1977

Remarks on Cheyenne obviation and pluralization

Wayne E. Leman
SIL-UND

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers>

Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Leman, Wayne E. (1977) "Remarks on Cheyenne obviation and pluralization," *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*: Vol. 21, Article 5.

DOI: 10.31356/silwp.vol21.05

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers/vol21/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commonson@library.und.edu.

Remarks on Cheyenne Obviation and Pluralization

Wayne Leman

In Cheyenne,¹ as in other Algonquian languages, when two or more third-person nominals are in the same sentence or "contextual span" (Wolfart 1973:17), one of the nominals must be treated as "nearer" or more "in focus" than the other third-person nominal(s). The nearer person is called the "proximate" form while any other(s) is said to be "obviate" (sometimes called a "fourth-person"). The proximate nominal can function as the "topic" of a discourse segment, or "the person earlier spoken of and already known" (Bloomfield 1962:38). The marking of one or more nominals as obviatives is called "obviation". We can see some of the discourse-related functions of obviation in the following beginning lines from a Cheyenne story about a ground squirrel and a turtle.²

méhne-vòhkàho?heso₃ naa ma?eno₃ é-sta-eve-amèhnéhoono₃₃.
ground squirrel₃ and turtle₃ they₃₃ were walking along
A ground squirrel and a turtle were walking along.

é-h-me?etoevóhoono₄₄₋₃₃ tsé-ohke-mévaevose₄₄₋₃₃;
they₄₄ discovered them₃₃ those₄₄ who eat them₃₃
Those who eat them discovered them;

é-h-nàha?enaevóhoono₄₄₋₃₃ né-ta-na?honeo?o₁₂₋₃₃;
they₄₄ grabbed them₃₃ let's₁₂ kill them₃₃
They grabbed them. "Let's kill them;

nè-sta-mévoneo?o₁₂₋₃₃ é-x-hetaevóhoono₄₄₋₃₃ taaxa?e
let's₁₂ eat them₃₃ they₄₄ said to them₃₃ let's see
let's eat them!" they said to them. "Let's see

é-ohke-toněšévésesto₃₃? é-x-hestóhehoo?o_{x-3} méhne-vòhkàho?heso₃
what do they₃₃ habitually do? he₃ was told ground squirrel₃
what do they do?" the ground squirrel was told.

ná-ohkè-ho?soo?e₁, é-x-hehoo?o₃.
I₁ habitually dance, he₃ said
"I dance," he said.

The "in focus" characters, the ground squirrel and the turtle, are introduced in the first sentence of this discourse segment. They are introduced on an equal status in the discourse, in a conjoined noun phrase, and so are both treated as proximate nominals. They are indexed by subscripts '3' and '33' which refer to proximate nominals. The next sentence has a new agent, "those (some new third-persons) who eat them (the ground squirrel and turtle)." But, because there are already proximate nouns, the new nominal is marked for obviation, and indexed by '44'³. Throughout this discourse segment the ground squirrel and turtle continue to be the proximate referents while their adversaries are obviatives, even when the latter function as the "subject" of a verb.

Cheyenne marks obviation on all animate nominals possessed by a third-person.

POSSESSION:

(1a)	(inan)	māheo?o _I	house
b)		na-māheo?o _{1-I}	my house
c)		ne-māheo?o _{2-I}	your house
d)		ne-māheonót se _{2-II}	your houses
e)		he-māheo?o _{3-I}	his house
f)		he-māheonót se _{3-II}	his houses
g)		he-māheonevo _{33-I}	their house
h)		he-māheonevót se _{33-II}	their houses
(2a)	(an)	mā-htóna _{x-3}	someone's daughter
b)		nā-htóna ₁₋₃	my daughter
c)		nā-htónaho ₁₋₃₃	my daughters
d)		nē-stóna ₂₋₃	your daughter
e)		nē-stónāhevo ₂₂₋₃	your (pl) daughter
f)		nē-stónāhevoo?o ₂₂₋₃₃	your (pl) daughters
g)		he-stónaho ₃₋₄₍₄₎	his daughter(s)
h)		he-stónāhevoho ₃₃₋₄₍₄₎	their daughter(s)

The noun, *house*, of (1) is inanimate, while in (2) *daughter* is animate. By comparing (1b, c, and e) we can see that no change takes place in nominal inflection (other than the changes in the possessive prefixes) when an inanimate noun is possessed by a third person (1e). This contrasts with the situation in (2). There we find a change in the nominal inflection when the animate noun is possessed by a third-person. Compare (2b) nā-htóna *my daughter* and (2g) he-stónaho *his daughter*. (2g) requires marking for obviation of the possessed noun by the suffix -ho.

Obviation neutralizes number distinction in possessed animate nouns. So (2g) can mean either *his daughter* or *his daughters*.⁴

The next main section of this paper will be a look at the effect obviation has on verbs. We will look at the verbs according to the four categories, II, AI, TI, and TA (see footnote 3). The reader should be aware that not all of the phenomena which will be presented are clearly obviation. But, because of similarities between the phenomena we will present all the data under the rubric of "obviation", then, later, we will discuss some alternative analyses.

II:

(3a)	māheo?o e-tāhpe?o	The house is big.
b)	na-māheo?o e-tāhpe?o	My house is big.
c)	he-māheo?o *e-tāhpe?o	His house is big.
d)	he-māheo?o e-tāhpe?ótse	His house is big.
e)	he-māheonótse e-tāhpe?onetótse	His houses are big.
f)	na-māheonótse e-tāhpe?onéstse	My houses are big.
g)	he-māheonevo e-tāhpe?ótse	Their house is big.
h)	he-māheonevótse e-tāhpe?onetótse	Their houses are big.
(4a)	mótšěške e-onenexo	The knife is broken.
b)	ne-mótšěške e-onenexo	Your knife is broken.
c)	he-mótšěške e-onenèxótse	His knife is broken.
(5a)	na-amāho?hestótse e-ma?o	My car is red.
b)	he-amāho?hestótse e-ma?ótse	His car is red.
c)	he-amāho?hestovevo e-ma?ótse	Their car is red.
(6a)	ne-voestato e-peva?e	Your belt is pretty.
b)	he-voestato e-peva?étse	His belt is pretty.
(7a)	na-mahpe e-héesevo?ta	My water is boiling.
b)	he-mahpe e-héesevo?tátse	His water is boiling.

We can see that third-person possession of an inanimate[(3d, e, g, h), (4c), (5b, c), (6b), and (7b)] does not trigger obviation inflection on the noun, but it apparently does require "obviative" marking on the verb which "governs"⁵ the possessed nominal. Compare (3b) and (3d). Note that number of the inanimate nominal is marked both on the nominal and on the verb (compare 3b and 3f, and 3d and 3e). But number of the

possessor is not marked on the verb. Compare (3d and 3g, 5b and 5c, 3b and 8a, 3f and 8b). Lack of verbal agreement with number of the possessor follows naturally, since the verb is intransitive. Only number of the subject (i.e. the possessed nominal, not the possessor) can trigger number agreement on the verb⁶ (e.g. compare 3b and 3f, 3g and 3h).

- (8a) na-máheonane e-táhpe?o Our (excl) house is big.
 b) na-máheonanótse e-táhpe?onéstse Our (excl) houses are big.

Obviation of subjects of AI verbs triggers the same morphological marking on the governing verb that we saw with obviation of animate nominals in (2) above.

AI:

- (9a) ná-htóna₁₋₃ e-néxohtahe₃ My daughter is cute.
 b) ná-htónaho₁₋₃₃ e-néxohtáheo?o₃₃ My daughters are cute.
 c) ka?ěškoneho₃₃ e-néxohtáheo?o₃₃ The children are cute.
 d) he-stónaho₃₋₄ *e-néxohtáheo?o₃₃ His daughters are cute.⁴
 e) he-stónaho₃₋₄ e-néxohtáheho₄ His daughter(s) is/are cute.

- (10a) na-e?ha₁₋₃ é-haaena₃ My son is hungry.
 b) he-e?haho₃₋₄ é-haaenaho₄ His son(s) is/are hungry.

- (11a) é-ho₂₋₃ e-pevetano₃ Your father is happy.
 b) he-ho₃₋₄ e-pevetanoho₄ His father is happy.

We see from (9e) and (10b) that number distinction is neutralized by obviation of possessed animate nominals and that this number-indifference is also found in the meaning of governing AI verb. (9d) shows the ungrammaticality of a verb which does not indicate obviation and the concomitant number-indifference, when the animate subject has been obviated.

Morphological marking on TI verbs differs according to whether it is the subject or the object which has been "obviated".

TI:

- (12a) ná-ho?oestse_{1-I} ho?évohkótse_I I boiled the meat.
 b) hetane₃ é-ho?oestse_{3-I} ho?évohkótse_I The man boiled the meat.
 c) hetane₃ he-e?haho₃₋₄ é-ho?oestsétse_{4-I} The man's son boiled the meat.

Notice that we get the same marking here as we saw under II verbs: -tse. This fact will be discussed further below. Apparent "obviation" of the direct objects of TI verbs requires a -vo marking on the governing verb.

- (13a) na-vóohta_{1-I} máheo?o_I I see the house.
 b) na-vóohta_{1-I} ne-máheo?o_{2-I} I see your house.
 c) na-vóohtanótse_{1-II} ne-máheonótse_{2-II} I see your houses.
 d) na-vóohtanonéstse_{11-II} ne-máheonótse_{2-II} We (excl) see your houses.
 e) na-vóohtomovo_{1-I} he-máheo?o_{3-I} I see his house.
 f) na-vóohtomovótse_{1-II} he-máheonótse_{3-II} I see his houses.
 g) na-vóohtomovo_{1-I} he-máheonevo_{33-I} I see their house.
 h) na-vóohtomovótse_{1-II} he-máheonevótse_{33-II} I see their houses.
 i) na-vóohtanone_{11-I} ne-máheo?o_{2-I} We (excl) see your house.

We can also see the -vo marking when the subject is a third-person and the object is possessed by some other third-person.

- (14a) e-vóohta_{3-I} na-máheo?o_{1-I} He sees my house.
 b) e-vóohta_{3-I} he-máheo?o_{3-I} He₃ sees his₃ house.
 c) e-vóohtomovo_{3-I} he-máheo?o_{4-I} He₃ sees his₄ house.
 d) e-vóohtomovonovo_{33-I} he-máheo?o_{4-I} They₃₃ see his₄ house.
 e) e-vóohtomovonovótse_{33-II} he-máheonótse_{4-II} They₃₃ see his₄ houses.
 f) e-vóohtanovo_{33-I} na-máheo?o_{1-I} They see my house.

(14a, b, and f) have regular TI verbs. These "regular" verbs show no -vo marking to indicate possession of the inanimate direct object by some other third-person (the second -vo in 13d and 13e and the only one in 13f is part of the third person subject pluralization marking).

Other TI verbs show this same -vo marking that we have seen with the verb *see* above, and so do some AI and TAI verbs ("double object" verbs having animate indirect objects and inanimate direct objects).

- (15a) ná-hestana maahe I took the arrow.
 b) ná-hestanomovo he-maahe I took his arrow.
 c) *ná-hestanomova na-maahe He took my arrow.
 d) é-hestana na-maahe He took my arrow.
- (16a) na-e?e?o?tse mótšěške I broke the knife.
 b) na-e?e?o?tse ne-mótšěške I broke your knife.
 c) *na-e?e?o?tse he-mótšěške I broke his knife.
 d) na-e?e?o?tovo he-mótšěške I broke his knife.
 e) *na-e?e?o?tova na-mótšěške He broke my knife.
 f) e-e?e?o?tse na-mótšěške He broke my knife.
 g) e-e?e?o?tse he-mótšěške He₃ broke his₃ knife.
 h) e-e?e?o?tovo he-mótšěške He₃ broke his₄ knife.
 i) na-e?e?o?tovótse he-mótšěškeohtse I broke his knives.
 j) na-e?e?o?tšenótse ne-mótšěškeohtse I broke your knives.

- (17a) ná-ho?eot sêstomovo he-maahe I brought his arrow.
 b) ná-ho?eotsest se na-maahe I brought my arrow.
- (18a) na-mea?a maahe I gave away the arrow.
 b) na-mea?a ne-maahe I gave away your arrow.
 c) na-meavo he-maahe I gave away his arrow.

AI:

- (19a) na-ve?še-vóosane amě-hóomäht séstôtse I see by means of the mirror.
 b) na-ve?še-vóosanevo he-amě-hóomäht séstôtse I see by means of his mirror.

TAI:

- (20a) ne-métsevo he-möxe?éstoo?o You gave me his book.
 b) ne-métsevonôtse he-möxe?éstoonôtse You gave me his books.
 c) ne-métatsevo he-möxe?éstoo?o I gave you his book.
 d) na-métanevo he-möxe?éstoo?o I was given his book.

Let us now look at obviation with TA verbs. The sentences in (21) show pronominal marking used in Cheyenne TA verbs.

TA:

- (21a) na-vóomo I saw him.
 b) ne-vóomo You saw him.
 c) na-vóoma He saw me.
 d) ne-vóoma He saw you.
 e) ne-vóomätse I saw you.
 f) ne-vóome You saw me.

It is important to notice that the pronominal prefix does not always indicate who is the logical subject of the verb in TA forms. Instead, Cheyenne follows a "person hierarchy" common to Algonquian languages: $2 > 1 > 3$. This means that if a person higher on the hierarchy is being acted upon by someone lower on the hierarchy, then it is the higher person who is indicated by the prefix on the verb. If the actor is higher than the person acted upon, then the actor appears indicated by the prefix, in the position it normally would as "subject" of the verb, as we have seen with AI and TI verbs. The forms for which the prefix does not indicate the logical subject, but, rather, the logical object, are generally called "inverse" forms.

- (22a) *na-e?e?o?tse_{1-I} na-mo?eško I broke my finger.
 b) na-e?e?o?xo₁₋₃ na-mo?eško₁₋₃ I broke my finger.
 c) *na-e?e?o?xo₁₋₃ he-mo?eško I broke his finger.
 d) na-e?e?o?xamoho₁₋₄ he-mo?ěškono₃₋₄ I broke his finger(s).

- e) e-e?e?o?xoho₃₋₄ mo?eškono₄ He broke a finger(s).
 f) e-e?e?o?xoho₃₋₄ he-mo?ěškono₃₋₄ He₃ broke his₃ finger(s)₄.
 g) e-e?e?o?xovo₃₃₋₄ mo?ěškono₄ They₃₃ broke a finger(s)₄.
 h) e-e?e?o?xamovo₃₃₋₅ he-mo?ěškono₄₋₅ They₃₃ broke his₄ finger(s)₅.
 i) e-e?e?o?xamoho₃₋₅ he-mo?ěškono₄₋₅ He₃ broke his₄ finger(s)₅.
- (23a) na-vóomo₁₋₃ poes₃ I see a cat.
 b) na-vóomoo?o₁₋₃₃ poesono₃₃ I see cats.
 c) *e-vóomo₃₋₃ poes₃ He sees a cat.
 d) e-vóomoho₃₋₄ poesono₄ He sees a cat(s).
 e) e-vóomovo₃₃₋₄ poesono₄ They see a cat(s).
 f) e-vóomoho₃₋₄ he-e?haho₃₋₄ He₃ saw his₃ son(s)₄.
 g) e-vóomoho₃₋₄ na-e?haho₁₋₄ He₃ saw my₁ son(s)₄.
 h) e-vóomamoho₃₋₅ he-e?haho₄₋₅ He₃ saw his₄ son(s)₅.

mo?eško *finger* is animate as can be seen by the ungrammaticality of the TI verb of (22a) and the grammaticality of the TA verb in (22b). A comparison of (23c) and (23d) shows that it is necessary to mark obviation of animate direct objects in TA verb clauses. The obviation must be marked on the animate direct object and on its governing verb.

The verbs in (22) and (23) are all "direct" forms, i.e. the logical subject is higher on the person hierarchy than the logical object. We will see a few examples of obviation with inverse forms below, in (25-29).

Notice that Cheyenne marks the obviation of animate direct objects in TA verbs (22, 23) the same as it did the obviation of the (animate) subjects of AI verbs (9, 10). In addition the governing verb in each of these cases is marked the same, i.e. with -ho. This is what is known as an "absolutive" marking, that is, Cheyenne treats animate direct objects of transitive verbs the same as it does animate subjects of intransitive verbs, with regard to obviation. Exactly the same situation exists in a related language, Central Ojibwa, where Rhodes (1976:206) finds animate absolutes marked with -an, a cognate of the Cheyenne -ho (possibly this should be regarded as -(o)ho). We can see this absolutive patterning clearly in (24).

- (24a) (AI) hetane₃ e-mésehe₃ The man is eating.
 b) (AI) hetaneo?o₃₃ e-mésèheo?o₃₃ The men are eating.
 c) (AI) hetanoho₄ e-mésèheho₄⁷ The man/men (obv) is/are eating.
 d) (AI) he-e?haho₃₋₄ e-mésèheho₄ His son(s) is/are eating.
 e) (AI) šé?še₃ e-mésehe₃ The duck is eating.

- f) (TA) na-mévo₁₋₃ šéʔše₃ I am eating the duck.
 g) (TA) hetane₃ e-mévo₃₋₄⁸ šéʔxo₄⁹ The man is eating the duck(s).
 h) (TA) hetane₃ he-eʔhaho₃₋₄ e-mévo₄₋₅ šéʔxo₅ The man's son(s) is/are eating the duck(s).
 i) (TA) šéʔxo₄ e-mévo₄₋₅ heneno₅ The duck (obv) is eating the tomato (obv).

The AI verb root for *eat* is -méseh(e), while the TA verb root is -mév-. (The pronominal prefix and suffixes are attached to the TA root.) Note that the obviated form for *duck* in (24h) is identical to that in (24g) and (24i). This is support for Delisle's (1973) analysis of Algonquian obviatives (see footnote 3) that obviatives really are just modified third-person nominals. Perhaps we can say, "once a nominal has been obviated, it cannot become any more obviated." Hence, while for book-keeping purposes we may label some obviatives "4", "5", "6", etc., they really are all just "3".

(25) illustrates differences between direct and inverse TA forms.

- (25a) (direct) na-vóomo₁₋₃ hetane₃ I see the man.
 b) (inverse) na-vóoma₃₋₁ hetane₃ The man sees me.
 c) (direct) hetane₃ e-vóomoho₃₋₄ oeškéseho₄ The man₃ sees the dog₄.
 d) (direct) oeškéseho₄ e-vóomoho₃₋₄ hetane₃ The man₃ sees the dog₄.
 e) (inverse) hetanoho₄ e-vóomaaʔe₄₋₃ oeškeso₃ The man₄ sees the dog₃.
 f) (inverse) oeškeso₃ e-vóomaaʔe₄₋₃ hetanoho₄ The man₄ sees the dog₃.

Each of the inverse forms has an "inverse relator" -a immediately following -m- of the stem (which indicates that the logical object is animate). This -a is the Cheyenne reflex of the Proto-Algonquian (PA) *-ekw found in TA inverse forms.

The sentences in (25) show that word order has a different function in Cheyenne from English. In English it generally indicates grammatical relationships. In Cheyenne, however, word order apparently functions more as a "focusing" strategy. The sentence-initial nominal is the one that is in focus.¹⁰ The nominals in (25c-f) all have the same semantic roles, and we can see by the English glosses, therefore, that their meanings are basically the same. The difference between (25c) and (25e) can be seen in a discourse context. A discourse might be talking about (the topic) a man. In such a context (25c) would be an appropriate utterance. We might imagine a partial discourse in English such as: *A man was sneaking into a house* [This establishes "the man" as discourse topic.]. Then we could say sentence (25c), *The man saw a dog*.¹¹ But, if instead of this sentence we had said something like, *The man spotted a dog*, then we could follow this latter sentence with (25g) or (25h), depending on whether we wanted to have the "man" or the "dog" more prominent. (Focused elements are underlined in the glosses.)

- g) (inverse) hetane₃ e-vóomaa?e₄₋₃ oeškéseho₄ The dog₄ saw the man₃.
 h) (inverse) oeškéseho₄ e-vóomaa?e₄₋₃ hetane₃ The dog₄ saw the man₃.

We could gloss (25g) and (25h) as a passive sentence, *The man was seen by the dog*, an appropriate utterance in our imaginery discourse. Either of these last two sentences would retain the man as the proximate nominal. The inverse verb morphology enables us to know what the semantic roles in the sentence are, namely, that it is the dog that is doing the seeing, not the man. (25i) and (25j) would only be appropriate in our imaginery discourse after "the dog" has been properly introduced into the discourse and the topic of the discourse has become "the dog" (this would entail making *the dog* the proximate nominal).

- i) (direct) oeškeso₃ e-vóomoho₃₋₄ hetanoho₄ The dog₃ saw the man₄.
 j) (direct) hetanoho₄ e-vóomoho₃₋₄ oeškeso₃ The dog₃ saw the man₄.

Let us now consider some other inverse forms:

TA:

- (26a) ka?ěškóne₃ na-ve?hóoma₃₋₁ The child is looking at me.
 b) nã-htóna₁₋₃ na-ve?hóoma₃₋₁ My daughter is looking at me.
 c) he-stónaho₃₋₄ na-ve?hóomaét senoto His daughter(s) is/are looking at me.
 (27a) hóht seme₃ na-nãha?e?ova₃₋₁ The ball hit me.
 b) he-stóht semo₃₋₄ na-nãha?e?oét senoto₄₋₁ His ball(s) hit me.

In (26c) and (27b) the logical subjects have been obviated since they are animate and possessed by a third-person. Notice that the verb requires the same *ʔtse* marking that we saw in the treatment of "obviation" of II verbs (3-7) and of "obviation" of the animate subject of TI verbs (12). We see this *ʔtse* again in (28) and (29) with so-called "ITA" verbs (TA verbs with inanimate actors).

- (28a) maahe_I na-nãha?e?oo?e_{1-I} The arrow hit me.
 b) ne-maahe_{2-I} na-nãha?e?oo?e_{I-1} Your arrow hit me.
 c) he-maahe₃₋₁ na-nãha?e?oétse_{I'-1} His arrow hit me.
 d) he-maahe_{3-I} ne-nãha?e?oétse_{I'-2} His arrow hit you.
 e) he-maahotse_{3-II} ne-nãha?e?oét senótse_{II'-2} His arrows hit you.
 (29a) ná-hohtana_{1-I} amãho?hestótse_I I ran over the car.
 b) ná-hohtanaa?e_{I-1} amãho?hestótse_I The car ran over me.
 c) *ná-hohtanaevo he-amãho?hestótse_{3-I} His car ran over me.
 d) ná-hohtanaétse_{I'-1} he-amãho?hestótse_{3-I} His car ran over me.

So far we have looked at examples from only one of the "orders"¹² in Cheyenne, i.e. the independent order, and from only the "indicative mode"¹³ within this order. Obviation is also marked within the conjunct order. Notice that in each situation in the following sentences in which obviation occurs it is marked in the conjunct verb with the *ʔtse* morpheme that we have seen several times. This is exactly what happens in Central Ojibwa with the *-ini* cognate of Cheyenne *ʔtse* (Rhodes 1976:206).

CONJUNCT:

- [illegible]

In (30g) the obviated nominal is a conjunct relative (sometimes called a "conjunct nominal"), tsé-haonátse, a conjunct order dependent of an independent verb, e-mého?toho. In (32) both nominals are of the conjunct order. The two nominals together form a job title.

- (31) t sé-ne?táhe?tovót se₃₋₄ t sé-páhae-?ovéstomósané-t se-se
conj-supervise:3-4 conj-"stick alongside"-teach-obv-4 suffix
pfx pfx
 Teacher-aide(s)' Supervisor (the one₃ who supervises teacher-aide(s)₄)

(32) and (33) show "obviation" marked on verbs of both the conjunct and independent orders triggered by obviation of possessed inanimate nominals governed by those verbs:

- (32a) na-vóhkéha?e_{1-I} tse-táho?ta_I táxemésêhesto-va e-vo?komo_I
my-hat conj-be on:I table - loc I-white
px
 My hat which is on the table is white.
- b) he-vóhkéha?e_{3-I} tse-táho?tá-tse_I, táxemésêhestova e-vo?komó-tse
his-hat conj-be on - obv I-white-obv
px
 His hat which is on the table is white.
- (33a) na-mo?kéhanótse_{1-II} tse-táho?taa?éstse_{II} táxemésêhestova
 e-vo?komonéstse_{II} My shoes which are on the table are white.
- b) he-mo?kéhanótse_{3-II} tse-táho?tá-tse-e?éstse_{II}, táxemésêhestova
-obv-pl
 e-vo?komonetó-tse_{II}, His shoes which are on the table are white.
-white:pl-obv

A few examples will suffice to show that obviation is marked on nominals and verbs within modes other than the indicative.

II:

(34a) (indic)	na-máheo?o	é-táhpe?o	My house is big.
b) (neg)	na-máheo?o	é-saa-táhpe?ó-hane ¹⁴	My house is not big.
c) (inter)	ne-máheo?o	é-táhpe?o? ¹⁵	Is your house big?
d) (indic)	he-máheo?o	é-táhpe?ótse	His house is big.
e) (inter)	he-máheo?o	é-táhpe?ótse?	Is his house big?
f) (neg)	he-máheo?o	é-saa-táhpe?ó-hané-hetse	His house is not big.

AI:

(35a) (indic)	nà-htótse	é-möšéškanáhe	My pet is brown.
b) (neg)	nà-htótse	é-saa-möšéškanáhé-he	My pet is not brown.
c) (inter)	nè-stótse	é-möšéškanáhe?	Is your pet brown?
d) (indic)	he-stótseho	é-möšéškanáheho	His pet is brown.
e) (inter)	he-stótseho	é-möšéškanáhevo?	Is his pet brown?
f) (neg)	he-stótseho	é-saa-möšéškanáhé-he-ho	His pet is not brown.
- 3-neg- brown -neg-obv*

TI:

(36a) (indic)	na-vóohta	ne-máheo?o	I saw your house.
b) (neg)	ná-saa-vóohtó-he	ne-máheo?o	I did not see your house.
c) (inter)	ne-vóohta	na-máheo?o?	Did you see my house?
d) (indic)	na-vóohtomovo	he-máheo?o	I saw his house?
e) (neg)	ná-saa-vóohtomovó-he	he-máheo?o	I did not see his house.

TA:

(37a) (indic)	na-vóomo	I saw him.
b) (neg)	ná-saa-vóomó-he	I did not see him.
c) (inter)	ne-vóomo?	Did you see him?
d) (indic)	e-vóomoho	He ₃ saw him ₄ .
e) (neg)	é-saa-vóomó-he-ho	He ₃ did not see him ₄ .
	<i>3-neg-see:3-neg-obv</i>	
f) (neg)	é-saa-vóomae-he-ho	He ₄ did not see him ₃ .

CONJUNCT:

(38a)	e-vóomoho	tsé-saa-?a?xaamé-he-tse	He ₃ saw the one ₄ who wasn't crying.
b)	he-vóhkéha?e	tsé-saa-táho?tá-hané-hetse	táxemésèhestova e-vo?komótse
	His hat which is not on the table is white.		

As in Central Ojibwa (Rhodes 1976:203) obviation can even be triggered by the presence of a non-term in a clause which has another third-person verb dependent.

- (39a) ná-tǎ-hooʔohtse tsé-h-voonaʔo I went home this morning.
1-toward-go home conj pfx-pret-morning
- b) é-tǎ-hooʔohtse tsé-h-voonaʔo He went home this morning.
- c) é-tǎ-hooʔohtse tsé-h-voonaʔótse He went home this morning.
-morning:obv
- d) na-tǎ-hooʔohtse *tsé-h-voonaʔótse I went home this morning.
-morning:obv

(39c) and (39d) are marked for obviation. (39d) is totally ungrammatical since a non-term time adverbial is the only "third-person" in the entire clause. But (39c) is grammatical to conservative Cheyenne speakers. For them, the presence of the third-person subject of the independent AI verb along with the non-term time clause is a trigger for obviating the non-term. Apparently younger Cheyenne speakers are losing some obviative marking for non-terms since (39c) is said to be grammatical by some speakers. We can see obviation of another non-term time adverbial in (40b) and of a possessor of a Direction non-term in (41b). Sentence (42b) shows obviation of a Locative non-term.

- (40a) tsé-sta-eše-nenove?xove ná-h-nemene After a little while I sang.
conj pfx-pst-already-certain time 1-pret-sing
- b) tsé-sta-eše-nenove?xové-tse é-h-nemene After a little while he sang.
-obv
- (41a) na-tá-htse?ohtse₁ John₃ he-māheone_{3-I(Dir)} I am going to John's house.
- b) e-tá-htse?ohtse₃ Johnevaho₄ he-māheone_{4-I(Dir)} He is going to
 John's house.
- (42a) ná-so?e-eve-amoeoo?e anòheto tsé-h-mena?o?eve
1-still-continue-stand down conj pfx-where-enclosed
 I was still standing down in the enclosed area.
- b) é-so?e-eve-amoeoo?e anòheto tsé-h-mena?o?evé-tse
-enclosed-obv
 He was still standing down in the enclosed area.

Throughout this paper, several instances of the word "obviation" have been in quotes. The reason this was done is that it is not clear that each case of what looks like obviation actually is that. Algonquianists are agreed that the marking with animate absolutes is obviation. Probably the same agreement comes with regards to obviation of animate nominals possessed by some other third-person. Both of these situations in Cheyenne mark -ho on a governing verb and -(o)ho (or a corresponding obviative marker such as a noun's pluralizer, see below) on the obviated nominal.

We have seen that Cheyenne marks governing verbs with ʔtse in four situations:

- (a) when an II subject is possessed by some third-person (3-7, 34);
- (b) when an animate TI subject is possessed by some third-person (12);
- (c) when the logical subject of TA inverse verbs is possessed by a third-person, whether that subject is animate or inanimate (26-29);
- (d) when "obviation" is required with conjunct order verbs (30-33, 38-42)

Rhodes regards the corresponding situations in Central Ojibwa (marked with -ini) to be instances of obviation. For the (a), (b), and (c) situations he says -ini is used "to mark the obviation of the possessor of a noun" (1976:199). This differs from the use of Central Ojibwa -an which, besides indicating obviation on the verb, marks obviation of an animate possessee, just as the corresponding -(o)ho does in Cheyenne.

Rogers (1975:119-20) presents a different analysis of the -ini marker. She says, tentatively, that -ini (corresponding to Cheyenne ʔtse) signals a "concerned role" rather than obviation. Of the (a) situation, above, she says that the -ini "allows some state of affairs to be represented as relevant for an animate third-person 'concerned' in the situation. {ini} in such cases introduces a second participant into otherwise intransitive forms" (1975:120). Of the (b) and (c) situation, above, she says that the -ini marks that some "concerned" third-person is different from another third-person actor in the same sentence. Conceivably, for the (c) situation Rogers might say that the significance of -ini is that "the actor for the verb in which it occurs is not to be identified referentially with the actor for an earlier verb" (1976:120). Since Cheyenne dependent verbs each have an "actor" (or "subject"), this explanation from Rogers may best fit the facts of Cheyenne. If this is so, we might then not want to continue using "obviation" as a label for the phenomena involved with ʔtse in dependent verbs. This might also be pertinent to its use as a label for any other situation in which verbs require ʔtse marking.

When the logical direct object of a TI or TAI verb is possessed by some third-person, we have seen (13-18, 36) that Cheyenne requires the verb governing the object to be marked with -vo. [It is possible that the morpheme break with this form is incorrect and that the marker is actually -ov or even -(om)ov. We saw the -om in (13-15, 17, 36).] Rhodes (1976:136) points out that the Central Ojibwa correspondent to -(om)ov, -amaw, is identical to Central Ojibwa's benefactive morpheme in spelling. Partly because of this identity, Rhodes analyzed the "possessor obviation" uses of -amaw as involving "possessor ascension". (In Relational Grammar terms this means that the possessor of the logical object "ascends" out of the noun phrase to take on the relationship of direct object of the verb.) The effect of "possessor ascension" in Central Ojibwa would be similar to that of "benefactive advancement" or "affectee advancement" in Central Ojibwa, just as it would be in Cheyenne. (In "benefactive advancement" and "affectee advancement" the logical benefactee and affectee, respectively,

trigger verb agreement normally used for animate direct objects. (Relational Grammar explains this fact by saying that the benefactee or affectee, non-terms (see footnote number 5), has been "advanced" to become a direct object.)

At this point it is not possible to say whether or not the -o of -vo is the same morpheme as the final -o of na-vóomo, *I see him*, which indicates that the direct object of a TA verb is third-person. In Cheyenne, affectee advancement forms (which show regular TA subject and object marking) do look very much like forms with the "obviative" -vo. Compare the sentences of (43), in which affectee advancement is evident, with the sentences in (15). Notice that the "obviative" situation only has

(43a)	ná-hestanomevo ₁₋₃	maahe _I	I took the arrow from him.
b)	ná-hestanomevo ₁₋₃	he-maahe _{3-I}	I took his arrow from him.
c)	ná-hestanomeva ₃₋₁	na-maahe _{1-I}	He took my arrow from me.
d)	né-hestanomevátse ₁₋₂	ne-maahe _{2-I}	I took your arrow from you.
e)	né-hestanomevátse ₁₋₂	he-maahe _{3-I}	I took his arrow from you.
f)	né-hestanomevo ₂₋₃	na-maahe _{1-I}	You took my arrow from him.

marking on the verb when the object's possessor is third-person. If we attempt to treat -vo as a regular TA object marking (15d), an ungrammatical sentence is produced. It may still be possible to retain Rhodes' generalization, calling the "obviative" -vo a marker of "possessor ascension", but we would, of course, then need a constraint that such an ascension can only occur with a third-person possessor.

A difference between the "obviative" -vo situations and clear-cut obviation can be seen when we compare sentences in (44) and (45).

(44a)	e-vóomoho ₃₋₄	he-e?haho ₃₋₄	He ₃ saw his ₃ son(s) ₄ .
b)	e-vóohta _{3-I}	he-máheo?o _{3-I}	He ₃ saw his ₃ house.
(45a)	e-vóomamoho ₃₋₅ ¹⁶	he-e?haho ₄₋₅	He ₃ saw his ₄ son(s) ₅ .
b)	e-vóohtomovo _{3-I}	he-máheo?o _{4-I}	He ₃ saw his ₄ house.

With the TA forms (44a, 45a) obviation is required, marked both on the obviated nominals and on the verb, regardless of whether or not the third-person possessor of the object is coreferential with the subject of the verb. But with the TI forms (44b, 45b), the "obviative" -vo is only marked on the verb when the third-person possessor is not coreferential with the subject.

The situation with -vo (as well as with 'tse) also differs from clear-cut obviation with regards to number-agreement on verbs. The data have shown (e.g. 2g-h, 9e, 10b, 22, 23d-h, etc.) that animate absolute obviation and obviation of possessed animate nominals causes number-indifference

both on governing verbs and on the obviated nominals. But inanimate subjects and objects possessed by a third-person continue to trigger number agreement on verbs, even though the verbs must be marked with *-tse* or *-vo* (cf. 3d, e; 3g, h; 13e, f; 13g, h; 14d, e; 16d, i; etc.). This situation follows from the fact that, with *-tse* and *-vo*, verbs are not marking "obviation" of the subject or object, but rather, the presence of a third-person possessor¹⁷ of the subject or object. Notice, too, that number of this possessor does not trigger number agreement on the verb (cf. 13e, g; 13f, h). This last fact would still fit with Rhodes' analysis that these mark possessor obviation, since we know that clear-cut obviation neutralizes number distinction. Or, alternatively, Rogers' analysis could still account for the various situations.

Finally, let us take a deeper look at some of the spellings of forms which are involved with obviation. The shape of an obviated animate noun is often identical to that noun's plural spelling. We can see this in (46). (It is important to note here that [tse] < /te/.)

	singular	plural	obviative
(46a) daughter	-htóna	-htónaho	-htónaho
b) finger	moʔeško	moʔěškono	moʔěškono
c) cat	poeso	poesono	poesono
d) child	kaʔěškóne	kaʔěškóneho	kaʔěškóneho
e) ball	hóht seme	hóht semo (no)	hóht semo
f) tree	hooht sěst se ¹⁸ /hoohtete/	hooht seto, /hoohteto/	hooht seto, /hoohteto/
g) shirt	ést seʔhe	ést seʔheno	ést seʔheno
h) god	maʔheoʔo	maʔheono	maʔheono
i) apple	máʔxe-me	máʔxe-méno ¹⁹	máʔxe-méno
j) snake	šéʔšenovótse, /šéʔšenovote/	šéʔšenovoto, /šéʔšenovoto/	šéʔšenovoto, /šéʔšenovoto/
k) ant	hát šěške, /hátěhke/	hát šěškého, /hátěhkého/	hát šěškého, /hátěhkého/
l) grasshopper	háhkota	hahkótaho	hahkótaho
m) coyote	oʔkòhome	oʔkòhomého	oʔkòhomého
n) feather	meeʔe	meeno	(meeno) ²⁰
o) deer	vaot seva	vaot seváhne	vaot seváhne
p) skunk	xaóʔo	xaóne	(xaóne)
q) animal	hova	hováhne	hováhne
r) chicken	kokòheaxa	kokòheaxane	kokòheaxane

Forms where the spelling of the plural animate noun differs from its obviative form are shown in (47).

	singular	plural	obviative
(47a) man	hetane	hetaneoʔo	hetanoho
b) woman	héʔe	heʔeoʔo	heʔoho
c) sun	ěšeʔhe	ěšeʔheoʔo	ěšeʔhoho
d) duck	šéʔše	šéʔšeoʔo	šéʔxo
e) bear	náhkohe	náhkòheoʔo	náhkòhoho
f) rock	hoʔhonaaʔe	hoʔhonaaoʔo	hoʔhonaaʔo
g) white woman	veʔhoʔaʔe	veʔhoʔaʔeoʔo	veʔhoʔaʔo
h) horse	moʔéhè-noʔha	moʔéhè-noʔháme	moʔéhè-noʔhámo

So-called "stress-shift" plurals behave similarly to the forms in (47) as we can see in (48).

	singular	plural	obviative
(48a) white man, spider ²¹	vé?ho?e	ve?hó?e	ve?hó?o
b) frog	oónáha?e	oonáhá?e	(oonáhá?o)
c) fish	nóma?ne	nomá?ne	nomá?no

The spelling alternations which occur in (46-48) are important and, generally, predictable. Information needed to "predict" what spellings a certain form will take is available from a study of several syntactic constructions into which the forms can enter. Two syntactic constructions which can assist in this discussion are "equative" forms (*He/It is a ____*.) and locative forms [see *table* in (32, 33)]. Equative forms are intransitive and agree in number with the subject of the verb, e.g. e-me?koneve means *It/he is a head (man)*; context and plural suffixes can tell us the intended meaning: e-me?koneveo?o *they (an.) are head men*; e-me?konevenestse *they (inan.) are heads (of bodies)*. Some equative and locative constructions are given in (49) along with the plurals of nouns.

	plural	equative	locative
(49a) cat	poesono	é-poesonèheve	poesonèheva
b) child	ka?ěškóneho	é-ka?ěškónèheve	(ka?ěškónèheva)
c) tree	hooht seto	é-hooht set seve	hooht set seva
d) god	ma?heono	é-ma?heoneve	(ma?heoneva)
e) apple	má?xe-méno	é-ma?xe-méneve	(má?xe-méneva)
f) ant	hát šěškého	é-hat šěškéheve	(hát šěškéheva)
g) grasshopper	hahkótaho	é-hahkótàheve	(hahkótàheva)
h) coyote	o?kòhomého	é-o?kòhoméheve	(o?kòhoméheva)
i) feather	meeno	é-meenove	(meeneva)
j) man	hetaneo?o	é-hetaneve	hetaneva
k) sun	ěše?heo?o	é-eše?heve	ěše?heva
l) duck	šě?še?o	é-še?ševe	šě?ševa
m) bear	náhkòheo?o	e-náhkòheve	náhkòheva
n) horse	mo?éhè-no?háme	é-mo?éhè-no?haméheve	mo?éhè-no?haméheva
o) rock	ho?honaeo?o	é-ho?honaeve	ho?honaeva
p) white woman	ve?ho?a?eo?o	é-ve?ho?a?eve	(ve?ho?a?eva)

"stress-shift" plurals:

q) white man	ve?hó?e	é-ve?ho?eve	(ve?ho?eva)
r) frog	oonáhá?e	é-oonáhá?eve	(oonáhá?eva)

"-ne" plurals:

s) deer	vaot seváhne	é-vaot seváheve	vaot seváheva
t) skunk	xaóne	é-xaóneve	(xaóneva)
u) animal	hováhne	é-hováheve	(hováheva)
v) chicken	kokòheaxane	é-kokòheaxaeve	kokòheaxaeva

Just by comparing animate singulars and plurals, it would appear that Cheyenne has several classes of animate pluralizers. Alford (1977:223-24) mentions eight animate pluralizers, and there are subcategories of these.

We can see some of these "surface" pluralizers by comparing singulars and plurals of some of the above nouns (46-48). ("Surface" plurals are listed in () following a gloss.): *finger* (-no); *child* (-ho); *tree* (e>o); *god* (delete -ʔo and add -no); *feather* (delete -ʔe and add -no); *deer* (-hne); *chicken* (-ne); *man* (-oʔo); *rock* (delete -aʔ- and add -oʔo); *horse* (-me); *skunk* (delete -óʔ- and add -ne); *white man* (shift stress), etc. Needless to say, this is a difficult situation for language-learning, and these are just animate pluralizers; to be complete, we would need to list the inanimate pluralizers which also are found in several different forms!

Through positing dialectal differences, and by historical-comparative study, Alford (1977) reduces the list of animate and inanimate pluralizers (35!) to just a handful. I would like to present a variation of Alford's approach, seeing if we can "derive" singulars and plurals from the kinds of morphological alternations we can see in (46-49), and further reduce the list of productive pluralizers.

For the time being, let us restrict our discussion to the alternations involved with nouns such as (46a-m, 47a-g). The remaining "pluralizers" are basically either "stress-shift" ones, or ones involving addition of -(h)ne.²² Most linguists who have studied Cheyenne have noticed that some plurals involve "deletion" of some segment(s), usually involving a -ʔ, and addition of some other elements. Ives Goddard (personal communication) has recently presented a formula which ultimately can account for most, if not all, of such "glottal stop-deletion" alternations. Goddard has observed that Cheyenne does not allow word-final vowel sequences.²³ Instead of an expected word-final vowel sequence, Cheyenne will "copy" one of the vowels and add a glottal stop. This process can be stated as a formula which I have dubbed "Goddard's Law" (50):

$$(50) \quad V_1V_2\# \rightarrow V_1V_x\#V_2\# \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{if } V_2 \text{ is } \underline{e}, \text{ then } V_x \text{ copies } V_1; \\ \text{if } V_2 \text{ is } \underline{a} \text{ or } \underline{o}, \text{ then } V_x \text{ copies } V_2 \end{array}$$

What this means is that what could be viewed as a deletion process can best be stated as a kind of copying and insertion process. Goddard's Law turns out to be a very important rule of Cheyenne phonology. It explains the existence of many alternations in a variety of syntactic constructions.²⁴ We will see its importance as the derivation of singulars and plurals is illustrated in Chart (51).

"Underlying forms" are posited in (51) from which singulars, plurals, and obviatives can be derived, often through loss of some word-final segment(s) of the underlying forms (UF's).²⁵ This process is not just a phonological accident. A typical characteristic of Algonquian daughter languages is the "dropping" of word-final vowels, nasal consonants, or even entire syllables.²⁶ Phonologically, we see this same basic process occurring between Cheyenne UF's and "surface" singular, plurals, and obviatives. Probably the UF's more nearly reflect the PA forms from which the Cheyenne forms derive. The plurals would be next in degree of closeness to the PA forms, similar to the obviative forms, and, then, singulars would be farthest removed from the PA forms. In (51) UF segments which are deleted to form plurals (and, generally, obviatives) are underlined once, while additional segments which are deleted to form singulars are underlined twice.

		underlying form	obviative	plural	singular
(51a)	cat	poesonehe	poeson-o	poeson-o	poeso
b)	child	kaʔěškónehe	kaʔěškóneh-o	kaʔěškóneh-o	kaʔěškóne
c)	tree	/hoohtete/	hooht set-o	hooht set-o ²⁷	hooht sèst se ¹⁸
d)	god	maʔheone	maʔheon-o	maʔheon-o	maʔheoʔo (G)
e)	apple	máʔxe-méne	máʔxe-mén-o	máʔxe-mén-o	maʔxe-me
f)	ant	hátšěškéhe	hátšěškéh-o	hátšěškéh-o	hátšěške
g)	grasshopper	hahkótahē	hahkótah-o	hahkótah-o	háhkota
h)	coyote	oʔkòhoméhe	oʔkòhoméh-o	oʔkòhoméh-o	oʔkòhome
i)	feather	meeno	(meeno)	meeno	meeʔe (G)
j)	man	hetane	hetan-oho	hetane-oʔo (G)	hetane
k)	sun	ěšeʔhe	ěšeʔh-oho	ěšeʔhe-oʔo (G)	ěšeʔhe
l)	duck	šěʔše	šěʔx-o	šěʔše-oʔo (G)	šěʔše
m)	bear	náhkohe	náhkòh-oho	náhkòhe-oʔo (G)	náhkohe
n)	horse	moʔéhe-noʔhame	moʔéhe-noʔham-o	moʔéhe-noʔhame	moʔéhe-noʔha
o)	rock	hoʔhonaē	hoʔhonaaʔ-o (G)	hoʔhonaē-oʔo (G)	hoʔhonaaʔe (G)
p)	white woman	veʔhoʔaʔe	veʔhoʔaʔ-o	veʔhoʔaʔe-oʔo (G)	veʔhoʔaʔe
"stress-shift" plurals:					
q)	white man	věʔhoʔe	veʔhóʔ-o	veʔhóʔe	věʔhoʔe
r)	frog	oonàháʔe	(oonàháʔ-o)	oonàháʔe	oonàháʔe

Let us attempt some generalizations from the data of (51). We can say that the animate pluralizer for each of the forms, except for the problematical "stress-shift" plurals, is -o. The pluralizer is suffixed to the UF minus any segment(s) which have been "dropped". Just in those cases where adding the -o produces a word-final vowel sequence, Goddard's Law will apply. It is for this reason that several of the nouns have apparent -o?o "surface" pluralizers. (A "(G)" has been placed after each form where Goddard's Law has applied.)

Now, is there any historical justification for saying that Cheyenne has a productive animate pluralizer, -o? When we look at Chart (52) of PA singular, plural, and obviative suffixes, we find that the answer to this question is "yes". These suffixes were productive markings on PA verbs and nouns (Goddard 1967:68). (Throughout this paper an "*" before a non-Cheyenne form indicates a reconstructed Proto-Algonquian form.)

	Animate		Inanimate
	Proximate	Obviative	
Singular	*-a	*-ali	*-i
Plural	*-aki	*-ahi	*-ali

Some important PA to Cheyenne sound changes which have occurred, and which are relevant to this discussion are (Alford 1975:24):

- (53) PA *i > Ch. e
 PA *o > Ch. e
 PA *e > Ch. a
 PA *a > Ch. o
 PA *l > Ch. t
 PA *k, *p > Ch. Ø (for many forms)

The Cheyenne animate proximate plural reflex of *-aki is apparently -o (Goddard, personal communication). The *-ki of the PA form was evidently lost through word-final weakening in the history of PA to Cheyenne.

Obviative forms can also be derived through observing the alternations in (51). A general rule for the obviative forms seems to be: First, apply Goddard's Law to the UF (this is done to get the proper vowel sequence on (51o), *rock*). Then,

- (a) if the plural stem (minus the -o pluralizer) ends in a consonant, add -o; or
- (b) if the plural stem (minus the -o pluralizer) ends in -e, replace the -e with -o.

Many forms will, in addition, add -ho (remember that a verb governing an obviated animate absolute always was marked with -ho). I do not yet know the conditions which require this addition of -ho. Some of the answer may lie in further study of the PA forms underlying the nouns in question. Notice that the PA form for the animate obviative plural suffix was *-ahi. If we say that the final *-i was lost in the PA to Cheyenne historical development, we are left with *-ah which is the expected PA form to

underlie Cheyenne -oh, which is, of course, a part of all obviatives ending with -oho. It is conceivable that forms which only have a final -o for the Cheyenne obviative are based on PA *-ahi which has lost the entire final syllable.

We can briefly comment on the remaining PA forms in (52). Cheyenne reflexes of the inanimate plurals are easy to find. *Berry* is méne-e which is a reflex of the PA root *mi:n- *berry*; the Cheyenne final -e here is very possibly a reflex of PA *-i, the inanimate singular suffix. Cheyenne *berries* is mén-ôtse /mén-ote/ which has the Cheyenne /-ote/ inanimate plural suffix which corresponds exactly with the PA inanimate pluralizer *-ali.

I would expect, according to the sound-change correspondences, that the animate obviative singular suffix would have a Cheyenne reflex /-ote/. But I am not sure how this would fit into the Cheyenne obviative system. For one thing, Cheyenne animate obviation is number-indifferent, so we would not expect to have parallel singular and plural animate obviative suffixes. It is possible, though, that the -tse marking that we saw with "obviation" of third-person possessors may have some historical connection with the PA *-ali form in question.

It is difficult to see a Cheyenne reflex of the proximate animate singular PA suffix *-a. The expected Cheyenne reflex would be -o. That may be exactly what we have in the forms for *feather*. The Cheyenne plural today ends in -no, possibly due to analogy with other "surface" -no plurals. The singular is mee?e through loss of word-final -no and application of Goddard's Law. But the PA singular form for *feather* is *mekwana. Notice that this ends in *-na which would correspond with Cheyenne -no. Notice, also, that the Cheyenne equative sentence, *it is a feather is* é-meenove, again, with a Cheyenne -o, an -o that may be the desired reflex of PA *-a, the animate singular proximate suffix. The Cheyenne singulars for *dog* and *bird* end in -o. They are, respectively, oeškeso and ve?keso. Perhaps these also reflect the PA *-a in question.

The result of all this is a unitary explanation for the derivation of spelling of Cheyenne plurals and obviatives. We have been able to "derive" singulars, plurals, and obviatives from underlying forms, solely on the basis of synchronic morphological alternations. We have seen that our hypotheses are, at the least, plausible in the light of historical PA information. We have been able to reduce the number of productive plurals listed by Alford (1977) and Petter (1952:5). A formula, Goddard's Law, has been used which is seen to be necessary to explain many alternations in Cheyenne phonology (see footnote 23).

We have surveyed various "obviation" strategies in Cheyenne. In spite of potential differences of interpretation of the different "obviative" markings, we can say that all the forms we have seen serve a unitary function: to make it easier to identify who the participants are in an utterance and what their semantic roles are.

FOOTNOTES

¹Cheyenne is spoken in Oklahoma and on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation in southeastern Montana. In Montana, there are an estimated 2,000 Cheyenne speakers of all ages. In Oklahoma, few speakers of Cheyenne are less than 30 years of age. There are approximately 2,500 enrolled Cheyenne tribal members in Montana and 2,500 in Oklahoma. The field work on which this paper is based was conducted in Montana.

I have benefitted from discussions with Danny K. Alford, Donald Frantz, and Richard Rhodes. Published and unpublished written materials on the Cheyenne language from Frantz, Alford, and Ives Goddard have been of particular stimulation and help in the development of this paper. The present paper is data-oriented, rather than theory-oriented.

The phonemes of Cheyenne are: p, t, k, ʔ, s, ʃ, x, h, m, n, v, a, e, and o. /t/ has allophone [ts] preceding /e/. Vowel-devoicing is non-phonemic. Stress is phonemic. /h/ has allophone [ʃ] between /e/ and /k/, and [s] between /e/ and /t/. Further discussion of Cheyenne phonology can be found in Frantz (1972a).

In this paper Cheyenne transcriptions are "orthographic" ("surfacey"), unless otherwise noted. A dot over a vowel indicates that it is voiceless. (Word-final vowels of non-interrogative verbs and all nouns are predictably voiceless.) Hyphenation indicates some morpheme boundaries. Person is indicated on verbs by pronominal prefixes (for independent verbs) and suffixes. Abbreviations used are: sg=singular; pl=plural; 1=1st person sg; 11=1st person pl (exclusive); 12=1st person pl (inclusive); 2=2nd person sg; 22=2nd person pl; 3=3rd person sg (proximate); 33=3rd person pl (proximate); 4=obviative sg; 44=obviative pl; obv=obviative; incl=inclusive; excl=exclusive; dir=direct; inv=inverse; obj=object; conj=conjunct; pfx=prefix; loc=locative; indic=indicative; neg=negative; inter=interrogative; pret=preterite; pst=past; Dir=Direction; II=inanimate subject intransitive verb; AI=animate subject intransitive verb; TI=transitive verb with inanimate object; TA=transitive verb with animate object; an=animate; inan=inanimate; I=inan sg nominal; II=inan pl nominal. Subscripted notations on forms indicate "persons" involved with those forms, e.g. na-vóomo₁₋₃ is a transitive verb. The subscripted numerals indicate that there is¹⁻³ a 1st person sg subject and a 3rd person sg object. The subscripting on na-máheo₁₋₃ *my house* indicates that this is an inanimate noun possessed by a ¹⁻³ 1st person sg. I'=obv inan.

²Howlingcrane, Jeannette. "The Ground Squirrel and the Turtle."

³While "4" and "44" indicate obviate animate singular and plural, respectively, it is probably more accurate to regard an obviated nominal as a kind of "third-person" (Delisle 1973), with abbreviation, "3₁". I will be using "4's" throughout this paper, however, since they can help to keep track of participants quite easily. It is possible to think of "obviated obviatives" where we would get abbreviations "3'", "3'", "3'", etc." which can become quite cumbersome!

⁴Because of this, I will dispense with the use of "4(4)" in the remainder of this paper. The reader should remember that "4" refers to one or more obviated referents since obviation neutralizes animate number distinction

⁵"Governs" is a concept used in the framework of Relational Grammar (RG) being developed by Paul Postal, David Perlmutter, and others. A verb governs nominals (called "dependents" of the governor) associated with it such as the "terms": subject, direct object, indirect object, and "non-terms", such as benefactive, instrumental, locative, etc. For a brief explanation of some important RG concepts, see footnotes 1 and 2 in the article by Allen and Gardiner, in this volume.

⁶The appropriate principle here is stated in Relational Grammar as the "Agreement Law": Only terms (subjects, direct objects, and indirect objects) can [potentially] trigger verb agreement.

⁷I have also been given the form e-méséhoho in this situation. Either form would still indicate obviation.

⁸The TA verb stem -mév- does not take the -ho marking to show obviation of its direct object, as do other TA verbs. It nevertheless can still be considered to indicate obviation in the full form e-mévo.

⁹š→x preceding a non-front vowel, i.e. a or o in Cheyenne.

¹⁰Note that this is a slightly different use of the word "focus" from that of the introduction to this paper. There, the word was used informally; here, it is referring to a specific prominencing strategy. We might say that the difference hinges on the difference between "topic", a discourse-related notion, and "focus", a related, but different prominence strategy.

¹¹Cheyenne nominals, outside of a discourse context, can generally be translated as definite or indefinite. English, of course, requires the use of the indefinite article a in this context.

¹²Cheyenne has three orders: independent, conjunct (analogous to English dependent verbs), and imperative.

¹³Various "modes" can occur within some of the orders, e.g. indicative, negative, interrogative.

¹⁴We can consider the negative morpheme to be a discontinuous -saa...hane for II verbs and -saa...he for other verbs.

¹⁵For these examples, we can say that interrogation is indicated by "revoicing" the last normally devoiced syllable of the verb, counting consecutive syllables from the end of the word left-ward. So, in (1), below, the word-final -o (normally devoiced) would be revoiced and in (2) the penultimate -o (normally devoiced) would be revoiced.

(1)	ne-vóomo?	Did you see him?
(2)	ne-mésenotse?	Did you eat them (inan.)?

¹⁶The -am is the reflex of Proto-Algonquian *-em. It has sometimes been called a marker of a "farther" or "further" obviative (Wolfart 1973:53).

¹⁷In RG one would say that the verb "registers" the presence of the third-person possessor.

¹⁸An "excessant" [s] is inserted between an unstressed penultimate -e and an immediately following -t.

¹⁹*Apples* is inanimate in the Southern (Oklahoma) Dialect of Cheyenne. The inanimate plural is má?xe-ménótse. There would, of course, be no inanimate obviative for *apple*.

²⁰I have not actually elicited forms in parentheses but I am guessing that they are correct.

²¹Taylor (1963:131, fn. 12) points out the interesting fact that several Plains Indian languages used the same word for *white man* and *spider*.

²²Neither of these "plurals" is nearly as productive as any of the others which we will discuss. Cheyenne does have a productive system of "stress-shifting" for various grammatical and phonological patterns. It may be that "stress-shift" plurals are simply a subcategory of the larger process. With the -(h)ne plurals, it may be significant that the only nouns that I can recall which use this suffix are animal names. It is conceivable that there is some parallel here with the fact that some verb paradigms involving TA forms with "instrumental finals" have -h/-hn alternations. It may be that -h/-hn alternation is a fairly regular facet of Cheyenne morphology.

²³Apparently, Cheyenne has a phonological constraint that word-final syllables must be devoiced. A vowel sequence would not allow such devoicing, so the strategy of "Goddard's Law" functions to make a word-final vowel sequence devoiced.

²⁴Some interesting examples of the various vowel sequences undergoing Goddard's Law follow. (See PA to Cheyenne (Ch.) sound-change correspondences (53) in the text. Underlined PA segments are ones which are lost in Cheyenne's historical development.)

ae# > aa?e#

*penkwi > Ch. pahke, or pae (by k-deletion) > paa?e *ashes*

*newa:pameko:ki > Ch. na-vóomae > na-vóomaa?e *they see me*
(cf. na-vóomaene *he sees us (excl.)*)

ee# > ee?e#

Ch. UF meeno > mee > mee?e *feather* (cf. meeno *feathers*)

*wi:ki > Ch. vée > vée?e *teepee*

oe# > oo?e#

*-api sit (AI suffix) > Ch. oe > oo?e, e.g. é-hoo?e *he's sitting (here)*
(cf. é-hoeo?o *they are (here)*)

aa# > aa?a# (no Ch. forms readily available)

ea# > ea?a#

e-méa > e-méa?a *he gave (it) away*

(cf. e-méavo he-voestato *He₃ gave away his₄ belt.*)

oa# > oa?a#

hotóa > hotóa?a *buffalo* (cf. hotóao > hotóao?o *buffaloes*;
hotóa-vóoma *buffalo robe*)

eo# > eo?o#

*mye:xkana:wi > Ch. méon > méo > méo?o *path*
(cf. méonótse *paths*)

ao# > ao?o#

é-tâhpeta *he is big* / é-tâhpetao > é-tâhpetao?o *they are big*)

oo# > oo?o#

*-a:pa *see* (root) > Ch. óo > óo?o, e.g. é-tsetóo > é-tsetóo?o *he is looking* (cf. na-vóomo *I see him*)

Goddard's Law must apply before /-te/ is suffixed to a form. Notice the alternations below:

é-ho?soo?e *he is dancing* / é-ho?soeo?o *they are dancing* / ho?soo?èstse / ho?soo?ete / *Dance (sg.)!*

tse-ve?evotoo?e *cave* (inan. conjunct nominal) / tse-ve?evotoo?ee?èstse *caves*

*či:paya *corpse* > Ch. séo + tse > séo?ótse *corpse* (cf. séoto *corpses*)

²⁵I am not necessarily claiming that the UF's were ever actually spoken. But I would guess that something close to them probably was.

²⁶See Haas (1966).

²⁷One hypothesis is that if a noun stem ended in -e, it was "replaced" by -o to form the plural. The same rule is very productive in the derivation of obviatives, see below, in text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alford, D. 1975. Linguistic speculation on the pre-history of the Cheyenne people. In Papers of the Sixth Algonquian Conference, 1974. National Museums of Canada. Ottawa, pp. 10-29.
- , 1977. A plurality puzzle unraveled. In Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Aubin, G.F. 1975. A Proto-Algonquian dictionary. National Museums of Canada. Ottawa.
- Bloomfield, L. 1962. The Menomini language. Ed. by C. F. Hockett. New Haven, Conn.
- Delisle, G. 1973. On the so-called fourth person in Algonkian. In Working Papers on Language Universals No. 12, pp. 69-83. Stanford University, Stanford.
- English-Cheyenne student dictionary. 1976. The Language Research Department of the Northern Cheyenne Title VII ESEA Bilingual Education Program. Lama Deer, Montana.
- Frantz, D. 1972a. Cheyenne distinctive features and phonological rules. IJAL 38.6-13.
- , 1972b. The origin of Cheyenne pitch accent. IJAL 38.223-25.
- Goddard, I. 1967. The Algonquian independent indicative. In Contributions to Anthropology: Linguistics I, Bulletin 214, pp. 66-106. National Museum of Canada. Ottawa.
- Haas, M. 1966. Vowels and semivowels in Algonkian. Language 42.479-88.
- Howlingcrane, J. 1977. The ground squirrel and the turtle. In Cheyenne short stories. Montana Council for Indian Education. Billings, Montana.
- Petter, R. 1952. Cheyenne grammar. Mennonite Publication Office. Newton, Kansas.
- Rhodes, R. 1976. The morphosyntax of the Central Ojibwa verb. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation. University of Michigan. Ann Arbor.
- Rogers, J. 1975. Prediction of transitive animate verbs in an Ojibwa dialect. IJAL 41.114-39.
- Taylor, A. 1963. Comparative Caddoan. IJAL 29.113-131.
- Wolfart, H.C. 1973. Plains Cree: a grammatical study. The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.