



Locatives and Obviation in Cree

Brian Joseph

International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Jul., 1980), 168-169.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0020-7071%28198007%2946%3A3%3C168%3ALAOIC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T>

International Journal of American Linguistics is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LOCATIVES AND OBVIATION IN CREE¹

BRIAN JOSEPH

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Wolfart has observed that the Cree locative suffix /-ehk/ "is mutually exclusive with the suffixes of the number-obviation paradigm. Thus, number and obviation are not expressed in locative forms; obviation would also be excluded on semantic grounds."² Wolfart is mainly concerned with morphology, specifically with the nonoccurrence of obviative endings on locative nouns, but his statement implies that locatives, as a category, are systematically excluded from the dimension of obviation. Indeed, in a more recent paper on obviation in Cree, Wolfart has claimed that "the *locative* . . . stands outside the proximate-obviative dimension and never interacts with it in any way," adding that in a string such as:

- (1) okimāw o-kosis-a o-tēm-iy(i)-ihk
chief_i/PROX his_i-son_j-OBV his_j-horse-
OBV. POSS-LOC
on the chief's son's horse

the noun otēmīyihk "as a locative . . . itself takes no part in obviation."³

¹ This work is based on research carried out at the University of Alberta and supported by a postdoctoral fellowship awarded by the Izaak Walton Killam Memorial Scholarship Committee of the University of Alberta. Thanks are due to those members of the Edmonton Cree community who willingly gave their time to help me with Cree. All responsibility for the interpretation and analysis of these facts, naturally, is my own.

² H. Christoph Wolfart, *Plains Cree: A Grammatical Study*, APS-T 63, pt. 5 (1973): 31.

³ H. C. Wolfart, "How Many Obviatives: Sense and Reference in a Cree Verb Paradigm," in *Linguistic Studies of Native Canada*, ed. E. Cook and J. Kaye (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978), pp. 258–59.

Wolfart's assertion regarding locatives and obviation is certainly correct so far as the morphology of Cree is concerned—locative nouns never are overtly marked with obviative suffixes. However, with regard to the syntax of Cree, it can be shown that locative nouns do participate in the obviation process and, moreover, do so in exactly the same way as inanimate nouns, the other noun class with no morphological marking for obviation.

Wolfart has noted that inanimate nouns are "covertly" obviative—although they show no markings for obviation, a verb which depends on them must itself be obviative in form, if the conditions for obviation, that is, the presence of another third-person referent in the same sentence or contextual span, are met.⁴ Thus, in:

- (2) okimāw wāpahtam cīmān ē-misā-yi-k
chief/PROX sees (it) canoe/INAN PVB-be
big-OBV-3SG(CONJUNCT)

The chief sees the canoe which is big
the subordinate verb ē-misāyik is inflected for an obviative subject, even though that subject, cīmān, is not overtly marked for obviation (being inanimate). This contrasts with the situation in (3), in which the conditions for obviation are not met (there being only one third-person noun in the sentence) and the subordinate verb is inflected for a (proximate) third-person subject:

- (3) ni-wāpahten cīmān ē-misā-k
1SG-see (it) canoe bebig-3SG
I see a canoe which is big.

The same distribution of obviative and proximate verb forms is found with verbs dependent on locative nouns. In a sentence

⁴ Ibid.

such as (4), in which the conditions for obviation are met:

- (4) cān wikiw pakwānikamikohk ē-misā-yi-k
 John/PROX lives tent/LOC be big-OBV-3SG

John lives in a tent which is big

the subordinate verb ē-misāyik, which depends upon the locative noun pakwānikamikohk, is the same form as in the inanimate covertly obviative sentence (2).⁵ Furthermore, if the conditions for obviation are removed, the subordinate verb

⁵ Moreover, a proximate verb form in such a sentence, according to one consultant, does not clearly refer to the tent at all:

- (i) ??cān wikiw pakwānikamikohk ē-misāk
John lives in a tent which is big (Intended Reading).

referring to the locative must be third-person proximate and cannot be third-person obviative (cf. 3):

- (5) ni-wikin pakwānikamikohk ē-misāk/
 *ē-misāyik

1SG-live tent/LOC PROX OBV

I live in a tent which is big.

Thus, the facts of (4) and (5) show clearly that locative nouns in Cree can participate in the proximate-obviative dimension, although their participation is "covert," in the manner of inanimate nouns. The claim, then, that locatives do not interact with obviation in any way is falsified by these sentences. The mutual exclusiveness of the locative and obviation endings is to be viewed, therefore, as essentially a morphological restriction, with no syntactic implications.