Chapter 3
Noun inflection and pronouns

The starting point for an investigation of Meskwaki morphology and syntax is agreement and case marking, the morphological expressions of syntactic relations. Meskwaki verbs are inflected for subject and object, nouns are inflected for possessors, and case marking is required on some oblique arguments and objects of adpositions. The present chapter describes the inflectional categories and their realization on NPs; verb inflection is covered in chapters 4 and 5.[1] The categories of number and person are discussed in 3.1, gender in 3.2, and obviation, the discourse-based opposition of proximate and obviative third persons, in 3.3. Gender and obviation are treated at length since each has been the subject of controversy. Gender in Algonquian is usually described by linguists as an arbitrary system, but this perspective has been criticized by some anthropologists, who claim instead that the division of nouns into animate and inanimate gender is culturally significant. The position taken here is that gender is to some degree semantically motivated, but it is not predictable. As for obviation, Algonquianists disagree over the extent to which obviation is a syntactic phenomenon. It is shown in 3.3. that the domain within which obviation is obligatory may be defined in syntactic terms, but within that domain, the choice of which third person is proximate and which obviative depends almost entirely upon discourse factors, not upon syntactic factors.

The categories of number, person, and obviation also play a role in the inflection of nouns for possessor, which is described in 3.4. A different type of inflection is found in case marking of NPs (3.5), of which Meskwaki has a limited amount. The case endings *-eki* and *-e* are used on obliques and objects of adpositions; there is also a vocative case. (Syntactically, vocative case indicates that the NP is outside the frame of the verb and its subcategorized arguments.) The case morphology runs counter to the general head-marking pattern of Meskwaki inflection (Nichols 1986). That is, the difference between subject and object is indicated in Meskwaki by inflection on the verb, the head of the clause, and possession is expressed by inflecting the possessed noun, the head of the NP. Case marking, in contrast, is a dependent-marking strategy: the morphology expressing grammatical relations is located on the complement rather than on the head V or P.

A possible candidate for an additional agreement category is the diminutive, described in 3.6. Diminutive morphology indicates that the referent is considered small, cute, dear, or pitiful; it is extremely productive and is found on both nouns and verbs. However, it is argued in 3.6. that the diminutive in Meskwaki is not inflection but rather derivation.

The final sections of this chapter describe various types of independent pronouns in Meskwaki, which are also inflected for number, person, gender, and obviation. Two series of personal pronouns are described in 3.7., demonstratives in 3.8., and all other types (e.g., indefinite, interrogative) in 3.9.

---

[1] Uninflected words in Algonquian languages are traditionally classified as 'particles' (Bloomfield 1946:94); the range of functions associated with particles include adverbials, independent negative elements, numbers, and adpositions.

3.1. Number and person. We begin the discussion of agreement with number and person, the most straightforward of the inflectional categories. The category of number distinguishes singular from plural and is expressed on nouns by the suffixes below.[2]

(1)

	ANIMATE			INANIMATE	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL		SINGULAR	PLURAL
PROXIMATE	**-a**	**-aki**			
				-i	**-ani**
OBVIATIVE	**-ani**	**-ahi**			

As can be seen in (1), the suffixes indicate not only number but also gender (and obviation, on animate nouns). The animate obviative singular suffix *-ani* is homophonous with the inanimate plural suffix. This curious homophony is widespread in Algonquian and is reconstructed for the proto-language (Bloomfield 1946:95). The suffixes in (1) are found on all nouns except those marked for locative, prepositional, or vocative case.

Two other points about number should be mentioned here: first, the distinction between singular and plural is neutralized in some areas of verb agreement and in obviative possessor agreement. Second, a grammatically singular NP is sometimes used as a collective plural, e.g. *mehtose·neniwa* 'person' for people in general. In such cases the verb takes singular agreement. Similarly, the quantifier *kekimesi* 'everyone' shows some variation between triggering singular agreement and triggering plural agreement on the verb.

Turning now to person, we find the usual three persons distinguished in verb agreement, possessor agreement, and independent personal pronouns. There are also separate forms for exclusive and inclusive first person plurals and for an unspecified subject or possessor. Some Algonquianists use the term 'fourth person' for the obviative (e.g. Uhlenbeck 1938:29, Frantz 1966:51), but it will be seen in 3.3. that the obviative is simply a subtype of third person.

3.2. Gender. Meskwaki, like the other Algonquian languages, divides the set of nouns into two genders, animate and inanimate. Nouns referring to people or animals belong to the animate gender, but nouns referring to objects or abstractions fall into two groups. Most belong to the inanimate gender, but some are classified as animate (e.g. Bloomfield's (1946:94) well-known example of animate raspberry, as opposed to inanimate strawberry).[3] The terminology of animate vs. inanimate for this classification was used even in the earliest descriptions of Algonquian languages: in 1634 for Montagnais and in 1666 for Massachusett (Le Jeune 1897:23 and Eliot 1666:10, respectively; cited in Straus and Brightman 1982:99). But despite the long history of descriptions a controversy still remains over the nature of the Algonquian gender system. It is

---

[2] As explained in chapter 2, noun stems ending in C*y* and some stems ending in C*w* undergo phonological changes when the number/gender suffixes are attached. For stems ending in C*y*, the *y* is deleted before inanimate singular *i* but not before animate proximate singular *a*: *aseny-* 'stone' (inanimate), *aseni*; *ahpeny-* 'potato' (animate), *ahpenya*. The *y* is retained before the disyllabic nominal suffixes and changes the following *a* to *e*: *asenye·ni* 'stones', *ahpenye·ki* 'potatoes'. Some noun stems ending in C*w* undergo coalescence, changing /Cw + a/ to Co· in nonfinal syllables. For example, *nenosw-* 'cow', *nenoso·ki* 'cows'; *mehtekw-* 'tree, stick' (inanimate), *mehteko·ni* 'trees, sticks'. This does not occur with all C*w*- final noun stems, however: *mahkw-* 'bear', *mahkwaki* 'bears'. See Bloomfield 1927:183 for a list of nouns undergoing the coalescence rule.

[3] All the Algonquian languages distinguish animate from inanimate gender, but the languages do not always agree on the gender classification of specific items. For example, in Cree *asiniy* 'stone' is animate and *pi·simwe·ya·piy* 'rainbow' is inanimate, while in Meskwaki *aseni* 'stone' is inanimate and *anakwe·wa* 'rainbow' is animate.

argued here that assignment of animate gender is motivated in part by semantic principles, but that there are also cases in which animate gender is simply arbitrary, and must be listed as part of the lexical information about the noun. Inanimate gender is the unmarked, elsewhere category. Other positions that have been taken on gender in Algonquian will be reviewed below before presenting examples of gender assignment in Meskwaki.

The most extreme positions in the debate over Algonquian gender are represented by Greenberg 1954:15-16, on the one hand, who argues that the entire system must be considered arbitrary because the gender of some items is unpredictable, and Hallowell 1955:109, 1976:361-363, on the other, who asserts that the system appears arbitrary only to outsiders but that in fact the gender of every noun has cultural significance. Though taking opposite positions, Greenberg and Hallowell make the same implicit assumption about the nature of linguistic categories like gender. They assume the system is either completely arbitrary or completely predictable, where predictable means that there is a single semantic feature which all members of the category have in common, and which does not occur with any nonmembers of the category. According to this view, a single example of arbitrary gender assignment would be enough to demonstrate the arbitrariness of the entire system (Greenberg's position), while the way Hallowell counters Greenberg is to say that there is in fact an exceptionless semantic principle at work, but one which outsiders have so far failed to grasp.

Lakoff 1987:92-104, discussing Dixon's (1972) work on Dyirbal gender, offers a more plausible view of linguistic categorization and makes an important distinction between prediction and semantic motivation. Lakoff's approach is based upon work in psychology on prototypes (e.g. Rosch 1978) and Wittgenstein's (1953) ideas about family resemblances and centrality within categories. Instead of looking for a single semantic property that all members of a gender category have in common, Lakoff assumes only that the central members of the category are picked out by a semantic feature. Various semantic extensions will then link the peripheral members to more central members; a few members of the category may simply be exceptions, with no semantic link to the rest. The links between central and peripheral members are semantically motivated (that is, once you know them they make sense), but they are not predictable. Each link must be separately learned by speakers of the language and is likely to be culture-specific, perhaps rooted in myth. With Lakoff's characterization of category structure in mind we can now consider additional linguistic and anthropological treatments of Algonquian gender. Most linguists treat Algonquian gender as having a semantic core based on animacy, plus many exceptional cases of animate gender assignment (e.g. Wolfart 1973:20-23 on Plains Cree, Bloomfield 1962:28-36 on Menomini). The exceptional cases are often grouped by semantic domain: thus Bloomfield 1962:31-32 lists tobacco and items associated with smoking; corn and foods made with corn; wheat and foods made with flour -- all animate in Menomini. Within each small domain the semantic links are clear, but the motivations, if any, linking the various semantic domains together are rarely made explicit in linguistic descriptions.

Ethnologists and linguistic anthropologists, on the other hand, have followed Hallowell in trying to find a unifying feature for the animate category. The feature of (spiritual) power, assumed to reside both in living beings and in sacred objects, is proposed by Black-Rogers 1982 and Straus and Brightman 1982, based upon extensive ethnographic fieldwork on Ojibwa and Cheyenne, respectively. Darnell and Vanek 1976, relying upon dictionary entries for Cree, also argue for power as the relevant feature.[4] Though the stated aim is to establish a single feature underlying all

---

[4] Shoaps 1993 (using dictionary entries for Meskwaki body parts) takes a different perspective, suggesting that location on the lower parts of the body is the relevant factor for animacy.

instances of animate gender, in practice these studies end up with a list of items or semantic domains, just as the linguistic descriptions do. The difference is that the anthropological treatments make explicit the semantic links holding among the various domains. For example, Straus and Brightman 1982:128 point out two ways in which the Cheyenne animate noun *hohtseme* 'ball (basketball, baseball)' is linked to examples of powerful entities: it is derived from a word denoting a part of an originally sacred game, and the shape of a ball evokes the sacred shape of the circle. Explanations like this fit Lakoff's conception of category structure: a relatively peripheral member like 'ball' will be connected to more central members of the category by one or more semantic links. It should also be noted that the recent anthropological studies depart from Hallowell in conceding that some instances of animate gender defy explanation. Black-Rogers 1982:67-68 conjectures that the now unexplainable cases were semantically motivated at an earlier stage of the language; as she observes in a footnote (p. 75, n.12), synchronically this is equivalent to the linguists' position that part of the system is arbitrary.

   With this preliminary discussion, we can now turn to the gender system of Meskwaki. I assume that the category is structured as outlined by Lakoff, with central members picked out by a semantic feature, peripheral members connected to more central ones by semantic links, and some exceptional, unmotivated members. A complete account of Meskwaki gender would identify all the semantic links within the animate category and list the remaining exceptions. This will not be done here: such an account requires the intuitions of a member of the speech community or at least extensive ethnographic investigation as Black-Rogers has done for Ojibwa and Strauss for Cheyenne. Here I will undertake the more limited task of outlining the semantic feature picking out the central members of the category and identifying a few of the links to more peripheral members. Other cases of animate gender will then be listed, leaving open the question of how many of them are motivated and how many simply arbitrary.[5] In the examples given below, all nouns ending in *-a* are animate and all nouns ending in *-i* are inanimate (see the chart of suffixes in (1)).

   The semantic feature picking out the central members of the animate gender in Meskwaki is animacy. Almost all nouns referring to people, spirits, or animals are animate.[6]

(2)   a.   neniwa   'man'
    b.   ihkwe·wa   'woman'
    c.   okima·wa   'chief'
    d.   maneto·wa   'spirit, manitou; snake'
    e.   anemo·ha   'dog'
    f.   mahkwa   'bear'
    g.   pešekesiwa   'deer'
    h.   ši·ši·pa   'duck'
    i.   a·mo·wa   'bee'

The most important semantic extension from the central animate members is to the domain of spiritually powerful entities. There is an overlap between the set of powerful entities and the set of

---

[5] More examples of animate and inanimate nouns may be found in Bloomfield's Fox lexicon (Goddard 1994).

[6] Two grammatically inanimate nouns have been found which have animate referents. One is the collective noun *mi·čipe·hi* 'game' (e.g. R266.44, 458.7); compare the animate *mi·čipe·ha* 'game animal', referring to an individual animal. Another example is *či·nawe·ti·weni*, which is ordinarily used to mean 'kinship (system)' but which may also be used to refer to 'kin' (Ives Goddard, personal communication).

animate entities: spirits are both animate and powerful; some humans and some animals may be powerful as well. Not all entities with power are named by animate nouns, however. For example, *mi·ša·mi* 'sacred bundle, sacred pack' denotes an extremely important and sacred item, yet the noun has inanimate gender.

(3)   a.   ase·ma·wa   'tobacco'
      b.   ahpwa·kana   'pipe'
      c.   te·we·hikana   'drum'
      d.   ahkohkwa   'drum; kettle with lid'
      e.   anemona   'red ochre'
      f.   a·teso·hka·kana   'sacred story'
      g.   mi·ša·mi   'sacred bundle'
      h.   na·tawino·ni   'medicine'
      i.   mena·koški·hi   'sage'

The fact that the set of nouns denoting powerful entities contains many exceptional inanimates argues against power being the central feature defining the gender category.

Though power may not be the central feature of the animate category it nevertheless plays a prominent role in the gender system, as evidenced by shifts in gender from inanimate to animate. Such shifts may occur in religious contexts: for example, the trees 'white oak' and 'sycamore' are named by inanimate nouns in everyday use (*mehtekomiši, ki·šowa·hkwi*, respectively) but by animate nouns if mentioned in a religious ceremony (*mehtekomiša, ki·šowa·hkwa*) (Ives Goddard, personal communication). More examples may be found in traditional narratives. The noun stem *aseny-* 'stone' is ordinarily inanimate, but in some contexts describing speech directed to a stone the gender of the noun is shifted to animate. The following sentence, for example, is taken from a text in which a man is addressing prayers to a stone heated for a sweat-lodge:

(4)   *e·ha·čimoha·či*   *asenye·ni*   *i·na*   *neniwa*
      e·h-a·čimoh-a·-t-i   aseny-ani   i·n-a   neniw-a
      AOR-speak.to-DIR-3-MODE   stone-OBV   that-SG   man-SG
      [speak.to 3-3'/AOR.CONJ]

      'That man (prox) spoke to the stone (animate, obv).' R206.1

(See chapter 5 for the functions of the aorist conjunct and other verb paradigms; the prefix *e·h-* is required by the aorist conjunct.) Here *asenye·ni* bears the animate obviative suffix *-ani* and the verb is inflected for an animate obviative object (indicated by 3' in the interlinear gloss). However, there are other contexts where speech directed to an inanimate object is described without a shift in gender:

(5)   *"nahi,   e·hpo·ni·kwe·hiki ki·hihpaho," e·hitaki owi·kewa·wi wi·sahke·ha*
      nahi   e·h-po·ni·-w-k-e·h-iki   ke-i·h-ihpaho
      well!   AOR-camp-INT-3-INT-3P   2-FUT-run.to
              [camp 3P/INTERR.PART/LOC.HEAD]   [FUT-run.to 2/IND.IND]

e·h-it-am-k-i	o-w-i·k-ewa·w-i	wi·sahke·h-a
AOR-say.to-0.OBJ-3-MODE	3- -house-(3)P-INAN.SG	W.-ANIM.SG
[say.to 3-0/AOR]		

'"Okay, you should run to wherever they are camping,"
Wisahkeha said to their house (inan).' W106EF

Within the quote the house is addressed with second person forms, which are necessarily animate in gender: *ki·hihpaho* 'you should run [there]'. But in the quoting frame following the direct quote the object *owi·kewa·wi* 'their house' is inanimate, as seen by the suffix *-i* on the noun and by the verb inflection for an inanimate object (0 in the interlinear gloss). From examples like these we may conclude that gender shift is motivated and culturally significant but not predictable, like the membership of the animate gender overall.

A different extension from the central feature of animacy is illustrated by the animate noun *ni·ča·pa* 'doll'. A doll is a representation of a human, which motivates the gender assignment here. Another animate noun, *či·paya* 'corpse; ghost' is doubly linked to the central members of the category. In its meaning of 'corpse' it is a former human being, and in its meaning of 'ghost' it denotes a spiritually powerful being.

Below I list a number of nouns in other semantic domains, without commenting on possible semantic motivations for the animate examples. Most nouns denoting part of a human or animal body are inanimate, but a few are animate.[7]

(6)   a.   ahkani   'bone'
       b.   meškwi   'blood'
       c.   owi·ne·tepi   'brain'
       d.   mete·hi   'heart'
       e.   menehki   'hand'
       f.   mi·kona   'feather'
       g.   ato·wa   'blood clot'
       h.   owi·wi·na   'horn; braid'
       i.   oto·neno·ha   'kidney'

Nouns denoting animal skins or fur provide a likely example of arbitrariness in Meskwaki gender. Skins of large animals are inanimate, while skins of small animals are animate (Goddard 1990c:452,n.11). The general word for 'skin', *asaya*, is animate.

(7)   a.   amehkwaya   'beaver skin'
       b.   ašaško·haya   'muskrat fur'
       c.   e·sepanaya   'raccoon skin'
       d.   ketiwaya   'golden eagle skin'
       e.   maneto·waya   'snake skin'
       f.   wi·teko·waya   'owl skin'
       g.   asayi   'skin of a large animal'

---

[7] Darnell and Vanek's (1976) conjecture that nouns denoting male genitals should be animate, while those for female genitals should be inanimate, is wrong. *mi·nakayi* 'penis' and *či·kaško·hi* 'clitoris' are inanimate; *onešiwa* 'testicle' and *mehketena* 'vulva' are animate.

h.	mahkwayi	'bear skin'
i.	nenoswayi	'buffalo skin'
j.	meše·we·wayi	'elk skin'

Nouns for plants are mostly inanimate (e.g. *ahte·himini* 'strawberry'), but some, including *wi·tawi·ha* 'raspberry', are animate. Other animate and inanimate plant examples are given below.

(8)	a.	meškwa·wa·hkwa	'red cedar'
	b.	mi·twi·wa	'cottonwood'
	c.	mesa·hkwa	'ear of corn'
	d.	ahpenya	'potato'
	e.	maškoči·sa	'bean(s)'
	f.	ani·pi	'elm'	[stem *ani·py-*]
	g.	mano·mini	'rice'
	h.	mehtekwi	'wood, tree, stick'
	i.	pe·škone·wi·hi	'flower'
	j.	ta·htapakwi	'leaf'
	k.	wa·pikoni	'squash, pumpkin'

Some nouns denoting natural phenomena are animate, others inanimate:

(9)	a.	ateko·wa	'wave'
	b.	ako·na	'snow'
	c.	ki·šeswa	'sun'
	d.	ana·kwa	'star'
	e.	mesihkwa	'ice'
	f.	aseni	'stone'	[stem *aseny-*]
	g.	ahki	'earth'	[stem *ahky-*]
	h.	aškote·wi	'fire'
	i.	menesi	'island'
	j.	nepi	'water'	[stem *nepy-*]

Likewise, some manufactured items are animate, others inanimate:

(10)	a.	mehte·ha	'bow'
	b.	ata·pya·na	'wagon'
	c.	ana·kani	'bowl'
	d.	či·ma·ni	'canoe'
	e.	ma·tesi	'knife'
	f.	pa·škesikani	'gun'

Nouns derived from verbs by suffixation of *-n, -wen,* or *-(a·)kan* are nearly always inanimate:

(11)	a.	nakamo·ni	'song'	<--	*nakamo-*	'sing'
	b.	a·čimo·ni	'story'	<--	*a·čimo-*	'tell a story'

c.	kepihikani	'fence'	<--	*kepihike·-*	'enclose things'
d.	nepo·weni	'death'	<--	*nep-*	'die'
e.	ayo·weni	'tool'	<--	*ay-*	'use'
f.	a·hkwe·weni	'anger'	<--	*a·hkwe·-*	'be angry'
g.	kota·kani	'throat'	<--	*kot-*	'swallow'
h.	a·teso·hka·kana	'sacred story'	<--	*a·teso·hke·-*	'tell a sacred story'

The exceptional form in (11h) is presumably animate because *a·teso·hka·kanaki* are stories about the spirits, who have mystical powers.

A different nominalization process -- initial change plus suffixation of *-h* -- produces both animate and inanimate nouns:

(12)	a.	e·nwe·we·ha·so·ha	'drum'	<--	*anwe·we·ha·so-*	'be drummed on'
	b.	mi·seče·ha	'peach'	<--	*mi·seče·-*	'have a hairy body'
	c.	mi·simi·si·ha	'Jerusalem artichoke'	<--	*mi·simi·si·-*	'defecate repeatedly'
	d.	ke·no·te·hi	'long house'	<--	*keno·te·-*	'be a long house'

See chapter 2 for the rule of initial change.

More clues about the principles underlying a gender system may be found by examining the classification of loan words. Meskwaki borrowed a few words from French in the 17th and 18th centuries and others from English more recently.

(13)	a.	fa·me·ha	'farmer'	
	b.	ko·hko·še·ha	'pig'	[< Fr. (dial.) *coucouche*]
	c.	pi·ki·hi	'playing card'	[< Fr. *pique* 'spade']
	d.	i·hke·hi	'acre'	
	e.	pe·škiti	'basket'	[stem *pe·škity-*]
	f.	tre·kite·hi	'tractor'	
	g.	četi	'jet'	
	h.	a·tamo·pi·na	'automobile'	
	i.	nehpaipema	'my pipe'	

(13a, f, g, and h) are from Voorhis 1971; (13i) is from Goddard 1991:158. See Goddard 1974:155,n.5 for the source of (13b).

As (13) shows, the pattern for assigning gender to loan words is similar to that for native Meskwaki nouns. Words for people and animals are animate, while words for other entities are mostly inanimate, with a few items taking animate gender. The animacy of *nehpaipema* 'my pipe' (with *ne-* 'my' and the possessed suffix *-em-* (3.4.)) matches the gender of the native *ahpwa·kana* 'pipe'. For *a·tamo·pi·na* 'automobile', the animate gender is presumably due to the motion of automobiles, but note that *tre·kite·hi* 'tractor' and *četi* 'jet' are inanimate.[8]

A final question about gender concerns conjoined NPs of mixed gender, where at least one conjunct is an animate NP and at least one other is an inanimate NP. Such NPs pose a problem for verb agreement if they are used as subject or first object. Recall that verbs are inflected for the

---

[8] An example of a borrowed plant name given animate gender may be seen in closely related Kickapoo *aahooha* 'garlic', from Spanish *ajo* (Voorhis 1988:4).

gender of subject and object, and that the shape of the verb stem itself is influenced by the gender of the object (if transitive) or the subject (if intransitive). If the subject or object of the verb is a conjoined NP of mixed gender, what will the form of the verb be? In Meskwaki, the agreement rule for NPs of mixed gender is for the verb to agree with the closest member of the conjoined NP.[9] For example, in the following sentence the NP closest to the verb is the inanimate *ahte·himinani* 'strawberries', so the verb contains the Transitive Inanimate stem *mi·či-* 'eat', inflected for first person exclusive plural subject and an inanimate object:

(14)   *nemi·čipena*   *ahte·himinani*   *na·hka*   *wi·tawi·haki*
       ne-mi·či-pena   ahte·himin-ani   na·hka   wi·tawi·h-aki
       1-eat$_{TI}$-1P   strawberry-INAN.PL   also   raspberry-ANIM.PL
       [eat 1P-0/IND.IND]

       'We ate strawberries [inan] and raspberries [anim].'

It is ungrammatical to use the Transitive Animate form of the verb stem (*amw-* 'eat') and animate object inflection if the closest NP to the verb is inanimate:

(15)   **netamwa·pena*   *ahte·himinani na·hka wi·tawi·haki*
        ne-t-amw-a·-pena
       1- -eat$_{TA}$-DIR-1P
       [eat 1P-3(P)/IND.IND]

       ('We ate strawberries [inan] and raspberries [anim].')

If the order of the conjoined NPs is reversed, with the animate NP closer to the verb, then the verb stem must be Transitive Animate, inflected for an animate object:

(16)   *netamwa·pena/*nemi·čipena wi·tawi·haki na·hka ahte·himinani*
       'We ate raspberries [anim] and strawberries [inan].'

       The same pattern holds for conjoined NPs preceding the verb. (See chapter 8 for the discourse functions of NPs to the left of the verb.) The gender of the NP closest to the verb determines the form of the verb stem and inflection.

(17)   *ahte·himinani na·hka wi·tawi·haki netamwa·pena/*nemi·čipena*
       'We ate strawberries [inan] and raspberries [anim].'

(18)   *wi·tawi·haki na·hka ahte·himinani nemi·čipena/*netamwa·pena*
       'We ate raspberries [anim] and strawberries [inan].'

       The gender agreement rule also applies to subjects. In the following examples the subject of the intransitive verb 'be many' is a conjoined NP of mixed gender. If the closest NP to the verb is inanimate, then the Inanimate Intransitive form of the verb stem, *ma·ne·t-*, must be used; the Animate Intransitive form, *ma·ne·-*, is ungrammatical.

---

[9] A similar phenomenon occurs in English number agreement (Morgan 1972).

(19) *ma·ne·to·ni*   *ahte·himinani*   *na·hka*   *wi·tawi·haki*
      ma·ne·t-w-ani   ahte·himin-ani   na·hka   wi·tawi·h-aki
      be.many-0-INAN.PL   strawberry-INAN.PL   also   raspberry-ANIM.PL
      [be.many 0P/IND.IND]

      'There are many strawberries [inan] and raspberries [anim].'

(20) **ma·ne·waki ahte·himinani na·hka wi·tawi·haki*
      ma·ne·-w-aki
      be.many-3-PL
      [be.many 3P/IND.IND]

      ('There are many strawberries [inan] and raspberries [anim].')

If the closest NP to the verb is animate, the Animate Intransitive form of the verb must be used:

(21) *ma·ne·waki/*ma·ne·to·ni wi·tawi·haki na·hka ahte·himinani*
      'There are many raspberries [anim] and strawberries [inan].'

Again, the agreement rule also applies to subjects appearing to the left of the verb:

(22) *ahte·himinani na·hka wi·tawi·haki ma·ne·waki/*ma·ne·to·ni*
      'There are many strawberries [inan] and raspberries [anim].'

(23) *wi·tawi·haki na·hka ahte·himinani ma·ne·to·ni/*ma·ne·waki*
      'There are many raspberries [anim] and strawberries [inan].'

The above examples are all elicited sentences; the agreement rule they illustrate is confirmed by the following textual examples.[10]

(24) *ni·hmawi-ašiha·wa*   *nemehte·ha*   *na·hka*   *ni·pani*
      ne-i·h-mawi aših-a·-w-a   ne-mehte·h-a   na·hka   n-i·p-ani
      1-FUT-go.to make-DIR-3-SG   1-bow-SG   also   1-arrow-INAN.PL
      [FUT-go-make 1-3/IND.IND]

      'I will go make my bow [anim] and my arrows [inan].' J290.19

(25) *e·hni·senakeheye·toke opepikwe·škowa·wi na·hka*
      otaškwa·ne·hkete·mwa·wi kaho·ni otahkohko·hwa·wani

      e·h-ni·sen-am-k-ehe=ye·toke   o-pepikwe·ško-wa·w-i   na·hka
      AOR-take.down-0.OBJ-3-PAST=it.seems   3-flute-(3)P-INAN.SG   also

---
[10] It is worth noting, however, that such examples are fairly rare: in texts most conjoined NPs of mixed gender function as second objects of verbs. Since verbs are not inflected for second objects, the problem of gender agreement is avoided.

[take.down 3-0/PAST.AOR]

o-t-aškwa·ne·hkete·m-wa·w-i   kaho·ni   o-t-ahkohko·h-wa·w-ani
3- -firestick-(3)P-INAN.SG   and   3- -drum.DIM-(3)P-OBV

'It seems he had taken down their flute [inan] and
their firestick [inan] and their small drum [anim].' R478.19

In (24) the verb is inflected for an animate singular object, matching the features of *nemehte·ha* 'my bow [anim]', the first half of the conjoined NP. In (25), on the other hand, the verb is inflected for an inanimate object, matching the features of *opepikwe·škwa·wi* 'their flute [inan]', the closest member of the conjoined NP.

       The rule of 'agree with the closest NP' accounts for the above cases of conjoined NPs of mixed gender. Suppose, however, that a verb is inflected for a pronominal argument which is understood to refer to a combination of animate and inanimate third persons. Which gender would be used for the pronominal argument? The one textual example which has been found uses inanimate gender: *mi·čikwe·na* 'whoever ate them [inanimate]' Kiyana 1913:54K, where the context makes it clear that the things eaten are strawberries (inanimate) and a kind of fish (animate). The choice of inanimate in this context is not surprising since inanimate is the semantically unmarked, elsewhere category of the gender system.[11]

3.3. Obviation. Obviation is a grammatical opposition within third person found in all the Algonquian languages. If more than one third person is mentioned within a certain syntactic domain, then the third person most central to the discourse is referred to by PROXIMATE forms (of nouns, pronouns, or verb agreement) and the more peripheral third persons are referred to by OBVIATIVE forms.[12] For example, in the following sentence the proximate and obviative morphology signals that the speaker views the woman as more central to the discourse than the child.

---

[11] Further evidence for the unmarked character of inanimate gender may be seen in constructions with *ke·ko·hi* 'something, anything' (3.9):

(i)   *a·kwi*   *ke·ko·hi*   *nehto·wa·čini*   *ši·ša·čiki*
           a·kwi   ke·ko·hi   neht-o·-wa·-t-ini   IC-ši·ša·-t-iki
           not   anything   kill-0.obj-3p-3-neg   IC-hunt-3-3p.head
                           [kill 3p-0/neg]   [hunt 3p/part/3p]

     'The ones who were hunting didn't kill anything.'

ke·ko·hi triggers inanimate object agreement on the verb and requires the Transitive Inanimate form of the verb stem, even though any semantically plausible object of 'kill' would have animate gender. (The subject in (i) is a relative clause; verbs in relative clauses take participle inflection and bear an additional suffix agreeing with the head of the relative clause (5.3).)

[12] The suffixes on grammatically inanimate nouns do not encode obviation overtly, but the difference between proximate and obviative inanimates may be seen in verb agreement when the inanimate third person is subject of an intransitive (4.2).

(26) *ihkwe·wana·hkači* *e·hso·kena·či* *oni·ča·nesani*
  ihkwe·w-<u>a</u>=na·hkači e·h-so·ken-<u>a·-t-i</u> o-ni·ča·nes-<u>ani</u>
  woman-SG=also AOR-hold-DIR-3-MODE 3-child-OBV
  [hold 3-3'/AOR]

'The woman (prox) also held her child (obv).' W66K

The proximate status of *ihkwe·wa* 'woman' is indicated by the animate proximate singular suffix *-a*; the obviative status of *oni·ča·nesani* 'her child' is indicated by the animate obviative singular suffix *-ani*. Obviation is also expressed in verb inflection: the suffix complex *-a·či* indicates a proximate singular subject (3) acting upon an obviative object (3') in the aorist conjunct paradigm.

The proximate forms of noun, pronoun, and verb inflection are identical to the unmarked third person forms used when only one third person is mentioned. The obviative forms, on the other hand, are used exclusively to mark peripheral third persons. (In the interlinear glosses of (26) and other examples obviative nouns and demonstratives are glossed 'obv' and proximate nouns and demonstratives are unmarked.) Obviation may thus be thought of as a privative opposition with obviative as the marked member: in contexts of neutralization (where there is only one third person) the proximate form is used with its fundamental meaning of third person. Contexts with two or more third persons require a choice to be made between proximate and obviative; here proximate takes on the additional meaning of 'most central to the discourse' because it is in contrast to obviative. It is important to note that if the context contains only one third person, proximate morphology does not signal anything about discourse status. Even an expletive subject of a weather verb (4.2.) occurs in the proximate form if there is no other third person in the context.[13]

The rough characterization of obviation given above needs to be made more precise in two ways. First, what is the syntactic domain of obviation? Second, what does it mean to be 'most central to the discourse'? In 3.3.1. I show that the syntactic domain within which obviation is obligatory covers not only a simple clause, as in (26), but also extends to the subject of a Comp clause (but not to oblique, adjunct, or co-ordinate clauses). This minimal domain may optionally be expanded, however, to include the entire sentence or to range over more than one sentence. Such expanded domains of obviation are typical of narrative texts, in which the grammatical opposition of obviation may be exploited for a number of stylistic purposes. 3.3.2. takes up the separate issue of assigning proximate and obviative status. That is, given two noncoreferential third persons appearing within the domain of obviation, what factors influence which is proximate and which obviative? The factors involved are primarily discourse conditions, such as empathy, with syntactic factors playing only a minor role. However, Rhodes 1990a (on Ojibwa) has argued just the opposite, that obviation is primarily a syntactic phenomenon. It will be shown below that most of Rhodes's syntactic constraints do not hold in Meskwaki.

3.3.1. The syntactic domain of obviation. I will first characterize the syntactic domain within which obviation is obligatory: in other words, where it is impossible for two noncoreferential third persons to both be expressed by proximate forms.

Obviation is obligatory if two third persons occur in the same NP (i.e., one possessing the other), if two third persons are arguments of the same verb, or if one third person is an argument of

---

[13] Additional evidence for the unmarked status of proximate can be found in conjoined NPs combining a proximate and an obviative third person: the conjoined NP as a whole is proximate plural.

a matrix clause and the other is the subject of an embedded clause bearing the Comp grammatical function. The following examples illustrate the obligatory nature of obviation in these contexts, beginning with possessed NPs.

(27)   *[NP   neniw-a   o-kwis-a]
                 man-sg   3-son-sg
        ('the man (prox)'s son (prox)')

(28)   [NP   neniw-a   o-kwis-ani]
                 man-sg   3-son-obv
        'the man (prox)'s son (obv)'

(27) shows that it is impossible for two noncoreferential third persons to both be proximate if they occur in the same NP. (See 3.4. for inflection on possessed nouns.) Furthermore, it is the possessed NP which must be obviative, as in (28). It is impossible to have an obviative possessor and proximate possessum:

(29)   * [NP   neniw-ani   o-kwis-a]
                 man-obv   o-son-sg
        ('the man (obv)'s son (prox)')

        Obviation is also obligatory if two third persons are arguments of the same verb. The following example is ungrammatical because the subject NP and the object NP are both proximate.

(30)   *ihkwe·wa   kaka·čime·wa   neniwa
        *ehkwe·w-a   kaka·čim-e·-w-a   neniw-a
        woman-sg   joke.with-direct-3-sg   man-sg
                      [joke.with 3-3'/ind.ind]

        ('The woman (prox) joked with the man (prox).')

(The verb inflection is for a proximate subject acting on an obviative object; there is no way to express proximate acting on proximate in the system of verb inflection.)
        When the third persons in question are arguments of the same verb there is no syntactic restriction regarding which third person is chosen as proximate and which as obviative.

(31)   ihkwe·wa   kaka·čime·wa   neniwani
        ehkwe·w-a   kaka·čim-e·-w-a   neniw-ani
        woman-sg   joke.with-direct-3-sg   man-obv
                      [joke.with 3-3'/ind.ind]

        'The woman (prox) joked with the man (obv).'

(32)   *ihkwe·wani*   *kaka·čimekwa*   *neniwa*
         ehkwe·w-ani   kaka·čim-ekw-w-a   neniw-a
         woman-obv   joke.with-inverse-3-sg   man-sg
                         [joke.with 3'-3/ind.ind]

'The woman (obv) joked with the man (prox).'

Rather, the assignment of proximate and obviative is sensitive to the discourse factors discussed in 3.3.2.

The final context in which obviation is obligatory is when one third person is an argument in a matrix clause and the other third person is subject of a complement clause. The sentence below is ungrammatical because the subjects of both clauses are proximate:

(33)   **e·hša·kwe·nemoči*   *oškinawe·ha*   *wi·hna·kwa·či*   *še·škesi·he·ha*
         e·h-ša·kwe·nemo-t-i   oškinawe·h-a   wi·h-na·kwa·-t-i   še·škesi·he·h-a
         aor-be.unwilling-3-mode   young.man-sg   fut-leave-3-mode   y.woman.dim-sg
         [be.unwilling 3/aor]   [fut-leave 3/aor]

('The young man (prox) didn't want the young woman (prox) to leave.')

Again, either of the third persons in question may be obviative and the other proximate:

(34)   *e·hša·kwe·nemoči*   *oškinawe·ha*   *wi·hna·kwa·niči*   *še·škesi·he·hani*
         e·h-ša·kwe·nemo-t-i   oškinawe·h-a   wi·h-na·kwa·-ni-t-i   še·škesi·he·h-ani
         aor-be.unwilling-3-mode   young.man-sg   fut-leave-obv-3-mode   y.womn.dim-obv
         [be.unwilling 3/aor]   [fut-leave 3'/aor]

'The young man (prox) didn't want the young woman (obv) to leave.'

(35)   *e·hša·kwe·nemoniči*   *oškinawe·hani*   *wi·hna·kwa·či*   *še·škesi·he·ha*
         e·h-ša·kwe·nemo-ni-t-i   oškinawe·h-ani   wi·h-na·kwa·-t-i   še·škesi·he·h-a
         aor-be.unwilling-obv-3-mode young.man-obv   fut-leave-3-mode   y.woman.dim-sg
         [be.unwilling 3'/aor]   [fut-leave 3/aor]

'The young man (obv) didn't want the young woman (prox) to leave.'

The next pair of examples shows that obviation is also obligatory between the object of the matrix clause and the subject of the complement clause:

(36)   *ni·hnana·tohtawa·wa*   *nekya*   *e·šawinikwe·ni*   *kwi·yese·hani*
         ne-i·h-nana·tohtaw-a·-w-a   ne-ky-a   IC-ešawi-ni-w-k-e-n-i   kwi·yese·h-ani
         1-fut-ask-dir-3-sg   1-mother-sg IC-fare.thus-obv-int-3-int-obl boy-obv
         [fut-ask 1-3/ind.ind]   [fare.thus 3'/int.part/obl.head]

'I will ask my mother (prox) what happened to the boy (obv).'

(37) *ni·hnana·tohtawa·wa   nekya   e·šawikwe·ni   kwi·yese·ha
     ne-i·h-nana·tohtaw-a·-w-a   ne-ky-a   IC-ešawi-w-k-e-n-i   kwi·yese·h-a
     1-fut-ask-dir-3-sg   1-mother-sg IC-fare.thus-int-3-int-obl boy-sg
     [fut-ask 1-3/ind.ind]   [fare.thus 3'/int.part/obl.head]

('I will ask my mother (prox) what happened to the boy (prox).')

    Obviation is *not* obligatory, however, if one third person is in a matrix clause and the other is an object (or other nonsubject function) in a complement clause, or if one third person is in a matrix clause and and the other is in an oblique or adjunct clause. Nor is obviation obligatory if the two third persons are in co-ordinate clauses. The first example below shows that an object in a complement clause is not in the domain of obligatory obviation.

(38) i·na   oškinawe·ha ša·kwe·nemowa   wi·hkano·naki   še·škesi·ha
     i·na   oškinawe·h-a ša·kwe·nemo-w-a   wi·h-kano·n-ak-i   še·škesi·h-a
     that   young.man-sg be.unwilling-3-sg fut-talk.to-1subj.3obj-mode y.woman-sg
                         [be.unwilling 3/ind] [fut-talk.to 1-3/aor]

'That young man (prox) didn't want me to talk to the young woman (prox).'

(38) is grammatical even though it contains two noncoreferential proximate third persons, in contrast to the ungrammatical (33). The difference is that the third person in the complement clause of (33) is a subject, while the third person in the complement clause of (38) is an object.
    (38) is an elicited example; the following textual example makes the same point. This sentence is part of a prayer addressed to a heated stone in a sweat lodge. Notice that the subject of the matrix clause and the object of the complement clause are noncoreferential third persons, and both are proximate.

(39) ki·na   mani   e·hki·ši-pakisenehki   maneto·wa
     ki·na   mani   e·h-ki·ši pakisen-ehk-i   maneto·w-a
     you   now   AOR-PERF permit 3SUBJ.2OBJ-MODE   spirit-SG
                    [PERF-permit 3-2/AOR]

     ma·haki   ko·šisemaki   wi·htaši-apwahapwane·hpwači
     ma·haki   ke-o·šisem-aki   wi·h-taši apwa-h-apwane·hpw-at-i
     these   2-g.children-PL   FUT-PROG REDUP- -warm.by.breath-2SUBJ.3OBJ-MODE
                                    [FUT-PROG-REDUP.warm.by.breath 2-3/AOR]

'The spirit (prox) has now permitted you
to warm your grandchildren (prox) with your breath' B85:74.19

    Obliques and adjuncts are also outside the domain of obligatory obviation. In the following example, the bracketed clause functions as an oblique: the matrix verb is 'walk away in such a way' and the oblique expresses the manner in which the subject walks. The subject of the matrix clause and the subject of the oblique clause are noncoreferential, yet both are proximate.

(40) *[mehto·čimeko   ši·ši·pa   e·hanemehka·či]   e·hanemi-inose·či*
mehto·či=meko   ši·ši·p-a   e·h-anemehka·-t-i   e·h-anemi inose·-t-i
like=EMPH   duck-SG   AOR-travel.away-3-MODE AOR-away walk.thus-3MODE
                                    [travel.away 3/aor]   [away-walk.thus 3/aor]

'She (prox) walked away just like a duck (prox) walks.' W572

Likewise, the subject of an adverbial adjunct clause may be proximate even when it is disjoint in reference to the proximate subject of the main clause:

(41) [ADJ *ki·ši-na·kwa·wa·či*],
   IC-ki·ši na·kwa·-wa·-t-i
   IC-PERF leave-3P-3-MODE
    [PERF-leave 3P/CH.CONJ]

   metemo·he·ha   *e·hwe·pi-*   *pe·hki*   *-nanawo·te·we·či*   *wi·kiya·pi·hki·ki.*
   metemo·h-e·h-a   e·h-we·pi   pe·hki nanawo·te·we·-t-i   wi·kiya·pi·hki·ki
   old.woman-DIM-SG   AOR-begin   really   visit.people-3-MODE   in.village
                       [begin-visit.people 3/AOR]

'After they [the men] (prox) left,
the little old woman (prox) began to go visiting in the village.' W216QR

The next example shows that the subject of a relative clause is outside the domain of obligatory obviation:

(42) *ihkwe·waki*   *apwa·ne·waki*   *ši·ši·pahi*   *ne·sa·wa·čihi*   *ši·ša·čiki*
ehkwe·w-aki   apwa·n-e·-w-aki ši·ši·p-ahi   IC-nes-a·-wa·-t-ihi   IC-ši·ša·-t-iki
woman-PL   roast-DIR-3-PL   duck-OBV.PL IC-kill-DIR-3P-3-OBV.PL IC-hunt-3-3P
        [roast 3P-3'/IND.IND]   [kill 3P-3'/PART/3'P]   [hunt 3P/PART/3P]

'The women (prox) roasted the ducks (obv) which the hunters (prox) had killed.'

In (42) both the subject of the main clause and the subject of the relative clause modifying 'ducks' are proximate.
    Nor does the domain of obligatory obviation extend into a co-ordinate clause. The two co-ordinate clauses in the following example have noncoreferential proximate subjects.

(43) *še·škimeko*   *ihkwe·wa*   *e·hwača·nota·či,*
še·ški=meko   ehkwe·w-a   e·h-wača·nota·-t-i
only=EMPH   woman-SG   AOR-do.cooking-3-MODE
                 [do.cooking 3/AOR]

neniwa	*še·ški=meko*	*e·hanemi-atahatama·či*	
neniw-a	še·ški=meko	e·h-anemi	ata-h-atama·-t-i.
man-SG	only=EMPH	AOR-away	REDUP- -smoke-3-MODE
		[away-REDUP.smoke 3/AOR]	

'The women (prox) did nothing but cook,
and the men (prox) just kept smoking.' wi·t 14NO

Note the use of a singular NP (*ihkwe·wa* 'woman', *neniwa* 'man') to stand for the whole group.

The examples given so far establish that there is a minimal syntactic domain within which obviation is obligatory. The domain of obviation may optionally be expanded, however, to include an entire sentence, or even more than one sentence. For example, an object of a complement clause may be included in the expanded domain of obviation:

(44)   *keki·šima·hiyo·we*   *-pahkimekowa·wa*   *wi·sahke·ha*

ke-ki·ši=ma·hi=iyo·we	-pahkim-eko-wa·w-a	wi·sahke·h-a
2-PERF=after.all=PAST	-assign-INV-(2)P-SG	Wisahkeha-SG
[PERF-assign 3-2P/IND.IND]		

wi·hanemi-keteminawome·kwe		*anemi-mehtose·neniwahi*
wi·h-anemi	keteminaw-em-e·kwe	anemi-mehtose·neniw-ahi
FUT-future	bless-OBV.OBJ-2P	future-person-OBV.PL
[FUT-future-bless 2P-3'/AOR]		

'Wisahkeha (prox) has already assigned you (pl)
to bless the future people (obv).' W964

(44) contains two noncoreferential third persons, one the subject of the matrix clause and the other the object of the complement clause. The subject of the matrix clause is proximate and the object of the complement clause is obviative. Making the object of the complement clause obviative is not syntactically obligatory, as we saw in (38) and (39). In (44), however, the speaker has chosen to expand the domain of obviation in order to emphasize the difference in discourse status between the two noncoreferential third persons.

Another example of an expanded domain of obviation is given below, this one involving an adjunct clause:

(45)   *o·ni*   *ki·ši-anenwi·wa·či,*

o·ni	IC-ki·ši-anenwi·-wa·-t-i
and.then	IC-PERF-swim-3p-3-MODE
	[PERF-swim 3P/CH.CONJ]

metemo·he·hani	*"..."*	*e·hina·niči*	*owi·č-ihkwe·wahi.*
metemo·h-e·h-ani		e·h-en-a·-ni-t-i	o-w-i·č ehkwe·w-ahi.
old.woman-DIM-OBV		AOR-say.to-DIR-OBV-3-MODE	3-fellow woman-OBV.PL
		[say.to 3'-3"/aor]	

'And then after they [the men] (prox) went swimming,
the little old woman (obv) said "..." to the other women (obv).' W324A-D

(45) forms a near minimal pair with (41). (41) shows that adjunct clauses are not in the domain of obligatory obviation, that it is possible to have two noncoreferential proximates if one is in an adjunct clause and the other is in the matrix clause. (45), however, shows that the domain of obviation may optionally be expanded to include the adjunct clause. Consequently, in (45) there are three noncoreferential third persons: the men, the old woman, and the other women. The men, subject of the adjunct clause, are chosen as proximate and the other third persons are obviative. (The matrix verb in (45) is glossed for an obviative subject acting on a 'further obviative' object. The distinction between 'nearer obviative' and 'further obviative' is discussed in 3.3.2.)

The domain of obviation is frequently expanded to include more than one sentence, as in the next example.

(46) *aškačimeko·ni*   *e·hkaškima·či,*
      aškači=meko=i·ni   e·h-kaškim-a·-t-i
      later=EMPH=then   AOR-persuade-DIR-3-MODE
                              [persuade 3-3'/AOR]

      e·howi·wiči   *i·nini.*
      e·h-owi·wi-t-i   i·n-ini
      AOR-take.O2.as.wife-3-MODE   that-OBV
      [take.O2.as.wife 3/AOR]

      pe·hkimeko   *e·hmya·ne·netaminiči*   *kotakahi*   *ihkwe·wahi.*
      pe·hki=meko   e·h-mya·ne·net-am-ini-t-i   kotak-ahi   ehkwe·w-ahi
      really=EMPH   AOR-dislike-INAN.OBJ-OBV-3-MODE other-OBV.PL   woman-OBV.PL
                    [dislike 3'-0/AOR]

'Much later, when he (prox) persuaded her (obv),
he (prox) married that one (obv).
The other women (obv) really didn't like it.' R602.40-41.

The two sentences of (46) are taken together as a single domain of obviation, resulting in the subject of the second sentence being marked obviative since it is disjoint in reference to the proximate subject of the first sentence.

The use of obviation illustrated in (44), (45), and (46) is not required by the syntax but is rather a stylistic device that the speaker has chosen to use. The stylistic functions of obviation include representing point of view, highlighting important scenes or information within the narrative, and varying the pace and rhythm of the narrative. For discussion of these functions and many textual examples see Goddard 1984, Goddard 1990a, Dahlstrom 1996b on Meskwaki, and Dahlstrom 1991, Russell 1991 on Cree.

3.3.2. Assigning proximate and obviative status. Our next task is to clarify the vague notion of 'most central to the discourse'. That is, suppose we have two noncoreferential third persons

appearing in the domain of obligatory obviation. (To simplify the initial discussion we will assume that there are no more than two third persons.) What factors play a role in deciding which of the third persons is proximate and which obviative? We have already seen one context in which the selection is automatic: if a noun is possessed by a third person, the possessor must be proximate and the possessed noun obviative (e.g. (28)). This is the only syntactic condition on assigning proximate and obviative status in Meskwaki. Another rule may be stated in terms of animacy. If one of the two third persons is a human and the other is (notionally) inanimate, the human will always be proximate and the inanimate third person will be obviative.[14]

(47) *ki·hta·wa*　　　　　　*wi·hki·nihe·wa*　　　　　*mo·sowi·wi·nani*
　　　ke-i·hta·w-a　　　　　wi·h-ki·nih-e·-w-a　　　　mo·sowi·wi·n-ani
　　　2- -brother-in-law-SG　FUT-sharpen-DIR-3-SG　　moose.horn-OBV
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[FUT-sharpen 3-3'/IND.IND]

'Your brother-in-law (prox) should sharpen a moose antler (obv)' J106.15

The notionally inanimate object of (47) is grammatically animate, so it is inflected with the animate obviative singular suffix *-ani*.

　　　If one of the two third persons in question is human and the other is an animal, the human will usually be proximate, as in the following example:

(48) *meši·name·kwanima·hipi*　　　　*komisahekwayo·we*　　　*kekina·na*
　　　meši·name·kw-ani=ma·hi=ipi　　　komisah-ekw-w-a=iyo·we　　ke-ky-ena·n-a
　　　whale-OBV=after.all=QUOT.　　　swallow-INV-3-SG=PAST　　2-mother-1P-SG
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[swallow 3'-3/IND.IND]

'A whale (obv) swallowed our mother (prox), it's said.' W267D

Many traditional stories, however, include animal characters who are treated on a par with human characters. In such cases the animal character is also a potential candidate for proximate status.
　　　If both third persons are humans, there is a great deal of leeway in assigning proximate and obviative status. The third person chosen as proximate is often the one the speaker feels closest to, such as a relative of the speaker as opposed to a nonrelative, a Meskwaki as opposed to an Indian of

---

[14] If one third person is an animal and the other is notionally inanimate, the animal is nearly always proximate. A rare exception occurs in a passage describing a religious ceremony; here the ceremonial role of the drum is of more interest than that of the dog to be sacrificed:

(i)　　*šewe·na ahpene·čimeko　manake·hi*　　*te·we·hikana*　　*e·yi·ki*
　　　šewe·na ahpene·či=meko　mana=ke·hi　　te·we·hikan-a　　e·yi·ki
　　　but　　always=EMPH　　this=and　　　drum-SG　　　also

　　　nekotimeko　　*anemo·hani*　　*ki·hpahke·ya·hkonamawa·pwa*
　　　nekoti=meko　　anemo·h-ani　　ke-i·h-pahke·ya·hkonamaw-a·-pwa
　　　one=EMPH　　　dog-OBV　　　2-FUT-offer.O2.to-DIR-2P
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[FUT-offer.O2.to. 2P-3/IND.IND]

'But you shall always offer one dog (obv) to this drum (prox)' R510.18

another tribe, or an Indian as opposed to a non-Indian. These are only tendencies, however, not hard and fast rules.

(49) *oškinawe·ha*   *aša·hahi*   *nesekwa*
      oškinawe·h-a   aša·h-ahi   nes-ekw-w-a
      young.man-SG   Sioux-OBV.PL   kill-INV-3-SG
                                            [kill 3'-3/IND.IND]

      'The Sioux (obv) killed a young man (prox)' J190.3

(50) *mo·hkoma·na*   *e·hnešiwana·čiha·či*   *neno·te·wahi*
      mo·hkoma·n-a   e·h-nešiwana·čih-a·-t-i   neno·te·w-ahi
      white.person-SG   AOR-ruin-DIR-3-MODE   Indian-OBV.PL
                          [ruin 3-3'/AOR]

      'The white man (prox) has ruined the Indians (obv).' B85:16.27-8.

In both (49) and (50) the syntax demands that one of the two third persons be obviative. (49) is an example of the usual pattern of assigning proximate status to a member of one's own group and referring to the outsider with an obviative form. But (50) shows that this is not obligatory: here *mo·hkoma·na* 'white person' is proximate and *neno·te·wahi* 'Indians' is obviative.

     Other factors besides empathy come into play in selecting a third person as proximate. NPs appearing in topic or focus position are often, but not always, proximate, as discussed in chapter 8. The main character of a narrative is often referred to by proximate forms. However, proximate status may be temporarily shifted to a relatively minor character for stylistic purposes such as representing point of view. (Numerous examples of such shifts are discussed in Goddard 1984, 1990a, and Dahlstrom 1996b.) When the two third persons are equally important characters and the narrator is presenting the action neutrally, proximate status is likely to be assigned to the agent of the action.

     The situation becomes more complicated if more than two third persons are involved. Only one third person will be proximate; the others will be obviative. However, another discourse-based distinction must be made among the obviatives if both subject and object of a transitive verb are obviative: one must be considered the 'nearer obviative' and the other the 'further obviative' for purposes of verb inflection (cf. 4.5).[15] The same factors at work in distinguishing proximate from obviative also serve to distinguish the nearer obviative from the further obviative. Consider the following example of a further obviative (3") subject and a nearer obviative (3') object.

(51) *o·sani*   *aša·hahi*   *e·hnesekoniči.*
      o-w-o·s-ani   aša·h-ahi   e·h-nes-eko-ni-t-i
      3- -father-OBV Sioux-OBV.PL   AOR-kill-INV-OBV-3-MODE
                                        [kill 3"-3'/AOR]

      'The Sioux (further obv) killed his (prox) father (obv)'   MM.1M

---

[15] Some Algonquian languages mark the further obviative NP with special inflection: e.g., Potawatomi doubles the obviative suffix (Hockett 1948:72). Meskwaki, however, has no special nominal inflection for the further obviative. Rather, the distinction between nearer and further obviative can be seen only in transitive verb inflection.

The proximate third person of (51) is a young boy, the possessor of *o·sani* 'his father', and both the father and the Sioux are obviative. The father, however, as a relative of the proximate character and as a Meskwaki, is higher on the scale of empathy. The father is therefore the nearer obviative and the Sioux are the further obviative.

When a noun is possessed by an obviative third person, the distinction of nearer and further obviative is automatic: the possessor is the nearer obviative and the the possessed noun is the further obviative (cf. the further obviative in (45)). Some Algonquian languages have special morphology identifying nouns possessed by obviatives. Plains Cree, for example, uses the prefix *o-* for a proximate singular possessor and the affixes *o- -iyiw-* for an obviative possessor. Meskwaki, however, does not have special morphology for either an obviative possessor or a further obviative possessum: nouns possessed by obviative third persons are formally identical to those possessed by proximate third persons.

To sum up so far, we have seen that one syntactic condition exists in Meskwaki for assigning proximate and obviative status: if one third person possesses another, either the possessor is proximate and the possessum obviative, or the possessor is nearer obviative and the possessum further obviative. In all other contexts the selection of a third person as proximate is sensitive to pragmatic factors such as humanness or animacy, and to discourse phenomena such as empathy or being the main character of a narrative. Some treatments of obviation in other Algonquian languages, however, have placed greater emphasis on syntactic factors. In the remainder of this section I will consider some of the proposed syntactic conditions and show that they do not hold in Meskwaki.

I will first briefly mention a proposal which appeals to the structural relation of COMMAND. Kaye 1979 (an unpublished paper discussed in detail in Grafstein 1981:100-108) defines a variant of standard c-command which he calls 'obviate-command', and claims that in the Algonquin dialect of Ojibwa the proximate third person must asymmetrically obviate-command the obviative third person. The following example shows that command, in any form, does not determine the selection of proximate in Meskwaki.

(52)   *e·hča·ki-nepeniči*   [NP *ke·poška·kočihi*   *aša·hahi*]
       e·h-ča·ki nep-e-ni-t-i   IC-kepoškaw-eko-t-ihi   aša·h-ahi
       AOR-all die- -OBV-3-MODE   IC-surround-INV-3-OBV.PL   Sioux-OBV.PL
       [all-die 3'/AOR]   [surround 3'-3/PART/3'P]

       'The Sioux (obv) who were surrounding him (prox) all died.' M9D

In (52) the subject in the main clause is obviative and contains a relative clause (5.3). The verb of the relative clause is inflected in the participle paradigm for an obviative subject acting upon a proximate object. The only reference to the proximate third person is thus in an embedded clause, while the obviative third person is subject of both clauses. The proximate third person does not asymmetrically command the obviative third person, in any variety or definition of command.

A more elaborate proposal regarding obviation is made by Rhodes 1990a, analyzing the Ottawa dialect of Ojibwa in a Relational Grammar framework. Rhodes claims that the relationship between a proximate and an obviative third person is sensitive to grammatical relations. If the two third persons are possessor and possessum, then the possessor must be proximate and the

possessum obviative, just as we have seen for Meskwaki. If the two third persons are clausemates, the proximate must outrank the obviative on the following hierarchy (Rhodes 1990a:102):

(53)   Subject > Object > Secondary Object > Oblique

The first point to notice about Rhodes's claim concerns the ranking of subject and (first) object. Rhodes is not claiming that it is impossible to have an obviative agent acting upon a proximate patient. Rather, he assumes that such a configuration triggers an obligatory transformation of 'Reversal' (Perlmutter and Rhodes, ms.), making the proximate patient the subject and the obviative agent the object -- the reverse of the usual mapping from thematic roles to grammatical relations. Thus, the ranking of subject above object in (53) is actually a claim about the existence of the Reversal rule, not a guideline for which argument of the verb is likely to be proximate.

How well does this part of Rhodes's hierarchy work for Meskwaki? In Meskwaki there is no evidence for Reversal applying at all; the arguments against it are given in 10.3. This means that clauses with an obviative agent and a proximate patient (e.g. (32), (48), (49)) have an obviative subject and a proximate object. Consequently, the first part of Rhodes's hierarchy does not hold for Meskwaki.

The remainder of the hierarchy in (53) is independent of the Reversal analysis. Rhodes cites Ojibwa examples showing that it is impossible to have a proximate second object and an obviative subject or first object; it is also impossible to have a proximate oblique and an obviative subject, object, or second object. But such combinations are possible in Meskwaki, as shown by the following examples.

(54) *o·ni*   *aškači e·škwi·čiki*   *wi·sahke·hani*   *e·hpya·niči.*
      o·ni   aškači   IC-aškwi·-t-iki   wi·sahke·h-ani   e·h-pya·-ni-t-i.
      and.then   later   IC-stay.behind-3-PL   Wisahkeha-OBV   AOR-come-OBV-3-MODE
                           [stay.behind 3P/PART/3P]   [come 3'/AOR]

'A while later Wisahkeha (obv) came to the ones (prox) who stayed behind.' R56.14 (B22F)

(54) is a counterexample to Rhodes's claim regarding obliques. Here the oblique argument of 'come' is proximate and the subject is obviative.

It is also possible to have a proximate second object if either the subject or the first object is obviative. The two examples below contain the verb stem *ahpe·nemo*- 'depend on, rely on', which is subcategorized for a subject and a second object.

(55) *e·hahpe·nemoniči*   *mehtose·neniwahi*   *owi·yawi*
      e·h-ahpe·nemo-ni-t-i   mehtose·neniw-ahi   owi·yawi
      AOR-depend.on-OBV-3-MODE   person-OBV.PL   him
      [depend.on 3'/AOR]

'The people (obv) depended on him (prox).' R594.37

(56)   *ahpe·nemoniwahi*   *mehtose·neniwahi*   *i·na*   *oškinawe·ha*
         ahpe·nemo-ni-w-ahi   mehtose·neniw-ahi   i·na   oškinawe·h-a
         depend.on-OBV-3-OBV.PL   person-OBV.PL   that   young.man-SG
         [depend.on 3'P/IND.IND]

         'The people (obv) depended on that young man (prox).'

In both (55) and (56) the subject is obviative and the second object proximate. These sentences are thus counterexamples to Rhodes's hierarchy in (53). (See 3.7.2. for the independent personal pronoun *owi·yawi* 'him/her' in (55).)
       It is also possible to have a ditransitive verb with an obviative first object and a proximate second object:

(57)   *e·hso·kenatahemaki*   *ihkwe·wani*   *netapeno·heme·ha*
         e·h-so·kenatah-em-ak-i   ehkwe·w-ani   ne-t-apeno·h-em-e·h-a
         AOR-let.O.hold.O2-OBV.OBJ-1SG.SUBJ.3.OBJ-MODE   woman-OBV   1- -child-POSS-DIM-SG
         [let.O.hold.O2 1-3'/AOR]

         'I let the woman (obv) hold my baby (prox).'

(58)   *nekoti*   *aša·hani*   *e·hpye·tahomeči*   *owi·yawi*
         nekoti   aša·h-ani   e·h-pye·tahw-em-et-i   owi·yawi
         one   Sioux-OBV   AOR-bring.O2.to-obv.obj-X-mode   her
                                 [bring.O2.to X-3'/AOR]

         'They (unspec) brought her (prox) to a certain Sioux (obv).' J220.1

Although the examples in (57) and (58) show that it is not syntactically impossible to have a proximate second object and an obviative first object, such combinations are rare. It is much more common for the first object to be proximate and the second object obviative. The reasons for this are pragmatic: first objects of ditransitive verbs are always animate and usually human, while second objects are often inanimate. An inanimate third person will never be chosen as proximate over a human third person. Additionally, many ditransitive verbs are the output of possessor raising (7.2.2), where the first object is understood as the possessor of the second object. Since nouns possessed by a third person are obligatorily obviative, this contributes to the overwhelming tendency of second objects to be obviative.

3.4. Possession. The syntactic relation of possession is expressed by inflecting the possessed noun for the person and number of the possessor. For example, in *pašito·ha oči·ma·ni* 'the old man's canoe' the head noun *či·ma·ni* 'canoe' is inflected with the prefix *o-*, which agrees with the third person singular possessor *pašito·ha* 'old man'. Note that the possessor NP does not bear any possessive inflection itself and may be omitted for a reading of pronominal possessor: *oči·ma·ni* 'his canoe'. This section describes the morphology of possessive inflection and a classification of noun stems based upon the syntax of possession: one set of stems requires a possessor, another set allows

an optional possessor, and a third set cannot be inflected for a possessor using the basic form of the stem.

The complete set of possessive affixes is listed below.

(59) a.   ne-   'my'
      b.   ke-   'your (sg.)'
      c.   o-   'his (prox.); his/their (obv.)'
      d.   ne- -ena·n-   'our (excl.)'
      e.   ke- -ena·n-   'our (incl.)'
      f.   ke- -wa·w-   'your (pl.)'
      g.   o- -wa·w-   'their (prox.)'
      h.   o- -inaw-   'one's, people's'

The person/number features of the possessor are marked on the possessed noun by a prefix or a prefix-suffix combination. In general, the prefix *ne-* marks first person, *ke-* second person, and *o-* third person, but note that for first person inclusive plural, which indexes both the speaker and the addressee, the second person prefix is used, not the first person prefix. The prefix *o-* used without a suffix is ambiguous between third person proximate singular and third person obviative. Obviative possessors are not specified for number; all other categories indicate number by the presence or absence of a suffix. Singular possessors take no suffix, first person plural possessors take the suffix *-ena·n-*, and the other plural categories take *-wa·w-*. There is also a form for unspecified possessor: the prefix *o-* plus a special suffix *-inaw-*.

The suffix indicating number, gender, and obviation of the head noun attaches to the right of the possessive suffix, if any. This is illustrated below first for the animate stem *te·we·hikan-* 'drum' and then for the inanimate stem *či·ma·n-* 'canoe'.

(60) a.   <u>ne</u>te·we·hikan<u>ena·</u>na   'our drum'   (prox. sg.)
      b.   <u>ne</u>te·we·hikan<u>ena·</u>naki   'our drums'   (prox. pl.)
      c.   <u>ne</u>te·we·hikan<u>ena·</u>nani   'our drum'   (obv. sg.)
      d.   <u>ne</u>te·we·hikan<u>ena·</u>nahi   'our drums'   (obv. pl.)

(61) a.   <u>ne</u>či·ma·n<u>ena·</u>ni   'our canoe'   (inan. sg.)
      b.   <u>ne</u>či·ma·n<u>ena·</u>nani   'our canoes'   (inan. pl.)

The set of noun stems is divided into INDEPENDENT and DEPENDENT stems (Bloomfield 1927:185), where dependent stems require a possessor and independent stems do not. Semantically, the dependent noun stems correspond to familiar types of inalienable possession: all kinship terms (also friend, enemy), most body parts, plus a few other items (e.g. house, name, skirt, arrow). Some examples of dependent nouns are given below.

(62) a.   <u>ne</u>kya   'my mother'
      b.   <u>ne</u>ta·nesa   'my daughter'
      c.   <u>ne</u>na·na   'my calf (of leg)'
      d.   <u>ne</u>nehki   'my hand'
      e.   <u>ne</u>ški·šekwi   'my eye'

f. n̲eko·te·hi 'my skirt'

Note that the dependent class includes nouns of both animate (62a-c) and inanimate gender (62d-f).

In syntactic terms we may think of the dependent stems as being subcategorized for a possessor (e.g. *-ta·nes-* 'daughter <POSS>'). If we examine the syntactic behavior of the independent stems, though, we find that they fall into two classes. One set of independent stems may optionally be inflected for a possessor; the other set does not allow possessive affixes to attach to the basic form of the noun stem. The nouns *te·we·hikana* 'drum' and *či·ma·ni* 'canoe' contain independent stems allowing optional possessive inflection, as seen in (60) and (61) where possessive affixes attach directly to the noun stem. *ši·ši·pa* 'duck' and *menesi* 'island', on the other hand, contain independent stems which cannot be inflected directly for possession: **neši·ši·pa* 'my duck', **nemenesi* 'my island'. Stems like *ši·ši·p-* and *menes-* must therefore be listed in the lexicon with a negative subcategorizational requirement, blocking the appearance of a possessor, while stems like *te·we·hikan-* 'drum' and *či·ma·n-* 'canoe' must be listed as allowing an optional possessor.

The noun stems which cannot be directly inflected for possession may undergo derivation to form a POSSESSED THEME, however, to which the possessive affixes then attach.[16] Possessed themes are formed by suffixing *-em-* to the noun stem. For example, *ši·ši·p-* 'duck' plus *-em-* gives the possessed theme *ši·ši·pem-*, which then is inflected with possessive morphology: *neši·ši·pema* 'my duck'. Similarly, *menes-* 'island' plus *-em-* takes possessive inflection: *nemenesemi* 'my island'. More examples of nouns in this class are listed below. (Noun stems ending in *w* or *y* undergo contraction or coalescence with a following short *e*.)

(63) a. n̲epašito·h̲e̲mi 'my old man'
      b. n̲emehtek̲o̲mi 'my stick' (*mehtekw-*)
      c. n̲epešekesi·ma 'my deer' (*pešekesiw-*)
      d. n̲epemite·mi 'my oil' (*pemite·w-*)

The syntactic result of suffixing *-em-* is to alter the subcategorizational frame of the noun stem: the bare stem *ši·ši·p-* 'duck' must be blocked from taking a possessor, but the possessed theme *ši·ši·pem-* is subcategorized for an obligatory possessor.

A comparable change in subcategorizational requirements occurs with the dependent nouns: their usual requirement for a possessor may be suppressed by prefixing *me-* or *o-*, producing a nonpossessed form of the noun.[17] Body parts, for example, are named by nonpossessed forms when the body part is separate from the body (having been severed or shed), when only that part of the body is visible and the identity of the possessor is unknown (e.g. a vision of only a hand), or if the body part is being considered in isolation.

(64) a. m̲ete·hi 'a heart'
      b. m̲enehki 'a hand'
      c. o̲neči 'a paw'
      d. o̲to·neno·ha 'a kidney'

---

[16] Bloomfield 1946:95 used the term 'possessed theme' in a different way: to refer to the basic stem plus possessive affixes. Bloomfield considered the *-em-* suffix to be part of the possessive inflection, listing as exceptions stems like *te·we·hikan-* and *či·ma·n-* which do not take *-em-*.

[17] Nonpossessed kinship terms do not take *me-* or *o-*, but rather *o- -ema·w-* (e.g. *okwis̲e̲ma·wa* 'the son'). However, nonpossessed kinship terms are rare.

It is not clear what determines the choice of *me-* or *o-* as the nonpossessed prefix for a given dependent noun. Bloomfield's (1927:187) suggestion that *o-* is used with animal body parts is wrong: see *owi·šan[i]* '(human) heads' (Michelson 1932:170.19) and *mehka·te·hani* 'little (duck) feet' (Kiyana 1913:988). The choice between *me-* and *o-* seems to be arbitrary, with some nouns allowing either (e.g. *onehki*, *menehki* 'hand').

   Bloomfield 1927:186,187 labels *me-* and *o-* as 'indefinite possessor', but this is not correct. Unspecified possessors are indicated by affixing *o- -inaw-*, which has a wider distribution than the nonpossessed forms and a different function. Noun stems of any type may be inflected for an unspecified possessor: *oni·ča·pinawaki* 'one's dolls' (independent stem); *otanemo·heminawaki* 'one's dogs' (possessed theme); *okinawaki* 'people's mothers' (dependent stem *-ky-* 'mother'). *me-* and *o-*, however, only occur with nonkinship dependent nouns. The semantic difference between unspecified possessor and nonpossessed forms may be seen in the following pair of examples containing the dependent inanimate noun stem *-i·pit-* 'tooth'. (The phonology of vowel-initial stems is explained later in this section.)

(65) *owi·pičinawani* *ča·keške·wani*
   o-w-i·pit-inaw-ani ča·keška·-w-ani
   X- -tooth-X-INAN.PL all.fall-0-PL
            [all.fall 0P/IND.IND]

   'One's teeth all fall out' A48H

(66) *manikohi* *ke·waki,* *mi·pitani*
   mani=kohi ke·waki m-i·pit-ani
   this=you.see still   UNPOSS-tooth-INAN.PL

   'One more thing, the teeth' W416

(65), with unspecified possessor inflection on the noun, states the consequence of violating a particular taboo. The noun is possessed, but not by a specific person; the rule is instead stated generally, to apply to anyone's teeth. (66), on the other hand, is taken from an episode in the creation myth in which the spirits are designing the human body. One speaker announces a new topic by saying (66). Here, teeth are considered in isolation so they are named with a nonpossessed form.

   The nonpossessed forms and the unspecified possessor forms are alike in one respect, however. Neither requires the head noun to be obviative, unlike nouns possessed by a third person. For dependent animate nouns taking *o-* as the nonpossessed prefix, therefore, the appearance of proximate morphology can disambiguate the nonpossessed form from the third person possessed form (e.g. *owi·wi·na* 'a horn; a braid' [prox] vs. *owi·wi·nani* 'his horn; his braid' [obv]).

   The class of dependent noun stems is associated with two properties not found with the two classes of independent stems. First, dependent and independent stems use different strategies to resolve the unacceptable vowel clusters created by adding a possessive prefix to a vowel-initial stem. The independent vowel-initial stems solve the problem by inserting an epenthetic *t*.[18]

---

[18] Two peculiarities of vowel-initial stems may be mentioned here. First, an initial short *o* is lengthened following a possessive prefix: *ošehki·ta·kani* 'clothing', *oto·šehki·ta·kani* 'his clothing; *okimawa* 'chief', *neto·kima·ma* 'my chief'

(67) a. <u>net</u>ahkohkwa   'my kettle, drum'
     b. <u>ket</u>ešite·ha·kani   'your thought'[19]
     c. <u>ot</u>o·te·weni   'his town'
     d. <u>ot</u>a·čimo·ni   'his story'
     e. <u>net</u>anemo·hema   'my dog'
     f. <u>ket</u>apeno·hema   'your child'
     g. <u>ot</u>aša·ti·hemi   'his headed arrow'

Notice that both types of independent stems take the epenthetic *t*: (67a-d) are stems to which possessive affixes may attach directly and (67e-g) require the possessed theme suffix *-em-* before possessive inflection may be attached.

The dependent nouns, however, do not employ the epenthetic *t*. Rather, the *e* of the first person, second person, and nonpossessed prefixes is deleted:

(68) a. <u>ni</u>·hka·na   'my friend'
     b. <u>ni</u>·wa   'my wife'
     c. <u>no</u>·sa   'my father'
     d. <u>ki</u>·pi   'your arrow'
     e. <u>ki</u>·so·ni   'your name'
     f. <u>ko</u>·hkomesa   'your grandmother'
     g. <u>mi</u>·nesi   'a hair'
     h. <u>mi</u>·so·ni   'a name'

For the third person prefix *o-* and the homophonous nonpossessed prefix, *w* is inserted between the prefix and the vowel-initial dependent noun stem:[20]

(69) a. <u>owi</u>·hta·wani   'his brother-in-law' (obv)
     b. <u>owi</u>·ki   'his house'
     c. <u>owi</u>·wani   his wife'(obv)
     d. <u>owi</u>·ne·tepi   'a brain'
     e. <u>owi</u>·wi·na   'a horn; a braid'

The second difference between dependent stems and the two classes of independent stems is morphological: dependent noun stems must be preceded by a prefix. This must be stated as a separate morphological requirement, distinct from the stem's subcategorization for a possessor. As

---

(with possessed theme suffix *-em-*). Second, Meskwaki has innovated *a* in some stems where one would expect initial *o* on the basis of comparative evidence: *ahpwa·kana* 'pipe', *ana·kani* 'bowl', *ahkani* 'bone'; cf. Kickapoo *ohpwaakana, onaakani, ohkani* ('his bone') (Voorhis 1988:90, 91, 27); Plains Cree *ospwa·kan, oya·kan, oskan*. The original *o*, however, is retained in possessed forms: <u>neto</u>·hpwa·kana 'my pipe', <u>keto</u>·na·kani 'your bowl'. <u>oto</u>·hkanemi 'his bone' (with possessed theme suffix *-em-*). (The *o* of such stems undergoes lengthening following the possessive prefix as in other *o*-initial stems.)

[19] The unpossessed form is *išite·ha·kani* 'thought'. /e/ becomes *i* word initially.

[20] When the third person prefix is added to a dependent noun stem beginning in long *o·*, however, the sequence of /*owo·*/ is contracted to *o·* (*o·sani* 'his father', *o·hkomani* 'his mother-in-law', *o·hkomesani* 'his grandmother', *o·šisemani* 'his grandchild'). Evidence for the underlying presence of the third person prefix may be seen in participles of verbs derived from the *o·* initial stems; see Goddard 1992b:255.n.22

we have seen with the nonpossessed forms in (64), a prefix is required even when the syntactic requirement for a possessor is suppressed. Further evidence that dependent stems require a prefix can be found in compounds of a PRENOUN and a noun stem. Consider first the regular pattern of possessive inflection found on compounds of a prenoun (e.g. *meši* 'big') and an independent noun stem. Though the prenoun is a separate phonological word, the compound is inflected as if it were a single lexical unit. The possessive prefix is added to the left of the prenoun and the possessive suffix is added to the right of the noun stem.

(70)　a.　　nemeši-te·we·hikanena·na　　'our big drum'
　　　b.　　nemeši-či·ma·nena·nani　　'our big canoes'

This pattern of inflection is identical to that of compound verbs: inflectional prefixes marking subject or object attach to the left of a preverb, and the inflectional suffixes attach to the right of the verb stem (6.2).

　　　If a dependent noun stem is compounded with a prenoun, however, the possessive prefix occurs twice, once to the left of the prenoun and once to the left of the noun stem, as pointed out by Voorhis 1971:66.

(71)　a.　　neši·kwi-ni·hta·wa　　　　　'my ex-brother-in-law'
　　　b.　　kekaka·či-kesekwisa　　　　　'your teasing aunt'
　　　c.　　ota·nehke·wi-omešo·hani　　　'his great-grandfather'

The prenoun in (71b), *kaka·či* 'teasing', refers to a ritualized teasing relationship holding between certain pairs of relatives (Tax 1937:257-258). See Goddard 1992b:258 for these and other prenouns used with kinship terms.

　　　Note that if a possessive suffix is used in a compound of prenoun and dependent noun it occurs only once, in the usual position to the right of the noun stem.

(72)　a.　　neši·kwi-ni·hta·wena·na　　　'our ex-brother-in-law'
　　　b.　　kekaka·či-kesekwiswa·wa　　　'your (pl.) teasing aunt'
　　　c.　　ota·nehke·wi-omešo·hwa·wani　'their great-grandfather'

The doubling of the possessive prefix in (71) and (72) is explained by the morphology of dependent noun stems. The prefix to the left of the prenoun matches the regular pattern seen in (70), while the copy of the prefix on the noun stem fulfills the morphological requirement that dependent stems be preceded by a prefix.

3.5. Case. There is a limited amount of case morphology in Meskwaki: locative case *-eki*, prepositional case *-e*, vocative singular *-e*, and vocative plural *-etike*. 'Locative' and 'prepositional' should be taken merely as labels for these case suffixes: the locative suffix is used on some nouns expressing manner as well as on locative nouns, and prepositional case is found on some nouns following numbers as well as on objects of prepositions.

　　　The case endings replace the suffixes which indicate number and gender of the noun (3.1). For example, *či·ma·ni* 'canoe' is suffixed with the inanimate singular suffix *-i* but *či·ma·neki* 'in the canoe' drops the number/gender suffix and adds the locative suffix *-eki*. In a sense the number/gender suffixes may be considered markers of a 'non-oblique' case. However, it is

important to note that NPs functioning as subject, object, and second object are not distinguished from one another by case marking: all bear the same 'non-oblique' case.

3.5.1. Locative case. The case suffix *-eki* appears on nouns identifying various types of location: goal, source, or path of motion, or stationary location. The suffix *-eki* has an additional nonlocative function, appearing on nouns expressing manner or appearance. Some examples of nouns inflected with *-eki* are given below.

(73)   a.   wi·kiya·p<u>eki</u>   'in the house'
          b.   atasan<u>eki</u>   'on the bench'
          c.   omye·m<u>eki</u>   'on his road'
          d.   ote·h<u>eki</u>   'in his heart'
          e.   ona·n<u>eki</u>   'on the calf of his leg' (anim.)
          f.   ni·hkan<u>eki</u>   'at my friend's place'
          g.   oto·kima·m<u>eki</u>   'at his chief's place'
          h.   iškwe·se·h<u>eki</u>   'like a girl'
          i.   pi·ša·kan<u>eki</u>   'like leather'

The locative case suffix may attach to noun stems of animate gender (73e-h) as well as inanimate gender (73a-d, i), and to stems which are dependent (73d-f), independent (73a, b, h, i), or possessed themes: (73c) *mye·w-* 'road' plus *-em-*; (73g) *okima·w-* 'chief' plus *-em-*. When the noun refers to a specific person, as in (73f, g), the locative form has the reading 'at NP's place'. (73h, i) are examples of *-eki* used to express manner.

      As explained in chapter 2, the short *e* of *-eki* undergoes contraction or coalescence with a preceding glide: *mehtekw-* 'tree', *mehtekoki*; *nepy-* 'water', *nepi·ki*; *kehčikami·w-* 'ocean', *kehčikami·ki*; *neniw-* 'man', *neni·ki* 'like a man'; *nenosway-* 'buffalo-skin', *nenoswa·ki* 'in a buffalo-skin robe'. The *e* of *-eki* also undergoes contraction with a preceding possessive suffix. *-wa·w-*, marking second or third person plurals, plus *-eki* yields *-wa·ki* (e.g. *o·hkomeswa·ki* 'at their grandmother's place'), and the first person plural *-ena·n-* contracts with a following *-eki* to yield *-ena·ki* (e.g. *kete·hena·ki* 'in our (incl) hearts'). The contraction in the second and third person plural follows the usual pattern for sequences of vowel, glide, and short *e*. The contraction in the first person plural forms, however, is quite irregular and must be explained by analogy with the second and third person plural form.
      The range of thematic roles associated with the locative case suffix *-eki* may be seen in the following examples.

(74)   *meneseki*   *e·hawiya·ni*
       menes-eki   e·h-awi-ya·n-i
       island-LOC   AOR-be.[there]-1-MODE
                       [be.[there] 1/AOR]

      'When I was on the island,' M20A

(75)   *e·hpya·či*   *i·nahi*   *meneseki*
       e·h-pya·-t-i   i·nahi   menes-eki
       AOR-come-3-MODE   that.LOC   island-LOC

[come 3/AOR]

'He came to that island.' M12N

(76)   *meneseki*   *e·hočiwenekoči*
       menes-eki   e·h-očiwen-eko-t-i
       island-LOC   AOR-carry.from-INV-3-MODE
                        [carry.from 3'-3/AOR]

'He (obv) carried him (prox) from the island.' M15B

(77)   *aškwa·te·meki*   *e·hoči-pye·či-pi·čihtaniki*
       aškwa·te·m-eki   e·h-oči   pye·či pi·čihtan-ni-k-i
       doorway-LOC   AOR-through   hither flow.inside-OBV-0-MODE
                        [through-hither-flow.inside 0'/AOR]

'It came flowing in through the doorway.' W698

(78)   *apeno·hekima·hi*   *e·hiši-wa·waneška·hiyani*
       apeno·h-eki=ma·hi   e·h-iši   wa·waneška·hi-yan-i
       child-LOC=after.all   AOR-thus   be.bad-2-MODE
                        [thus-be.bad 2/AOR]

'You have been bad like a little child.' wit.11P

In (74) the locative form of *menesi* 'island' expresses stationary location, in (75) it expresses the goal of motion, and in (76) it expresses source of motion. (77) shows that locative case is used for the thematic role of path, and (78) is an example of locative case used for manner. Syntactically, these NPs are oblique arguments of the verb (1.2.3). Note that the form of the oblique NP does not vary according to thematic role: stationary location, goal, source, path, and manner are all marked with the same case suffix, and there is no accompanying adposition which identifies the NP's thematic role. It is rather the verb which the oblique is in construction with that determines the interpretation of the oblique as stationary location, goal, source, path, or manner. The verb stem *awi-* 'be [there]' in (74) is subcategorized for an oblique of stationary location, *pya·-* 'come' in (75) for an oblique of goal, and *očiwen-* 'carry from' in (76) for an oblique of source. In (77) and (78) a preverb has been compounded with the verb to add an oblique to the verb's subcategorizational requirements. (See 7.3. for more discussion of this process.) The preverb *oči-* adds an oblique of source or path and *iši-* adds an oblique of goal or manner.
    NPs inflected with locative case may also function as adjuncts:

(79)   *oto·nekiči·*   *e·hpakama·či!*
       o-to·n-eki=či·   e·h-pakam-a·-t-i
       3-mouth-LOC=EXCLAM   AOR-hit-DIR-3-MODE
                        [hit 3-3'/AOR]

'He (prox) hit him (obv) on the mouth!' J158.5

Here, the verb stem *pakam-* 'hit' is subcategorized only for a subject and an object: the point on the body at which the object was hit is optionally expressed by an adjunct NP inflected with locative case.

Adpositional phrases are relatively rare in Meskwaki: as we have seen, many obliques and adjuncts are NPs marked with locative case, with no accompanying adposition. The prepositions and postpositions that do exist, however, display a variety of case marking patterns. A few, like the postpositions *oči* 'from; through', *iši* 'toward', and *taši* 'at' require locative case on their object. (*oči*, *iši*, and *taši* are homophonous with the preverbs used to add oblique arguments to a verb's subcategorizational frame; cf. 7.3.)

(80) a. owi·hka·n<u>eki</u> oči 'from his friend's place'
      b. mo·nepya·n<u>eki</u> oči 'through the hole in the ice'
      c. aškwa·te·m<u>eki</u> iši 'toward the doorway'
      d.   wi·kiya·p<u>eki</u> taši 'at the house'

Most prepositions require prepositional case on their object, the topic of the following section. However, a few prepositions, such as *či·ki* 'next to; on the edge of' and *ahkwiči* 'on top of', also occur with objects inflected with locative case.

(81) a. či·ki wi·kiya·p<u>eki</u> 'next to the house'
      b. ahkwiči oto·n<u>eki</u> '[from] the top of his mouth'

The form in (81b) is an idiom for speaking insincerely.

There are also a few adpositions, such as *takwi* 'together with', which take an object bearing the regular number/gender suffixes of 3.1.

(82) *kotakahi*   *aneno·te·wahi*   *takwi*
      kotak-ahi   aneno·te·w-ahi   takwi
      other-OBV.PL   Indian-OBV.PL   together.with

      'together with other Indians' J10.1-2

(83) *takwimeko*   *ana·kani*
      takwi=meko   ana·kani
      together.with=EMPH   bowl

      'together with the bowl' W230Q

takwi may either precede or follow its object; it is homophonous with a preverb which adds a second object to the verb's subcategorizational requirements (7.4).

3.5.2. Prepositional case. Prepositional case is used on objects of prepositions and on some nouns following a number.[21] The case ending is *-e* everywhere except after *k*, where it is *-i*. Some examples of prepositions and their objects are listed below.

(84) a. či·ki kehčikami·we   'on the shore of the ocean'
      b. ahkwiči asenye   'on top of a stone'
      c. keki či·ma·ne   'with the canoe'
      d. na·mi nepye   'under the water'
      e. na·wi kehčikami·we   'in the middle of the ocean'
      f. nahkani ki·šekwe   'for the duration of the day'

Syntactically, these constructions may function either as oblique arguments or as adjuncts. Note that the contraction and coalescence rules affecting glides followed by short *e* do not apply in word final syllables.

  Many prepositions in Meskwaki allow incorporation of the object into the preposition, forming a single phonological word which also bears the prepositional case suffix.

(85) a. či·ka·hkwe   'next to the tree'
      b. ahkwita·naki   'at the top of the hole'
      c. ahkwitapahkwe   'on top of the roof'
      d. kekikane   'with the bones; bones and all'
      e. na·mahkamiki   'under the earth'
      f. na·metone   'inside the mouth'

-a·hkw- 'tree, wood', *-a·nak-* 'hole', *-apahkw-* 'roof', *-ikan-* 'bone', *-ahkamik-* 'earth', and *-eton-* 'mouth' are bound forms, used as incorporated arguments in verbs and prepositions. We will return to the question of incorporation into prepositions in chapter 6, section 2, where we will consider extending the incorporation analysis needed for (85) to cover the apparent phrasal constructions in (84) as well.[22] (The arguments for such an analysis depend upon points developed in 6.2. on the syntactic equivalence of preverbs and stem-initial morphemes of verbs.)

  'Prepositional' case is also used on nouns designating units of time or units of measure after a number:

(86) a. nekoti ki·šeswe   'for one month'
      b. nekoti še·šketo·he   'one kettleful'
      c. nekotawahi·ne   'for one year'
      d. nekotetone   'one mouthful'

Like the objects of prepositions, the nouns in this construction may undergo incorporation (86c, d).

---

[21] The only examples I have seen of bare nouns inflected for 'prepositional' case are forms designating areas or regions: e.g. *meškwahki·hina·we* 'in the Meskwaki country'; *aša·hina·we* 'in the Sioux country'. These forms are composed of a noun stem naming a people (*meškwahki·h-* 'Meskwaki', *aša·h-* 'Sioux') plus *-ina·w-* 'country', followed by the case suffix *-e*. It is apparently more common, however, to use locative case on these forms: *meškwahki·hina·ki* 'in the Meskwaki country'; *aša·hina·ki* 'in the Sioux country' (with contraction of /a·we/ to *a·*). The semantic difference between prepositional case and locative case here is not clear.

[22] If the constructions in (84) are instances of incorporation, however, the motivation for labelling the suffix *-e* ~ *-i* a case marker is rather weak; perhaps it instead identifies syntactically complex prepositions.

3.5.3. Vocative case. The final case to be discussed is vocative, used on forms of direct address. The syntactic information associated with vocative case is only negative: a noun marked vocative is neither an argument nor an adjunct of the predicate, but rather stands outside the syntactic frame altogether. There are distinct vocative suffixes for singular and plural addressees. The vocative singular suffix is *-e*:

(87) a. metemo·k<u>e</u>   'old woman!'
     b. wa·pasay<u>e</u>   'White-Robe!' [name]
     c. ni·w<u>e</u>   'wife!'
     d. ni·hka·n<u>e</u>   'friend!'
     e. mahkw<u>e</u>   'bear!'
     f. anemw<u>e</u>   'dog!'[23]

Notice that the vocative form of a dependent noun includes the first person possessive prefix *ne-* (87c,d).

 Noun stems ending in V·*h* form vocatives by dropping the *h* and shortening the vowel: *kwi·yese·h-* 'boy', *kwi·yese* 'boy!'; *-mešo·h-* 'grandfather', *nemešo* 'grandfather!'. (Many kinship terms, however, have irregular vocatives; see Goddard 1992b.) The vocative form of a noun possessed by first person exclusive plural has an idiosyncratic form of the possessive suffix, *-ena·t-* instead of the regular *-ena·n-*: *no·šisemena·te* 'our grandchild!'

 The vocative plural case ending is *-etike*, as seen in the following examples:

(88) a. kwi·yese·h<u>etike</u>   'boys!'
     b. ni·hka·n<u>etike</u>   'friends!'
     c. no·šisem<u>etike</u>   'grandchildren!'
     d. pašito·h<u>etike</u>   'old men!'

The short *e* of *-etike* contracts with a preceding vowel-glide sequence: *neniw-* 'man', *neni·tike* 'men!'; *ihkwe·w-* 'woman', *ihkwe·tike* 'women!'.

3.6. Diminutive. A diminutive suffix *-e·h-* may be attached to noun stems, adding the meaning of small, dear, cute, or pitiful. The diminutive is followed by inflectional suffixes encoding number/gender, possessor, and case.

(89) a. metemo·he·ha   'little old woman'
     b. anemo·he·ha   'little dog, puppy'
     c. owi·ya·se·hi   'a little meat'
     d. ni·ke·hena·ni   'our little house'
     e. nepise·heki   'at the little lake, pond'
     f. netapeno·heme·ha   'my baby'

---

[23] The vocative form of 'dog' could be said between men in a 'joking' relationship to each other (Tax 1937:257-258), such as uncle and nephew. The form of the vocative reflects the archaic stem *anemw-* (cf. Cree *atimw-* 'dog'); the modern Meskwaki stem is *anemo·h-*, in which the diminutive suffix has been lexicalized as part of the stem. See 3.6. for other lexicalized diminutives.

If the possessed theme suffix *-em-* is present, it precedes the diminutive ((89f)).

Goddard 1992a points out a number of irregularities in diminutive morphology. Stems ending in C*w* and C*y* form diminutives in C*o·h* and C*i·h*, respectively: *mehtekw-* 'stick', *mehteko·hi*; *aseny-* 'stone', *aseni·ha*. Stems ending in V*w* drop the *w* and add *·he·h*: *a·mo·w-* 'bee', *a·mo·he·ha*; *neniw-* 'man', *neni·he·ha*. Most stems ending in *n* replace the *n* and the preceding vowel with *a·h*: *mi·čiwen-* 'food', *mi·čiwa·hi*; *ana·kan-* 'bowl', *ana·ka·hi*; *te·we·hikan-* 'drum', *te·we·hika·ha*. A few *n*-final stems form regular diminutives: *mi·kon-* 'feather', *mi·kone·ha*; *-i·so·n-* 'name', *ki·so·ne·hi* 'your little name'.

In some nouns the diminutive suffix has become lexicalized as part of the stem: e.g. *iškwe·se·h-* 'girl', *kwi·yese·h-* 'boy'. Such stems may take another diminutive suffix to express smallness, etc.: *iškwe·se·he·ha* 'little girl', *kwi·yese·he·ha* 'little boy'.

Verb stems may also bear a diminutive suffix, typically *-(o)·hi-*. Formally the verbal suffix is clearly related to the nominal diminutive suffix, and the verbal suffix often expresses that one of the verb's arguments is small, cute, dear, or pitiful. This raises a syntactic question: is the diminutive another inflectional category in Meskwaki, as person, number, gender, and obviation are? The high productivity of the diminutive suffix and its appearance on both nouns and verbs are what we would expect if this were an inflectional category. Furthermore, it can be seen in the verb paradigms given in the appendix that on transitive verbs the diminutive suffix occurs to the right of one of the inflectional suffixes. Despite these suggestive properties, however, the Meskwaki diminutive cannot be analyzed as inflectional. An NP argument may bear a diminutive suffix without triggering diminutive marking on its verb, as in the following example.

(90)   *ki·šikenikini*   *pe·škone·wi·he·hani*
      IC-ki·šiken-ni-k-ini   pe·škone·wi·h-e·h-ani
      IC-grow-OBV-0-MODE   flower-DIM-INAN.PL
      [grow 0'/ITERATIVE]

      'whenever the little flowers bloom' N3F

Here the subject *pe·škone·wi·he·hani* 'little flowers' contains the diminutive suffix *-e·h-* but the verb is not marked for the diminutive. If the diminutive were inflectional in Meskwaki, we would expect that the form of the verb would be *ki·šikeno·hinikini*, to agree with the subject. The absence of the verbal diminutive suffix here shows that diminutive marking is not just a mechanical type of agreement.

Moreover, on verbs the diminutive is associated with other functions besides expressing smallness, etc., of one of the verb's arguments. With temporal verbs, for example, the diminutive picks out the beginning of the time span: *meno·hkami·-* 'be spring', *meno·hkami·hi-* 'be early spring'; *ana·kwi-* 'be evening', *ana·kwi·hi-* 'be early evening'. With verbs expressing numbers or scalar properties the diminutive often expresses 'only [that amount]': *nekoti-* 'be one', *nekoti·hi-* 'be only one'. On other verbs the diminutive may signal that the action of the verb is brief or attenuated: *ina·čimekosi-* 'be talked about [thus]', *ina·čimekosi·hi-* 'be talked about [thus] a little bit'. These examples show that the semantic effect of the diminutive suffix may be confined to the predicate itself, without implying that one or more of the verb's arguments is small, cute, dear, or pitiful. Furthermore, these examples show that the type of meaning added to the predicate depends partly

upon the semantic class of the verb. Such lexical variation in a morphological category suggests that the category is derivational, not inflectional.

3.7. Personal pronouns. We now take up the various types of independent pronouns, beginning with personal pronouns. Though ordinary deictic and anaphoric pronominal reference to subject, object, and possessor is expressed by the inflectional morphology on verbs and possessed nouns, there are also two series of independent personal pronouns in Meskwaki (Dahlstrom 1988). The emphatic series of pronouns is used for the discourse functions of topic and focus, while the other series, composed of possessed forms of the noun stem *-i·yaw-* 'body', is primarily used for reflexives and other arguments which cannot be expressed by the inflectional system. (The body pronouns were called 'ni·yawi' pronouns in Dahlstrom 1988, after the first person singular form.)

3.7.1. Emphatic pronouns. The set of emphatic pronouns is listed below. The pronouns either appear as independent words or they may undergo optional cliticization.

(91) a.   ni·na   'I'
      b.   ki·na   'you'
      c.   wi·na   'he (prox)'
      d.   ni·na·na   'we (excl)'
      e.   ki·na·na   'we (incl)'
      f.   ki·nwa·wa   'you (pl)'
      g.   wi·nwa·wa   'they (prox)'

There is no obviative emphatic pronoun, nor is there an emphatic pronoun for the unspecified person ('one').

    The emphatic pronouns are used to announce new topics or to put a pronominal argument in focus. A few examples will be given here; see chapter 8 for more about the functions of topic and focus and their constituent-structure positions. In the following passage the emphatic pronoun *wi·nwa·wa* 'they' signals a shift from the topic of the preceding sentence, becoming the topic of the current sentence.

(92) *o·swa·wani*   *e·hkahkihta·kowa·či*   *i·nini*   *pešekesihe·hani.*
      o-w-o·s-wa·w-ani   e·h-kahkihtaw-eko-wa·-t-i   i·n-ini   pešekesih-e·h-ani
      3- -father-(3)P-OBV   AOR-hide.O2.from-INV-3-MODE that-OBV   deer-DIM-OBV
                               [hide.O2.from 3'-3P/AOR]

      o·ni   *wi·nwa·wa*   *wa·paniki*
      o·ni   wi·nwa·wa   IC-wa·pan-ni-k-i
      and.then   they   IC-be.dawn-OBV-0-MODE
                                      [be.dawn 0'/CH.CONJ]

      e·hnatone·hwa·wa·čina·hkači.
      e·h-natone·hw-a·-wa·-t-i=na·hkači.
      AOR-look.for-DIR-3P-3-MODE=again
      [look.for 3p-3'/AOR]

'Their father hid that young deer from them.
And as for them, the next morning
they looked for it again.' W86HI

In the next sentence, the pronoun *ki·na* 'you' is contrastively focused:

(93) *ki·nawe·na*   *ki·hnepe*
    ki·na=we·na   ke-i·h-nep-e
    you=rather   2-FUT-die-
                [FUT-die 2/IND.IND]

    '<u>You</u> will die, instead.' J68.16

Three lines previously the addressee had said, 'May the man who is staying with us die!'. The sentence in (93) takes as presupposed the open proposition '*x* will die', and asserts that the identity of *x* is *ki·na* 'you'.
    If the presupposed proposition is recoverable from the context it may be omitted altogether, leaving only the asserted portion:

(94) *a·kwima·hki·na!*
    a·kwi=ma·h=ki·na
    not=after.all=you

    'Not you!' L33

(The emphatic pronoun in this example has undergone optional cliticization, deleting the final vowel of the enclitic =*ma·hi*.)
    Another syntactic construction used to express focus is the equational sentence. (Note that Meskwaki has a zero copula.)

(95) *wi·nwa·wa*   *we·či-mehtose·neniwiyani*
    wi·nwa·wa   IC-oči   mehtose·neniwi-yan-i
    they   IC-from   be.alive-2-oblique
                [from-be.alive 2/part/oblique.head.of.rel.clause]

    'They [your parents] are the reason why you are alive.' B85:32.5-6

Here *wi·nwa·wa* 'they' is equated to the participle 'the reason why you are alive' (see 5.3. for participle formation). The presupposed information is 'you are alive because of *x*'; what is asserted is that the identity of *x* is 'they' (your parents).
    A final use of the third person emphatic pronouns *wi·na* 'he', *wi·nwa·wa* 'they' should be noted here: they may optionally accompany a focused lexical NP, with a reading comparable to the emphatic reflexive of English:

(96) *mani*   *kene·ta·pwa*   *wi·nwa·wa*   *maneto·waki*   *ki·šepye·hamowa·či.*
    mani   ke-ne·t-a·-pwa   wi·nwa·wa   maneto·w-aki   IC-ki·šepye·h-am-o-wa·-t-i

this	2-see-INAN.OBJ-2P	they	spirit-PL	IC-draw-0.OBJ- -3P-3-INAN.SG
	[see 2p-0/IND.IND]			[draw 3p-0/PART/0]

a·kwi<u>ni·na</u>   *mani*   *ki·šepye·hama·nini*
a·kwi=ni·na   mani   ki·šepye·h-am-a·n-ini
not=I   this   draw-INAN.OBJ-1-MODE
                    [draw 1-0/NEG]

'You see this [map] which the spirits themselves drew.
<u>I</u> didn't draw this.' R54:41-2

Here the spirits are asserted to be the ones who drew the map, not the speaker. The use of the emphatic pronoun alongside the NP *maneto·waki* 'spirits' expresses the contrast between them and other possible candidates, and may also convey that this information is somewhat surprising.

3.7.2. 'Body' pronouns. The second set of independent personal pronouns is composed of possessed forms of the dependent inanimate noun stem *-i·yaw-* 'body'.

(97) a. ni·yawi   'I'
       b. ki·yawi   'you'
       c. owi·yawi   'he (prox); he/they (obv)'
       d. ni·ya·na·ni   'we (excl)'
       e. ki·ya·na·ni   'we (incl)'
       f. ki·ya·wa·wi   'you (pl)'
       g. owi·ya·wa·wi   'they (prox)'
       h. owi·ya·ninawi   'one'

The body pronouns also have literal readings of possessed forms of 'body': *ni·yawi* 'my body', *ki·yawi* 'your body', etc. The pronouns follow the regular pattern of possessor inflection for vowel-initial dependent stems (3.4.), except that the second and third plural forms undergo contraction as if the plural possessor suffix were *-ewa·w-* instead of the usual *-wa·w-*, and the unspecified person form in (97h) is suffixed with *-eninaw-* rather than the regular *-inaw-*.

A number of grammatical peculiarities of the body pronouns follow from their origin as possessed nouns. First, the body pronouns trigger third person inanimate singular agreement, regardless of the person and number of their referent. For example, if *ki·ya·wa·wi* 'you (plural)' is used as subject of an intransitive verb, the verb will be inflected for a third person inanimate singular subject, not for a second person plural subject. The grammatical person and gender of the body pronouns is due to their inanimate stem *-i·yaw-* 'body'; the fact that all the pronouns are singular, however, reflects the grammaticization of the pronominal readings of these forms. That is, if the forms in (97) had only the literal possessed readings, we would expect the forms with plural possessors to be inanimate plural: *ki·ya·wa·wani* 'your (pl) bodies', rather than the singular *ki·ya·wa·wi* 'your (pl) body'. Another grammatical peculiarity of the body pronouns is that the third person forms *owi·yawi* and *owi·ya·wa·wi* trigger obviative agreement, following the rule that nouns possessed by third persons are obligatorily obviative. Furthermore, *owi·yawi* may refer either to a proximate singular third person or to an obviative third person; recall from 3.4. that obviative possessor inflection is homophonous with proximate singular.

The body pronouns may be used as reflexive first or second objects, as nonreflexive second objects or obliques, and, in some contexts, as subjects of intransitives.[24] Their use as reflexive pronouns is the most common:

(98) *ki·hte·pihto*   *ki·yawi*
      ke-i·h-te·piht-o·   ki·yawi
      2-FUT-make.happy-INAN.OBJ   you(rself)
      [FUT-make.happy 2-0/IND.IND]

      'You will benefit yourself.' R92.18

Here the body pronoun functions as first object and is coreferential to the subject. Notice that the verb is inflected for an inanimate object.
      The body pronouns may also express reflexive second objects, with either a subject or first object antecedent. The following two examples contain the ditransitive verb stem *wa·pato·n-* 'show', which takes the thing shown as second object and the person caused to see it as the first object.

(99) *e·hwa·pato·na·tehe*   *owi·yawi*   *kehčine·we*
      e·h-wa·pato·n-a·-t-ehe   owi·yawi   kehčine·we
      AOR-show-DIR-3-MODE   him(self)   in.person
      [show 3-3'/PAST.AOR]

      'He (prox) had shown them (obv) himself in person.' W822

(100) *newa·pato·na·wa*   *apeno·ha*   *owi·yawi*
      ne-wa·pato·n-a·-w-a   apeno·h-a   owi·yawi
      1-show-DIR-3-SG   child-SG   her(self)
      [show 1-3/IND.IND]

      'I showed the baby herself.'

      The body pronouns are also used if there is partial coreference between the subject and object. For example, in the following sentence the second person singular subject is included in the first person inclusive object:

(101) *ki·nayo*   *mani*   *keto·ta*   *ki·ya·na·ni*
      ki·na=iyo   mani   ke-to·t-a·   ki·ya·na·ni
      you=of.course   this   2-do.thus.to-inan.obj   us.inclusive
                                    [do.thus.to 2-0/ind.ind.]
      'You have done this to us (incl).' B105:30.15

(101) also contains an emphatic pronoun, *ki·na* 'you'.

---

[24] No textual examples of personal pronouns used as objects of adpositions have been found, but in elicitation either type of pronoun is accepted: *ki·nwa·wa oči*, *ki·ya·wa·wi oči* 'from you (pl)'.

As will be seen when the system of verb inflection is described in chapter 4, there is no way to inflect a transitive verb stem for coreferential (or partially coreferential) subjects and objects. Using the body pronouns in this context thus gets around a limitation of the inflectional system.[25]

Other gaps in the inflectional system are also filled by the body pronouns: they are used to express nonthird person obliques and second objects.

(102) *a·kwi,* *nekwi·he,*   *owiye·ha*   *wi·hočimehkini*   *ni·yawi*
      a·kwi   nekwi·he   owiye·h-a   wi·h-očim-ehk-ini   ni·yawi
      not   son.VOC   anyone-SG   FUT-speak.to.for.(Obl)-3SUBJ.2OBJ-MODE   me
                                      [FUT-speak.to.for.(Obl) 3-2/NEG]

'No one, my son, will stand up to you on my behalf.' W295

(103) *mana*   *ni·hka·na*   *ni·hmi·na·wa*   *ki·yawi*
      man-a   ne-i·hka·n-a   ne-i·h-mi·n-a·-w-a   ki·yawi
      this-SG 1-friend-SG   1-FUT-give-DIR-3-SG   you
                        [FUT-give 1-3/IND.IND]

'I will give you to this friend of mine.' R184.10

(104) *ahpe·nemowaki*   *ki·ya·wa·wi*
      ahpe·nemo-w-aki   ki·ya·wa·wi
      depend.on-3-PL   you.PL
      [depend.on   3P/IND.IND]

'They depend on you (pl).' W249

In (102), the verb stem *očim-* 'speak to (Obj) for (Obl)' is a three place predicate taking the speaker as subject, the addressee as object, and the person on whose behalf the words are spoken as an oblique. To express a first person oblique here, the body pronoun *ni·yawi* 'me' must be used. In (103) and (104), on the other hand, the body pronouns are used to express second objects. In (103) the verb stem is the ditransitive *mi·n-* 'give'; *ki·yawi* 'you' is what is being given. The verb stem in (104) is *ahpe·nemo-* 'depend on', which is subcategorized for a subject and second object, but no first object. The second object here is *ki·ya·wa·wi* 'you (pl)'.

Third person pronominal second objects are ordinarily expressed by zero anaphora. However, there is a special use of the third person body pronoun as a second object. When the second object is proximate and there is an obviative subject or first object, the proximate second object is expressed by a body pronoun:

(105) *e·hahpe·nemoniči*   *mehtose·neniwahi*   *owi·yawi*
      e·h-ahpe·nemo-ni-t-i   mehtose·neniw-ahi   owi·yawi
      AOR-depend.on-OBV-3-MODE person-OBV.PL   him
      [depend.on 3'/AOR]

---

[25] Another strategy, discussed in 7.1.2, is to add a reflexive suffix to the verb stem, deriving an intransitive stem which is then inflected for a subject. This is available only for expressing full coreference between a subject and a first object, however.

'The people (obv) depended on him (prox).' R594.37

(106) e·hwe·pa·hke·nici   owi·yawi
       e·h-we·pa·hke·-ni-t-i   owi·yawi
       AOR-throw-OBV-3-MODE   him
       [throw 3'/AOR]

'She (obv) threw him (prox).' J150.2

(107) kotakanina·hka   e·hmi·nemeči   owi·yawi
       kotak-ani=na·hka   e·h-mi·n-em-et-i   owi·yawi
       other-OBV=again   AOR-give-OBV.OBJ-X-MODE her
                          [give X-3'/AOR]

'They (unspec) gave her (prox) to yet another [man] (obv).' J220.7

The verbs in (105) and (106) are subcategorized for a subject and a second object: in both the subject is third person obviative and the second object is proximate. In (107) the first object of the verb (the recipient) is obviative and the second object is proximate.

     The third function of the body pronouns is to express subjects of intransitive verbs. Here it is clear that the body pronoun is not filling a gap in the inflectional system of verbs, because intransitive verbs do have a full set of inflectional forms for subject. In this context the use of a body pronoun as subject is optional, and seems to reflect a rather high register use, found especially frequently in religious speeches. The body pronouns in this context are sometimes glossed as possessed forms of 'life', e.g. ni·yawi 'my life'.

(108) wi·hmya·neteniwi   owi·yawi
       wi·h-mya·net-e-ni-wi   owi·yawi
       fut-be.bad- -obv-3-sg   he
       [fut-be.bad 0'/ind.ind]

'He will get into trouble.' ('His life will be bad.')   W833

(109) ni·ka·ni   i·he·mikatwi   ki·ya·wa·wi
       ni·ka·ni   i·h-a·-mikat-w-i   ki·ya·wa·wi
       ahead   fut-go-inan.subj-0-sg you.pl
                     [fut-go 0/ind.ind]

'You (pl) should go ahead.' W824

(110) we·pa·čimekwatesa   owi·ya·ninawi
       we·pa·čim-ekwat-esa   owi·ya·ninawi
       begin.to.tell.about-pass-0   one
       [begin.to.be.told.about 0/potential]

'One would begin to be talked about.' W183

Notice that the third person body pronoun in (108) triggers obviative inanimate subject agreement on the verb while the second person and unspecified person pronouns in (109) and (110) trigger proximate inanimate subject agreement.

The body pronouns are not associated with the topic and focus discourse functions as the emphatic pronouns are, but instead are realizations of subcategorized arguments of the verb. A body pronoun cannot function both as an argument of the verb and as topic or focus: a separate emphatic pronoun must be used to express topic or focus.

(111) *ni·na* *ni·yawi* *e·hkeko·mye·pahoči*
      ni·na ni·yawi e·h-keko·mye·paho-t-i
      I   me   aor-run.carrying.on.back-3-mode
                      [run.carrying.on.back 3/aor]

'As for me, she ran carrying me on her back.' R130.38

The emphatic pronoun *ni·na* expresses the topic of the above sentence, and the body pronoun *ni·yawi* expresses the second object.

3.8. Demonstrative pronouns. Meskwaki has several series of demonstrative pronouns, inflected for number, gender, obviation, and locative case. They may accompany a head noun or be used on their own. The forms for 'this' and 'that' are given below.

(112)   'this'   (113)   'that'

	'this'			'that'	
a.	mana		a.	i·na	anim. prox. sg.
b.	ma·haki		b.	i·niki	anim. prox. pl.
c.	ma·hani		c.	i·nini	anim. obv. sg.
d.	ma·hahi		d.	i·nihi	anim. obv. pl.
e.	mani		e.	i·ni	inan. sg.
f.	ma·hani		f.	i·nini	inan. pl.
g.	ayo·hi		g.	i·nahi	locative

In (112a-f), the regular gender/number suffixes from 3.1. are attached to a demonstrative stem *man-* or *ma·h-*. In (113a-f), on the other hand, the stem is *i·n-* and the suffixes have a slightly different form: in the disyllabic suffixes the first vowel is *i* rather than *a*. For example, the animate proximate plural ending in (113b) is *-iki*, not *-aki*. The suffixes of (113) are identical to the participle suffixes which agree with the head of a relative clause (5.3).

In texts, the 'this' series is used cataphorically and the 'that' series anaphorically. Goddard 1990a:330 points out that the 'that' series is often used to mark proximate shifts in narrative. The inanimate singular forms ((112e) and (113e)) are also often used as temporal pronouns: *mani* 'now', *i·ni* 'then'.

The locative forms in (112g) and (113g) may be used either to modify a head noun in locative case or on their own, as locative pronouns: *ayo·hi* 'here', *i·nahi* 'there' (stationary location). A separate form, *i·tepi*, is used for 'there' as the goal of motion away from the deictic center. Yet another locative pronoun, *i·ya·hi*, is used for the goal of motion to a deictic center set up in a

narrative: e.g. *i·ya·hi pye·ya·wa·či, ...* 'when they came there, ...'. (For discussion of the use of *i·ya·hi* in narratives see Reynolds 1996.)

Meskwaki also has two series of ABSENTATIVE demonstrative pronouns. Formally, these pronouns are composed of special absentative suffixes for number, gender, and obviation attached to the stem *ma·h-* 'this' or *i·n-* 'that'.

(114)	'this (absent)'	(115)	'that (absent)'	
a.	ma·hiya	a.	i·niya	anim. prox. sg.
b.	ma·hiye·ka	b.	i·niye·ka	anim. prox. pl.
c.	ma·hiye·ne	c.	i·niye·ne	anim. obv. sg.
d.	ma·hiye·ha	d.	i·niye·he	anim. obv. pl.
e.	ma·hiye	e.	i·niye	inan. sg.
f.	ma·hiye·ne	f.	i·niye·ne	inan. pl.

(115c) and (115d) have alternative forms *i·niye·na* and *i·niye·ha*, respectively. There are no locative absentative forms.

The most salient function of the absentatives is to refer to the dead: e.g. *i·niya nemešo·ha* 'my late grandfather'. They are also used more generally, however, to mark that the referent is simply not present in the context of speaking: *i·niya ki·hka·na* 'your friend (who isn't here)'. The choice between the two series of absentatives depends upon the evaluation of the speaker: the 'this' series of absentatives is used if the speaker feels that the referent has been absent only a short time, while the 'that' series seems to be unmarked for the length of absence. In narratives, the 'that' series of absentatives has an additional function, to reintroduce a previously mentioned character.

The boundary between the two absentative series is a subjective one and cannot be stated in absolute terms. The following pair of sentences illustrates this point (Ives Goddard, personal communication). The first contains a 'this' series absentative to refer to a man dead for four years.

(116) *ma·hiyayo*   *wi·čawiwata*   *netowi·hka·ni*
       ma·hiya=iyo   IC-wi·čawiw-at-a   ne-t-owi·hka·ni
       this.absent=for   IC-live.with-2subj.3obj-sg 1- -have.O2.as.friend
                            [live.with 2-3/part/3]   [have.O2.as.friend 1/ind.ind]

       'After all, your late husband was my friend.' A188C

In the next sentence, however, a 'that' series absentative pronoun is used for a woman dead for about one year:

(117) *ke·senwiya·pi*   *keno·ta·ke*   *i·niya*   *wi·čawiwaka*   *e·hpakamaki?*
       ke·senwi=ya·pi   ke-no·ta·ke·   i·niya   IC-wi·čawiw-ak-a   e·h-pakam-ak-i
       how.many=emph   2-hear   that.absent   IC-live.with-1.3-sg   aor-hit-1.3-mode
                            [hear 2/ind.ind]   [live.with 1-3/part/3] [hit 1-3/aor]

       'Exactly how many times did you hear that I hit my late wife?' A145E

Meskwaki also has two series of demonstrative pronouns for distant referents:

(118)   'yonder (visible)'   (119)   'that (distant, invisible)'
        a.   i·ya·ka   a.   i·na·ka   anim. prox. sg.
        b.   i·ya·ma·haki   b.   i·na·ma·haki   anim. prox. pl.
        c.   i·ya·ma·hani   c.   i·na·ma·hani   anim. obv. sg.
        d.   i·ya·ma·hahi   d.   i·na·ma·hahi   anim. obv. pl.
        e.   i·ya·mani   e.   i·na·mani   inan. sg.
        f.   i·ya·ma·hani   f.   i·na·ma·hani   inan. pl.
        g.   i·ya·ma·hi   locative

(119b) and (119c) have alternative forms *i·ne·ke* and *i·ne·ne*, respectively.
        The forms in (118) are used for referents that are or could be pointed to, while the ones in (119) are too far away to be pointed out.

(120)   *i·ya·ma·hi*   *apihapita·we*
        i·ya·ma·hi   api-h-api-ta·we
        yonder.LOC   REDUP- -sit-21/IMPERATIVE

        'Let's sit for a while over yonder.' N18H

(121)   *i·na·ka*   *kehči-maneto·wa*   *a·šotamokwe·ni*
        i·na·ka   kehči   maneto·w-a   a·šot-amo-w-k-e·n-i
        that.distant.invisible.SG   great   spirit-SG   urge-INAN.OBJ-INTERR-3-INTERR-MODE
                                        [urge 3-0/INTERR]

        i·ni   *wi·hišawiniči*   *ki·šeso·ni.*
        i·ni   wi·h-ešawi-ni-t-i   ki·šesw-ani
        that   FUT-do.thus-OBV-3-MODE   sun-OBV
                [FUT-do.thus 3'/AOR]

        'The Great Spirit (distant and invisible) must have urged that the Sun do that.' W317ST

It is difficult to state precisely the semantic difference between the distant, invisible forms in (119) and the absentatives of (114) and (115). Perhaps the absentatives are used for referents whose 'home base' is (or was) the current deictic center but who are now absent, while the distant, invisible series is used for referents whose home base is located at some remove from the current deictic center.
        Finally, there is a series of demonstrative pronouns glossed 'that (on the far side)'. The referents pointed out might be on the far side of a lodge, a woods, a valley, or a body of water.

(122)   'that (on the far side)'
        a.   anika·na·ka   anim. prox. sg.
        b.   anika·ne·ki   anim. prox. pl.
        c.   anika·ne·ni   anim. obv. sg.
        d.   anika·ne·hi   anim. obv. pl.
        e.   anika·ne   inan. sg.
        f.   anika·ne·ni   inan. pl.

g.   anika·nahi   locative

(123) *nahi, anika·nahi   nana·hapino*
       nahi   anika·nahi   nana·hapi-no
       okay, far.side.LOC   sit.down-2/IMPERATIVE

'Well, have a seat over there [on other side of lodge].' N265

3.9. Other pronouns. There are a number of other pronouns in Meskwaki which are neither personal pronouns nor demonstratives. Several of the nondemonstrative, nonpersonal pronouns take the regular number/gender endings of 3.1. The stems for 'other, another' and for 'whats-his-name, whatchamacallit' appear with the full range of gender, number, and obviation distinctions:

(124)	'other'	(125)	'whats-his-name'	
a.	kotaka	a.	awahi·na	anim. prox. sg.
b.	kotakaki	b.	awahi·naki	anim. prox. pl.
c.	kotakani	c.	awahi·nani	anim. obv. sg.
d.	kotakahi	d.	awahi·nahi	anim. obv. pl.
e.	kotaki	e.	awahi·ni	inan. sg.
f.	kotakani	f.	awahi·nani	inan. pl.
g.	kotakeki			locative

(124) also has a locative form ((124g)) and a diminutive (*kotake·h-*). Some Meskwaki speakers use *awahi·m-* as the form of the stem in (125).
     The stems for 'who?' and 'someone/anyone' take animate inflectional endings:

(126)	'who?'	(127)	'someone'	
a.	we·ne·ha	a.	owiye·ha	anim. prox. sg.
b.	we·ne·haki	b.	owiye·haki	anim. prox. pl.
c.	we·ne·hani	c.	owiye·hani	anim. obv. sg.
d.	we·ne·hahi	d.	owiye·hahi	anim. obv. pl.

(127) also has a diminutive form, *owiye·he·h-*, used for 'some (small) animal'.
     The interrogative pronoun *we·kone·h-* 'what?' may be inflected with the inanimate singular or inanimate plural suffixes.

(128)	'what?'		
a.	we·kone·hi	inan. sg.
b.	we·kone·hani	inan. pl.

One example has been found where *we·kone·h-* 'what' takes an animate inflectional ending: *ma·haki=ča·h=we·kone·haki?* 'And these, what are they?' Kiyana 1913:46A. The context here is that the speaker is asking about a kind of fish.
     One interrogative pronoun, *ta·n-* 'which?', is inflected with the suffixes used on participles (5.3.) and the 'that' demonstrative (3.8):

(129)   'which?'
    a.   ta·na   anim. prox. sg.
    b.   ta·niki   anim. prox. pl.
    c.   ta·nini   anim. obv. sg.
    d.   ta·nihi   anim. obv. pl.
    e.   ta·ni   inan. sg.
    f.   ta·nini   inan. pl.

The pronouns in (129) may also be used on their own to ask 'where is ... ?': *ta·na?* 'where is he?', *ta·niki?* 'where are they?', etc.

Other indefinite and interrogative pronouns invariably end in *i*, including *ke·ko·hi* 'something, anything' (and its diminutive *ke·ko·he·hi*), *nekotahi* 'somewhere, anywhere', *ta·ni* 'how?', *ta·tepi* 'whither?', *ta·nina·hi* 'when?; at what distance?', *kaši* 'how?', *ke·swi* 'how many?', and *ke·senwi* 'how many times?'.