibwe that are practical for learners and for revitalization in general. These ongoing research projects are presented as case studies of what can be accomplished when learner challenges are supported by theoretical study and vice versa.

2. Case Study #1 - Ji-: Future/Modal Prefix | Presented by Aandeg Muldrew

Ji- occurs on conjunct order verbs (essentially, dependent verbs). It is essential for a learner to know how to use *ji-* if they are to speak Ojibwe. The relationship of tense and modal affixes in independent order and conjunct order verbs are a challenge to learners. *Ji-* can have a future tense use, and it can have a more modal and ‘irrealis’ that is less appreciated (Valentine, 2001). All the uses of *ji-* in this sense are not well understood by the L2 language community.

2.1. Future Tense *ji-*

- (1) “Infinitive” use of *ji-*¹
Niwiindamawaa ji-maajaad
1.tell.DIR JI-go.3.CONJ
‘I’m telling him/her to leave’ (AMDM69)
- (2) “Wish” construction
Ambesh wiindamawinaambaan ji-maajaayan
I.wish tell.1>>2.PRET JI-go.2.CONJ
‘I wish I told you to leave’ (AMDM86)

* Zoe Brown, University of Minnesota, brow3692@umn.edu. Aandeg Muldrew, University of Minnesota, muldr016@umn.edu. Mskwaankwad Rice, University of Minnesota, rice0286@umn.edu. Fieldwork for these studies has been conducted in areas across Ojibwe country with many speakers of a variety of dialects. We the authors are greatly indebted to the kind and helpful teachers and Elders who make our learning and research possible.

¹ Glossing abbreviations utilized in this paper are: 1 - first person; 2 - second person; 3 - third person; 3’ - obviative third person; X - unspecified actor; SG - singular; PL - plural; OPT - optative particle; Q - question particle; WH - wh-marker; RR - relative root; DIR - direct argument alignment; DM - discourse marker; EMPH - emphatic particle; NEG - negation; IND - independent verbal order; CONJ - conjunct verbal order; PRET - preterit mode; DUB - dubitative mode; PRET/DUB - preterit-dubitative mode; IC - initial change; FUT - future tense; PST - past tense; MOD - modal; DEM - demonstrative; >> - indicates subject to object in transitive verbs.

- (3) Future tense use of *ji-*
gidinendam na ji-mawinewind?
 2.think.so Q JI-attack.X>>3.CONJ
 ‘Do you think they’re gonna attack him/her?’ (AMDM173)
- (4) Future tense *ji-*
Mii ji-diba’amaang
 DM JI-pay.it.1PL.CONJ
 ‘we will pay for it’ (AMDM ‘story 1’)

Learners overuse *ji-*, since they identify it with the infinitive in English. However, its use does not align with the infinitive, as (5a) is not said. Rather, native speakers will produce the sentence without *ji-*, as in (5b).

- (5) a. **ni-minwendam ji-waabaminaan*
 1.happy JI-see.1>>2.CONJ
 ‘I’m happy to see you’
 b. *ni-minwendam waabaminaan*
 1.happy see.1>>2.CONJ
 ‘I’m happy to see you’

2.2. Possibility/ ‘whether or not’

Ji- also shows up in cases where the speaker is unsure if the event happened or not. This ‘possibility’ whether or not the event with *ji-* contrasts with examples where the speaker is sure where no *ji-* is used, as in (6-9).

- (6) ‘Possibility’ with *ji-* past tense
Gaawiin n[g]ii-gikendanziin ji-[g]ii-zoogipog
 NEG 1.PST-know.NEG JI-PST-snow.0.CONJ
 ‘I don’t know if it snowed’ (AMDM181)
 Context: there was a weather report saying it would snow and then he looks outside and doesn’t see any snow. Maybe it all melted in the night or it didn’t snow at all.
- (7) No *ji-* ‘Definite occurrence’
Gaawiin n[g]ii-waabandanziin [g]ii-zoogipog
 NEG 1.PST-see.it.NEG PST-snow.0.CONJ
 ‘I didn’t see it snow’ (AMDM183)
 Context: when you wake up and see that it had snowed
- (8) No *ji-* ‘Definite occurrence’
Gaawiin nimikwendanziin [g]ii-wiisiniyaan
 NEG 1.recall-NEG PST-eat.1.CONJ
 ‘I don’t remember eating’ (AMDM246)
 Context: speaker joked that ‘I was in a black out’, i.e. he did in fact eat
- (9) ‘Whether or not’ use of *ji-*
Gaawiin nimikwendanziin ji-[g]ii-wiisiniyaambaan
 NEG 1.recall-NEG JI-PST-eat-1.CONJ.PRET
 ‘I can’t remember if I ate’ (AMDM117)
 Context: it was a busy day and it slipped his mind if he did or not.

Another common use is in embedded polar questions.

- (10) ‘Possibility’ in a question
Gagwejim ji-ayaawaagwen boozhensan
 ask.IMP JI-have.3>>3’.CONJ.DUB cat.OBV
 ‘Ask her if she has a cat’ (Pat Ningewance)
- (11) ‘Possibility’ in a question
N[g]ii-[g]agwejimaa geyaabi ji-aakozid
 1.PST-ask-DIR still JI-sick-3.CONJ
 ‘I asked him if he’s still sick’ (AMDM286)

2.3. Contrast with conditionals

Learners often use *giishpin* ‘if’ to create sentence like with that same ‘possibility’ as in (9) and (11) in line with the English use of ‘if.’

- (12) ‘If’ with plain b-form
- a. *[giishpin] aakozid, n[g]a-agwejimaa*
 [if] sick.3.CONJ 1-FUT-ask
 ‘If he’s sick I’ll ask him’
- b. *N[g]a-[g]agwejimaa, [giishpin] aakozid*
 1-FUT-ask [if] sick.3.CONJ
 ‘I’ll ask him, If he’s sick ’ (AMDM292-3)

2.4. Modals and *ji-*

If *ji-* is a modal used in contexts of ‘possibility’, then we might expect it in (13) and (14). However, it must not be necessary since there is already a modal in the matrix clause (*daa-*). In English this is marked twice with *would* and *if*. Ojibwe only marks it once, as the tense/modal information of the main clause in Ojibwe carries over, as is seen in other cases in the language.

- (13) Modal with no *ji-*
[d]aa-onizhishin waabang dagoshing
 MOD-is.nice tomorrow arrive-3CONJ
 ‘it would be nice if s/he came tomorrow’ (AMDM15)
- (14) Modal with no *ji-*
[d]aa-onizhishin biinichigeyan
 MOD-be.nice clean-2SG.CONJ
 ‘It would be nice if you cleaned up’ (AMDM213)

2.5. ‘Never’ and *ji-*

Puzzlingly, *ji-* is also used in cases as in (15) and (16). This seems to align with the overall irrealis use of *ji-*, as the speaker has never seen or heard an event to have ever possibly occurred.

- (15) ‘Never’ with *ji-*
Gaawiin wiikaa giwaabamisinoon ji-diba’igeyan
 NEG ever 2-see.1>2 JI-pay.2.CONJ
 ‘I never see you pay’ (AMDM131)
- (16) ‘Never’ with *ji-*
Gaawiin wiikaa ningii-noondawaasii awiya iwe ji-ikidod
 Neg ever 1.PST.hear someone DEM JI-say.3.CONJ
 ‘I never heard anyone ever say that’ (Pat Ningewance)

2.6. Conclusion and Further work

Ji- must be a modal as well as a future tense marker. As a morpheme, it seems to be used in cases of irrealis and possibility. It is also worth noting that in this initial investigation, it is related to, but distinct from conditionals. Future work will focus on identifying more common patterns that use *ji-*, especially looking at its relationship with preterit and *wh*-questions, and findings of this research will be used to educate learners about the use of *ji-*.

3. Case Study #2 - Verbs Just Wanna Have [-bʌn] | Presented by Mskwaankwad Rice

The Ojibwe *preterit mode* is verbal suffixal morphology realized as *-ban* and variants and is likely so-called *preterit* because of its past tense interpretation though the nomenclature does not capture all functions. Interpretations are reliant on clause type (verbal order), additional temporal-aspectual morphology, and lexical aspect, among other factors. Matrix/independent verbal order clauses with the preterit typically indicate past action, habitual action, and a cessation implicature. In subordinate/conjunct verbal order clauses, the presence of the preterit indicates hypotheticality, unlikelihood, and counterfactuality.

3.1. Motivation for research

There is a learner-centered motivation for examining the preterit, which is often first learned as an interrogative handy for the learner:

- (17) *Aaniin ge-ikidoyamban...*²
 a:ni:n ge-ikidɔ-jʌmbʌn
 aaniin ge-ikido-yamban
 Q MOD-say.it-CONJ.PRET
 ‘How would you say...?’

The preterit is however also heard in many other aspects of L1 speech, such as in certain past tense contexts:

- (18) *Nigiigoonkenaaban gii-bi-ganoozhiyan.*
 ni-gi:ɡɔ:ke-na:bʌn gi:-bi-ɡəno:ʒijʌn
 ni-giiɡoonke-naaban gii-bi-ganoozh-iyān
 1SG-fishing-1SG.IND.PRET PST-hither-talk.to.h/-2SG>>1SG.CONJ
 ‘I was fishing when you called me.’

The seeming disjoint in interpretations of the preterit in (17) and (18) is confounding for learners and its use generally is difficult due to its many and varied functions. It is necessary for L2 speakers to master the expression of sophisticated concepts in order to gain L1-level fluency and this includes use of the preterit. This leads to a focus upon its functions and uses from a learner’s perspective versus a strictly linguistic classification of the mode, though theoretical linguistic investigation has proven valuable in researching the preterit. The end goals of my research are to provide a comprehensive description of functions for the learner’s toolbox, alongside a unified semantics of the [-bʌn] suffix.

3.2. Matrix/independent order clauses

Matrix clauses/independent order clauses with the preterit typically indicate past action, habitual action, and a cessation implicature.

² Fieldwork for this study was conducted with speakers of a variety of dialects of Ojibwe and functions of the preterit mode and consequent generalizations made here were seen to be consistent among speakers. Speaker initials are noted in examples in order to hopefully disambiguate some phonological variation across dialects.

- (19) Past habitual:
Nii-minwendaanaaban.
 ni:-minwenda:na:bʌn
 1SG.PST-like.it.0SG.PRET
 ‘I used to like it.’ JN

The lexical aspect of preterit-marked verbs is important and the presence of the preterit can trigger a range of aspectual interpretation. A prominent function of the preterit mode is to carry a cessation implicature:

- (20) Past (with cessation implicature):
Aakoziiban.
 a:kozi:bʌn
 sick.PRET
 ‘S/he was sick (but isn’t anymore).’ JN

Under negation, the implicature holds with a reversed interpretation, i.e. ‘s/he wasn’t sick (but may be now).’

- (21) Negative (with cessation implicature):
Kaa go zoogposnaaban degshinaan.
 ka: ɡɔ zɔ:ɡpɔsna:bʌn degʃina:n
 kaa go zoogpo-s-naaban degshin-aan
 NEG EMPH snows-NEG-PRET IC.arrive-1SG.CONJ
 ‘It wasn’t snowing when I arrived (but it is now).’ AP

Further study is needed to determine whether the inference is a true implicature. It is also noted that the presence of prefixal tense morphology greatly influences TAM interpretations of matrix/independent order preterit clauses. Nonetheless, it has long been identified in the linguistic literature that aspectual morphology is implicated in counterfactual marking and the preterit certainly influences aspect in the independent verbal order. As seen below, the morphology functions as a counterfactual marker.

3.3. Subordinate/conjunct order clauses

Preterit morphology in the conjunct order appears to be the bearer of counterfactuality in Ojibwe, as seen in counterfactual conditionals:

- (22) Counterfactual Conditional:
Daa-mno-yaa daapnamgobne mshkiki.
 da:-mno-ja: da:pnaɱgɔbne mʃkiki
 daa-mno-yaa daapnam-gobne mshkiki.
 MOD-good-be.3SG pick.up-3SG.CONJ.PRET/DUB medicine
 ‘If he took this medicine/had he taken this medicine, he would be well.’ MC

As in other languages, the morphology utilized in indicating counterfactuality is also implicated in constructions the speaker believes to be unlikely:

- (23) Unlikelihood/Future Less Vivid (FLV) construction:
Nindaano-gii-gagwedwe gaye ji-wiigibijigaadegiban.
 nnda:na-ɡi:-ɡaɡwedwe ɡaje dʒi-wi:kəbɪdʒəɡa:deɡɪbʌn
 nin-daano-gii-gagwedwe gaye ji-wiigibijigaadeg-iban
 1SG-in.vain-PST-ask and MOD-it.is.moved-3SG.CONJ.PRET
 ‘I have been asking in vain that it be moved (but it won’t be).’
 (Nichols 1980: 122)

The conjunct-preterit combination is also employed in conveying the unattainability of a desire:

- (24) Unattainable desire (with lexicalized *wish*):
Begish naa bkinaageyaambaa.
 begiʃ na: bkina:geja:mba:
 begish naa bkinaage-yaambaa
 OPT EMPH win-1SG.CONJ.PRET
 ‘I wish I would win’ MC
- (25) Unattainable desire (without lexicalized *wish*):
Ndaa-kchinendam ji-zhoonyaakeyaambaan.
 nda:-ktʃinendam dʒɪ-zɔ:nja:keja:mba:n
 n-daa-kchinendam ji-zhoonyaake-yaambaan
 1SG-MOD-be.happy FUT-make.money-1SG.CONJ.PRET
 ‘I’d be happy to make lots of money.’ GP

There is a marked difference in interpretations of the preterit via verbal order and even within each, the functions vary. This can lead to confusion for the learner but as is illustrated in the following section, the study of theoretical linguistics has proven valuable in attempts to provide a unified description of the Ojibwe preterit mode as it patterns cross-linguistically.

3.4. Theoretical connection

An alternation in the presence of the preterit in a *begish* (wish) complement led to a foray into counterfactuality, in turn supporting a fuller account of the Ojibwe preterit mode and the typology of X-marking as per von Fintel and Iatridou (2020). On the micro level, the Ojibwe preterit patterns with related languages such as Potawatomi and Moose Cree in form and function, and on the macro level, its use as a counterfactual marker accords with X-marking generally. Von Fintel and Iatridou (2020) identify X-marking morphology as implicated in counterfactual conditionals, unattainable desires, and weak necessity modality, and Ojibwe patterns with their Conditional/Desire (C/D) Generalization repeated here:

- (26) Conditional/Desire (C/D) Generalization:
 a. X marked conditional: if p_{ant} , q_{cons}
 b. unattainable desire: I want_{cons} that p_{ant}
 (von Fintel and Iatridou 2020: 10)

This generalization notes that the morphology of X-marked conditional antecedents patterns with that in the complements of unattainable desires and moreover the consequent morphology of the former matches that of the want/wish predicate of the latter. This generalization holds in English, though that language has a lexicalized *wish* item:

- (27) C/D generalization in English:
 a. If I had a car now, I would be happy
 b. I wish I had a car now.
 (von Fintel and Iatridou 2020: 12)

Ojibwe also illustrates the C/D generalization in both X-marked conditionals and unattainable desires. Note the X-marked conditional CONJ.PRET and consequent MOD morphology:

- (28) Ojibwe X-marked conditional:
Gkendaaspa, daa-gchitwaawzi.
 gkenda:spʌ, da:-gʃitwa:wzi
 gkendaas-pa, daa-gchitwaawzi
 be.smart-3SG.CONJ.PRET MOD-be.rich.3SG
 ‘If he were smart, he would be rich.’ MC

Like English, Ojibwe has a lexicalized wish item (also seen as *begish* and variants):

- (29) Unattainable desire with lexicalized wish:
Gesnaa zhoonyaamyaambaan.
 gesna: ʒo:nja:mja:m̄ba:n
 gesnaa zhoonyaamyaambaan
 OPT be.rich.1s.CONJ.PRET
 ‘I wish I were rich.’ DK

We see the preterit morphology in the wish complement in (29) and the C/D generalization is clearer in unattainable desire constructions not using a lexicalized wish item, wherein the MOD morphology of an X-marked conditional consequent matches that of an unattainable desire predicate:

- (30) Transparent unattainable desire:
Ndaa-kchinendam ji-zhoonyaakeyaambaan.
 nda:-kʃinendam̄ dʒi-ʒo:nja:keja:m̄ba:n
 n-daa-kchinendam ji-zhoonyaake-yaambaan
 1SG-MOD-be.happy FUT-make.money-1SG.CONJ.PRET
 ‘I wish I was rich.’ (lit.: ‘I’d be happy to make lots of money.’) GP

In both of the previous examples, the presence of the preterit conveys a sentiment of unattainability and complements in the plain conjunct lacking preterit morphology are interpreted as attainable, with speakers typically translating to English using a *hope* rather than *wish* predicate.

3.5. *Aaniish wenji-zhichgeyaan?* (*Why am I doing this?*)

The goal of my research is to both arm the learner and teacher with tools to understand and replicate L1 speech, as well as to contribute to the literature of counterfactuality/X-marking. Theoretical exploration has been found to demystify the preterit mode and ease the ongoing investigation of it, in turn contributing to the goal of helping the learner to use and understand L1 speech patterns.

4. Case Study #3 Wh-Suggestions/Wh-Imperatives in Southwestern Ojibwe | Presented by Zoe Brown

In Southwestern Ojibwe, wh-questions are formed with a-pronoun/wh-pronoun and a changed conjunct/c-form complements (Nichols 1980, Sullivan 2020, Valentine 2001 among others). The changed conjunct form is generally proposed to be a necessary feature for asking these types of questions, particularly for its ability to mark wh-agreement or create relative clauses. Knowing this pattern informs teaching and learning, it shapes the questions learners ask each other, what learners ask and understand from speakers, and how things are asked of the babies in the next generation of L1 speakers.

For language learners and generally as human beings, asking questions is our lifeline to navigating the world and obtaining the information we want to know. Having access to more nuanced and conversational forms of speech, acts like making suggestions, expressing concern or potential outcomes is extremely important to language reclamation. Understanding the when and where of using plain conjunct forms in question asking in Ojibwe is an area where language learning for revitalization and linguistic work can happen in a mutually advantageous way.

As is attested in the literature, the exception to the initial change wh-question pattern can be seen in ‘where’ questions for Southwestern speakers. This pattern seemingly depends on verb type and presence or absence of relative root in the verb. Verbs discussing location and lacking a relative root appear in ‘where’ questions with plain conjunct forms (Nichols 1980, Sullivan 2020). Although the question word meaning where may change (*aaniindi*, *aandi*, *aaniish* at times per our speaker) result in plain conjunct and holds true for other Ojibwe language speakers at least in Minnesota. (B. Kishketon, pc 2020). Sullivan’s proposal to account for this observation is that initial change (the feature that

distinguishes changed conjunct from plain conjunct) also implicates that the clause is a relative phrase, and that in Ojibwe, clauses with this verb must not be true relative clauses (2016, 2020). The examples that follow in (31) highlight ‘when’ questions - the verb complex presents in changed conjunct form regardless of the root of the verb (presence or absence of a relative root makes no difference). In (32) are sample ‘where’ questions, in which the verb complex appears in both changed conjunct and plain conjunct seemingly depending on whether or not there is a relative root in the verb.

- (31) Initial Change for ‘when’ question, verb with Rel. Root
 a. *Aaniin apii waa-izhaayan?*
 a:ni:n ʌpi: **wɑ:-ɪʒɑ:jʌn**
 WH time **IC.FUT-RR**.go.2sgCONJ
 ‘When are you going?’
 Initial Change for ‘when’ question, verb without Rel. Root
 b. *Aaniin apii waa-wiisiniyan?*
 a:ni:n ʌpi: **wɑ:-wi:smijʌn**
 WH time **IC.FUT-eat**.2sgCONJ
 ‘When are you eating?’
- (32) Initial Change for ‘where’ question, verb with Rel. Root
 a. *Aaniindi waa-izhaayan?*
 a:ni:ndi **wɑ:-ɪʒɑ:jʌn**
 WH;where **IC.FUT-RR**.go.2sgCONJ
 ‘Where are you going?’
 No Initial Change for ‘where’ question, verb without Rel. Root
 b. *Aaniindi wii-wiisiniyan?*
 a:ni:ndi i: **wi:-wi:smijʌn**
 WH;where time **FUT-eat**.2sgCONJ
 ‘Where are you eating?’ (Barstow, Northbird, and Dunnigan 1978)

Wh-imperatives are a cross-linguistically noted pattern in which interrogative directives employ wh-question structures, not to probe for information, but to comment or suggest a course of action. They have been documented and discussed to some extent for English, German, with the term whimperative being coined by Sadock in 1972 (see Holmberg 1979 for discussion, Reis and Rosengren 1992 for work in German and implications on movement, and others). In work with a Southwestern first language Ojibwe speaker, this speaker shared several question types that appear to have similar meanings to wh-imperative type questions in other languages. What is particularly interesting is that this pattern is attested for other Southern speakers of the language (B. Kishketon, personal communication, 2020). It can also be found in the University of Minnesota curriculum written and recorded in the 70s and 80s by first language speakers (Barstow, Northbird, Dunnigan 1979, 1980). In considering wh-question words/A-pronouns, there are two main puzzles that concern plain conjunct compliments. The first being that the verb in ‘where’ questions containing a verb without a relative root will appear in plain conjunct, but when there is a relative root present, the verb presents in changed conjunct form.

- (33) Plain Conjunct ‘where’ Q, No Relative Root in verb
 a. *Aandish (g)ii-wiisiniyan?*
 a:ndɪʃ i:-wi:smijʌn
 WH.DM **PST-eat**.2sgCONJ
 ‘Where did you eat?’ JN (ZBMR 108)
 Changed Conjunct ‘where’ Q, Relative Root in verb results in initial change
 b. *Aaniish (g)aa-tazhi-wiisiniyan?*
 a:ni:ʃ a:-tʌʒi-wi:smijʌn
 WH.DM **IC.PST-RR**-eat.2sgCONJ
 ‘Where did you eat?’ JN (ZBMR 109)

- (34) Necessity of Plain Conjunct in a ‘where’ with Verb ‘
- wiisini*
- ’ (no relative root)

a. *Aaniish wii-wiisiniyang?*

a.ni:f wi:-wi:smjΛŋ

WH FUT-eat.21Pconj

‘Where are we gonna eat?’ (ZBMR 234)

IC not possible, considered ungrammatical:

b. **Aaniish waa-wiisiniyang*

a.ni:f wa:-wi:smjΛŋ

WH IC.FUT-eat.21Pconj

Note: ungrammatical or semantically weird - JN rejected (ZBMR 235)

This patterning has been described by Sullivan and discussed in the previous section, but it may have a relationship with or implications for the second area of inquiry having to do with the second line of inquiry and focus of my thesis. This inquiry or puzzle is made clear by examining two patterns that have been translated by speakers as “Why don’t you...” and “What if...” These appear consistently in plain conjunct like the non-relative root ‘where’ questions, but for these patterns, it is always in plain conjunct, seemingly regardless of presence of relative root ³.

- (35)
- Aaniish wiisiniawan*

a.ni:f wi:smiwaΛŋ

WH eat.NEG.2sg;CONJ

‘Why don’t you eat.’ (ZBMR 231)

note: this is a suggestion

- (36) Comparison of suggestion and information-probing wh-question, absence/presence of RR

a. *aaniish ishkaataasiwan*

a.ni:f iʃkwa:ta:siwaΛŋ

WH quit.NEG.2sg;CONJ

‘Why don’t you just quit.’ (ZBMR 275)

b. *aaniish enji-ishkaataasiwan*

a.ni:f e:ndʒi-iʃkwa:ta:siwaΛŋ

WH IC.RR-quit.NEG.2sg;CONJ

‘Why haven’t you quit?’ (ZBMR 277)

- (37) ‘What-if’ Examples

a. *Aaniish naa dagoshing...*

a.ni:f na: dΛgoʃiŋ

what.SH EMPH arrive.3sg.CONJ

‘What if he comes’

b. *Aaniish naa minwenimisig...*

a.ni:f na: minwenimisig

what.SH EMPH like.1<<NEG<<3;CONJ

‘What if she doesn’t like me...’ (ZBMR 169,170)

The following examples crucially show the lack of sensitivity that the suggestion pattern has to the relative root in a verb that seemed to predict the plain versus changed conjunct variability in ‘where’ questions. The example (38b) brings into question whether or not this is second person necessary pattern, as this concept but for a third person goes back to the information-probe pattern, complete with the insertion of relative root *onji-* and initial change.

³ See presentation slides for relative root discussion - for the sake of this presentation and handout only constructions around a few verbs (eg: *wiisini* as a verb lacking RR, *izhaa* as a verb with RR, *izhi-*) have been selected to maximally highlight the additional morphology at work around the verb

- (38) Shows plain conjunct on a verb w/ relative root in this suggestion pattern
 a. *Aaniish izhaasiwan oodaawewigamigong?* (or: *adaawewigamigong*)
 a:ni:f̄ ɪzɑ:sɪwʌn u:da:wewigʌmigoŋ
 WH.SH RR.go.NEG.2sgCONJ store.LOC
 ‘Why don’t you/Why aren’t you going to the store?’ (ZBMR 555)

Comparison to (38a) - 3rd person form reverts back to having relative root/IC

- b. *Aaniish (w)enji-izhaasig oodaawewigamigong?* (*adaawewigamigong*)
 a:ni:f̄ endʒ-ɪzɑ:sɪg u:da:wewigʌmigoŋ
 WH.SH IC.RR.go.NEG.3sgCONJ store.LOC
 ‘Why didn’t s/he just go to the store?’ (ZBMR 557)

- (39) For additional comparison - Highlighting same RR verb, *izhaa* in WHERE question, has IC
Aaniish ezhaayan? / *Aandish ezhaayan?*
 a:ni:f̄/a:ndɪf̄ eʒɑ:jʌn
 WH/ where IC.RR.go.2SG
 ‘Where are you going?’ (ZBMR 101)

What is particularly interesting here in example (38a), is that in spite of the presence of the relative root in conjunct order, the wh-imperative phrase appears in plain conjunct. This, as a language learner and even in literature, may be an unexpected pattern and it suggests that there may be something distinctive about these type of phrases. This section ends with the quintessential example of this patterning and phraseology, complete with A-pronoun and a distinct lack of initial change.

- (40) *Aaniin da gagwejimaasiwad Ziibiins? Ozhooniyaami gosha.*
 a:ni:n dʌ gʌgweɟɪmɑ:sɪwʌd zi:bɪ:s oʒu:nɪjɑ:mi goʃʌ
 WH DM ask.NEG.2sg>>3sgCONJ river.DIM have.money(3sg) DM
 ‘Why don’t you ask Ziibiins? She’s got money.’ (Barstow, Northbird, Dunnigan 1980)

There is something about this type of ‘question’ that necessitates plain conjunct order rather than changed. Because of the conversational nature of these phrases, even in attempting to form an exhaustive account of wh-questions, these examples may not come up unless in context, yet they have significant implications for offering a full account of what the language does in terms of initial change and wh-movement. It is from the privileged position of seeking to learn and wanting to be able to use language that is as nuanced as possible that we can look more into these patterns and try to enhance knowledge in every domain of comprehending language.

References

- Altshuler, Daniel, and Roger Schwarzschild. 2013. Moment of change, cessation implicatures, and simultaneous readings. In *Sinn und Bedeutung 17*, eds. Emmanuel Chemla, Vincent Homer, and Grégoire Winterstein, 45–62. Paris: ENS.
- Barstow, Rose, and Angeline Northbird, Timothy Dunnigan. 1978. *Winita Ojibwemong: Nazhosing*. Ojibwe Language Program, Department of American Indian Studies, University of Minnesota.
- Barstow, Rose, and Angeline Northbird, Timothy Dunnigan. 1980. *Winita Ojibwemong*. Ojibwe Language Program, Department of American Indian Studies, University of Minnesota.
- Fairbanks, Brendan. 2016. The Ojibwe changed conjunct verb as completive aspect. In *Papers of the Forty-Fourth Algonquian Conference: Actes du Congrès des Algonquistes* (p. 51). SUNY Press.
- von Fintel, Kai and Sabine Iatridou. 2020 (to appear). Prolegomena to a theory of X-marking. Submitted to L&P.
- Nichols, John D. 1980. *Ojibwe Morphology*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Sullivan, Michael. 2020. *Relativization in Ojibwe*. University of Nebraska Press. (2016 Dissertation)
- Valentine, J. Rand. 2001. *Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar*. University of Toronto Press.

Proceedings of the 39th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Robert Autry,
Gabriela de la Cruz Sanchez,
Luis A. Irizarry Figueroa,
Kristina Mihajlovic, Tianyi Ni,
Ryan Smith, and Heidi Harley

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2024

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 39th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2024 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-481-2 hardback

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the printed edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Brown, Zoe, Aandeg Muldrew, and Mskwaankwad Rice. 2024. Using Every Tool in the Box: Case Studies Highlighting the Mutual Support of Practical Learning and Formal Linguistics in the Ojibwe Language. In *Proceedings of the 39th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Robert Autry et al., 284-293. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3640.