A Synthesis of Obviation in Algonquian Languages

by

Irina Volchok

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Linguistics

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Abstract

One of the most prominent features of the Algonquian languages of North America is obviation, a third person referencing system. Although it has been known for nearly 400 years, linguists are still debating about its role and function. This work seeks to synthesize what is already known about obviation and what is still unresolved. More specifically, it looks at the syntactic and discourse working principles of obviation in different types of noun phrases, and in single, conjoined, complement, and adverbial clauses, as well as in narratives and in elicitation.

Table of Contents

Chapter I

Introduction

The Algonquian languages form one of the largest and best known linguistic families in North America. Among their more noteworthy features are their so-called "polysynthetic" structure, elaborate verb paradigms, relatively free word order, and a third person referencing system known as obviation. Although obviation was first noticed nearly 400 years ago, its role is still the subject of debate among linguists; this work seeks to provide a comprehensive summary of what is known, and what is still unresolved.

This chapter opens with an inventory of the Algonquian languages, giving their historical and modern locations, noteworthy publications, and their current status, followed by an outline of their classification into subgroups and a brief history of prior research on Algonquian languages. It concludes with a summary of earlier descriptions and definitions of obviation as well as an overview of the work as a whole.

1.1 Geographical Location of Algonquian Languages

The Algonquian languages constitute a family of Native American languages that stretch from the east coast of North America to the Rocky Mountains. This family of about three dozen languages has three geographical subdivisions: Eastern, Central, and Plains. Only the Eastern languages form a genealogical unit that underwent its own development as a whole after splitting off from the Proto-Algonquian parent language (Goddard 1967, 1974a, 1979). On the other hand, the Central and Plains subdivisions are "merely convenient geographic groupings" (Goddard 1978b:583). A general description of each subdivision appears below.

The Eastern Algonquian branch consists of at least 18 languages formerly spoken along

the Atlantic coast of North America and adjoining inland areas from the Maritimes to North Carolina. What is known about each individual language varies widely. For some languages, only one or two documents containing words and phrases collected by missionaries, explorers or settlers are available. For others, not only do descriptions embodying words and phrases exist, but also texts and full-scale grammars (Goddard 1978a). A general description of each language follows.

Micmac, or Mi'kmaq, was historically spoken in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, eastern New Brunswick, southern Newfoundland and the Gaspé Peninsula of Québec (Mithun 1999:328). There are published reference grammars by Maillard (1864) and Pacifique (1990). Dictionaries have been compiled by Rand (1888) and DeBlois (1996). Texts are found in DeBlois (1991). Presently, there are 7,140 speakers of Micmac (Canada Census 2017) with "a fair amount of dialectal diversity in the present-day language" (Goddard 1978a:70).

The name Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is used by linguists to refer to the language spoken with only minute differences by the Maliseet in western New Brunswick and the Passamaquoddy in eastern Maine. An early description of morphology is found in Prince (1914) and texts were published in Prince (1909, 1921). Grammatical sketches include the work of Teeter (1971) and Leavitt (1996). A large dictionary has been published by Francis & Leavitt (2008) based on materials compiled by Philip S. LeSourd. There are 355 speakers of Maliseet (Canada Census 2017); however, there is no data available for Passamaquoddy. Goddard (1978a:71) reports that there were 600 speakers of Maliseet and 200 speakers of Passamaquoddy in 1970.

Etchemin is said to have been spoken in the area between the Kennebec and the Saint John rivers; it is known only from a list of numbers from 'one' to 'ten' collected by Lescarbot in the early 17th century (Goddard 1978a:70).

Eastern Abenaki was spoken in central and eastern Maine. The Caniba dialect was spoken along the Kennebec River and by the Wawenock at the Bécancour mission (Mithun 1999:329). The Penobscot dialect was documented by Prince (1910), Voorhis (1979, 1982), and especially by Frank T. Siebert, Jr. (1996). All dialects are now extinct.

Western Abenaki was the language of various displaced groups from Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire who moved to the Saint Francis mission village at the beginning of the 19th century (Goddard 1978a:71). Western Abenaki materials include texts, grammatical discussions (Laurent 1884, Prince 1901), and a dictionary (Day 1994-95). The language is now extinct.

The name *Loup* (French 'wolf') was used by the French to refer to several Algonquian groups (Day 1975). Loup A was spoken in the central New England area. Loup B typologically resembles Western Abenaki and Mahican; it was spoken in the Saint Francis mission village and in the mission villages of Stockbridge, on the upper Housatonic, and Shecomeco, in Dutchess County, New York (Goddard 1978a:72). The only records of these languages are word lists that were recorded at the northern missions from refugees. For Loup A, there is a 124-page manuscript by Jean-Claude Mathevet (Day 1975). For Loup B, there is a 13-page wordlist by an unidentified French missionary (Goddard 1978a). The most recent noteworthy publications are Gustafson (2000) and Goddard (2016). Both languages died out in the 18th century.

Massachusett was spoken on the coast and islands of southeastern New England. The most extensive records of the language were made by John Eliot, who translated the entire Bible into Massachusett (1663) and published a brief grammar (1666). A modern grammar is included in Goddard & Bragdon's *Native writings in Massachusett* (1988). Massachusett became extinct around the end of the 19th century.

Narragansett was spoken in southern Rhode Island. The only substantial description of the language was published by Roger Williams in 1643. Narragansett has been extinct since the beginning of the 19th century (Mithun 1999:330).

"A group of dialects Mohegan-Pequot-Montauk was spoken in eastern Connecticut (Mohegan, Pequot) and across the Sound on the eastern end of Long Island (Montauk)" (Mithun 1999:330). The earliest record of Mohegan is attributed to James Noyes (1690). Additional Mohegan material was recorded from Fidelia Fielding (1827-1908), the last known speaker; a diary she kept from 1902-05 was published with facing page translation by Speck (1928). A vocabulary of Montauk was recorded by Gardiner in 1798 (Mithun 1999:330).

The Quiripi lived around Branford, Connecticut. In 1658, Pierson (or Peirson) published a translation of the catechism—the only record of the language, which has been extinct since the 18th century.

In 1791, Thomas Jefferson noted that speakers of Unquachog, Shinnecock, and Montauk "can barely understand each other" (Jefferson 1982:468). His notes attest quite a few points of difference between Unquachog and Montauk. However, the Shinnecock data "are too sparse to permit any precise statements about its dialectal affiliation" (Goddard 1978a:72). All three languages became extinct around the beginning of the 19th century.

Mahican was spoken in the area from Lake Champlain south along the Hudson River to Dutchess County, New York. Mahican is "known primarily from two missions established in the 18th century, one by Baptists at Stockbridge in the Berkshires, the other by Moravians at Shecomeco in Dutchess County" (Mithun 1999:331). In the 1830s, the Mahicans migrated west and resided among the Wisconsin Stockbridges. This is where the language was last spoken (Mithun 1999:331). Mahican records include a dictionary by the Moravian missionary Johann

Jacob Schmick (Masthay 1991) and grammatical notes on the Stockbridge dialect (Edwards 1788). Various aspects of Mahican have been discussed by Goddard (2008). Mahican died out before the middle of the 20th century.

Munsee was spoken in "an unknown number of dialects" (Goddard 1978a:72) from western Long Island and southeastern New York State south to the Delaware Water Gap and the Raritan River. In the 19th century, Munsee speakers lived at Munceytown, Moraviantown, and on the Six Nations Reserve in Ontario. There are no remaining speakers of Munsee (Canada Census 2017).

The Northern and Southern dialects of Unami, also known as Delaware or Delaware proper, prevailed in the southern two-thirds of New Jersey and along the west side of the Delaware River and Delaware Bay from the Water Gap to Cape Henlopen. Goddard (1978a:73) notes that most of the earliest vocabularies of Unami are actually records of a trade jargon. Both dialects are now extinct (Canada Census 2017; U.S. Census 2015). The phonology and inflectional morphology of both Munsee and Unami are discussed by Goddard (1969, 1979).

The first Nanticoke vocabularies were collected by Heckewelder in 1785 (Mithun 1999:332) and by Murray in 1792 (Goddard 1978a:73) on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The language became extinct in the middle of the 19th century. One of the earliest records of Conoy was discovered in 1970 (Goddard 1978a:73), consisting of some Catholic prayers written in 1633 (Goddard 1978a:73). Conoy is now extinct.

Powhatan, also known as the Virginia Indian language, was spoken by the Powhatan confederacy in tidewater Virginia from the Potomac south to the James River. There are only two major resources for the language (Mithun 1999:332): one is a wordlist recorded between 1607 and 1609 by Captain John Smith (1612); the other is a longer wordlist recorded in 1618

(Strachey 1953). The phonology and parts of the inflectional system have been described by Siebert (1975). Powhatan has been extinct since the 18th century.

Carolina Algonquian, or Pamlico, was spoken in eastern North Carolina. There are two short vocabularies: one was recorded at the Roanoke colony in 1585-86 (Quinn 1955), and the other appears in Lawson (1709:225-7). The language died out in the 18th century.

The Indigenous people of Newfoundland spoke Beothuk. Although the language seems to be very different, attempts have been made to relate it to Algonquian (Goddard 1978a:77). Beothuk has been extinct since the 19th century.

Central Algonquian refers to the seven or more languages which were spoken historically in the area of the upper Great Lakes and the Canadian North, to the east of the Great Plains. More information is available about Central then Eastern languages. Each language and its dialects are described below.

Cree dialects are spread across Canada from the Rocky Mountains in the west to James Bay in the east, including the central areas of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba as well as northern Ontario and southwestern Québec. Dialects of Cree include Plains Cree, Woods Cree, Western Swampy Cree, Eastern Swampy Cree, Moose Cree, and Atikamekw. The first attestation of the language dates back to the 17th century (Pentland 1978). The 19th century brought several grammatical descriptions: Howse (1844) on Woods Cree, Lacombe (1874) on Plains Cree, and Horden (1881) on Moose Cree. Another wave of grammatical descriptions appeared in the 20th century: Wolfart (1969, 1973a, 1996) on Plains Cree, Béland (1978) on Atikamekw, and Ellis (1983) on Eastern Swampy and Moose Cree. Cree texts are found in Bloomfield (1930, 1934), Wolfart (1988), Ahenakew & Wolfart (1992, 1997), and Ellis (1995). Montagnais-Naskapi dialects are East Cree with Northern and Southern subdialects, Naskapi,

and Montagnais, also called as Innu or Innu-aimun. Montagnais grammatical sketches have been published by Clarke (1982), Martin (1991) and Cyr (1996). An Innu reference grammar has recently been published by Drapeau (2014). Cree-Montagnais languages are still spoken today by over 96,000 people (Canada Census 2017). The most recent dictionary of Innu was published by MacKenzie & Mailhot (2013).

Dialects of Ojibwa are spoken in Canada from southwestern Quebec, through Ontario, Manitoba, and parts of Saskatchewan to a few communities in Alberta, and in the United States, from Michigan to Wisconsin and Minnesota, with several communities in North Dakota and Montana as well as Kansas and Oklahoma. From east to west, the dialects include: Algonquin, Eastern Ojibwa, Ottawa (Odawa), Oji-Cree (Severn Ojibwa), Northwestern Ojibwa, Southwestern Ojibwa (Chippewa), and Western Ojibwa (Saulteaux). All of the dialects are well documented and currently being actively worked on (Mithun 1999:334). Earlier grammatical descriptions include Baraga (1878), Cuoq (1866, 1891-2), Wilson (1874), Bloomfield (1957), and the more recent are by Todd (1970), Rhodes (1976), Nichols (1980), and Valentine (2001). There are several dictionaries: Baraga (1878-80), Cuoq (1886), Lemoine (1909), Nichols & Nyholm (1976, 1995), Rhodes (1985), and McGregor (1987). Ojibwa texts are found in Josselin de Jong (1913), Jones (1917-19), Bloomfield (1957), Quill (1965), Nichols (1988), and Bloomfield & Nichols (1991). There are about 50,000 speakers of Ojibwa dialects across Canada and the U.S. (Mithun 1999:334).

The Potawatomi resided in southern Ontario and in Michigan and Wisconsin. A grammar was published by Hockett (1939a, 1939b, 1948). There are 200 speakers (Mithun 1999:334).

Menomini was historically spoken in northern Wisconsin. Although there were some references to the Menomini tribe in the 17th century, the language itself has been attested only

since the beginning of the 19th century (Goddard 1978b:584). Bloomfield's grammatical description (1962), lexicon (1975), and texts (1928) are the primary sources on the language. "The language has played an important role in the development of linguistic theory, partly because of its complex phonology..., partly as 1 of 4 languages on which Bloomfield's reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian was based" (Mithun 1999:335). There are 35 Menomini speakers in the United States (U.S. Census 2015).

Sauk, Fox (Meskwaki), and Kickapoo are three dialects of a language which has no single name (Goddard 1978b:584). Sauk is spoken in Oklahoma and Kansas. The Fox reside near Tama, Iowa (Goddard 1978b:584), and the Kickapoo live in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Coahuila, Mexico (Voorhis 1974). Mascouten appears to have been a fourth dialect; however, it is almost completely unattested (Goddard 2003). William Jones, a Fox speaker, documented the language through his dissertation on word formation (1904), a text collection (1907), and a grammatical sketch (1911). Michelson (1921, 1925), Bloomfield (1925-27, 1984b), Voorhis (1971), Goddard (1990, 1991), and Dahlstrom (1987, 1997) have contributed to the study of Fox. As for Kickapoo, Jones & Michelson (1915) contains texts, Voorhis (1967, 1974, 1977, 1983) provides grammatical descriptions, and Ketakea (1988) and Voorhis (1988) are dictionaries. There are 400 Fox speakers and 820 speakers of Kickapoo in the United Sates (U.S. Census 2015).

Miami-Illinois was spoken by the Miami and Illinois tribal groupings. Despite the fact that there was a large stock of materials collected by missionaries in the 17th and 18th centuries and by later recorders, neither systematic scientific study nor thorough analysis was done before Miami-Illinois became extinct in 1965 (Goddard 1978b:585). Costa (2003) has published a study focusing on a synchronic and diachronic analysis of the phonology and inflectional morphology

of the language.

Three dialects of Shawnee, namely Absentee Shawnee, Eastern Shawnee, and Cherokee Shawnee, are now spoken in Oklahoma. The dialects show "some lexical differences, very few phonemic and no phonetic differences" (Voegelin 1935:35). Apart from the first records in the late 18th century and translated portions of the Bible between 1842-1929, the most substantive works are Voegelin's articles on phonology (1935), paradigms (1936), and stems (1938-40). Boling (1981) discusses the formal syntax. Additional Shawnee sources include texts (Voegelin 1953; Voegelin, Robinett, & Hickerson 1953), a dictionary (Pearson 1991), and a grammatical description (Andrews 1994). There are 255 speakers of Shawnee (U.S. Census 2015).

The Plains Algonquian languages are located in the Great Plains area of Canada and the northern United States. They are Cheyenne, Arapaho-Atsina-Nawathinehena, and Blackfoot. A brief account of each language follows.

Cheyenne is spoken in southeastern Montana and in western Oklahoma. A dialect of Cheyenne, So?taa?e or Sutaio, is no longer spoken (Alford 1977; Goddard 1978c). The work of Wayne Leman provides a well-rounded documentation of the language and includes a two-volume grammatical description (Leman 1980a) and a collection of texts with interlinear translation and glossary (Leman 1980b, 1987). A large Cheyenne dictionary has been edited by Fisher, Leman, Pine & Sanchez (2006).The language is still spoken by 2,100 people (U.S. Census 2015).

There are two Arapaho tribes: the Northern Arapaho are located in Wyoming, and the Southern Arapaho are in Oklahoma. The most northern dialect of Arapaho is Gros Ventre or Atsina; the other dialects are Besawunena, Arapaho, and Nawathinehena. Kroeber (1916) and Salzmann (1956, 1963, 1983) contributed to the study of the Arapaho dialects. A reference

grammar was compiled by Cowell & Moss (2008). There are 55 speakers of Gros Ventre and 1065 of Arapaho (U.S. Census 2015). Besawunena and Nawathinehena are extinct.

Blackfoot is spoken in Alberta and Montana. The first records of Blackfoot were vocabularies gathered by traders in the 18th century.The first texts were published at the beginning of the 20th century (Uhlenbeck 1911, 1912; Josselin de Jong 1914). A grammar of Blackfoot has been published by Frantz (2009), and there is a dictionary by Frantz & Russell (1995). In Canada, there are 3,465 Blackfoot (Canada Census 2017), and 1,450 Blackfoot speakers are in the United States (U.S. Census 2015).

1.2 Classification of Algonquian Languages

From the first contact with Native American languages, Europeans noticed that some of the languages were similar and some were different from each other. As a result, these observations triggered the first attempts of classifying the languages. The affinity of the Algonquian languages was recognized in 1650 by Gabriel Druillettes and John Eliot (Goddard 1996:291). Later, Louis-Armand de Lom d'Arce, baron de Lahontan was the first to use the name *Algonquin* to refer to the languages (Lahontan 1703, 2:95). The name was taken from the Algonquin people who lived in the Ottawa River valley. However, classification attempts made in the 17th and 18th centuries were rather unreliable because "the accuracy of phonetic recording and grammatical analysis was often poor, and the observations of similarities between languages were unsystematic" (Goddard 1996:290).

In this context, scholarly work in the early 19th century continued to focus on typological classification. Duponceau (1838) suggested that the American languages were exclusively *polysynthetic*. "Unfortunately, this assumption of structural similarity led scholars to discount the

value of grammatical resemblances as evidence of relationship and to emphasize vocabulary as the only clue to closer genetic affinity" (Campbell & Mithun 1979:6).

The classification of Albert Gallatin (1836, 1848) accounted for both grammatical resemblances and vocabulary, and "succeeded in ascertaining 32 distinct families in and north of the United States" (Gallatin 1848:xcviii). Later, John Wesley Powell (1891) based his classification into 58 families (or "stocks") on Gallatin. However, Powell neglected grammatical resemblances and based his classification solely on vocabulary because

> Grammatic structure is but a phase or accident of growth, and not a primordial element of language. The roots of a language are its most permanent characteristics, ... the grammatic structure or plan of a language is forever changing, and in this respect the language may become entirely transformed [Powell 1891:11].

Due to these rather inconsistent and shifting methods of classification, scholars of the 20th century began to analyze the American languages differently. Since this thesis is concerned only with the Algonquian languages, they will be used to demonstrate the alternative ways of classification.

The first comprehensive attempt to classify Algonquian languages was that of Truman Michelson (1912), who divided them into four main groups:

1. Blackfoot
2. Cheyenne (and Sutaio)
3. Arapaho, including Besawunena, Atsina, Nawathinehena, and Haʔanahawunena
4. Eastern-Central
    - A. Central Subtype
        - (a) Cree-Montagnais
        - (b) Menomini
        - (c) Sauk Group: Sauk-Fox-Kickapoo; Shawnee
        - (d) Ojibwa Group: Ojibwa-Potawatomi; Peoria
        - (e) Massachusett and Pequot-Mohegan
        - (f) Delaware Group: Munsee, Unami, Unalachtigo
    - B. Eastern Subtype
        - (a) Micmac
        - (b) Abenaki Group: Malecite-Passamaquoddy, Penobscot-Abenaki

Michelson based his classification on the occurrence of various consonant clusters and "a few other phonetic phenomena" and also on a comparison of pronominal verb inflections in the languages available to him (Michelson 1912:226).

In his 1925 paper *On the sound system of Central Algonquian*, Bloomfield used the four languages best attested at the time – Fox, Cree, Menomini, and Ojibwa – for his reconstructions. Since these languages were spoken in the Great Lakes area, Bloomfield called the proto-language he reconstructed *Primitive Central Algonquian*. Subsequent work by Michelson (1935) on Plains languages – Cheyenne and Arapaho – and by Siebert (1941) on Eastern languages – Delaware and Penobscot – validated Bloomfield's reconstruction for the Algonquian family as a whole. The proto-language was therefore referred to as *Proto-Algonquian* in Bloomfield's (1946) sketch of Algonquian comparative grammar.

About twenty years later, Ives Goddard (1967) proposed a new classification that was based on his study of the independent indicative verb paradigm. He set up an Eastern Algonquian subgroup consisting of all the languages spoken south of the Saint Lawrence and east of the Allegheny Mountains, suggesting that they all have "a multi-staged formal innovation" in the transitive inanimate verb paradigm:

> Other things being equal, it demonstrates that these languages constitute a genetic subgroup within Algonquian. It therefore seems necessary to assume that these languages descend from a common protolanguage (Proto-Eastern-Algonquian, PEA) which had undergone a certain amount of innovatory development after its separation from Proto-Algonquian [Goddard 1967:78].

Overall, "the Eastern languages exhibit an extensive diversity, and [...] they must have been diverging from each other for something on the order of 2,000 years" (Goddard 1978a:70).

The most modern classification is presented in Goddard (1996:4-5) and is as follows:

Algonquian

Blackfoot
Cree-Montagnais
Arapaho-Atsina, Nawathinehena
Cheyenne
Menominee
Ojibwa (Northern and Southern), Potawatomi
Sauk-Fox (Meskwaki)-Kickapoo
Shawnee
Miami-Illinois

Eastern
Micmac
Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
Eastern Abenaki
Western Abenaki
Etchemin
Massachusett-Narragansett
Loup
Quiripi-Unquachog
Mahican
Munsee
Unami
Nanticoke-Conoy
Virginia Algonquian (Powhatan)
Carolina Algonquian

Although Blackfoot is an Algonquian language, it appears to have developed differently from the rest. Despite the fact that most of the Blackfoot segments and clusters can be traced to Proto-Algonquian, there are no Algonquian sources for many features of Blackfoot phonology (Goddard 1994:188). Thus, Blackfoot may be "the earliest offshoot from the protolanguage, perhaps early enough to constitute a sister branch to the rest of the family" (Goddard 1996:318); as a consequence, Blackfoot will not be considered in this study.

1.3 History of Research

As soon as travellers and missionaries reached the New World and came into contact with the Indigenous people, they began recording American Indian languages. The first grammatical studies, however, did not appear until the 17th century.

The first serious discussion of a North American language, *De la langue des Sauuages Montagnais,* was published by Paul Le Jeune in the 1634 *Jesuit Relation*. This ten-page description begins with a discussion of vocabulary wherein Le Jeune pointed out:

> I'escriuy l'an passé, que leur langue estoit tres-riche et tres-pauure; toute pleine d'abõdance et de disette; la pauureté paroist en mille articles. Tous les mots de pieté, de deuotion, de vertu; tous les termes dont on se sert pour expliquer les biens de l'autre [vie]; ... toutes les paroles qui concernent la police et le gouuernement d'vne ville, d'vne Prouince, d'vn Empire; ... les noms d'vne infinité d'arts qui sont en nostre Europe, ... tout cela ne se trouue point ny dãs la pensée, ny dans la bouche des Sauuages; ... voila vne grande disette [Thwaites 1896-1901, 7:20].

Le Jeune suggested that this shortcoming of vocabulary is due to the fact that the natives did not have any of these objects, concepts or activities in their culture rather than due to "some natural poverty of the language" (Hanzeli 1969:56). "This apparently material orientation of the vocabulary satisfies our modern historical sense and our awareness of the relativity of cultures, but in the eyes of the missionaries it constituted quite an extraordinary feature" (Hanzeli 1969:56). Le Jeune also mentioned that the animate vs. inanimate distinction of nouns is arbitrary and that Montagnais verbs distinguish between actions directed towards animate and inanimate things. He was even aware that the verb *aoui-* 'to use' requires different inflections depending on whether the object is unpossessed or possessed by some other person as shown below:

> *nitaouin agouniscouehon* 'ie me sers d'vn bonnet' vs.
>
> *nitaouiouan outagoumiscouhon* 'ie me sers de son bonnet'
>
> [Thwaites 1896-1901, 7:22-24]

Beyond discussing the abundance of Montagnais vocabulary, Le Jeune showed that "the task of separating the verb and noun classes in Algonquian is indeed an arduous one and headway was made only recently in this direction" (Hanzeli 1969:58). And, almost as an

afterthought, he made a few remarks on the Montagnais sound system which was "judged in terms of known letters and by comparison with other languages" (Hanzeli 1969:58).

John Eliot came to be known as "the Apostle to the Indians" (Hoijer 1976:3) because he learned Massachusett so well that within a few years he was able to deliver his sermons in it and translated the Bible and other religious literature into the language. This work led to his publishing a grammatical study of the language that was based upon empirical observations (Wolfart 1967:154) rather than upon "some preconceived notion of universal grammar, or as was more often the case, on a Graeco-Latin model" (Hoijer 1976:3).

Roger Williams and four other clergymen founded Providence in Rhode Island. There Williams became acquainted with the Narragansett Indians and learned their language. His linguistic contribution consisted of a phrase book of Narragansett (Williams 1643) which was "invaluable to travellers among the Indians of nearly all of New England" (Hoijer 1976:3).

During the 18th century, missionaries and travellers collected wordlists of unfamiliar languages around the world. Ultimately, Adelung and Vater used these wordlists as the basis for their four-volume work published between 1806 and 1818. According to Duponceau (1819:xxxii), volume 4 contained sketches of 34 Native American languages, and the Lord's Prayer in 59 of them. Such a broad number of "exotic languages" (Hoijer 1976:4) came to the attention of scholars of the time, and so did the practical difficulties and methods of fieldwork that impeded adequate studies of the languages, such as the lack of an adequate phonetic alphabet.

The 19th century opened with the realization of the fact that the American languages differed from each other and were substantially different from the better known European and Middle Eastern languages.

Around the end of the 19th century, Franz Boas became one of the major contributors to the study of American languages. He edited the *Handbook of American Indian languages* (Boas 1911, 1922, 1933-38), which contains grammatical studies of 20 languages, each representing one of Powell's linguistic groupings. Additionally, Boas founded the *International Journal of American Linguistics* in 1917, solely devoted to the study of American Indian languages.

From about 1910 until 1940, three scholars, inspired and influenced by Franz Boas, stand out: Truman Michelson, Edward Sapir, and Leonard Bloomfield. When Michelson joined the Bureau of American Ethnology at the Smithonian Institution in 1910, he began his field research on the languages of the Algonquian family (Cooper 1939:282-5). Most of his research focussed on the Fox people and their language, culminating in a large number of publications on Fox ethnology and linguistics. He also supervised the posthumous publication of several of William Jones' manuscripts (Jones 1911, 1917-19).

Edward Sapir, a student of Boas (Hoijer 1976:13), made a two-fold contribution to the general field of American Indian languages. On the one hand, Sapir was the first to claim that the methods of comparative linguistics are suitable for indigenous language analyses. As a result, he proposed a classification of American Indian languages, "more far-reaching scheme than Powell's [1891 classification], suggestive but not demonstrable in all its features at the present time" (Sapir 1929:139). This classification recognized only six language super-stocks: Eskimo-Aleut, Algonquin-Wakashan, Nadene, Penutian, Hokan-Siouan, and Aztec-Tanoan. On the other hand, Sapir proposed that Wiyot and Yurok, two languages of California, were related to the Algonquian languages spoken in Canada and the eastern U.S. (Sapir 1913).[1] Although his proposal led to a heated debate between Sapir and Michelson (Michelson 1914, 1915; Sapir

[1] Dixon & Kroeber (1913) observed that Yurok and Wiyot have some common roots with each other, but not with the other languages spoken in California. As a result, they asserted a genetic connection between the two languages formerly assumed to be isolates and called them the Ritwan family.

1915), the current consensus is that the "the Ritwan languages are related to the Algonquian languages, but not a part of the family. The label "Algic" is used for the Algonquian languages plus Wiyot and Yurok, either as a grouping with three separate branches (Algonquian, Wiyot, Yurok) or as a group with two branches (Algonquian, Ritwan)" (Bakker 2009:152-3).

Bloomfield's Algonquian research began around 1919 and initially concentrated on analyses of the Fox text collections published by Jones (1907) and Michelson (1921). While working through these texts, he extracted grammatical information and compiled a grammatical sketch of Fox (Bloomfield 1925-27). His field research on Menomini resulted in the publication of a collection of texts (1928); his Menomini grammar and lexicon were both published posthumously (Bloomfield 1962, 1975). In 1925 Bloomfield conducted field research with Plains Cree speakers in Saskatchewan at the Sweet Grass and Star Blanket reserves, resulting in two volumes of texts (1930, 1934) and a posthumous lexicon (1984a). His research on Ojibwa began with the examination of texts collected by William Jones (1917-19) and grammars and dictionaries from the nineteenth century (Goddard 1987). His Ojibwa grammar, texts, and lexicon were published posthumously in a single volume in 1957. Bloomfield's thorough knowledge and deep understanding of these four Algonquian languages created an opportunity for comparative studies leading to the reconstruction of the sound system and morphology of the Proto-Algonquian language as well as the classification of Algonquian languages (cf. section 1.2).

The post-Bloomfieldian period in Algonquian linguistics began in the 1940s. In this period, several scholars made major contributions to the field. First, Charles F. Hockett entered Algonquian studies with his Ph.D. dissertation (1939a) based on fieldwork on Potawatomi. In the same year, Hockett's paper on Potawatomi syntax appeared in *Language* (1939b), and in 1948,

he reworked his dissertation into a series of articles dealing with the analysis of Potawatomi (1948). Hockett considered Bloomfield his mentor and served as his literary executor. He collected, edited, revised, and published much of that work, including *Eastern Ojibwa* (1957), and *The Menomini language* (1962). Hockett "considered his own work on Algonquian languages, extending throughout his career, to be a tribute to the master" (Gair 2006:7).

Carl F. Voegelin studied Delaware, Potawatomi, Fox, Menomini, Shawnee, Ojibwa, and Blackfoot. However, he contributed the most through his studies of Delaware (1945, 1946) and Shawnee (1935, 1936, 1938-40) as well as through reviving the *International Journal of American Linguistics* after the death of its founder, Franz Boas.

Ives Goddard, curator emeritus in the Department of Anthropology of the National Museum of Natural History at the Smithsonian Institution, is considered the leading expert on the Algonquian languages. Goddard's own research has concentrated on Fox (Meskwaki) (1984, 1988, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1995) and the Delaware languages (1974b, 1979, 1982). He has largely contributed to the study of Massachusett (1981; Goddard & Bragdon 1988), Cheyenne (1978c), and Arapaho-Gros Ventre (1974a, 1998, 2015a). Additionally, Goddard served as the linguistic and technical editor of the *Handbook of North American Indians*.

H. Christoph Wolfart, a student of Hockett, is a distinguished professor emeritus at the University of Manitoba. Wolfart has primarily contributed to the study of Plains Cree, having published grammars (1973a, 1996), texts (1988; Wolfart & Ahenakew 1993, 2000, 2010), a dictionary (Wolfart & Ahenakew 1998), and many articles (1969, 1971, 1973b, 1978, 1984, 1989a, 1989b). He served as the editor of *Papers of the Algonquian Conference* from 2002 to 2007.

The family of Algonquianists has grown exponentially since the 1970s and includes but

is not limited to: Richard A. Rhodes (Ojibwa), David H. Pentland (Cree, Ojibwa), Lynn Drapeau (Innu [Montagnais]), John D. Nichols (Ojibwa), Amy Dahlstrom (Plains Cree and Fox [Meskwaki]), David J. Costa (Miami-Illinois), Philip LeSourd (Maliseet-Passamaquoddy), Marie-Odile Junker (East Cree), Rand Valentine (Ojibwa), Lucy Thomason (Fox [Meskwaki]), Arok Wolvengrey (Plains Cree), and Will Oxford (Innu and Cree).

1.4 Definitions of Obviation

Obviation is a prominent, yet subtle feature of Algonquian narratives (Goddard 1984, Dahlstrom 1986, Wolfart 1996). John Eliot described obviation in Massachusett as follows:

> [Nouns are not] *varied* by *Cases*, *Cadencies*, and *Endings*: herein they are more like to the *Hebrew*. Yet there seemeth to be one *Cadency* or *Case* of the *first Declination*, of the *form Animate*, which endeth in *oh*, *uh*, or *ah*; viz. when an *animate Noun* followeth a *Verb transitive*, whose *object* that he acteth upon is *without himself* [Eliot 1666:8].

As Eliot's description suggests, obviation has frequently been associated with and even identified as a case because grammatical discussions in the past were based on the Graeco-Latin model (Hoijer 1976:3) wherein nouns have a declension system and, therefore, cases.

Two centuries later, Cuoq (1866) proposed the name now used for what Eliot identified as a *Cadency* or *Case*:

> Quand dans une phrase, se *rencontrent* deux 3èmes personnes de première classe, l'une *sujet* et l'autre *régime* de la phrase, la personne-régime se met à l'obviatif [Cuoq 1866:43].

Later, Cuoq (1891-92) stated that:

> La distinction des *cas* existe en algonquin; mais, à part le vocatif, les autres cas sont loin de correspondre avec ce que les grammairiens entendent par nominatif, génitif, datif, accusatif et ablatif. On peut distinguer jusqu'à cinq cas dans les noms algonquins, savoir: le nominatif, le vocatif, l'obviatif, le sur-obviatif et le locatif [Cuoq 1892:91].

Cuoq (1866) described the *sur-obviatif* as follows:

> Quan[d] dans une phrase se rencontrent trois 3èmes personnes, une de première classe et sujet de la phrase; une autre, régime de la phrase, et pouvant être indifféremment de première ou de seconde classe; et enfin, une troisième de première classe et qui *domine* la personne-régime, cette personne-régime *dominée* se met au surobviatif; et, si le nom de la personne *dominante* se trouve exprimé, on le met à l'obviatif simple [Cuoq 1866:43].

In the 20th century, Bloomfield added to Cuoq's proposal: "In any one context, there is a distinction, among animate third persons, between proximate and obviative. Only one animate third person, be it singular or plural, is proximate; all others are in obviative form. The proximate third person represents the topic of discourse, the person nearest to the speaker's point of view, or the person earlier spoken of and already known" (Bloomfield 1962:38).

Between Cuoq's and Bloomfield's descriptions of obviation, there is a two-fold distinction. On the one hand, the term *case* is no longer used to refer to obviation. On the other hand, the term *proximate* replaces *nominative*. However, neither Cuoq nor Bloomfield provided a solid explanation of obviation.

In the second half of the 20th century, several more attempts have been made to define the proximate:

> Within each CONTEXTUAL SPAN only one third person is proximate; all others are obviative...We shall say that the proximate person, in any context, is in focus and the obviative person or persons are not [Wolfart 1973a:17].

> The proximate is the most prominent, "the hero of the discourse", and the obviative is less prominent [Goddard 1984:273].

> The proximate third person may be the topic of the discourse, similar to what Karmiloff-Smith 1980 calls the thematic subject. The proximate third person is also usually the focus of the speaker's empathy (cf. Kuno and Kaburaku 1977); in narratives, proximate often corresponds to the character whose point of view is being presented [Dahlstrom 1986:108].

Russell (1991:322) assumes that proximate is related to "this loosely defined concept of 'point of

view' or, perhaps more accurately, what literary theorists have explored under the rubric of 'focalization'." However, none of these descriptions of proximate causes one to think about inanimate nouns taking the role of proximate. In fact, inanimate third persons can also be either proximate or obviative wherein "obviation is present covertly" (Wolfart 1996:400) and appears in a pronoun or verb with which the inanimate noun is in agreement. Overall, "[b]y identifying only one third-person referent in each contextual span as proximate and all others as obviative, the dimension of obviation marks a semantic system of focus in addition to the syntactic construction of cross-reference" (Wolfart 1996:400).

In this work, the term *obviation* refers to a third person referencing system that is used to disambiguate and single out one third person or group of third persons from all others in any given context. The one that is singled out or in focus is called *proximate*. All other third persons are *obviative*. Morphologically speaking, in most languages, animate proximate singular and inanimate singular nouns are usually unmarked; inanimate nouns are typically not marked for obviation. Obviation is usually marked in the inflection of verbs.

The goal of this work is to provide a comprehensive summary of the role of obviation in Algonquian languages. The analysis will be based on the available data in all of the languages in the Algonquian family with the exception of Blackfoot, which is typologically different (cf. section 1.2). Chapter II deals with syntactic obviation in the noun phrase. In particular, this chapter examines the relevant inflectional morphology and the role of obviation in noun phrases (NPs), possessive phrases, and more complex NPs. A discussion of relative clauses in relation to obviation concludes the chapter.

Chapter III begins with a discussion of obviation in verb phrases and continues by examining the instances of obviation that appear to be controlled by discourse and pragmatic

factors. The analysis of the function of obviation in a single clause is followed by the examination of the behaviour of obviation between matrix clauses and complement clauses. Typically, the assignment of proximate status to one NP in a single-clause sentence or in a matrix clause persists for some time in a discourse, but there are also examples of proximate shifts in later clauses, either when the first proximate is no longer relevant or when the speaker's focus has changed.

Chapter IV considers instances of eluded obviation, the role of obviation in narratives, and the frequent lack of obviation in elicited examples. Unexplained cases of obviation conclude this chapter.

Chapter V provides a general consensus of the role of obviation and discusses whether obviation should be considered primarily as a sentence-level syntactic mechanism or a discourse-level device.

Chapter II

Obviation in the Noun Phrase

This chapter is devoted to syntactic obviation, specifically to the role of obviation in noun phrases. The first part of the chapter discusses the marking of gender, number, and obviation in nouns and demonstrative pronouns and obviation in possessive noun phrases. The second part deals with obviation in conjoined noun phrases and in noun phrases with overlapping reference as well as with obviation in relative clauses.

2.1 Gender, Number, and Obviation

All Algonquian nouns belong to either the animate or the inanimate gender. Semantically *animate* nouns referring to people or animals are grammatically animate. Most semantically *inanimate* nouns such as non-living physical objects and abstract concepts are grammatically inanimate. However, some body parts, plants, and various culturally important objects are grammatically animate. For example, in Cheyenne, *náhkohe* 'bear' is semantically and grammatically animate since it denotes an animal, *mo'keha* 'shoe' is semantically and grammatically inanimate as it refers to a non-living physical object, but although *hóema* 'blanket' is semantically inanimate, it is animate grammatically. In Kickapoo, *eenikwa* 'ant' is semantically and grammatically animate, *miini* 'berry' is semantically and grammatically inanimate, but although *oteemina* 'strawberry' is semantically inanimate, it is animate grammatically. In Plains Cree, *awa·sis* 'child' is semantically and grammatically animate, *akohp* 'blanket' is semantically an inanimate non-living physical object and grammatically inanimate, but although *asa·m* 'snowshoe' is semantically inanimate, it is animate grammatically.

The function of the gender of any noun is two-fold: on the one hand, the gender

determines what number and/or obviation marking a noun takes; on the other hand, the gender regulates how nouns agree with demonstrative pronouns and verbs. Note that unlike the other Algonquian languages, Shawnee (partially), Miami-Illinois, and Fox-Kickapoo mark gender suffixally on every noun (cf. Costa 2003:216). Table 1 presents gender, number, and obviation marking in animate and inanimate nouns in the better attested languages, summarized from the grammars cited in section 1.1.

Table 1. Noun Inflections in Algonquian Languages

Language	Animate				Inanimate	
	Prox. Sg	Prox. Pl	Obv. Sg	Obv. Pl	Sg	Pl
Proto-Algonquian	*-a	*-aki	*-ali	*-ahi	*-i	*-ali
Cheyenne	Ø	-o	-o		Ø	-otse
Arapaho	Ø	-oʔ	(-on)	-o	Ø	-o
Plains Cree	(-a)	-ak	-a		(-i)	-a
Eastern Ojibwa	(-a)	-ak	-an		(-i)	-an
Severn Ojibwa			-an	-ah		
Potawatomi	Ø	-ək	-ən		Ø	-ən
Menomini	Ø	-ak	-an		Ø	-an
Fox (Meskwaki), Kickapoo	-a	-aki	-ani	-ahi	-i	-ani
Sauk			-ani			
Miami-Illinois	-a	-aki	-ali/ari	-ahi	-i	-a
Shawnee	-a	-aki	-ali	-hi	-i	-a(li)
Micmac	Ø	-ək	-əl	-ə	Ø	-əl
Maliseet-Passamaquoddy	Ø	-ək	-əl	-ə	Ø	-əl
Eastern Abenaki	Ø	-ak	-al	-a	Ø	-al
Western Abenaki			-a			
Massachusett	Ø	-ak	-ah		Ø	-aš
Eastern Mahican	Ø	-ak	-an	-ah	Ø	-an
Western Mahican			-ah			
Munsee, Unami	Ø	-ak	-al		Ø	-al

As Table 1 shows, in most Algonquian languages animate nouns have a zero ending in the proximate singular, and they all have an overt ending for proximate plural. Also, some Algonquian languages (e.g., Arapaho, Severn Ojibwa, Micmac) have preserved the number distinction in the obviative while others (e.g., Plains Cree, Eastern Ojibwa, Menomini) have lost it. In most of the languages, inanimate nouns, on the other hand, are unmarked for singular, marked for plural, and lack inflections that distinguish proximate from obviative. In (1), there are a few concrete examples of these points:

(1) Micmac
(a) muwin 'bear' (3SG) muwin*ax* (3PL) muwin*al* (3'SG) muwin*a* (3'PL)
(b) puktew 'fire' (0SG) pukt*al* (0PL)
(Proulx 1978:75)

Severn Ojibwa
(c) na·pe· 'man' (3SG) na·pe·w*ak* (3PL) na·pe·w*an* (3'SG) na·pe·w*ah* (3'PL)
(d) nipe·win 'bed' (0SG) nipe·win*an* (0PL)
(Rogers 1964:119)

Menomini
(e) enɛ·niw 'man' (3SG) enɛ·niw*ak* (3PL) enɛ·niw*an* (3'SG/PL)
(f) we·kewam 'house' (0SG) we·kewam*an* (0PL)
(Bloomfield 1962:113)

Eastern Ojibwa
(g) ko·kko·šš 'pig' (3SG) ko·kko·šš*ak* (3PL) ko·kko·šš*an* (3'SG/PL)
(h) makkisin 'shoe' (0SG) makkisin*an* (0PL)
(Bloomfield 1957:39)

Additionally, in some dialects of Cree-Montagnais and Ojibwa, there is a suffix *-(e)liw* that marks inanimate obviative singular in unpossessed inanimate nouns (Ellis 1983:205; Todd 1970:108-110):

(2) (a) Moose Cree
ci·ma·n*iliw* 'canoe' (0'SG) ci·ma·n*a* (0'PL)

(b) Severn Ojibwa
nipe·win*ini* 'bed' (0'SG) nipe·win*an* (0'PL)

The use of demonstrative pronouns along with the nouns generates a fluent and "normal" discourse (Ahenakew 1987:11). Demonstrative pronouns vary in gender, number,

and obviation in order to agree with the nouns, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Demonstrative Pronouns
(Plains Cree: Wolfart 1996:423; Menomini: Bloomfield 1962:193; Maliseet-Passamaquoddy: Leavitt 1996:30; Shawnee: Andrews 1994:166)

Language	Demonstrative Pronoun	Anim, Prox Sg (3s)	Anim, Prox Pl (3p)	Animate, Obviative (3')	Inanimate, Sg (0)	Inanimate, Pl (0p)
Plains Cree	near (this)	awa	o·ki	o·hi	o·ma	o·hi
	far (that)	ana	aniki	anihi	anima	anihi
Menomini	near (this)	ayom, ayow	akoh, akom, akekoh	anoh, anom, anenoh	yo·m, yo·w	anoh, anom, anenoh
	far (that)	enoh, enom	akeh, akem	aneh, anem	eneh, enem	aneh, anem
Maliseet-Passamaquoddy	near (this)	wòt	yúktok	yúhtol -Sg yuhùht -Pl	yùt	yúhtol
	far (that)	wòt	níktok	níhtol -Sg nihìht -Pl	nìt	níhtol
Shawnee	near (this)	ya·ma	yoʔkoma	yo·loma-Sg yohoma-Pl	yo·ma	yo·loma
	far (that)	hina	niʔki	nili - Sg nihi - Pl	hini	nili

As Table 2 shows, animate obviative singular forms often resemble inanimate plurals. This resemblance is only homonymous (Voegelin 1946:145; Wolfart 1973a:14; Pentland 1999:245; Pentland 2013:243 n.).

2.2 Obviation in Possessed Noun Phrases

The simplest syntactic environment in which obviation occurs is possessive noun phrases. A basic possessive noun phrase contains two nominal phrases – the possessor and the possessed. The possessors can be divided into three categories: third person animate, third person inanimate, and non-third persons. The possessed noun, in turn, can be of either gender and number, but is always third person. The possessive noun phrase as a whole copies the features (i.e., person, number, and obviation) of the possessed noun phrase.

When an animate noun is possessed by an animate third person, the possessed noun is obligatorily obviative:

(3)	(a) Severn Ojibwa	na·pe· *o*to·te·m*an*	'the man's friend'
	(b) Cheyenne	hetane *he*néson*o*	'the man's child(ren)'
	(c) Micmac	Misel *w*ti·*l*	'Michael's pet'
	(d) Massachusett	waskeetôp *wut*ahtuq*ah*	'the man's deer'

In (3), the possessors (i.e., man, Michael) are animate singular third persons. They are marked on the possessed nouns (i.e., friend, child(ren), pet, deer) via personal prefixes attached to each possessed noun. Each possessed noun is marked for obviation by the suffixes presented in Table 1 (section 2.1).

The following examples illustrate plural possessors:

(4)	(a) Severn Ojibwa	na·pe·w*ak o*to·te·m*iwa·n*	'the men's friend'
	(b) Cheyenne	hetane*o'o he*nésonėh*evóho*	'the men's child(ren)'
	(c) Kickapoo	inen*íaki o*tooteem*wáani*	'the men's brother'
	(d) Miami-Illinois	kweehs*aki a*sekohs*awaali*	'the women's aunt'

In (4), all the possessors are plural. The possessed nouns are inflected for the preson and number of the possessor by *central suffixes,* and for obviation by *peripheral suffixes* (cf. Goddard 1969: 38). Since possessed nouns are inflected for the person and number of the possessor, nouns expressing the possessors are optional as shown in (5):

(5)	(a) Severn Ojibwa	*o*kosihs*an*	'his son'
	(b) Cheyenne	*he*néso*no*	'his child(ren)'
	(c) Kickapoo	*o*tooteem*wáahi*	'their brothers'
	(d) Miami-Illinois	*a*sekohs*awaahi*	'their aunts'

In (5), in the Severn Ojibwa and Cheyenne examples, the possessors are singular; in the Kickapoo and Miami-Illinois examples, the possessors are plural.

In the examples (3) through (5), the possessors are proximate, and the possessed nouns are obviative. Possessive phrases that contain animate proximate possessors and proximate

possessed nouns do not exist in the Algonquian languages (Dahlstrom 1986:116; Dahlstrom 1995:38; Wolfart 1973a:78).

The possessor of the possessed noun can itself be a possessed noun, so that the following forms are possible:

(6) (a) Menomini
anenoh o·hn*an* oti·hsehs*an*
this.3' 3.father.3' 3.dog.3'
'his father's dog'
(Bloomfield 1962:39)

(b) Kickapoo
ooθ*ani* otooteem*ani*
3.father.3'SG 3.brother.3'SG
'his father's brother'
(Voorhis 1974:28)

(c) Potawatomi
nos· ʔok·məs·ən tənnim*nən*
1.father.3SG 3.grandmother.3' 3.husband.3'»3"
'my father's grandmother's husband'
(Hockett 1939b:240)

(d) Arapaho
néih'e hiníiteh'éího hiníí3e'één*in*
1.son.3SG 3.friend.3'SG 3.hair.3'»0'
'my son's friend's hair'
(Cowell & Moss 2008:64)

(e) Moose Cree
Ca·n *o*ste·s*a* *o*to·te·m*ili·w*
John.3SG 3.older.brother.3' 3.friend.3'»3"
'John's older brother's friend(s)'
(Ellis 1983:25)

In (6), in Menomini and Kickapoo, both the possessors and the possessed nouns are marked as obviative. In Potawatomi, the possessed noun is inflected for obviative possessor and for obviation. In Arapaho and Moose Cree, the possessed noun is marked for obviative possessor, but not for obviative singular.

In connection with Moose Cree, Ellis (1983:205) reports that in the case of third person obviative possessor, "all formal distinction as to number for both possessor and noun possessed,

whether animate or inanimate, disappears":

(7) (a) okosis*ili·w* 'his(their) son(s)'
(b) oci·ma·n*ili·w* 'his(their) canoe(s)'

The suffix *-ili·w* in (7) marks obviative possessors. In Eastern Ojibwa obviative possessors are marked by the suffix *-ini(w)* (Bloomfield 1957:41):

(8) usi·sepa·kkutom*eni* 'the other's sugar'

Bloomfield (1957:33) notes that this suffix is frequently omitted when the possessed noun is inanimate. Valentine (2001:204) gives the following example that illustrates the lack of an obviative possessor suffix on the possessed inanimate noun 'book':

(9) Ojibwa
wiidigemaagn*an* wmaznahgan
3.spouse.3' 3.book.0SG
'his wife's book'

Neither Bloomfield nor Valentine provides a reasonable explanation for the existence of these forms.

Plains Cree uses the suffix *-eyiw* to mark an obviative third person possessor:

(10) (a) okima·w oci·ma·n e·-misa·yik
chief.3SG 3.canoe.0SG AOR-be.big.0'SG
'the chief's big canoe'

(b) okima·w okosisa oci·ma·niyiw e·-misa·yik
chief.3SG 3.son.3' 3.canoe.3'»0SG AOR-be.big.0'SG
'the chief's son's big canoe'

(Wolfart 1978a:259)

Wolfart (1978a:259) concludes that "the occurrence of /eyi/ does not argue for recognising a second, further obviative", but is "a strictly thematic morpheme which constitutes part of the possessive theme". Additional arguments against the use of the term "further obviative" and/or "fourth person" come from Rhodes (1985), who suggests that there is no distinction made within the pronoun system that would support a fourth person, and Goddard (1990:317), who claims

that "it is either not intended literally or not supported by any morphological or syntactic arguments".

When the possessed noun is inanimate, the noun itself is marked for number, but as usual not for obviation:

(11) (a) Kickapoo

omaateθi	'his knife'	omaateθwai	'their knife'
omaateθani	'his knives'	omaateθwaani	'their knives'

(b) Moose Cree:

oci·ma·n	'his canoe'	oci·ma·niwa·w	'their canoe'
oci·ma·na	'his canoes'	oci·ma·niwa·wa	'their canoes'

However, an Inanimate Intransitive (II) verb accompanying the noun may reveal that it is obviative:

(12) (a) Plains Cree

o·ma ka·-pi·kopayi*yik* oska·t
this.0SG COMP-break.0'SG 3.leg.0SG
'his broken leg'

(Dahlstrom 1986:116)

(b) Kickapoo

opiiθehkaahi waapaatee*niki*
3.shirt.0SG be.white.0'SG
'his light-colored shirt'

(Voorhis 1974:86)

(c) Ojibwa

gii-maajaamgad*nig* wdaakziwin
PAST-leave.0'SG 3.illness.0SG
'his illness had gone'

(Valentine 2001:252)

In (12), all the II verbs bear inanimate obviative inflections suggesting that the inanimate nouns they accompany are obviative.

Inanimate possessors are not typically discussed in the Algonquian literature (cf. Aissen 1997). However, Bloomfield (1962:42) reports on Menomini:

> The noun inflection for a third person possessor does not in principle distinguish gender: *ohka·t* 'his leg' (of a person, animal, or kettle) is used also for inanimate possessor, 'its leg'

(as, of a stove, chair, or table).

Hockett (1966:64) adds, in connection with Potawatomi:

> If the possessed noun is animate but the possessor inanimate, then the prefix /w-/ appears but the obviative suffix is not needed. Thus, /wnukwiknun/ is *his (a bird's) wing* (bird's wings happen to be animate entities in Potawatomi, at least when named by this noun), with the possessed noun obviated; while /wnukwikun/ might occur meaning *its wing*.

Aissen (1997:716) interprets Bloomfield's point by saying that "while the animacy of the genitive is not marked directly through agreement on the possessum, it can be deduced from the obviation status of the possessum". Her interpretation of Hockett's statement is that "the obviative suffix is not needed because the possessum need not be obviative; it can be proximate". As a result, Aissen (1997: 717) concludes that when an animate noun is possessed by another animate, the possessed noun must be obviative whereas if an animate noun is possessed by an inanimate, the possessed noun does not need to be obviative and "may thus be proximate".

Aissen (1997) reaches her conclusion on the basis of optimality theory according to which each language has constraints provided by universal grammar. These constraints are ranked by the grammar of a particular language, so that the most optimal outcome is selected. Sometimes the constraints are violated; such violations ensure that a higher-ranked constraint is satisfied. In the case of possessed noun phrases, Aissen (1997) presents two constraints: the Nominal Relational Hierarchy and the Animacy Hierarchy. In the Nominal Relational Hierarchy, genitive outranks possessum; in the Animacy Hierarchy, animate outranks inanimate. When both the genitive and the possessum are animate, the optimal obviative status assignment is "the genitive is proximate" and "the possessum is obviative" since this assignment satisfies the higher-ranked constraint, in this case the Nominal Relational Hierarchy. The opposite assignment is not optimal because it violates the Nominal Relational Hierarchy. On the other hand, when the genitive is inanimate and the possessum is animate, the optimal obviative status

assignment is "the genitive is obviative" and "the possessum is proximate" since this assignment satisfies the highest-ranked constraint, in this case the Animacy Hierarchy. The reverse obviative status assignment fails to satisfy either hierarchy.

When the possessor is first person or second person, the possessed noun phrases may be proximate or obviative:

(13)		Plains Cree		Menomini
	(a)	*n*ite·m	'my horse'	*ne*pɛ·sekokasyam
	(b)	*n*ite·m*ak*	'my horses'	*ne*pɛ·sekokasyam*ak*
	(c)	*n*ite·m*a*	'my horse(s)'	*ne*pɛ·sekokasyam*an*

In (13), all possessors are first person singular (i.e., my). In (13a), the possessed nouns are proximate singular; in (13b), the possessed nouns are proximate plural; and in (13c), the possessed nouns are obviative. The same pattern of obviation and number assignment is observed when the possessor is the second person:

(14)		Meskwaki		Shawnee
	(a)	ketaya	'your pet, horse'	kitaya
	(b)	ketaye·*ki*	'your pets, horses'	kitaye·*ki*
	(c)	ketaye·*ni*	'your pet, horse'	kitaye·*ni*
	(d)	ketaye·*hi*	'your pets, horses'	kitaye*hi*

In (14), the possessors are second person singular (i.e., your). In (14a), the possessed nouns are proximate singular; in (14b), the possessed nouns are proximate plural; and in (14c), the possessed nouns are obviative singular; in (14d), the possessed nouns are obviative plural.

In sentences involving two animate third person participants such as 'he sees my sister', 'he' is usually proximate, so the possessive noun phrase 'my sister' must be inflected for obviative. However, some speakers of Arapaho reject such forms (Cowell & Moss 2008:64). Although Cowell & Moss (2008:64) have found one example of an obviative first-person-possessed form, they suggest that it might be "limited to only certain groups of speakers, or else has become obsolete recently (or perhaps both)":

(15) néí'eibéhe' niicebe'éihoot nebésiiwóho' kóxuhetíít.
1.grandmother.3SG IMPERF-defeat.3SG»3' 1.grandfather.3'SG handgame.0SG
'My grandmother beats my grandfather at handgame.'
(Cowell & Moss 2008:64)

Note that in this sentence there are two first-person-possessed forms: *néí'eibéhe'* 'my grandmother' is proximate whereas *nebesiibehe'o* 'my grandfather' is obviative.

2.3 Obviation in Conjoined Noun Phrases

Conjunction involves the linking of similar elements such as noun phrases. Conjoined noun phrases may occur before or after the main verb. For instance in English,

(16) (a) John and Kathy go to the cinema every Friday.
(b) I plant roses and globeflowers every spring.

In (16), both (a) and (b) contain conjoined noun phrases. In (16a), the conjoined noun phrase is *John and Kathy*. In (16b), the conjoined noun phrase is *roses and globeflowers*. In similar instances in the Algonquian languages, the verb inflection reveals the gender, number, and obviation status of the conjoined noun phrase:

(17) (a) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy:
mali naka sohsan petkawətəwək naka nwicohkemkon.
Mary.3SG and Susan.3SG come.walking.3PL and 1.help.3PL»1SG
'Mary and Susan came over and helped me.'
(Sherwood 1983:134)

(b) Plains Cree:
e·kota mihce·t ninipaha·wak niskak mi·na si·si·pak...
there many 1.kill.1SG»3PL goose.3PL and duck.3PL
'Over there I have killed a lot of geese and ducks,...'
(Wolfart 1996:394)

(c) Delaware:
lənəw wa·k óxkwe·w lpáko·k
man.3SG and woman.3SG cry.3PL
'The man and the woman cried.'
(Goddard 1969:32)

In (17), each conjoined noun phrase is animate proximate plural, and each verb shows proximate

plural agreement. There are also instances where the nouns in the conjoined noun phrase are mixed (i.e., one is proximate and the other is obviative) as in (18):

(18) Menomini
nekot tɛh wayɛ·skenɛni·t okian wa·we·kewaken
one and be.young.man.3SG 3.mother.3' dwell.3PL.QUOT
'A certain young man and his mother are said to have dwelt there.'
(Bloomfield 1962:443)

Here, 'young man' is proximate, and 'his mother' is obviative; the verb shows third person plural proximate agreement. The following example illustrates that both nouns in the conjoined noun phrase can be obviative:

(19) Kickapoo
pasitooha saaka eeh=taθwihaaci okwiθahi nekoti iskweeθeeni
old.man.3SG nine AOR-have.so.many.3SG»3' 3.son.3'PL one girl.3'SG

maacahkoociihani
youngest.born.3'SG
'An old man had nine sons and one daughter, the youngest born.'
(Jones & Michelson 1915:54)

In (19), the verb 'had' is inflected for obviative object which is the conjoined noun phrase consisting of 'nine sons' and 'one daughter'.

When a conjoined noun phrase includes nouns of both genders, the verb agrees with the closest member of the conjoined noun phrase:

(20) Fox
(a) ni·h=mawi-ašiha·wa nemehte·hka na·hka ni·pani.
FUT-go-make.1SG»3SG 1.bow.3SG also 1.arrow.0PL
'I will go make my bow and my arrows.'
(Dahlstrom 1995:63)

(b) e·h=ni·senakehe=ye·toke opepikwe·škowa·wi na·hka
AOR-take.down.3SG»0-it.seems 3.flute.3PL»0SG also

otaškwa·ne·hkete·mwa·wi kaho·ni otahkohko·hwa·wani
3.firestick.3PL»0SG and 3.drum.DIM.3PL»3'SG
'It seems he had taken down their flute and their firestick and their small drum.'
(Dahlstrom 1995:63)

In (20a), the verb 'make' agrees with the closest noun phrase 'my bow' in gender. In (20b), the verb 'take down' is inflected for the gender of the closest noun phrase 'their flute'. Dahlstrom (1995:63-64) states that the rule of "agree with the closest noun phrase" works in instances of conjoined noun phrases of mixed gender regardless of whether the conjoined noun phrases precede or follow the verb, but cites only examples with the verb in first position.

When an inanimate object is closest, the verb stem must be Transitive Inanimate (TI); if the order is reversed, with the animate noun phrase closer to the verb, then the verb stem must be Transitive Animate (TA) and inflected for the animate noun phrase as demonstrated in (21):

(21) Fox

(a) nemi·čipena ahte·himinani na·hka wi·tawi·haki.
1.eat.1PL»0 strawberry.0PL also raspberry.3PL
'We ate strawberries and raspberries.'

(Dahlstrom 1995:62)

(b) netamwa·pena wi·tawi·haki na·hka ahte·himinani
1.eat.1PL»3 raspberry.3PL also strawberry.0PL
'We ate raspberries and strawberries.'

(Dahlstrom 1995:63)

Since constituents in Algonquian languages may be discontinuous, conjoined noun phrases may be split:

(22) (a) Fox

mo·hči=meko apeno·ha atame·ha·pi, ihkwe·waki=ke·hi, kekimesi, še·škesi·haki [...]
Even children are given a smoke, and women, everyone, maidens [...]

(Goddard 1984:277)

(b) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

mecimí=te Píyel pəmíhhik naka Máli.
always-EMPH Peter.3SG go.along-3PL and Mary.3SG
Peter and Mary are always on the go.

(LeSourd 2013:126)

In (22), all the conjoined nouns have the same obviation status. Bruening (2006) points out a different construction in connection with Maliseet-Passamaquoddy:

(23) Píyel ali=wiciyewtə́wək Malíwəl.

Peter.3SG around-go.with.RECIP.3PL Mary.3'SG
'Peter and Mary are going around with each other (i.e., dating)'.

(Bruening 2006:3)

Bruening calls this construction *split* as the two noun phrases are treated as if they were semantically conjoined. Furthermore, he notes that such split coordinate constructions are different from ordinary coordinate constructions in the way they handle obviation (Bruening 2006:4-5). In (23), only one of the conjoined noun phrases is proximate; the other is obviative. Under the framework of Chomsky's Minimalist Program, Bruening suggests that the obviative noun phrase serves as a sister to an intransitive verb within the verb phrase (VP). This statement, in turn, assumes that any intransitive verb can appear in this construction. Although Bruening confirms this assumption, LeSourd (2013) claims that only verbs that refer to an activity carried out jointly by the participants can occur in the split construction, and they usually agree with both the "subject" and a secondary object:

(24) Píyel 'tali=wiciyewtínəyal Malíwəl.
Peter.3SG 3.around-go.with.RECIP.3PL»3'SG Mary.3'SG
'Peter is going around with (going out with) Mary.'

(LeSourd 2013:123)

In (24), the verb of joint activity contains the subject agreement suffix *-ya* 'proximate plural'. It combines the properties of both the subject *Píyel* 'Peter (PROX)' and the secondary object *Malíwəl* 'Mary (OBV)'. Additionally, the verb carries the object agreement suffix *-l* 'obviative singular'. This construction focuses only on one participant, which is "syntactically expressed as the subject of the verb, while backgrounding the other participant(s), expressed as the object" (LeSourd 2013:123-4). Generally, the agreement of such animate intransitive verbs[2] with the secondary object is not obligatorily in Passamaquoddy, and an AI+O verb may have the same form as the corresponding animate intransitive (AI) verb. As a result, a verb of joint activity, as

[2] Goddard (1974:319) termed these verbs transitivized animate intransitive, abbreviated AI+O.

in (23), still takes subject inflection *-ək* 'proximate plural' for the combined properties of the subject *Píyel* 'Peter (PROX)' and secondary object *Malíwəl* 'Mary (OBV)', but does not take object inflection (i.e., there is no obviative suffix).

2.4 Obviation with Overlapping Reference

Noun phrases with overlapping reference are noun phrases that hold a part/whole relationship in which one or several noun phrases represent a group or a category. In English, such noun phrases can be loosely illustrated by collective nouns:

(25) (a) The Department select graduate students in the middle of every January.
(b) Dr. Washington thinks that the Chinese candidate is suitable.

In (25), *the Department* refers to the members that constitute the department; *Dr. Washington* is one of the members of the department. Thus, *the Department* and *Dr. Washington* overlap in reference. In Algonquian languages, noun phrases that overlap in reference must have the same obviative status:

(26) Plains Cree

(a) ahpo· ayisiyiniw pe·yak ka·-minahot, kahkiyaw
even person.3SG one COMP-kill.game.3SG all

e·-ki·-wi·hkomihcik ayisiyiniwak.
AOR-PAST-invite.X»3PL person.3PL
'If a person killed even a single animal, all the people used to be invited.'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:78)

(b) e·-pasiko·cik e·kwa, ka·-nitonike·t e·sa o·te·.
AOR-arise.3PL then COMP-search.3SG it.appears over.there
'When they got up, he was searching for something in there.'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:106)

In (26a), the noun phrases *ayisiyiniw* 'a person' and *ayisiyiniwak* 'people' overlap in reference and are proximate. In (26b), 'they' and 'he' overlap in reference and are proximate. Compare the sentences in (26) to the sentences in (27):

(27) Plains Cree

(a) ...e·-ki·-pe·hot ma·na ispi· o·hi ayi, ka·-ni·mihitoyit.
AOR-PAST-wait.3SG usually when these.3' COMP-dance.3'
'...She used to wait for the time when they were dancing.'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:184)

(b) pa·mwaye·s ka·-nihta·wikiyit awa·sisa, sa·say e·-kwaya·ci-nitonahkik
before COMP-be.born.3' child.3' already AOR-prepared-seek.3PL»0

piskihcikamikos...
separate.room.0SG
'...before the child is born, they already look for a separate room...'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:222)

In (27), both sentences illustrate that the nominal phrases 'she' and 'they' in (27a) and 'the child' and 'they' in (27b) do not overlap in reference: first, 'she' and 'the child' are not members of either 'they', and, second, 'she' and 'the child' differ from each 'they' in their obviation status.

2.5 Obviation in Relative Clauses

"The relative clause, which represents a special case of embedding with subordination, can be described in terms of two sentences that have an identical constituent. Embedding in this case means the subordination of the one sentence to the shared constituent of the other sentence" (Klima 1964:7). In languages such as English, the head of the relative clause is the "shared constituent" which is located in the matrix clause and is replaced by a relative pronoun in the subordinate clause:

(28) (a) The girl who was sick yesterday won the marathon today.
(b) The children who were sick yesterday are going to the concert today.

In (28), *the girl* and *the children* are the shared constituents which are housed in the matrix clauses and are replaced by the relative pronoun *who* in the subordinate clauses. In both sentences, the relative pronoun *who* inherits and carries the gender and number of the shared

constituents into the subordinate clauses. Also, relative clauses typically follow the shared constituent.

Algonquian relative clauses have similar properties to relative clauses in English (Valentine 2001:579). Typically, Algonquian relative clauses modify a nominal such as a noun phrase or a demonstrative pronoun, but the nominal head may also be an argument of the verb in the matrix clause that is represented only by an inflection. The verb in the relative clause requires initial change and conjunct inflection (in some languages, such as Fox and Ojibwa, with special participial peripheral endings as well), but the initial change may be on the verb itself or on a preceding preverb. Also, the obviation status of the "shared constituent" must remain the same in the matrix and relative clauses as shown in (29):

(29) (a) Cheyenne
é-pėhêvatamóho kaʔėškóneho tsé-sâa-némenéhetsese
3-like.3SG»3' child.3' who-not-sing.3'
'He likes the child who is not singing.'
(Leman 1980a:117)

(b) Miami-Illinois
Míhsima (kwániswa) ihsa neepiki; neehi-'hsa ooneeli
elder.sister.3SG girl.3SG EMPH die.3SG and-EMPH this.3'SG

neehsikohpanali ahšiimima kwániswa keešinikihaakoci.
capture.3'SG»3SG younger.sister.3SG girl.3SG raise.3'SG»3SG
'The older sister of the two girls had died, and so the one who had captured them raised the younger girl as his own.'
(Costa 2003:302)

(c) Ojibwa
ma·pa kwi·wesse·ns ukossa·n uwe·kwe·n pi-eya·necin.
this.3SG boy.3SG 3.fear.3SG»3' whoever here-exist.3'
'This boy is afraid of everyone who comes here.'
(Bloomfield 1957:170)

(d) Massachusett
ummanittoomoh appinnutche kesukqut
3.god.3' sit.3' heaven.LOC
'his God who is in heaven'
(Goddard & Bragdon 1988:433)

In (29), in the Cheyenne sentence, the shared constituent is 'the child' which is replaced by *tsé-*

'the one who'; 'the child' and the participle are both obviative. In the Miami-Illinois sentence, not only are there co-referential noun phrases (i.e., 'the older sister' and 'the younger girl') but there is also a relative clause with the obviative shared constituent 'the one'. In the Ojibwa example, the verb 'come' in the relative clause has the obviative inflection revealing that its agent 'who' is obviative. Finally, in the Massachusett sentence, the verb 'sit' in the relative clause is marked for the obviative possessed head 'his God' (cf. section 2.2).

Additionally, there are relative clauses that modify inanimate nominals:

(30) (a) Plains Cree
okima·w wa·pahtam ci·ma·n e·-misa·yik
chief.3SG see.3SG»0 canoe.0SG AOR-be.big.0'SG
'The chief sees the canoe which is big.'

(Joseph 1980:168)

(b) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
ək^{w}tewakən peskəkpən kisi-kincəkesso.
clothing.0SG wear.3SG»0 PERF-be.dirty.0SG
'The clothing that he was wearing got dirty.'

(Sherwood 1983:87)

Inanimate nominals do not overtly participate in obviation, but the II verbs that accompany them may reveal their obviative status (cf. section 2.2). In the Plains Cree example in (30), the verb *e·misa·yik* in the relative clause is inflected for the obviative inanimate subject which is *ci·ma·n*. In Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, however, II verbs are not inflected for obviation; the matrix verb *kisi-kincəkesso* lacks any obviative morphology and so does the verb *peskəkpən* in the relative clause.

A relative clause can also characterize a locative phrase as in the Plains Cree example below:

(31) ca·n wi·kiw pakwa·nikamikohk e·-misa·yik
John.3SG live.3SG tent.LOC AOR-be.big.0'SG
'John lives in a tent that is big.'

(Joseph 1980:169)

In (31), the subordinate verb *e·-misa·yik* depends upon the locative noun *pakwa·nikamikohk*. Evidently, locative nouns do participate in "the proximate-obviative dimension, although their participation is 'covert', in the manner of inanimate nouns" (Joseph 1980:169). Whether this is the case in other Algonquian languages remains unclear as none of the language descriptions and analyses I have examined discuss locative phrases with a relative clause.

The existence of equational relative clauses in the Algonquian languages provides another environment for obviation. Although such clauses may refer to first and second persons, they are typically expressed in the third person and may, therefore, trigger obviation in the relative clause:

(32) Ojibwa

(a) nii aw gaa-waabmaad waawaashkeshwan.
I.1SG that.3SG COMP-see.3SG»3' deer.3'
'I am the one who saw the deer.'

(b) Giinwaa go sha giwi gaa-niimjig.
you.2PL EMPH EMPH those.3PL COMP-dance.3PL
'You are the ones who danced.

(Valentine 2001:583)

In (32a), since there are two third persons in the relative clause (i.e., 'the one who' and 'the deer'), one of them is singular proximate (i.e., 'who'), and the other is obligatorily obviative (i.e., 'the deer'). In (32b), because 'the ones who' is the only third person in the relative clause, it is proximate; it is also marked for plural number.

Overall, this chapter has demonstrated the syntactic role of obviation in noun phrases. Both animate and inanimate Algonquian nouns participate in obviation: the former overtly, the latter covertly. Additionally, some Algonquian languages have preserved the Proto-Algonquian distinction of number with obviative animate nouns while others have become number

indifferent in obviative animate nouns. Since both animate and inanimate nouns are typically accompanied by demonstrative pronouns, these pronouns vary in gender, number, and obviation in order to agree with the nouns. The simplest syntactic environment in which obviation plays a role is possessive noun phrases. As section 2.2 has demonstrated, obviation is used to differentiate the possessor from the possessee as well as to disambiguate the possessor in the case of multiple possessors. In conjoined noun phrases, obviation links two or more noun phrases in a single unit either syntactically (i.e., when the conjoined noun phrase is proximate plural, the verb has proximate plural morphology) or semantically (i.e., when the conjoined noun phrase includes a proximate and an obviative noun or when the conjoined noun constitutes nouns of both genders or when the conjoined noun phrase is split). Finally, the role of obviation in noun phrases with overlapping reference and relative clauses appears to be purely syntactic: obviation tracks reference of a third person either belonging to a group or being on its own in the context of a sentence.

Chapter III

Obviation in the Verb Phrase

This chapter looks at the role of obviation in verb phrases. It opens with a general discussion of Algonquian verbs, more specifically their transitivity, orders, and inflections in relation to obviation. The second section of this chapter is devoted to the role of obviation in a single clause. The third section deals with obviation in conjoined clauses. Obviation in complement-like and adverbial clauses is discussed in the fourth and fifth sections respectively.

3.1 Obviative Verb Inflections

"The verb in the Indian idiom, is the supreme chief of the language; it draws into its magical circle all the other parts of speech, and makes them act, move, suffer and even exist in the manner and in such situations as is pleasing to it" (Baraga 1878:422). As a result, Algonquian verbs carry information about the gender, number, person, and obviation status of their arguments so that no overt noun phrases are required.

Like many other languages, Algonquian languages differentiate between transitive and intransitive verbs. The examples in (1) demonstrate that there are four classes of Algonquian verbs, namely transitive animate (TA), transitive inanimate (TI), intransitive animate (AI), and intransitive inanimate (II). Transitive classes of verbs express the gender of the goal by a combination of inflectional endings and the shape of the stem. Intransitive verbs, on the other hand, express the gender of the actor by the inflectional endings and the shape of the stem:

(1) (a) Fox

TA	awiwe·wa	'he has/gets him'
TI	awiwa	'he has/gets it'

(Goddard 1995:126)

(b) Massachusett

TA	<ayéuau> /ayəwa·w/	'he makes him'

TI <ayum> /ayəm/ 'he makes it'

(Goddard 1995:126)

(c) Plains Cree

AI mihkosiw 'he is red'

II mihkwa·w 'it is red'

(Wolfart 1996:402)

(d) Arapaho

AI níihonéíhinoo 'I am yellow'

II níihooyóó' 'it is yellow'

(Cowell & Moss 2009:10)

Furthermore, Algonquian verbs can be inflected in the independent or the conjunct order.[3] Verbs that are in the independent order are used in matrix clauses. On the other hand, verbs in the conjunct order are typically used in subordinate clauses, but may as well be used in matrix clauses. Table 3 illustrates the inflectional morphology of both orders in intransitive verbs in "the four best-known languages" (Bloomfield 1946:85):

Table 3. Intransitive Verb Inflections

	Animate Intransitive				Inanimate Intransitive			
	3SG	3PL	3'SG	3'PL	0SG	0PL	0'SG	0'PL
	Independent							
Proto-Algonquian	*-w-a	*w-aki	*-li-w-ali	*li-w-ahi	*-w-i	*-w-ali	*-li-w-i	*-li-w-ali
Plains Cree	-w	-wak	-iyiwa		-w	-wa	-yiw	-yiwa
Fox	-wa	-waki	-niwani	-niwahi	-wi	-wani	-niwi	-niwani
Ojibwa	(-w)	-wak	-wan		(-w)	-wan	-niw	
Menomini	-w	-wak	-wan		-w	-wan		
	Conjunct							
Proto-Algonquian	*-č-i	*-t-wa·w-i	*-li-č-i		*-k-i		*-li-k-i	
Plains Cree	-t	-cik	-iyit		-k	-ki	-yik	-yiki
Fox	-č-i	-(o)wa·či	-(i)ničі		-ki		-niki	
Ojibwa	-t	-iwa·t	-init		-k		-inik	
Menomini	-t	-twa·ʔ	-net		-k	-ken		

As the table demonstrates, languages such as Plains Cree and Fox have preserved the

[3] The imperative order is not considered in this work.

Proto-Algonquian obviative marker *-*li*- in the independent animate and inanimate paradigms while languages such as Ojibwa and Menomini lack this suffix in the independent animate paradigm. Note also that Ojibwa has the obviative marker in the independent inanimate paradigm as Plains Cree and Fox do whereas Menomini does not have any morphology differentiating between proximate and obviative subject in the independent paradigm. Moreover, in the conjunct paradigm, although all the languages have proximate and obviative inflections, when the subject is animate, the obviative inflections are number indifferent. The conjunct inanimate paradigm shows that although Menomini does not have obviative inflections, Fox and Ojibwa have number-indifferent suffixes for proximate and obviative, while Plains Cree has number-sensitive inflections for proximate and obviative. To illustrate, below are two Plains Cree and two Menomini verbs – animate intransitive and inanimate intransitive respectively – conjugated in the independent and conjunct orders:

(2) (a) Plains Cree

	Independent		Conjunct	
3SG	apiw	'he sits'	e·-apit	'as he sits'
3PL	apiwak	'they sit'	e·-apicik	'as they sit'
3'	apiyiwa	'he/they sit(s)'	e·-apiyit	'as he/they sit(s)'
0SG	misa·w	'it is big'	e·-misa·k	'it being big'
0PL	misa·wa	'they are big'	e·-misa·ki	'they being big'
0'SG	misa·yiw	'it is big'	e·-misa·yik	'it being big'
0'PL	misa·yiwa	'they are big'	e·-misa·yiki	'they being big'

(Wolfart 1996:417-9)

(b) Menomini

3SG	po·sew	'he embarks'	po·set	'if he embarks'
3PL	po·sewak	'they embark'	pu·setuaq	'if they embark'
3'	po·sewan	'he/they embark(s)'	po·senet	'if he/they embark(s)'
0SG	mɛhki·w	'it is red'	taki·k	'when it exists'
0PL	mɛhki·wan	'they are red'	taki·ken	'when they exist'

(Bloomfield 1962: 150-1, 176-9)

As the examples in (2) show, in some Algonquian languages (e.g., Plains Cree, Potawatomi) a

preverb is commonly used in addition to the inflectional suffixes in conjunct forms. In other Algonquian languages (e.g., Menomini, Miami-Illinois), only the suffixes distinguish between the independent and conjunct forms.

Because TA verbs may be inflected for two arguments, the actor and the goal, there are special suffixes to indicate which is the actor and which is the goal:

(3) (a) Miami-Illinois

waapameewa	waapamekwa
look.3SG»3'	look.3'»3SG
'He looks at him.'	'He (OBV) looks at him.'

(Costa 2003:270)

(b) Plains Cree

se·kihe·w na·pe·w atimwa.	se·kihik na·pe·w atimwa.
scare.3SG»3' man.3SG dog.3'	scare.3'»3SG man.3SG dog.3'
'Man scares dog.'	'Dog scares man.'

(Wolfart 1996:409-10)

(c) Arapaho

hinén nonoohówoot hísein	hinén nonoohobéít hísein
man.3SG see.3SG»3' woman.3'	man.3SG see.3'»3SG woman.3'
'A man sees a woman.'	'A woman sees a man.'

(Cowell & Moss 2009:59)

(d) Menomini

kan onɛ·wa·nan	kan oniakonan
not 3.see.3SG»3'	not 3.see.3'»3SG
'He does not see the other.'	'The other does not see him.'

(Bloomfield 1962:141)

These special suffixes (PA direct *-*a*·- and inverse *-*ekw*-) express the grammatical category of direction. When the actor ranks higher than the goal, the action is direct (e.g., the examples in the left column in (3)). On the other hand, when the goal ranks higher than the actor, the action is inverse (e.g., the examples in the right column in (3)). This ranking, known as the Person Hierarchy, is purely grammatical and is as follows:

(4) 2 > 1 > X > 3 > 3' > 0

According to the Person Hierarchy, second person outranks first person, unspecified actor, and third person; proximates are higher than obviatives; and animates outrank inanimates.

In some Algonquian languages, direct TA verbs may have absolute or objective inflections. Absolute inflections are used when the goal is an indefinite noun phrase. In contrast, objective inflections are used when the goal is a definite noun phrase (cf. Goddard 1967; Pentland 1999; Goddard 2007). Consider the sentences in (5):

(5) Munsee

(a) máxkwal níhle·w
bear.3' kill.3SG(»3')
'He killed a bear/bears.'

(b) wənihlá·wal né·l máxkwal
3.kill.3SG»3' that.3' bear.3'
'He killed the bear(s).'

(c) wənihlá·wal
3.kill.3SG»3'
'He killed him/them.'

(Goddard 2007:210)

In (5a), the absolute verb 'kill' is marked only for the third person actor; it also requires an overt nominal obviative goal. On the other hand, in (5b), the objective verb 'kill' is inflected for both the proximate actor and the obviative goal. Objective verbs do not require overt nominals, however, as shown in (5c).

Goddard (2007) reports that the absolute/objective contrast in both transitive paradigms is found only in Eastern languages such as Unami, Munsee, Mahican, Western Abenaki, Loup, and Massachusett. Some other languages (e.g., Ojibwa, Shawnee, Potawatomi) "preserve the absolute-objective contrast in transitive inanimate (TI) verbs as a contrast between objectless TI's (TI-O) and ordinary TI's" (Goddard 2007:211). Consider the following examples:

(6)

	TI absolute	TI objective
(a) Munsee	né·m 'he sees (indef.)'	wəné·mən 'he sees it (def.)'
(b) Ojibwa	ine·ntam (TI-O) 'he thinks so'	otine·nta·n 'he thinks of it so'
(c) Shawnee	wa·kotamwa (TI-O) 'he knows'	howa·kota 'he knows it'

(Goddard 2007:211)

When TI verbs appear in a sentence, they carry actor and inanimate goal inflections:

(7) (a) Moose Cree
wa·pahtam nici·ma·niliw
see.3SG»0 1.canoe.0'SG
'He sees my canoe'
(Ellis 1983:95)

(b) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
nəmihtonəya skitapəyək wikəwam
see.3PL»0 man.3PL house.0SG
'The men see the house.'
(Sherwood 1983:92)

(c) Eastern Ojibwa
wi·ya·ss omi·čin
meat.0SG 3.eat.3SG»0
'He eats meat.'
(Bloomfield 1957:152)

(d) Cheyenne
é-mésénóvo ho'évohkȯtse
3-eat.3PL»0 meat.0SG
'They ate meat.'
(Leman 1980a:89)

In (7), the Cree verb 'see' is marked for the singular third person actor and inanimate goal. The inanimate goal 'my canoe' is possessed by the first person and is obviative. In the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy sentence, the verb 'see' is inflected for the plural third person actor and singular inanimate goal. The Eastern Ojibwa verb 'eat' carries morphology for the singular third person actor and singular inanimate goal. In the Cheyenne sentence, the verb 'eat' is marked for the plural third person actor and singular inanimate goal. The important pattern that emerges from these examples is that the actor of a TI verb always outranks the goal on the Person Hierarchy.

3.2 Obviation in a Single Clause

Based on the discussion above, the simplest Algonquian single-clause sentence would consist of a verb in either the independent or the conjunct order and its overt arguments. If the sentence contains a transitive verb with a third person subject and a third person goal, one of

them can be proximate. The other argument may be proximate or obviative (as discussed in Chapter IV).

(8) (a) Eastern Ojibwa
oppini·n otamwa·n
potato.3' 3.eat.3SG»3'
'He is eating potatoes.'
(Bloomfield 1957:157)

(b) Kickapoo
mana neewea Ciisesani
this.one.3SG see.3SG»3' Jesus.3'SG
'This one saw Jesus.'
(Voorhis 1974:45)

(c) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
nehpahawal ətohkəl nowel naka can
kill.3PL»3'SG deer.3'SG Nowel.3SG and John.3SG
'John and Nowel killed a deer.'
(Sherwood 1983:110)

All the clauses in (8) contain a TA verb with two third person arguments (note that in the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy example, the actor noun phrase is conjoined; cf. section 2.3), one of them being a proximate actor and the other being an obviative goal. In (9), the examples show that the actor can be obviative and the goal proximate:

(9) (a) Fox
amokwa mahkwani
eat.3'»3SG bear.3'SG
'A bear ate him.'
(Dahlstrom 1996:134)

(b) Plains Cree
se·kihik na·pe·wa atim.
scare.3'»3SG man.3' dog.3SG
'Man scares dog.'
(Wolfart 1996:409)

(c) Ojibwa
niw dash kwewan wgii-gnawenmigwaan giw binoojiinyag.
this.3' then woman.3' 3.PAST-take.care.3'»3PL this.3PL child.3PL
'The woman/women took care of the children.'
(Valentine 2001:631)

If the actor is first or second person, the goal may be either proximate or obviative:

(10) (a) Miami-Illinois
...nooki kati nitankihaa moohswa.
again FUT 1.kill.1SG»3SG deer.3SG
'I will kill another deer.'

(Costa 2003:327)

(b) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
ktətələmawak kiləwaw minsəssək
2.eat.2PL»3PL you.2PL raspberry.3PL
'You are eating raspberries.'

(Sherwood 1983:110)

(c) Plains Cree
niwa·pamima·wa okosisa
1.see.1SG»3' 3.son.3'
'I see his son.'

(Dahlstrom 1986:43)

(d) Eastern Ojibwa
niwa·pema· otayiwa·n
1.see.1SG»3 3.dog.3PL»3'
'I see their dog.'

(Bloomfield 1957:155)

In the first two sentences in (10), the third person arguments (i.e., 'deer' and 'raspberries') are proximate whereas in the latter two sentences, the third person arguments (i.e., 'his son' and 'their dog') are possessed by a third person and, thus, obviative. Note that in Eastern Ojibwa the verb does not indicate that the object is obviative if the actor is first or second person.

The third person actor can be either proximate or obviative if the goal is first or second person:

(11) (a) Eastern Ojibwa
ninki·-na·tama·k aw inini kičči·na·kwa.
1.PAST-help.3SG»1SG that.3SG man.3SG yesterday
'That man helped me yesterday.'

(Bloomfield 1957:158)

(b) Kickapoo
nepemenekwa
1.take.care.3SG»1SG
'He took care of me.'

(Voorhis 1974:69)

(c) Plains Cree
niwa·pamikoyiwa okosisa
1.see.3'»1SG 3.son.3'

'His son sees me.'

(Dahlstrom 1986:43)

(d) Plains Cree
niwa·pamikona·na
1.see.3'»1PL
'He sees us.'

(Dahlstrom 1986:44)

In (11), in the Eastern Ojibwa and Kickapoo sentences, the third person actors (i.e., 'that man' and 'he') are proximate whereas the goals are first person singular (i.e., 'me'). In both Plains Cree examples, however, the actors are third person obviative: one is possessed by another third person ('his son'), and the other (i.e., 'he') is marked only on the verb. Moreover, the Plains Cree verbs carry different inflections: in the sentence with the possessed actor, the verb has *-iyi-* and *-a* suffixes whereas in the sentence with the unexpressed third person obviative actor, the verb has only the *-a* suffix.

Algonquian transitive verbs may also have a secondary goal. In languages such as English, such verbs are called ditransitive or double-object verbs:

(12) Sam gave Mary the book.

In (12), the transitive verb *gave* has two objects: *the book* is the direct object and *Mary* is the indirect object. In similar sentences, an Algonquian verb agrees with the indirect object, which must be animate in gender, whereas the nominal phrase that denotes the direct object may be of either gender. Consider the following Shawnee sentences:

(13) (a) ya·ma ca·n hopo·namawahi yo·loma hapasiwali yohoma kwehi
this.3SG John.3SG 3.keep.3SG»3'PL this.0PL stick.0PL this.3'PL woman.3'PL
'John is keeping these sticks for these women.'

(b) ya·ma ca·n hoteʔpo·namawa·li mkwamali tephika·neki nili pil.
this.3SG John.3SG 3.put.there.for.3SG»3'SG ice.3'SG cup.LOC that.3'SG Bill
'John put ice in a cup for Bill.'

(c) ya·ma kwe·tayce hotepenamawa·li yo·loma pisko·cali nli-ʔkwe·li
this.3SG Gweech.3SG 3.buy.for.3SG»3'SG this.3'SG Bill.3'SG that.3'SG-woman.3'SG

'Gweech bought the woman for Bill.'

(d) ya·ma kwe·tayce hotepenamawa·li nli-ʔkwe·li yo·loma pisko·cali
this.3SG Gweech.3SG 3.buy.for.3SG»3'SG that.3'SG-woman.3'SG this.3'SG Bill.3'SG
'Gweech bought Bill for the woman.'

(Boling 1980:98-100)

In (13a), the indirect object is animate and obviative (i.e., these women'), but the direct object is inanimate (i.e., 'these sticks'). The verb is marked for the indirect object. In (13b), both indirect and direct objects are animate (i.e, 'ice' and 'that Bill') and obviative (note that the name 'Bill' is not marked for obviative, but the preceding obviative demonstrative indicates its obviative status). In (13c) and (13d), both indirect and direct objects denote human beings and are obviative.

Other examples of ditransitive sentences include:

(14) (a) Miami-Illinois
neehi-'hsa-hka ahšamaaci wiina
and-EMPH-DUB feed.3SG»3' nut.meat.0PL
'And (Wissakatchakwa) meant to feed him nut meats.'

(Costa 2003:425)

(b) Kickapoo
miineetokeehiki
give.DUB.3PL»3'
'They must have given it to him/them.'

(Voorhis 1974:73)

(c) Micmac
ik'n'muwata(l)
give.3»3'PL+0PL
'He will give them (inan) to them (anim).'

(Proulx 1978:125)

(d) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
pəyəl k'isihtəwan ntehpiteməl pəsənot.
Peter.3SG 3.make.for.3SG»3'+0 1.woman.3' basket-0SG
'Peter made a basket for my wife.'

(Sherwood 1983:95)

In (14), in all sentences indirect objects are animate and obviative whereas direct objects, except in the Kickapoo sentence, are inanimate.

3.3 Obviation in Conjoined Clauses

Conjoined clauses are clauses that are joined together and constitute a single sentence. In English, conjoined clauses are typically joined by one of the coordinate conjunctions (e.g., *and, but, or*):

(15) (a) John studies at a university, but Kate studies at a college.
(b) On one side of the table, there are pens, and on the other side, there are pencils.

In (15), the clauses in (a) and (b) are conjoined by *but* and *and* respectively. Sentences of similar composition are found in Algonquian languages:

(16) (a) Shawnee
ca·n ktoʔθe we ya·ma Mary memekwi.
John.3SG walk.3SG then this.3SG Mary.3SG run.3SG
'John walked, but Mary ran.'
(Boling 1981:83)

(b) Ojibwe
...miinwaa baatiindoon miinan, giigoonyag ge yaawag
and be.abundant.0PL blueberry.0PL fish.3PL and be.there.3PL
'...and there were lots of berries, and there were also fish'
(Valentine 2001:999)

(c) Cheyenne
náhko'éehe é-aseo'ėxova ho'évohkȯtse, naa
1.mother.3SG 3-slice.3SG»0 meat-0PL and

naaxaa'éhéme é-tavéstȧhémóho tsé-heškétse.
1.sister.3SG 3-help.3SG»3' COMP-have.mother.1PL
'My mother started slicing the meat, and my sister helped our mother.'
(Leman 1980b:199)

(d) Fox
menwina·hi=meko e·h=owi·kihekoči o·sani,
some.distance.away-EMPH AOR-cause.to.dwell.3'»3SG 3.father.3'

meše=meko e·h=taši-ma·-mahkate·wi·či
freely-EMPH AOR-be.engaged.in-REDUP-fast.3SG
'His father made a place for him some distance away, and he just kept on fasting.'
(Dahlstrom 2015:165)

In the Shawnee sentence in (16), both 'John' and 'Mary' are proximate; they are third person actors of the verbs 'walked' and 'ran' respectively. The Ojibwa sentence demonstrates that one of

the clauses in a conjoined sentence can have a proximate third person animate actor whereas the second clause has a proximate inanimate actor. The Cheyenne sentence is interesting because both actors are possessed by first person and proximate, and the first actor (i.e., 'my mother') becomes the obviative goal in the second clause. In the Fox example, in the first clause the actor (i.e., 'his father') is possessed by third person proximate and, thus, is obviative. The verb in this clause is inflected for the obviative actor and proximate goal. The goal in this clause becomes the actor in the second clause preserving the proximate status.

Since one of the noteworthy features of Algonquian languages is obviation, when two clauses are conjoined in a single sentence, they remain distinct domains for obviation (i.e., they behave as single clauses with regards to obviation). In other words, there is a shift in assignment of proximate status between the two clauses as seen in (16 a-c). This is called a *proximate shift* (Goddard 1984:279), and it occurs when a new proximate replaces the previous one (see also sections 1.4 and 4.2).

Sometimes in written English conjoined clauses are joined together only by punctuation as illustrated in (17):

(17) (a) Mark returned home; they went camping.
(b) It was snowing; we stayed home.

Rhodes (1990) refers to similar sentences in Algonquian languages as "sentence clusters". These sentence clusters "encode a few very specific semantic relations, viz. temporal proximity, immediate cause-effect, paraphrase, and a few others" (Rhodes 1990:108). Unlike the ordinary kind of conjoined sentences, the control of obviation in this type of conjoined sentences extends "from the subject of the event sentence to the subject of the background sentence" (Rhodes 1990:108):

(18) Ojibwe

(a) Jina dash eta gii-teni maa shkodeng, miinwaa gii-gweksidood.
'[When] it (OBV) has been in the fire for a short time, she (PROX) flips it over.'

(b) Niw dash mtigoon gii-gziibweshkaawan megwaa yaazwaakshinnijin. "Nga-wa-kawe-niisaakbinaa," gii-nendam.
'Then a tree (OBV) [started] rubbing in the middle where one part leans against another, and he (PROX) thought, "I will interrupt [my eating] and pull that tree down.'
(Rhodes 1990:108-9)

In (18), the subjects of both event clauses (i.e., 'she' and 'he' respectively) are proximate. They control the obviation of the subjects (i.e., 'it' and 'tree' respectively) in the background clauses. Rhodes (1990:109) concludes that "the victims of this type of obviation are largely limited to logical inanimates" and claims that it is "a syntactic idiom".

Additionally, there are sentence clusters in which both actors are animate third persons as in the Potawatomi sentences below:

(19) (a) ibe é-byat jik-gchegem; bama zhe na gete
there AOR-come.3SG next.to-big.lake soon EMPH EMPH for.sure

gigabéyen é-nemsénet.
boy.3' AOR-walk.off.3'SG
'She came there to the big lake; soon the boy had started to walk off.'

(b) é-wabmawat kojésen é-bshkobnanet; jak zhe na
AOR-see.3PL»3' bean.3' AOR-pull.out.3SG»3' all EMPH EMPH

é-zhechgénet
AOR-do.things.thus.3'
'They saw him pulling out beans; he was doing all kinds of things.'
(Buszard 2003:168)

In (19), the clauses are connected by temporal proximity (Buszard 2003:168). In (19a), just as she comes closer to the lake, the boy starts to walk off. The third person proximate actor 'she' in the first clause controls the obviation status of the third person obviative actor 'the boy' in the second clause. In (19b), the second clause refers to his general behaviour whereas the first clause describes an instance of it (Buszard 2003:168). Thus, the third person proximate actor 'they' in

the first clause controls the obviation status of the third person obviative actor 'he' in the second clause.

3.4 Obviation in Complement Clauses

A complement clause is a subordinate clause that is an argument of a verb. Thus, the matrix verb must be transitive. At the same time, the head of the complement clause is located within the complement clause itself. The following English examples illustrate the point:

(20) (a) He knows that she came.
(b) He saw that she came.

In (20), the complement clause *that she came* is an argument of the transitive verb phrases *knows* and *saw*. *She* is the head of the complement clause whereas *he* is the head of the matrix clause. Since the head of the matrix clause and the head of the complement clause can both be third person, the assignment of obviation has to be considered in Algonquian complement clauses.

As shown in section 3.1, Algonquian languages have two types of transitive verbs – TA and TI – that both can have a complement. Long (1999b) has analysed complement clauses in Plains Cree and proposed that no proximate shift can occur between the head of the matrix clause and the head of the complement clause:

(21) (a) kiske·yihtam e·wako e·h-kostamiyit.
know.3SG»0 this.0SG AOR-fear.3'»0
'He (PROX) knew that the other (OBV) feared this object.'

(b) ...ka·-wa·pama·t e·h-kitowe·hkwa·miyit.
COMP-see.3SG»3' AOR-snore.3'
'.., he (PROX) saw that he (OBV) was sound asleep and snoring.'

(Long 1999b:97-98)

The sentences in (21) demonstrate that both TA and TI matrix verbs can have a complement. Also, these sentences show the absence of proximate shift between the head of the matrix clause

and the head of the complement clause. Other Algonquian languages show a similar pattern (but cf. section 4.1):

(22) (a) Ojibwa
gnimaa niiwgon wgii-gkendaan wii-bi-dgoshninid.
probably four.days 3.PAST-know.3SG»0 FUT-here-arrive.3'
'He knew that they were probably going to come in four days.'
(Valentine 2001:666)

(b) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
t'əlitahamal canəl wicohkekeməwəl.
3.think.3SG»3' John.3'SG help.3'
'He thinks that John is helping out.'
(Sherwood 1983:96)

(c) Munsee
nál=i·n we·wíhto·n wtəli·-=č lá·pi·w -pəmá·wsi·n ní·l xwi·səməsal.
then know.3SG»0 3.thus-FUT again -live.3SG»0 that-3' 3.younger.sibling.3'
'Then he knew that his younger brother would come back to life.'
(Goddard 2015b:296)

(d) Fox
e·h=pwa·wi-kehke·nema·či e·h=tanwe·taminikwe·ni
AOR-not-know.3SG»3' AOR-be.making.sound.3'
'He did not know where the sound of it could be coming from.'
(Thomason 2015:364)

Long's analysis suggests that proximate shifts do not happen between the matrix clause and subordinate complement clause because the complement verb belongs to the domain of the matrix verb (i.e., there is only one domain, governed by the matrix verb).

On the other hand, given that obviation is a reference tracking system, when the proximate argument of the matrix verb overlaps in reference (cf. section 2.4) with the argument of the complement verb, the latter argument has to be proximate:

(23) (a) Plains Cree
kiske·yihtam e·ka· e·h-pakitiniht pa·kahkos
know.3SG»0 not AOR-release.X»3SG bony.specture.3SG
'The bony spectre knew that it would not be freed.'
(Long 1999b:97)

(b) Fox
e·h=a·čimoči e·=išawiči...
AOR-narrate.3SG AOR-fare.thus.3SG
'He explained what happened to him.'

(Dahlstrom 2015:150)

In (23), the arguments of the matrix clauses overlap in reference with the arguments of the complement clauses and are proximate.

In Moose Cree, some intransitive verbs that denote thoughts and emotional reactions can be marked for a singular proximate subject and have what appears to be a complement clause:

(24) (a) ite·lihta·kwan na·pe·w e·-milowe·lima·t me·ri·wa.
seem.0SG man.3SG AOR-like.3SG»3' Mary.3'
'It seems that the man likes Mary.'

(b) išina·kwan či·ma·na e·-kosa·pe·ki.
look.so.0SG boat.0PL AOR-sink.0PL
'It appears that the boats are sinking.'

(James 1984:207-8)

In both of these sentences, the matrix verbs are inanimate proximate singular. The complement verbs are also inflected for proximate subjects. The fact that both complement clauses can be considered to be sentential subjects (i.e. the subjects of the matrix verbs; James 1984:208) explains the proximate shifts in both (24a) and (24b). (25) provides sentences similar to (24) from other Algonquian languages:

(25) (a) Maliseet-Passamaquoddy
assəkinak^{w}at skitapəyək mehtəlokhətinəya.
seem.strange.0SG man.3PL stop.working.3PL+0
'It is strange that the men have stopped working.'

(Sherwood 1983:133)

(b) Ojibwa
gkendaagod maanii debwed.
be.evident.0SG Mary.3SG be.truthful.3SG
'It is obvious that Mary is telling the truth.'

(Valentine 2001:677)

Consider another pair of Moose Cree sentences in (26):

(26) (a) ite·lihta·kosiw na·pe·w e·-milwe·lima·t me·ri·wa.
seem.3SG man.3SG AOR-like.3SG»3' Mary.3'
'It seems that the man likes Mary. / The man seems to like Mary.'

(b) išina·kwanwa či·ma·na e·-kosa·pe·ki.
look.so.0PL boat.0PL AOR-sink.0PL
'It appears that the boats are sinking. / The boats appear to be sinking.'
(James 1984:208-9)

In (26a) and (26b), the matrix verbs are intransitive, but are inflected either for singular animate proximate subject or for plural inanimate proximate subject which appear to be the subjects of the complement clauses. According to James' (1984) analysis, 'the man' in (26a) and 'the boats' in (26b) have been copied ("raised") to become the subject of the matrix clauses and cause the respective matrix verbs to indicate the animacy, person, number, and obviation of their raised subjects.

3.5 Obviation in Adverbial Clauses

An adverbial clause is a subordinate clause that is not an argument of a predicate. As a result, the matrix verb can be transitive or intransitive. Since adverbial clauses are non-argument clauses, they can precede or follow the matrix clause. The following English sentences demonstrate the point:

(27) (a) She thanked him when he finished the project.
(b) Once he left, the dog fell asleep.

In (27a), the subject of the matrix clause is *she*, and the matrix verb *thanked* is transitive. The subject of the adverbial clause is *he*. In (27b), the subject of the matrix clause is *dog*, and the matrix verb *fell asleep* is intransitive. The subject of the adverbial clause is *he*. When the subjects of both clauses are third persons, one of them may be subject to obviation in Algonquian languages.

The behaviour of obviation in sentences containing adverbial clauses can be exemplified by the instances in (28):

(28) (a) Ojibwa
gegaa dash go kina e-ni-nsaad mii iw gii-gnjibhiwenid.
almost then EMPH all AOR-going.2-kill.3SG»3' then that.0SG PAST-flee.3'
'When he had killed nearly all of them they fled.'
(Valentine 2001:830)

(b) Plains Cree
ka·-ma·toyit, sa·say mosti-to·hto·sa·poy, e·-asiwata·cik e·-mosci-miya·cik
COMP-cry.3' already cow-milk.0SG AOR-put.inside.3PL AOR-merely-give.3PL»3'
'When the baby cries, they immediately put cow's milk into a bottle and simply give that to the baby...'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:225)

(c) Fox
o·ni mesa·hkwahi e·h=ki·šikiniči na·hina·hi,
and,then ear.of.corn.3'PL AOR-grow.up.3'PL time,distance

i·ni na·hkači e·h=ni·miheti·wa·či.
then.also, again AOR-dance.together.3PL
'And when the ears of corn were ripe, that was another time when they had dancing.'
(Goddard 2007:12)

(d) Potawatomi
i je wsezéyma é-zhyat éje-nim'edinet.
and older.brother.3SG AOR-go.there.3SG where-dance.3'
'so the older brother would go to dances where they dance.'
(Buszard 2003:165)

All the sentences in (28) consist of a matrix clause and a subordinate adverbial clause. In these examples, the behaviour of obviation between the matrix clause and the adverbial clause resembles the behaviour of obviation between a matrix clause and a complement clause as in (21) and (22). In other words, none of the sentences in (28) has a proximate shift even though adverbial clauses, unlike complement clauses, are not arguments of the matrix verbs (Long 1999a). Although an adverbial clause normally constitutes an independent domain, in these examples the matrix clause governs the behaviour of obviation in the adverbial clause.

If a proximate argument of the matrix verb is co-referential with an argument of the adverbial verb, however, the latter argument also has to be proximate:

(29) (a) Miami-Illinois
namehta weehkweetiita eehkwi nipehsiikwi
for.short.time wear.trousers.3SG while be.dead.NEG.3SG

'He wore trousers for a short time before he died.'

(Costa 2003:423-4)

(b) Munsee

é·nta-=i·n -kí·ši-wəli·xəmá·te yó·l o·xwí·sal
when finish.3SG»3' that.3' 3.grandchild.3'

nál=i·n á·šte· yó·l wtá·n'sal wəli·xəmá·wal
then in.turn that.3' 3.daughter.3' lay.to.rest.3SG»3'
'When she had finished putting her grandchildren to bed, then, in turn, she laid her daughter to rest.'

(Goddard 2015:284-5)

(c) Plains Cree

e·-pahkisihk o·ma, kinose·wa ka·-kapata·siwe·piskawa·t...
AOR-fall.down.3SG this.0SG fish.3' COMP-pull.ashore.3SG»3'
'When it [a moose] fell, it splashed a fish out of water.'

(Ahenakew 1986:4)

In (29), an argument of the matrix clauses is co-referential with an argument of the adverbial clauses.

Adverbial clauses may also denote the state of the physical environment. As Wolfart (1996) observes, the impersonal subjects of such adverbial clauses must be obviative when the matrix clause involves an animate third person:

(30) Plains Cree

e·-ota·kosiniyik iyikohk, ki·we·w
AOR-be.evening.0'SG at.that.time go.home.3SG
'When it was evening, she went home.'

(Wolfart 1996:401)

In connection with Ojibwe, Rhodes (1990) defines this phenomenon as "cross-clausal obviation" wherein "an argument of a matrix clause controls the obviation of an argument in an embedded clause" (Rhodes 1990:106) and provides the following examples:

(31) (a) ...degwaagnigin zgaknamwaad iw mnoomin
be.fall.0'.ITER store.3PL»0 that.0SG rice.0SG
'...every fall they store wild rice'

(b) gii-boonii dash maa ddibew mtigoonskaanig
PAST-land.3SG EMPH there on.shore be.bushes.0'
'She landed on the shore where there were bushes.'

(Rhodes 1990:106)

In (31a), the animate third person 'they (PROX)' controls obviation in the temporal adverbial clause 'every fall'. In (31b), the animate third person 'she (PROX)' governs obviation in the locative adverbial clause 'there were bushes'. Below is a similar example from Fox:

(32) nye·wokonakatenikini e·h=na·kwa·či
be.four.days.0'.ITER AOR-leave.3SG
'After four days, he would leave.'

(Dahlstrom 2015:186-7)

In (30) through (32), the arguments of adverbial clauses are impersonal. In other words, they have the features [+3rd person, -plural, -animate], and they are obligatorily obviative because all other third person noun phrases belonging to the same obviative span are higher on the Person Hierarchy (Pentland 1996:338-9).

Consider the examples in (33):

(33) Cree

(a) e·-kimiwahk ka·-takosina·n
AOR-rain.0SG COMP-arrive.1SG
'It was raining when I arrived.'

(b) e·-kimiwaniṅik ka·-takosihk
AOR-rain.0'SG COMP-arrive.3SG
'It was raining when he arrived.'

(Pentland 1996:339)

In (33a), there is only one third person argument, 'it'; the verb 'rain' is therefore proximate. In (33b), however, the presence of the third person animate argument 'he' requires the inanimate argument 'it' to be obviative.

Counterexamples to "cross-clausal obviation", in which the adverbial clause forms a separate obviation span from the matrix clause, are presented in section 4.1 below.

In summary, this chapter has considered how obviation affects verb phrases. Not only it has discussed transitivity, orders, and inflections of Algonquian verbs in respect to obviation, but also it has looked at how obviation works in single, conjoined, complement, and adverbial clauses. In a single clause, the verb usually constitutes a single domain and can have two or three arguments. When the verb has two third person arguments, one of them can be proximate while the other is obviative. On the other hand, when the verb has one third person argument and a first or second person argument, the third person argument can be either proximate or obviative. In ditransitive clauses, the verb agrees with the subject and the indirect object (which must be animate in gender) whereas the direct object can be animate or inanimate. In the presence of a proximate subject and when both objects are animate, the latter are obviative. Furthermore, since each clause in a conjoined sentence constitutes its own domain, these domains are separated by a proximate shift. However, when two clauses are in a very particular relationship (e.g., temporal proximity or immediate cause-effect), the control of obviation extends "from the subject of the event sentence to the subject of the background sentence" (Rhodes 1990:108). In complement clauses, proximate shifts are not allowed between the matrix clause and the complement clause because there is only one domain that is controlled by the matrix verb. However, when the two arguments overlap in reference, both are proximate. Proximate shifts are permitted between the matrix clause and the complement clause when (i) a complement clause can be considered the subject of the matrix clause or (ii) the subject of the complement clause is copied ("raised") to serve as the subject of the matrix clause. Similar to complement clauses, subordinate adverbial clauses are resistant to proximate shifts although they constitute a different domain than that of the matrix verb. Also, an adverbial clause can have a proximate argument when that argument overlaps in reference with the proximate argument in the matrix clause. Finally, when an

adverbial clause denotes a state of the physical environment and the matrix clause involves a third person argument, the argument of the adverbial clause must be obviative because the argument of the matrix clause is higher on the Person Hierarchy.

Chapter IV

Obviation beyond Syntax

The focus of this chapter is four-fold. First, this chapter considers a few instances where obviation violates its own working principles as seen in Chapters II and III. Secondly, since these chapters have discussed the most prominent syntactic environments in which obviation operates, this chapter extends the domain of a sentence to the domain of a narrative and shows how obviation works within a text. A brief discussion of the behaviour of obviation in elicitation follows. The chapter concludes with examples of unexplained shifts between proximate and obviative in narratives.

4.1 Eluded Obviation

The discussion of eluded obviation considers four environments: naming constructions, violation of Person and Animacy Hierarchies as well as complement and adverbial clauses.

With respect to naming constructions, Goddard (1984) reports that a proximate shift occurs in a relative clause when it denotes a name or designation as shown in (1) below:

(1) Fox
me·me·čiki=ča·h=meko kehke·nemekwa maneto·wa e·nemečini...
certainly- well-EMPH know.3'-3SG manitou-3SG call.X»3'
'Certainly the one called manitou knows about him...'

(Goddard 1984:278)

In (1), there are two proximate arguments – 'manitou' and 'him'. Although 'manitou' and 'the one' refer to the same entity, 'manitou' does not agree in obviation with the obviative participle *e·nemečini* 'the one (OBV) called'. Goddard (1984: 277-8) explains that naming and designation constructions do not belong to the syntax of the sentence and, therefore, do not "show concord with a co-referential obviative".

Secondly, as seen in Chapter II, obviation is normally subject to the Person Hierarchy wherein animate noun phrases outrank inanimates. The following Kickapoo sentence, however, contains a proximate inanimate argument despite the presence of a proximate animate argument:

(2) pietóaki eeskikeki ohkaaci.
bring.3PL be.new.0SG foot.0SG
'They (AN.PROX) brought a new (IN.PROX) tire.'
(Voorhis 1974:29)

In (2), not only does this sentence violate the Person Hierarchy ranking by leaving the inanimate noun phrase 'a new tire' proximate in the presence of a higher ranked animate third person 'they', but it also does not conform to the one-proximate-per-clause syntactic constraint. Voorhis (1974:29) accounts for such violations by saying that "the obviative is sometimes neglected in inanimate nouns."

Obviation in inanimate nouns can be neglected in Ojibwa as well:

(3) Miinwaa mtigoons wgii-nokaason gii-bshazhehang
and stick.0SG 3.PAST-use.3SG»0SG PAST-knock.off.ashes.3SG»0

iw bkwezhgan menpodok.
that.0SG bread.0SG taste.good.0SG
'And she (AN.PROX) used a stick to knock the ashes off that tasty bread (IN.PROX).'
(Rhodes 1990:110)

In (3), there are two single-clause sentences. The arguments of the first clause are governed by the Person Hierarchy in assigning obviation (i.e., the higher ranked animate proximate argument acts on the lower ranked obviative inanimate). At the same time, in the second clause, both arguments are proximate even though 'she' outranks 'that bread' on the Person Hierarchy (i.e., 'she' is animate, and 'that bread' is inanimate). Rhodes (1990:110) claims that "the object of the purpose clause is 'bread', a high ranking nominal, which fails to undergo obviation, even though there is a potential clausemate controller." Following Rhodes' explanation, then, 'a new tire' in

(2) must be a high ranking nominal as well; however, on what grounds both 'that bread' and 'a new tire' are high ranking nominals remains unclear.

An interesting example of eluded obviation is presented in (4):

(4) Fox

i·ni	e·hkwiči	mi·ša·mi-a·teso·hka·na	e·=nah-ina·čimoči
there	be.so.long.3SG	sacred.pack-story.3SG	AOR-used.to.narrate.3SG

no·sa	a·nawowa·ta.
1.uncle.3SG	Anawowata.3SG

'That is the end of the sacred-pack story the way my uncle Anawowata used to tell it.'
(Goddard 1984:277)

Here 'the sacred-pack story' and 'my uncle Anawowata' are both proximate animate arguments. Goddard attributes the proximate shift as due to the Animacy Hierarchy in which people outrank other animates: even though 'the sacred-pack story' is "clearly the topic and the first mentioned animate", the Animacy Hierarchy preserves the higher rank of 'my uncle Anawowata' by keeping it proximate (Goddard 1984:277).

As discussed in Chapter III, the head of a complement clause is typically obviative unless it overlaps in reference with a proximate argument in the matrix clause. This generalisation is violated in the following example:

(5) Plains Cree

namoya	kiske·yime·wak	ta·nte·	e·-ohtohte·t	awa	ayahciyiniw.
not	know.3PL»3'	where	AOR-come.from.3SG	this.3SG	Blackfoot.3SG.

'They (PROX) did not know where this Blackfoot (PROX) had come from.'
(Bloomfield 1934:82-84)

Even though complement clauses belong to the domain of their matrix clauses, the sentence in (5) shows that a proximate shift has occurred between the non-coreferential arguments of the matrix and complement clauses, 'they (PROX)' and 'Blackfoot (PROX)' respectively.

Both Dahlstrom (1996) and Long (1999a) have discussed this example. Dahlstrom (1996:121) suggests that the proximate shift happens in this sentence because "the Blackfoot had

been the proximate third person two sentences before in the text." Long (1999a:84), on the other hand, presumes that the reason for the proximate shift is the fact that "the subordinate clause is direct discourse rather than indirect discourse."

A very similar example comes from Ojibwa:

(6) gaawii wgii-kenmaasiin manj
not 3.PAST-know.NEG.3SG»3' however

ge-kidgwen aw noos
FUT-say.3SG.DUB that.3SG 1.father.3SG
'She (PROX) did not know what my father (PROX) would say.'
(Rhodes 1990:108)

In Rhodes' example in (6), the argument of the matrix clause 'she' is third person proximate, and the complement argument 'my father' is a proximate first person possessed noun. Rhodes (1990:110) notes that this proximate shift happens despite the fact that "the agreement with [the] nominal referring to the father in the matrix clause is obviative...but in the complement clause the correferential nominal is proximate", suggesting that "[a]ny theory of obviation that claims that it is a purely textual device without [a] significant non-textual syntactic component founders on this sentence."

Proximate shifts in sentences containing adverbial clauses are presented in (7):

(7) (a) Plains Cree
...e·-itwe·t, e·-pe·-takopayit nipa·pa·.
AOR-say.3SG AOR-hither-arrive.3SG 1.father.3SG
'She (PROX) said, when my dad (PROX) arrived home.'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:171)

(b) Miami-Illinois
alaankwa aanchseeta, mihtohseeniaki iilaacimwaaci "Lénipinšia aanchseewa".
star.3SG move.3SG Indian.3PL tell.thus.3PL Lennipinja.3SG move.3SG
'Whenever a star (PROX) would move, the Indians (PROX) would say:"Lennipinja is moving".
(Costa 2003:439)

Here, both sentences contain an adverbial clause. In the Plains Cree sentence, the matrix verb 'said' is marked for a proximate argument 'she' as well as the subordinate verb 'arrived' is

inflected for a proximate argument 'my dad'. In the Miami-Illinois sentence, both the matrix verb 'would say' and the subordinate verb 'would move' have proximate arguments. Here, the proximate shifts between the matrix and subordinate adverbial clauses happen because adverbial clauses are adjuncts (Long 1999a). However, Bloomfield's (1962) analysis of the following Menomini sentences in (8) bears a different interpretation:

(8)(a) pes-ona·pew enɛ·niw enes anenoh metɛ·mohsan as mɛ·k-ape·net
come-sit.3SG man.3SG there that.3' woman.3' COMP while-sit.3'
'That man (PROX) came and seated himself there where that woman (OBV) was sitting.'

(b) pes-ona·pewan anenoh enɛ·niwan enes enoh metɛ·moh as mɛ·k-ape·t
come-sit.3' that-3' man.3' there that.3SG woman.3SG COMP while-sit.3SG
'That man (OBV) came and seated himself there where that woman (PROX) was sitting.'

(c) pes-ona·pew enoh enɛ·niw enes enoh metɛ·moh as mɛ·k-ape·t
come-sit.3SG that.3SG man.3SG there that.3SG woman.3SG COMP while-sit.3SG
'That man (PROX) came and seated himself there where that woman (PROX) was sitting.'
(Bloomfield 1962:38,40)

In (8), each sentence contains a matrix clause and a locative adverbial clause. In (a) and (b), there is only one proximate argument – 'that man' and 'that woman' respectively. Bloomfield (1962) suggests that since both arguments are at the centre of the discourse, they are proximate. In (c), however, both the argument of the matrix clause ('that man') and the argument of the subordinate clause ('that woman') are proximate. Bloomfield describes this proximate shift as "a slightly clumsy and less urbane, but not unusual form" (Bloomfield 1962:40).

The following sentence containing an adverbial clause comes from Ojibwa:

(9) gye go gii-dbaajmod gaa-dgoshing widi endaawaad
and EMPH PAST-tell.3SG COMP-arrive.3SG there live.3PL
'...and she (PROX) told the story as soon as she got to where they (PROX) lived.'
(Rhodes 1990:108)

The proximate shift in (9) is possible because the behaviour of obviation in the subordinate clause depends on the "information flow" and on the rank of nominal referents "in the world of

[a] text" (Rhodes 1990:108-9). [4] The higher the rank of a nominal referent is, the more likely it is to be proximate; the lower the rank of a nominal referent is, the more likely it is to be obviative (Rhodes 1990:109). In (9), however, as neither of the arguments ranks higher, there is a proximate shift.[5] The only question that requires further investigation is what the specific characteristics of a higher ranked nominal referent are (perhaps beside "speaker's sympathy" or "from the knower's point of view").

There are a few exceptional instances of proximate shift in temporal clauses:

(10) Plains Cree

(a) e·kwa ma·na mi·na ka·-miyoskamik, e·-ki·-nihta·-no·cihcike·t.
then usually also COMP-be.spring.0SG AOR-PAST-be.good.at-trap.3SG
'And then also in spring he used to be a good trapper.'
(Ahenakew & Wolfart 1992:147)

(b) anohc ka·-ki·sika·k, e·kwa o·mayikohk e·-miyo-aya·cik awa·sisak...
today COMP-be.day.0SG then this.much AOR-good-be.3PL child.3PL
'Today the children are so well off....'
(Ahenakew &Wolfart 1992:209)

Here, there is a proximate shift in each sentence. The shifts in Plains Cree sentences are exceptional to Rhodes' (1990) "cross-clausal obviation" (cf. section 3.5).

4.2 Obviation in Narratives

Having considered the working principles of obviation and its exceptional cases in single as well as multiple clause sentences, we now turn to analyse the behaviour and role of obviation when several clauses come together in narratives.

In a narrative, on the one hand, it is theoretically possible that the proximate referent can change with every clause. Practically, however, the proximate referent usually stays the same over several clauses (cf. Russell 1991). On the other hand, it is also possible that the same

[4] Rhodes (1990) relies on Givón's (1983) notion of topicality.
[5] Observe that this proximate shift may also be due to the fact that 'she' and 'they' overlap in reference (i.e., 'she' is a member of the group that lives there).

proximate referent is the only proximate referent in the entire narrative, but this rarely happens (cf. Russell 1991). In reality, most uses of obviation in narratives distinguish two patterns: in one pattern, there is one proximate referent per episode; [6] in the other pattern, there are multiple proximates[7] per episode (Dahlstrom 1986:128).

Dahlstrom's (1986) analysis of these patterns in Plains Cree narratives suggests that each pattern has its own lexical and syntactic devices. When there is one proximate referent per episode, the episode usually opens with *ki·tahtawe·* 'presently, soon; suddenly' and an overt noun phrase introducing the proximate referent; the last sentence of the episode often starts with *ta·pwe·* 'truly'. Secondly, proximate shifts from episode to episode are signalled by one of the following syntactic devices:

a) the new proximate referent is introduced in the clause by an overt noun phrase and a verb stem that was used in the preceding clause to describe the action/state of the previous proximate referent;

b) proximate shifts typically occur with intransitive verbs (less frequently with transitives) and with verbs that express perception or feelings;

c) proximate shifts may signal a surprising point (i.e., via the use of the particle *po·tih* 'surprise');

d) a new episode may begin with an impersonal II verb with a perfective preverb indicating elapsed time;

e) proximate referents are the referents whose points of view are being expressed.

Additionally, within a single episode, obviation is used to refer to indefinite, not previously mentioned people or groups of people; for example, if the Blackfoot are looking for Cree in

[6] An episode is about the size of a paragraph.
[7] The term "multiple proximates" comes from Goddard 1984.

general, without any reference to any specific group, Cree are obviative, but once the Blackfoot see the Cree, the Blackfoot are obviative whereas the Cree are proximate.

In the case of multiple proximates per episode, proximate referents tend to belong to the same group and, therefore, often appear as conjoined (cf. section 2.3). Furthermore, when one of the proximate referents of an intransitive verb acts on another (i.e., when a transitive verb is employed), one becomes obviative for the duration of the clause and then regains its proximate status in the following context. In such clauses and throughout a multiple proximates episode direct forms of verbs are preferred. As with a singular proximate per episode, a new proximate referent in multiple proximates per episode is introduced in the clause by an overt noun phrase and a verb stem repeated from the immediately preceding clause that described the action/state of the previous proximate referent. Finally, the last sentence of an episode typically begins with *ta·pwe·* 'truly'.

Overall, Dahlstrom's (1986) analysis constitutes a lexical and grammatical toolbox for how proximate shifts are employed in a narrative. On the other hand, Russell (1991, 1996) looks at whether proximate shifts have any relations with other devices that speakers use to structure a narrative. Russell (1991) considers the rhetorical structure of a recorded narrative in relation to proximate shifts whereas Russell (1996) examines the interaction of proximate shifts with deictic grammatical features that can perhaps mark point of view.

Given that a proximate referent tends to be proximate over several clauses and that there are few proximate referents in a narrative, Russell (1991:323) concludes that "obviation groups clauses and sentences together into larger units and divides the entire narrative into smaller units". As a result, he observes that obviation may resemble the functions of five rhetorical components – prosodic phrasing, pause phrasing, syntactic constituency, global form/content

parallelism, and adverbial particle phrasing. All five components work simultaneously, dividing speech into different units in accordance with their own criteria. In the default case, the division of the speech by each component is the same; however, this is not necessary, as the mismatches between units may signal a dramatic anticipation or an indication of rapidly changing events.

The results of Russell's (1991) analysis of a Swampy Cree recorded narrative are not conclusive, but significant. First of all, upon identifying proximate spans[8] or, in Dahlstrom's (1986) terms, episodes with a single proximate referent, Russell (1991:327) indicates that neither prosodic nor pause phrasing has a "simple correlation with proximate spans." It appears that the larger the proximate span is, the more sympathetic it is to prosodic and pause phrasing, but this does not always happen. The phrasing mismatches occur in exactly the same areas where syntactic obviation does not apply although almost half of proximate shifts are marked by an overt noun phrase. Additionally, Russell (1991:328) observes that the mismatches appear at "the high points of the story", "the most significant actions" or "climaxes"; also, "[t]he more intense the story, the more frequently the proximate referent changes." In this regard, Russell (1991) also notes the behaviour of *ispiy* 'when': not only does it show up near climaxes, but it also provokes a proximate shift between a matrix and a subordinate clause.

Another line of Russell's analysis of proximate shifts concentrates on deictic grammatical features and whether these features mark point view. In Russell (1996), the demonstrative particles and the preverb *pe·-* 'motion towards speaker' are the grammatical features under examination. The demonstratives in Plains Cree are of three degrees of proximity, namely, *awa* 'close', *ana* 'further' (that) and *naha* 'distant' (all are singular proximate and often appear with a full noun phrase). These demonstratives along with *pe·-* mark spatial deixis and coincide in the narrative where there is "a steady progression from the more distal demonstratives to the most

[8] A "proximate span" is a term traditional to Goddard (1984) and Wolfart (1973).

immediate demonstratives" (Russell 1996:378). This, in turn, means that the events in the narrative are not being presented from any particular proximate referent's perceptual point of view, but rather events are unfolding through "external focalization" (Russell 1996:378) wherein

> [w]e, and the narrative camera, stand at a distance from both characters, then move closer in, then closer still. We may turn our attention from one to the other, but we can see both characters with equal clarity most of the time. We are not seeing the entire scene first from one character's perceptual point of view and then from the other's [Russell 1996:378].

Therefore, the deictic system structures the narrative in its own progression from more distal to more immediate forms for "a zoom-in effect" (Russell 1996:378). Since proximate referents are seen with "equal clarity" and since narrative events are presented through external focalization, the proximate system divides the narrative in accordance with its own requirements, "perhaps to create an atmosphere of suspense" (Russell 1996:378).

Up to this point, we have seen that the proximate/obviative system is used to divide a narrative up into episodes. Some episodes have a single proximate referent; other episodes have multiple proximate referents. We have additionally discussed a series of lexical and grammatical tools that are typically utilized for proximate shifts. Furthermore, we have looked at possible correlations between proximate shifts and rhetorical as well as deictic features and found a partial correlation with rhetorical features and a lack of correlation with deictic features. At this point, we may conclude that the proximate/obviative system behaves on its own, quite perplexing, terms. Whether these terms hold in narratives of different styles and whether they depend on the speaker will be explored in the reminder of this section.

A narrative is a form of discourse that consists of a series of connected and sequenced events which constitute the plot of the narrative. Based on the plot, narratives can be formal or informal. The plot of formal narratives concentrates on legendary and mythological material. The

plot of informal narratives, on the other hand, focuses on the history of one's life. Additionally, there are narratives that have characteristics of both: they discuss traditional practices and daily life (i.e., informal) and their relations to legends and mythology (i.e. formal). For the purposes of this thesis, I will call these narratives fused. Since obviation is a feature of the entire Algonquian family, in this section, I will discuss the analyses of the behaviour and role of obviation in formal, informal, and fused Fox narratives. The aim of the reminder of this section, thus, is to illustrate what obviation devices are used in each narrative type, what purpose they serve within a discourse, and whether different speakers employ these devices in a similar manner.

Goddard's (1990) detailed analysis of the discourse assignment of the proximate and obviative categories focuses on the principles that control their use in the texts of a single Fox author, Alfred Kiyana. The plots of Kiyana's texts are based on legendary and mythological material; therefore, these texts represent the formal type of narratives (cf. Goddard 1990; Thomason 1995). The distribution of the proximate and obviative inflections in Kiyana's texts exhibits the following features: (1) sustained proximates: unless there is a predictable shift in the point of view, the central figures of the narratives hold their proximate status throughout; (2) overtly-marked proximate shifts: figures with narrative prominence (e.g., villains, secondary heroes significant to the action or to the point of view shifts) or figures with inherently high status (e.g., manitous and heroes) occur in the proximate; and (3) substantial use of obviatives: all low-status figures and all figures acting or being acted upon by the central or high status figures appear in the obviative. Because of these features, proximate shifts within a single clause are not possible in Kiyana's texts. On the other hand, proximate shifts regularly coincide with the beginning of a new paragraph where they are overtly marked by the particles *(kah)o·ni* 'and then' or *-(i)pi* 'it is said'. The new proximate is overtly stated through a specialized demonstrative or a

participle that refers back to the old proximate. Exceptions to these principles appear when the proximate shift is a return to the central figure, when the new proximate is an appositive of the previous proximate, when the new proximate is introduced after a quote addressed to its referent, and when the syntax requires the shift. Therefore, in Kiyana's texts the choice of a proximate depends on the narrator's perception of the centrality or status of third person actors within a particular discourse, rather than on their grammatical roles (cf. Goddard 1990).

Thomason's (1995) analysis concentrates on both informal and fused narratives. The informal narrative constitutes the Autobiography of a Fox Indian Woman, a set of personal reminiscences by an anonymous author. Three mortuary texts discussing the traditional practices and stories associated with burials and written by Sam Peters represent a set of fused narratives.

In the Autobiography, Thomason (1995) observes the following behaviour of obviation: (1) proximate shifts abound due to "the tendency to make each new subject a proximate" (Thomason 1995:467); (2) same sentence proximate shifts are abundant; and (3) formal devices that signal proximate shifts are rare. Based on these observations, Thomason (1995:478) concludes that in an informal narrative "where possible, make all third persons proximate [...] whenever it is not possessed by a third person and is not a manitou bestowing a blessing." [9] Furthermore, when there are two third persons in a clause, the pre-established ones outrank the new ones unless formal devices (e.g., overtly marked beginnings of a new paragraph, a defocusing construction in *ki·ši*, topicalization) are used to emphasize a new third person or if the new third person is the subject. In other words, the distribution of proximate and obviative arguments as presented in Thomason (1995) is as follows: familiar, central, or more prominent figures outrank "new (or locally peripheral) third persons except in rare cases of overt marking to the contrary" (Thomason 1995:478). As a result, the proximate/obviative assignment in informal

[9] Note that under Goddard's (1990) analysis, manitous are high status figures and are proximate.

narratives is based on the syntactic role of a third person; the discourse is secondary.

Having discussed paradigms of proximate and obviative assignments in formal and informal narratives, the next step is to look at how these paradigms work in a fused narrative. The analysis of the mortuary texts produced by Sam Peters in Thomason (1995) shows that for the most part the distribution of proximate and obviative assignment goes in accordance with the informal paradigm. However, as Thomason (1995:479) observes, it diverges at the following three points: (1) recalling a myth; (2) recalling a legend; and (3) a cautionary event. In these sections of Sam Peters' texts, the distribution of proximate and obviative assignment aligns with Goddard's (1990) formal paradigm. Moreover, the transitions between informal and formal parts of the texts "involve a mixture of the two paradigms: the distribution of proximates and obviatives conforms more closely to informal usage in the opening and closing stages of the formal episodes " (Thomason 1995:493). The informal parts of Sam Peters' texts demonstrate the following syntactic devices for proximate and obviative assignment: (a) clause-final positioning of a brand new proximate which is preceded by a pronominal or indefinite preverbal reference; (b) a new type of defocusing construction in which "attention is shifted away from the current proximate (or obviative) by means of an overt nominal reference to that person in the unmarked (or "peripheral") post-verbal position" (Thomason 1995:489); and (c) demonstratives which overtly signify a proximate status change. In order to reflect the use of these devices in Peters' texts, Thomason (1995: 488) adds that "the different third persons of the sentence do not occur as arguments of the same clause, and they are inherently indefinite, or the verbal mode is habitual." These extra devices of proximate and obviative distribution alleviate the proximate and obviative assignment and tracking in fused narratives.

So far, the principles of distribution of proximate and obviative assignments have been

considered for formal, informal, and fused narratives. These narratives were produced by different speakers, and each narrative has its own plot. The analysis of the distribution of proximate and obviative assignment in narratives would not be complete without looking at how obviation works in different speakers' tellings of the same narrative. In this regard, a very broad and detailed analysis of *Apaya·ši·ha,* a Meskwaki story, is found in Thomason (2003). She has compared eight variants of this story told by five people focusing on some of the devices employed in proximate shifts. For the purposes of this thesis, I will discuss the distribution of proximate and obviative assignment in three versions of the story, told by Anonymous 8, Sa·poči·wa, and Kiyana, and provide a summary of Thomason's findings concentrating on the reasons for various proximate and obviative uses.

Thomason (2003) shows that the same story delivered by different speakers has a varying number of proximate spans, ranging from four to six. Additionally, the spans vary in length, from one to about thirty lines; only the concluding part of each version of the story is up to three lines. Moreover, the number of proximate and obviative characters differs from one version of the story to another. Thomason (2003:352) suggests that the distribution of proximate and obviative assignment is dependent on three factors: (1) the character's importance in the story, as in Anonymous 8's version; (2) the character's affect, as in Sa·poči·wa's version; and (3) the combination of both, or the "character's importance, with occasional marking by affect for dramatic effect", as in Kiyana's version. These factors rank third persons in terms of their potential for proximate assignment. This ranking is based on whose actions are more interesting, whose point of view is being assumed, and who is most sympathetic or emotionally affected by an event (Thomason 2003:120). In addition to the character-ranking factors, Thomason (2003:141-2) points out two requirements for proximates: "[o]ne is a set of necessary

preconditions of their use: third persons can be used only in the presence of an appropriate observer. The other is a set of preferred conditions of their use: third person assignment should hold across a discourse span" (Thomason 2003:141). If a proximate shift happens within a span, it is due to one of the three factors discussed above.

On the whole, the analysis of the distribution of proximate and obviative assignment in three versions of a story produced by different people shows that speakers rank the characters differently (i.e., based on their importance or affect). This, in turn, would influence the inclusion or exclusion of additional characters (thus, the variation in the number of characters per version of a story). Also, different distributions of proximates and obviatives result in several versions of the same series of events (cf. Thomason 2003:352).

4.3 Obviation in Elicitation

It is also interesting to consider the behaviour of obviation in elicitation. Given that elicitation is the practice of evoking and collecting linguistic data from language users, it does not assume a natural speech context since the language users are assigned a variety of selected tasks usually focusing on a single sentence rather than a text. This, in turn, implies that the context of each sentence has to be artificially constructed either by the language user, the linguist, or both (cf. Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:106). And, most critically, this implies that "anything in the language that relies on speaker performance will fluctuate in elicitation" (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:107).

Cook & Mühlbauer (2006:103-4) report that instances of obviation are more frequent, more consistent, and appear in a broader range of constructions in a corpus than in elicitation. In elicitation, it is often the case that speakers omit overt obviative marking in constructions

containing a proximate noun phrase as demonstrated in (11):

(11) Plains Cree

Expected: e·-wa·pama·t na·pe·w iskwe·wa
AOR-see.3SG»3' man.3SG woman.3'
'The man (PROX) saw the woman (OBV).'

Elicitation: e·-wa·pama·t na·pe·w iskwe·w_

(Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:103)

Additionally, Cook & Mühlbauer (2006:104) suggest that obviation in elicitation rarely appears on names and question words, frequently occurs in clauses in which the subject precedes the object or which involve a cross-clausal relation, and always occurs on possessed nouns and on objects that precede subjects. In texts, obviation always appears in all these contexts. Based on the performance hypothesis,[10] they attribute these differences in obviation marking in elicitation to (i) the methodology; (ii) the speaker's familiarity with the elicitation setting; and (iii) the linguistic status of obviation.

In order to analyse the behaviour of obviation in elicitation, Cook & Mühlbauer (2006) worked with three native speakers of Plains Cree and assigned several tasks, for instance, translation, judgement or correction tasks. Regardless of the task, native speakers of Cree experienced a number of difficulties. First, each task calls for a certain level of the speaker's familiarity. If the speaker has never performed a task before, they may fail to understand it and may complete it erroneously. Secondly, each task requires a certain level of speaker's awareness of a language phenomenon (in this case, obviation). To illustrate, one of the language consultants had experience teaching Plains Cree in the school system; Cook & Mühlbauer (2006:109) report that "this speaker had much more robust obviation patterns" than the other two speakers. Additionally, speakers may misinterpret the meaning of a morpheme: the Plains Cree consultants

[10] A performance hypothesis assumes that elicitation is not a direct reflection of competence, but is dependent on the demands of language production in specific context (Chomsky 1964).

would "often notice the obviation marking, interpret it as a plural, and remove it because a singular meaning is intended" (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:112). Another problem that arises during elicitation is English priming, especially in translation tasks. For instance, sentences elicited through translation tasks often mirror English word order (i.e., SVO), use the independent order (as opposed to conjunct), and omit obviation (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:110). Moreover, Cook & Mühlbauer (2006:110) report that the priming effect may "be strong enough to remove obviation marking in possession constructions – the context that is thought to be most stable." However, when the context increases (e.g., translating a multi-clause sentence as opposed to a single-clause), most of these problems disappear: "obviation is not just preferred – the obviative-less sentences are rejected outright" (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:114).

Differences in obviation marking in elicitation also depend on the speaker's familiarity with the elicitation settings. One of Cook & Mühlbauer (2006)'s language users had never participated in elicitations while the other participated in elicitation dealing with the domain of the verbal complex. Nevertheless, both language users struggled to produce constructions containing obviation marking. Moreover, Cook & Mühlbauer (2006:108) observe that as language users' familiarity with elicitation tasks increases over a period of time, so does their level of comfort and, crucially, obviation usage: "almost all utterances have obviation marking after a year of elicitation work, and the consultant often rejects sentences that lack it."

In addition to the methodology and the speaker's familiarity with the elicitation settings, the linguistic status of obviation affects the behaviour of obviation in elicitation. This appears to be the case since obviation is a discourse-dependent, rather than discourse-independent, grammatical feature. Cook & Mühlbauer (2006) discuss four alternative strategies that speakers often use in elicitation instead of overt obviative marking. The first is the word order strategy

wherein "the subjects are linearly placed before objects, and obviation is not needed to aid the interpretation" (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:123). Secondly, language users almost never mark proper names for obviation: "proper names are considered the most definite of definite descriptors – that is, they are the most deictically clear of all possible nominal forms" (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:126). In other words, proper names have a high discourse salience. And, since obviation is a device for tracking discourse referents, this high discourse salience of proper names allows them to omit overt obviative marking (cf. Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:126). The third alternative strategy that speakers often use in elicitation instead of overt obviative marking is the "empathy hierarchy" (cf. Kuno 1987). In this hierarchy, people are more suitable to be proximate than animals. In elicitation, language users prefer this empathy hierarchy rather than overt obviative marking (Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:125). Finally, when the elicitation discourse calls for three third person arguments, one language user adhered to the forms expected by the traditional analyses:

(12) Translation task

Wa·pastim	kiske·yihtam	e·-nipaha·yit	Tomio	kine·pikwa
Wapastim.3SG	know.3SG»3'	AOR-kill.3SG»3'	Tomio.3SG	snake.3'

'Wapastim knows that Tomio killed a snake.'

(Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:126)

Here, *Wa·pastim* is the proximate referent, *Tomio* is the unmarked obviative actor of the verb *e·-nipaha·yit* (since *Tomio* is a proper name, it may omit the obviative morphology), and *kine·pikwa* 'snake' is overtly marked for obviation with the suffix *-a*.

The other language user, in contrast, exploited a proximate shift so that each clause involves only two third person referents, one proximate and one obviative:

(13) Translation task

ka·-me·kwa-pimo·hte·t	Jeff	e·-nakiskawa·t	iskwe·wa	
COMP-midst-walk.along.3SG	Jeff.3SG	AOR-meet.3SG»3'	woman.3'	

e·kwa awa iskwe·w e·-waniha·t otawa·simisa
and this.3SG woman.3SG AOR-lose.3SG»3' 3.child.3'
'When Jeff was walking, he met a woman who lost her child.'
(lit: '...and that woman had lost her child')

(Cook & Mühlbauer 2006:127)

Overall, the analysis of the behaviour of obviation in elicitation suggests that, first and foremost, obviation is a discourse-dependent third person tracking system. Since obviation is a discourse-dependent grammatical feature, insufficient discourse results in lack of obviation. Moreover, even when language users are familiar with elicitation per se, they omit obviative marking. This may result from unfamiliarity with an elicitation task, unawareness of a language phenomenon (i.e., obviation), priming with an English sentence or any combinations of these. Finally, language consultants use alternative grammatical features (such as word order) as substitutes for obviation.

4.4 Unexplained Shifts

This section considers three unexplained shifts: one is from the Massachusett Bible and the other two are from Fox narratives.

The clause in (14) comes from the Massachusett Bible, Genesis 5, 2:

(14) wosketomp kah mittamwossissoh ukkezheuh
male.3SG and female.3' 3.create.3SG»3'
'male and female created he them.'

(Trumbull 2009:198)

In (14), there is a conjoined noun phrase that consists of a proximate noun 'male' and an obviative noun 'female'. The subject of the clause is 'he' (i.e., God). The verb is marked for a proximate subject and obviative object. The obviative object consists of a conjoined noun phrase 'male and female'. Why 'male' is proximate remains unclear.

A somewhat opposite example is found in the Fox phrase in (15):

(15) mešihke·ha mahkwa·hke·hani
snapping.turtle.3SG tortoise.3'SG
'snapping turtle (and) tortoise'

(Goddard 1984:277)

Goddard (1984) reports that this conjoined phrase occurs four times in the Owl Sacred Pack text. Three times out of four it appears as illustrated in (15), but the fourth time both nouns are proximate. Goddard (1984:277) calls it "an unusual exception" to conjoined noun phrases.

In narratives, there is at least one example of an *obviative shift*, "the shift of a proximate to obviative status with no syntactic motivation" (Goddard 1984:281). In the narrative that precedes (16), the hero assures his father that he will go to find arrowheads and will come back in four days. Then, he goes into a cliff behind a waterfall and the scene in (16) happens:

(16) e·h=pi·tikawa·či maneto·wani i·nahi e·winičini. ke·htena=meko
nye·wokonakateniki e·h=py[a]·niči. e·h=ki·ša·koči- we·weneteniki aša·ti·hani,
nye·wi e·h=pye·to·niči. e·h=a·čimoči...

'He (PROX) went inside [to] a manitou (OBV) who lived there. And indeed in four days he (OBV) came back. The arrowheads were exceedingly fine, and he (OBV) brought four of them. And he (PROX) gave his report...'

(Goddard 1984:282)

Goddard (1984:282) attributes the obviative shift to a shift in point of view: it is only from the viewpoint of the father and the rest of his people that the hero can be said to return after four days although neither the father, nor the rest of the people, are mentioned. Once the hero's accomplishment is stated, the hero resumes his proximate status until the end of the narrative.

Overall, this chapter has demonstrated eluded obviation in naming constructions, the Person and Animacy Hierarchies, and complement and adverbial clauses. More precisely, the first section of this chapter has shown that if the head of the relative clause denotes a name or a designation, it may have a different proximate status. Also, proximate shifts can violate the

principles of the Animacy Hierarchy and the one-proximate-per-clause syntactic constraint. Moreover, the heads of complement and adverbial clauses (including the heads of adverbial clauses of time) can be proximate despite the presence of proximate non-coreferential heads in matrix clauses. This chapter has additionally discussed how obviation behaves in narratives and elicitation. In narratives, proximate shifts are used to divide a text into episodes. In formal narratives, proximate shifts are concurrent with a shift in the point of view whereas in informal narratives, every new subject tends to be proximate. Also, informal narratives allow same-clause proximate shifts. Furthermore, when several speakers tell the same narrative, the number of characters and their obviation status vary. In elicitation, speakers skip obviative marking due to (i) the elicitation methodology, (ii) the speaker's familiarity with the elicitation settings, and (iii) the linguistic status of obviation as a discourse dependent grammatical feature. The final section of this chapter has demonstrated several unexplained patterns of obviation: these instances are exceptional to both syntactic and discourse constraints.

Chapter V

Conclusions

The main goal of this thesis has been to synthesise the behaviour and role that obviation has in syntax (cf. Chapter II and Chapter III) and discourse (cf. Chapter IV). Chapter II has demonstrated the function of obviation in possessive, conjoined, co-referential noun phrases and in relative clauses. The role of obviation in possessive noun phrases is two-fold. On the one hand, obviation is used to disambiguate the possessor from the possessee. On the other hand, obviation helps to differentiate a certain possessor among other possessors. In conjoined noun phrases, obviation connects two or more noun phrases either syntactically (i.e., the verb has proximate plural morphology when the conjoined noun phrase is proximate plural) or semantically (e.g., the verb carries the proximate plural inflection when the conjoined noun phrase includes one proximate and one obviative noun). And, the role of obviation in noun phrases with overlapping reference and relative clauses is purely syntactic: it is used to track reference of a third person which either is a member of a group or is on its own in the context of a clause.

Chapter III has shown how obviation functions in single, conjoined, complement, and adverbial clauses. Since conjoined clauses consist of at least two single clauses, each clause can have a proximate argument. Additionally, in each clause obviation forms a single domain around the verb. As a result, when a verb with its own obviation domain is paired up with a subordinate complement verb, the latter belongs to the domain of the former, prohibiting a proximate shift. However, when the argument of the complement clause is the same as an argument of the matrix clause or when the entire complement clause serves as an argument of the matrix clause,

proximate shifts are allowed. The behaviour of obviation in adverbial clauses resembles that of complement clauses despite being non-arguments of matrix clauses.

Chapter IV has considered eluded obviation, obviation in narratives and in elicitation, and unexplained shifts. It has shown that the head of a relative clause may have a different proximate status from its co-referential noun phrase when it denotes a name or designation. Additionally, it has demonstrated that proximate shifts may violate not only the Animacy Hierarchy, but also the one-proximate-per-clause syntactic constraint. Moreover, both the head of a complement and the head of an adverbial clause can be proximate regardless of a proximate non-co-referential head of the matrix clause. The heads of adverbial clauses of time may also be proximate despite the presence of a higher proximate third person argument in a matrix clause. Furthermore, in narratives, proximate shifts are used to divide a text into episodes. The way this works is based on the type of the text: in formal narratives, proximate shifts happen when there is a predictable shift in the point of view. In informal narratives, on the other hand, every new subject is proximate, and same-sentence proximate shifts prevail. Additionally, when the same story is told by different speakers, the narratives themselves have a variable number of characters and, as a result, different assignments of proximate and obviative status. In elicitation, speakers seem to omit obviative marking due to the elicitation methodology, lack of familiarity with the elicitation settings, and the linguistic status of obviation as a discourse-dependent grammatical feature. Finally, Chapter IV has illustrated a few instances of unexplained obviative shifts which appear in a perfectly rounded discourse.

Finally, is obviation a syntactic or discourse feature? In order to answer this question, reconsider the following two sentences (initially used in section 4.1, as (5) and (6) respectively):

(1) Plains Cree

namoya	kiske·yime·wak	ta·nte·	e·-ohtohte·t	awa	ayahciyiniw.

not know.3PL»3' where AOR-come.from.3SG this.3SG Blackfoot.3SG.
'They (PROX) did not know where this Blackfoot (PROX) had come from.'
(Bloomfield 1934:82-84)

(2) Ojibwa
gaa wii wgii-kenmaasiin manj
not 3.PAST-know.NEG.3SG»3' however

ge-kidgwen aw noos
FUT-say.3SG.DUB that.3SG 1.father.3SG
'She (PROX) did not know what my father (PROX) would say.'
(Rhodes 1990:108)

In both sentences, the subordinate complement clauses could be analysed as embedded indirect questions. Under this analysis, a proximate shift is possible since an indirect question would be outside of the context of the text, just like a direct question. However, whether this is a typical and significant pattern in at least "the four best-known languages" (Bloomfield 1946:85) is as yet unknown.

Another way of analysing proximate shifts between complement and matrix clauses has been proposed by Hammerly & Göbel (2018). They suggest that obviation correlates with how attitude holders (i.e., the people whose thoughts are being communicated) refer to themselves while speaking. In other words, people can refer to themselves in a self-conscious way (i.e., *de se* attitude ascription) or be completely unaware that they are actually referring to themselves (i.e., *de re* attitude ascription). Under the *de se* ascription, the co-referential reading in (4b) is ungrammatical whereas under the *de re* ascription, the co-referential reading in both senteces is grammatical:

(3) Ojibwe

(a) Adikoons inendam mamaazhid mezinibii'iged
Adikoons.3SG think.3SG be.bad.3SG draw.3SG
'Adikoons$_J$ (PROX) thinks she$_J$ (PROX) is bad at drawing.'

(b) Adikoons inendam mamaazhinid mezinibii'igenid
Adikoons.3SG think.3SG be.bad.3' draw.3'

'Adikoons$_J$ (PROX) thinks she$_J$ (OBV) is bad at drawing.'

(Hammerly & Göbel 2018:7-8)

According to Hammerly & Göbel (2018), this variation in grammaticality of the sentences is due to the fact that the speaker and Adikoons perceive the truth of the proposition 'Adikoons is bad at drawing' differently. In other words, the speaker is aware of the (possible) co-reference in both the *de se* and *de re* contexts; however, Adikoons is only aware in the *de se* context (thus the ungrammaticality of (3b)). On the other hand, in the *de re* context, the speaker's attitude (that 'Adikoons thinks that she is bad at drawing') is encoded in (3a), but Adikoons' attitude (that 'someone is bad at drawing', not necessarily herself) is encoded in (3b). Whether this is a typical pattern of how obviation works in complement and matrix clauses is a subject for further investigation.

Another example for a syntactic reconsideration is in (4) (repeated from section 4.1):

(4) Fox

i·ni	e·hkwiči	mi·ša·mi-a·teso·hka·na	e·=nah-ina·čimoči
there	be.so.long.3SG	sacred.pack-story.3SG	AOR-used.to-narrate.3SG

no·sa a·nawowa·ta.
1.uncle.3SG Anawowata.3SG
'That is the end of the sacred-pack story the way my uncle Anawowata used to tell it.'

(Goddard 1984:277)

In this sentence, the proximate shift may separate two conjoined clauses (cf. section 3.3); whether this is the case depends on the syntactic boundaries and the relationship between the clauses.

Nonetheless, the proximate shifts in sentences in (1), (2), and (3a) can be explained on either syntactic or discourse grounds. On the other hand, in the sentences discussed in section 4.4 and in the following example neither syntax nor discourse provides satisfactory explanations for proximate shifts (or the lack of shifts):

(5) Plains Cree

kiske·yime·w ayahciyiniwa. E·kwa opa·skisikan pi·hta·sow. Moskistawe·w e·-pimisiniyit.
know.3SG»3' Blackfoot.3' then 3.gun.0SG load.3SG attack.3SG»3' AOR-lie.down.3'
"He knew him for a Blackfoot. He loaded his gun and attacked him as he lay on the ground.

e·kwa e·-kiske·yihtahk awa ayahciyiniw, ne·hiyawa e·-moskista·kot, tapasi·w.
then AOR-know.3SG»0 this.3SG Blackfoot.3SG Cree.3' AOR-attack.3'»3SG flee.3SG
When the Blackfoot perceived that a Cree was attacking him, he fled;

e·-saka·yik kote·ska·mow. e·kosi pa·skiswe·w ne·hiyaw
AOR-be.bushy.0' flee.to.shelter.3SG thus shoot.at.3SG»3' Cree.3SG
he hid in the bushes. The Cree tried to shoot him..."

(Bloomfield 1934:26)

In (5), there are two proximate shifts, from the Cree to the Blackfoot, and then back to the Cree. A Cree is the hero of the story, and hence proximate at the beginning of this excerpt. But after he spots a Blackfoot enemy and attacks him, there is an unexpected shift to Blackfoot's point of view when he percives the Cree and flees. The Cree is again the proximate character when he tries to shoot the Blackfoot, but the focus continues to shift between the two for the remander of the episode. Hives (1948:63) comments that "this is a laxity in use which is not expected, nor accounted for." However, the narrator (Coming Day) was an elder well known for his repertoire of traditional stories (Bloomfield 1930:1), and the hero of the tale is Sweet-Grass, a legendary chief; the repeated shifts away from the Cree to the anonymous enemy may be unexpected, but they are the deliberate choice of the narrator.

All in all, there are prominent syntactic environments for obviation (discussed in Chapters II and III), and there are also definite discourse functions of obviation (shown in Chapter IV). The examples presented in this chapter demonstrate how obviation can behave when both syntax and discourse are at work. A certain theoretical ground may shed more light on how this perplexing feature of the Algonquian languages works in some cases, but no theory seems to be able to account for all the examples. Perhaps the one point that everyone agrees on is

that obviation serves to disambiguate and single out one particular third person referent in a clause, sentence, episode or text.

References

Adelung, Johann Christoph, & Johann Severin Vater.
1806-18 *Mithridates, oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde*. Berlin.
Ahenakew, Freda.
1987 *Cree language structures: A Cree approach.* Winnipeg: Premmican Publications.
Ahenakew, Freda, ed.
1986 *Kiskinahamwakan - acimowinisa - Student Stories*. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
Ahenakew, Freda, & H. C. Wolfart, eds.
1992 *Kôhkominawak otâcimowiniwâwa: Our grandmothers' lives, as told in their own words*. Saskatoon: Fifth House.
1997 *Kwayask ê-kî-pê-kiskinowâpahtihicik: Their example showed me the way*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
Aissen, Judith.
1997 On the syntax of obviation. *Language* 73:705-750.
Alford, Danny.
1977 A plurality puzzle unraveled (or, the importance of being Soʾtaaʾe). *Proceedings of the 3rd annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 223-240. Berkeley, Calif.: BLS.
Andrews, Kenneth.
1994 *Shawnee grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina.
Bakker, Peter.
2009 C. C. Uhlenbeck and the Ritwan languages of California. *Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies* 29-30: 151-163.
Baraga, Frederic.
1878 *A theoretical and practical grammar of the Otchipwe language*, 2nd ed. Montreal, Que.: Beauchemin & Valois.
1878-80 *A dictionary of the Otchipwe language*, 2nd ed. Montreal, Qué.: Beauchemin & Valois.
Béland, Jean-Pierre.
1978 *Atikamekw morphology and lexicon*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
Bloomfield, Leonard.
1925 On the sound-system of Central Algonquian. *Language* 1:130-156.
1925-27. Notes on the Fox language. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 3:219-232; 4:181-219.
1928 *Menomini texts*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 12. New York.
1930 *Sacred stories of the Sweet Grass Cree*. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 60. Ottawa.
1934 *Plains Cree texts*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 16. New York.
1946 Algonquian. *Linguistic structures of Native America*, by Harry Hoijer et al., 85-129. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, 6. New York.
1957 *Eastern Ojibwa: grammatical sketch, texts, and word list*, ed. by Charles F. Hockett. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

1962 *The Menomini language*, ed. by Charles F. Hockett. New Haven: Yale University Press.
1975 *Menomini lexicon*, ed. by Charles F. Hockett. Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology and History, 3.
1984a *Cree-English lexicon*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.
1984b *Fox-English lexicon*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.

Bloomfield, Leonard, & John D. Nichols.
1991 *The dog's children: Anishinaabe texts told by Angeline Williams*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Boas, Franz, ed.
1911 *Handbook of American Indian languages*, Part 1. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40. Washington, D.C.
1922 *Handbook of American Indian languages*, Part 2. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40. Washington, D.C.
1933-38 *Handbook of American Indian languages*, Part 3. New York: Columbia University Press.

Boling, Jerry.
1981 *Selected problems in Shawnee syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Bruening, Benjamin.
2006 Discrepancies between projection and selection: Split coordination and raising to object in Passamaquoddy. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Linguistics and Cognitive Science, University of Delaware.

Buszard, Laura Ann.
2003 *Constructional polysemy and mental spaces in Potawatomi discourse*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Campbell, Lyle, & Marianne Mithun, eds.
1979 *The languages of Native America: a historical and comparative assessment*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Canada Census.
2017 Aboriginal mother tongue, Aboriginal language spoken most often at home and other Aboriginal language(s) spoken regularly at home for the population excluding institutional residents of Canada, provinces and territories. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/hlt-fst/lang/Table.cfm?Lang=E&T=41&Geo=01

Chomsky, Noam.
1964 *Current issues in linguistic theory*. The Hague: Mouton.

Clarke, Sandra.
1982 *North-West River (Sheshātshīt) Montagnais: a grammatical sketch*. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Papers 80. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

Cook, Clare, & Jeff Mühlbauer.
2006 The behaviour of obviation in elicitation. *Actes du 37e Congrès des Algonquinistes*, ed. by H. C. Wolfart, 103-129. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Cooper, John M.
1939 Truman Michelson. *American Anthropologist* 41:281-285.

Costa, David.

2003 *The Miami-Illinois language*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
2015 Redacting premodern texts without speakers: the Peoria story of Wiihsakacaakwa. *New voices for old words: Algonquian oral literatures*, ed. by David J. Costa, 34-89. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Cowell, Andrew, & Alonzo Moss, Sr.
2008 *The Arapaho language*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
2009 *Let's learn Arapaho: An introduction to the Arapaho language*. Boulder: Center for the Study of Indigenous Languages of the West, University of Colorado.

Cuoq, Jean-André.
1866 *Etudes philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages de l'Amérique*. Montreal: Dawson Brothers.
1886 *Lexique de la langue algonquine*. Montreal: J. Chapleau & fils.
1891-92 Grammaire de la langue algonquine. *Mémoires du Société royale du Canada*, 9.1:85-114; 10.1:41-119. Montreal.

Cyr, Danielle.
1996 Montagnais. *Quebec's aboriginal languages: history, planning, development*, ed. by Jacques Maurais, 174-203. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dahlstrom, Amy.
1986 *Plains Cree morphosyntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
1987 Discontinuous constituents in Fox. *Native American languages and grammatical typology*, ed. by Paul D. Kroeber & Robert E. Moore, 53-73. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
1995 Motivation vs. predictability in Algonquian gender. *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, 52-66. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
1996 Narrative structure of a Fox text. *nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâkihtêpayih! Studies in honour of H. C. Wolfart*, ed. by John D. Nichols & Arden C. Ogg, 113-162. Algonquian and Iroquoian Memoir 13. Winnipeg.
1997 Fox (Mesquakie) reduplication. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 63:205-226.
2015 Highlighting rhetorical structure through syntactic analysis: an illustrated Meskwaki text by Alfred Kiyana. *New voices for old words: Algonquian oral literatures*, ed. by David J. Costa, 118-197. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Day, Gordon.
1975 *The Mots loups of Father Mathevet*. National Museum of Man Publications in Ethnology, 8. Ottawa.
1994-95 *Western Abenaki dictionary*. Canadian Museum of Civilization Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Papers, 128-129. Ottawa.

DeBlois, Albert D., ed.
1991 *Micmac texts*. Canadian Museum of Civilization Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Papers, 117. Ottawa.
1996 *Micmac dictionary*. Canadian Museum of Civilization Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Papers, 131. Ottawa.

Dixon, Roland, & Alfred Kroeber.
1913 New linguistic families in California. *American Anthropologist* 15:647-655.

Drapeau, Lynn.
2014 *Grammaire de la langue innue*. Quebec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.
Duponceau, Peter Steven.
1838 *Mémoire sur le système grammatical des langues de quelques nations indiennes de l'Amérique du nord*. Paris: A. Pihan de la Forest.
Edwards, Jonathan.
1788 *Observations on the language of the Muhhekaneew Indians*. New Haven: Josiah Meigs.
Eliot, John.
1663 *The Holy Bible*. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green & Marmaduke Johnson.
1666 *The Indian grammar begun*. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson.
Ellis, C. Douglas.
1983 *Spoken Cree: West coast of James Bay*. Revised ed. Edmonton: Pica Pica Press.
1995 *Atalôhkâna nêsta tipâcimowina / Cree legends and narratives from the west coast of James Bay*. Publications of the Algonquian Text Society, 4. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
Fisher, Louise, Wayne Leman, Leroy Pine Sr., & Marie Sanchez.
2006 *Cheyenne dictionary*. Lame Deer, Mont: Chief Dull Knife College.
Francis, David A., & Robert M. Leavitt.
2008 *A Passamaquoddy-Maliseet dictionary / Peskotomuhkati Wolastoqewi latuwewakon*. Orono: University of Maine Press / Fredericton, N.B.: Goose Lane Editions.
Frantz, Donald G.
2009 *Blackfoot grammar*, 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Frantz, Donald G., & Norma Jean Russell.
1995 *Blackfoot dictionary of stems, roots, and affixes*, 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Gair, James W.
2006 *Charles Francis Hockett 1916-2000. A biographical memoir*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.
Gallatin, Albert.
1836 *A synopsis of the Indian tribes within the United States east of the Rocky Mountains, and in the British and Russian possession in North America*. Transactions and collections of the American Antiquarian Society, 2.
1848 Hale's Indians of north-west America, and vocabularies of North America, with an introduction. *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society* 2: xxiii-clxxxviii, 1-138.
Givón, Talmy.
1983 Topic continuity in discourse: An introduction. *Topic continuity in discourse: a quatantive cross-language study*, ed. by Talmy Givón, 5-41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Goddard, Ives.
1967 The Algonquian independent indicative. *Contributions to anthropology: Linguistics I (Algonquian), 66-106.* National Museum of Canada Bulletin 214. Ottawa.
1969 *Delaware verbal morphology: A descriptive and comparative study*. Ph.D.

dissertation, Harvard University.
1974a An outline of the historical phonology of Arapaho and Atsina. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40:102-116.
1974b Dutch loanwords in Delaware. *A Delaware Indian symposium*, ed. by Herbert Kraft, 153-160. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
1978a Eastern Algonquian languages. *Handbook of North American Indians* v.15, ed. by Bruce G. Trigger, 70-77. Washington, D.C.: Smithonian Institution.
1978b Central Algonquian languages. *Handbook of North American Indians* v.15, ed. by Bruce G. Trigger, 583-587. Washington, D.C.: Smithonian Institution.
1978c The Sutaio dialect of Cheyenne: A discussion of the evidence. *Papers of the 9th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 68-80. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1979 *Delaware verbal morphology*. New York: Garland.
1981 Massachusett phonology: A preliminary look. *Papers of the 12th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 57-105. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1982 The historical phonology of Munsee. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48:16-48.
1984 The obviative in Fox narrative discourse. *Papers of the 15th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 273-286. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1987 Leonard Bloomfield's descriptive and comparative studies of Algonquian. *Historiographia Linguistica* 14:179-217.
1988 Stylistic dialects in Fox linguistic change. *Historical dialectology, regional and social*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, 192-209. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
1990 Aspects of the topic structure of Fox narratives: Proximate shifts and the use of overt and inflectional NPs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56: 317-340.
1991 Observations regarding Fox (Mesquakie) phonology. *Papers of the 22nd Algonquian* Conference, ed. by William Cowan, 157-181. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1993 Songs in Fox (Mesquakie) texts: Linguistics and philology. *Papers of the 24th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 212-239. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1994 The west-to-east cline in Algonquian dialectology. *Actes du 25e Congrès des Algonquinistes*, ed. by William Cowan, 187-211. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1995 Notes on Fox (Mesquakie) inflection: Minor modes and incompletely described morphemes. *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, 124-150. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
1996 The classification of the Native languages of North America. *Handbook of North American Indians* 17, *Languages*, ed. by Ives Goddard, 290-323. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
1998 Recovering Arapaho etymologies by reconstructing forwards. *Mír Curad: Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. by Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert & Lisi Olivier, 183-200. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 92.
2003 Heckewelder's 1792 vocabulary from Ohio: a possible attestation of Mascouten. *Papers of the 34th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by H. C. Wolfart, 165-191.

Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

2007 Reconstruction and history of the independent indicative. *Papers of the 38th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by H. C. Wolfart, 207-271. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

2008 Notes on Mahican: dialects, sources, phonemes, enclitics, and analogies. *Papers of the 39th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by Karl S. Hele & Regna Darnell, 246-315. London: University of Western Ontario.

2015a Arapaho historical morphology. *Anthropological Linguistics* 57:345-411.

2015b Three nineteenth-century Munsee texts: archaisms, dialect variation, and problems of textual criticism. *New voices for old words: Algonquian oral literatures*, ed. by David J. Costa, 198-314. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

2016 The "Loup" languages of western Massachusetts: the dialectal diversity of southern New England Algonquian. *Papers of the 44th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by Monica Macaulay, Margaret Noodin, & J. Randolph Valentine, 104-138. Albany: SUNY Press.

Goddard, Ives, ed.

2007 *The Owl Sacred Pack: a new edition and translation of the Meskwaki manuscript of Alfred Kiyana*. Algonquian and Iroquian Linguistics Memoirs, 19. Winnipeg.

Goddard, Ives, & Kathleen J. Bragdon.

1988 *Native writings in Massachusett*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 185. Philadelphia.

Gustafson, Holly Suzanne.

2000 *A grammar of the Nipmuck language*. M.A. thesis, University of Manitoba.

Hammerly, Christopher, & Alex Göbel.

2018 A "perspective" on obviation from attitude contexts. Paper presented at the 50th Algonquian Conference, Edmonton, 27 October 2018.

Hanzeli, Victor.

1969 *Missionary linguistics in New France: a study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century descriptions of American Indian language*s. The Hague: Mouton.

Hives, H. E.

1948 *A Cree grammar*. Toronto: Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.

Hockett, Charles F.

1939a *The Potawatomi language*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

1939b Potawatomi syntax. *Language* 15:235-248.

1948 Potawatomi I-IV. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 14:1-10, 63-73, 139-149, 213-225.

1966 What Algonquian is really like. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32:59-73.

Hoijer, Harry.

1976 History of American Indian linguistics. *Native languages of the Americas*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 1:3-22. New York: Plenum Press.

Horden, John.

1881 *A grammar of the Cree language, as spoken by the Cree Indians of North America*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Howse, Joseph.
1844 *A grammar of the Cree language: with which is combined an analysis of the Chippeway dialect*. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington.
James, Deborah.
1984 Raising to subject in Moose Cree: a problem for subjacency. *The syntax of Native America languages*, ed. by Eung-Do Cook & Donna B. Gerdts, 205-213. Orlando: Academic Press.
Jefferson, Thomas.
1982 *The papers of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. by Julian Boyd, v. 20. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Jones, William.
1904 Some principles of Algonquian word-formation. *American Anthropologist* n.s. 6:369- 411.
1907 *Fox texts*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 1. Leiden.
1911 Algonquian (Fox), ed. by Truman Michelson. *Handbook of American Indian languages*, ed. by Franz Boas, part 1, 735-873.
1917-19 *Ojibwa texts*, ed. by Truman Michelson. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 7. Leiden/ New York.
Jones, William, & Truman Michelson.
1915 *Kickapoo tales*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 9. Leiden.
Joseph, Brian D.
1980 Locatives and obviation in Cree. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:168-169.
Josselin de Jong, J. P. B. de.
1913 *Original Odžibwe-texts, with English translation, notes and vocabulary.* Baessler-Archiv Beiheft 5. Leipzig & Berlin.
1914 *Blackfoot texts from the Southern Peigans, Blackfoot Reservation, Telon Caunty, Montana*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, n.s. 14.4. Amsterdam & Berlin.
Ketakea, Anita.
1988 *Kickapoo and English dictionary*, ed. by Doris Beleele. Harrah, Okla.: IKWAI F.O.R.C.E.
Klima, E. S.
1964 Relatedness between grammatical systems. *Language* 40:1-20.
Kroeber, Alfred L.
1916 Arapaho dialects. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 12:71-138.
Kuno, Susumu.
1987 *Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lacombe, Albert.
1874 *Grammaire de la langue des Cris*. Montreal: Beauchemin & Valois.
Lahontan, Louis Armand de Lom d'Arce, baron de.
1703 *Nouveaux voyages de M. le baron de Lahontan dans l'Amérique septentrionale*. The Hague.
Laurent, Joseph.

1884 *New familiar Abenakis and English dialogues*. Québec: Leger Brousseau.

Lawson, John.

1709 *A new voyage to Carolina*. London.

Leavitt, Robert M.

1996 *Passamaquoddy-Maliseet*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Leman, Wayne.

1980a *A reference grammar of the Cheyenne language*. Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Linguistics Series 5. Greeley: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.

1980b *Cheyenne texts: An introduction to Cheyenne literature.* Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Linguistics Series 6. Greeley: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.

1987 *Náévo̱hóo'o̱htséme / We are going back home. Cheyenne history and stories told by James Shoulderblade and others*. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 4. Winnipeg.

Lemoine, Georges.

1909 *Dictionnaire francais-algonquin*. Chicoutimi: G. Delisle/ Québec: L'Action Sociale.

LeSourd, Philip S.

2013 On split coordination in Passamaquoddy. *Papers of the 41st Algonquian Conference*, ed. Karl S. Hele & J. Randolph Valentine, 120-142. Albany: SUNY Press.

Long, Michelle A.

1999a *Adverbial and argument-doubling clauses in Cree*. M.A. thesis, University of Manitoba.

1999b Obviation and clausal relations in Plains Cree. *Papers from the Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Native American Languages (WSCLA 1)*, ed. by Leora Bar-el, Rose-Marie Déchaine & Charlotte Reinholtz, 91-100. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17. Cambridge, Mass.

MacKenzie, Marguerite, & José Mailhot.

2013 *Innu-English dictionary*. Sheshatsiu, NL: Mamu Tshishkutamashutau Innu Education.

Maillard, Antonine Simon.

1864 *Grammar of the Mikmaque language of Nova Scotia / Grammaire de la lanque micmaque*, ed. by J. Bellenger. New York: Cramoisy.

Martin, Pierre.

1991 *Le montagnais: langue algonquienne du Québec*. Paris: Editions Peeters.

Masthay, Carl, ed.

1991 *Schmick's Mahican dictionary*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 197. Philadelphia.

McGregor, Ernest.

1987 A*lgonquin lexicon*. Maniwaki, Qué.: River Desert Education Authority.

Michelson, Truman.

1912 Preliminary report on the linguistic classification of Algonquian tribes. *Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report* 28:221-290b.

1914 Two alleged Algonquian languages of California. *American Anthropologist*

16:361-367.
1915 Rejoinder. *American Anthropologist* 17:194-198.
1921 *The Owl sacred pack of the Fox Indians*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 72. Washington, D.C.
1925 List of stems. *Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report* 40:616-658.
1935 Phonetic shifts in Algonquian languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 8:132-171.

Mithun, Marianne.
1999 *The languages of Native North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nichols, John D.
1980 O*jibwe morphology*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Nichols, John D., ed.
1988 *An Ojibway text anthology*. London, Ont.: University of Western Ontario.

Nichols, John D., & Earl Nyholm, eds.
1976 *Anishinaabe giigidowin*. Wisconsin Native American Languages Project, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.
1995 *A concise dictionary of Minnesota Ojibwe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Noyes, James.
1690 *Pequot Indian glossary*. Ms. in the Beincke Library Ms. Yale University.

Pacifique, *père*.
1990 *The Micmac grammar of Father Pacifique*, translated and retranscribed by John Hewson & Bernard Francis. Algonquian and Iroquoian Lingistics Memoirs, 7. Winnipeg.

Pearson, Bruce.
1972 *A grammar of Delaware: semantics, morpho-syntax, lexicon, phonology*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
1991 *Shawnee language dictionary*. Shawnee, Okla.: M. H. Mallory.

Pentland, David H.
1978 A historical overview of Cree dialects. *Papers of the 9th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 104-126. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1996 Verbs of precipitation in Algonquian. *Nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in honour of H. C. Wolfart*, ed. by John D. Nichols & Arden C. Ogg, 337-353. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 13. Winnipeg.
1999 The morphology of the Algonquian independent order. *Papers of the 30th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, 222-266. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
2013 Nominal inflections in Nipmuck. *Actes du 41e Congrès des Algonquinistes*, ed. by Karl S. Hele & J. Rand Valentine, 230-267. Albany: SUNY Press.

Pierson, Abraham.
1658 *Some helps for the Indians*. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green.

Powell, John Wesley.
1891 Indian linguistic families of America north of Mexico. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report* 7:1-142.

Prince, J. Dyneley.

1901 The modern dialect of the Canadian Abenakis. *Miscellanea linguistica in onore di Graziado Ascoli*, 343-362. Turin: E. Loescher.
1909 A Passamaquoddy aviator. *American Anthropologist* 11:628-650.
1910 The Penobscot language of Maine. *American Anthropologist* 12:183-208.
1914 The morphology of the Passamaquoddy language of Maine. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 53:92-117.
1921 *Passamaquoddy texts*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 10. New York.

Proulx, Paul.
1978 *Micmac inflection*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

Quill, Norman.
1965 *The moons of winter and other stories*, ed. by Charles Fiero. Red Lake, Ont.: Northern Light Gospel Mission.

Quinn, David Beers, ed.
1955 *The Roanoke voyages, 1584-1590: documents to illustrate the English voyages to North America under the patent granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584*. London: Hakluyt Society.

Rand, Silas.
1888 *Dictionary of the language of the Micmac Indians*. Halifax: Nova Scotia Printing Co.

Rhodes, Richard A.
1976 *The morphosyntax of the Central Ojibwa verb*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
1985 *Eastern Ojibwa-Chippewa-Ottawa dictionary*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
1990 Obviation, inversion, and Topic rank in Ojibwa. *Proceedings of the 16th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics: special session on general topics in American Indian linguistics*, ed. by David J. Costa, 101-115. Berkeley: BLS.

Rogers, Jean H.
1964 Survey of Round Lake Ojibwa phonology and morphology. *Contrbutions to anthropology 1961-62, part II*, 92-154. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 194. Ottawa.

Russell, Kevin.
1991 Obviation as discourse structure in a Swampy Cree *âcimowin*. *Papers of the 22nd Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 320-335. Ottawa: Carleton University.
1996 Does obviation mark point of view? *Nikotwâsikiskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in honour of H. C. Wolfart*, ed. by John D. Nichols & Arden C. Ogg, 367-382. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 13. Winnipeg.

Salzmann, Zdeněk.
1956 Arapaho II: texts. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 22:151-8.
1963 *A sketch of Arapaho grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
1983 *Dictionary of contemporary Arapaho usage*. Arapaho Language and Culture Instructional Materials, Series 4. Wind River Reservation, Wyo.

Sapir, Edward.
1913 Wiyot and Yurok, Algonkin languages of California. *American Anthropologist* 15:617-646.

1915 Algonkin languages of California: a reply. *American Anthropologist* 17:188-194.
1929 Central and North American Indian languages. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th ed., 5:138-141.

Sherwood, David Fairchild.
1983 *Maliseet-Passamaquoddy verb morphology*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

Siebert, Frank T., Jr.
1941 Certain Proto-Algonquin consonant clusters. *Language* 17:298-303.
1975 Resurrecting Virginia Algonquian from the dead: the reconstructed and historical phonology of Powhatan. *Studies in southeastern Indian languages*, ed. by James M. Crawford, 285-453. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press.
1996 *Penobscot dictionary*. Ms., version 3.5.

Smith, John.
1612 *A map of Virginia, with a description of the covntrey*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes.

Speck, Frank G.
1928 Native tribes and dialects of Connecticut: a Mohegan-Pequot dairy. *Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report* 43:199-287.

Strachey, William.
1953 *The historie of travell into Virginia Britania*, ed. by Louis B. Wright & Virginia Freund. London: Hakluyt Society.

Teeter, Karl.
1971 The main features of Malecite-Passamaquoddy grammar. *Studies in American Indian languages*, ed. by Jesse Sawyer, 191-149. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 65. Berkeley & Los Angeles.

Thomason, Lucy.
1995 The assignment of proximate and obviative in informal Fox narrative. *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, 462-496. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
2003 *The proximate and obviative contrast in Meskwaki*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
2015 On editing Bill Leaf's Meskwaki texts. *New voices for old words: Algonquian oral literatures*, ed. by David J. Costa, 349-452. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Todd, Evelyn M.
1970 *A grammar of the Ojibwa language: the Severn dialect*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Trumbull, James Hammond.
2009 *Natick dictionary: A New England Indian lexicon.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Thwaites, Reuben Gold.
1896-1901 *The Jesuit Relations and allied documents*. Cleveland: Burrows Brothers.

Uhlenbeck, Christianus Cornelius.
1911 *Original Blackfoot texts from the Southern Peigans, Blackfoot reservation, Teton county, Montana*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, n.s. 12.1. Amsterdam & Berlin.
1912 *A new series of Blackfoot texts from the Southern Peigans, Blackfoot reservation, Teton County, Montana*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie

van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, n.s. 13.1. Amsterdam & Berlin.

U.S. Census.

2015 Detailed languages spoken at home and ability to speak English. United States Census Bureau. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/topics/population/language-use/data.html

Valentine, J. Randolph.

2001 *Nishnaabemwin reference grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Voegelin, Carl F.

1935 Shawnee phonemes. *Language* 11:23-37.

1936 Productive paradigms in Shawnee. *Essays in anthropology presented to A. L. Kroeber*, ed. by Robert Lowie, 391-403. Berkeley: University of California Press.

1938-40. Shawnee stems and the Jacob P. Dunn Miami dictionary. *Indiana Historical Society Prehistory Research Series* 1:63-108, 135-167, 289-323, 345-406, 409-478.

1945 Delaware texts. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 11:105-19.

1946 Delaware, an Eastern Algonquian language. *Linguistic structures of Native America*, by Harry Hoijer et al., 130-157. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, 6. New York.

1953 From FL (Shawnee) to TL (English): autobiography of a woman. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 19:1-25.

Voegelin, Carl, Florence Robinett, & Nancy Hickerson.

1953 From FL (Shawnee) to TL (English): Some differences between two versions of the autobiography. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 19:106-117.

Voorhis, Paul.

1967 *A grammar of Kickapoo*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

1971 New notes on the Mesquakie (Fox) language. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 37:63-75.

1974 *Introduction to the Kickapoo language.* Indiana University Research Center for the Language Sciences. Language Science Monographs, 13. Bloomington: Indiana University.

1977 Notes on Kickapoo derivation. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 43:42:55.

1979 *Grammatical notes on the Penobscot language from Frank Speck's Penobscot Transformer tales*. University of Manitoba Anthropology Papers, 24. Winnipeg.

1982 Grammatical notes on the Wawenock language. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 7:177-208.

1983 Notes on the Kickapoo medial suffixes. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49:77-86.

1988 *Kickapoo vocabulary*. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, Memoir 6. Winnipeg.

Williams, Roger.

1643 *A key into the language of America*. London: Gregory Dexter.

Wilson, Edward.

1874 *The Ojebway language: a manual for missionaries and others employed among the Ojebway Indians*. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison for the Society for

Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Wolfart, H. Christoph.

1969 *An outline of Plains Cree morphology*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

1967 Notes on the early history of American Indian linguistics. *Folia Linguistica* 1:153-171.

1971 Plains Cree internal syntax and the problem of noun incorporation. *Verhandlungen des 38. Internationalen Amerikanistenkongresses = Proceedings of the 38th International Congress of Americanists*, 3:511-518. Munich: Kommissionsverlag Klaus Reimer.

1973a *Plains Cree: a grammatical study*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 63.5.

1973b Boundary maintenance in Algonquian: a linguistics study of Island Lake, Manitoba. *American Anthropologist* 75:1305-1323.

1978 How many obviatives? Sense and reference in a Cree verb paradigm. *Linguistic studies of Native Canada*, ed. by Eung-Do Cook & Jonathan Kaye, 255-272. Lisse, Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press; Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

1984 Notes on the Cree texts in Petitot's *Traditions indiennes du Canada Nord-Ouest*. *Essay in Algonquian bibliography in honour of V. M. Dechene*, ed. by H. C. Wolfart, 47-48. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 1. Winnipeg.

1988 *Pisiskiwak kâ-pîkiskwêcik/ Talking animals*, told [in Swampy Cree] by L. Beardy. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 5. Winnipeg.

1989a Prosodische Grenzsignale im Plains Cree. *Folia Linguistica* 23:327-334.

1989b Cree midwifery: linguistic and literary observations. *Actes du 20e Congrès des Algonquinistes*, ed. by William Cowan, 326-342. Ottawa: Carleton University.

1996 Sketch of Cree, an Algonquian language. *Handbook of North American Indians* 17, *Languages*, ed. by Ives Goddard, 390-439. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Wolfart, H. Christoph, & Freda Ahenakew.

1998 *The student's dictionary of literary Plains Cree, based on contemporary texts.* Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 15. Winnipeg.

Wolfart, H. Christoph, & Freda Ahenakew, eds.

1993 *Kinêhiyâwiwininaw nêhiyawêwin = The Cree language is our identity: the La Ronge lectures of Sarah Whitecalf*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

2000 *Âh-âyitaw isi ê-kî-kiskêyihtahkik maskihkiy = They knew both sides of medicine: Cree tales of curing and cursing told by Alice Ahenakew*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

2010 *Piko kîkway ê-nakacihtât: Kêkêk otâcimowina ê-nêhiyawastêki, mitoni ê-âh-itwêt mâna Cecilia Masuskapoe*. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics Memoirs, 21. Winnipeg.