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The dialect situation in Southern Ontario and the lower peninsula of Michigan has never been particularly clear with respect to a group of mutually intelligible dialects known variously as Chippewa, Ojibwa, Odawa, and, to linguists, Eastern Ojibwa. Several years work in this region with several speakers makes possible some hypotheses and some tentative conclusions regarding the distribution of dialects and major dialect features. The work leading up to this report was done for reasons other than dialect study, therefore the results should be considered somewhat tentative. However, it is hoped that this report will provide a starting point for any who would be interested in further investigation.

The dialects in question are characterized by a deletion of short, unstressed vowels. They are spoken in the lower peninsula of Michigan and in Ontario on the north shore of Georgian Bay, on Manitoulin Island, and south and east of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. Among older speakers in the northernmost areas (including Manitoulin Island) the deletion seems to be a kind of casual speech phenomenon, and the vowels can be easily resupplied (with only some ambiguity of quality). For younger speakers everywhere, and everyone in southern areas, the vowels deleted are totally abstract. They cannot resupply the vowels except by reference to appropriate allomorphs even though the use of open transitions in some places from which vowels have been deleted is common.¹

(1) (a) /giːnamadabi/ He sat./He was sitting

Western dialects

[giːnamadabɪ]

Older eastern speakers

{[giːnamadxʌbɛ] (normal)

[giːnʌmˈdɑːbɛ] (careful)

Southern speakers

{[giːnmʌdbɛ] or

[giːnʌmʌdbɛ]}
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(b) /baba:mose:/ He's walking around./He's going for a walk.

Western dialects \[
\text{[babá:mose:]}
\]
Older eastern speakers \[
\begin{align*}
\text{[pa:mse:]} & \quad \text{(normal)}^2 \\
\text{[bá:bá:múse:]} & \quad \text{(careful)}
\end{align*}
\]
Southern speakers \[
\text{[pa:mse:]} \quad \text{(only way)}
\]

Within the dialect area just outlined, there are essentially two dialects.\(^3\)
The central dialect is spoken west of a line running north-south through the Bruce peninsula,\(^4\) and including all of Manitoulin Island. The eastern dialect is spoken east of that line.

The differences between these two dialects while for the most part being relatively minor cover the total spectrum of the parts of the language: phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical. The next section of this paper will be devoted to exemplifying some of these differences. While it may turn out that not all of the features listed below will uniquely characterize one dialect over against the other,\(^5\) it is hoped that they will be useful to others working in this area.

The most striking difference between the two dialects is in the determiner system and the question word system. Therefore these systems will be treated first and separately from the rest of the data.

(a) determiner systems\(^6\)

(a) central dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>animate</th>
<th>inanimate</th>
<th>locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>plu.</td>
<td>sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearer</td>
<td>ma:ba</td>
<td>gonda</td>
<td>ma:nda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>giw</td>
<td>iw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aside from the fact that many speakers are losing the three way distinction here represented, there are speakers who know all of one system and parts of the other. Bloomfield's informant (Bloomfield (1957)) is an example. He basically used the central system but knew the remote forms of the eastern dialect, as well as ow (= ma:nda). At the end of this paper we will return to this fact and explain it. Before leaving this discussion two further forms should be added, živi (= wadi) and žanda (= ma:mpi:), which are characteristically Odawa, although all central speakers seem to know them, whether or not they use them.

(3) question words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what (anim.)</td>
<td>we:ne:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what (inan.)</td>
<td>we:ne:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how</td>
<td>a:ni:n/a:ni:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>a:ni:š pi:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>a:ni: pi:š/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why</td>
<td>a:ni:n daš⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There is one syntactic process which affects question words and which deserves mention here. The word das 'then, (and) so' often appears in content questions. It is normally contracted with the preceding word which is, in the case of questions, the question word. The possible contractions are given in (4).

(4) plain form contracted form
we:ne:n we:ne:š
we:gne:n we:gne:š
a:ni:n a:ni:š
a:ndi a:ndiš

It is interesting to note that the central words for when and where involve lexicalized contractions. The expressions for why may not contract unless they are in a full sentence to avoid synonymy with how in the central dialect and what in the eastern dialect.

Phonological Differences. There are phonological differences both of the low-level type and of the more abstract type. We start by examining some low-level differences.

(5) Vowel Placement (long vowels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>central</th>
<th>eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i:/</td>
<td>[i:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e:/</td>
<td>[ɛ:] ~ [e:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o:/</td>
<td>[o:] ~ [u:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/a:/</td>
<td>[a:] ~ [o:]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the difference in vowel placement, apicals and spirants are often treated differently. Eastern speakers tend to have alveolar apical stops, while central speakers tend to have dental apical stops. Central speakers tend to use retroflex [\$], while eastern speakers use [\$].

(6) Intonation (S = syllable, # = end of sentence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>central</th>
<th>eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>$S$ $S$ $S$ #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>$S$ $S$ $S$ #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the low-level differences there remain a number of miscellaneous systematic differences in pronunciation that seem to be captured best as rules. There also does not seem to be any better way to present them than to simply list them. One additional note seems necessary, at this level, lenis and fortis consonants neutralize syllable finally in a way that is capturable most naturally by treating fortes as voiceless and lenes as voiced.

Central speakers neutralize the lenis fortis contrast word finally.

(7) [+obs] → [-vd] / ___#

Some examples follow.

(8) | central | eastern |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b/p</td>
<td>źi:ši:p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mba:p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d/t</td>
<td>ńgi:git</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Two comments can be made about these facts. First, consonants in final position are released in both dialects. One effect of this is that the voiced consonants (i.e. lenes) of the eastern dialect often have a voiceless release, and in fact sound like a cluster of voiced plus voiceless aspirated, e.g. $[bp']$ for /b/. Secondly, the $z$ of both dialects is often weakly voiced, especially at the beginning and end of words. Nonetheless there is a voicing contrast in the eastern dialect, at the end of words.

Central speakers lower word final short i.

(9) $i \rightarrow e / \_\_\#$

Some examples follow.

(10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>central</th>
<th>eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ninə</td>
<td>nini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pičə</td>
<td>piči</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni:me</td>
<td>ni:mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:we</td>
<td>a:wi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This feature was noted by Bloomfield, but it is characteristic only of central speakers.
Central speakers back short a in the sequence wag, or wak, or wan

(11) a → r / w __ [+velar]

(12)                   central   eastern
    ni'wrik              nin'wag    men
    da:ŋkškawrk          da:ŋgškawag (that) I touch him
    be:žwrik             be:žwak   (that) it is near
    gmiwŋŋ               gmiwŋ    (that) it rains

Actually, it is probably the eastern dialect that is out of line here. Baraga often writes wog for wag which probably reflects the effect of (11) in his western dialect.

Central speakers devoice obstruents in front of voiceless consonants.

(13) [+obs] → [−vd] / ___ [−vd]

This rule is used more by southern speakers than by northern speakers. It is also beginning to operate optionally in the speech of some eastern speakers.

(14)                   central   eastern
    b/p                  bmipto:   bmipto:  he runs
    d/t                  wa:tkohge: wa:dkohge: he waves
    ň/jče                 mbana:čto:n  ñbina:įto:n I break it
    g/k                  bi:kška:11 bi:gška:  it is torn
    z/s                  ā:skon'ye:  ā:zkon'ye: he changes clothes
    z/s                  do:što:n    wdo:žto:n  he makes it
The effect of rule (13) is to reduce the number of contrastive clusters.

Theoretically there are five, e.g. for ʃ/ʃ plus g/k: ʃg (underlying), ʃg (derived, by vowel deletion), ʃk (derived, by vowel deletion), šk (derived by vowel deletion), and šg (derived by vowel deletion). In fact there are only three on the surface, by (13) źk → šk, and the underlying lenis cluster źg also merges with derived šk because it is not voiced. Thus the three surface clusters are: šk (three sources), źg, and šg.¹²

Younger central speakers optionally delete w between vowels.

(15) w → Ø / V _ _ V (optional)

This is a casual speech phenomenon. When speakers who use (15) are asked to slow down, or to speak carefully, the w's reappear.

(15) central casual central careful eastern

nda:i:sin nda:wi:sin nda:wi:sin I should eat
gi::rk gi:wε:wyk gi:wε:wag they go home

Notice that the last example in (16) shows that (15) is ordered after (11) which backs a after w.

Eastern speakers nasalize vowels in the sequence vowel - semivowel - nasal - consonant. Vowel length is irrelevant and the sequence of consonants may arise as the result of vowel deletion.

(17) V → [+nas] / _ _ _ C
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Some eastern speakers have a rule that moves nasalization leftward onto a long vowel from a deleting nasalized short vowel.

\[(19) \ V: \rightarrow [+\text{nas}] / _{-\text{long}}^\text{V} / _{+\text{nas}}^\text{C} \]

The rule can be formulated in this form because the presence of the long vowel conditions the deletion of the following short vowel in all cases except where that vowel is word final. But there are no word final short nasalized vowels.

Not only is this rule unusual, it is of some theoretical interest because it amounts to a 'look-ahead' rule. However, it is likely that it is limited to an area smaller than the whole eastern area. It was first noticed in a speaker
Now let us consider some of the more abstract phonological rules differentiating the two dialects.

Perhaps the single best diagnostic for differentiating central from eastern speakers is the rule that central speakers have which deletes n from an ad hoc list of inflectional suffixes and pronouns.

\[(21) \text{n} \rightarrow \emptyset / _-\] # irregularly

This rule operates consistently in suffixes. But distinguishes unstressed from stressed pronouns.

\[(22)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>central</th>
<th>eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suffixes</td>
<td>nwa:bma:ba</td>
<td>nwa:bma:ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf. nwa:bma:bni:g</td>
<td>nwa:bma:bni:g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngi:we:mi</td>
<td>ngi:we:min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf. ngi:we:mna:ba</td>
<td>nwa:bma:ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>ni:</td>
<td>ni:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ni:nwi</td>
<td>ni:nwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gi:</td>
<td>gi:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gi:nwi</td>
<td>gi:nwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wi:</td>
<td>wi:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stressed</td>
<td>ni:n</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>gi:n</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wi:n</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Central speakers delete \( w \) from preconsonantal position which comes about as the result of vowel deletion.

(23) \( w \rightarrow \emptyset / _{___} C \)

(24) central eastern

(a) do:da:ba:nan wdo:da:ba:nan his car
minpida:n wminpida:n it tastes good to him
(lit. he tastes it good)

(b) wi:snidig wi:sniwdog he supposedly eats
wi:sniba wi:sniwban he ate
cf. bo:zwidig bo:zwidog he supposedly embarks
bo:zwiba bo:zwiban he embarked

(c) \( \ddot{\text{omi}}:\dot{z}i\text{do}:n \) \( \ddot{\text{omi}}:\dot{z}i\text{wdo}:n \) I took it (there)
cf. ndizwido:n \( \ddot{\text{n}}\dddot{\text{dziwido}}:n \) I take it (there)

Rule (23) operates uniformly only in casual speech. The hierarchy of environments is given in (24). For all central speakers (23) operates word initially in all speech styles, e.g. (24a). For most central speakers (23) operates in all speech styles when the following consonant belongs to one of the two modal suffixes, bani preterite and dig dubitative, e.g. (24b). For younger central speakers in casual speech, (23) operates everywhere, e.g. (24c).

Central speakers nasalize long vowels while deleting \( n \) by (21).

(25) \( V: \rightarrow [+\text{nas}] / _{___} n \# \text{irregular} \)
In addition to the two endings, *aːn* conjunct first person singular and *eːn* dubitative, the prohibitive *keː* conditions both (21) and (25).

Apparently the appearance of (25) is recent and (25) is spreading eastward. Bloomfield (1957) contains a text discussing the effect of (25), in which the informant says that (25) was used in Saginaw but not on Walpole. The text was given in 1938. Nowadays speakers on Walpole use (25) consistently.

Central speakers denasalize syllabic *n*'s.
that n denasalizes."14

(29) central eastern
di'gi'skwa: digiskwa: he gets kicked
ne:mndige: wnedenge:n (don't) forget
dbe:nidizo dbe:ndizo he's on his own
mbazi'da:n mbiznda:n I listen to it

Kaye (1973) discusses this rule (28) briefly.

Eastern speakers delete the w off the end of determiners when they precede
the nouns they modify.

(30) w + Ø / ___ # N (in determiners)

(31) central eastern
aw nini a nini that man
(ma:nda ki) o ki this ground, the earth
iw mo:kma:n i mo:kma:n that knife

Eastern speakers treat the morpheme minw 'good, well' irregularly, deleting
the w before vowel initial morphemes and morphemes that begin with deletable w
(i.e. we:n 'use the mind' and wa:b 'see, light').

(32) w + Ø / ___ V (in the morpheme minw)

(33) central eastern
nminwa:bmina:goz nmina:bmina:goz I'm good looking
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Central speakers have a rule (or complex of rules) that irregularly contract wa and wi to o. The contraction of wi to o is more irregular than the change of wa to o. Because there is an irregular change of i to a in the central dialect (which we will discuss below) we will treat the change of wi to o as a two step process: wi → wa → o. For the most part correspondences between the two dialects represent restructuring in the central dialect.

(34) wa → o / C ___ {C #}

(35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>žomin</td>
<td>źimin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa:ga:kot</td>
<td>wa:ga:kwad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mko</td>
<td>mkwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mnopgot</td>
<td>mnopgwad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contraction of wa and wi to o is a very difficult analytical problem. There was a rule of Proto Algonkian.

(36) *we → *o

the reflex of which in all dialects of Ojibwa is

(37) wi → o
because of the change from PA to Ojibwa *e > i. Consider the evidence for contraction (37) from the eastern dialect given in (38).

(38) II AI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa:bi:skad</td>
<td>wa:bi:skizi</td>
<td>it is white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:bdad</td>
<td>a:bdizi</td>
<td>it is useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mnopgwad</td>
<td>mnopgozi</td>
<td>it tastes good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mskwa:</td>
<td>mskozi</td>
<td>it is red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, in view of this problem, we will pass over a more detailed analysis leaving that for future investigation.

The final abstract rule that will be considered here involves a complex restructuring in the eastern dialect. The rule in question deletes y before i and w before o. The central dialect also has a version of this rule but relative order of the rules is different.

(39) \( \{y\} \rightarrow \emptyset \) __ \( \{i\} \) __ \( \{o\} \)

Consider the following evidence for the w part of the rule in the central dialect.

(40) father friend
    my no:s ni:ka:nis
    your go:s\(^{15}\) gi:ka:nis
    his o:san wi:ka:nsan

There is similar direct evidence in the eastern dialect for the w part of (39).
However the complexity in the eastern dialect arises in the interaction of this rule with the vowel deletion rule, and with a rule that deletes $h$ preceding a semivowel. The operation of the $h$ deletion rule is best seen in the allomorphs of $ahw$ a TA final meaning 'act with an instrument'. When the $w$ contracts with a following $i$ by (37) the $h$ remains as in (42a). When the $w$ remains as $w$ the $h$ is deleted as in (42b).

(42) (a) ngi:bo:knike:hok  
/ni-gi:-bo:kw-nike:-ahw-igw/  
he broke my arm

(b) ngi:bo:knike:wa:  
/ni-gi:-bo:kw-nike:-ahw-a:/  
I broke his arm

The $h$ deletion rule is given in (43).

(43) $h$  $\emptyset / \{y, w\}$

Now in the eastern dialect the deletion of $y$ and $w$ follows the vowel deletions. (In addition the contraction of (37) works a little differently as we shall see.) The following data illustrate this.

(44) central  |  eastern  
$\text{ngi:bo:knike:hok}$  |  $\text{ngi:bo:knike:hog}$  
he broke my arm  |  
$\text{ngi:bo:knike:hgo:k}$  |  $\text{ngi:bo:knike:wgo:g}$  
they broke my arm
To make it clear how this works let us derive the eastern form *ngi:bo:knike:wgo:g* they broke my arm next to the form *ngi:bo:knike:hog* he broke my arm.

(45) Underlying

ni-gi:-bo:kw-nike:-ahw-igw-ag

Other rules

nigi:bo:kwinike:hwigo:g

Revised (37)$^{17}$

nigi:bo:kwonike:hwogo:g

Vowel Deletion

nigi:bo:kwinike:hwgo:g

h Deletion (43)

nigi:bo:kwinike:hwgo:g

Other rules$^{18}$

nigi:bo:knike:wgo:g

(46) Underlying

ni-gi:-bo:kw-nike:-ahw-igw

Other rules

nibo:kwinike:hwig

Revised (37)

nibo:kwonike:hwog

Vowel Deletion

nbo:kwinike:hwog

(39)

nbo:kwinike:hog

Other rules

nbo:knike:hog

Now consider the following forms which show that eastern speakers have restructured instances of *hi* as *hyi* and instances of *ho* as *hwo*.

(47) (a)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hi</th>
<th>hyi</th>
<th>central</th>
<th>eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>nma:wha:</td>
<td>nmo:ha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nma:whigo:k</td>
<td>nmo:ygo:g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mawih</td>
<td>mo:y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>0gi:we:ha:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0gi:we:ha:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0gi:we:hgo:k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gi:we:h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I make him cry
they make me cry
make him cry$^{19}$
I send him home
they send me home
send him home
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hi hyi  
(iii) ngi:mnihom.:i le  

(b) ho hwo  

(i) nminmanjhom.:i  

(ii) mba:ski:hok  

The final phonological facts that we will mention concern two characteristic sounds shifts of the central dialect.

First i shifts irregularly to a.

(48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>central</th>
<th>eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ndakwe:m</td>
<td>ndikwe:m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mba:zidam:n</td>
<td>nbiznda:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nminmanjah</td>
<td>nminmanjw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some instances of this are listed in Baraga and characterized as Odawa. The vowels that are most susceptible to this shift are those that are deleted in the most statistically common allomorphs and those that appear post-tonically, i.e. in the penultimate and final syllables.

Secondly o shifts to a in casual speech, except after velars.
Morphological Differences. There are four morphological differences which have been noticed. We simply list them.

Central speakers contract the sequence of ni I and wi: intentive future to ni:.

In transitive inanimate verbs central speakers use na:ni to mark first person plural, eastern speakers use min.20
Central speakers "borrow" the form that means 'you are acted upon' and use it for 'we act on you'. The borrowed forms do not neutralize the plurality of the second person even though the original forms did.

(52) central  eastern

(a)  gwa:bam  gwa:bam  you see me
    gwa:bmim  gwa:bmim  you (pl.) see me
    gwa:bmimi  gwa:bmimin  you see us
    gwa:bmimi  gwa:bmimin  you (pl.) see us

(b)  gwa:bmim  gwa:bmim  I see you
    gwa:bmim  gwa:bmim  I see you (pl.)
    gwa:bmigo:  gwa:bmimin  we see you
    gwa:bmigo:m  gwa:bmimin  we see you (pl.)

(c)  nwa:bmigo:  nwa:bmigo:  I am seen
    gwa:bmigo:  gwa:bmigo:  you are seen
    gwa:bmigo:m  gwa:bmigo:m  you (pl.) are seen

Some morphemes have slightly different spellings not due to sound change. The list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.

(53)  central  eastern

mi:nzis  wi:nzis  (a) hair
ba:gha:kwa  ba:gha:kwe:  chicken
i:dig  i:dog  dubitative markers

Syntactic Differences. The syntactic differences noticed are fewer and have
Some eastern speakers omit obviation mark(s) on fronted nouns.

(54) (a) mbil wgi:wa:bma:n ɲa:n John saw Bill.
(b) wgi:wa:bma:n mbili:n ɲa:n John saw Bill.

(mbili:n = mbil + an obviative)

Some eastern speakers omit the n of the pseudo-transitives derived from intransitive verbs.

(55) (a) nminkwe: I'm drinking.
(b) nminkwe: i źwimna:bo: I'm drinking the wine.

Some eastern speakers omit second plural marker in transitive animate verbs when the referent is unemphasized.

(56) (a) ngi:wa:bma:na:n We (exc.) saw him/them.
(b) gi ninwag ngi:wa:bma:na:nig We (exc.) saw those men.

Lexical Differences. There are a relatively large number of lexical differences between the two dialects. We will simply list some examples including differences in conversational items (57a) and other differences.

(57) central eastern
(a) ma:ja:n (wn)da:s ma: Come here.
   cf. ma:ja:n Go away, get lost!
   wa: way huh?
central  eastern 

a:  ambe:  Let's go, come on.

ma:nda  mbe:  Here, here it is.

(b)  nde:de:m  my father

mbaba:  --  my dad

mgaši  ndo:do:m  my mother

nmama:  --  my mom

mi:kno:t  bodye:gwa:zon  trousers

cf.  central :  a:bdik  ngawanoki:

ej.  eastern :  po:j  ngawanoki:

I have to go to work

nganoki:  I will work

ngawinoki:  I will go to work

(d)  bi:da:zi:t  be:ge:d  to belch\(^{21}\)

zgaswe:d  to smoke

gi:goj  ga:ši:waŋ  to be small (II)

gi:hit  ga:ši:wid  to be small (AI)

gkide:k  ga:de:g  to be hidden (II)

gkizot  ga:zod  to be hidden (AI)

gkido:t  ga:do:d  to hide s.t. (TI)

gkina:t  ga:na:d  to hide s.o. (TA)

mbwa:cha:t  mwadsa:d  to visit s.o. (TA)

za:goj:taŋ  za:ghaŋ  to go out(side)

Conclusion. At this point the evidence is clear that there are two dialects in the vowel deleting area. Even a cursory examination of Bloomfield (1957) will
show that his speaker was basically a central speaker. He used the central
determiner system, most of the central question words, showed many of the
central phonological rules, used many of the central morphemes and lexical
items. However, he did not use all of them, and this appears to be a problem.
In fact this apparent problem turns out to be an interesting fact of linguistic
history. Consider the following data from Baraga (1878) (in edited spelling)
which suggest strongly that the central dialect is the descendent of the dialect
spoken by the Odawa people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(58)</th>
<th>modern Baraga</th>
<th>modern Baraga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>central Odawa</td>
<td>eastern Ojibwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndip</td>
<td>ondib</td>
<td>wštigwa:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni:bna</td>
<td>ni:bina</td>
<td>ni:bwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mno:kmi</td>
<td>mno:kami</td>
<td>zí:gwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gkizo</td>
<td>gakizo</td>
<td>ga:zo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sina:miž</td>
<td>asina:miž</td>
<td>niná:tig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sipnigan</td>
<td>asiponigan</td>
<td>mo:žwa:gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ža:ži</td>
<td>ža:žaye:</td>
<td>me:mža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋaši</td>
<td>ningaši</td>
<td>ndo:do:m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndakwe:m</td>
<td>nindakwe:m</td>
<td>ndikwe:m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, many speakers of the central dialect are from Ojibwa families. Many
of the older speakers of the central dialect know eastern (i.e. Ojibwa) forms
even though they don't normally use them. In fact many of the oldest speakers
in this group have "Ojibwaisms" in their speech. Almost certainly Bloomfield's
speaker is among these. He came from an Ojibwa family but grew up in an Odawa
area. Apparently Ojibwa people moved into Odawa areas and "shifted" dialects.
In view of this one would expect to find less consistency in the central dialect than there appears to be. This also explains why speakers on Manitoulin say that they speak a mixture of Odawa and Ojibwa, when linguistically they speak Odawa.

The final issue that needs to be mentioned regards the naming of the two dialects. Because of the way the dialects run, Bloomfield's term 'Eastern Ojibwa' is inappropriate to the dialect it was coined to name. Because of the feelings of the Odawa and Ojibwa people about how their language should be named, I feel it is most appropriate to call the central dialect Central Ojibwa-Odawa, and to reserve the term Eastern Ojibwa for the eastern dialect.
Except in the places where phonetic detail is relevant, forms will be cited in a "phonemic" notation of the sort that should be obvious to any Algonkianist. In particular this means that the abstract vowels will be omitted. In effect the transcription amounts to a loose phonetic rendering.

Clusters of identical lenis obstruents word initially contract to a fortis consonant. Bloomfield claims that there is a contrast between an initial fortis consonant and a cluster of identical lenis at the same point of articulation (1957, § 1.11 pg. 8), but that contrast has been lost in the speech of many speakers.

This statement has to be hedged somewhat because there seem to be many localisms. For example, in the dialect including Manitoulin Island the word meaning 'to smoke' is bi:nda:kwe:d, whereas the other dialect uses zgaso:we:d. But on Manitoulin bi:na:kwe:d is now considered old fashioned and zgaso:we:d is the word normally used.

Unfortunately, data from Cape Croker is lacking at this time. Therefore it is impossible to be more specific. The folk analysis suggests that it is in the eastern area. Eastern speakers say that people in Cape Croker speak the same as they do, while speakers in the central area say that people in Cape Croker speak differently.

Again there are some localisms. On Manitoulin Island the forms wa and wi are used for aw and iw respectively.

Localisms are ignored in this table.

In addition to differences in question words, there are differences in the use of initial change in questions in the two dialects. These are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Word</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>who?</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what?</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how?</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when?</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where (at)?</td>
<td>change/plain</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where (to)?</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why?</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emphatic daš cannot be used with this phrase. See the discussion below.

This is the form that appears in elliptical questions, "Why?". In the non-elliptical form the questions look as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>central: A:nin ga:=-nji-gi:we:yan?</td>
<td>Why did you go home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eastern: We:gne:n ga:=-wnji-gi:we:yan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preverb \( (w)n\ddot{j}i \) means 'for a reason', so the literal translation of the central question is: Which is the reason..?; the literal translation of the eastern question is: What is the reason..?.

The situation is more complicated in the central dialect than this suggests. Kaye (1973) discusses the phenomenon at length. However, he calls it stress rather than the pitch or pitch accent which it is.

Notice that the voiceless cluster of lenes devoices the preceding lenis.

It is the facts relating to these clusters which show that voicing rather than lenis-fortis is the crucial fact about the consonants. If we were to treat voicing as derived, the rule voicing lenes would have to precede the vowel deletion to get these clusters to come out right. But even then a devoicing rule would be needed to get the form \( \text{bi:k}\ddot{s}k\ddot{a}: \) in (14).

This form shows a slight allophonic nasalization of the final vowel, but there is still a clear contrast with the nasalized vowel in \( \text{wa:bmin} \ddot{\text{a}}: \).

The argument supporting this analysis is too intricate to go into here, but it depends on the fact that when the syllabic \( n \) assimilates to a preceding labial it remains as a syllabic \( m \) and does not denasalize, e.g., \( \text{nwa:bmda:n} \).

The \( n \) is the mark of the obviative which is obligatory in animates with a third person possessor.

Some eastern speakers have restructured this form as \( \text{wno:kms} \ddot{\text{n}} \).

The revision is

\[
(61) \quad i \rightarrow o / w
\]

Lest the reader think that the rule needed to delete the \( w \) in the environment \( C \_ C \) is an ad hoc rule forced by the revision of (37) as (61), consider the forms

\[
(62) \quad \text{bi:nna:gwad} \quad \text{bi:nna:gd}\ddot{o}:n \quad \text{it looks clean} \quad \text{they (inan.) look clean}
\]

The suffix meaning 'act on him' (imperative) is \( i \) which is deleted by a regular rule.

Rogers (1975) lists both forms for Parry Island Ojibwa.

Verbs are cited in 3rd singular conjunct forms as is the custom of conservative speakers.
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