

Cheyenne Pronouns and Pronominal Functions

by

Wayne Leman

WINTER 1985, LING 507
SEMINAR: ANAPHORIC PRONOUNS
University of Oregon
Professor Colette Craig
Submitted: March 20, 1986

- 0. Introduction
- 1. Overview
- 2. Pronominal marking
 - 2.1. Personal
 - 2.1.1. Personal intransitive
 - 2.1.2. Personal transitive
 - 2.1.3. Zero third person
 - 2.1.4. Nonconfiguration
 - 2.2. Impersonal
 - 2.3. Unspecified subject
 - 2.4. Reflexive
 - 2.5. Reciprocal
 - 2.6. Possessive
 - 2.7. Noun-replacive
 - 2.8. Emphatic
 - 2.8.1. Independent order
 - 2.8.2. Conjunct order
 - 2.8.3. Genitive reflexive
 - 2.8.4. Other emphatic forms
 - 2.8.4.1. 'body/sake'
 - 2.8.4.2. 'alone'
 - 2.8.4.3. 'all'
 - 2.8.4.4. 'whole of'
 - 2.8.4.5. Numbers
 - 2.9. Indefinite
 - 2.10. Nonspecific
 - 2.11. Interrogative
 - 2.12. Predicative
 - 2.12.1 Deictic use
 - 2.12.2 Cleft use
 - 2.12.3 Other predicative pronominal forms
 - 2.13. Demonstrative
 - 2.13.1. Exophoric
 - 2.13.2. Endophoric
 - 2.14. Anaphoric use of demonstratives
 - 2.14.1. Participant contrast
 - 2.14.2. Speaker preference
 - 2.14.3. Genre
 - 2.14.4. Word order
 - 2.14.5. Other possible counts
- 3. Conclusion
- Bibliography

[Appendices are not included here.]

Appendix 1: Overall word order counts

Appendix 2: Random sample demonstrative counts

Appendix 3: Contrastive demonstrative counts

Appendix 4: Speaker preference demonstrative counts

0. Introduction

Cross-linguistically, pronouns perform a number of functions. They

identify and track reference, mark anaphora and coreference, encode possession, indicate contrast or emphasis of referents, interact with deixis, and contribute to textual coherence. Depending on the language, these typical pronominal functions may be encoded by a word class of pronoun or by pronominal affixes on other word classes, often by a combination of pronouns and affixes. Pronouns typically mark categories of person, number, gender, and case of referents.

This paper will describe pronouns and other grammatical devices, all of which function pronominally, for Cheyenne, an Algonquian language spoken in Oklahoma and southwestern Montana. A recent paper by Schwartz and Dunnigan (hereafter S&D) (1983) describes the pronominal system of Ojibwa, another Algonquian language. No complete survey of Cheyenne pronominal categories has previously appeared. There are, as expected, numerous points of similarity between the Cheyenne system and more typical Algonquian systems, such as that described by S&D for Ojibwa. But there are significant differences, also, which a study like this should highlight.

Cheyenne is one of the westernmost members of the Algonquian language family. It, along with Blackfoot and Arapaho, is one of the most phonologically innovative. Its morphology and syntax are thoroughly Algonquian but there is sufficient variation among Algonquian languages that good descriptions of linguistic phenomena in each of the daughter languages are completely warranted. We will occasionally refer to pronominal categories in other Algonquian languages. To set the stage for comparison we list a number of the other languages within the Algonquian family: Abnaki, Arapaho, Blackfoot, Cree, Delaware, Fox (and Kickapoo), Illinois, Malecite, Menomini, Micmac, Natick, Ojibwa, Penobscot, Potawatomi, and Shawnee. We will by not refer to data from all of these languages, but having this listing will enable us to know when we are speaking of another Algonquian language.

This paper has benefitted from study of cross-linguistic surveys of pronoun systems, especially Anderson and Keenan (1985), Givón (1984), and Schachter (1985), the brief glossary definitions in MacLeish (1971), several descriptions of pronouns in individual languages, and the pioneering linguistic descriptions of the Mennonite missionary, Rodolphe Petter (1907, 1915, 1952), who studied Cheyenne fulltime from his first contact in 1891 until his death in 1947. I have also built upon previous brief treatments of some aspects of Cheyenne pronominal categories in W. Leman (1979, 1984). The present paper is a new and much expanded description of Cheyenne pronominal data with discussion of some interesting theoretical and functional issues concerning them.

The major sections of this paper are a brief overview of Cheyenne, next, a sketch of all Cheyenne phenomena which have a pronominal function, including a more detailed examination of the independent pronouns, followed by a focus upon demonstratives which can function like anaphoric pronouns.

1. Overview

Cheyenne is a highly polysynthetic language. Its major word classes are noun, verb, and particle. Numbers and a few other forms such as hóséstse 'few' and háesto 'many' could be considered part of a small class of adjectives.

Nouns are inflected for number, animate or inanimate gender, and obviation, an important "out-oØ-focus" third person category of Algonquian languages. Verbs appear in three "orders", independent, conjunct (basically subordinate), and imperative. Various modes appear within orders. Verb agree in person, number, and obviation status with their subject and, if available as argument, object, and semantic dative. As in other Algonquian languages, transitive verb stems are classified according to animacy of object and for intransitive stems, animacy of subject:

TA	Transitive Animate--object is animate
TI	Transitive Inanimate--object is inanimate
AI	Animate Intransitive--subject is animate
II	Inanimate Intransitive--subject is inanimate

The formula for an independent order Cheyenne verb is:

PRO-TENSE-DIR-PREVERB(S)-REL-ROOT-MEDIAL-FINAL-EVIDENTIAL

Each verb has at least a pronominal prefix and a root. Independent order verbs take a pronominal prefix for person plus pronominal affixes for number, person (other than that marked by the prefix), and gender of arguments. Conjunct order verbs only take pronominal suffixes. Further details of verbal, as well as nominal, morphology are found in W. Leman (1979, 1986). Details of Cheyenne phonology are found in Davis (1962), Frantz (1972), and W. Leman (1979, 1981).

Case marking is suffixal on nouns, and only marks obliques (the same -va suffix encoding locatives, temporals, and instrumentals) and locatives. (There are two different locative suffixes.)

Basic word order is mostly determined by discourse/pragmatic factors. Elena Leman is studying these factors and will describe them in her M.A. thesis (to appear). For now, it is sufficient to say that it appears that preverbal position is predominantly used for discontinuous material, such as emphasis and contrast. Postverbal position is used for more highly topical nominal arguments. These are general tendencies. There is much variation so that any such generalized statements are oversimplified. Text counts (see Appendix 1) show that the majority of verbs, following introduction of discourse participants, appear without overt nominal arguments. Order of morphemes within words is fixed.

2. Pronominal marking

By far, the most predominant marking for pronominal categories in Cheyenne is verbal affixation. Independent order prefixes and suffixes and conjunct order suffixes supply nearly all information needed for tracking referents in discourse. Affixation is, of course, one of the most common cross-linguistic means for marking pronominal categories, as Schachter (1985:26) points out in the section on pronouns in his survey of parts- \emptyset -speech systems, "It is quite common for the equivalent of personal pronouns, particularly of subject and object pronouns, to be expressed by affixes on the verb." Verbal affixation is variously called agreement, cross-referencing, and person-indexing (Wolfart and Carroll 1973) in the literature. Most seem to treat these labels as basically equivalent. I would prefer to use the label agreement for those languages where there is a sufficient number of nominals in existence in discourse for verbs to agree with, rather than for a language like Cheyenne where if a verb "agrees" with any nominal the nominal may only have been mentioned early in a discourse, and subsequently "omitted". Person-indexing seems the more appropriate label for a language like Cheyenne where a large majority of verbs have no nearby nominal to "agree" with, yet obligatorily keep track of reference with pronominal marking on all verbs. But I will yield to tradition in this paper and use the label agreement as a general cover term for verbal affixation of pronominal categories.

The major function of pronouns, cross-linguistically, is to keep track of referents in discourse. Since this function is covered by Cheyenne verb agreement, it should not be surprising that words which appear as separate "pronouns" serve functions other than pure tracking of reference. Because this paper is written for a seminar on anaphoric pronouns, we want to focus upon free form pronouns and particularly upon those pronouns which have anaphoric function within texts. Verb agreement, of course, is often highly anaphoric. A verb which only has agreement and no overt nominals would mark participants which presumably are most predictable within text, i.e. of highest topicality. We will have more to say, later, about degrees of topicality within Cheyenne.

First, though, we must briefly sketch how Cheyenne syntactically encodes pronominal categories on verbs.

2.1. Personal

English personal pronouns are nominative case I, you, he, she, it, we, and they. The corresponding objective case pronouns are me, you, him, her, it, us, and them. The Cheyenne equivalent to all these pronouns is verbal pronominal affixation. The three persons first, second, and third are marked by prefixes:

- 1) ná-péhévahe 'I am good (pretty, etc.)'
- 2) né-péhévahe 'you (sg.) are good'
- 3) é-péhévahe 'he/she is good'

2.1.1. Personal intransitive

The prefix in 1-3) only marks person. The prefix é- marks any referential third person. There is no verbal differentiation for sex, so 3) can be predicated of either a male or female. Verb stems are differentiated for gender, either animate or inanimate. But an inanimate subject of an intransitive verb (II) will be marked by é- just as an animate subject of an intransitive verb (AI) will be. Contrast 4) with 3):

4) é-péhéva'e 'it is good'

In the remainder of this paper, I will gloss third person animate singulars with 'he', as an abbreviation for 'he/she', and inanimate singular as 'it'.

Within a single discourse span, typically a single clause, only one third person animate referent may be "in focus", or, in Algonquian terms, proximate. This referent receives ordinary third person marking. Any other third person is marked as "out-oØ-focus" or, in Algonquian terms, as obviative. An AI verb with obviated subject receives the usual third person é- prefix, but a slightly modified stem ending plus obviative suffix -ho:

5) é-péhévaho 'he (obv.) is good'

Number of pronominal arguments is marked suffixally on verbs:

- 6) ná-péhéváhé-me 'we (excl.) are good'
- 7) né-péhéváhe-ma 'we (incl.) are good'
- 8) né-péhéváhé-me 'you (pl.) are good'
- 9) é-péhéváhe-o'o 'they (an.) are good'
- 10) é-péhéva'é-néstse 'they (inan.) are good'

Obviated arguments are undifferentiated for number. Hence, 5) could refer to a single (obviated) referent or a plural one.

2.1.1. Personal transitive

So far we have presented personal pronominal marking has been simple. This is because AI and II verbs are rather straightforward with regard to person marking. But greater complexity arises when two or more persons occur as arguments of a verb.

In Cheyenne, as in other Algonquian languages, a person hierarchy determines prefixal person marking when a verb has two or more arguments:

- 11) 2
- 1
- 3
- 4
- I

The numbers 2, 1, and 3 refer, as expected, to first, second, and third

persons. 4 refers to obviative, while I refers to inanimate. When two (or more) persons are arguments of a verb, the person highest on this hierarchy receives prefixal personal marking. If the remaining person is lower on the hierarchy, a verb is marked (suffixally) as being in the "direct" voice, while if the remaining person is higher on the hierarchy, the verb is marked as being in the "inverse" voice. Transitive combinations of first and second persons are referred to as "local". Any other argument combinations are non-local. W. Leman (1979) can be consulted for full transitive (TA and TI) verb paradigms, but a few examples are appropriate here:

- 12) ná-vóóm-o
1-see:AN-DIR:3 'I saw him'
- 13) ná-vóóm-ā-ā'e
1-see:AN-INV-3PL 'They saw me'
- 14) né-vóóm-ē-me
2-see:AN-INV(2:1)-2PL 'you (pl.) saw me'
- 15) ná-vóohta-nótse
1-see:INAN-IIPL. 'I saw them (inan.)' (II = Inanimate Plural)
- 16) ná-véstáhém-aa'e
1-help:AN-INV:I 'It helped to me'
- 17) é-véstáhém-áá'e
3-help:AN-INV(4:3) 'He (obv.) helped him (prox.)'

Cheyenne verbs given so far are unmarked for tense. They may be glossed either as English presents, e.g. 'I see him' for 12), or simple past, as I have done so far. The marked past /h-/ is only glossed with past, and refers to relative far past. Rather than presenting the alternate English tenses in glosses I will only present one option or the other throughout this paper.

2.1.3. Zero third person

Third person (any third, whether proximate, obviative, or inanimate) is marked prefixally, when allowed by the person hierarchy, except for future tense verbs and verbs of the so-called dubitative mode:

- 18) é-h-méséhé-hoo'o
3-PST-eat-MED
'He ate' (MED = Mediate mode, cognate with Algonquian preterit)
- 19) é-tóněšéve-séstse
3-what.do-ATTRIB
'I wonder what he is doing?' (ATTRIB = Attributive mode)
- 20) Ø-tse-mésehe
3-FUT-eat

'He will eat'

- 21) mó-Ø-h-méséhe-hé-he
DUB-3-PST-eat-NEG-NONAFFIRM
'He must have eaten'

All other persons take overt prefixal marking in all tenses and modes of the independent order. The future tense does condition low pitch, leading to devoicing, of first and second person prefixes:

- 22) ná-htse-mésehe
1-FUT-eat
'I will eat'

- 23) né-stse-mésehe
2-FUT-eat
'You will eat'

The future tense morpheme is phonemically /hte-/. Morpheme-initial /h/ deletes with third person (zero) "subject", and "assimilates" to [s] following /e/, as in 23).

This zero third person is a true zero morpheme in Cheyenne. It is not a zero "which isn't there" which Mithun (1986) claims that a language such as Lakhota has (as opposed to third person zero morphemes which Mithun finds support for in other languages).

2.1.4. Nonconfiguration

Before leaving this brief introduction to pronominal affixation, we should note that Jelinek (1985:169) would classify Cheyenne as a Pronominal Argument (PA) language, as opposed to a Lexical Argument (LA) language, such as English. What this means for syntax is that a case can be made (see references in Jelinek 1985:169) for saying that the few overt nominals which do occur associated with a verb can be considered not to bear a grammatical relation to that verb. Cheyenne verbs, like those of other PA languages, only has pronominal, specifically pronominal affix, arguments.

Additionally, we can use Chomsky's terminology to call Cheyenne a nonconfigurational language. There is no VP or subject NP node. There simply is no syntactic configurational status for sentential constituents. Because of this, some theoretical issues pertaining to configurational languages are not very relevant to Cheyenne. In his study of Kwakwala, a polysynthetic Wakashan language of British Columbia, Levine (1984:244, fn. 10) notes:

It is worth noting that Chomsky (1981) tentatively adopts the position that there are no empty categories at all in nonconfigurational languages, thus excluding both traces and PROs in these cases. If a nonconfigurational languages (sic) then uses missing arguments anaphorically, but offers internal evidence that empty syntactic categories are not involved, it

follows that **a different descriptive model**, which in no obvious way "falls out" from Government-Binding Theory, **is required for such a language**. (emphasis added)

The same comments are pertinent to Cheyenne, which, as another polysynthetic language, lacks empty categories, traces, and prototypical anaphoric pronouns. We will not pursue the theoretical issues further here. In spite of this disclaimer with regards to (Chomskyan) syntax, there are plenty of other interesting issues in discussion of Cheyenne pronominal categories. As a start there is need for a complete description of all pronominal marking, which we attempt in this paper.

In summary, Cheyenne verbs are inflected for pronominal category features of person, number, gender, and obviation.

Givón (1976, 1984) and others assume that verbal agreement markers are historically derived from independent stressed pronouns. There will be discussion of this hypothesis for Cheyenne agreement after we describe possessive affixation and emphatic pronouns.

2.2. Impersonal

Impersonal verbs are those for which there is no nominal argument. German clauses with man and French clauses with on and some Spanish clauses with reflexive se, as in 24), can be analyzed as impersonals:

24) se habl-a español
REFL speak-3 Spanish
'Spanish is spoken (here)'

Cheyenne impersonal verbs take third person prefix é- only. An impersonal suffix is required. There are two, phonemic /-htove/ and /-nove/. I have been unable to find any semantic difference between forms containing one or the other. The narrator of "The Spit Man" text used two nearly identical impersonal verbs one immediately after the other. The first used the /-htove/ suffix while the second used the /-nove/ suffix:

25) é-h-móhee-ohtsé-stove é-h-móhen-óe-nove
3-PST-gather-move-IMPERS 3-PST-gather-stand(?)-IMPERS
"'There is a meeting, there is a meeting,'

é-'-óhke-tóxe-het-áhtsé-sest-o
3-PST-HABIT-around-tell:AN-RECIP-ATTRIB-3PL
they told each other." (17:7)

(The source abbreviation (17:7) in 25) refers to page 17, clause 7, of the collection of texts edited by W. Leman (1980). We will use this abbreviation format hereafter.) Exactly the same AI stem, -móhenóe is used in the second verb of 25) as in an impersonal verb in the second clause of "The Spit Man". In 25) the stem takes the /-nove/ suffix, while the same stem takes the /-htove/ in the second clause of the text. I suspect that the /ht/ vs. /n/ alternation is rooted in the Algonquian historical development of

Cheyenne.

Other examples of Cheyenne impersonals follow:

26) é-méséhé-stove
3-eat-IMPERS
'There is eating'

27) é-péhéve-tanó-htove
3-good-mental-IMPERS
'There is happiness'

It is possible to pluralize an impersonal, in which case a speaker is asserting that some action took place on more than one occasion:

28) é-méséhé-stóvé-néstse
3-eat-IMPERS-IIPL
'There are eatings'

Cheyenne impersonal verbs simply predicate some action, with no core arguments permitted. Impersonals are built on AI verb stems, that is, they are predications about actions of animates. The AI stem plus impersonal suffix is itself inflected as an II verb, which is consistent with the impersonal status as having no nominal argument. Weather verbs, which are also encoded as II verbs, never take appear as impersonal constructions. There is no animate argument involved in the propositional content of weather constructions, whereas an implied animate is involved in impersonal constructions, requiring the AI stem, albeit presence of the impersonal suffix indicates that no specific animate is subject or agent. Rather we can view impersonals as having generic argument semantics.

Cross-linguistically, impersonal constructions often involve indefinite pronouns, such as German man and French on. In Cheyenne, there is no morphological relationship between indefinite pronouns, which we will describe in Section 2.9, and impersonal verbs.

In texts impersonals can be used to set the stage for action for nominal arguments which are established later in discourse. In the text "The Trek from Oklahoma" there are three impersonals out of the first four verbs of the text. We will save space here by presenting some data only in English gloss but indicating pertinent Cheyenne forms where they appear. Clauses are numbered in this text:

29) 1) Long ago there was moving (IMPERS) of the camp (no overt nominal).
2) There was arrival (IMPERS) in Oklahoma. 3) People (overt nominal) started to be sick (AI) and there was hunger (IMPERS). (9:1-3)

An impersonal verb, with the preverb me'- 'should', can be used (31) rather than a direct imperative (30), apparently to socially distance a speaker from what he is trying to get his hearer to do:

- 30) ho'soo'è-stse
 dance-IMPV
 'Dance!'
- 31) é-me'-ho'sóe-stove
 3-should-dance-IMPERS
 'There should be dancing'

2.3. Unspecified subject

Cross-linguistically, impersonal constructions often relate to unspecified subject phenomena. In Cheyenne, impersonals and unspecified subjects are treated differently morphologically, although there is an obvious semantic similarity which involves the absence of an explicit argument. The semantic difference is that while impersonal verbs have no nominal argument at all, unspecified subject verbs contain one nominal argument, never agent, usually patient.

Cheyenne has no true passive. But as in other Algonquian languages, the unspecified subject verb can be considered a kind of passive. Specifically, it would be an agentless passive, also known as a "short passive".

Unspecified subject verbs with animate objects take TA stems, i.e. indication of animacy of object, but word-final AI inflection. This is consistent with the cross-linguistic detransitivizing nature of passivization:

- 32) ná-vóom-āne
 1-see:AN-x:1
 'I was seen'
- 33) né-vóom-āne
 2-see:AN-x:2
 'You were seen'
- 34) é-vóom-e
 3-see:AN-x:3
 'He was seen'
- 35) ná-vóom-ané-me
 1-see:AN-x:1-1PL
 'We (excl.) were seen'

The "x" refers to the unspecified subject. Note how 32-35) relate to the prefix-assigning person hierarchy. There is no specification of who the semantic agent/actor is. So the highest ranked person left on the hierarchy in each case is the semantic patient, or informally, the object. The person of this argument which is left is marked prefixally.

It is not possible to specify anything about an agent in unspecified

subject forms. Even a construction with an unidentified referent indefinite pronoun would be ungrammatical:

- 36) ná-oom-āne *nevá'eséstse
1-hit:AN-x:1 someone
('I was hit *by someone')

It is also possible for objects of unspecified subject constructions to be inanimate. In such cases that I am aware of, the construction is built with a TI stem, then suffixed with an impersonal suffix found in 2.2, e.g.

- 37) ho'évohkótse é-mésè-stove
meat 3-eat:INAN-IMPERS
'The meat (inanimate) was eaten'

2.4. Reflexive

When the object argument of a transitive verb is coreferential with its subject argument, the verb receives the reflexive suffix:

- 38) ná-vóom-ahtse
1-see:AN-REFL
'I saw myself'

Reflexive verbs take AI inflection, consistent with the cross-linguistic detransitivizing nature of reflexivization. Note, however, that the verb stem retains marking for animacy of its object. This animacy-indicating stem agreement marker (SAM) is -m in 38). The REFL suffix is invariant as -ahtse, phonemic /-ahte/ ~ /-ahté/, throughout an entire conjugation, except when the subject is obviative, in which case there is the expected word-final phonological change for obviatives:

- 39) he-stóna-ho é-vóom-àhtó-ho
3POSS-daughter-OBV 3-see:AN-REFL-OBV
'His daughter (obv.) saw herself'

2.5. Reciprocal

In Cheyenne when the subject of a reflexively marked verb is plural, the verb is potentially ambiguous between a reflexive or reciprocal reading:

- 40) é-oom-àhtse-o'o
3-hit:AN-REFL-3PL
'They hit themselves/they hit each other'

Reciprocals and reflexives use the same verbal -ahtse suffix. Usually, semantic context produces an intended reading. A speaker may further specify for a reciprocal reading with the reciprocal pronoun nonámé'tó'e

'each other'. Addition of this pronoun disallows a reflexive reading when ambiguity might be possible.

In "The Story of a Ghost", the narrator at one point says of two main participants:

- 41) é-s-ta-osáane-ase-néhovan-àhtsé-sest-o
3-PST-away-commence-start-wrestle-REFL-ATTRIB-3PL
'They began to wrestle' (35:61)

Probably only linguists would imagine a possible reflexive reading here. Wrestling would seldom be done with oneself. But a few clauses later in the text, the narrator added the reciprocal pronoun, speaking of the same two participants:

- 42) nonámé'tó'e é-s-ta-tšěše-néhovan-àhtsé-sest-o
each.other 3-PST-away-?-wrestle-REFL-ATTRIB-3PL
'They were wrestling each other'

The reciprocal pronoun is a complex nominal. The morpheme mé'tó'e can appear as a free form meaning something like 'instead of, in place of'. The first part of the reciprocal pronoun strikes me as being some kind of reduplication, which in Cheyenne indicates multiple action of some kind.

2.6. Possessive

Cheyenne has no possessive pronouns. Rather, person of the possessor is marked prefixally on a possessed noun. Suffixes on the noun encode number of possessor and possessed, and obviation of possessed. An animate noun possessed by a third person is obligatorily obviative. The possessive prefixes are similar to those for personal prefixes on independent order verbs:

- 43) na- '1POSS'
44) ne- '2POSS'
45) he- '3POSS'

Contrast 43-45) with the verbal prefixes in 1-3). Note that the verbal personal prefixes are high-pitched, except in future tense verbs: n[a- '1', né- '2', and é- '3'. Note, also, that the third person possessive prefix has an initial h. In addition to the prefixes of 43-45) there is a so-called unspecified possessor prefix:

- 46) ma- 'unspecified possessor'

ma- is used to prefix noun stems which cannot appear as free forms such as -'évo 'nose' or -'éxa 'eye', when no personal possessive prefix is specified. Frantz and Creighton (1982) argue for an allomorphic analysis, that the Blackfoot cognate of ma- is a part of the noun stem, without a meaning of 'unspecified possessor'. Linguistically untrained Cheyennes, of course, would not define ma- as being an "unspecified possessor prefix", but it seems to me that the prefixal analysis is preferred on grounds of

pattern regularity (which Frantz and Creighton do discuss) and probably semantics, as well. While I have investigated the semantics, I am not sure that the results are conclusive and will not pursue this further here. Typically, a translation of a ma- prefixed form can simply leave off any mention of possession, as seen in 49) below. Examples illustrating variety of person, number, and animacy of the possessed noun follow:

- 47) na-maahe
1POSS-arrow
'my arrow (inan.)'
- 48) he-maahe-vó-tse
3POSS-arrow-3PL-INAN.PL
'their arrows'
- 49) ma-'éxa
UNSPEC.POSS-eye
'eye'
- 50) ne-'éxae-nó-tse
2-eye-1PL-INAN.PL
'our (incl.) eyes'
- 51) na-'éxae-nó-tse
1-eye-1PL-INAN.PL
'our (excl.) eyes'
- 52) he-měšem-o
3POSS-grandfather-OBV
'his grandfather(s) (obv.)'
- 53) ne-měšéme-vo-o'o
2POSS-grandfather-2PL-3PL
'your (pl.) grandfathers'

Synchronically, there is another set with high pitch on the possessive prefixes. The high pitch reflects a long vowel which occurred in etyma in Proto-Algonquian. There is synchronic difficulty in dividing off the prefixes on these forms, but we cannot discuss this further in this paper. Some examples with the alternate marking system are:

- 54) n-étove
1POSS-body
'my body (inan.)'
- 55) étove
2POSS:body
'your (sg.) body'
- 56) he-vétove-vó-tse
3POSS-body-3PL-INAN.PL
'their bodies'

There are other details of Cheyenne possession which are not directly relevant to a study of pronominal categories, so we will not describe them here. See W. Leman (1979) for an elementary introduction to Cheyenne possession and numerous examples with full possessive paradigms.

S&D (1983) describe a set of free possessive pronouns for Ojibwa. Ojibwa also has the prefixal system, cognate to that which we have just described for Cheyenne. Cheyenne lacks a free set.

2.7. Noun-replacive

English noun-replacive pronouns are *mine*, *yours*, *theirs*, etc. Cheyenne lacks true noun-replacive pronouns, but has similar semantics in a construction with the obligatorily possessed noun stem -htsehótse which means something like 'property, possession':

57) ná-htsehótse
1POSS-property
'mine'

This noun stem can be fully declined in the possessive paradigm.

2.8. Emphatic

So far, our survey of Cheyenne pronominal categories has only concerned morphological affixation. Such categories are typically highly anaphoric in discourse. We now begin description of free forms which have pronominal function.

We label the first category as emphatic pronouns. Examples of English emphatic pronouns (which in other constructions happen to serve double duty as reflexive pronouns as well) are *myself*, *ourselves*, *herself*, etc., as in:

58) I painted the house myself.

59) She herself did it.

The Cheyenne emphatic forms which we shall examine in 2.8.1 and 2.8.2 are inflected as AI verbs, but they often function much as pronouns do.

2.8.1. Independent order

The forms which we label as emphatics are fully inflected as independent and conjunct order AI verbs. The conjunct set will be described in 2.8.2. The independent order set (from W. Leman 1979:30) follows in 60). For now, we gloss them with English personal pronouns, but, as we shall soon see, this is an oversimplification:

60) ná-néehove 'I'
né-néehove 'you (sg.)'

é-néehove	'he/she'
é-néehóvó-ho	'he/she (obv.)'
ná-néehóvé-me	'we (excl.)'
né-néehóve-ma	'we (incl.)'
né-néehóvé-me	'you (pl.)'
é-néehóve-o'o	'they (an.)'

The prefixes and suffixes are clearly of the AI set as can be seen by comparing forms in Section 2.1.

The forms in 60) function as free form personal pronouns in conjoined NPs:

61) na-měšéme naa nánéehove ná-tá-hó'e'ov-ó-ne
 1POSS-grandfather and I 1-away-follow-DIR:3-1PL

ného'éeéhe
 1POSS:father
 'Grandpa and I followed my father' (19:44)

Elsewhere, these free forms typically contribute an emphatic sense. In an interview I conducted on issues concerning presentday Cheyenne literacy, my informant's responses were often directed back to herself, emphasizing her own behavior as an example of a point she was making:

62) há mó'óhtse nánéehove ná-ohké-héne'ená-tanó-'ta
 for.example I.myself 1-HABIT-know-want-it
 'For example, I myself want to know it...' (Interview, p. 2)

Petter, established dean of Cheyenne linguists, said in his dictionary (1915:566) under the entry for the English pronoun I: "only when special stress is laid upon the 'I' is 'nane[e]hov' used". He also lists nánéehove as the only Cheyenne form for the entry myself.

An emphatic pronoun can be used in a copular construction to identify someone. Last summer I obtained a text from an old man who began his story about the Cheyennes' claim to gold in the Black Hills of South Dakota with the following:

63) nánéehove Náhkóhe-o'émóxe'eha
 I bear-sole
 'I am Bear Soles'

The old man, as narrator, was identifying himself to his audience, whom he addressed in the following clause with Cheyenne vocatives, 'my relatives and my friends'. In such a copular construction I doubt that this "pronoun" has an emphatic function. It simply identifies. One can also identify oneself, by giving one's name, followed by Cheyenne which means 'that is what I am named', but this would seem to focus upon the name, rather than upon identification of self, a subtle difference, I believe.

As verbs, these forms can be negated:

64) ma'enóhkevo'eha ná-sáa-néehóvé-he é-x-hé-hoo'o
 Turtle.Moccasin 1-NEG-stand.be(?) -NEG 3-PST-say-MEDIATE
 "'I am not Turtle Moccasin,' he said" (57:71)

More literally, we might gloss 64) as "'Turtle Moccasin, I am not he,' he said". We will have more to say, a little later, about the tentative gloss of 'stand.be' in the pronoun.

These forms can receive the normal word-final -he interrogative suffix:

65) né-néehóve-he 'Is it you?/Are you the one?'

These "pronouns" can also be imperatives:

66) naa kásováahe-ho mó-Ø-h-néšé-he-vó-he.
 and young.men-PL DUB-3-PST-two-NEG-3PL-NONAFFIRM.
 "And there were two young men.

mó-Ø-h-né-het-ó-he-vó-he
 DUB-3-PST-ANAPH-say-DIR(3:4)-NEG-4-NONAFFIRM
 He told them,

ta-néehóvé-héne é-x-het-ó-sest-o
 away-stand.be(?) -DELAY.IMPV 3-PST-say-DIR(3:4)-ATTRIB-4
 'You (pl.) be the ones!' he told them."

The last word in the second line of Cheyenne in 66) is a delayed imperative verb, built on the "pronoun" stem we have been examining.

These emphatic "pronouns" can be part of cleft-like constructions. This should not be surprising, since they focus upon the identity of an individual. Cross-linguistically, cleft constructions have a similar focusing function. Note these Cheyenne examples:

67) né-néehove né-ta-vóom-átse tsé-to'se-véstoēm-ótse
 2-stand.be(?) 2-away-see:AN-INV(2:1) CJT-gonna-sit.with-2:3
 'You are the one (whom) I select (lit. see) to marry

ná-htona
 1POSS-daughter
 my daughter' (62:60)

68) né-néehove né-né-heše-mane-stse
 2-stand.be(?) 2-ANAPH-thus-make-it
 'You're the one that caused it to happen' (JG)

The emphatic form can be used for informational repair (a kind of contrastive focus) with the same cleft-like construction. The following elicited interchange between two speakers, A and B, is, I believe, quite representative of how one Cheyenne speaker might repair information as to

identity of a participant:

69) A: Amé'há'e mó-péhév-o'eétahe tsé-h-pén-óhe
 Flying Woman DUB-good-do CJT-PST-pound-it
 'Elena must have done a nice job pounding it (e.g. drymeat)'
 (CJT=Conjunct prefix)

B: hová'áháne ná-néehove tsé-pénóóhtse
 no 1-stand.be(?) CJT-pound(3:it)
 'No, I am the one who pounded it' (DLB)

The so-called predicative pronouns, to be described in 2.12 are commonly used as the cleft-focus element for third person referents.

S&D (1983) describe free personal pronouns for Ojibwa:

70) niin 'I'
 kiin 'you (sg.)'
 wiin 'he/she'
 niinawint 'we (excl.)'
 kiinawint 'we (incl.)'
 kiinawaa 'you (pl.)'
 wiinawaa 'they'

I have substituted sequenced vowels for S&D's long vowel notation of a macron over a vowel. The Ojibwa personal pronouns appear to be used in similar ways to those we are describing in this section for Cheyenne, e.g. in compound NPs and to indicate emphasis. Cognate free pronouns exist in other Algonquian languages (e.g. Clarke 1982 for Montagnais, Wolfart 1973 for Cree, and Voorhis 1974 for Kickapoo). Apparently, in the other Algonquian languages, these are true pronouns, whereas the Cheyenne forms are inflectionally verbs.

Givón (1976, 1984) has forcefully argued that verb agreement is the last stage in a diachronic process of

71) independent PRO > unstressed PRO > clitic PRO > verb agreement

We have, of course, no way to totally prove or disprove this hypothesis in a language like Cheyenne, for which we have no written records beyond barely 100 years (and the broad outlines of the language are virtually unchanged since then). But we should note that the Cheyenne reflex of long vowels in Proto-Algonquian (reflected in 70) in the double vowel notation) is high pitch. As described in 2.1, personal verbal prefixes are high pitched, the expected reflex of the initial long vowels of 70). It is conceivable that the evolution of 71) was somehow part of the history of Cheyenne.

But there are also problems for this analysis. If Proto-Algonquian (PA) independent pronouns eroded to become prefixal agreement, then why would Cheyenne prefixes be high-pitched while cognate verbal prefixes in other Algonquian languages are short vowels? All historical work on PA

(e.g. Goddard 1967) has simply reconstructed the verbal prefixes as *ne- 'first person', *ke- 'second person', and for some verbal forms, *we- 'third person', with corresponding expected Cheyenne reflexes of na-, ne- and he-, respectively. This is, however, not the verbal prefix set, which is, for non-future tense verbs, rather, ná-, né-, and é-. The first Cheyenne forms given here are, instead, the possessive prefix set, as described in 2.6, above.

As far as I know, other Algonquian languages use the same prefix set for both verbs and possession, with a few constraints on the third person prefix for verbs. If the evolution of 71) is to hold for Cheyenne, we must account somehow for the different development for the verbal and possessive prefixes. Two explanations come to mind, one following 71) would say that the Cheyenne verbal prefixes actually did derive from the PA independent pronouns, with normal phonological erosion which typically accompanies this process. This would explain high pitch on the Cheyenne verbal prefixes. We would have to account for the low pitches on the possessive prefixes separately. The weakness of this account is that it does not explain the unique development of the pitches of Cheyenne verbal prefixes vis-a-vis the prefixes of other Algonquian languages.

The other explanation is a teleological one. This, in essence, would say that Algonquian verbs have always had short vowel prefixes, coexisting with long vowel independent pronouns. Cheyenne speakers wanted a more salient way to distinguish the verbal from possessive prefixes, and independently placed high pitch on the verbal prefixes to accomplish this differentiation. Such "independent" development did not have to be necessarily spontaneous, it could have been by analogy with the long vowel PA independent pronouns. I shall pursue these matters further in W. Leman (to appear), in discussion of grammaticalization of various elements of the Cheyenne verb.

The gist of this discussion is that we do not know if Cheyenne verbal (or possessive, for that matter) prefixes evolved from free personal pronouns.

Finally, we should touch on the possible diachrony of the stem -néehove which is the core of the emphatic pronouns of this section. Obviously, this stem is phonologically very long compared to the verbal prefixes. We know from segmental correspondences that the stem is not directly derived from the PA free form pronouns, although a historical relationship may exist somehow. I am inclined to regard this stem as some kind of independent development with regards to pronominal semantics.

The AI stem for 'stand' is -néé. I believe that the TA stem is -nééh. The equative final is -ve 'be' (from PA *-wi) as seen in

72) é-hetane-ve
3-man-be
'He is a man'

I consider it possible that the stem -néehove, phonemically /-nééhóve/,

somehow derived from a combination of the meanings of 'stand' and 'be'. There is a great deal of speculation in this. It is entirely possible that the stem, instead, is a rather ordinary reflex of some other Algonquian form, possibly having some pronominal function. Further insight into the meaning of the stem awaits another day.

2.8.2. Conjunct order

We mentioned earlier that conjunct order verbs take suffixal pronominal affixation, as opposed to a combination of prefix and suffixal marking for independent order verbs. A full conjunct set of emphatic pronouns occurs in Cheyenne (W. Leman 1979:112):

- 73) tsé-h-néehóvé-to 'I who am he/I myself'
 tsé-h-néehóvé-to 'you (sg.) who are he/you yourself'
 tsé-h-néehóvé-se 'he who is he/he himself'
 tsé-h-néehóvé-tsése 'he (obv.) who is he/he (obv.) himself'
 tsé-h-néehóvé-tse 'we who are we/we ourselves'
 tsé-h-néehóvé-se 'you (pl.) who are you/you (pl.) yourselves'
 tsé-h-néehóvé-vóse 'they who are they/they themselves'

The glosses of 73) are, admittedly, a little awkward; usage in actual examples can be glossed with more natural English. The first person exclusive/inclusive contrast seen in independent order verbs (e.g. 60), above) and possessed nouns (e.g. 50-51), is neutralized in all conjunct forms, including adverbial clauses, relative clauses, and complement clauses. We call the forms of 73) conjunct emphatic pronouns, but the same disclaimers pertain here as they did in the preceding section: these forms are actually inflected as ordinary conjunct verbs.

The /h-/ following the conjunct prefix tsé-, appears to be the normal /h-/ found in that position in conjunct verbs which function as adverbial clauses. In adverbial clauses, the /h-/ gives some kind of "oblique" reading to the verb, most commonly temporal or locative. I would have expected conjunct forms which function something like pronouns to lack the /h-/ as conjunct relative clause verbs (participles) do, and take the participle third person endings seen by comparing the conjunct adverbials of 74-75) with the participles of 76-77):

- 74) tsé-h-néméné-se
 CJT-PST-sing-3
 'when he sang'
- 75) tsé-h-néméné-vóse
 CJT-PST-sing-3PL
 'when they sang'
- 76) tsé-néméné-stse
 CJT-sing-3:PARTICIPLE
 'he who sings/the singer'

- 77) tsé-némene-se
 CJT-sing-3PL:PARTICIPLE
 'they who sing/the singers'

At this point I cannot explain why the conjunct emphatic "pronouns" take the /h-/. Petter (1915, 1952) glosses these forms as he glosses h-less true participles, and I think he is correct in doing so. For example, he glosses (1952:21) tséhnééhóvéto as 'I, the one who'.

In texts and conversation, the conjunct emphatics seem to behave much like the independent order emphatics do, but with less ability to stand alone as independent clauses. Their semantics is nearly the same, which is to be expected since both use the same -néehove stem.

A conjunct emphatic can appear as part of a conjoined NP:

- 78) é-ohke-no'ke-nóhtóv-óhomo'he naa tséhnééhóvéto
 3-HABIT-alone-know-dance and I
 'Only she knew how to dance, and me'

The singular referent of the first verb is a *káse'ééhe* 'young lady' introduced in the preceding clause of this text. The reference to self is conjoined to the singular subject verb. We could gloss 78) in more natural English as 'Only she and I knew how to dance', but this would not respect the singular verb agreement. If the verb indexed both referents, it would require plural agreement.

The Interview text uses conjunct emphatics as well as the independent emphatics mentioned with example 62):

- 79) naa é-hoháe-hótoanáto tsé-het-óxe'-ohe é-ohké-hevoone taamááhe
 and 3-very.much-difficult CJT-thus-write-x:I 3-HABIT-say:3PL own
 "'And it is really difficult how it is written,' they say (for?)

 tséhnééhóvévóse
 they.themselves
 their ownelves" (Interview, p. 1)

I believe that the essence of this sentence is that the speaker is saying that Cheyennes say that Petter's orthography in the Bible he translated (spoken of in this text's preceding sentence) is very difficult for themselves to read. We will describe the free form pronoun *taamááhe* 'own', which appears in 79), in Section 2.8.3.

As conjunct verbs, the emphatic forms of 73) cannot appear as imperatives or interrogatives. They could be negated, as other conjunct forms can be. They can appear as complement clauses:

- 80) naa néhe'se hotáhtse
 and then apparently
 'And then apparently

mó-Ø-s-tá-héne'enov-ó-he-vovó-he
 DUB-3-PST-away-know:AN-DIR(33:4)-NEW-33:4-NONAFFIRM
 they knew

tsé-heše-néehóvé-vóse néhe he'e-o'o
 CJT-COMP-stand.be(?) -3PL ANAPH.DEMO:distal:AN woman-PL
 that those women were the ones'

Complement clauses typically appear in the conjunct order. See W. Leman (1986) for further description of Cheyenne complementation.

2.8.3. Genitive reflexive

The pronoun taamááhe, seen in 79) intensifies coreference, similar to how the English genitive reflexive pronoun own does:

81) She helped her own daughter.

82) He painted that picture for his own house.

Petter's dictionary (1915:789) translates taamááhe as 'own'. One of the examples he gave is:

83) taamááhe he-móxe'éstoo'o
 own 3POSS-book
 'his own book'

2.8.4. Other emphatic forms

A number of other fully inflected lexical sets which have various emphatic meanings occur in Cheyenne. This is not the place to list their entire paradigms. All of them occur as free forms and can function pronominally. We cannot give much detail on these, since we want to leave room in this paper to focus on those free form elements which function most anaphorically.

2.8.4.1. 'body/sake'

The bound stem for 'body' can act as a kind of pronoun:

84) nétove 'my body' (the noun stem is -étove 'body')

84) is part of a possessed noun paradigm which is inflected for all persons and numbers. Petter (1952:20) claims that 84) can be glossed as 'by me, for my sake.'¹ I would expect 85) to be grammatical:

85) ná-né-hešéve étove
 2-ANAPH-do 2POSS-body
 'I did it for your sake'

84) could be used instead of the second person possessor pronoun in

85). In such case, the new clause would be translated as 'I did it for my sake'. Cheyenne reflexives are marked suffixally on verbs (Section 2.4), but the 'body' "pronoun" can add a reflexive idea to a clause. I would guess that it would be especially called for when its referent appears as a reflexive with semantic role other than patient or dative, both of which we would expect to be marked with the reflexive suffix on a transitive verb.

Pronominal use of a term for 'body' is interesting cross-linguistically. Schachter (1985:28) points out:

In a good many languages, reflexive forms are analyzable as a head nominal modified by a pronominal possessive agreeing with the subject. Often the head nominal occurs as a common noun meaning 'head' or 'body'.

In the future I would like to investigate pronominal use of the Cheyenne 'body' forms further.

2.8.4.2. 'alone'

A complete set of "pronouns" occurs with conjunct verb suffix inflection, word-initial *néh-*, and AI verb stem *-no'kahe* meaning 'be one/be alone'. Two examples are:

- 86) *néhno'káhéto* 'I alone'
néhno'káhétse 'we alone'

2.8.4.3. 'all'

A similar complete conjunct set occurs with stem meaning 'all of', e.g.

- 87) *néstóxétse* 'all of us'
néstóxévòse 'all of them'

2.8.4.4. 'whole of'

Another complete conjunct paradigm (Petter 1952:20-21) refers to the entirety of a set, e.g.

- 88) *něšemáhéto* 'the whole of me'
něšemáhése 'the whole of you (pl.)'

Note that *máhe-* by itself means 'all'. I am not sure what *něše-* contributes here.

2.8.4.5. Numbers

Cheyenne numbers can function adjectivally as in

89) neše hetane-o
two man-PL
'two men'

or pronominally as in

90) é-x-hóse-né-het-ó-hoono na'éstse
3-PST-again-ANAPH-say-DIR(3:4)-MED(3:4) one
'she told one (child), ...' (23:13)

Numbers can also take the same conjunct marking seen in 86), which is, of course, itself a number. In 91) néhnévévòse seems to be functioning pronominally:

91) naa néhe'še m-Ø-s-ta-osáane-aseohe-he-vó-he
and then DUB-3-PST-away-commence-leave-NEG-3PL-NONAFFIRM

néh-névé-vòse
?-four-3PL

'And then those four started to go' (7:32)

A conjunct number "pronoun" néh-néšé-vòse 'both of them' occurs in the text collection (25:5).

The néh- prefix of 86) and 91) may be the same prefix found in 87). Both would be phonemically /néh-/. This may be cliticized néhe, which is a demonstrative pronoun only used anaphorically, to be described below in 2.13.2. The conjunct forms in 86), 87), and 91), often (usually?) function anaphorically in texts, and if this preclitic analysis is correct, it is additional support for regarding these conjunct forms as kinds of anaphoric pronominal devices.

In summary, Cheyenne uses verb agreement to index core arguments. It uses free form "pronouns" to additionally mark arguments which typically are emphasized. T. Payne (1985) found a similar state of affairs in Yagua, a South American Indian language, which uses its free pronouns contrastively, as opposed to noncontrastive verb agreement.

2.9. Indefinite

In this section and the next we list some indefinite and nonspecific Cheyenne pronouns. The distinction between these two categories is not always clearcut and what distinction there is depends, obviously, on a speaker's intent concerning referentiality at a particular point in a discourse.

The same word, e.g. vo'éstane 'person, someone', can sometimes be used referentially to refer to a specific person (in which case I would class it as a noun):

92) tsé'tóhe vo'éstane é-péhév-oéstomo'he
 DEMO:AN:proximal person 3-good-character
 'This person is kind'

or it may be part of an indefinite NP introduced by na'éstse 'one' which can serve as an indefinite article:

93) na'éstse vo'éstane é-h-vée-hoo'o
 one person 3-PST-camp-MED
 'A person was camping'

or it may serve as a nonspecific pronoun-like noun substitute meaning 'someone' as in:

94) hé'tóhe mo'kéha-nótse ná-manéstóotáh-ahtse-nótse.
 DEMO:INAN:proximal moccasin-PL 1-make.for-REFL-INAN.PL
 'I'm making these moccasins for myself.'

ná-to'se-taomé-he-mo'kéhane-nótse naa mátó-héva vo'éstane
 1-gonna-on.own-have-be.moccasined-INAN.PL and also-maybe person
 They are gonna be my own moccasins or if someone

máx-ho'áe-stse ná-hta-něšé-hohtóva-nótse
 SBJCTV-want-3:INAN 1-FUT:away-continue-sell-INAN:PL
 wants them I'll sell them' (73:4-6)

Remembering that classification as indefinite or nonspecific is not clearcut we list a number of forms. Each listed form can function pronominally, that is, it can stand alone as a kind of noun substitute. As their equivalents in English, hóséstse, na'éstse, and háesto also can function adjectivally in NPs:

95) Some indefinites

hóséstse 'some' (both inan. and animate)
 nevá'eséstse 'someone' (identity at time of speaking is unknown to the speaker)
 nevá'ésesto 'someones' (awkward gloss; form is plural)
 hénáá'énése 'something' (identity unknown to speaker)
 hénóvá'énése 'something' (identity unknown to speaker)
 na'éstse 'one' (other numbers may be indefinites also)
 háesto 'many'

The forms noted as having an identity unknown to the speaker end with attributive suffixes. These suffixes mark verbs as being of the attributive mode. It is significant that a few nominal forms, such as those listed in 95) may also take this suffix. The attributive mode has to do with information not directly known to a speaker. One kind of such verbal information is hearsay. Another kind, relevant here, relates to something a speaker knows to be occurring or existing, but for which the precise identity of some aspect of it is unknown to the speaker, typically because he cannot directly or clearly see, taste, (etc.) it. Further details belong

in a separate study of the important category of Cheyenne evidentiality.

2.10. Nonspecific

Nonspecific forms are those for which a speaker is not referring to a specific individual or individuals. There are complications in determining such referential status. We cannot pursue them further here. Discussion of some complications is found in Lyons (1977:187ff). Set 98) is particularly interesting because, with the exception of the first form, they all seem able to participate in "flip-flop" semantics in certain contexts. To illustrate hová'éhe means 'something' in an affirmative context:

96) ná-ho'ahe hová'éhe
1-want something
'I want something'

but 'anything' in a negative context:

97) ná-sáa-ho'áhé-he hová'éhe
1-NEG-want-NOAFFIRM something
'I don't want anything'

The "flip-flop" semantics is a point of amusement and sometimes frustration to some bilingual Cheyennes.

98) Some nonspecifics:

hovánee'e 'no one, nobody'
hováneehóho 'no one, nobody (obv.)'
hová'éhe 'something, anything, nothing'
hová'ehótse 'things'
tósa'e 'Where?/somewhere'
tóne'se 'When?/sometime'
tónesto 'How many?/however many'
tónéstoha 'How many times?/however many times'

2.11. Interrogative

The last four items of 98) are interrogative words (pro-adverbs) which double as nonspecifics in non-interrogative contexts. Interrogative words which ask for the identity of nominals are typically regarded as "interrogative pronouns" (Petter 1952:22; MacLeish 1971:100; Schachter 1985:34). This label is appropriate since these pro-forms substitute for nouns. (The pro-adverbs of (98) substitute for semantic classes of place, time, number, and number of times.)

We cannot detail the behavior of Cheyenne interrogative pronouns in this paper. We should point out that an interrogative pronoun appears clause-initial, one of the few word order constraints of Cheyenne. This constraint is consistent with an overall pragmatic pattern in Cheyenne that highly discontinuous, focused or emphasized material appears preverbal.

Interrogative pronouns are inflected for animacy, number, and obviation:

99) hénáá'e 'What?'
hénova'e 'What?'
hénová'éto 'What?'
hénová'etse 'What (relational)? (relational is similar to obviative;
see discussion below)
hénová'ehótse 'What (pl.)?'
hénová'etotse 'What (pl. relational)?'

névááhe 'Who?'
néváéso 'Who?'
neváesóho 'Who (obv.)?'
neváeseo'o 'Who (pl.)?'

táase 'Which one (inan.)?'
táasévoonéstse 'Which ones (inan.)?'
táasévoo'o 'Which one (an.)?'
táasévoone 'Which ones (an.)?'

A brief introduction to Cheyenne questions, with illustrative uses of the forms in 99), is found in W. Leman (1979:183-187).

2.12. Predicative

I label the forms in this section predicative pronouns because they typically help predicate something about a referent, yet they have features of being noun-substitutes. Predicative pronouns are inflected for animacy, number, obviation (here subsuming "relational" inanimates under obviation), distance, and anaphoric status. Even though these forms "predicate", they are not verbs: they do not take verbal prefixes; they cannot take negation, nor the verbal -he interrogative suffix; like interrogative pronouns they only refer to third persons. They clearly enter into Cheyenne deixis, yet some predicative pronouns are also highly anaphoric.

I briefly listed and described predicative pronouns in W. Leman (1984) in discussion of "Cheyenne Deixis and Sound Symbolism". What follows is a much fuller treatment.

Cheyenne locatives, predicative pronouns, and demonstratives are inflected for two degrees of distance, proximal and distal. They are also marked as to whether or not the speaker assumes that the referent has already been established in the immediate discourse context, or sometimes, in the larger shared knowledge context of speaker and hearer. I regard a form which is thusly assumed known or established as being anaphoric (ANAPH). The opposite of anaphoric (NONANAPH) with regards to these forms is basically a kind of pointing to something which is new information. The label "deictic" is not alone sufficient for the latter, since both categories have a deictic function. Anaphoric elements of a language point

"back" (to established referents) while these NONANAPH elements point to new referents.

100) Inanimate predicative pronouns

	PROXIMAL	DISTAL
NONANAPH (sg.)	heta'háanéhe	hata'háanéhe
NONANAPH (sg. obv.)	heta'háanetséhe	hata'háanetséhe
NONANAPH (pl.)	heta'háanevótse	hata'háanevótse
NONANAPH (pl. obv.)	heta'háanetsevótse	hata'háanetsevótse
ANAPH (sg.)	hena'háanéhe	hana'háanéhe
ANAPH (sg. obv.)	hena'háanetséhe	hana'háanetséhe
ANAPH (pl.)	hena'háanevótse	hana'háanevótse
ANAPH (pl. obv.)	hena'háanetsevótse	hana'háanetsevótse

Cheyenne inanimate nouns which are "obviated" are not themselves marked for obviation yet the verbs for which they are arguments are marked with "relational" inflection (parallel to obviative marking which concerns animates). While "obviated" inanimate nouns are not marked differently from proximate inanimate nouns, pronouns are, or at least interrogative and predicative inanimate pronouns are. Recall that animate obviatives are indifferent as to number. But inanimate obviation (i.e. relational) is sensitive to number. The labels obviative and relational come from the Algonquianist literature.

101) Animate predicative pronouns

	PROXIMAL	DISTAL
NONANAPH (sg.)	tsea'háanéhe	taa'háanéhe
NONANAPH (pl./obv.)	tsea'háanevóhe	taa'háanevóhe
ANAPH (sg.)	nea'háanéhe	naa'háanéhe
ANAPH (pl./obv.)	nea'háanevóhe	naa'háanevóhe

There are some similarities between word endings of predicative pronouns and verbs of the dubitative mode paradigm (see forms in W. Leman 1979). If the animate predicative pronouns which are plural or obviative actually end in *vóhe*, the similarity to the dubitative paradigm would be even greater. I shall pursue the phonetic detail further with native speakers.

In W. Leman (1984) I described the "sound symbolism" patterning which can be seen in 100-101). If an entity is close, use the vowel e in the first syllable (up front in the mouth), while if an entity is far, use a "far" vowel, a, in the first syllable. We will see this same symbolic patterning with demonstratives in Section 2.13. The opposition of front vs. back vowel is a common cross-linguistic correlate of deictic distance. Use of n in the first (for animates) or second (for inanimates) syllable marks an anaphoric entity, while parallel use of t marks an entity not yet

established in the discourse. This has no cross-linguistic precedent, that I am aware of. It does, however, correlate with phoric deixis in Cheyenne verbs. *ne-* precedes the relator preverb *heše-* in verbs and points a listener back to some previous discourse "chunk" or action, while *tse-* (phonemic /te/) plus relator preverb points a listener to some propositional "chunk" about to be introduced in discourse.

2.12.1. Deictic use

Predicative pronouns are often used to point out an entity (object or person). If it is an entity which the speaker assumes the hearer knows about, then the ANAPH form is used. Otherwise, the NONANAPH form is used. If the entity is relatively nearby, a proximal form is used; otherwise, the distal form is used. If the speaker is referring to plural entities, then a plural form is used. Such "pointing" deictic use may take place within conversation, or within text. Textual "pointing" to established entities amounts to anaphora and will be described later. For now, it is important to note that there is no absolute categorical boundary between deixis and anaphora. Their uses are intimately related in language.

If a speaker motions (the motioning may be contextually understood or often by lip gesture; finger pointing is impolite) to something and says:

102) *hena'háanéhe*

the form is understood to mean 'there it is' or 'that's the one'. The entity referred to is assumed to be an established part of the discourse context. Note the predicative idea in the English gloss.

Translations of the other forms of 100) and 101) can be determined from the example of 102). Hence, if I point to a tree (animate) a good distance away and say *taa'háanéhe*, I am introducing the tree into the discourse for the first time and meaning something like 'there it is' or 'that's the one'.

2.12.2. Cleft use

Predicative pronouns often serve as focused (usually clause-initial) element of a cleft-like construction. This is consistent with their core use of drawing deictic attention to an entity. The referent is typically an entity or portion of discourse previously established:

103) *hena'háanéhe* *hapó'eveta tsé-ohké-hešé-hóséstom-ónéto*
 PROXIMAL:INAN:ANAPH likewise CJT-HABIT-thus-tell-x:1-1
 'That is likewise what was told to me...' (23:27)

103) is the next to last clause of the text "The Bat". The full clause 103) in the text translates as 'That is likewise what was told to me, this story, when I was young.' The next "clause" is the same proximal predicative pronoun *hena'háanéhe*, which now means 'that's it'. It is a very common text-closure device. A speaker delivering a monologue, such as a sermon, or traditional speech, often ends his delivery with *hena'háanéhe*. It has,

in essence, come to mean 'the end' when used as discourse closure.

In the Interview (on literacy) text, there is an interesting cleft sentence, again using hena'háanéhe as focused element:

104) naa vo'èstane tsé-s-ta-vé'-nésovave-nestsé-se
and person CJT-OBL-away-CAUS-two.ways-speak.language-3
'And when someone speaks two languages

hena'háanéhe tsé-osee-péhéva'e, hová'éhe
PROXIMAL:INAN:ANAPH CJT-much-good:INAN, something
that is what is very good, everything

é-ta-ohké-hósé-hóna'ové-héne'en-ohe hoháahpe'e
3-away-HABIT-again-additional-know-x:I very.much
you learn even more' (Interview, p.

6)

The focus pronoun may introduce a reason:

105) hena'háanéhe tsé-nèx-hešé-he'háe-stove
PROXIMAL:INAN:ANAPH CJT-toward-thus-cough-IMPERS
'That's how colds developed' (17:22)

105) occurs just before the text closure and refers back to a cute story about a "spit man" (ghost-like being). The story is one of many which are meant to explain the origin of things in the Cheyenne world.

A plural animate predicative pronoun nea'háanevóhe appears in the following cleft construction:

106) tsé'tóhe ka'ěškóné-heso-no naa tsé'tóhe kàse'éehe-ho naa
kàsováahe-ho
DEMO child-DIM-PL and DEMO young.woman-PL and young.man-PL
'these children and these young women and young men,

nea'háanevóho tsé-nóhtóv-oéstone-tano-se
PROX:AN:PL CJT-know.how-read-DESID-3PL
they are the ones that want to learn to read' (Interview, p. 4)

(The abbreviation PROX in 106) stands for proximal, here, not proximate which it usually abbreviates.) Note the use of conjunct participles (headless relative clauses) in each of the cleft constructions.

The antecedent of the anaphoric pronoun of 103) is the entire text just delivered, as is the anaphor of 105). The antecedent in 104) is the proposition 'when someone speaks two languages', sententially linked to the following cleft construction. There is tight anaphora in 106), that is, the (conjoined) antecedents of the cleft pronoun immediately precede it.

2.12.3. Other predicative pronominal forms

A few other forms with pronominal reference and predicative function occur. I do not understand them well, but can note some of the forms and their characteristics:

107) nésesto 'they (an.) are the ones' (ATTRIB suffix -sesto; 12:21; 52:107)

108) néséhoo'o 'this is he' (MEDIATE suffix -hoo'o; 67:100)

109) mónéséhanevóhe 'it was she (obv.)' (DUBITATIVE verb; 51:85)

110) hénésehe 'Is that the way it is? Is that the one? (inan.)' (Petter 1952:22)

107-110) seem to be built on the endophoric ("demonstrative") pronouns néhe (animate) and héne (inanimate) which we shall examine in Section 2.13. 107), 108), and 110) lack prefixes so it is doubtful that they are full verbs (Attributive and mediate mode verbs require pronominal prefixes for all persons, unlike dubitative verbs which take a zero third prefix.) All the forms, however, take mode marking indicating (evidential) source of information which is not direct to the speaker.² I prefer to regard 107-110) as modally-marked (perhaps predicative) pronouns. These deserve further study, beyond the scope of this paper.

Before leaving this major section (2.13) on predicative pronouns, we should note that their predicative nature is of a copular variety. It is as if there is a missing (or understood) copula which only relates to referential identification or location of entities. This would not be surprising in terms of cross-linguistic considerations, since languages often omit copulas in precisely these semantic/pragmatic contexts. When greater attributive detail about an entity is desired, a Cheyenne speaker must use richer verbal constructions.

2.13. Demonstratives

In many languages demonstratives function as third person pronouns (Schachter 1985:30; Anderson and Keenan 1985:261; Givón 1984:357 with Ute data; Watkins 1984:98 with Kiowa data). English demonstratives can stand alone as pronouns:

111) I like this.

112) Those are the guys who threw rocks at me.

Cheyenne has two sets of demonstratives. Both can act as definite articles, modifying a (usually) following noun. Both sets can also stand alone as pronouns.

I label the two sets "exophoric" and "endophoric" demonstratives (these are established labels in linguistic literature). The first set is much like English demonstratives. They have a primary deictic function,

and extension to anaphoric function. Hence, the label exophoric focuses upon (deictic) pointing "outside" (exo-) of the words of a discourse. The second set, on the other hand, primarily points "within" (endo-) discourse. The anaphoric function of both sets is of most interest to us in this paper, as is their functioning as pronouns, as opposed to articles.

Both demonstrative sets are inflected for animacy (gender) and distance (proximal vs. distal). It is important to note that they are not inflected for number or obviation as are the predicative pronouns and as are demonstratives in other Algonquian languages (cf. S&D 1983 for Ojibwa; Wolfart 1973:33 for Cree; Voorhis 1974:43ff for Kickapoo).

2.13.1. Exophoric

113) Exophoric demonstrative set:

	PROXIMAL	DISTAL
INANIMATE	hé'tóhe 'this, these'	há'tóhe 'that, those'
ANIMATE	tsé'tóhe 'this, these'	tá'tóhe 'that, those'

Some examples are:

114) tsé'tóhe hē'e 'this woman'

115) hé'tóhe máheo-nótse 'these houses'

116) tá'tóhe hoohtséstse 'that tree'

In Ojibwa (S&D 1983:16-17), if a demonstrative precedes a noun it has an adjectival (article) function, but when it follows a noun, the noun has a predicative function and the demonstrative acts like a pronoun. However, in Cheyenne data I have seen, parallel predicate nominal constructions have the demonstrative preceding. Hence, in the proper discourse context, 114-116) can mean, respectively, 'this is a woman', 'these are houses', and 'that is a tree'.

2.13.2. Endophoric

117) Endophoric demonstrative set:

	PROXIMAL	DISTAL
INANIMATE	héne 'this, these'	háne 'that, those'
ANIMATE	néhe 'this, these'	náne 'that, those'

Note the front vs. back vowel correlation with distance parameter in the exophoric and endophoric sets. We saw this same sound symbolism with the predicative pronouns (100-101).

Endophoric demonstratives are used to refer to entities which a speaker assumes are established in the mind of the hearer. They are not,

as far as I know, used in outside-oØ-discourse strong deictic contexts such as those of 114-116).

The general statement of distribution of proximal vs. distal endophorics is that the proximal form is used to refer to an entity established in an immediate discourse context, e.g. in the immediate conversation or monologue which a speaker is producing, whereas the distal form is used to refer to an entity outside of the immediate discourse but assumed to be part of the shared knowledge with the speaker.

I recall an informant explaining that if she said to a friend:

118) náhe hetane 'that man'

she could be referring to a certain man that the informant and hearer knew the informant to be having an affair with. They might have shared the secret in previous conversations.

At the end of the text "The Ant, the Bug, and the Rabbit", the rabbit refers to the taste of something which the three participants had fought over as being

119) ta'se háne ho'évohkótse óh-ta-esto'éne-e'éstse
like DEMO meat CJT:when-away-mixed.up-INAN:PL
'like that meat when it's mixed up,

é-xae-né-he'éno'e
3-just-ANAPH-thus.taste
it tastes like that' (29:25)

There was no actual meat in the discourse context, but the rabbit referred his hearers to the taste of meat that they were familiar with.

The iconicity here is clear. Use the proximal form for entities more recently established. Use the distal form for entities established farther away in time or memory.

Cheyenne use of the proximal demonstrative as definitizer or anaphoric pronoun runs counter to Givón's prediction (p.c. and 1984:357 on Ute) that, cross-linguistically, when there is a choice between proximal and distal and demonstratives are used as pronouns, the distal form is used as pronoun. Kiowa's demonstrative pronouns (Watkins 1984:96ff, 208) aligns with Givón's prediction (Kiowa may be distantly related to Ute). But we must remember that, in one sense, Cheyenne distal demonstratives are even more definite than are its proximal demonstratives. The distal forms are used for entities which are assumed by the speaker to be so definite (established) in the mind of hearer (and speaker) that they are not even established in the immediate discourse context.

Note, too, that English distal 'that' is used as definitizer to mark anaphoric entities (e.g. 'And then that guy hit him'), whereas proximal 'this' is used as an indefinite article to introduce new participants in

discourse (e.g. 'This guy at Safeway had a really weird punk jacket'; see Shroyer 1985 for a study of this as indefinite article in English).

2.14. Anaphoric use of demonstratives

During study for this paper I examined pronominal categories in approximately 3500 clauses in a variety of Cheyenne texts (2200 of the clauses are found in W. Leman 1980). There are many demonstratives in the texts. Counting their total number is a bigger job than I can do at this point, but some smaller counts on specific issues will be presented. I can estimate that about 98% of the textual demonstratives are proximal. This is not surprising. Most of the texts are of the narrative genre (with little need for strong deictic pointing as in 114-116) and most demonstratives therein function anaphorically. Both the exophoric and endophoric demonstratives use their proximal forms for indicating anaphoricity, e.g.

119) naa néhe'še vé'ho'e é-h-nè-het-ó-sest-o
and then whiteman 3-PST-ANAPH-say-DIR(3:4)-ATTRIB-3:4 DEMO
'And then the whiteman said to the (this)

tsé'tóhe xae-vo'èstanó-ho
common-person-OBV
Indian, ...' (40:5)

120) naa néhe vé'ho'e é-'-asé-stóhta'hane-séstse
and DEMO whiteman 3-PST-start-tell.story-ATTRIB
'And the (this) whiteman started to tell his story, ...' (40:13)

Interestingly, a demonstrative may even precede a proper name. To my mind, the speaker of 121) is emphasizing that she is continuing to talk about the same woman whose name is Sweet Woman:

121) naa mó-Ø-s-tá-héne'en-ó-hé-he néhe Vé'eené-hē'e
and DUB-3-PST-away-know-it-NEG-NONAFFIRM DEMO sweet.woman
'and that Sweet Woman knew (understood) it' (Alcohol text, p. 2)

Several texts, including "The Whiteman and the Indian" from which 119-120) are taken, are found in Appendices 2-4 of this paper. The exophoric demonstratives are boxed, while the endophoric demonstratives are circled.

The demonstratives primarily (see counts in 124-125) appear adjectivally as definite articles in my corpus. But demonstratives also appear alone, as pronouns, e.g.

122) naa é-h-néšé-hóxoveehé-sest-o néhe
and 3-PST-continue-move.across-ATTRIB-3PL DEMO
'And they (some of the people) kept moving across' (1:24)

123) tsé'tóhe mó-Ø-s-ta-éšé-héne'en-ó-hé-he
DEMO DUB-3-PST-away-already-know-it-NEG-NONAFFIRM
'He/This (young man) already knew

tsé-to'sè-hešévé-stse
 CJT-gonna-do-3
 what he was going to do' (32:23)

A count of article versus pronoun use of demonstratives in texts (517 "clauses") of the first 20 pages of W. Leman (1980) shows the following distribution:

124) Article vs. pronoun in random sample:

	ARTICLE	PRONOUN
néhe	14	4
tsé'tóhe	14	3

I counted these 20 pages of texts (Appendix 2) to try to get a random sample, not unduly influenced by individual factors such as speaker preference, contrastive participants, etc. Only anaphoric use of demonstratives was counted, that is, instances where a demonstrative was used to refer to an entity previously established in the discourse. (Definite articles, of course, are highly anaphoric.) 124) shows that in the random sample both néhe and tsé'tóhe distribute almost identically between use as article or pronoun.

Distribution of article vs. pronoun remains essentially the same in the 349 clauses found in texts of Appendix 3 which have participants which I regard to be in potentially contrastive relationships (see Section 2.14.1):

125) Article vs. pronoun in contrastive texts:

	ARTICLE	PRONOUN
néhe	24	0
tsé'tóhe	33	8

We are admittedly dealing with low numbers of tokens, which will be a weakness of all of our quantitative study of the demonstratives, yet it seems significant to me that when we total the numbers in 124) and 125) demonstratives (nehe and tsé'tóhe combined for 85 total) occur as articles 5.7 times as often as they do as pronouns (15 total tokens).

Charts 124) and 125) clearly confirm the primary demonstrative (article) nature of the forms we are considering in this section. Their use as pronouns is derived and follows the scheme which Givón (1984) and others have described in which demonstratives come to be used as third person pronouns, thus justifying the label "demonstrative pronouns" which is often used in the linguistic literature (e.g. Anderson & Keenan 1985:261, Schachter 1985:30, MacLeish 1971:100, Petter 1952:21).

Since both the exophoric and endophoric demonstratives mark textual

anaphoric material--both appear as definite articles as well as anaphoric third person pronouns--a question which has been foremost in my mind throughout this study has been, what factor or factors determine the choice of exophoric vs. endophoric in texts? Having studied Cheyenne for a number of years and spent many hours examining texts for this study, I cannot list any single factor which alone accounts for the distribution of exophoric vs. endophoric demonstratives when both are used anaphorically. Rather, I feel the most reasonable account is that several factors probably contribute to the choice.

When beginning to sift through the large number of possible factors in a study such as this, we can list those which could be most plausible:

- a. Speaker preference--some speaker might "like" one form more than another.
- b. Speaker age--I predict that endophorics are older forms, being replaced by exophorics.
- c. Degree of continuity--one form might be more topical than another. This is related to Topic Persistence.
- d. Contrast--one form may be preferred to mark contrastive or focused entities.
- e. Return--one form may be preferred to mark discourse return to a previously introduced topic after an absence of some amount. This is related to Referential Distance.
- f. Episode boundaries--one form may be preferred when there is an episode boundary of some kind, such as when switching from one already established major participant to another already established major participant. This is functionally related to the phenomenon of switch reference.
- g. Genre--one form may be more appropriate in some genres than others.
- h. Word order--one form may be more appropriate preverbally.

The hypotheses presented in a-h are not necessarily mutually exclusive. It is quite possible that there are several determining factors or that a number of factors conspire together to tilt a speaker toward use of an exophoric demonstrative as opposed to an endophoric one.

We are limited by space and time and have been unable to do complete textual counts of tokens with reference to every possible hypothesis. We do have hunches based on our experience with the language and study of our rather large corpus.

One of my strong hunches is that when there is need to indicate contrast of some anaphoric entity, such as pitting one established major participant against another, speakers prefer to use tsé'tóhe, the exophoric demonstrative. This is consistent with its primary function as a deictic.

In fact, in such cases of textual disambiguation, I would not have been surprised if while a narrator was telling a story, he used hand or lip paralinguistic gestures in collaboration with the use of tsé'tóhe. We will quantify this parameter in Section 2.14.1.

One of the frustrations of trying to sift through a number of possible determining factors is that it does not appear that there are any categorical determinants. We can build a hypothesis based on a number of good examples, then find a number of apparent counter-examples.

Let us examine some empirical evidence relating to our hypotheses under consideration. We cannot examine every hypothesis to the extent we would like, and we are unable to do proper quantification on the entire corpus available.

Since it is quite possible that several factors interact, we need to remember that, ideally, we should vary one factor at a time, keeping all others constant. But this ideal can be difficult to achieve with a corpus of texts. (One might prefer experimental data, such as that promoted by Professor Tomlin of the University of Oregon, but there are difficulties in obtaining good quality experimental data with American Indians who are suspicious of Anglo investigators.)

Most of the texts in my corpus are of the narrative genre. A few are hortatory and expository, prayers, sermons, admonitions, and the like. So, we are limited in genre variety. I have very few texts from young speakers. Many of the texts were recorded in Oklahoma by another linguist. I am not familiar with the elicitation context. For instance, did the linguist discuss the story with the narrator first, then the narrator spoke into a tape recorder? Many of the stories are very familiar Cheyenne legends. Familiarity often leads to discourse shortcuts. If an audience is familiar with a text, a narrator can use more anaphoric devices than he might use if he assumed his hearer was not familiar with a story. So, our counts are not conclusive and should be viewed as tentative attempts to gain some insight into the problem.

2.14.1. Participant contrast

Impressionistically, I sense that tsé'tóhe is preferred over néhe when a speaker wants to emphasize which of two (or more) major participants he is talking about. This is especially true of passages where there is animated action going on rapidly between main participants. I have selected several texts in my corpus which seem to me to qualify as potentially showing participant contrast. These texts appear in Appendix 3.

126) néhe vs. tsé'tóhe in participant contrast texts:

TEXT	# of	ANTAGONISTS
(page)	clauses	

(32)	28		man	ghost		TOTAL
		<u>néhe</u>	f	2		2
		<u>tsé'tóhe</u>	1	f		1
(34)	80		man1	man2 (ghost)	friend	
		<u>néhe</u>	f	5	2	7
		<u>tsé'tóhe</u>	6	3	5	14
(37)	39		man1	man2 (ghost)	friend	
		<u>néhe</u>	f	f	f	f
		<u>tsé'tóhe</u>	f	f	f	f
(38)	48		man1	man2	water monster	
		<u>néhe</u>	f	f	f	f
		<u>tsé'tóhe</u>	f	5	f	5
		<u>(tá'tóhe)</u>	(1)			
(40)	26		whiteman	Indian		
		<u>néhe</u>	1			1
		<u>tsé'tóhe</u>	3	8		11
(41)	12		Son	Buffalo	Corn	others
		<u>néhe</u>	1	2	f	11
		<u>tsé'tóhe</u>	f	4	5	f

néhe appears 24 total times in chart 126) while tsé'tóhe appears 40 total times. This ratio of 24:40 is consistent with my prediction that tsé'tóhe marks contrastive entities. But they are small numbers of tokens and may not be significant as gross totals.

To me, the numbers become more significant when we make detailed analysis of participant interaction in the texts. We can only briefly note some salient points. The numbers in 126) lean much more in favor of a contrastive analysis for tsé'tóhe if we disregard all instances of néhe for other participants in the text "A Chief's Son and His Two Wives" which begins on text page 41. It is legitimate to do so since the plot highlights the son and his two wives. Other characters enter into the action in the middle of the text (from clause 36-111) but they never are marked with tsé'tóhe and they are not main participants in the text. I find the most interesting marking to be in clauses 7-21) where, except for the last instance, tsé'tóhe appears as definite article preceding the name of one of the women, either Corn Woman or Buffalo Woman. The narrator intensely alternates the spotlight from one woman to the other. tsé'tóhe highlights the participants, consistent with its erstwhile role as strong deictic (see Anderson and Keenan 1985 for discussion of strong vs. weak deictics). We have attempted to avoid the circular reasoning that this kind of analysis

is open to by doing overall counts. I believe that the counts empirically tilt us in a certain direction, but that we must look at further specific factors within gross counts.

It may be significant that in the text "The Whiteman and the Indian", beginning on text page 40, tsé'tóhe marks the Indian 8 times in contrast to 3 times for the whiteman. The motif is a common one in Cheyenne stories. The greedy culture "hero" (now translated as 'whiteman') is ultimately outfoxed. It is entirely possible that the narrator is highlighting the Indian as the real hero, in the end, by marking him more often with tsé'tóhe.

We wish we could do further analysis of plot structure, but time and space do not permit it.

2.14.2. Speaker preference

One hypothesis is that some speakers may prefer one demonstrative over another. Ideally, we need a large number of texts of a variety of genre from many speakers. In lieu of the ideal I have made gross counts of demonstratives in the texts of three speakers: Anna Hawk, Mrs. Allen Flyingout, and Elaine Strangeowl. The first two are Oklahoma speakers and the last is a Montana speaker with whom I have worked closely. I chose the first two because they tell the same story in the texts "Story of a Ghost" (Hawk: text page 34) and "The Ghost Man" (Flyingout: text page 37), but Hawk uses 21 demonstratives while Flyingout uses none in her version of the story.

The texts I used for counts of speaker preference appear in Appendix 4. I counted all anaphoric demonstratives regardless of whether they were articles or pronouns.

127) Speaker preference of néhe vs. tsé'tóhe:

	Total clauses	néhe	tsé'tóhe	Total DEMO	DENSITY
Hawk	103	8	17	25	.242
Flyingout	160	6	3	9	.056
Strangeowl	317	2	3	5	.016

Obviously, since there are varying numbers of total clauses in the corpus of each speaker we cannot directly compare numbers between speakers. The DENSITY column normalizes the numbers in that it shows density of total use of demonstratives per speaker per clause, i.e. for each speaker, total number of demonstratives divided by total number of clauses. The number of tokens is small and generalizations are therefore difficult to come by, but at least in terms of gross density, it is obvious that Hawk uses demonstratives much more than Flyingout or Strangeowl, and Flyingout uses demonstratives 4 times as much as Strangeowl.

In terms of the contrast between néhe and tsé'tóhe, the speakers also vary. Hawk uses the latter twice as often as the former, while Flyingout does the opposite, using néhe twice as often as tsé'tóhe. Strangeowl's

2 tokens vs. 3 are basically in balance. The difference between Hawk's and Flyingout's counts may be significant, especially in view of Flyingout's total lack of any demonstratives in the same story for which Hawk had 21 demonstratives, but I am hesitant to draw too strong of a conclusion. It may be more the case that the particular way that Hawk structured her ghost story did not have as much need for participant contrast or other parameters which might be shown by demonstratives. The Strangeowl case is more significant. The two most plausible accounts I can give for the paucity of demonstratives in her corpus are a) she is a relatively younger speaker of the language, probably with some loss of use of néhe, but b) more likely, the genre of Strangeowl's texts. We look at genre in the next section.

2.14.3. Genre

I used the same corpus in Appendix 4 for analysis of the role of genre in the use of demonstratives. See results in 127). It happens to be that all of the texts of Hawk and Flyingout are folk tales. None of Strangeowl's texts are. Strangeowl's texts apparently do not need demonstratives. She does not have much action going on between third person participants that need to be highlighted by demonstratives.

Strangeowl's texts are about her family, a kind of first person narrative genre. Some of her texts are explanatory, telling why Cheyenne fear owls and how flute playing was conducted. 6 clauses are a prayer. Two are her texts (20 clauses) are procedural, short recipes. I would not expect a recipe to often need demonstratives referring to animate entities, unless, perhaps a recipe were telling how to cook kidney or melon which are two grammatically animate foods. Finally, 140 of Strangeowl's clauses are of two expository texts, telling how people should behave. There is no narrative action going on between third person participants.

So, I conclude that genre type will influence the presence of demonstratives. It is also possible that genre type will influence choice between endophoric vs. exophoric demonstrative but this would need to be investigated further.

2.14.4. Word order

If it is true that Cheyenne preverbal position is primarily for contrastive and focused material, then this position might be particularly reserved for one of the demonstrative types. I would predict it to be tsé'tóhe, since I sense that it is the more contrastive demonstrative. Counts of demonstratives vis-a-vis word order in the random sample first 20 pages of text (Appendix 2) plus the texts of Appendix 3, which I predict to highlight contrastive use of demonstratives (see discussion in Section 2.14.1), appear as follows:

128) Word order and choice of néhe vs. tsé'tóhe:

Appendix 2: Random sample

	PREVERBAL	TOTAL	f
néhe	6	18	33.3f
tsé'tóhe	10	17	58.8f

Appendix 3: Contrastive participants

	PREVERBAL	TOTAL	f
néhe	13	24	54.2f
tsé'tóhe	30	41	73.2f

The results of 128) are consistent with, and perhaps are significant enough, to confirm our hypothesis. In both the random sample and the sample selected for contrastive participants, tsé'tóhe occurs significantly more often preverbally than it does postverbally. The percentage of preverbal demonstratives rises for both néhe and tsé'tóhe in the Appendix 3, which is consistent with our prediction that preverbal position is used for especially salient nominals. Participants highlighted because they are highly ranked topics, major antagonists, in episodic contrast, etc. will more often appear preverbally than postverbally.

Hence, the counts are consistent both with our intuitive sense that preverbal position is for emphasis of one kind or another (Mithun's preverbal position "newsworthy" parameter) and that the exophoric demonstrative is more highly emphatic than is the endophoric demonstrative.

2.14.5. Other possible counts

A number of other counts are possible. In a complete study we would want to examine Topic Persistence and Referential Distance. My intuition (open to change from results of quantified studies) at this point is that neither measure would contribute much more to our understanding of Cheyenne demonstratives. TP and RD for both can, I believe, vary widely, as we can see, for instance, in the text "The Chief's Son and His Two Wives" which we have highlighted in this study. Note, for example, that the narrator refers to the Corn Woman wife with contrastive tsé'tóhe in clause 112) at the end of the text, after last referring to the Corn Woman thusly in clause 19). This is a significant gap (RD), and, it may support the idea that tsé'tóhe is not primarily an anaphoricity indicating device but a marker of various kinds of emphasis, combined with anaphoricity..

3. Conclusion

Every Cheyenne verb indexes its arguments though verb agreement. A variety of other devices, such as "emphatic pronoun" verbs, predicative pronouns, indefinite pronouns, and demonstrative pronouns are used to pronominally mark referents which have needs which cannot be met simply through verb agreement, such as the need for emphasis, contrast, focus, special reflexivization, and a variety of other semantically rich

pronominal-like categories.

Every language probably divides its pronominal "pie" in different ways. But every language will have adequate ways of encoding the pronominal communicative needs of its speakers. Thorough descriptions of such encoding should be a goal of every student of language. Hopefully, this study is a step toward that goal.

FOOTNOTES

¹Petter confused nétove with né'tóve 'my brother-in-law' which is nearly identical phonetically. Hence, under the dictionary entry sake, he (1915:934) says of nétove 'for my sake', etc., "The same terms are used to express 'my, thy his_etc, brother-in-law' and also 'myself, etc.'".

²I am also aware of a very few textual occurrences of full nouns with evidential mode marking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Stephen R. and Edward L. Keenan. 1985. Deixis. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, ed. Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carlson, Robert. 1985. Emphatic pronouns and coreference in complex sentences in Supyire. Ms.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1980. The evolution of third person verb agreement in the Iroquoian languages. In *Mechanisms of Syntactic change*, ed. Charles N. Li. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Clarke, Sandra. 1982. North-west River (Shesha:tshi:t) Montagnais: A grammatical sketch. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.
- Davis, Philip W. and Ross Saunders. 1984. An expression of coreference in Bella Coola. In *The Syntax of Native American Languages, Syntax and Semantics Vol. 16*, eds. Eung-Do Cook and Donna B. Gerdt. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. Functional syntax and universal grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 7)
- Frantz, Donald G. 1971. *Toward a generative grammar of Blackfoot*. Norman: SIL.
- Frantz, Donald G. and Eugene Creighton. 1982. The indefinite possessor prefix in Blackfoot. In *Papers of the Thirteenth Algonquian Conference*, ed. William Cowan. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Topic, pronoun, and grammatical agreement. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press.

- Givón, T. 1980. Ute reference grammar. Ignacio: Ute Press.
- Givón, T. 1984. Syntax: a functional-typological introduction. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1985. Ergativity and the argument type parameter. In Proceedings of the First Annual Pacific Linguistics Conference, eds. Scott DeLancey and Russell S. Tomlin. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Leman, Elena. 1985. Cheyenne relative clauses. MS.
- Leman, Elena. To appear. Basic constituent order in Cheyenne. M.A. thesis, University of Oregon.
- Leman, Wayne. 1979. A reference grammar of the Cheyenne language. Vols. 1 and 2. Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Linguistics Series No. 5. Greeley: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.
- Leman, Wayne. 1981. Cheyenne pitch rules. IJAL 47:283-309.
- Leman, Wayne. 1984. Cheyenne deixis and sound symbolism. In Papers of the Fifteenth Algonquian Conference, ed. William Cowan. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Leman, Wayne. 1986. Cheyenne complementation. Ms.
- Leman, Wayne. To appear. On grammaticalization of some Cheyenne verbal elements. Ms.
- Leman, Wayne, ed. 1980. Cheyenne texts: an introduction to Cheyenne literature. Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Linguistics Series, No. 6. Greeley: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.
- Levine, Robert D. 1984. Empty categories, rules of grammar, and Kwakwaka complementation. In The Syntax of Native American Languages, Syntax and Semantics Vol. 16, eds. Eung-Do Cook and Donna B. Gerds. Orlando: Academic Press.
- MacLeish, Andrew. 1971. A glossary of grammar & linguistics. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1986. When zero isn't there. Paper presented to the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1985. Contrastive pronouns in Yagua. In Proceedings of the First Annual Pacific Linguistics Conference, eds. Scott DeLancey and Russell S. Tomlin. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Petter, Rodolphe. 1907. Sketch of the Cheyenne grammar. American

- Petter, Rodolphe. 1915. English-Cheyenne dictionary. Kettle Falls, Wash.
- Petter, Rodolphe. 1952. Cheyenne grammar. Newton, Kansas: Mennonite Publication Office.
- Schachter, Paul. 1985. Parts-oØ-speech systems. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. I: Clause Structure*, ed. Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwartz, Linda and Timothy Dunnigan. 1983. Pronouns and pronominal categories in Southwestern Ojibwe. Ms.
- Shroyer, Suzanne. 1985. The demonstrative 'this' as an indefinite article in spoken English. In *Proceedings of the First Annual Pacific Linguistics Conference*, eds. Scott DeLancey and Russell S. Tomlin. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Steele, Susan. 1980. Clisis and diachrony. In *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, ed. Charles N. Li. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Voorhis, Paul H. 1974. Introduction to the Kickapoo language. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Watkins, Laurel J. 1984. A grammar of Kiowa. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wolfart, H. Christoph and Janet F. Carroll. 1973. *Meet Cree: a practical guide to the Cree language*. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press.