

reflexive; OBJ_θ cannot be the target of these processes. The gender of OBJ influences the shape of the verb stem, but OBJ_θ may be either animate or inanimate without affecting the form of the verb. Moreover, verbs are inflected for OBJ but not for OBJ_θ. Pronominal OBJ is expressed by the inflection on the verb if no OBJ NP is present. Pronominal OBJ_θ, in contrast, is expressed by an independent personal pronoun – a grammaticalized possessed form of ‘body’ – under certain syntactic circumstances (described in the full paper), and by zero anaphora elsewhere. The syntax of independent reflexive pronouns also reveals an asymmetry between OBJ and OBJ_θ. The antecedent of an OBJ_θ reflexive may be either SUBJ or OBJ; an OBJ reflexive pronoun cannot have an OBJ_θ antecedent.

Using the above criteria for distinguishing OBJ from OBJ_θ, we must analyze some two-place verbs as being subcategorized for a SUBJ and an OBJ_θ, not an OBJ. The subcategorization frame of SUBJ plus OBJ_θ may be the result of an OBJ-suppressing process, such as antipassive, reflexive, or reciprocal, applying to a ditransitive stem:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|--|---------------|
| (5) | a. | mi·šiwe- | 'give O _θ away <S O _θ >' | [antipassive] |
| | b. | ašameti- | 'feed each other O _θ <S O _θ >' | [reciprocal] |

Other verbs are inherently subcategorized for a SUBJ and OBJ_θ:

- | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|---------------------------------|
| (6) | a. | ahpe·nemo- | 'depend on <S O _θ >' |
| | b. | we·pa·hke- | 'throw <S O _θ >' |
| | c. | takwi- | 'join <S O _θ >' |

The nonsubject argument of the verbs in (5-6) cannot be the target of antipassive, reflexive or reciprocal formation, it may be either animate or inanimate without changing the form of the verb stem, it does not trigger agreement on the verb, and it may be expressed by pronouns from the 'body' series or by zero anaphora: all properties of OBJ_θ.

Other sections of the full paper argue that the nonsubject argument in (5-6) is not OBL (evidence from word order and relative clauses) and investigate the range of thematic roles associated with Meskwaki OBJ_θ.

Analyzing the nonsubject argument in (5-6) as OBJ_θ requires modification of standard views such as: "... not all languages have OBJ_θ and even in those that do non-Patient themes are only mapped to OBJ_θ if there is also an OBJ." (Falk 2001:106) The markedness of OBJ_θ mapping is evidenced by the rarity of the Meskwaki pattern, not by its absolute absence. The unusual nature of Meskwaki OBJ_θ can also contribute to current conversations regarding the inventory of GFs (e.g. Alsina et al 2005), the nature of OBJ (Börjars & Vincent 2008), and the syntax of ditransitives (Maling 2001, Kibort 2008). In a sense, the Meskwaki pattern is the mirror image of the problem presented by symmetrical double object languages: instead of multiple arguments displaying primary object properties here we find a non-subject, non-oblique argument bereft of the expected primary object properties.

Alsina, A, T Mohanan & KP Mohanan 2005. How to get rid of COMP. *Proc. of LFG05*.

Börjars, Kersti & Nigel Vincent 2008. Objects and OBJ. *Proceedings of LFG08*.

Bresnan, Joan and L Moshi 1990. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. *LI*.

Falk, Yehuda. 2001. *Lexical Functional Grammar*. CSLI Publications.

Kibort, Anna. 2008. On the syntax of ditransitive constructions. *Proceedings of LFG08*.

Maling, Joan. 2001. Dative: the heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case.... *Lingua*.