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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.\(^2\)

\[
\text{mélne-vōhkāho}\_\text{heso}_3 \text{ naa ma\_\text{eno}_3} \text{ é\_\text{sta\_eve\_amēhnāhoono}_33}. \\
\text{ground squirrel}_3 \text{ and turtle}_3 \text{ they}_3 \text{ were walking along.}
\]

\[
\text{é\_\text{h\_me\_etoevōhoono}_44\_\text{33}} \text{ tsē\_ohke\_mēvāevose}_44\_\text{33}; \\
\text{they}_44 \text{ discovered them}_33 \text{ those}_44 \text{ who eat them}_33 \\
\text{Those who eat them discovered them;}
\]

\[
\text{é\_h\_nāha\_\text{enaevōhoono}_44\_\text{33}} \text{ nē\_\text{ta\_na\_honeo}_\text{3}_12\_\text{33};} \\
\text{they}_44 \text{ grabbed them}_33 \text{ let\_'s}_12 \text{ kill them}_33 \\
\text{They grabbed them.} \text{ "Let's kill them;}
\]

\[
\text{nē\_\text{sta\_mēvoneo}_\text{1}_12\_\text{33}} \text{ é\_\text{x\_hetaevōhoono}_44\_\text{33}. taaxa\_e} \\
\text{let\_'s}_12 \text{ eat them}_33 \text{ they}_44 \text{ said to them}_33 \text{ let\_'s see} \\
\text{let\_'s eat them!} \text{ they said to them.} \text{ "Let's see} \\
\text{é\_\text{ohke\_tonē\text{šēvēsesto}_33}? \text{ é\_\text{x\_hestōhehoo}_\text{3}_x\_\text{x-3}} \text{ mélne-vōhkāho\_heso}_3 \\
\text{what do they}_33 \text{ habitually do? he}_3 \text{ was told ground squirrel}_3 \\
\text{what do they do?" the ground squirrel was told.}
\]

\[
\text{nā\_\text{ohkē\_ho\_soo\_e}_1, \text{ é\_\text{x\_hehoo}_\text{3}_g}} \\
\text{I\_ habitually dance, he}_3 \text{ said} \\
\text{"I dance," he said.}
\]
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'. 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?o1 house
   b) na-māheo?o1-1 my house
   c) ne-māheo?o2-1 your house
   d) ne-māheonôtse2-II your houses
   e) he-māheo?o3-1 his house
   f) he-māheonôtse3-11 his houses
   g) he-māheonevo33-1 their house
   h) he-māheonevôtse33-II their houses

(2a) (an) mā-htóna3-3 someone's daughter
   b) nā-htóna1-3 my daughter
   c) nā-htónahol-33 my daughters
   d) né-stóna2-3 your daughter
   e) né-stónâhevo22-3 your (pl) daughter
   f) né-stónâhevo?o22-33 your (pl) daughters
   g) he-stónahol3-4(4) his daughter(s)
   h) he-stónâhevohol33-4(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-stónahol 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) màheo?o e-tāhpe?o The house is big.
  b) na-màheo?o e-tāhpe?o My house is big.
  c) he-màheo?o *e-tāhpe?o His house is big.
  d) he-màheo?o e-tāhpe?ótsë His house is big.
  e) he-màheonôtse e-tāhpe?onétsë His houses are big.
  f) na-màheonôtse e-tāhpe?onétsë My houses are big.
  g) he-màheonevo e-tāhpe?ótsë Their house is big.
  h) he-màheonevótsë e-tāhpe?onétsë Their houses are big.

(4a) mútišëške e-onenexo The knife is broken.
  b) ne-mútišëške e-onenexo Your knife is broken.
  c) he-mútišëške e-onenëxótsë His knife is broken.

(5a) na-amāho?hestótsë e-ma?o My car is red.
  b) he-amāho?hestótsë e-ma?ótsë His car is red.
  c) he-amāho?hestovevo e-ma?ótsë Their car is red.

(6a) ne-voestato e-peva?e Your belt is pretty.
  b) he-voestato e-peva?ótsë His belt is pretty.

(7a) na-mahpe e-héesëvo?ta My water is boiling.
  b) he-mahpe e-héesëvo?tótse 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 obviative 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 verb\(^6\) (e.g. compare 3b and 3f, 3g and 3h).

(8a) na-mâheonane e-tâhpe?o Our (excl) house is big.
    b) na-mâheonanôtse e-tâhpe?onêstse 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) nâ-hîtona\(_{1-3}\) e-nêixohtahê\(_{3}\) My daughter is cute.
    b) nâ-hîtonaho\(_{1-33}\) e-nêixohtâhe\(_{33}\) My daughters are cute.
    c) ka'êskoneho\(_{33}\) e-nêixohtâhe\(_{33}\) The children are cute.
    d) he-stônaho\(_{3-4}\) *e-nêixohtâhe\(_{33}\) His daughters are cute.\(^4\)
    e) he-stônaho\(_{3-4}\) e-nêixohtâhe\(_{3}h0\) His daughter(s) is/are cute.

(10a) na-e?ha\(_{1-3}\) é-haaena\(_{3}\) My son is hungry.
    b) he-e?haho\(_{3-4}\) é-haaenaho\(_{4}\) His son(s) is/are hungry.

(11a) é-ho\(_{2-3}\) e-pevetano\(_{3}\) Your father is happy.
    b) he-ho\(_{3-4}\) e-pevetanoho\(_{4}\) 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?oëstse\(_{1-1}\) ho?évohkôtse\(_{1}\) I boiled the meat.
    b) hetane\(_{3}\) é-ho?oëstse\(_{3-1}\) ho?évohkôtse\(_{1}\) The man boiled the meat.
    c) hetane\(_{3}\) he-e?haho\(_{3-4}\) é-ho?oëstsetse\(_{4-1}\) The man's son boiled the meat.

Notice that we get the same marking here as we saw under II verbs: òtse. 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-vóohta₁-māheo?o₁ I see the house.
    b) na-vóohta₁-ne-māheo?o₂ I see your house.
    c) na-vóohtanötse₁-ne-māheonötse₂ I see your houses.
    d) na-vóohtanonestse₁-ne-māheonötse₂ We (excl) see your houses.
    e) na-vóohtomovo₁-he-māheo?o₃ I see his house.
    f) na-vóohtomovötse₁-he-māheonötse₃ I see his houses.
    g) na-vóohtomovo₁-he-māheonevö₃ I see their house.
    h) na-vóohtomovötse₁-he-māheonevötse₃ I see their houses.
    i) na-vóohtanone₁-ne-māheo?o₂ 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-vóohta₃-na-māheo?o₁ He sees my house.
    b) e-vóohta₃-he-māheo?o₃ He₃ sees his₃ house.
    c) e-vóohtomovo₃-he-māheo?o₄ He₃ sees his₄ house.
    d) e-vóohtomovonovo₃-he-māheo?o₄ They₃ see his₄ house.
    e) e-vóohtomovonötse₃-ne-māheonötse₄ They₃ see his₄ houses.
    f) e-vóohtanovo₃-na-māheo?o₁ 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 mótsëške I broke the knife.
    b) na-e?e?o?tse ne-mótsëške I broke your knife.
    c) *na-e?e?o?tse he-mótsëške I broke his knife.
    d) na-e?e?o?tovo he-mótsëške I broke his knife.
    f) e-e?e?o?tse na-mótsëške He broke my knife.
    g) e-e?e?o?tse he-mótsëške He₃ broke his₃ knife.
    h) e-e?e?o?tovo he-mótsëške He₃ broke his₄ knife.
    i) na-e?e?o?tovötse he-mótsëškeohtse I broke his knives.
    j) na-e?e?o?tosenötse ne-mótsëškeohtse I broke your knives.
(17a) na-ho?eotséstomovo he-maahe I brought his arrow.
  b) na-ho?eotséstese na-maahe I brought my arrow.

(18a) na-meavoa maahe I gave away the arrow.
  b) na-meavoa na-maahe I gave away your arrow.
  c) na-meavoa he-maahe I gave away his arrow.

AI:
(19a) na-ve?še-vóosane amé-hóomáhtséstötse I see by means of the mirror.
  b) na-ve?še-vóosanevo he-ame-hoomahtsestotse I see by means of his mirror.

TAI:
(20a) ne-métsevo he-móxe?éstoo?o You gave me his book.
  b) ne-métsevonotse he-móxe?éstoonotse You gave me his books.
  c) ne-métatsevo he-móxe?éstoo?o I gave you his book.
  d) na-métatanevo he-móxe?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-vóomátse 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.

  b) na-e?e?o?xo na-mo?eško I broke my finger.
  d) na-e?e?o?xamoho he-mo?eškono I broke his finger(s).
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-méséheo?o33 The men are eating.
  c) (AI) hetanoho4 e-méséheho4 The man/men (obv) is/are eating.
  d) (AI) he-e?haho3-4 e-méséheho4 His son(s) is/are eating.
  e) (AI) še?še3 e-méséhe3 The duck is eating.
f) (TA) \( ná-mévo_{1-3} šé?ʃe_{3} \) I am eating the duck.

g) (TA) \( hétane_{3} e-mévo_{3-4} šé?xo_{4} \) The man is eating the duck(s).

h) (TA) \( hétane_{3} hē-e?ḥaho_{3-4} e-mévo_{4-5} šé?xo_{5} \) The man's son(s) is/are eating the duck(s).

i) (TA) \( šé?xo_{4} e-mévo_{4-5} he-neno_{5} \) The duck (obv) is eating the tomato (obv).

The AI verb root for \textit{eat} is \(-mēseh(e)\), while the TA verb root is \(-mēv-\). (The pronominal prefix and suffixes are attached to the TA root.) Note that the obviated form for \textit{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 bookkeeping 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) \( ná-vóomo_{1-3} hétane_{3} \) I see the man.

b) (inverse) \( ná-vóoma_{3-1} hétane_{3} \) The man sees me.

c) (direct) \( hétane_{3} e-vóomo_{3-4} oeskéseho_{4} \) The man sees the dog.

d) (direct) \( oeskéseho_{4} e-vóomo_{3-4} hétane_{3} \) The man sees the dog.

e) (inverse) \( hétanoho_{4} e-vóomaeʃe_{4-3} oeskeso_{3} \) The man sees the dog.

f) (inverse) \( oeskeso_{3} e-vóomaeʃe_{4-3} hétanoho_{4} \) The man sees the dog.

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. 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. 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.)
We could gloss (25g) and (25h) as a passive sentence, *The man was seen by the dog*, an appropriate utterance in our imaginary 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 imaginary 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).

Let us now consider some other inverse forms:

**TA:**

(26a) kaʔeškone3 na-veʔhóoma3-1 The child is looking at me.
   b) ná-htóna1-3 na-veʔhóoma3-1 My daughter is looking at me.
   c) he-stónaho3-4 na-veʔhóomachtse Her daughter(s) is/are looking at me.

(27a) hóhtséme3 na-náhaʔeʔovo3-1 The ball hit me.
   b) he-stóhtsémio3-4 na-náhaʔeʔovetsenoto 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) maahe1 na-ńańaʔeʔooʔe1-I The arrow hit me.
   b) ne-maahe2-I na-ńańaʔeʔooʔe1-I Your arrow hit me.
   c) he-maahe3-I na-ńańaʔeʔoętse1-I-1 His arrow hit me.
   d) he-maahe3-I ne-ńańaʔeʔoętsese1-2 His arrow hit you.
   e) he-maahtse3-II ne-ńańaʔeʔoętsetse1-2 His arrows hit you.

(29a) ná-hohtana1-I amáhoʔhestótse1 I ran over the car.
   b) ná-hohtanaa2-I amáhoʔhestótse1 The car ran over me.
   c) *ná-hohtanaʔevo amáhoʔhestótse3-I His car ran over me.
   d) ná-hohtanaʔevo1-1 amáhoʔhestótse3-I His car ran over me.
So far we have looked at examples from only one of the "orders" in Cheyenne, i.e. the independent order, and from only the "indicative mode" 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 ْتَسُي morpheme that we have seen several times. This is exactly what happens in Central Ojibwa with the -ini cognate of Cheyenne ْتَسُي (Rhodes 1976:206).

CONJUNCT:

(30a) ْتَسُ ـ ەوۆنت ـ ەس ـ ەن ـ ەس

b) ْتَسُـ ـ ەوۆنت ـ ەس

c) ْتَسُـ ـ ەوۆنت ـ ەس

d) ْتَسُ ـ ەوۆنت ـ ەس

e) ەوەـمەو ـ ەتۆ ـ ێـ ـ ەس ـ ەن ـ ەس
f) ەوەـمەو ـ ەتۆ ـ ێـ ـ ەس

g) ەوەمەو ـ ەتۆ ـ ێـ ـ ەس ـ ەن ـ ەس

In (30g) the obviated nominal is a conjunct relative (sometimes called a "conjunct nominal"), ْتَسُ ـ ەوۆنت ـ ەس, a conjunct order dependent of an independent verb, ەوەـمەو ـ ەتۆ. In (32) both nominals are of the conjunct order. The two nominals together form a job title.

(31) ْتَسُ ـ نەـئەحەتوۆتوەطـ ـ ەس

(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) ەوەمەو ـ کەحەن ـ ەئ 1 ـ ێـ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تە~ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تە~ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تە~ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تە~ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تە~ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تە~ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ T

b) ەوەمەو ـ کەحەن ـ ەئ 3 ـ ێـ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ T

(33a) ەوەمەو ـ کەحەن ـ ەئ 1 ـ ێـ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ تەـ ـ ەکەـ 1 ـ ێ ـ T

b) ەوەمەو ـ کەحەن ـ ەئ 3 ـ ێـ ـ T
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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-mâheo?o é-tâhpe?o  
My house is big.

b) (neg) na-mâheo?o é-saa-tâhpe?ô-hane  
My house is not big.

c) (inter) ne-mâheo?o é-tâhpe?ô?  
Is your house big?

d) (indic) he-mâheo?o é-tâhpe?ôtse  
His house is big.

e) (inter) he-mâheo?o é-tâhpe?ôtse?  
Is his house big?

f) (neg) he-mâheo?o é-saa-tâhpe?ô-hané-hetse  
His house is not big.

AI:

(35a) (indic) ná-htôtse é-môsâškanâhe  
My pet is brown.

b) (neg) ná-htôtse é-saa-môsâškanâhé-he  
My pet is not brown.

c) (inter) nê-stôtse é-môsâškanâhe?  
Is your pet brown?

d) (indic) he-stôtseho é-môsâškanâheho  
His pet is brown.

e) (inter) he-stôtseho é-môsâškanâhevo?  
Is his pet brown?

f) (neg) he-stôtseho é-saa-môsâškanâhé-he-ho  
His pet is not brown.

TI:

(36a) (indic) na-vôohta ne-mâheo?o  
I saw your house.

b) (neg) ná-saa-vôohtô-he ne-mâheo?o  
I did not see your house.

c) (inter) ne-vôohta na-mâheo?o?  
Did you see my house?

d) (indic) na-vôohtomovo he-mâheo?o  
I saw his house?

e) (neg) ná-saa-vôohtomovô-he he-mâheo?o  
I did not see his house.

TA:

(37a) (indic) na-vâomo  
I saw him.

b) (neg) ná-saa-vâomô-he  
I did not see him.

c) (inter) ne-vâomo?  
Did you see him?

d) (indic) e-vâomoho  
He3 saw him4.

e) (neg) é-saa-vâomô-he-ho  
He3 did not see him4.

f) (neg) é-saa-vâomae-he-ho  
He4 did not see him3.

CONJUNCT:

(38a) e-vôomoho tsê-saa-?a?xâmâ-he-tse-he  
He3 saw the one4 who wasn't crying.

b) he-vôhkâha?e tsê-saa-tâho?tá-hané-hetse tâxêmésâhestova e-vo?komôtse  
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-tá-hoo?ohtse t sé-h-voona?o I went home this morning.
     1-toward-go home conj pfx-pret-morning
b) é-tá-hoo?ohtse t sé-h-voona?o He went home this morning.
c) é-tá-hoo?ohtse t sé-h-voona?óts e He went home this morning.
   -morning:obv
d) ná-tá-hoo?ohtse *t sé-h-voona?óts e 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 obvative 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) t sé-sta-es e-nenove?xove ná-h-nemene After a little while I sang.
     conj pfx-pst-already-certain time 1-pret-sing
b) t sé-sta-es e-nenove?xové-tse é-h-nemene After a little while he sang.
    -obv

(41a) ná-tá-htse?ohtse 1 John 3 he-máheone 3-I(Dir) I am going to John's house.
b) e-tá-htse?ohtse 3 Johnevaho 4 he-máheone 4-I(Dir) He is going to John's house.

(42a) ná-so?e-eve-amoo?o?e anöheto t sé-h-mena?o?e evé-tse
     1-still-continue-stand down conj pfx-where-enclosed
I was still standing down in the enclosed area.
b) é-so?e-eve-amoo?o?e anöheto t sé-h-mena?o?e 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 -tse 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 -tse) 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 -tse in dependent verbs. This might also be pertinent to its use as a label for any other situation in which verbs require -tse 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) na-hestanomevo1-3 maahe1-
I took the arrow from him.

b) na-hestanomevo1-3 he-maahe3-I
I took his arrow from him.

c) na-hestanomeva3-1 na-maahe1-I
He took my arrow from me.

d) né-hestanomevátse1-2 ne-maahe2-I
I took your arrow from you.

e) né-hestanomevátse1-2 he-maahe3-I
I took his arrow from you.

f) né-hestanomevo2-3 na-maahe1-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-vómoho3-4 he-e?haho3-4
He3 saw his3 son(s)4.

b) e-vóohta3-I he-mâheo?o3-I
He3 saw his3 house.

(45a) e-vómamohó3-5 he-e?haho4-5
He3 saw his4 son(s)5.

b) e-vóohtomovo3-1 he-mâheo?o4-1
He3 saw his4 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 ñtse) 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 absolutive 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 possessor\textsuperscript{17} 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/.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>obviative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(46a) daughter</td>
<td>-htóna</td>
<td>-htóna ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) finger</td>
<td>mo?eško</td>
<td>mo?eškono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) cat</td>
<td>poeso</td>
<td>poeso no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) child</td>
<td>ka?eškóne</td>
<td>ka?eškóne ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) ball</td>
<td>hóhtseme</td>
<td>hóhtsemo (no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) tree</td>
<td>hoohtsestse,</td>
<td>hoohtseto,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) shirt</td>
<td>éstse?he</td>
<td>éstse?heno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) god</td>
<td>ma?heo?o</td>
<td>ma?heono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) apple</td>
<td>má?xe-me</td>
<td>má?xe-méno\textsuperscript{19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) snake</td>
<td>šé?šenovótse,</td>
<td>šé?šenovoto,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) ant</td>
<td>hátšeške,</td>
<td>hátšeškého,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) grasshopper</td>
<td>háhkota</td>
<td>háhkótao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) coyote</td>
<td>o?kóhome</td>
<td>o?kóhomého</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) feather</td>
<td>meene</td>
<td>meeno (meeno)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) deer</td>
<td>vaotseva</td>
<td>vaotseváhne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) skunk</td>
<td>xaó?o</td>
<td>xaóne (xaóne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) animal</td>
<td>hova</td>
<td>hováhne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) chicken</td>
<td>kokóheaxa</td>
<td>kokóheaxane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>obviative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(47a) man</td>
<td>metane</td>
<td>metane ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) woman</td>
<td>he?e</td>
<td>he?eo?o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sun</td>
<td>éše?he</td>
<td>éše?heo?o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) duck</td>
<td>šé?śe</td>
<td>šé?šeo?o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) bear</td>
<td>nákhohe</td>
<td>nákhoheo?o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) horse</td>
<td>mo?éhë-no?ha</td>
<td>mo?éhë-no?háme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So-called "stress-shift" plurals behave similarly to the forms in (47) as we can see in (48).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>obviative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spider-21</td>
<td>b) frog</td>
<td>oónâha?e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) fish</td>
<td>nôma?ne</td>
<td>nomâ?ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?konevenéstse they (inan.) are heads (of bodies). Some equative and locative constructions are given in (49) along with the plurals of nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plural</th>
<th>equative</th>
<th>locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td>poesonono</td>
<td>é-poesonêheve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) tree</td>
<td>hooht seto</td>
<td>é-hooht set seve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) god</td>
<td>ma?heono</td>
<td>é-ma?heoneve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) apple</td>
<td>má?xe-méno</td>
<td>é-ma?xe-méneve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) grasshopper</td>
<td>hahkô.ta ho</td>
<td>é-hahkô.ta heve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) coyote</td>
<td>o?kôhomého</td>
<td>é-o?kôhoméheve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) feather</td>
<td>meeno</td>
<td>é-meenove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) man</td>
<td>hetaneo?o</td>
<td>é-hetaneve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) bear</td>
<td>nákôhêheo?o</td>
<td>é-nákôhêheve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"stress-shift" plurals:

| r) frog | oonâhá?e | é-oonâhá?eve | (oonâhá?eva) |

"-ne" plurals:

| s) deer | vaotsevâhne | é-vaotsevâheve | vaotsevâheva |
| t) skunk | xaóne | é-xaóneve | (xaóneva) |
| u) animal | hovâhne | é-hovâheve | (hovâheva) |
| v) chicken | kokôheaxane | é-kokôheaxaeve | kokôheaxaeva |

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 -?o and add -no); feather (delete -?e and add -no); deer (-hne); chicken (-ne); man (-o?o); rock (delete -a? and add -o?o); horse (-me); skunk (delete -?i 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 -hne. Most linguists who have studied Cheyenne have noticed that some plurals involve "deletion" of some segment(s), usually involving a ?, 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. 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):

\[ V_1 V_2 \rightarrow V_1 \tilde{V}_x \tilde{V}_2 \quad \text{if } V_2 \text{ is } \tilde{a}, \text{ then } V_x \text{ copies } V_1; \]
\[ \text{if } V_2 \text{ is } \tilde{e} \text{ or } \tilde{o}, \text{ then } V_x \text{ copies } V_2 \]

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. 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). 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. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying Form</th>
<th>Obviative</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(51a) cat</td>
<td>poesonehe</td>
<td>poeson-o</td>
<td>poeso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) child</td>
<td>ka?eskonehe</td>
<td>ka?eskoneh-o</td>
<td>ka?eskone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) tree</td>
<td>/hoohtete/</td>
<td>hooht set-o</td>
<td>hooht set-o27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) god</td>
<td>ma?heone</td>
<td>ma?heon-o</td>
<td>ma?heo?o (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) apple</td>
<td>ma?xe-mene</td>
<td>ma?xe-mén-o</td>
<td>ma?xe-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) ant</td>
<td>hátšeskéhe</td>
<td>hátšeskéh-o</td>
<td>hátšeské</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) grasshopper</td>
<td>hahkotane</td>
<td>hahkotah-o</td>
<td>hahkota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) coyote</td>
<td>o?kóhoméne</td>
<td>o?kóhoméh-o</td>
<td>o?kóhome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) feather</td>
<td>meeno</td>
<td>(meeno)</td>
<td>meeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) man</td>
<td>hetane</td>
<td>hetan-oho</td>
<td>hetane-o?o (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) sun</td>
<td>GLenum</td>
<td>GLenum</td>
<td>GLenum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) duck</td>
<td>GLenum</td>
<td>GLenum</td>
<td>GLenum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) bear</td>
<td>náhkohe</td>
<td>náhkóh-oho</td>
<td>náhkóh-o?o (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) horse</td>
<td>mo?he-no?hame</td>
<td>mo?he-no?ham-o</td>
<td>mo?he-no?ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) rock</td>
<td>ho?honae</td>
<td>ho?honaa?-o (G)</td>
<td>ho?honaa?e (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) frog</td>
<td>oónáha?e</td>
<td>(oonáha?-o)</td>
<td>oónáha?e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"stress-shift" plurals:
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.)

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

- PA *i > Ch. e
- PA *o > Ch. e
- PA *e > Ch. a
- PA *a > Ch. o
- PA *l > Ch. t
- PA *k, *p > Ch. 0 (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), roak). 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 mène-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 ětse 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 mее?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 singualrs for dog and bird end in -o. They are, respectively, oeškeso and veʔkeso. 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" singualrs, 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.
1 Cheyenne 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, ?, s, s, 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; II=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=conjunction; 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-vëməmoò is a transitive verb. The subscripted numerals indicate that there is a 1st person sg subject and a 3rd person sg object. The subscripting on na-məheoʔo my house indicates that this is an inanimate noun possessed by a 1-1st person sg. I'=obv inan.

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

3 While "4" and "44" indicate obviating 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, "3'. 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!

4 Because 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.
"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.

The 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.

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

The 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.

§ preceded a non-front vowel, i.e. a or o in Cheyenne.

Note 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 prominence 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.

Cheyenne 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.

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

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

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

For 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.

Did you see him?
Did you eat them (inan.)?

The -am is the reflex of Proto-Algonquian *-em. It has sometimes been called a marker of a "farther" or "further" obviative (Wolfart 1973:53).
17 In RG one would say that the verb "registers" the presence of the third-person possessor.

18 An "exsessant" [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 máxe-ménótse. There would, of course, be no inanimate obviative for apple.

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

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

22 Neither 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.

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

24 Some 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#
    *penkwí > Ch. pahke, or pae (by k-deletion) > paa?e ašhes
    *newà:pameko:ki > Ch. na-vómæ > na-vómää?e they see me
        (cf. na-vómǽne 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-hoo?o they are (here)
    aa# > aa?aa# (no Ch. forms readily available)
    ea# > ea?aa#
    e-méa > e-méa?a he gave (it) away
        (cf. e-méavo he-voestato he gave away his belt.)
    oa# > oo?aa#
    hotóá > hotóá?a buffalo (cf. hotóao > hotóao?o buffaloes;
        hotóá-vómǽna buffalo robe)
Goddard's Law must apply before /-te/ is suffixed to a form. Notice the alternations below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e-ho?soo?e} & \quad \text{he is dancing} \\
\text{e-ho?soo?o} & \quad \text{they are dancing} \\
\text{ho?soo?ete} & \quad \text{Dance} \\
\text{tse-ve?evotoo?e} & \quad \text{cave} \\
\text{tse-ve?evotoo?ee?estse} & \quad \text{caves}
\end{align*}
\]

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

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


27 One 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.
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