Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-84008-5
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-84008-5

OBVIATION IN TWO INNU-AIMUN *ATANUKANA*

by

Laurel Anne Hasler

A thesis submitted
to the School of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Linguistics
Memorial University of Newfoundland

2002

St. John's Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes how obviation, a grammatical structure found in Algonquian languages, is used in two Innu-aimun *âtanûkana* (myth-legends) told in Sheshatshiu, Labrador. Specifically, I explore the way in which obviation patterns in the two stories, and how the storyteller makes the choice of whether to assign each particular third-person referent proximate or obviative status.

In the study, I identify seven semantic and syntactic environments in the narratives in which the storyteller generally assigns third-person referents proximate status. My study also points to exceptions to these apparent "rules" of proximate assignment where the storyteller will give a third person an unexpected status in order to reflect some meaning at the level of discourse, for example foreshadowing an event, placing focus on a particular character, or attributing the quality of agentivity to a particular character.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their encouragement and support while I researched and wrote this thesis: my supervisor, Dr. Marguerite MacKenzie, for always offering her honest opinion and for being so approachable throughout this whole process; Dr. Sandra Clarke, for her generous advice and for editing Chapter Three; the entire faculty of Linguistics, for having faith that I could do this; Innu-aimun speakers, Kanani Penashue and Judy Hill, for giving me immeasurable help with the translations of the stories; my colleague, Jane Bannister, for listening (or at least convincingly *pretending* to listen) many, many times as I read aloud the conference paper that would eventually become a large part of Chapter Three; Colleen Banfield, for being the absolute "awesomest" departmental secretary anyone could wish for; Lawrence Greening, for devoting an hour and a half to helping me fix my table of contents; Doug Vincent, for his determination (and success) in getting footnote 25 on the right page; Jon Lee, for periodically listening to me brainstorm over coffee at Hava Java; Tracy O'Brien, for sharing in mutual rant/freak-out sessions with me; my roommates, Jillian Gould and Jim Rice, for making that yummy couscous dish and miso soup when I was too obsessed with my thesis to cook; my Spur friends, for being there when I really needed to relax; my parents, for listening when I needed someone to; and Brian Callahan, for never for one moment allowing me to think that I wasn't capable of writing this thing (oh, and all that editing, too, of course!). … and thanks to my cat, Candi, just for being so darned cute.

ABBREVIATIONS

Obviation Patterns

PS	proximate shift
OS	obviative shift
PSp	proximate span
OSp	obviative span
MP	multiple proximates
CoP	coreferent proximates
COP	coordinate proximates
PSw	proximate switch

Syntactic Roles

Vsbj	subject of the verb
Vobj	object of the verb
PN	proper noun
POSSD3	possessed third (i.e., proximate) person
POSSD4	possessed fourth (i.e., obviative) person
POSSR3	third person possessor
PNobv	obviative proper noun

Abbreviations Used in Glosses

adv	adverb
an	animate
CIN	conjunct indicative neutral
CS	conjunct subjunctive
dem	demonstrative
dim	diminutive
dir	direct
dup	reduplicated form
fut	future
IC	initial changed form
IDN	independent dubitative neutral
IDRP	independent indirect preterit
IIN	independent indicative neutral
IIP	independent indicative preterit
Imp	imperative

in	inanimate
intj	interjection
indef	indefinite
intrg	interrogative
inv	inverse
Loc	locative
NA	animate noun
NAD	animate dependent noun
NAP	nominalized animate noun
neg	negative
NI	inanimate noun
num	number
obv	obviative
p	particle
p	plural
perf	perfect
pl	plural
poss	possessive form
prfx	prefix
pro	pronoun
prv	preverb
sbjctv	subjective
sfx	suffix
s	singular
TS	theme sign
VAI / (AI)	animate intransitive verb
VAI+O	VAI that takes an object
VII / (II)	inanimate intransitive verb
VTA / (TA)	transitive animate verb
VTI / (TI)	transitive inanimate verb
1	first person
2	second person
21	inclusive "we"
3	third person
4	fourth (i.e., obviative) person
X>Y	X=subject; Y=object

Other Abbreviations

AG	agentive third person
AV	avoidance structure
E	explicit proximate/obviative reference

FN	frame narrative
GD	general description
I	implicit proximate/obviative reference
NC	narrative context
nonAG	non-agentive third/fourth person
PE	proximate environment
QS	quoted speech

CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction and Overview

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. Aim

Obviation is a grammatical structure used in Algonquian languages to distinguish between multiple third persons. This distinction is made by giving one third person proximate status, and designating all others as obviative. While the choice of which third person to make proximate can be straightforward in a simple sentence, the choice becomes more complex within the context of a narrative, where the ranking of third-person nominals becomes "a complex function which includes grammatical function, inherent semantic properties, and discourse salience" (Aissen 1997:705). This thesis examines and analyzes the way in which proximate and obviative status are assigned in two Innu-aimun[1] *âtanûkana* (myth-legends) told in Sheshatshiu[2], Labrador: *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} (Hare and Frog) and *Meshâpush* (literally, The Great Rabbit). In order to understand and describe how these choices are made by the storyteller, I have divided my research into three stages: 1) the interlinear (morpheme-by-morpheme) translation of the two stories, which reflect each third-person referent's isolated, changing, and/or

[1] Innu-aimun, formerly referred to as Montagnais, includes the most easterly set of dialects in the Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi continuum, spoken in Quebec and Labrador.
[2] Sheshatshiu is one of two Innu communities in Labrador.

continued status as proximate or obviative throughout the story; 2) the analysis of different types of obviation patterns in the stories, where I explore four patterns of sustained or isolated obviation (single proximate spans, coreferent proximates, coordinate proximates, and obviative spans) and four patterns of shifting obviation (proximate shifts, proximate switches, proximate shifts in function (i.e., other multiple proximates), and obviative shifts); and 3) the systematic identification and analysis of the environments in which the storyteller designates a third person as proximate (what I term "proximate environments"). Here, I chart each third-person referent's obviation status in a separate table that highlights the syntactic and semantic environments in which third persons are proximate or obviative, and I draw hypotheses concerning the discourse functions served by unexpected uses of obviation.

My preliminary analysis, for example, indicated a correlation between proximate status and agentive third persons. There also appears to be a tendency to use what I call "avoidance strategies", more marked grammatical structures that allow the narrator to avoid changing a particular third-person referent's obviation status in contexts where a shift in obviation is not otherwise required by the context of the narrative.

1.1.2. Theoretical Framework

The broad theoretical framework I have adopted for this study is that of narrative analysis, a subdivision of discourse analysis also referred to in the literature by the overlapping, but not equivalent, terms "genre analysis" (Paltridge 2000) and "text

analysis" (Valentine 1995). Working within this framework, in this study I isolate and analyze the formal linguistic patterns of obviation that create and reflect meaning in the two *âtanûkana*. Because there is no specific methodology already set up within this framework that is suitable for identifying and describing the obviation patterns and proximate environments on which this study focuses, for the purposes of this thesis I have designed a method of analysis in which I chart each story's use of obviation in tables that highlight the sustained, isolated, or changing statuses of particular third-person referents in the narratives and the syntactic and semantic environments in which proximates and obviatives occur. Based on the information collected and highlighted in these tables, I have analyzed the narratives by identifying the ways in which patterns or isolated instances of proximates and obviatives correspond with other features in the texts.

Within the scope of the study of obviation in Algonquian narratives, this research models its theoretical approach primarily on the studies of Ives Goddard (1984,1990), Amy Dahlstrom (1991,1996), and Kevin Russell (1991,1996). These studies explore the discourse uses of obviation by identifying correlations between patterns of obviation and the narrative contexts in which they appear. The obviation patterns I explore in this thesis, for example, are taken from the above-mentioned studies, as are some basic theoretical assumptions regarding obviation and the analysis of narratives.

1.1.3. Some General Theoretical Assumptions

The Systemic Perspective: This thesis adopts the systemic perspective on language use, which treats language not as a set of rules but as "a resource for making meaning" (Paltridge 2000:106). Specifically, this approach is concerned with the system of choices speakers make and with how these choices relate to the genre and structure of texts. This study, therefore, focuses on the narrator's choices in designating particular third persons in the stories as either proximate or obviative, and aims to discover how these choices are made and how their outcomes are meaningful within the texts.

Proximate/Obviative Status as Meaningful: This thesis assumes a third-person referent's designation as proximate or obviative or their shifts from one status to the other are meaningful. That is, I have assumed in this study that the choice as to whether to assign proximate or obviative status to a particular third-person referent is not strictly a grammatical choice, but instead often reflects either a genre-defining feature of the text or fulfills some other narrative function.

1.2. Previous Research in the Field

1.2.1. Discourse Analysis

The study of discourse involves the analysis of language above the level of the morpheme, word, clause, phrase, and sentence; that is, unlike areas of linguistics that concentrate on these more micro-areas of language, discourse analysis involves the

"bigger picture" of linguistic description (Riggenbach in Paltridge 2000:3), dealing with "language-in-use" (Brown and Yule 1983:1). Defined from a functional perspective, discourse analysis explores both how we create meaning using linguistic forms and what we actually *mean* by the things we say. From a theoretical standpoint, discourse analysis seeks to answer two broad questions: "why we make particular language choices" and "what we mean by them" (Paltridge 2000:3), and it does this by identifying and describing the linguistic patterns that occur across written texts or stretches of verbal communication.

Compared with other areas of linguistic study, discourse analysis is still in the early stages of development. Within the field of discourse, few terms have been universally agreed upon or standardized in the literature, and the result is a wide range of terminology and models of study that rarely correspond precisely, or even closely, with one another. Instead, discourse analysts often create their own categories within the field, and their distinct methods of categorization have created a confusion of overlapping terms and methods of study. For example, Jaworski and Coupland's "narrative analysis", Paltridge's "genre analysis", and Valentine's "text analysis" are all very closely related in that they are all concerned with the analysis of text, but they do not refer to identical areas of study, each being used to describe slightly different methodologies and aims. Because of inconsistencies like this, a unified description of what constitutes discourse analysis is not yet possible. However, many approaches to the study are shared, and it is useful to become familiar with the kinds of terms and divisions that have been created in order to understand the range of study encompassed by discourse analysis and the way in

which a more focused study (like that of narrative analysis, explored in this thesis) fits into the field of discourse analysis as a whole.

As an example of how the field can be subdivided, Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland argue that seven approaches constitute discourse analysis (1999:14-35): 1) speech act theory and pragmatics (Austin 1999); 2) conversation analysis (Grice 1999); 3) discursive psychology; 4) ethnography of communication; 5) interactional sociolinguistics; 6) narrative analysis; and 7) critical discourse analysis. However, both Paltridge and Valentine divide the field somewhat differently, using some of the same terms in overlapping but non-equivalent ways. The following table represents three categorizations of areas of study within the field of discourse analysis. Although the divisions do not correspond directly with one another, I have organized them so models of study sharing some similarities in their approach to discourse are listed beside the same number.

Table 1: Areas of Study within Discourse Analysis

Area of study	Jaworski and Coupland	Paltridge	Valentine
1	Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics	Speech Act Theory	___
2	Conversation Analysis	Conversation Analysis	Conversation Analysis
3	Discursive Psychology	Pragmatics and Conversation	Discourse as a Social-interactional Analysis
4	Ethnography of Communication	Ethnography of Communication	Ethnopoetics
5	Interactional Sociolinguistics	Patterns of Cohesion	Form-content Parallelism
6	Narrative Analysis	Genre Analysis	Text Analysis
7	Critical Discourse Analysis	Critical Discourse Analysis	Socio-linguistic Research

1.2.2. Narrative Analysis

Narrative analysis, which encompasses the main focus and theoretical approach of this thesis, corresponds roughly with Paltridge's "genre analysis" and Valentine's "text analysis" and involves isolating linguistic patterns within texts, locating where certain features of the language are used instead of others, and postulating what a particular pattern of use might indicate. As such, this model of study focuses on things like topic, comment, participants, and cohesive devices within stretches of narrative or text in order that a narrative analyst can identify and describe the formal linguistic features that mark and divide these units into genres or that serve other functions related to the intended meaning and interpretation of the text. Ruqaiya Hasan argues that basic to this approach to discourse is the need to distinguish between obligatory and optional structural elements in a text, where structures that are obligatory are "genre defining" (in Paltridge 2000:112). For example, linguists interested in this area of study might explore something like what formally marks a folk tale as a folk tale and not, say, as a legend in a particular linguistic community. Similarly, a narrative analyst could explore what the use of a discourse feature like the historical present tense indicates in different types of narrative genres. In this thesis, I examine the role of obviation as a discourse feature in Innu-aimun *âtanûkana*.

Often, narrative analysts employ the Labovian framework of textual analysis in which the text being analyzed is divided into six structural segments: 1) abstract; 2) orientation; 3) complicating action; 4) evaluation; 5) result or resolution; and 6) coda

(Labov and Waletzky 1967; Labov 1999). By dividing the text in this way, a narrative analyst can identify structural elements in each stage of a story that are characteristic of the story's particular genre. Valentine, for example, uses this approach in her structural analysis of Severn Ojibwe narratives in *Making it their Own* (1995).

For the purposes of the present study, however, a structural analysis of the texts, like that of Labov, is not suitable because it does not allow for a focussed examination of one particular discourse feature in a text (here, obviation). Instead, I have developed my own methodology within the framework of narrative analysis that allows for the examination of a particular obviation pattern or the obviation status of a particular referent within its immediate context. In my analysis, I also consider the use of obviation within the context of the story as a whole entity. For example, in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, because Hare is proximate throughout most of the story, I consider the structural location and importance of the very few instances in which he is not proximate. However, my main focus is on proximates and obviatives as isolated occurrences and as they occur immediately preceding or following third persons with which they corefer.

Jaworski and Coupland argue for the importance of narrative analysis because it "deals with a pervasive genre of communication through which we enact important aspects of our identities and relations with others" (1999:32). They also suggest that the analysis of narratives is valuable for the philosophical and social perspectives it presents, and argue that "it is partly through narrative discourse that we comprehend the world and present our understanding of it to others" (1999:32).

1.2.3. Algonquian Discourse Analysis and Narrative Analysis

Lisa Philips Valentine's 1995 book *Making it their Own: Severn Ojibwe Communicative Practices,* and Roger Spielmann's 1998 book *'You're So Fat!': Exploring Ojibwe Discourse,* are comprehensive studies of the discourse practices of particular Ojibwe (Algonquian language family) communities. Because both Valentine and Spielmann incorporate a wide range of approaches into their analyses of Algonquian discourse, these two studies provide a good overview of the kinds of analyses that can be carried out in this field. The features of discourse that Valentine and Spielmann identify and describe in the communicative practices of the people of Lynx Lake (Valentine), and Pikogan, Winneway, and Wikwemikong (Spielmann) are a valuable resource for comparison with each other and with the findings of studies carried out on other Algonquian languages and dialects.

Valentine's study explores the language and discourse of the Severn Ojibwe people of Lynx Lake in northwestern Ontario. Corresponding to some degree with the approaches of Jaworski and Coupland discussed earlier, Valentine incorporates six theoretical approaches into her study (Valentine 1995:8-9): text analysis, conversation analysis, sociolinguistic research, discourse as a social-interactional analysis, form-content parallelism, and ethnopoetics. Working with a broad definition of "discourse" as "language used in social interactions" (1995:7), Valentine outlines and describes the linguistic situation in Lynx Lake, focusing on the linguistic resources and language use in the community. She situates the Lynx Lake variety of Severn Ojibwe within the

Algonquian language family, explores the changes in communication that have arisen with the introduction into the community of technologies like the telephone, radio, newspaper, and so forth, and identifies instances of lexical and phonological code-switching between Severn Ojibwe and Cree or English. She also discusses Native literacy and the use of syllabics in Lynx Lake, explores the relationship between speech and music, and analyzes the role of religious discourse in the community.

More relevant to the focus of this thesis, Valentine's study also examines discourse-internal structuring in a Severn Ojibwe first-person narrative and in a myth-legend (*aatisoohkaan*)[3], using Labov's model for narrative analysis. Here, Valentine focuses on the "metanarrative" features of these texts, which "frame" or "key" the text for the reader or listener. She also explores differences and similarities between these two story genres and identifies some of the genre-specific features that mark them, including pronoun shifts, tense shifts, discourse particles, repetition, formulaic expressions, and so forth. Lastly, she discusses the active role that discourse analysis can play in observing social change and addressing social concerns.

In *'You're So Fat!,'* Spielmann explores the contemporary use of Ojibwe in two Algonquin communities in Quebec, Pikogan and Winneway, and in one Odawa community in Ontario, Wikwemikong. In his book, Spielmann focuses on three aspects of discourse: 1) language and cultural values, where he explores Aboriginal ethnohistories and values, interaction patterns in naturally occurring conversation, and some differences in language use between Algonquian and Indo-European speakers;

[3] Severn Ojibwe *aatisoohkaan* is cognate with Innu-aimun *âtanûkan* 'myth-legend'.

2) conversation analysis, where he looks at how reality is built and upheld through everyday talk, how oral legends and other stories are elaborately constructed by Anishnaabe storytellers, and how humourous talk and complaints are carried out in Ojibwe; and 3) linguistic discourse analysis, where he analyzes various genres of Ojibwe narrative and identifies several of the linguistic features that characterize them in order to gain a deeper understanding of the role of stories in contemporary Anishnaabe culture.

Valentine's and Spielmann's studies of Algonquian narratives analyze a wide range of discourse features. The analysis of Algonquian narratives can take two forms, however: 1) a generalized look at several discourse features and strategies, usually within a small number of texts; or, like the approach adopted in this thesis, 2) a more focussed approach that examines the occurrence and use of one particular strategy or feature within one or more texts. In what follows, I describe five studies that analyze the general narrative structure of particular Algonquian texts (type 1) and three studies that concentrate instead on only one or two discourse features (type 2), including the use of mode and evidentiality in Algonquian narratives. The studies that concentrate specifically on obviation are discussed in depth in Chapter Two.

Richard Rhodes, in his 1979 article "Some aspects of Ojibwa discourse," outlines some of the discourse phenomena that occur in Central Ojibwa and Ottawa. He explores the distribution and function of several phenomena that appear to be significant at the level of discourse, including use of the past tense, the conjunct mode, and certain morphemes, words, and constructions and various discourse particles. Based on the results of his analysis, Rhodes draws several conclusions. Among these, he finds that the

use of the past tense and the untranslatable discourse particle (i.e., a word that has meaning primarily at the level of discourse) *dash* mark prominence (1979:103), that the conjunct is sometimes used to mark the future tense (1979:112), and that the discourse particle *gsha* indicates to hearers that they should suspend their judgement upon hearing what the narrator is about to say (1979:113).

In C. Douglas Ellis' 1995 introduction to *âtalôhkâna nêsta tipâcimôwina: Cree Legends and Narratives from the West Coast of James Bay*, he analyzes the use of several discourse features to mark specific genres of Cree stories. Included in his analysis are sequential ordering, the use of archaic terms, characterization, and the use of formulaic expressions, among others. His findings show, for example, that *tipâcimôwina*, which include all stories that are not myth/legends and that often deal with historical or real-life experiences, are marked in one way as belonging to the genre by their lack of characterization (1995:xxxiii). He also finds that specific formulaic expressions are used to mark a story as belonging to a particular genre and not to another. For example, he argues that the presence of the word *êskwâpihkêyâk* 'the length of the story' at the end of a narrative marks the narrative as being a "heroic episode" (1995:xxvi), a subgenre of Cree cyclical *âtalôhkâna,* or myth/legends.

Unlike Rhodes, who analyzes particular discourse features in order to determine their specific functions, Ellis is more concerned with the role that discourse features play in dividing narratives into discrete genres. Because of his particular focus, Ellis' analysis provides a valuable framework for identifying, organizing, and analyzing different types of Algonquian narratives.

In her 1995 book *Making it their Own*, Valentine explores a wide variety of strategies that play a role at the level of discourse. Specifically, she looks at the use of dubitative verbs, formulaic expressions, the first person, pronoun shifts, tense shifts, direct discourse, repetition, highly-specific verbs, narrator laughter, particles, parallel constructions, pauses, proper names, and so forth. All of these, she argues, reflect particular ways in which the narrator signals information to the hearers. For example, she finds that dubitative verbs are common in legends and "carry the story into the realm of hearsay, liberating story from contemporary life" (1995:194). Where a narrator uses a dubitative verb, then, hearers will know the storyteller is not claiming the story is necessarily true.

Amy Dahlstrom's 1996 article, "Narrative structure of a Fox text," presents an analysis of the story "A Young Man who Fasted" in which she identifies several linguistic patterns in the text and hypothesizes the functions of particular discourse features. While she concentrates on the use of obviation in the text[4], she also looks at occurrences of the evidential enclitic *=ye·toke* 'it seems', conjunctions, the changed conjunct, overt noun phrases, and anaphoric temporal adverbs. From her analysis, Dahlstrom identifies several correlations between the patterns of use of particular discourse strategies and other changes in the text. For example, she finds that evidentials are often used by storytellers where they were not actually witness to the events being recounted, but instead heard the story from someone else (1996:120). Similarly, she notes that the use of the changed conjunct often corresponds with a change in location,

[4] Dahlstrom's discussion of obviation is dealt with in Chapter Two.

the use of overt noun phrases often signals a topic shift, and the use of anaphoric temporal adverbs often indicates a simultaneous shift in time, for example from the time of the story's events to the present time of the narrator's telling of the story (1996:117). Dahlstrom concludes from her study that the use of the linguistic devices she identifies may indicate evidential distinctions, stylistic functions, or the division of the story into what she calls "acts" (the major components of a story) and "scenes" (the smaller sections that make up the acts).

Chapter 10 in Spielmann's 1998 book, *'You're So Fat!,'* describes the linguistic discourse analysis of a traditional Anishnaabe legend "Amik Anishnaabewigoban." In the analysis, Spielmann explores the use of seven discourse features (1998:186): 1) direct discourse; 2) verb switching; 3) doublet constructions; 4) character focus; 5) particles and other discourse markers; 6) word-internal constructions; and 7) general narrative structure. He identifies various ways in which the narrator may use these features, such as to make the hearer focus on significant events in the story, to partition important events, and to show diverse perspectives on the narrative action.

All of the studies discussed above identify patterns of discourse features as they occur in Algonquian narratives. While Rhodes, Dahlstrom, and Spielmann explore how discourse features function within the texts they analyze, Ellis instead identifies the way in which these features pattern differently in distinct genres, with the aim of classifying Algonquian narratives into subgroups of narrative types that can then be compared and contrasted to discover the particular function of different discourse strategies. Valentine, however, incorporates both of these approaches to narrative analysis, first distinguishing

first-person narratives from myth-legends and subsequently analyzing the function of various discourse strategies in each of these two genres. In this way, her analysis implies that distinguishing different Algonquian narrative genres and determining the functions of specific discourse features should really be studied in conjunction with one another. That is, in order to determine a particular feature's function, it is often useful or even necessary to first know the context in which it is used (i.e., what genre of narrative it occurs in and where within the structure of the text itself it is usually found). Similarly, in order to identify the formal features that mark discrete Algonquian narrative genres, it is often useful to have some idea of how the features function at the level of discourse so that a feature marking timelessness, for example, could provide evidence toward the classification of a particular story as a myth or legend. Valentine's study, therefore, highlights the benefit of incorporating considerations of both genre and function into the analysis of Algonquian narrative discourse.

Other studies have focused on one or two particular discourse strategies and have therefore offered thorough analyses of multiple environments in which a particular discourse feature can occur and have identified patterns that emerge from this set of occurrences. Lynn Drapeau, in the following three studies, explores Montagnais (=Innu-aimun) evidentials. Although the first of these studies really explores features that do not fall into this category, I have included it in this section because its findings are so closely related to those of the subsequent two papers, and it therefore makes sense for the three to be discussed in conjunction with one another.

In her 1984 article, "Le traitement de l'information chez les Montagnais," Drapeau looks at several discourse features that appear to be involved in marking the status of reported information in the Betsiamites dialect of Montagnais, including repetition, double direct discourse marking (e.g., John said, "...", he said to me.), multiple embedding, and the use of verbal paradigms. Specifically, Drapeau concentrates on how the distinction is drawn in Montagnais reported information between events that have been directly witnessed and those that have not. For example, she finds that the indicative mode tends to be used to talk about events that the speaker has witnessed, while the indirect mode is used to talk about information that the speaker has been given from a third party (1984:28). She also finds that in Montagnais narratives the indirect mode is often used at the opening and closing of a story, at the same time as old or background information is provided by the storyteller, and that the indicative mode is often found elsewhere in the story (1984:32). In this paper, Drapeau further analyzes the conclusions she draws about particular discourse features in an attempt to formally characterize the Montagnais narrative genres of *atânûkana* 'myth-legends' and *tipâtshimuna,* which include all other stories, and demonstrates that the knowledge of how these features are distributed and function in narratives is crucial to distinguishing between these genres.

Drapeau's 1986 article, "Entre le rêve et la réalité: le mode subjectif en montagnais," examines the system of verbal paradigms in the Betsiamites dialect of Montagnais and, specifically, explores the context in which what Drapeau calls the "subjective" mode occurs. She finds that the subjective mode occurs in six particular

contexts: 1) dream stories; 2) reminiscences; 3) subjective perceptions; 4) astonishment because of a surprising event; 5) euphemisms; and 6) the designation of individuals, objects, or places. Based on similarities between the first five contexts, Drapeau suggests that the subjective mode is used in Montagnais to signal the speaker's opinion, taste, avoidance of a direct question, or desire to reduce the impact of criticism. In terms of designating people, things, and places using the subjective mode, Drapeau suggests that speakers feel this use reflects a way in which speakers can avoid directly pointing at someone.

In her 1996 article, "Conjurors: the use of evidentials in Montagnais second-hand narratives," Drapeau explores the system of evidential modalities in Montagnais that is grammatically encoded in the language's verb paradigms to signal the status of information. She analyzes the ways in which different modalities pattern in distinct Montagnais narrative genres, with the particular aim of discovering how they mark foreground or background information and first or second-hand narratives. She finds, for example, that the independent indirect preterit and indirect conjunct forms of the verb correspond with background information in *âtâlûkana* (myths-legends), and that the use of the independent present dubitative form of the verb in non-embedded clauses of a second-hand narrative overtly marks foregrounding (1996:173). She also finds that in *âtâlûkana* it is not necessary, as it is elsewhere, for evidentiality to be marked. This lack of marked evidentiality, she suggests, constitutes a formal discourse feature of Montagnais *âtâlûkana*, where the storyteller can relate the story events as if she/he had witnessed them (1996:174).

The following table represents the studies of Algonquian narratives discussed above, and includes the specific language or dialect of the text(s) being analyzed and the specific feature(s) the narrative analyst explores. It also represents the studies on obviation, which are discussed in Chapter Two. Where I have written "various" for the type of features analyzed, the study explores several features such as the use of repetition, anaphoric temporal adverbs, discourse particles, sequential ordering, direct/indirect discourse, verb-tense ordering, formulaic expressions, and so forth.

Table 2: Algonquian Narrative Studies

Discourse analyst	**Language/dialect**	**Feature(s) analyzed**
1. Dahlstrom (1991, 1996)	Cree and Fox	Obviation/various
2. Drapeau (1984, 1986, 1996)	Montagnais	Evidentials/various
3. Ellis (1995)	Cree	various
4. Goddard (1984, 1990)	Fox	Obviation
5. Rhodes (1979)	Ojibwa and Ottawa	various
6. Russell (1991)	Cree/Swampy Cree	Obviation
7. Spielmann (1998)	Algonquin and Odawa (Ojibwe)	various
8. Thomason (1995)	Fox	Obviation
9. Valentine (1995)	Severn Ojibwe	various

CHAPTER TWO

Obviation in Algonquian Narratives

2.1. Introduction

Obviation, a grammatical category found in Algonquian languages, has the primary function of distinguishing between multiple third-person referents. As a general rule, in any stretch of narrative involving two or more third persons, one will be proximate, and all others will be obviative. This distinction is reflected morphologically: proximate forms are morphologically unmarked and obviative forms are marked with a suffix. Obviation can therefore be triggered within a verb containing two third persons (subject and object), in the broader context of a clause or sentence, or over a series of sentences. However, while there are many environments in which obviation occurs, there are only two absolutely obligatory rules governing its use: 1) only one of the arguments of a verb can be proximate, and 2) if an animate noun is possessed by an animate third person, the possessed noun is obviative (Goddard 1990:318). Thus, the basic principle states that where there are two animate third persons in any given context, one will be proximate and the other obviative, but "the rules of grammar, in particular of syntax, leave the choice almost entirely open as to which can be which," creating "a wide latitude of choice in the assigning of proximate and obviative status in a discourse" (Goddard 1990:318).

Although there are numerous instances in which the choice of proximate or obviative appears to be open to the storyteller, there are several tendencies that seem to narrow the latitude of choice to some extent. For instance, Amy Dahlstrom has found that perception verbs or verbs expressing feelings generally have proximate subjects (1991:110); Kevin Russell has shown that there is a tendency for a proximate to stay constant over a series of clauses, although, in any given text, obviative status will almost always change at least twice (1996:368); Lucy Thomason has found that, in Fox autobiography, obviative forms are rare and that there is a large number of same-sentence proximate shifts (1995:467); and Ives Goddard has demonstrated that there exists a "quasi-universal animacy hierarchy," which consistently requires that an animate noun designating a non-human never be higher in rank than an animate human noun (1984:277). That is, where an animate non-human noun is proximate, an animate human noun cannot be obviative (i.e., must also be proximate), even if it is the topically secondary third-person referent.

In addition to the grammatical limitations that play a role in the distribution of obviation in narratives, there also appear to be more discourse-based constraints that determine how a storyteller can assign and change the proximate or obviative status of particular third-person referents. What this means is that the tendencies or patterns of obviation in discourse may not reflect complete flexibility in a storyteller's choice of obviation status where grammatical constraints have already been satisfied; instead, they may reflect the semantic notions on which a particular status is based beyond more easily identifiable grammatical constraints. The important point to be made, as Russell

observes in relation to Cree narratives, is that "the choice of which referent to make proximate cannot be forced by the grammatical relations borne by the referents ... [because] ... Cree has devised some circumlocutions that will usually allow even a proximate nominal to be 'possessed' " (1996:368). This means other factors beyond the basic grammatical rules must also play a role in determining this choice. Russell's statement holds true for other Algonquian languages (and dialects of the Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi continuum), where environments that dictate that a particular noun phrase (NP) have a specific obviation status can similarly be avoided by a creative storyteller.

To say patterns of obviation may reflect the semantics governing the choice of proximate or obviative raises the more specific question of what these semantic notions might be. In other words, we must then ask the question: what are the factors, both syntactic and semantic, that drive the choice of obviation status for each particular noun phrase in a discourse?

2.2. Previous Research on Obviation in Algonquian Narratives

The studies discussed below give an overview of the kind of work that has been done towards understanding the discourse uses of obviation in Algonquian languages and answering the question of what drives a storyteller's choice of obviation status for each particular third-person referent in a story. These studies focus their analyses on the use of obviation in narratives told in a variety of Algonquian languages and dialects and offer

thorough considerations of how proximate and obviative status are assigned in the texts examined.

Two studies carried out by Ives Goddard, for example, explore the use of obviation in Fox narratives. In Goddard's 1984 article, he analyzes the general patterns of obviation that determine which characters are proximate and which are obviative, and, in his 1990 article, he turns his attention to where changes in obviation occur with respect to the narrative structure of texts, and particularly with respect to paragraph divisions.

Goddard's 1984 article, "The obviative in Fox narrative discourse," presents what he calls a preliminary survey of some of the patterns of obviation found in Fox texts (1984:274). In the article, he distinguishes "normal multiple proximates" (including coreferent and coordinate proximates, among others) from "proximate shifts," and identifies "obviative shifts." A proximate shift, he argues, where a formerly obviative third person becomes proximate, tends to occur in sections of the narrative that correspond to a shift in focus or point of view and "promotes a subordinate character to coordinate status with the former main character" (1984:279-280).

In his 1990 article, "Aspects of the topic structure of Fox narratives: Proximate shifts and the use of overt and inflectional NPs," Goddard extends his study of Fox narratives, focussing his analysis on the distribution of proximate shifts. He also classifies these shifts in terms of how they correspond with paragraph divisions as "delayed" or "anticipated" proximate shifts. He concludes that, while proximate shifts often coincide with shifts in paragraph (1990:320), "a one-clause delay in making a proximate shift at the beginning of a new paragraph is a common pattern when ... the

first clause of the new paragraph contains a verb in the changed conjunct mode" (1990:323). Furthermore, he argues that the changed conjuncts that describe the completion of a movement to a new location or the recapitulation of the previous action "frequently function as scene shifters or episode delimiters ..." (1990:323).

Amy Dahlstrom explores the discourse uses of obviation in two Algonquian languages: Plains Cree and Fox. In her 1991 book, *Plains Cree Morphosyntax*, she examines the narrative environments and discourse functions of single and multiple proximates in Plains Cree narratives. She argues that, while there are some similarities between the functions of subjecthood and sentence topic in English and proximate status in Algonquian languages, proximate status cannot be considered as equivalent to either of these. Unlike subjecthood in English, proximate status is not a clause-level relation since "proximate and obviative third persons may range over a sentence or a paragraph-sized episode" (1991:95), and unlike sentence topic in English, proximate status is not a sentence-level relation since "although it is common for there to be one proximate third person in a given sentence, some sentences may have no proximate third person at all, while others have more than one proximate" (1991:95). Dahlstrom concludes that proximate status is often used to reflect the viewpoint of the character with whom the audience can most readily sympathize, and that multiple proximates can be employed by the storyteller to reflect equality in status between two or more characters (1991:119).

In her 1996 article, "Narrative structure of a Fox text," Dahlstrom further investigates the discourse uses of obviation, this time in a single Fox text. Based on her analysis of the narrative, she concludes that proximate third persons may express a broad

range of discourse functions, indicating the character(s) with which the storyteller empathizes, the character(s) whose point of view is being expressed, or the topic of the sentence or passage (1996:122).

Kevin Russell also looks at the nature of obviation and its distribution and discourse functions in Algonquian narratives. His 1991 article, "Obviation as discourse structure in a Swampy Cree *âcimowin*," examines the use of obviation in the Swampy Cree genre of *âcimowin* (histories and other non-myth/legend stories) and the subgenre of *wawiyatâcimowina* (funny stories). This study deals with the question of how and to what extent the boundaries of syntactic and obviative constituents coincide (1991:326). For example, he explores instances where the same referent remains proximate over an extended stretch of narrative by asking questions like whether obviation spans coincide with spans of background information, or perhaps with paragraphs. He finds that not only do long stretches of narrative without proximate shifts coincide with stretches of background information, or states rather than actions (1991:328), but that they also seem to represent mid-level discourse units where "obviation groups clauses and sentences together into larger units and divides the entire narrative into smaller units" (1991:323). However, when he looks at how the proximate spans interact with discourse units defined by intonation, pausing, and syntax, he does not find any easy correlations (1991:325).

In his 1996 article, "Does obviation mark point of view?," Russell examines the interaction of deictic grammatical features that could mark point of view with proximate choice in the Plains Cree narrative "The Story of Skirt" (in Bloomfield 1934) to see whether or not the distribution of proximates and obviatives can be shown to reflect

perceptual point of view, thus answering the question "Who sees?" In order to test this hypothesis, Russell compares occurrences of proximate referents with the occurrence of deictic expressions marking the spatial orientation of the relevant third-person referent (1991:374). However, he finds that these do not coincide in "The Story of Skirt," and so concludes that obviation cannot be said to mark point of view.

Lucy Thomason has also studied the discourse uses of obviation in Fox narratives. In her 1995 article, "The Assignment of Proximate and Obviative in Informal Fox Narrative," she explores how proximate and obviative status are given in *Autobiography of a Fox Indian Woman* and in three Mortuary texts. By comparing the use of obviation in these informal narratives with Ives Goddard's 1990 findings for the more formal narratives of Alfred Kiyana, Thomason identifies two paradigms, informal and formal, that characterize the use of obviation. In informal or casual narratives, she argues, discourse features are used more extensively to differentiate third persons, resulting in a drop in the use of obviation. She also finds a tendency in informal narratives for third persons to be introduced as proximates and finds that obviatives in subject position are extremely rare. Thomason argues that, in the informal paradigm, global importance (i.e., within the text as a whole), local importance (i.e., within the immediate context), and the independent status of a particular third-person referent compete for proximate assignment, where global prominence outranks local prominence. Similarly, other tendencies suggest that certain types of third persons are preferred as proximates: 1) inherited proximates (i.e., that are coreferent with the previously-mentioned proximate)

are preferred over new third persons; 2) subjects are preferred over objects; and 3) agents and experiencers are preferred as proximates over patients.

The data in Table 3 show some proposed functions of obviation as analyzed in narratives told in Cree, Fox, and the Algonquin and Odawa dialects of Ojibwa.

Table 3: Obviation in Algonquian Narratives

Analyst	Language/ Dialect	Proposed Function(s)
Russell	Cree	excitement; suspense; not point of view; non-topic
Dahlstrom	Cree/Fox	empathy/point of view/topic/spatial orientation
Spielmann	Algonquin/Odawa	moving spotlight from one character to another/focus shifting
Goddard	Fox	point of view/focus shift reflecting the status of one third person referent with respect to another
Thomason	Fox	(in informal narratives) prox. status reflects rankings: subject>object, inherited prox.>new 3p, agent/experiencer>patient

Table 3 shows the general consensus on obviation is that it functions in Algonquian narratives in some way to shift focus or spatial orientation with respect to third-person referents in the story. Although several analysts suggest obviation might reflect speaker point of view, Russell argues that, at least in Cree, it can be proven that point of view is not reflected in this way (1996:374).

2.3. Methodology

The aim of the present study is to fill some of the gaps in the existing corpus of studies on obviation in Algonquian narratives by providing a systematic analysis of the assignment of proximate and obviative forms in two Innu-aimun *atanûkâna* 'myth/legends'. The methodology employed involves five stages of analysis: 1) the interlinear translation of the two stories; 2) tracking the obviation status of each third-person referent in the stories; 3) identifying instances of eight obviation patterns in the stories; 4) identifying the semantic and syntactic environments in which third-person referents are proximate; and 5) proposing discourse functions for proximate and obviative status in the stories.

2.3.1. Interlinear Translations

In order to gain an understanding of the way in which obviation patterns in each of the two Innu-aimun stories, a detailed morphological analysis of both *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} and *Meshâpush* was necessary. For each story, I worked with Marguerite MacKenzie, Jane Bannister, and Innu-aimun speakers Kanani Penashue and Judy Hill to create morpheme-by-morpheme translations of the stories. These translations indicate the proximate or obviative status of each third-person referent and provide and highlight the data necessary for the identification and analysis of corresponding obviation patterns

as well as the semantic and syntactic environments in which particular obviation statuses are assigned in the narratives.

2.3.2. Tracking Obviation Status

Secondly, I tracked the isolated, sustained, and changing status of each third-person referent in the two stories in a table like that given below. These tables provide the following information for each third-person referent: 1) the line number in which the referent is mentioned; 2) the referent's status as proximate or obviative; 3) whether the referent's status reflects a proximate or obviative shift; 4) whether the referent is mentioned explicitly (e.g., proper noun, possessive form) or implicitly (e.g., verb subject or object); 5) the syntactic role of the proximate or obviative third person(s); 6) the semantic role of the proximate or obviative third person(s); and 7) commentary on the particular use of obviation (e.g., avoidance strategy, agent). The tables also provide the data necessary for counting proximate and obviative occurrences and for drawing conclusions based on these numbers.

Table 4 shows the obviation status of Hare between lines 85 and 91 in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}.[5]

[5] The abbreviations used in these tables are explained in the list of abbreviations on pages iv-vi.

Table 4: Table for Tracking the Obviation Status of Third-Person Referents

Third Person Referent (e.g. *Uâpush* 'Hare' in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u})						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
85	P		I	itikû-obj	spoken to	AV
87	P		I	iteu-sbj	speaking	AG
89	O, O	OS	E	POSSD4, PNobv	sung to	AV,song, climax
89	P	PS	E	PN Vsbj	not wanting	
90	O	OS	I	Vobj	flown at	nonAG
91	P	PS	I	Vsbj	not giving	

2.3.3. Identifying Patterns of Obviation

Using the interlinear translations and the tables discussed in 2.3.1. and 2.3.2., the third stage of analysis involved identifying occurrences of four patterns of isolated and sustained obviation (third-person referents considered on their own and third-person referents whose status as proximate or obviative does not change over a particular stretch of narrative) and four patterns of shifting obviation (the ways in which third persons can alternate between proximate and obviative within a particular stretch of narrative). By identifying occurrences of these obviation patterns in the two stories, I was able to draw correlations between textual environment and obviation status. My focus for this analysis, then, was on the specific sections of text where patterns emerged from the data. These analyses are presented in detail in Chapters Three and Four (Sections 3.2., 3.3., 4.2., and 4.3.).

2.3.4. Identifying Proximate Environments

Fourthly, for each character in the two *âtanûkana*, I identified the immediate semantic or syntactic environments in which the character appears as a third-person referent (corresponding with Thomason's "local importance"), and therefore where the storyteller had to make the choice between proximate or obviative status. This analysis revealed a fairly small number of "proximate environments" (PEs: semantic or syntactic environments in which third-person referents are proximate), versus a much larger number of obviative environments (i.e., environments in which third persons are obviative). Although the status of proximate must be considered the unmarked member of the proximate/obviative grammatical opposition - proximate status being given wherever only one third person appears in a narrative context - in contexts where there already exists an opposition between proximate and obviative, the distribution of proximates and obviatives suggests that the status of obviative becomes the default situation, obviative status being given to third-person referents that are not required, by virtue of their context, to be proximate. I decided, therefore, to focus my analysis on the instances in which a character is assigned proximate status so that I could identify the specific environments in which at least this one storyteller, Etuat Rich, has chosen proximate status over obviative status for the third person involved. Occurrences of obviatives, by contrast, I decided to deal with as the default status in all instances where more than one third person is present. Where exceptions occurred and either proximate status was assigned outside a PE or obviative status was assigned in a PE, I examined the

third person's role within a larger context of the story (Thomason's "global importance") to explore how the storyteller might use this unexpected status to alter the listener's interpretation of the narrative by conveying additional meaning at the level of discourse. These analyses are explored in Chapters Three and Four (Sections 3.4. and 4.4.).

2.3.5. Proposing Discourse Functions

Based on the results of the previous stages of analysis, I have drawn hypotheses regarding (at least) this particular storyteller's use of obviation. For example, where preliminary research indicated a correlation between proximate status and agentive third persons, a possible conclusion to be drawn would be to hypothesize a constraint on obviation requiring an agentive third person to be proximate. My preliminary research also revealed a tendency in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} to use what I have termed "avoidance strategies". These strategies can be analyzed as a reflection of constraints governing the use of obviation, where a particular status must be purposely *avoided* so the storyteller is able to choose an alternative obviation status in order to express a third person's global importance in the story (i.e., its meaning at the level of discourse).

2.4. The Patterns

This section offers a brief description of each of the eight types of obviation pattern I identify in the two Innu-aimun *âtanûkana*. I have also included examples given in the literature that have been identified and analyzed in other Algonquian narratives.

2.4.1. Patterns of Sustained or Isolated Obviation

By "sustained and isolated obviation," I am referring to the instances of third-person referents whose status as proximate or obviative does not change over a particular stretch of narrative. I have chosen to divide the various patterns into two major groupings — sustained/isolated vs. shifting patterns — because this division is particularly useful in terms of textual analysis; that is, the grammatical binary distinction of shifting/non-shifting seems to correlate with similar semantic oppositions in the narratives, such as active/static. The following patterns of obviation are discussed in this section: single proximate spans, coreferent proximates, coordinate proximates, and obviative spans.

2.4.1.1. Single Proximate Spans (PSp)

A single proximate span is "a stretch of narrative where the same referent is in the proximate" (Russell 1991:323) and where there are no other noun phrases that are

proximate. Russell observes a correlation between occurrences of single proximate spans and semantic and syntactic divisions in the narrative structure. For instance, he notes that long stretches of narrative with a single proximate span tend to reflect background information or states rather than actions (1991:328). He also argues that single proximate spans represent mid-level discourse units where "obviation groups clauses and sentences together into larger units and divides the entire narrative into smaller units" (1991:323).

In "The Bear as Truck Driver," for instance, the Swampy Cree *âcimowin* that Russell explores in his 1991 article, the man is the only proximate for lines 1-17 (with the exception of part of line 16, where the truck is proximate). Similarly, Goddard looks at how proximate spans correlate with paragraphs, but because it is the proximate shifts (PS) that determine the beginning and end of a particular span, this topic will be dealt with in the section discussing patterns of shifting obviation.

2.4.1.2. Coreferent Proximates (CoP)

Two or more proximate noun phrases that refer to the same person or group of people in a particular narrative context can be interpreted as coreferent proximates. The following excerpt from a Plains Cree narrative (Dahlstrom 1991:102) illustrates such a situation:

(1) *e·kwah awa kâ=kaskatahoht e·wako simatapiw.*
And the one (P) who was wounded, he (P) sat up.

In this example, the proximate form '*kâ=kaskatahoht*' and the proximate subject of '*simatapiw*' are coreferent. They can co-occur because they are semantically one proximate, both referring to the same third-person referent.

2.4.1.3. Coordinate Proximates (COP)

Two or more non-coreferential proximate noun phrases occasionally co-occur in a single narrative context. It appears that this is allowed when all of the proximates share equal status with one another (for example, if they are part of a team). When this occurs, these multiple proximates can be referred to as coordinate proximates. Falling into the category of multiple proximates, coordinate proximates can be defined as two or more conjoined third-person noun phrases coexisting in a particular narrative context as proximate, with or without a conjunction joining them, as in the following example from Plains Cree (Dahlstrom 1991:115):

(2) ... *awa na·pe·sis e·kwah aw o·skini·kiw mawi·hka·ta·wak.*
This boy (P) and this young man (P) were being mourned.

In this case, the two third-person referents in this sentence, 'the boy' and 'this young man,' are coordinate proximates. Unlike coreferent proximates, these proximates can co-occur because they are semantically joined, or grouped, even though they represent two different third persons. Here, the referents' coordinate status is also reflected syntactically by *ekwąh* 'and', but this need not be the case.

The following example from a Fox text (Goddard 1984:277) offers convincing evidence that conjoined noun phrases are subject to different restrictions on obviation, because it contains seven conjoined noun phrases, all proximate in form:

(3) *mo:hči=meko apeno:ha atame:ha:pi, ihkwe:waki=ke:hi, kekimesi, š:e š·kesi:haki, iškwe:se:he:haki, neniwaki, oškinawe:haki, kwi:yese:haki.*
Even children (P) are given a smoke, and women (P), everyone (P), maidens (P), little girls (P), men (P), youths (P), boys (P).

In this sentence, 'children', 'women', 'everyone', 'maidens', 'little girls', 'men', 'youths', and 'boys' are all conjoined, and all are assigned proximate status. Examples (2) and (3), therefore, demonstrate conclusively that there are cases in which several proximates can coexist within the same narrative context.

Dahlstrom observes, however, that not all conjoined noun phrases agree in obviation status. Rather, it is possible for a proximate noun phrase to be conjoined with an obviative noun phrase, as the following example from Plains Cree demonstrates (Dahlstrom 1991:115):

(4) *wa·pam e·si·miyosicik nisi·m o·h i·skwe·w*
Look how beautiful are my brother (P) and this woman (O).

The contrasting obviation statuses given in (4) are difficult to reconcile: Why would the conjoined noun phrases 'my brother and this woman,' which are seemingly grouped together, be distinguished by different obviation statuses? Because evidence is still inconclusive as to what proximate and obviative designations imply, it is not possible to

conclude what the storyteller is suggesting (or whether the storyteller is suggesting anything) by grammatically distinguishing these two noun phrases.

Similar to coordinate proximates are expanded proximates, which also reflect a close relationship between two noun phrase groups that can share proximate status. The difference between them is that, while coordinate nouns refer to two or more distinct noun phrases, expanded proximates reflect the combination of a previous proximate and another noun phrase, subsumed under one plural proximate form. Goddard presents the following example from a Fox text (1990:324):

(5) *i·tepi=meko e·h=išiwena·či e·h=owi·kiwa·či*
He (P) took him (O) to where they (P) lived.

In (5), the proximate form 'they' refers to a combination of the earlier proximate 'he' and others in his group, who are not mentioned separately in this sentence (but who have presumably been mentioned earlier in the discourse and are still contextually relevant). The question arises, then, as to what happens when the noun phrases that merge into an expanded proximate disagree in obviation status. Goddard argues that a plural pronoun that refers to a previous proximate and obviative that have been joined as a plural form is always proximate and that a noun phrase (NP) consisting of a proximate and an obviative is always construed as proximate (1990:325).

This is easily explainable if we once again consider the status of proximate as the unmarked member of the grammatical opposition (see 2.3.4.). It follows, then, that when two separate proximate and obviative referents merge into a single expanded NP, the

newly-formed third-person referent will also receive the grammatically-unmarked status of proximate.

The fact that coordinate proximates commonly occur makes it clear that the claim I made in the introduction to this chapter that, generally, only one third-person referent will be proximate and the others obviative is somewhat misleading. In fact, in the context of discourse, as Goddard observes, it is not unusual for two distinct animate third persons in the same context to be proximate as long as "two proximates are of equal overall status as opposite members of a balanced pairing and are not interacting directly" (1984:278-9).

There are, however, instances of multiple proximates that either do not reflect a balanced pairing, or *do* interact directly with each other. Goddard argues that there exist multiple proximates that violate the principles of the above definition in each of these two ways. For instance, he argues that there are a few examples of naming constructions in which "the name or designation is in effect quoted matter that stands outside the syntax of the sentence" (Goddard 1984:278). Constructions like these seem to be exempt from the requirements of obviation that would be triggered within most sentences.

Goddard argues that the "animacy hierarchy" (AH) is another constraint that often affects the obviation status of NPs. That is, he points to examples where two third-person referents are interacting directly, and do not represent an equally-balanced pair topically speaking, but where the ranking of human over non-human neutralizes the distinction that obviation would otherwise reflect. The following example taken from a Fox narrative demonstrates the animacy hierarchy constraint (Goddard 1984:277):

(6) *i:ni e:hkwiči mi:ša:mi·a:teso:hka:kana e:nahina:* čimoči *no:sa a:nawowa:ta.*
That is the end of the sacred-pack story (P) the way my uncle Anawowata (P) used to tell (it).

Here, the animacy hierarchy "prevents the uncle (*no:sa* 'my father's brother') from going into the lower-status category of the obviative, since even though he is topically secondary and mentioned second he is of higher rank, and hence the uncle must be proximate also" (Goddard 1984: 277). The two third-person referents in this passage, 'story' (P) and 'uncle' (P), are interacting directly, and do not represent an equally-balanced pair topically speaking, but the ranking of human over non-human neutralizes the distinction obviation would otherwise reflect.

The animacy hierarchy is significant in that it demonstrates that there is an order to or ranking of the constraints that govern obviation. In the above example, the animacy hierarchy, which requires that 'uncle' be proximate, outranks the constraint that would impose an obviative status on the same third-person referent if the animacy hierarchy did not apply.

2.4.1.4. Obviative Spans (OSp)

An obviative span occurs where a particular third-person referent remains obviative for the duration of a stretch of narrative. Goddard discusses an unusual case of sustained obviation found in a passage in which almost everything is described by the manitous who, over 34 manuscript pages, remain obviative except for two brief proximate shifts, both of which are explained as "focus shifts" (1990:326). This example

of a sustained obviative "contrasts with the largely backgrounded proximate status of the hero and is an indication that it is the hero's viewing of the manitous' activity that is significant to the narrative" (Goddard 1990:328). Because this occurrence is, in Goddard's words, "a remarkable case" with very little with which to compare it, it is especially difficult to determine any discourse functions or constraints. However, it is an interesting example of another kind of obviation pattern found in Algonquian narratives.

2.4.2. Patterns of Shifting Obviation

Unlike the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation discussed above, patterns of shifting obviation illustrate the ways in which noun phrases can alternate between proximate and obviative status in Algonquian narratives. These patterns also often suggest the motivation behind changes in obviation, since the shifts in obviation may delineate, or correlate with, the boundaries of other textual divisions. The following patterns are discussed in this section: proximate shifts, proximate switches, proximate shifts in function, and obviative shifts.

2.4.2.1. Proximate Shifts (PS)

A proximate shift occurs when a third-person noun phrase previously marked as obviative becomes proximate. Unlike proximate switches, proximate shifts do not reverse the obviation status of the two third persons because the previous proximate is no

longer present in the narrative. That is, the previous proximate does not become obviative; it is no longer mentioned[6]. The following is an example of a proximate shift in Plains Cree (Dahlstrom 1991:111):

(7) *peˑhtamiyiwa ayahciyiniwah namoya waˑhyaw eˑh=ayaˑyit, mitaˑtaht eˑy=ihtasiyit, miˑn eˑyakonik neˑhiyawah eˑh=ntonawaˑcik.*
Ten Blackfoot (O) who were not far away heard it, and they (P) also were seeking Cree (O).

In (7), the Blackfoot are obviative in the first clause and proximate in the second clause. The example does not represent a proximate switch because 'Cree (O) "is not, strictly speaking, coreferential with the earlier references to the group of Cree men and the boy" (Dahlstrom 1991:112); instead, it is non-referential, identifying the aim of the Blackfoot's search, and so the Cree men and the boy are not demoted to obviative status (Dahlstrom 1991:112).

The following example (taken from Goddard 1990:319-320) can be analyzed as a proximate switch (see 2.4.2.2.), but because the proximate shift is more prominent than the obviative shift, I will deal with the passage in this section:

(8) A woman (P) and her one-year-old have become lost during the spring buffalo hunt.

(1.1) *weˑčiˑči =keˑhi eˑh=kehčiˑnatoneˑhoči.*
And where she (P) had come from a great search was made for her (P).

[6] It is possible to posit an abstract obviation status for the third person who is no longer mentioned. This is discussed in 2.4.2.3., 3.3.3., and 4.3.3.

(1.2) *ona·pe·mani apina=meko e·h=mahkate·wi·niči.*
Her (P) husband (O), for his part, fasted.

(1.3) ¶[7] *o·ni=pi we·wi·wita, "nahi! wa·pake ki·h=ne·wa·wa ki·wa," e·h=ineči.*
¶ And then, it is said, her (O) husband (P) was told, "Well, tomorrow you will see your wife."

This proximate shift is from the woman to her husband, and it coincides with a shift in paragraph, which Goddard argues is often the case (1990:320). Interestingly, the different ways of referring to the husband in the passage reflect circumlocutions or avoidances of the normal patterns that govern the use of obviation. In this way, the storyteller can cause the shift to occur simultaneously with the shift in paragraph. Goddard explains how the storyteller manages to express a possessed NP as proximate:

> In (1.2) *ona·pe·mani* 'her (P) husband (O)' is an ordinary possessed noun. As such, the possessor can be proximate or obviative, but the possessed noun itself must be obviative; the morphology does not provide for an obviative possessor of a proximate noun. In (1.3) the structure of the discourse calls for the husband to become a new proximate, and hence requires a form that is proximate but still indicates the continuity of the identity of the husband. This requirement could have been filled by *neniwa* 'man (P)'... but the more elegant solution in the text is to use *we·wi·wita* 'her (O) husband (P),' a participle of the verb *owi·wi·* 'have (her) as wife' meaning literally 'he (P) who has her (O) as wife' (1990:320-321).

The more complex structure used by the storyteller is convincing evidence for motivational intent behind the proximate shift. It seems likely that the storyteller intentionally caused the shift to occur at the same time as the shift in paragraph.

[7] This symbol marks the shift in paragraph.

However, Goddard observes proximate shifts that do not coincide with changes in paragraph; instead, they occur one clause later ("delayed") or one clause earlier ("anticipated") than the corresponding shift in paragraph. He argues that "a one-clause delay in making a proximate shift at the beginning of a new paragraph is a common pattern when ... the first clause of the new paragraph contains a verb in the changed conjunct mode" and that the changed conjuncts that describe the completion of a movement to a new location or a recapitulation of the previous action "frequently function as scene shifters or episode delimiters ..." (1990:323). The following example from a Fox narrative reflects this type of "delayed" proximate shift (Goddard 1990:322):

(9) *ma·ne=meko e·h=neseči, e·h=ča·ki·=meko ·nakatešitamowa·či owi·kewa·wani.*
Many of them (P) were killed. And all of them (P) fled abandoning their (P) houses.

¶ *ki·ši·=pi ·ča·ki·nakatamowa·či, pe·hki e·h=wa·wi·seniwa·či neno·te·waki.*
¶ After they (P) all had abandoned them, they say, the people (P) feasted in earnest.

In this example, a group of Sioux are being forced by the Fox to abandon their homes. The proximate shift is in the second clause after the paragraph change. In the first clause of the paragraph, the Sioux are still in the proximate (perhaps recapitulating the action), and only in the second clause do the Fox re-enter the scene as proximate.

Like Goddard, who has worked with Fox texts, Matthew Dryer analyzes the distribution of proximate shifts in Ojibwa and Cree narratives (and in a British Columbia isolate, Kutenai) in order to discover whether proximate shifts are predictable from other textual properties. He charts the number of proximate shifts in a number of stories by

text environment, although he acknowledges that proximate shifts are most likely determined by "fairly abstract properties in the speaker's cognitive representation underlying the text [and therefore may be] symptomatic of these underlying determining factors" (1992:143).

The structure of Dryer's charts offers a clear and objective way by which instances of obviation in narratives can be organized and analyzed, perhaps revealing new patterns of obviation. But his study is to some degree problematic. For example, the percentages he calculates for shift occurrences are not based on enough data from which to draw reliable conclusions. Furthermore, although his Ojibwa chart is based on the first twenty clauses (skipping the first one) in *ten* texts, his Cree chart is based on the first hundred clauses (skipping the first one) in only *one* text. By comparing a small introductory section from ten texts with a large section from a single text, Dryer's comparison is based on imbalanced data that will likely produce skewed results. While the Ojibwa data reflect the distribution of proximate shifts in numerous story introductions, the data for Cree reflect the distribution of proximate shifts in more varied structural environments of a text.

Keeping these limitations in mind, Dryer's charts suggest that proximate shifts occur in similar environments in both Ojibwa and Cree. His data show, for example, that the number of proximate shifts that occur when the previous proximate is still present in the current clause is 3.1% in Cree and 4.4% in Ojibwa. Furthermore, in neither language do the data attest a proximate shift where the previous proximate is not in the current

clause (which contains equally animate (i.e., human) participants) and when the one clause is embedded in the other.

His data also suggest two differences between Ojibwa and Cree proximate shifts in discourse. For one, Dryer's Cree data do not attest proximate shifts where the previous proximate has dropped out of the discourse, and where all other third-person participants are non-human or inanimate. His data for Ojibwa, however, suggest that proximate shifts occur in this environment 9.4% of the time. Secondly, in environments other than the special environments identified by Dryer, his Ojibwa data suggest that a proximate shift will occur 100% of the time, while his Cree data attest occurrences only 52.6% of the time.

Despite its problems, Dryer's study is not without merit. It does suggest that there are structurally or semantically based patterns that characterize the distribution and use of proximate shifts by storytellers. It would, however, be useful to produce similar charts based on more extensive and more balanced data in order to elicit more reliable results concerning the distribution of proximates in these and other Algonquian languages and dialects.

Other Algonquianists have proposed several suggestions as to the discourse functions of proximate shifts. Goddard, for example, claims a proximate shift will sometimes change the focus of the narration, describing a character from the speaker's point of view (1984:279). The suggestion has also been made that proximate shifts may mark heightened actions where "the more intense the story, the more frequently the proximate referent changes" (Russell 1991:328). These shifts, especially where there are

mismatches between proximate spans and the discourse units, may contribute to suspense or excitement in the narrative (Russell 1996:368). Regina Pustet, in contrast, proposes that:

> ...the notion of some abstract, pragmatic deixis is being expressed, coinciding both with Uhlenbeck's ideas about obviation placing the participants of a clause at different stages of 'closeness' to the ego, as well as with the concept of foregrounding, i.e. discourse prominence (1994:63).

Because proximate shifts can occur in such a wide variety of contexts, even allowing, as the earlier example shows, a possessed noun phrase to become proximate, it stands to reason that their uses may reflect a number of different discourse functions, which may or may not correspond with those suggested above.

2.4.2.2. Proximate Switches (PSw)

I draw a distinction between proximate shifts and switches, defining proximate switches as proximate shifts where the previous proximate also changes status, becoming marked as obviative. In other words, proximate and obviative noun phrases *exchange* obviation status with each other. In order to demonstrate this pattern, Goddard uses the following example in which the hero, who is proximate, becomes obviative and the people, who are obviative, become proximate. I have deliberately left out some of the lines in order to avoid unnecessary repetition, but all changes in obviation in the passage are reflected (1990:329):

(10) *"šewe·wi·na=ni·na mahkwaki ayo·hi tanamiye·ke·koha," e·h=ina·či.*
"...but with me you would have eaten bears here," he (Hero-P) told them (his people-O).

¶ *o·ni nye·wokonakateniki e·h=a·čimoči.*
¶ And then, after four days, he (Hero-P) made a statement.

...¶ *i·ni·='na, "ni·na=ke·hi nepye·netiso," e·h=iči ki·mo·či.*
...¶ At that, that one (One of his people-P) said secretly, "But I brought myself."

"...¶ anika·ne me·hkate·wa·pata·niki wi·h=mawi·taši·wača·hoye·kwe," eh=iniči.
"...¶ that black object up ahead is where you are to go and cook," he (Hero-O) said.

ihkwe·waki e·h=penowa·či.
And the women (P) departed.

Because this switch in proximates is not syntactically motivated by the grammatical constraints on obviation, this a good example of obviation status being determined by discourse constraints. Based on the above example, Goddard claims that:

> This stylistic flourish draws attention to the somewhat unusual obviative status the hero has in the passage, an obviative status that evidently signals the narrative intent that his quoted statements be heard from the point of view of the addressees. (1990:331).

Where a similar shift occurs in a Plains Cree narrative between the Blackfoot and the Cree, Dahlstrom argues that "one effect of the change in proximates is to focus upon the Blackfoot, highlighting their nearness to the Cree, and creating suspense in the narrative" (1991:112). She also suggests viewpoint might be involved in the switch because there is a semantic parallel between the reciprocal searches of the Blackfoot for the Cree and the Cree for the Blackfoot.

2.4.2.3. Proximate Shifts in Function (PSF) (Other Multiple Proximates (MP))

Instances of multiple proximates can be analyzed (and defined) in a number of ways: 1) as coexistent proximates, 2) as evidence for distinct obviation spans, or 3) as proximate shifts in function, where each third-person referent is alternately obviative underlyingly, even though they are never pronounced as such. That is, if analyzed as proximate shifts in function, we could account for these multiple proximates by saying that we simply do not see either of the third persons becoming obviative because each time they are mentioned, their status shifts once again to proximate.

The following example from Plains Cree demonstrates multiple proximates that are best analyzed as coexistent proximates (Dahlstrom 1991:114):

(11) *e·h=takohte·cik e·kotah, a·say o·ma ka·=pa·skiswa·t mostoswah.*
When they (P) arrived there, he (P) had already shot the buffalo (O).

In this case, where 'they' and 'he' are proximates, Dahlstrom argues that, because both proximate third persons belong to the group of Cree who are out looking for Blackfoot, "neither is more prominent than the other, so they share proximate status" (1991:114). In other words, they reflect a balanced pairing between which there is no direct interaction.

However, there are other instances of multiple proximates that either a) do not reflect a balanced pairing, or b) *do* interact directly with each other. Goddard shows two instances of multiple proximates that violate the principles of the above definition in each of these two ways. For instance, he argues that there are a few examples of naming

constructions "in which the name or designation is in effect quoted matter that stands outside the syntax of the sentence" (Goddard 1984:278). Constructions like these seem to be exempt from the requirements of obviation that would be triggered within a normal sentence. The following is an example of this type of naming construction in Fox (Goddard 1984:277):

(12) *me:me: čiki=ča:h=meko kehke:nemekwa maneto:wa e:nemečini.*
Certainly the one (O) called manitou (P) knows about him (O).

Although 'manitou' refers to the same third person as 'the one', they are not given equal obviative status because the phrase 'called manitou' is somehow outside the syntax of the sentence (Goddard 1984:277). Note that the sentence is grammatical without 'called manitou' since you can say, "Certainly the one knows about him." In this way, the designation of 'manitou' as proximate is not really relevant to the opposition of obviation functioning in the rest of the sentence, so it is not marked for obviation.

Some multiple proximates, however, as mentioned above, might be better analyzed as proximate shifts in function. Goddard argues that the following example from a Fox text illustrates this possibility (1984:280):

(13) *i:ni=ke:h=ni:ki še:ški=meko wi:h=inekihkwišina:ke no:hkomesa inekihkwihto:kwe:ni nekya. "ko:hkomesa:='ni wi:h=na:naki ayo:h=wi:h=taši·wi: ˇcihehki," netekwa nekya. Kotaka=ma:h =wi:na=meko metemo:he:ha.*

My mother (P2) seemingly had made that house of mine only big enough for my grandmother (P1) and me to lie down. "Now I will go get your grandmother to be here with you," my mother (P2) told me. It was another old woman (P1) though.

In this passage, both third-person participants, the mother and the grandmother, are proximate. However, Goddard suggests that, rather than coexistent as proximates, these multiple proximates represent a series of abstract shifts, first from the grandmother to the mother, and then from the mother back to the grandmother. He claims that, rather than reflecting balanced equals, the storyteller is expressing a transition from the mother, who is more central before this passage, to the grandmother, who is more prominent in the story after this passage. As such, he argues there is a shift of focus occurring in this excerpt from the mother to the grandmother, reflected in the storyteller's use of back-to-back proximate shifts.

2.4.2.4. Obviative Shifts (OS)

I define an obviative shift as a shift from proximate to obviative where there is no obvious syntactic motivation for the change in status, and therefore for which the constraints that require the shift are yet to be determined. Obviative shifts often create the unusual occurrence of a sentence or clause with an obviative form but no corresponding proximate. Because such a construction cannot serve the grammatical function of distinguishing between two third persons, the occurrence of a lone obviative strongly suggests some discourse function at work, and one that reflects a constraint that outranks the basic grammatical restriction that usually requires a lone third-person referent to be proximate. The following example from Fox illustrates an obviative shift (Goddard 1984:282):

(14) *e:h=pi:tikawa:* či *maneto:wani i:nahi e:winiči*ni. *ke:htena=meko nye:wokonakateniki e:h=py[a]:ni*či· *we:weneteniki aša:ti:hani, nye:wi e:h=pye:to:ni*či. *e:h=a:* či*mo*či...

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

In the second sentence, the hero shifts from proximate to obviative status, and remains obviative until the last sentence when he becomes proximate again. Goddard argues that this shifting in obviation "has the effect of shifting the point of view from the hero back to his father and the rest of his people, even though they are not mentioned" (1984:282). Whether or not this obviation pattern functions to shift point of view is to some degree ambiguous, but there is a definite correlation in this passage between the obviative status of the hero and his presence and absence in the scene described.

CHAPTER THREE

Obviation in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}

3.1. Introduction

This chapter explores the use of obviation in the Innu-aimun story *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} */ Hare and Frog*, told in Sheshatshiu by Etuat Rich. Specifically, I identify and describe patterns of sustained and isolated obviation in the story (proximate spans, coreferent proximates, coordinate proximates, and obviative spans) and patterns of shifting obviation (proximate shifts, proximate switches, proximate shifts in function, and obviative shifts). My analysis of these patterns suggests the use of avoidance strategies, where the storyteller uses a more unusual (i.e., marked) syntactic construction in order to assign an obviation status (proximate or obviative) to a third-person referent that would not be grammatical with a more common (i.e., less marked) syntactic construction. It also points to a correlation between proximates and agentive participants, where active (e.g., flying, killing, carrying) third persons are proximate and less active (e.g., sitting, being killed, being carried) third persons are obviative. Both of these results indicate that obviation serves some function at the level of discourse (e.g., perhaps a hierarchy of agentivity). In this chapter — and in Chapter Four — I do not discuss the morphological shape of the obviative markers because such a description is not essential to the analysis. Rather, all patterns rely on the binary distinction of whether third-person referents are

proximate or obviative — morphologically unmarked (i.e., no suffix) or marked (i.e., with a suffix).[8]

Secondly, in this chapter, I also explore the semantic and syntactic constraints governing obviation. Because this analysis has pointed to an identifiable and finite set of environments in which third persons are designated as proximate, and has suggested that obviatives occur "elsewhere", my focus in this analysis is on the nature of these environments, which I term "proximate environments". That is, I analyze the use of obviation in this story by determining in which textual environments the storyteller assigns proximate status to a character (e.g., where a third person is an agent) as opposed to the much more numerous set of "elsewhere" environments in which he assigns what I refer to as the "default obviative status" to third-person referents.

3.1.1. *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*

This Innu-aimun story, recorded in Sheshatshiu, Labrador, can be found in *Sheshatshiu Atanukana mak Tipatshimuna / Myths and tales from Sheshatshit,* collected by Madeleine Lefebvre and Robert Lanari in 1967 as part of the Labrador Innu Text Project. Examples appear in the recently established standardized transcription (Drapeau and Mailhot 1989, Mailhot 1997) with the addition of vowel length. The following is a brief summary of the story.

[8] For a grammatical description of obviation, see Clarke 1982.

3.1.2. Summary of *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk"*

In the first episode of the story, Hare comes upon a porcupine and runs home afraid. Frog tells his brother, Hare, that if he carries him to the porcupine, he will kill it. After killing the porcupine, Frog brings it home, and Hare begins cooking it, telling Frog to go to bed and that he will call him when the meal is ready. However, Hare eats the entire porcupine himself.

In the second episode, Hare comes upon a group of beavers and again runs home afraid. Frog gets Hare to carry him to the beavers so he can kill them. After killing the beavers, Frog brings them home and Hare starts cooking them, again telling his brother to go to sleep. This time, however, Frog refuses to sleep, demanding he be fed. When Hare ignores him, Frog starts singing that his brother Hare won't give him any food, and an owl appears and flies toward Hare, scaring him into the corner of the tent while Frog eats his share of the food. Only when Frog is full does the owl leave.

In the third and final episode, Hare comes upon animal tracks. Yet again, he runs home afraid. Frog explains that he has seen moose tracks and that moose is delicious. Frog finds and kills the moose and tells Hare the lungs are very good to eat. Hare eats the lungs and soon becomes sick. Frog tells Hare that his greediness is what has made him sick. Because of this experience, Hare is less greedy with food in the future.

3.2. Patterns of Sustained and Isolated Obviation

3.2.1. Single Proximate Spans

In *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, Hare is proximate throughout most of the story with only a small number of exceptions. Furthermore, he is only overtly obviative twice, with both occurrences appearing in a single sentence. That is, the form *Uâpush-a* (Hare-obv.), with the obviative suffix *-a,* only occurs twice, on one particular occasion in the story. Apart from this instance, Hare is obviative once in the form *ushtesha* 'his (P) brother (O)' (line 126), and elsewhere only where he is not mentioned, but contextually implied, as a topically-secondary third person (lines (70), (73), (89), (90), (92), (93), and (102)). The following example illustrates some of the ways in which the storyteller keeps Hare proximate while designating other third persons as obviative:

(15) *Pâtukâiât ek^{u} ushîma, pîtûteueshpimitameu utamishkuminua.* (77)[9]
When he (Hare-P) brought his (Hare-P) little brother (Frog-O) inside, he (Hare-P) threw his (Frog-O) beavers (O) inside his tent.

Ek^{u} peminuet ek^{u} nenua amishkua. (78)
Then he (Hare-P) cooked the beavers (O).

Nipâ! iteu nenua ushîma. (79)
"Go to sleep!" he (Hare-P) told his (Hare's-P) brother (Frog-O).

Ek^{u} nepekâshunitî nenua ushîma tâpue. (80)
Then his (Hare's-P) brother (Frog-O) indeed pretended that he was asleep.

[9] The numbering given to lines from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* (and from *Meshâpush* in Chapter Four) is my own.

Kâtshî tshîshtenuet, mâtshishut ek^{u}, tshekât tshetâmuât nenua amishkua, kutuâsht itashinua. (81)
When he (Hare-P) was finished the cooking, he (Hare-P) started eating; he (Hare-P) had almost finished eating all of the six beavers (O).

Ashamî ek^{u}! itikû. (82)
"Feed me!" he (Frog-O) said to him (Hare-P).

Ekâ pitamâ, iteu. (83)
"Not now," he (Hare-P) said to him (Frog-O).

In line (80), it is significant that, although he is the only third person overtly mentioned in the sentence, Frog is obviative. This is achieved by describing him in terms of a possessed form in which Hare is the possessor (and therefore proximate) and Frog is the possessee (obviative). To state this argument in more concrete terms, by using the form *ushîma* 'his little brother' instead of the independent noun phrase *Umâtshashkuk^{u}* 'Frog,' the storyteller can avoid promoting Frog to proximate status. In other words, the use of *ushîma* is an effective "avoidance strategy."

A similar avoidance strategy occurs in lines (82) and (83), which contrast the direct form *iteu* 'he (proximate) said to him (obviative)' with the inverse form of the same verb *itikû* 'he (obviative) said to him (proximate).' Although the use of the two contrasting forms serves to distinguish between the two speakers (Hare and Frog), the choice of which form is assigned to which third-person referent is significant. By using the direct form *iteu* when Hare is the speaker and the inverse *itikû* when Frog is the speaker, the storyteller can keep Hare proximate and Frog obviative even when their respective roles as speaker and listener change.

These avoidance strategies are not limited to the above example. The use of *iteu* when Hare is the speaker persists throughout the story. (Hare is the subject of the verb *iteu* 21 times, and the object of *iteu* only twice.) Similarly, the form *ushîma* 'his little brother (obviative)' is used consistently to describe Frog, while the form *nishtesh* 'my older brother (proximate),' which occurs in direct speech, appears consistently to describe Hare when Frog is the speaker. The form *nishtesh*, representing a first-person possessor and a third-person possessee, is proximate because there is only one third person, the possessor being a first-person speech act participant (SAP). The result of this distribution of possessives, then, is to keep Hare proximate and Frog obviative. The following example from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* demonstrates this tendency:

(16a) ... *iteu nenua ushîma* (frame narrative[10]) (79)
... he (Hare-P) said to his (Hare-P) little brother (Frog-O)

(16b) *"... nishtesh", itikû* (quoted speech[11]) (12)
"... my (Frog's-SAP) older brother (Hare-P)," he (Frog-O) said to him (Hare-P)

3.2.2. Coreferent Proximates

The following is an example of coreferent proximates in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*:

[10] The frame narrative includes all of the textual material that appears outside direct quotations (e.g., *iteu*, *itikû*).
[11] Quoted speech includes any direct quotations (i.e., spoken material).

(17) *Ashuâpameu nenua, kushteu tshetshî nâshâukut.* (34)
He (Hare-P) waited for him (Beaver-O), because he (Hare-P) was afraid that he (Beaver-O) might have followed him (Hare-P) (=he (Hare-P) might have been followed).

Based on the use of obviation in (17), we can infer that all of the proximates refer to the same person. It is important to note, however, that the same inference does not hold true for the obviatives. Because the general pattern suggests a particular obviation span will allow only one third-person referent to be proximate while all others must be obviative, a storyteller's use of obviation cannot indicate whether multiple obviative third persons in a span are coreferent or whether they refer to distinct third persons. In this particular case, multiple proximates tell us the same person is the subject of the verbs *waited, was afraid* and the patient of the verb *followed*, but, based on the use of obviation, we cannot determine whether or not the follower and the person being waited for are the same or different third persons. As readers, therefore, we must rely on contextual clues within the text in order to distinguish these third-person referents. Here, for example, the context makes it clear that Hare waits for and fears the same third-person referent who he believes has followed him. In other words, all three obviative third persons refer to the beaver.

3.2.3. Coordinate Proximates

There are no examples of coordinate proximates in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*. However, there is a good example in the story of Goddard's "animacy hierarchy"[12] at work. That is, there is an example where two third-person referents are interacting directly, and do not represent an equally-balanced pair topically speaking, but where the ranking of human over non-human neutralizes the distinction obviation would otherwise reflect.[13] The porcupine, who has been consistently obviative until this point in the narrative (lines (2), (3), and (9)), is given proximate status when he interacts directly with the animate, but non-human, noun *mishtik^{u}* 'tree', as shown in the following example[14]:

(18) *Uiâpamât auennua akushînua kâkua.* (2)
He (Hare-P) saw someone (O), the porcupine (O), perched (in a tree).

Akushînua auennua uâpameu,uâuieshinua kâkua. (3)
He (Hare-P) saw someone who was perched, a round porcupine (O).

...

Tshika nakatitin takushinitî. (9)
"I (Hare) will leave you behind when he (Porcupine-O) arrives."

Mueu anite mishtikua auen nuâpamâu, akushîu anite. (10)
"I saw someone (Porcupine-P) eating a tree (O) there; he (Porcupine-P) was perched up there."

---

[12] The animacy hierarchy is discussed in Sections 2.1. and 2.4.1.3. of Chapter Two.
[13] It is important to note that the term "human" as it applies with regard to the animacy hierarchy includes characters in the stories that are animals, like Hare and Frog.
[14] In this example, I have left out the lines where Porcupine is not mentioned. I have made similar omissions in later examples, always marked by ellipses.

In lines (2) and (3), the porcupine is given obviative status relative to Hare (who is proximate) even when he is the subject of the verbs *akushînua* 'he is perched' and *uâuieshinua* 'he is round'. In line (9), the porcupine keeps his status as obviative, which is more marked in this sentence because he is the lone third person in the sentence. However, his status shifts to proximate in line (10). Even though the porcupine was previously given obviative status relative to Hare, who is proximate, when the tree is introduced into the narrative alongside the porcupine, the animacy hierarchy requires the porcupine to have a higher status than the non-human tree, thus neutralizing the grammatical distinction previously reflected between Hare and the porcupine. The animacy hierarchy is significant in that it demonstrates that there likely exists a ranking of the constraints that govern obviation.

3.2.4. Obviative Spans

The following excerpts from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* reflect the period for which the owl is obviative after being introduced into the narrative as proximate and subsequently shifting back to obviative status:

(19) *Ek^{u} pet teueunitî nenua ûhûa anite utashtuaikanît, shieshkâshkupanîut niâte ne Uâpush.* (94)
When the owl (O) landed on top of the ridge pole, Hare (P) quickly moved back into the forest.

...

Apû tshî nâtât, tânite kushteu nenua ûhûa, akushînua anite tânite. (98)
He (Hare-P) couldn't go towards him because he (Hare-P) was
afraid of the owl (O), who was perched (on top of the tent).

...

Ek^{u} tshâtâpamikut mâni ûhûa, kâu niâte pâtâpipanîu mâni. (100)
The owl (O) kept staring at him (Hare-P), and he (Hare-P) kept running away
over there.

...

Kâtshî mîtshishut tâpue, ek^{u} nekatâukuht nenua ûhûa. (103)
When he (Frog-P) was indeed finished eating, then the owl (O) flew off from
them.

This example illustrates the suggested correlation between action and obviation status. Hare is the more active third person and is correspondingly proximate while the owl, who is perched on top of the tent, is obviative. However, if more agentive third persons are required to be proximate, an argument would have to made to explain why the owl is still obviative in line (103), when he leaves. A possible explanation for this could be that the owl is less agentive when leaving than when flying at Hare in order to scare him, but it would be difficult to determine exactly where the line between agentive and non-agentive should be drawn. This correlation is more clearly evident in the patterns of shifting obviation found in the narrative and is therefore discussed in more depth below.

3.2.5. Discussion

Although most studies have concentrated on shifts in obviation, the patterns of sustained obviation offer an organized way of looking at how obviation is used in

different textual situations. Furthermore, these patterns often correlate with patterns of shifting obviation in Algonquian narratives. Unlike the patterns of shifting obviation, though, which are often analyzed in order to discover corresponding changes involving point of view or focus, the patterns of sustained obviation represent the durations between the boundaries created by the shifts. To give a hypothetical example of this, if we were to say that a proximate shift places "focus" on the noun phrase that becomes proximate, then the span of text for which the noun phrase is proximate would correspond with the duration of the focus. Specifically, the lack of change in obviation that characterizes the aforementioned patterns may indicate a parallel lack of action, suspense, and so forth in the narrative. If this is the case, and spans of obviation are meaningful, then collecting data on each of the patterns of sustained obviation will allow a comparison of spans of obviation with other discourse patterns in particular narratives.

3.3. Patterns of Shifting Obviation

3.3.1. Proximate Shifts

An example of a proximate shift in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} occurs in a passage where Frog shifts from obviative to proximate when he kills the porcupine:

(20) *Tshâtuâtamât ek*^{u}*, ek*^{u} *nepâiât nenua kâkua ne Umâtshashkuk*^{u}*, nepâiât nenua.*
(15)
He (Hare-P) carried him (Frog-O), and then Frog (P) killed the porcupine (O), he (P) killed him (O).

There are (at least) three possible readings that can account for the distribution of obviation in this passage. First, the shift may represent the promotion of Frog to a higher obviation status than Hare. This scenario would involve Frog shifting from obviative to proximate, as attested by the data; Hare may shift to obviative status, but because Hare is not mentioned in the second half of the sentence, it is left unspecified and cannot be determined.

It is also possible to account for this shift by hypothesizing a second scenario in which Frog is promoted to a status that is *equal* with Hare; that is, Frog and Hare become coordinate proximates as opposite members of a balanced pairing (even though Hare is not explicitly mentioned). Furthermore, the grammatical contexts do not inhibit this situation. In the first clause, the verb *tshâtuâtamât* 'he (proximate) carries him (obviative)' requires a proximate third-person subject and an obviative third-person object (i.e., Hare and Frog are interacting directly) and therefore Hare and Frog cannot both be proximate. Even if the verb were in the inverse form, the two third persons would still be interacting directly and would therefore require different obviation statuses. In the second clause, however, where the storyteller marks Frog's shift to proximate explicitly by using the full proximate NP *Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, Hare and Frog are no longer interacting directly with each other and so the constraint requiring that they have different statuses is no longer applicable. By removing the grammatical context in which Hare and Frog are required to have distinct obviation statuses, the storyteller can use obviation to reflect the notion of equality between the two characters.

Semantically, this second reading is also plausible if we consider Hare and Frog's respective roles in the sentence (their local importance) and within the story as a whole (their global importance). In the first clause, Hare carries Frog to the place where they will find the porcupine they both wish to kill. In the second clause, Frog kills the porcupine and, in doing so, plays his role in the shared aim of killing the porcupine. In other words, when Frog kills the porcupine, it is as if he becomes part of a team with Hare, and it therefore makes sense that the two, like noun phrases in coordinate structure, share proximate status.[15]

Third, Lucy Thomason[16] suggests Frog's shift in status from obviative to proximate could also be analyzed as his promotion to a status higher than that of the porcupine, but still lower than that of Hare. This scenario would correspond to the following obviation ranking: Hare (P) > Frog (P) > Porcupine (O). That this further distinction is not reflected in the morphology used by the storyteller can be explained by the fact that Innu-aimun cannot morphologically encode this relative ranking. That is, obviation can only make the binary distinction between marked and unmarked and therefore cannot reflect the relative ranking of three unequal third persons. This third reading, therefore, represents another plausible description of the use of obviation in Example (20).

Again, considering a possible correlation between proximate status and agentivity is revealing because the passage can also be explained in terms of which third person is

[15] Additional evidence supporting this argument is found in a passage from *Meshâpush,* discussed in Section 4.3.1. in Chapter Four.

[16] This suggestion was made to me by Lucy Thomason during the discussion that followed the presentation of my paper at the 2001 Algonquian Conference at the University of California at Berkeley.

the most "active" or "agentive" at any particular point. In the first clause in (20), Hare is logically the more active of the two third persons because he is the one doing the carrying. In the second clause, however, Frog is more active since he kills the porcupine. This argument also accounts for the porcupine's status as obviative. As the one being killed, he is logically less agentive than the one doing the killing, and certainly less of an agent when he is dead.

3.3.2. Proximate Switches

The following example from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* shows a proximate switch where Hare and the owl exchange status, Hare becoming proximate and the owl becoming obviative:

(21) *Niâtâuât ek^{u}.* (93)
Then he (Owl-P) flew over to him (Hare-O).

Ek^{u} pet teueunitî nenua ûhûa anite utashtuaikanît, shieshkâshkupanîut niâte ne Uâpush. (94)
When the owl (O) landed on top of the ridge pole, Hare (P) quickly moved back into the forest.

As in the other examples from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* involving shifts in obviation, there is again a correlation between action/agentivity and proximate status. In this passage, while the owl is flying at Hare to scare him and to allow Frog to eat, he is proximate. When he is perched on the tent, however, and Hare is moving back in fear, Hare becomes proximate, a shift explicitly signaled by the storyteller's use of the full

proximate NP *Uâpush*. This correlation between proximates and more agentive third persons suggests that the more marked third person (i.e., more active/agentive) will be assigned the semantically more prominent (although morphologically unmarked) proximate form. A logical extension of this prediction is that all less marked (i.e., less active/agentive) third persons will be assigned a default obviative status.

However, it is also significant that the owl (obviative) is the first of the two third persons mentioned after the switch in obviation. This ordering of a new obviative before a newly-assigned proximate makes the switch appear more deliberate. Furthermore, it indicates that obviative status may (at least in some cases) represent more than a default status since the owl is designated as obviative before Hare is explicitly re-introduced as proximate.

3.3.3. Proximate Shifts in Function

Goddard suggests that what appear to be multiple proximates may in fact sometimes be proximate shifts in function, constituting or foreshadowing a shift in narrative focus (1984:280). Based on this analysis of multiple proximates, I suggest that the following example from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} demonstrates multiple proximates that could alternatively be analyzed as coexistent proximates, evidence for distinct obviation spans, or proximate shifts in function:

(22) *Kâtshî nipâiât ekue tshîuetâiât.* (16)
After killing it (Porcupine-O), then he (Frog-P) took it home.

Piâtâkuepanit ekᵘ ne Uâpush. (17)
Then Hare (P) burned the quills off the porcupine (O).

Nipâ! iteu. (18)
"Go to sleep!" he (Hare-P) said (to him (Frog-O)).

...

Ekᵘ nepât tâpue, ne Umâtshashkukᵘ nipekâshû. (20)
Then he (Frog-P) indeed went off to bed, but Frog (P) only pretended that he (P) was sleeping.

Kâtshî piminuepanit ekue muâkuet. (21)
After he (Hare-P) finished cooking, he (P) ate the porcupine (O).

It could be argued that, in this passage, Hare and Frog are coexistent as proximates in a single obviation span, perhaps in a way akin to that of coordinate proximates. However, because Hare and Frog are diametrically opposed in terms of their goals (Hare to eat all the food and Frog to get his share), it is difficult to explain what circumstances might allow this situation.

Another possibility is that the occurrences of non-coreferent proximates in different sentences offer evidence for the fact that each sentence constitutes a separate and distinct obviation span where the status of a particular third person as proximate or obviative is not relevant to the same or other third-person referents in separate sentences. However, this too is problematic. If each sentence constitutes a distinct obviation span, then how do we account for the occurrence of proximate spans where there are convincing examples of avoidance strategies to indicate that a particular third-person referent is deliberately being kept proximate over a series of sentences, or even

throughout the story as a whole? The evidence suggests, then, that obviation status is at least sometimes significant over a larger stretch of text.

Third, there exists the possibility that these multiple proximates are, in fact, proximate shifts in function. With regard to (22), we could hypothesize that proximate status shifts from Frog to Hare, back to Frog, and then back to Hare again. That we see no evidence for either of them becoming obviative can be explained by the fact that the one third person is not mentioned while the other is proximate. And, in fact, we do see some evidence supporting this hypothesis in line (18) where Frog is the obvious obviative object of *iteu* 'he (P) said to him (O).'

3.3.4. Obviative Shifts

In *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, after a period of time in which Hare is continuously proximate, Hare's status shifts from proximate to obviative, as shown in the following example:

(23) *"Nishtesha uâpusha ama ni uî ashamik^{u} nishtesha uâpusha," itueu ne Umâtshashkuk^{u}.* (89)

"My older brother (O) Hare (O) doesn't want to feed me any, my older brother (O) Hare (O)," Frog (P) was saying.

The only third person in this passage is the obviative form *nishtesha uâpusha* 'my brother Hare (O)', (repeated twice) although the possessor (Frog) is implied as a first-person

referent by the context.[17] The use of this lone obviative is significant because the author could have avoided making Hare obviative by using the proximate forms *nishtesh uâpush* 'my brother Hare (P)', which would be equally grammatical in the context. Because of the presence of this marked and overtly obviative form, then, the passage constitutes another type of avoidance strategy, where the storyteller avoids using a proximate.

Interestingly, this single instance in which Hare is given overt obviative status occurs while Frog is singing, the action that summons the owl and results in Frog getting his share of food to eat. It therefore also occurs when Hare is least agentive in the story, since all action at this point in the story is being carried out on Hare.[18]

3.3.5. Discussion

In his study of obviation in Swampy Cree, Russell states that, "while it is perfectly possible for the proximate referent to change from clause to clause, it usually does not"; and, "while it is theoretically possible for the same referent to be proximate throughout an entire story, this rarely happens" (1991:323). General tendencies like these suggest that when the proximate referent does change, it is likely significant. The patterns of shifting obviation discussed in the above section support this claim. Correlations between particular patterns and the agentive role of the third-person referents suggest a connection between use of obviation and discourse function.

[17] It is possible the beavers represent a second third person, implied as the second object of the verb *asham-* 'feed'. However, positing the beavers' status as proximate is problematic, since this status would violate both the animacy hierarchy and the hierarchy of grammatical relations.
[18] Another explanation for the form *nishtesha Uâpusha* is given in Section 3.4.6.

The apparently deliberate use of avoidance strategies that create the patterns also points to a role for obviation at the level of discourse. Similar tendencies and correlations occur in *Meshâpush* and are discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

3.4. Proximate Environments: Semantic and Syntactic Contexts Where Proximates Occur, and the Default Obviative

In this section, I examine the semantic and syntactic environments in which the narrator assigns proximate status to each character in the story: 1) the moose; 2) the beavers; 3) the porcupine; 4) the owl; 5) Frog; and 6) Hare. In order to identify these proximate environments (PE), I have used tables like the one described in Section 2.3.2. of Chapter Two. For each line in which a particular character is mentioned, these tables indicate the character's status as proximate or obviative, whether the status represents a proximate or obviative shift, whether the referent is referred to explicitly (e.g., by a proper noun) or implicitly (e.g., implied within the verb form), the syntactic role of the referent, the semantic role of the referent, and any additional comments regarding the environment in which the referent occurs (e.g., if the referent is the lone third person in the narrative context). The information gathered and highlighted in these tables presents a clear picture of how the storyteller assigns proximate and obviative status within the narrative, and indicates a small set of PEs in which Etuat Rich usually assigns a third-person referent proximate status.

3.4.1. *Mûsh* 'Moose'

The moose, who is seen by Hare and later killed by Frog, is referred to as obviative seven times and as proximate five times[19], as shown in Table 5:

Table 5: Obviation Status of *Mûsh*

(*Mûsh* 'Moose')						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
107	O		E	Vobj PN	seen *mûsha*	nonAG
115	***P***	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**tastes good**	**GD**
116	***P***		**E**	**PN**	***mûsh***	**GD naming**
117	***P***		**I**	**Vobj-P**	**(I) killed (general)**	**nonAG, GD**
119	***P***		**I**	**Vobj-P**	**(we) find**	**nonAG, lone 3p**
121	***P***		**I**	**Vobj-P**	**(I) find**	**nonAG, lone 3p**
124	O, O, O	**OS**	E	Vobj ×3, PN	followed, caught up to, killed, *mûsha*	nonAG
125	O, O		I	Vobj ×2	killed, head cut off	nonAG (dead)
128	O		E	PN Vobj	seen *mûsha*	nonAG (dead)
133	O		I	POSSR-O	'his lungs' *ûpana*	nonAG (dead)
136	O		E	PN-O, POSSR-O	*mûsha* 'his lungs' *ûpana*	nonAG (dead)
142	O		I	POSSR-O	'his lungs' *ûpana*	nonAG (dead)

These five proximate occurrences can be accounted for by two classes of textual environment. First, adhering to the basic rule of Algonquian obviation, the moose is generally required by grammatical constraints to have proximate status when he is the

[19] Proximate forms, and their corresponding data, are represented in bold in all tables. In the Prox/Obv column, referents that occur in direct quotations are represented in italics, while those in narrative clauses are given in normal print.

only third person in a particular narrative context. It is important to note, however, that a narrative context (NC), as I use the term here, is not definable in specific terms; how large a textual environment affects the storyteller's choice of whether to assign a third person proximate or obviative status appears to change. The NC is sometimes roughly equal to the quoted speech (QS) of a sentence; sometimes, to the frame narrative (FN).[20] Analyzing the NCs as corresponding with these particular spans of text, we find the moose is the only third-person referent in its narrative context, and is therefore assigned the predictable status of proximate in lines (117), (119), and (121):

(24) *Ninipâiâtî ne mâni.* (117)
"I used to kill <u>them</u> (moose, in general-P)."

...

Nika nâshâuâu, itikû. (119)
"I will swim to find <u>him</u> (the moose-P)," he (Frog-O) said to him (Hare-P).

...

Nika nâshâuâu, itikû. (121)
"I will swim after <u>him</u> (the moose-P)," he (Frog-O) said to him (Hare-P).

The moose is also proximate when being described in terms of the class of animals in general, as in lines (115), (116), and (117)[21]:

[20] I treat the frame narrative as separate from the quoted speech because the rules of obviation do not apply across this boundary. Also, a narrative context sometimes comprises a larger section of text, or even the story in its entirety. I explore these larger NCs later in the chapter when I discuss the ways in which the storyteller can use obviation to serve discourse functions.

[21] In line (117), the moose is semantically doubly-marked for proximate status, because he is the only third person in the sentence and is also being described in general, rather than specific, terms.

(25) *Mishta uîtshitû an tshîtshue, nishtesh, itikû.* (115)
"It (moose, in general-P) tastes very good, my brother," he (Frog-O) said to him (Hare-P).

Mûsh an ishinîkatâkanû. (116)
"He is called a moose (P)." (naming construction)

Ninipâiâtî ne mâni. (117)
"I used to kill them (moose, in general-P)."

In line (115), Frog tells Hare that moose (in general) taste good; he is not commenting on the particular moose Hare has seen. Similarly, in line (116), Frog names the class of animals and not this specific moose as *mûsh.* Lastly, in line (117), Frog tells Hare he has killed moose in the past. At this point in the story at least, this particular moose is clearly still alive and so Frog must once again be referring to other moose (i.e., the animal, in general) that he has killed.

The moose is also mentioned a few times after he is killed by Frog, as the possessor of his head (line (125), when he is facing Hare (line (128)), and as the possessor of his lungs (lines (133), (136), and (142)). In each of these instances, he is given obviative status.

3.4.2. *Amishkuat* 'Beavers'

Table 6 shows the distribution of proximate and obviative status for the beavers in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}:

Table 6: Obviation Status of *Amishkuat*

Amishkuat 'Beavers'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
34	O, O		I	Vobj, Vsbj-inv	awaited, follows	nonAG, AV
39	***P***	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**they break**	**AG plural**
40	***P, P, P***		**I**	**Vsbj ×3**	**have sharp teeth, bite, kill**	**plural AG, GD**
41	***P***		**I**	**Vsbj**	**tastes good**	**GD**
42	***P***		**E**	**PN**	***amishk*^{u}**	**GD naming**
52	O	**OS**	E	PN-O	*amishkua* (come out)	plural
53	O, O		I	Vsbj ×2	go through ×2	plural
55	O		I	Vobj	seen	plural
56	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**take off**	**AG**
58	O, O	**OS**	I	Vobj, Vsbj	grabbed, go ahead	
60	O		I	Vsbj	are gone	noneAG
67	O, O		E	Vobj PN, Vobj	rejoined *amishkua* killed	nonAG, nonAG
69	O, O		E	Vobj, POSSD4	pulled, 'his beavers'	nonAG, AV
70	O, O		E	Vobj, POSSD4	pulled, 'his beavers'	nonAG, AV
71	***P***	**PS**	**E**	**POSSD3**	**cook 'my beaver'**	**lone 3p**
78	O, O	**OS**	E	Vobj, PN-O	cooked, *amishkua*	nonAG
81	O		E	PN-O	*amishkua*	

The eight times in which the storyteller assigns the beavers proximate status can be accounted for by three classes of PE. Like the moose, the beavers are always proximate when they are either the lone third-person referent in their narrative context (line (71)), or when the beavers are being described in general (lines (40), (41), and (42)). However, the beavers are also proximate in a third environment; they are also given proximate status in lines (39), (40), and (56)[22]:

[22] Both the agentive third person and the verb reflecting the character's agentivity are underlined.

(26) *Mishtikua nenua nânâtuâkameuat anite shâkaikanît.* (39)
"They (the beavers-P) are chewing down trees, there at the lake."

Mishta kâshimâpitetshenat, tshîtshue mâkumitâkuî, tshessinât tshika nipâikunânat, iteu. (40)
"They (beavers-P) must have very sharp teeth. Indeed, if they (P) were to bite us, they (P) would surely kill us," he (Hare-P) said to him (Frog-O).

...

Ekue tshîtûteht tâpue. (56)
At that moment, indeed, they (the beavers-P) took off.

In each of these three sentences, whenever the beavers are mentioned, they are not only the subject of the verbs with which they correspond; they are also the agents of some action (i.e., chewing, biting, killing, taking off) or possess some otherwise agentive attribute (i.e., have sharp teeth that, presumably, are used for biting).

It is important to note here that, while there is a strong correlation between proximate status and both agentivity and subjecthood, the two are not interchangeable in terms of their effect on obviation status. Agentivity generally requires proximate status for its corresponding third-person referent, but subjecthood does not. Logically, the correlation between agents and subjects as proximates makes sense, because most agents are subjects. It is also significant that the opposite is not true; many subjects are not agents. The fact that subjecthood, unlike agentivity, does not appear to correlate with proximate status is evident in lines (34), (53), and (60), where the group of beavers is the grammatical subject of the verbs 'follow', 'go through', and 'are gone' but is nevertheless obviative in each of these occurrences. Every time the beavers are agents, however, they are given proximate status.

3.4.3. *Kâkᵘ* 'Porcupine'

The porcupine is given obviative status nine times, and proximate status seven times (in line (9), twice in line (10), and in lines (11), (12), (13), and (23)):

Table 7: Obviation Status of *Kâkᵘ*

(*Kâkᵘ* 'Porcupine')						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
2	O		E	Vobj, Sbj-O (PN-O)	seen, perches *kâkua*	intro'd in Obv
3	O, O		I	Vobj, Vsbj-O (PN-O)	seen, perches *kâkua*	nonAG
3	O		E	Vsbj-O (PN)	is round *kâkua*	
9	*O*		I	Vsbj-O	arrives	(lone 3p)
10	***P, P***	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj (PRO) Vsbj**	**eats, perches**	**Anim.H (tree)**
11	***P***		**I**	**Vsbj**	**looks scary**	**GD**
12	***P***		**I**	**Vsbj**	**tastes good**	**GD**
13	***P***		**I**	**Vobj (1p-sbj)**	**killed**	**nonAG/ GD**
15	O	**OS**	E	Vobj (PN-O)	killed *kâkua*	nonAG
16	O, O		I	Vobj ×2	killed, taken	nonAG
23	***P***	**PS**	**E**	**POSSD3**	**'your porcupine'**	**lone 3p**

By comparing the NCs involved in the porcupine's occurrences as proximate with the proximate environments identified so far for the moose and the beavers, we can account for five of the times the storyteller assigns the porcupine proximate status by his occurrence in three proximate environments: 1) where he is the lone third-person referent in a narrative context (lines (11) and (23)); 2) where the narrator is giving a general

description of porcupines (lines (11), (12), and (13)); and 3) where he is an agent (line (10), where the porcupine is eating a tree).

However, there is a second instance in line (10) where the porcupine is given proximate status but is not an agent, is not being described in general terms, and is not the lone third-person referent in the narrative context, as shown in the following:

(27) *Mueu anite mishtikua auen nuâpamâu, akushîu anite.* (10)
"I saw someone (Porcupine-P) eating a tree (O) there; he (Porcupine-P) was perched up there."

There are a couple of arguments to explain the storyteller's choice of proximate status here. First, this third-person referent must be proximate because it occurs in the same narrative context with a second coreferent third-person referent (the porcupine) who is acting as an agent in its context and therefore requires proximate status.

It is worth noting, however, that another constraint, the animacy hierarchy, would also require the porcupine to be proximate in this environment. Described in the same narrative context with the non-human, albeit grammatically-animate, *mishtikᵘ* 'tree', the porcupine would be required to have proximate status.

The fourth environment in which the porcupine is proximate, then, involves both coreference and the animacy hierarchy, both of which require proximate status for their corresponding third-person referent.

3.4.4. *Uhû* 'Owl'

With regard to the characters discussed thus far, the storyteller's choice as to when to make a third person proximate has been fairly straightforward. The distribution of proximates for the moose, the beavers, and the porcupine can all be explained by their presence in only a few PEs. However, the way in which the storyteller chooses the owl's obviation statuses throughout the story is more complex. Rather than assigning the owl proximate or obviative status based solely on each particular narrative context in which he is mentioned, it appears the storyteller sometimes chooses the owl's obviation status based on the owl's presence in a much larger NC — and maybe even within the context of the story as a whole. That the owl's obviation status reflects his global importance is evident when we look at Table 8, where a pattern emerges: the first five times the owl is mentioned in the narrative, he is proximate; then, his status shifts to obviative and he keeps this status for the last five times he is mentioned. In other words, the owl is proximate for half of the time he is present in the story, and then obviative for the second half of the story:

Table 8: Obviation Status of *Uhû*

Uhû 'Owl'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
86	***P***		**I**	**Vobj**	**told (1>3)**	**intro'd as P**
90	**P**		**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**rejoins (*ûhû*)**	**AG**
91	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
92	**P**		**I**	**itâkanu-obj**	**told**	**AV, FN**

Uhû 'Owl' (continued)						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
93	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**rejoins**	**AG**
94	O	OS	E	Vsbj, (PN-O)	lands *ûhûa*	nonAG?, AV
98	O		E	Vobj, (PN-O)	feared *ûhûa*	nonAG
98	O		I	Vsbj	perches	nonAG?, AV
100	O		E	Vsbj-inv, (PN-O)	watches	AG
105	O		I	Vsbj-inv	leaves	AG

This is not to say that the particular narrative contexts in which the owl is mentioned are not relevant with regard to the storyteller's decision of whether to make him proximate or obviative. Of the owl's five occurrences in the story as proximate, two can be explained by the owl's agentivity in the immediate NC (lines (90) and (93) where he is the agent of the verb 'rejoins'). Two other instances occur in the frame narrative, as shown in (28):

(28) *Apû uî ashamâut nenua tshishîminâna, iteu.* (91)
"He (Hare-P) doesn't want to give our brother (Frog-O) anything to eat," he (the owl-P) said to him (unidentified hearer-O).

Nâtâu, itâkanû. (92)
"Fly over to where he (Hare-O) is," he (the owl-P) was told by (unidentified speaker-O).

In lines (91) and (92), the narrator's use of *iteu* and *itâkanû* in the frame narrative serves to keep the third-person referents straight, distinguishing the owl (as speaker and hearer) from the other speaker/hearer, who is unidentified[23]. Although the owl is not the

[23] Here, it is not the storyteller's use of obviation but the context that suggests the unidentified hearer and speaker refer to a single third person.

only third person here, one of the two third persons must be designated as proximate, and it makes sense that the known variable, the owl, should have the semantically "superior" status to the unknown speaker/hearer. In this way, the narrator can use obviation to rank multiple third persons in a "participant hierarchy" (Silverstein 1976; Aissen 1997).

Line (86), however, where both the owl and Hare are assigned proximate status, is problematic:

(29) *Nika uîtamuâu nishtesh ekâ uâ ashamîn.* (86)
"I will tell him (the owl, although unspecified at this point in the story-P) that my older brother (Hare-P) won't give me any."

In this sentence, the third-person referent (who we later find out refers to the owl) is not coreferent with 'his brother', which refers to Hare, and yet the two third-person referents share proximate status in what appears to be a single narrative context. Furthermore, the owl is not an agent here; he is the passive object and hearer/listener of the verb 'tell'. Only because it would be semantically incoherent for the two proximates to corefer do we know that this cannot be the case. Nor can the other identified PEs account for the owl's status as proximate; the animacy hierarchy is not relevant, and the narrator is not describing owls in general, since it is this specific owl that Frog is going to tell about Hare's greediness.

So, what can we say about this particular use of the proximate? One suggestion would be to hypothesize that the narrator can sometimes break the "rules" of proximate assignment and employ proximate status to serve deliberate discourse functions by designating proximate status where its occurrence is noticeable as an exception to the

general constraints governing its use. That is, by designating the owl as proximate where no grammatical or semantic environment requires him to be proximate, perhaps the narrator is suggesting listeners interpret some meaning at the level of discourse. For example, this could represent an instance of Goddard's "proximate shifts in function", where the occurrence of the second proximate foreshadows something in the following section of narrative[24]. In this case, the narrator could be foreshadowing the characteristic of agentivity in a character that has yet to act as an agent.

By regarding the storyteller's use of obviation in (29) as an exception to the general rules governing proximate assignment, we can draw hypotheses regarding the discourse functions of similar exceptions when the owl is obviative in narrative contexts where we would expect him to be proximate, as in the following:

(30) *Ek^{u} pet teueunitî nenua ûhûa anite utashtuaikanît, shieshkâshkupanîut niâte ne Uâpush.* (94)
When the owl (O) landed on top of the ridge pole, Hare (P) quickly moved back into the forest.

...

Apû tshî nâtât, tânite kushteu nenua ûhûa, akushînua anite tânite. (98)
He (Hare-P) couldn't approach him (Frog-O) because he (Hare-P) was afraid of the owl (O), who was still perched on top of the tent.

...

Ek^{u} tshâtâpamikut mâni ûhûa, kâu niâte pâtâpipanîu mâni. (100)
The owl (O) kept staring at him (Hare-P), which made Hare (P) run back.

...

[24] See page 65 for a discussion of "proximate shifts in function".

Ekue iâpit nakatâukut. (105)
And then, he (Owl-O) flew off anyway, leaving him (Hare-P) behind.

In these four sentences, the owl is the obviative subject of the verbs 'lands', 'perches', 'watches', and 'leaves', and, although it is to some degree ambiguous, it can also be argued that he is a semantic agent in these sentences. As discussed in Section 3.2.4., however, by designating the owl in these sentences as obviative, the storyteller could be manipulating the extent to which he thinks the owl should, in fact, be regarded as an agent. By breaking the "rules" of obviation, Rich could be drawing attention to the fact that, while the owl is landing, perching, watching, and leaving, his real purpose in the story — to fly at Hare in order to scare him away from Frog's food — has already been accomplished, and his role in the story is essentially over.

3.4.5. *Umâtshashkuk*^{u} 'Frog'

Despite the large number of times in which Frog is referred to in the third person and must therefore be assigned either proximate or obviative status, the distribution of Frog's obviation status is extremely regular. All 23 of Frog's occurrences as proximate coincide with his semantic status as an agent. Whenever Frog is proximate, he is killing, pretending to sleep, removing poles, making a toboggan, singing, and so forth.

There is, however, one example in which Frog is given obviative status in what, at first, appears to be an exception to the rule that requires all agents to be proximate:

(31) *Ekue kutapanîunitî niâte.* (66)
Then, he (Frog-O) went underwater.

In this sentence, however, the English translation is somewhat misleading. Although Frog is the subject of the verb *kutapanîunitî* 'go underwater', he is not the agent of this action. Rather, he goes underwater as a result of Hare having hit him and, as he falls into the water, is believed by Hare to be dead. In other words, when translated into English, the verb *kutapanîunitî* suggests agentivity, but the context (and the use of a lone obviative) show that this is not, in fact, the case. Perhaps a more accurate translation with regard to agentivity would therefore be: 'Then, he (Frog-O) sank into the water.'

There are additional exceptions. In saying that there are 23 occasions where Frog is given proximate status, I have chosen to exclude a couple of instances involving the verb *it-* 'to say'. I have decided to treat this verb separately because of the difference in the way in which obviation status patterns with forms like *iteu* 's/he (prox) says to him/her (obv)' and *itikû* 's/he (obv) says to him/her (prox)'. This difference in how obviation is assigned and functions in the frame narrative can be seen in lines (70), (73), and (102), where Frog is proximate as the subject of the verb *iteu*:

(32) *Kâtshî tshîuetâpet nenua utamishkuma, ek^{u}, iteu: Nishtesh, petâ mâ anite ishkuteu.* (70)
After he (Frog-P) pulled his beavers home, he (Frog-P) said to him (Hare-O): "My older brother, bring me some fire there."

...

Uuu, uuu, iteu, nâsht tshitakuînâua (73).
"Ooh, ooh," he (Frog-P) said to him (Hare-O), "you're really hurting me."

...

Shâsh, shâsh nitepishkun,iteu ne Umâtshashkuk^{u}. (102)
"Okay, okay, I am full now," Frog (P) said to him (Hare-O).

Unlike the assignment of obviation in (32), the overwhelming tendency with regard to the frame narrative in this story is to designate Frog as obviative, distinguishing him in this way from, say, Hare, who is consistently proximate in this narrative context. Frog is the object of *iteu* on 23 occasions, and the subject of the inverse form *itikû* on 17 occasions, where he is accordingly given obviative status. This distribution allows the storyteller to create a ranking of these two characters: Hare (P) > Frog (O). So why is Frog given the unexpected role of the proximate subject of *iteu* in lines (70), (73), and (102)?

In all three cases, Hare is the object of *iteu*, and so we know relative ranking is not coming into play, since Hare has been shown (see Section 3.3.1.) to have superior ranking to Frog the large majority of the time. Line (70) can be explained by one of the proximate environments already identified. Although Frog is usually assigned obviative status when he is the subject or object of *iteu/itikû*, in this sentence he has already been assigned proximate status within the narrative context of the frame (i.e., as the subject of 'pulling the beavers') and so coreference would require that Frog also be given proximate status in his role as speaker. A logical conclusion to draw from this distribution of proximate status is that the constraint requiring coreferent third persons to share obviation status outranks the constraint requiring a particular obviation status for the frame narrative verb.

Frog's status as proximate in lines (73) and (102), however, is more complex. As I hypothesized with regard to the owl, I would like to suggest that these so-called "exceptions" may represent two more examples of the storyteller using obviation to fulfil some discourse function (i.e., the assignment of proximates here is significant within a larger NC). In lines (73) and (102), the context makes it clear which third person refers to Hare and which refers to Frog (as is the case with line (70), as well). Not needing obviation to distinguish between multiple third persons, then, the narrator is free to use obviation for some other purpose.

A clue as to the storyteller's intent surfaces if we consider where in the storyline Frog becomes the subject of *iteu*. In line (73), Frog tells Hare he is hurting him. Frog's status as proximate over Hare's status as obviative stands in stark contrast with the action itself, which is being carried out solely by Hare, who grabs and hurts Frog. Perhaps, then, by reversing their obviation statuses (and therefore their relative ranking) where it is clear that Hare is the agent and Frog the patient of the action, the narrator can further draw attention to (i.e., put focus on) the action itself.

Similarly, in line (102), where Frog's status as proximate and his role in the sentence as an agentive subject are further emphasized by the full NP *Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, Frog has finally gotten enough to eat after the previous occasions when Hare had eaten all the food himself. Here, the narrator can signaling the importance of (or agentivity involved in) this particular moment in the story by assigning Frog proximate status — a status listeners do not expect to find in the context of the frame narrative.

Due to its length, Table 9, which shows the assignment of proximate and obviative status for Frog, can be found in Appendix C.

3.4.6. *Uâpush* 'Hare'

Because Hare is proximate throughout most of the story, initially it appears counter-intuitive to consider the few instances in which he is obviative as the "default" situation. However, a large percentage of Hare's occurrences as proximate can easily be accounted for by his presence in two proximate environments already discussed in this chapter. Of the 81 times when Hare is referred to as proximate (not including occurrences involving *iteu* and related forms of the verb 'to say'), 69 coincide with Hare's status as a semantic agent. Two more involve narrative contexts in which Hare is the semantic object of a verb but where he is also a proximate agent elsewhere in the same NC; in these cases, therefore, coreference requires that he be proximate in both occurrences. An example where coreference determines Hare's status as proximate is given in (33):

(33) *Ek^{u} tshâtâpamikut mâni ûhûa, kâu niâte pâtâpipanîu mâni.* (100)
The owl (O) kept staring at him (Hare-P), which made Hare (P) run back.

In the first clause, Hare is a non-agent in his role as the object of the owl's stare, but in the second clause he is the semantic agent (and subject) of the verb *pâtâpipanîu* 's/he runs back'. Because the two third persons (Hare and the owl) are directly

interacting in this sentence, and are not coordinate proximates, they are required to have distinct obviation statuses. Therefore, it appears that, because Hare is agentive in the second clause, he is also required to be proximate (even as a non-agent) in the first clause of the sentence. Based on the rules of obviation discussed so far in this thesis, there is no obvious reason why the sentence would not be equally grammatical if the owl were proximate and Hare obviative in this sentence. However, in light of the narrator's tendency to make Hare proximate throughout most of the story, it makes sense that Etuat Rich chooses to give Hare, rather than the owl, proximate status.

The distribution of Hare's proximate status also suggests an additional PE. The last group of proximate occurrences coincides with Hare's syntactic and semantic status as a possessor, a PE that Judith Aissen refers to as "the genitive constraint" (1997). Hare is a proximate third-person possessor ten times in the story, in lines (22), (41), (45), (64), twice in (77), and in lines (79), (80), (122), and (148). In possessive forms, the rules of obviation require a third-person possessor and a fourth-person (i.e., obviative third-person) possessee. That is, "when both a possessed noun (possessum) and its possessor (genitive) are third persons (animate), the genitive must outrank the possessum on the participant hierarchy" (Aissen 1997: 711-712). An example of this is given in (34):

(34) *Pâtukâiât ek^{u} ushîma, pîtûteueshpimitameu utamishkuminua.* (77)
When he (Hare-P) let his (Hare's-P) little brother (Frog-O) inside, he (Hare-P) threw his (Hare's-P) brother's (Frog's-O) beavers (O) inside.

In line (77), Hare is the third-person possessor of both his brother, Frog, and his brother's beavers and is therefore required to be proximate. Because possessive forms like these

strictly require proximate status for the possessor and obviative status for the possessee, the storyteller's choice to use a possessive form may represent another avoidance strategy employed to keep Hare proximate and other characters, like Frog, obviative.

It is also informative to look at the nine times Hare is obviative (i.e., where no constraints require him to be proximate, or where his assignment as obviative is an exception). He is obviative three times in lines (90), (92), and (93), each of which involves the verb 'fly to/at', where the owl is the subject of the verb and Hare, the object. It makes sense that Hare is not designated as proximate in these narrative contexts since: 1) he is not a lone third person; 2) he is not an agent; 3) he is not coreferent with a proximate third person; 4) he is not a possessor; and 5) the narrator is not describing hares in general. In other words, there is no obvious semantic or syntactic context to cause Hare to be proximate in this textual environment.

Three more times when Hare is designated as obviative have already been discussed in the previous section. These occurrences involve sentences in which Hare is the object of *iteu* (i.e., obviative), while Frog is the subject of *iteu* (i.e., proximate). Suggested reasons for this distribution of proximate and obviative are discussed in Section 3.4.5.

Hare is also obviative twice in line (89), where he is described by the overt noun phrases *nishtesha uâpusha* on two occasions in the song that marks what would generally be agreed upon as the story's climactic moment. Here, unlike the occurrences in which Hare is the semantic object of 'fly to/at', we would expect a proximate form, since Hare is the only third person in the narrative context.

There are a couple of possible explanations for this use of an obviative. First, if we treat this as another exception, the storyteller could again be breaking the general rules of obviation in order to draw attention to the song and its role as the story's climax. However, it is also possible that, in this particular example, Hare is not obviative at all.[25] Because so much has still to be learned regarding the phonological and syntactic nature of the songs in these stories, it is possible that the suffix *-a* found on *nishtesh-a* and *uâpush-a* in this example — which usually marks a NP as obviative —is not the obviative marker at all but rather some phonological addition, inserted to make the song flow more smoothly, or included for some other reason.

Lastly, Hare is overtly obviative as a possessed fourth-person referent in line (126):

(35) *Nete tshe utûtenitî ushtesha ekute anite etashtât nenû ushtikuânim.* (126)
He (Frog-P) put the head where he (Frog-P) knew his (Frog's-P) older brother (Hare-O) would be when he (Hare-O) arrived.

This is the only time in the story where we get the form *ushtesha* 'his (P) older brother (O)', and it is an interesting sentence because, while the two third persons are neither coreferent nor coordinate, and therefore cannot share proximate status, both Frog and Hare are semantic agents (i.e., Hare placing the head and Frog arriving) and so it is not clear how the choice as to which third person should be proximate and which should be obviative would be made by the storyteller. Because the general tendency throughout the story is for Hare to be proximate and Frog to be obviative (compare Tables 9 and 10 in

[25] Marguerite MacKenzie made this suggestion in a private meeting.

Appendix C), it would seem that this example might also best be regarded as an "exception", the narrator again using an unexpected obviation status to create some other meaning in the discourse, perhaps placing focus on Frog and highlighting the action he is taking to get back at Hare by scaring him with the moose head.

3.4.7. Discussion

Based on the above analysis of the distribution of proximate and obviative status for each of the characters in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, I have identified six semantic and syntactic environments in which a third-person referent is generally proximate (i.e., PEs): 1) where a referent is the lone third person in a narrative context (NC); 2) where a third-person referent is being described in general terms; 3) where the third person is an agent; 4) where the third person is coreferent with a proximate in the same NC; 5) where the animacy hierarchy requires a third person to have a higher status than a non-human third person in the same NC; and 6) where a third person occurs as the possessor in a possessive form. If any one (or combination) of these conditions or environments is met, the relevant third-person referent will usually be assigned proximate status.

However, the above analysis also reveals exceptions to these constraints and suggests a storyteller will sometimes break these "rules" in order to reflect some discourse function in the narrative, such as drawing attention to a particular event in the story, foreshadowing that a particular character will serve an agentive role within the narrative, or implying a character's role is no longer important in the story.

Also, where obviation is not serving any function necessary to the interpretation of the narrative by the listener (e.g., eliminating ambiguities in reference), the storyteller will sometimes use obviation status to rank characters in a "participant hierarchy", where proximates rank above obviatives.

CHAPTER FOUR

Obviation in *Meshâpush*

4.1. Introduction

This chapter extends the analysis in Chapter Three, exploring the use of obviation in a second Innu-aimun story, *Meshâpush* (literally, *The Great Hare*), also told by Etuat Rich in Sheshatshiu, Labrador. As in Chapter Three, I identify and describe occurrences of the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation and the patterns of shifting obviation in the story. These patterns, like those identified in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, suggest the use of avoidance strategies and point to a correlation between proximates and agentive third persons. Secondly, I identify and analyze this story's proximate environments. My conclusions indicate that third persons tend to be proximate in the same environments in this *âtanûkan* as in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, and that, once again, the storyteller will sometimes give a third person an unexpected obviation status in order to express meaning at the level of the discourse.

4.1.1. *Meshâpush*

Along with *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, this Innu-aimun story can be found in *Sheshatshiu Atanukana mak Tipatshimuna / Myths and tales from Sheshatshit,* collected

by Madeleine Lefebvre and Robert Lanari in 1967 as part of the Labrador Innu Text Project. The following is a brief summary of the story.

4.1.2. Summary of *Meshâpush*

Meshapush sees many fish while walking along the shore but, even when he tries to spear them, he cannot catch any. He explains his dilemma to his grandmother and she tells him about a spider who weaves nets during the night. Taking his grandmother's advice, Meshapush goes and finds the spider. He hides in an old rotten tree and when the spider asks some girls to go fetch the rotten wood, Meshapush is brought by the girls, hidden inside the wood, to a spot where he watches the spider and learns how to weave a net. Meshapush runs home before the spider can catch him.

Meshapush and his grandmother make a net, and Meshapush uses the net to catch fish. However, he has no knife and cannot clean the fish. This time, his grandmother tells Meshapush about a metalworker from whom he can get metal with which to make a knife. He goes and finds the metalworker, who gives him metal, but the piece is too thin and keeps bending so Meshapush cannot clean the fish. His grandmother tells him to get a better piece from the metalworker. Once again, Meshapush runs off and finds the metalworker, who refuses to give him a better piece. Meshapush hits the metalworker on the head and runs off with a good piece of metal. He then makes a good knife and cleans the fish.

Without fire, though, Meshapush cannot cook the fish. So he takes his net and goes to the ocean where he sings out to the whales to come and join together to form a bridge he can cross. The whales do this, but warn Meshapush not to scratch them. He scratches them, and as he reaches the last whale, they go underwater. Meshapush washes up on shore, almost dead. Some girls find him and take him back to their house so they can play with him. Although their father orders them to kill him, the girls place Meshapush by the stove to dry out.

After Meshapush dries out, he puts his net under his armpit and it catches fire. With the burning net, Meshapush runs toward home. He again scratches a whale, and falls into the water, but manages to run ashore with his fire. He runs home and is finally able to cook the fish. This, the narrator tells us, is how the Innu got fire. Never before Meshapush brought it there, he tells us, was there fire in their part of the world.

4.2. Patterns of Sustained and Isolated Obviation

4.2.1. Single Proximate Spans

In *Meshâpush*, the girls who find Meshapush washed up on shore and bring him into their house are never given obviative status. Unlike any other character mentioned in either *Meshâpush* or *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, this group of girls is always proximate, each of the 12 times they are mentioned by the storyteller.

As was the case in many of the examples taken from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} discussed in Chapter Three, the girls' status as proximate correlates with their collective

semantic role as a group of agents rather than patients. Every time the girls are mentioned, they are playing an active/agentive role in the story (walking, looking, taking Meshapush inside, speaking, placing a net, leaving Meshapush behind, etc.). In 11 of the 12 occurrences, the girls are also subjects rather than objects. Once, however, they are the semantic object of *itikû* 's/he (O) says to him/her (P)'. As in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, where the storyteller uses avoidance strategies to keep Hare proximate, here the narrator keeps the girls proximate (i.e., avoids making them obviative) by using the verb's inverse form.

Meshapush, the story's main character, is also proximate for long spans of narrative throughout most of the story, although there are eight occasions where the narrator briefly assigns him obviative status. This distribution can be seen clearly in Table 19, given in Appendix C, and is discussed in greater detail in Section 4.4.1. of this chapter.

4.2.2. Coreferent Proximates

The following shows an example of coreferent proximates in *Meshâpush*:

(36) *Ek^{u} anite ushpishkunnît uet nâtât, pemûshinâtâuât, keutâuât ne, uetshipitamuât nenû utassîkumânnû, tshâuepâtuât nenû menuânit, eukuannû tâpue.* (50)

Then he (Meshapush-P) went over there towards his (Metalworker's-O) back, he (P) crept up behind him, (Metalworker-O), he (P) threw something (metal-O), he (P) knocked him (Metalworker-O) down, and ran back with the good piece of metal (O); indeed it was the one (O) (that he wanted).

In this example, the subject of the verbs 'rejoin', 'throw', 'knock over', 'grab', and 'run home carrying' are all proximate. Because multiple proximates in a single NC have been shown to represent coreferent NPs, we can deduce that the subject of each of these verbs refers to the same character. And, from the context, we know each of the proximates refers to Meshapush. Although the designation of obviative status cannot tell us whether the multiple obviatives in this sentence are coreferent, contextual clues indicate that it is the metalworker who is both rejoined and knocked down by Meshapush and the piece of metal that is thrown, grabbed, and judged to be good.

Another example of coreferent proximates can be seen in the following:

(37) *Apû tshî uâpamâkanit an iânapîtshetî, tepishkânitî ek^{u} iânapîtshet.* (9)
"No one can see her (Spider-P) when she (Spider-P) makes the nets. At night, she (Spider-P) makes the nets."

This is an interesting example of coreferent proximates because it shows us that, by using proximate status, a storyteller can signal a verbal object's coreference with a verbal subject. Here, for instance, the spider is both the subject of the verbs *iânapîtshetî* 'when she (Spider-P) makes a net (O)' and *iânapîtshet* 'she (Spider-P) makes a net (O)' and the object of the verb *uâpamâkanit* 'someone (O) sees her (Spider-P)'. As readers or listeners, we know the spider must be the one who is seen, as well as the one who makes the net, because of the proximate status of the object (and patient) of *uâpamâkanit.*

4.2.3. Coordinate Proximates

Nowhere in *Meshâpush* are two proximates joined by a conjunction or present in the same clause. However, in (38), two proximates occur in separate clauses of the same sentence in what, at first, appears to be a single narrative context:

(38) *Kâtshî tshîtûteht, ekue ânapîtshet.* (20)
After they (Girls-P) left, then she (Spider-P) made the net.

In (38), both the girls and the spider are proximate. However, it is important to note that most of the instances of proximates coexisting in a single sentence (i.e., possible coordinate proximates) in *Meshâpush* and *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} occur in sentences constructed like the one given above; that is, in most sentences in these two stories containing two non-coreferent proximates, the first occurs in a temporal clause beginning with the preverb *kâtshî* 'after', and the second occurs in the following clause after the particle *ekue* 'at that moment, then'.

This distribution suggests these multiple proximates are perhaps better analyzed as something other than coordinate proximates. In Sections 3.3.3. and 4.3.3., these constructions are dealt with as "proximate shifts in function", but another possibility is that the multi-clausal construction whose first clause begins with *kâtshî* 'after' represents, in fact, two distinct obviation spans, where the two proximates can seemingly co-exist and still obey the grammatical constraint requiring a single proximate in a particular narrative context. Semantically, this is also a plausible explanation, because the two clauses are separated in time, the first action having already been completed at the time

when the second commences. More evidence would be needed, however, to substantiate this alternative hypothesis.

4.2.4. Obviative Spans

In *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, the owl is obviative for a span of narrative where he is the less active/agentive third person and in which Hare, the more active third person, is kept proximate by the storyteller (see 3.2.4.). A similar pattern shows up in *Meshâpush*. Although the father is only mentioned three times, he is always obviative, as seen in (39):

(39) - *Nûtâ, iteu, nipeshuânân ne aueshîsh.* (71)
"Father," they (Girls-P) said to him (Father-O), "we brought home an animal (Meshapush-P)."

...

- *Mâuât, nipâikw anite, itikû nenua ûtâuîa.* (73)
"No, kill it there," their father (O) said to them (Girls-P).

...

- *Namaieu an, iteu.* (75)
"No, it isn't," she (one of the girls-P) said to him (Father-O).

Even when the father is speaking to the girls, ordering them to kill Meshapush, the narrator avoids giving him proximate status by using both the inverse form of the verb 'to say' (i.e., *itikû*) and the third-person possessive form of the noun denoting 'father' (i.e., *ûtâuîa* 'their father (O)'). That the narrator keeps the father obviative is not

surprising when we consider the context in which the father appears. Each time the father is mentioned, rather than playing an active role in the story, he is always speaking. In fact, the father never actually *does* anything in the story; he only tells his daughters what they should do (and his daughters ignore his orders). His daughters, however, play a very active role in the story, taking Meshapush home (line (70)), bringing him inside, placing him near the stove (line (77)), and so forth. As in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, then, we again find a pattern where a particular non-active (non-agentive) third person remains obviative for the span of narrative during which it is juxtaposed to another, clearly active or agentive, third person.

4.2.5. Discussion

By looking at the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation in a second Innu-aimun *âtanûkan*, we find that similar tendencies and correlations occur in both stories. Specifically, characters tend to remain proximate over the particular stretch of narrative in which they are agentive. And, the reverse is also often the case; often characters will remain obviative for the period in which they are non-active or non-agentive. These patterns also give insight into what constitutes the narrative context (NC) in which the rules of obviation apply. Based on the pattern found with *kâtshî* 'after' constructions, for example, we might hypothesize that separate clauses constitute distinct NCs when they are temporally distinct from one another (i.e., when the action in the first clause precedes or follows the action in the second clause).

4.3. Patterns of Shifting Obviation

4.3.1. Proximate Shifts

The following passage from *Meshâpush* shows an example of a proximate shift that parallels an example from *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* discussed in Chapter Three:

(40) *Ek^{u} uiâshkashâpepanit ne ishkueu, kûkûminâsh.* (28)
Then, that woman (P), the old woman (P), started cutting babiche on her own.

Kâtshî uâshkashâpet ne kûkûminâsh, ekue ânapîtshet Uâpush, ânapîtshepanû. (29)
After the old woman (P) made babiche, Hare (P) made a net; he (Hare-P) made a net on his own.

Before line (28), when her status shifts to proximate, the grandmother is always obviative. Again, this shift is consistent with the theory that agentivity requires proximate status, since the grandmother becomes proximate when she cuts the babiche. Line (29), however, is another example of a *kâtshî* 'after' construction (see 4.2.3.). While the two clauses may constitute separate NCs, they can also be analyzed another way. The use of obviation in line (29) is also interesting if we consider the possibility that obviation status can sometimes reflect equality (or lack of equality) between characters. In the first clause of this sentence (and in line (28)), the grandmother is proximate when she is cutting the babiche that will enable Meshapush to make the net. In the second clause, Meshapush makes the net and plays his role toward their shared goal of catching fish. As with Hare and Frog in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}* (see Example (20)), here Meshapush and his grandmother can be viewed as members of a team, and it can be argued that the

storyteller's choice to give them the same obviation status serves to grammatically encode their semantic equality.

4.3.2. Proximate Switches

In *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, Hare and the owl switch status where there is a corresponding shift in agentivity. When Hare is more agentive, he is proximate and the owl is obviative, and vice versa. In *Meshâpush*, a similar switch in status occurs between Meshapush and the spider:

(41) - *Shâsh tshitshî tshissinuâpamitin, iteu, etânapîtshein, etâpekaut tshitânapî.* (23)
"I already saw what you were doing," he (Meshapush-P) said to her (Spider-O), "the way you weave your net."

At utûtâmueu enik^{u}, apû kâ tsheshtâuât. (24)
The spider (P) kept trying to hit him (Meshapush-O), but she (Spider-P) couldn't hit him (Meshapush-O).

In line (23), Meshapush observes the spider and learns how to weave a net and, in doing so, becomes the more agentive of the two third persons in the narrative context. Correspondingly, Meshapush is given proximate status and the spider is assigned obviative status. In line (24), however, the spider tries to hit Meshapush and, having become the more agentive third person in this situation, shifts from obviative to proximate, while Meshapush's status shifts from proximate to obviative. As in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk^{u}*, this proximate/obviative switch can be explained entirely by

agentivity, where the more agentive third person receives proximate status, and the less agentive third person is designated the default obviative status.

4.3.3. Proximate Shifts in Function

In Chapter Three, I argue that a stretch of narrative in which Hare and Frog are both proximate can be explained as a series of proximate shifts where proximate status shifts from one third person to the other, but where, because the non-proximate third person is not mentioned, we see no textual evidence for the shifts. The following passage from *Meshâpush*, where obviation patterns similarly, can be explained in the same way:

(42) *Ek^{u} uiâshkashâpepanit ne ishkueu, kûkûminâsh.* (28)
Then, that woman (Grandmother-P), the old woman (Grandmother-P), started cutting the babiche.

Kâtshî uâshkashâpet ne kûkûminâsh, ekue ânapîtshet Uâpush, ânapîtshepanû. (29)
After the old woman (Grandmother-P) made the babiche, Hare (P) made the net (O); he (Hare-P) made the net (O) on his own.

Kâtshî ânapîtshet ekue nipâiât namesha tâpue. (30)
After he (Hare-P) made the net (O), indeed he (Hare-P) caught fish (O).

Mishta-mîtshetinua namesha nepâiât. (31)
He (Meshapush-P) caught many fish (O).

In line (28) and the first clause of line (29), the grandmother is proximate. Then, in the second clause of line (29) — and in lines (30) and (31) — Meshapush is proximate. Although there is no textual evidence for the grandmother's shift to obviative after Meshapush is given proximate status (i.e., she is not mentioned in lines (30) and (31)), it

is possible to argue that this is, in fact, what happens. If we posit an abstract obviative status for the unmentioned character and argue that what look like multiple proximates are in fact proximate shifts in function, then we eliminate the problem of two non-coordinate, non-coreferent third persons coexisting as proximate in a single narrative context. That is, we can say that in the second clause of line (29), the grandmother is obviative, but because she is not mentioned, we simply do not see any results of this shift. Furthermore, line (32) supports this analysis:

(43) *- Apû takuâk mûkumân, iteu ne kûkûminâsh.* (32)
"There is no knife (P)," that old woman (Grandmother-P) said to him (Meshapush-O).

Once again, the grandmother is proximate, but this time the transitive verb *iteu* 's/he (P) says to him/her (O)' implies Meshapush as its obviative object and so there is evidence of Meshapush's shift from proximate to obviative.

4.3.4. Obviative Shifts

Meshapush is generally proximate when he is the subject or object of the verb *it-* 'to say'. However, there are a few instances where Meshapush shifts to obviative status in this context[26]:

(44a) *Mishta-mîtshetinua namesha nepâiât.* (31)
He (Meshapush-P) caught many fish (O).

[26] Meshapush's status before and after the shifts is underlined.

- *Apû takuâk mûkumân, iteu ne kûkûminâsh.* (32)
"There is no knife (P)," that old woman (Grandmother-P) said to him (Meshapush-O).

(44b) *Ek^{u} apû tshî uînameshet eshk^{u}, ushâm papakâshinû nenû, uâkâpissinam^{u} mâni nenû ât uâ uînameshetî.* (40)
But, he (Meshapush-P) couldn't clean the fish yet. It (the metal piece-O) was too thin. He (Meshapush-P) kept bending it as he (Meshapush-P) tried to clean the fish.

- *Mâuât apû minuât au, iteu nenua ûssima.* (41)
"No, it (knife-P) is no good," she (Grandmother-O) said to her grandson (Meshapush-O).

Etatû menuânit kanuenitam^{u} an. (42)
"He has a better one (P)."

« Apû minuât », tshe itât. (43)
"It (knife-P) is no good," she (Grandmother-P) would say to him (Meshapush-O).

- *Eshe, itikû.* (44)
"Yes," he (Meshapush-O) said to her (Grandmother-P).

In both (44a) and (44b), Meshapush's status shifts from proximate to obviative. Furthermore, these shifts occur while Meshapush is being informed of some obstacle preventing him from attaining his goal of eating the fish. In (44a), his grandmother tells him they have no knife with which to clean the fish; in (44b), she explains that the knife he has acquired is no good because it keeps bending and is not be strong enough to clean the fish.

Another obviative shift involves the whales, who are proximate the first few times they are mentioned, then shift to obviative, and remain obviative for as long as they appear in the story. Their shift from proximate to obviative is given in (45):

(45) - *Eshe, itikû.* (60)
"Yes," he (Meshapush-O) said to him (Whale-P).

...

Nete tshekât nenua mâshten kâssipiteu ekue kutapanîunitî. (63)
He (Meshapush-P) was almost on the last one when he (Meshapush-P) scratched him (Whale-O) and it (Whale-O) went underwater.

As seen in the above example, the whale shifts to obviative status after Meshapush steps on and scratches him. After this point, even when the whales are the lone third-person referent in the sentence, they are obviative:

(46) *Ekue kutapanîunitî kassinû etashinitî.* (87)
Then then all (Whales-O) went underwater.

Eukuekuâ kuetapanîunitî kassinû. (89)
All of them (Whales-O) went underwater.

The distribution of proximate and obviative status for the whales suggests their shift to obviative may reflect some other meaning in the narrative. By keeping the whales obviative in environments where we would expect them to be proximate (i.e., when they occur in PEs), the storyteller may be accentuating a difference in the whales' status in the story before and after they have been scratched by Meshapush.

4.3.5. Discussion

As with the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation, the patterns of shifting obviation in *Meshâpush* closely resemble those found in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}.

Once again, there is a strong correlation between proximate status and the corresponding referent's role as an agent. However, several shifts in status also appear to reflect the storyteller's use of obviation to serve some discourse function, for example highlighting a character's status or focusing on some event or aspect of the story. These patterns also suggest an alternative analysis for *kâtshî* 'after' constructions. Although they can be analyzed as a case of two clauses representing distinct NCs, they can also be explained as proximate shifts in function, where, if we posit an abstract obviative status, we can argue that the first proximate has shifted to obviative but, because the newly-obviative third person is not mentioned, we have no textual evidence for the shift.

4.4. Proximate Environments: Semantic and Syntactic Contexts Where Proximate Occur, and the Default Obviative

In Chapter Three, I identified six environments in which third-persons are usually designated as proximate (see Section 3.4.7.). In this section, I test this analysis to see if the characters in *Meshâpush* are proximate in the same environments and if any additional proximate environments surface. Here, I explore the environments in which the following characters are proximate: 1) the father; 2) the fish; 3) the whale(s); 4) the grandmother; 5) the metalworker; 6) the spider; 7) the girls; 8) the (other) girls; and 9) Meshapush. I also further explore the contexts in which the storyteller designates a third person as obviative in a PE or gives a third person proximate status in an unexpected environment in order to serve some discourse function.

4.4.1. *Utâuîa* 'Father'

Although the girls' father is mentioned only three times, it is significant that, unlike any other character in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} or *Meshâpush*, the father is always obviative (i.e., never proximate). This distribution is easily explainable, though, if we analyze the immediate NCs in which he is mentioned. The father only appears in the story when he is speaking to, or being spoken to by, his daughters. Based on findings discussed in Chapter Three, we already know forms of the verb 'to say' (including *iteu*, *itikû*, etc.) interact with obviation assignment differently than quoted speech or other types of frame narrative. Obviation status with regard to this verb often functions: 1) to distinguish multiple third persons; and 2) to reflect a ranking — proximate over obviative — between the two third persons involved. It follows, then, that the girls, who are more prominent in the story than their father, are the subject of the direct form of the verb 'to say' and therefore assigned proximate status, and that, in contrast, the narrator makes the father the subject of the inverse form of the verb 'to say' in order to assign him the default obviative status. The father's obviation status is represented in Table 11:

Table 11: Obviation Status of *Utâuîa*

Utâuîa 'Father'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
71	voc, O	**OSp**	E	(PN) iteu-obj	nûtâ, spoken to	FN
73	O		E	itikû-sbj	says, that father	AV, FN
75	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN

4.4.2. *Nameshat* 'Fish'

The fish, who are mentioned eight times in the story, are only proximate twice. The storyteller assigns them as coreferent proximates in one sentence, where they are the lone third-person referent in their narrative context, as shown in (47):

(47) *Nûkum, iteu, apû tshî nipâikâu anite nameshat, mishta-mîtshetuat.* (6)
"Grandmother," he (Meshapush-P) said to her (Grandmother-O), "I couldn't kill the fish (P); they (Fish-P) were very many."[27]

Elsewhere, the fish are obviative, and occur in narrative contexts that do not require proximate status (i.e., where they are non-agentive, occur alongside more prominent third persons, etc.). That the fish are almost always obviative is not surprising, however, since they are always patients rather than agents; their role in the story is limited to being plentiful, caught, cleaned, cooked, and eaten by Hare, and they are referred to in relation to Hare as he tries to acquire them for food. The obviation status of the fish is given in Table 12:

Table 12: Obviation Status of *Nameshat*

Nameshat 'Fish'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
2	O		E	PN Vobj	seen, are big/many	intro'd O
3	O		I	Vobj	(not)killed	nonAG
4	O, O		I	Vobj×2	(not)speared,killed	nonAG

[27] Although the noun phrase *Nûkum* 'Grandmother' looks like a third-person referent, it is actually a vocative form and therefore acts as if in a separate narrative context from the rest of the sentence.

Nameshat 'Fish' (continued)						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
6	**P, P**	**PS**	**E**	**PN Vobj, Vsbj**	**(not)killed, are big**	**lone 3p, CoP**
30	O	**OS**	E	PN Vobj	caught/killed	nonAG
31	O		E	PN Vobj	caught/killed	nonAG

4.4.3. *Uâpamekʷ* 'Whale'

The obviation status assigned to the whale — who is alternately referred to in the singular (the last whale) and plural (the entire group of whales) — is represented in the following table:

Table 13: Obviation Status of *Uâpamekʷ*

Uâpamekʷ 'Whale'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
56	*VOC*		E	interj	Mishtamekw	
57	**P×2**		**E**	**Vsbj PN, Vsbj**	**uâpamekuat, be in group×2**	**AG (pl)**
59	**P**		**E**	**PN iteu-sbj**	**uâp. says**	**AG (s), FN**
60	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV, FN**
63	O×2	**OS**	E	Vobj, Vsbj	nenua, scratched, go under	nonAG, AG (s)
64	O		I	Vsbj	goes under	AG
86	O×2		E	Vobj PN-O, Vobj	stepped on, scratched	nonAG
87	O×2		I	Vsbj×2	go under, are a #	?
88	O		I	itâkanû-indef	they say	FN
89	O		I	Vsbj	go under	

The whale(s) are proximate four times. Twice, they are proximate where they are the lone third person in the sentence:

(48) *Ekue ne âshakumuat tâpue uâpamekuat, âshakumuat neka ite akâmît.* (57)
Then, it is true, the white whales (P) got themselves hooked together right across the river.[28]

One of the whales is also proximate two times, first as the subject of *iteu* and second as the object of *itikû:*

(49) *Nika kutapanîunân uesh kâssipishîâtî, iteu ne uâpamekᵘ.* (59)
"We will go underwater if you scratch us," that white whale said to him.

Eshe, itikû. (60)
"Yes," he (Meshapush-O) said to him (Whale-P).

In both cases, the storyteller assigns Meshapush obviative status and assigns the whale proximate status in relation to the verb *it-* 'to say' (i.e., *iteu, itikû*) in the frame narrative. Because Meshapush is the main character, and therefore the one we would expect to be assigned the more prominent status (i.e., proximate), this distribution could reflect some additional meaning in the discourse. For example, by assigning this unexpected proximate status, the storyteller could be drawing attention to the importance of the whale's role in the story.

[28] The river, although translated into English as a third-person referent, is a locative form denoting the location of the action (i.e., across the river).

4.4.4. *Ukûma* 'Grandmother'

The grandmother is proximate seven of the 13 times she is mentioned in the story. Two occurrences in which she is designated as proximate are given in the following:

(50) *Ekᵘ uiâshkashâpepanit ne ishkueu, kûkûminâsh.* (28)
Then, that woman (Grandmother-P), the old woman (Grandmother-P), started cutting the babiche.

Kâtshî uâshkashâpet ne kûkûminâsh, ekue ânapîtshet Uâpush, ânapîtshepanû. (29)
After the old woman (Grandmother-P) made the babiche, Hare (P) made the net; he (Hare-P) made the net on his own.

In (50), the grandmother fulfils the semantic role of agent as the subject of the verbs *uiâshkashâpepanit* 'cuts babiche' and *uâshkashâpet* 'cuts babiche', but other factors influence the narrator's choice to make her proximate. While the two coreferent and explicit references to the grandmother (*ne ishkueu* and *kûkûminâsh*) and her grammatical inclusion as a verbal subject all represent a single third-person referent in line (28) — the nominal concept of 'babiche' encompassed in the intransitive verb *uiâshkashâpepanit* 'cuts babiche' — there is not only a second third person in line (29), but a second proximate. Because the second proximate refers to Meshapush, the two cannot corefer and only a few explanations, therefore, can account for this distribution of proximates.

First, the grandmother and Meshapush can be analyzed as coordinate proximates, as I propose in Section 4.2.3. They can also be analyzed as proximate shifts in function, as I posit in Section 4.3.1. Thirdly, these multiple proximates may represent another exception to the rules of obviation assignment, where the narrator purposely breaks the

rule that generally allows only one proximate in a narrative context. Lastly, it can be argued that the grandmother and Meshapush occur in separate narrative contexts, and can therefore both be proximate (see 4.2.3.). This argument becomes more convincing when we consider the syntactic structure of the sentence; the grandmother appears in the first clause, headed by *kâtshî* 'after', and Meshapush appears in the second clause after *ekue* 'and then', his action occurring in a temporally-distinct environment.

The grandmother's obviation status is given in Table 14:

Table 14: Obviation Status of *Ukûma*

Ukûma 'Grandmother'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
6	*VOC*, O		E	(POSSD3) iteu-obj	(nûkum) spoken to	interj./AV, FN
7	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV, FN
10	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN
11	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV, FN
28	**P, P, P**	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj, PN, PN**	**cuts, woman, old woman**	**AG (team?)**
29	**P**		**E**	**Vsbj PN**	**cuts, old woman**	**'after' clause**
32	**P**		**E**	**PN iteu-sbj**	**old woman, speaks**	**sees problem, FN**
35	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	Hare agrees, FN
41	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**sees problem, FN**
43	**P**		**I**	**itât-sbj**	**would say**	**sees problem, FN**
44	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**Hare agrees, FN**
55	O	**OS**	E	iteu-obj PN	spoken to, nenua ûkuma	proposes solution, FN
91	O		E	iteu-obj PN	spoken to, ûkuma	H finds fire (AG), FN

As shown in the above table, the remaining five times in which the grandmother is given proximate status all occur in the frame narrative. These are discussed in further detail in Section 4.4.9.

4.4.5. *Kâiassîkumanitshesht* 'Metalworker'

The metalworker is proximate six times. In line (33), he is the lone third person; in line (51), he is the possessor of the third-person noun phrase 'metal' in *utassîkumânim*; and in lines (34), (38), and (51), the animacy hierarchy can account for his proximate status, as given in Example (51):

(51) *Tshipâ tshî mînik^{u} natuenitamutî assîkumâna tshetshî mûkumânitshein.* (34)
"Perhaps he (Metalworker-P) would give you metal (O) to make a knife, if you asked him (Metalworker-P)."

Ekue mînât ne kâiassîkumanitshesht, papatshishekushinû nenû mîneu. (38)
Then, the metalworker (P) gave him a very thin piece (O) (of metal).

Ek^{u} ne uîâshkamenimut apû akuannit nene utassîkumânim ne kâiassîkumanitshesht. (51)
Then, when he (Metalworker-P) woke up, the metalworker's (P) metal (O) was gone.

The animacy hierarchy requires the metalworker, who is proximate, to be superior in status than the inanimate and non-human *assîkumân-a* 'metal-obviative', and 'thin piece', expressed as obviative in the verb *paptshishekushinû* 'it is a thin piece (O)'. However, the metalworker's status as proximate in these sentences can also be explained by his simultaneous presence in other proximate environments. Twice when the metalworker is

proximate in these lines, he is also a semantic agent. The metalworker's proximate status in lines (34) and (38), then, can also be explained by the fact that he is the agent of the verb *mineu* 'he gives', and his proximate status in line (34), where he is the semantic object of the verb *natuenitamutî* 'asks for', can be accounted for by coreference.

The metalworker's obviation status is given in Table 15:

Table 15: Obviation Status of *Kâiassîkumanitshesht*

Kâiassîkumanitshesht 'Metalworker'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
33	***P***		**E**	**PN**	**metalworker**	**intro'd P**
34	***P×2***		**I**	**Vsbj-inv, Vobj**	**he gives you, you ask him**	**AG, AH**
37	O×2	**OS**	E	Vobj D, iteu-obj	seen, spoken to	nonAG, FN
38	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**PN Vsbj**	**gives (metal)**	**AG, AH**
45	O	**OS**	I	Vobj	found/gotten	nonAG
46	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN
47	O		I	itikû-sbj	says	AV, FN
48	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN
50	O×2		I	Vobj×2	found/thrown at	nonAG
51	**P×3**	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj, POSSR3, PN**	**awakes, his metal, PN**	**AH**

4.4.6. *Enikᵘ* 'Spider'

The spider is proximate 13 times in *Meshâpush*. Nine times, she is the semantic agent in her narrative context (in lines (7), (8), (9), (11), (12), (20), and (24)); once, she is the lone third person (line (10)); one occurrence can be explained by coreference (line

(9)); and twice, she is proximate in the frame narrative involving the verb 'to say', once as the subject of *iteu*, and once as the object of *itikû*, in lines (15) and (17) respectively. The spider's occurrences as proximate in the frame narrative are given below:

(52) *Natuâpamekᵘ uîssîtâkᵘ, iteu uetakussinit.* (15)
"Go look for rotten wood (P)," she (Spider-P) said to them (Girls-O) in the evening.

Eshe, itikû. (17)
"Yes," they (Girls-O) said to her (Spider-P).

In this example, the spider is given proximate status, and the girls are assigned obviative status. When the spider speaks with Meshapush in line (23), however, she is obviative and Meshapush is proximate:

(53) *Shâsh tshitshî tshissinuâpamitin, iteu, etânapîtshein, etâpekaut tshitânapî.* (23)
"I already saw what you were doing," he (Meshapush-P) said to her (Spider-O), "the way you weave your net."

Which third person is assigned proximate status in relation to the verb *it* 'to say' in the frame narrative is significant in that it suggests a relative ranking of the characters. Based on the storyteller's assignment of obviation status in (52) and (53), for example, we can interpret the following ranking: Meshapush > Spider > Girls.

Table 16: Obviative Status of *Enik^{u}*

Enik^{u} 'Spider'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
7	***P***		**E**	**Vsbj PN**	**enik^{u}, makes webs**	**intro'd P, AG**
8	***P***		**I**	**Vsbj PN**	**enik^{u}, makes webs**	**AG**
9	***(P?), P×2***		**I**	**Indef., Vsbj×2**	**(not)seen, makes nets×2**	**AG×2**
10	***P***		**I**	**Vobj**	**(I) look for him**	**AV**
11	***P***		**I**	**Vsbj**	**will kill**	**AG**
12	***P***		**I**	**Vsbj**	**will (not) kill**	
13	O	OS	E	Vobj, PNsomeone	found/gotten	nonAG
15	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
17	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV, FN**
20	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**makes web**	**AG**
21	O, O	OS	I	Vobj, Vsbj	seen, makes net	nonAG, AG
23	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN
24	**P, P**	**PS**	**E**	**PN Vsbj, Vsbj**	**(try to) hit, (not) hit**	**AG (but missing)**

4.4.7. *Ishkuessat* 'Girls'

The storyteller assigns the girls proximate status three times. They are the lone third person in line (14), and they are required by the animacy hierarchy to be proximate in line (18), where both the *ishkuessat* 'girls (P)' and the animate, but non-human, *uîssîtâkua* 'rotten wood (O)' occur in the same NC. They are also proximate in line (20), involving a *kâtshî* 'after' construction (refer to Section 4.4.4.):

(54) *Kâtshî tshîtûteht ekue ânapîtshet.* (20)
After they (Girls-P) left, then she (Spider-P) made the net.

Once again, in a two-clausal sentence headed by the preverb *kâtshî*, two proximates can coexist where one (the girls) occurs in the first clause and the other (the spider) occurs in the second clause.

The only environment in which the girls are not proximate is in relation to the verb *it-* 'to say' where, as speakers and hearers, they are obviative relative to the proximate spider in lines (15) and (17). This distribution of obviation status in the frame narrative therefore suggests the ranking: Spider > Girls.

Table 17: Obviation Status of *Ishkuessat*

Ishkuessat 'Girls'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
14	**P**		**E**	**Vsbj PN**	**ishkuessat, come out**	**lone 3p**
15	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN
17	O		I	itikû-sbj	speak	AV, FN
18	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**PN Vsbj**	**anitshenat ishkuessat, bring wood**	**AH**
20	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**leave**	**S makes web**

4.4.8. *Ishkuessat* '(Other) Girls'[29]

Unlike any other character in either *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} or *Meshâpush*, and even though they are never the lone third person in their narrative context, the *ishkuessat* '(other) girls' are always proximate, as shown in Table 18:

[29] I have called these girls the '(other) girls' in order to distinguish them from the girls discussed in 4.4.7. These girls are the *ishkuessat* who find Meshapush washed up on shore and bring him into their home.

Table 18: Obviation Status of (other) *Ishkuessat*

Ishkuessat '(Other) girls'						
Line #	Prox/ Obv	Pattern	E/I	Syntactic Role	Semantic Role	Comment
66	**P**	**Psp**	**E**	**Vsbj PN**	**ishkuessat, walk around**	**AH**
67	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**see**	**AG**
68	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**say**	**AG**
70	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**take (M) inside**	**AG**
71	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**say**	**FN**
73	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV, FN**
75	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**say**	**FN**
77	**P×2**		**I**	**Vsbj×2**	**bring inside, place/check net**	**AG×2**
79	**P×2**		**I**	**Vsbj×2**	**leave him, check net**	**AG×2**
80	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**leave him**	**AG**

The girls are proximate in three proximate environments: 1) they are agents in lines (67), (70), (77), (79), and (80), where they 'see', 'take', 'bring', 'place', and 'leave' Meshapush; 2) they are proximate in line (66), where the animacy hierarchy requires them to have a higher obviation status than the inanimate and non-human *mîtshuâp* 'house'; and 3) in lines (68), (71), (73), and (75) in the frame narrative, the storyteller assigns the girls proximate status and their father, with whom they are speaking, obviative status, producing the ranking: Girls > Father. In line (68), also involving the verb *iteu*, one of the girls is designated as proximate when speaking to the other girls in the group, who are relegated to obviative status.

4.4.9. *Meshâpush* 'Meshapush'

The distribution of proximate and obviative status assigned to Meshapush is fairly complex, although a large number of his proximate occurrences can be accounted for by the following: 1) his status as an agent; 2) the effect of the animacy hierarchy; 3) his occurrence as the lone third person in a NC; 4) his status as a possessor; and 5) his occurrence in a sentence involving the *kâtshî* 'after' construction. The remaining times where Meshapush is proximate all involve varying forms of the verb *it-* 'to say' and occur in the frame narrative. However, Meshapush is sometimes proximate and sometimes obviative in this environment, as shown in (55a):

(55a) *Shâsh tshitshî tshissinuâpamitin, iteu, etânapîtshein, etâpekaut tshitânapî.* (23)
"I already saw what you were doing," he (Meshapush-P) said to her (Spider-O), "the way you weave your net."

...

Apû minuât au ka mînin, iteu, uâuâkâpissipanû. (46)
"What you gave me is no good," he (Meshapush-P) said to him (Metalworker-O). "It (O) keeps bending."

(55b) *Apû takuâk mûkumân, iteu ne kûkûminâsh.* (32)
"There is no knife (P)," that old woman (P) said to him (Meshapush-O).

...

Nika kutapanîunân uesh kâssipishîâtî, iteu ne uâpamek^{u}. (59)
"We will go underwater if you scratch us," that white whale (P) said to him (Meshapush-O).

In (55a), the storyteller assigns Meshapush the higher status relative to the spider and the metalworker, but in (55b), the whale and the grandmother are given the higher status. While the rankings of Meshapush > Spider, Meshapush > Metalworker, and Whale(s) > Meshapush are sustained throughout the story (in the context of the frame narrative), the grandmother and Meshapush's statuses as proximate and obviative sometimes switch, as shown in (56a) and (56b):

(56a) *Nûkum, iteu, apû tshî nipâikâu anite nameshat, mishta-mîtshetuat.* (6)
"Grandmother," he (Meshapush-P) said to her (Grandmother-O), "I couldn't kill the fish; there were very many."

Tâu anite nussim, itikû, ânapîtsheu enik^{u}. (7)
"There is, my grandchild," she (Grandmother-O) said to him (Meshapush-P), "a spider (P) who makes nets."

(56b) *Mâuât apû minuât au, iteu nenua ûssima.* (41)
"No, it's no good," she (Grandmother-P) said to her grandson (Meshapush-O).

Apû minuât, tshe itât. (43)
"It is no good," she (Grandmother-P) would say to him (Meshapush-O).

In (56a), Meshapush is proximate and in (56b), he is obviative. What determines this distribution can be explained by the respective roles of the grandmother and Meshapush. The majority of the time, Meshapush is proximate relative to the grandmother in this environment, yielding the ranking Meshapush > Grandmother. Only when the grandmother points out a problem to Meshapush is the ranking reversed and the grandmother assigned the more prominent proximate status:

(57) *Apû takuâk mûkumân, iteu ne kûkûminâsh.* (32)
"There is no knife (P)," that old woman (Grandmother-P) said to him (Meshapush-O).

...

Mâuât apû minuât au, iteu nenua ûssima. (41)
"No, it's no good," she (Grandmother-P) said to her grandson (Meshapush-O).

Etatû menuânit kanuenitam^{u} an. (42)
"He has a better one (P)."

Apû minuât, tshe itât. (43)
"It is no good," she (Grandmother-P) would say to him (Meshapush-O).

Eshe, itikû. (44)
"Yes," he (Meshapush-O) said to her (Grandmother-P).

In the above example, the grandmother is proximate when she tells Meshapush he has no knife with which to clean the fish (line (32)) and when she tells him the metal he has is no good because it keeps bending (line (41)). It is also important to note that the speaker in line (32) is marked overtly by the noun phrase *kûkûminâsh* 'old woman (P)' and that the hearer in line (41) is marked overtly by *ûssima* 'his/her grandson (O)'. Because the characters are explicitly identified in this way, it is not necessary for the narrator to use *iteu* and *itikû* for the purpose of distinguishing speaker and hearer.

These are the only instances in which the grandmother ranks above Meshapush in this syntactic context, and it is therefore plausible that the narrator is using this unexpected ranking to highlight the importance of the grandmother's role in telling Meshapush what he needs in order to clean the fish.

4.4.10. Discussion

My analysis of the proximate environments in *Meshâpush* has shown that third persons in this story are generally proximate in all six of the PEs identified in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}. The analysis has also pointed to a seventh environment, the *kâtshi* 'after' construction, in which third persons are proximate. That the same PEs show up in both stories is significant because this provides further evidence for the existence of a finite set of constraints determining the distribution of proximates and obviatives not only in these two narratives, but perhaps in the genre more generally. Further study, therefore, may reveal these PEs to be genre-defining features of Innu-aimun *âtanûkana*, or even of all Algonquian myth-legends.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

5.1. General Conclusions

In this thesis, I have characterized the complexity involved in the syntactic and semantic role of obviation in two Innu-aimun *âtanûkana*. While obviation is to some extent a grammatical (morphological and syntactic) phenomenon in Algonquian narratives, it must also be understood as a discourse phenomenon, reflecting participant hierarchies and carrying layers of meaning involving discourse salience and the individual creative expression of the storyteller at this higher level of linguistic communication. The analyses in this thesis have shown, as argued by Ann Grafstein, that "obviation within sentences is governed by syntactic constraints which are part of sentence grammar, while obviation across sentences is governed to a large extent by properties of discourse" (1981:87). The identification and description of patterns of sustained, isolated, and shifting obviation and the detailed and systematic analysis of the immediate syntactic and semantic proximate environments have suggested a theory of the constraints that govern obviation both within and across sentences (or, otherwise stated, within different types of narrative context). These analyses have also presented a theory of how a creative storyteller can manipulate these constraints in order to use obviation as a tool of discourse. This chapter summarizes the conclusions suggested by the different uses of obviation explored in this thesis.

5.1.1. Patterns of Sustained and Isolated Obviation

By virtue of the fact that they involve proximate or obviative statuses that are maintained by the storyteller over prolonged stretches of narrative, the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation found in the two Innu-aimun *âtanûkana* provide evidence in support of the argument that a storyteller can use obviation to create meaning at the level of discourse. Specifically, it is significant that the same patterns show up in both stories. Just as we find a tendency to keep Hare proximate in *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, we also see a tendency to keep Meshapush and the father's daughters (the *ishkuessat*) proximate in *Meshâpush*. Furthermore, I have shown that, in both stories, the narrator employs avoidance strategies in order to maintain the proximate status of these characters. In other words, that these characters remain proximate for a prolonged duration in the narratives reflects the purposeful intent of the storyteller.

Not only are characters kept proximate by the storyteller; the analysis of these obviation patterns indicates that a character's status as obviative will also often be purposely sustained by the narrator. In *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}, the storyteller uses avoidance strategies on the one hand to keep Hare proximate and, on the other hand, to keep the owl obviative for a stretch of narrative; in *Meshâpush*, similar strategies are employed by the storyteller in order to keep the father obviative.

Of more significance than the presence of the same patterns of sustained and isolated obviation in both stories, then, is the fact that, in both *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u} and *Meshâpush*, the storyteller uses avoidance strategies to purposely

sustain the obviation status (either proximate or obviative) of a particular character. Although much of the criteria involved in the choice of whether to make a third-person referent proximate or obviative can indeed be found at the level of the clause or sentence (as shown in the analysis of proximate environments), the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation provide evidence for the fact that the storyteller also considers larger contexts in the story, and sometimes the story as a whole, in making the choice between proximate and obviative status for a third-person referent.

5.1.2. Patterns of Shifting Obviation

Like the patterns of sustained and isolated obviation, the patterns of shifting obviation show that obviation can be triggered, and can carry meaning, at the level of discourse (i.e., obviation can be used to reflect a character's global importance). For example, that characters like the whales (in *Meshâpush*) only shift status once throughout the entire narrative suggests a change in obviation status is likely significant within the context of the story as a whole and implies the location of the shift may coincide with a semantic shift in the story.

However, the patterns of shifting obviation also indicate that not only is the choice of obviation status meaningful within the scope of larger stretches of narrative but it often carries meaning within smaller contexts like the clause or sentence (i.e., obviation can also be used to reflect a character's local importance). For example, in the two

âtanûkana, these patterns indicate that a change in obviation status often coincides with a change in agentivity, where third persons are assigned proximate status if they are agents.

In this way, the shifts in obviation and the way in which they pattern in these two stories provide evidence that both larger narrative contexts (e.g., the story as a complete entity) and smaller narrative contexts (e.g., the clause or sentence) influence the storyteller's choice of whether to make a third-person referent proximate or obviative.

Lastly, the analysis of the patterns of shifting obviation raises the possibility that obviation status is assigned to characters at an abstract level (i.e., even characters that are not explicitly mentioned are assigned either proximate or obviative status). By analyzing some multiple proximates as proximate shifts in function, we find that even characters who are not mentioned can be argued to have underlying obviation statuses, where explicitly-mentioned proximate third persons shift to obviative when they are not mentioned, and shift back to proximate when they reappear in the story.

5.1.3. Proximate Environments

A detailed look at the smaller narrative contexts that generally require a third person to be proximate in these two *âtanûkana* reveals a set of seven environments in which the relevant third person will usually have proximate status: 1) where a referent is the lone third person in a NC; 2) where a third-person referent is being described in general terms; 3) where the third person is an agent; 4) where the third person is coreferent with another third person in the same NC who is required to be proximate;

5) where the animacy hierarchy requires a third person to have a higher status than a non-human third person in the same NC; 6) where a third person occurs as the possessor in a possessive form; and 7) in a *kâtshî* 'after' construction.

Having identified these proximate environments, exceptions to the rules governing obviation surface in instances where the storyteller assigns a third person either obviative status in a proximate environment, or proximate status in a context other than a proximate environment. These exceptions appear to be a reflection of the storyteller's intentional manipulation of the rules governing obviation in order to employ obviation as a tool of discourse within a context larger than that encompassed in a proximate environment. By using an unexpected obviation status in this way, the narrator can signal meaning at the level of discourse, placing focus on a character, foreshadowing an event, and so forth.

An understanding of the way in which obviation is triggered and carries meaning in smaller narrative contexts better equips us to clarify the ways in which the storyteller can use obviation at the level of discourse. For example, because the data suggest a proximate is often assigned its status based on its semantic role as an agent, we might interpret an unexpected proximate (e.g., proximate status assigned to a character who is not explicitly described as an agent) as a signal of agentivity. Similarly, we might hypothesize that an unexpected proximate status functions to foreshadow the important role a character will play later in the story.

The analysis of proximate environments also indicates that, while obviatives have been shown to be the default status, given to third-person referents who do not occur in a

proximate environment, this does not imply that obviative status is relegated to default status when triggered within larger narrative contexts. That is, although obviative status is the default situation when assigned in contexts like the clause or sentence, by giving a third person the unexpected status of obviative in a proximate environment, the storyteller can use this predominantly-default status for a discourse function such as a character's lack of agentivity or inferior status relative to another, more prominent character.

The analysis of proximate environments also points to a hierarchy of characters that the storyteller can express — in some contexts — through obviation. By designating third persons as proximate or obviative (most notably when they are the subject or object of the verb *it-* 'to say'), as long as obviation status is not serving the function of distinguishing between multiple third persons, the storyteller can rank proximate third persons above obviative third persons, using obviation to create a participant hierarchy.

5.2. Concluding Remarks

In answer to the question, "Does the use of obviation in narratives reflect not only grammatical functions but discourse functions as well?," the overwhelming answer must be yes, "the choice of proximate referent and the distribution of proximate shifts is based largely on higher-level discourse factors" (Russell 1996: 368). Not only does the use of obviation in the two Innu-aimun stories reflect a set of finite rules that drive a storyteller's choice of proximate or obviative status for each third-person referent in

smaller narrative contexts, but, because the rules governing obviation are sometimes purposely broken within the NC of the sentence or clause, it suggests a storyteller's assignment of obviation must correspond to something meaningful at the level of discourse. Goddard shares the conclusion that obviation functions as a tool of discourse:

> For a given pair of animate third persons in a discourse there is, in the first place, the option of which to make proximate and which to make obviative. Even when a proximate has been established, however, there is still the option of whether to make the next third person an obviative or a new proximate. It is because of this flexibility and the way it functions that obviation must be considered a category of discourse, rather than of sentence syntax (Goddard 1990:318).

While I would stress that it is equally important to recognize the significant syntactic and semantic role that obviation plays at the level of the sentence or clause — where the uses of obviation identified in these two *âtanûkana* may be shown in future studies to characterize the genre of Innu-aimun *âtanûkana*, or Algonquian myth-legends in general — I agree with Goddard that obviation is at the same time a discourse phenomenon. Beyond the syntactic and semantic functions obviation fulfils within the context of a sentence or clause in this thesis, obviation has been shown to serve discourse functions that reflect the storyteller's "creativity in using what is available in the language to tell a compelling and coherent story" (Spielmann 1998:198).

That the grammatical form of obviation can be used to express meaning beyond more basic grammatical functions supports Dell Hymes' and Dennis Tedlock's assertion that "native North American performed narratives are better seen as oral poetry than as what Western cultures have classified as prose" (Russell 1991:320). Similarly, inspired

by the papers of Joel Sherzer and Anthony Woodbury (1987:2), Dahlstrom sums up the role of the study of Native American discourse analysis:

> Work in ... [the ethnopoetics of Native American discourse] ... seeks to simultaneously bring out the art and power of Native American literature by attending to the linguistic details of the original text, and to increase our understanding of the grammatical oppositions within the language by investigating their use in the context of verbal art (1996:124).

Dahlstrom highlights an important aspect of linguistic study. In no case can linguistic structures be completely separated from the contexts in which they occur. Nor should we *attempt* this complete disassociation. To bring this point back within the scope of this thesis, we can learn much about obviation by considering its many roles in Algonquian narratives while at the same time experiencing the art and power the literature expresses.

REFERENCES

Aissen, Judith. 1997. On the Syntax of Obviation, *Language* 73, 705-750.

Austin, John L. 1999. How to Do Things with Words. In Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *The Discourse Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 63-75.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1934. Plains Cree Texts. *Publications of the American Ethnological Society,* 16. New York: G.E. Stechert.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Clarke, Sandra. 1982. *North-West River (Sheshâtshît) Montagnais: A Grammatical Sketch.* Ottawa: National Museum of Man (Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper No.80).

Dahlstrom, Amy. 1991. *Plains Cree Morphosyntax.* New York: Garland.

—. 1996. Narrative Structure of a Fox Text. In John D. Nichols and Arden C. Ogg. (eds.), *Nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in Honour of H.C. Wolfart.* Memoir 13, Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, 113-162.

Drapeau, Lynn. 1984. Le traitement de l'information chez les montagnais. *Recherches amérindiennes au Québec* 14(4), 24-35.

—. 1986. Entre le rêve et la réalité, le mode subjectif en montagnais. *Actes du XVIIe Congrès des Algonquinistes.* In William Cowan (ed.), Ottawa: Carleton University, 101-118.

— and José Mailhot. 1989. *Guide pratique d'orthographe montagnaise.* Institut éducatif et culturel attikamek-montagnais: Wendake (Village-des-Hurons).

—. 1996. Conjurors: The Use of Evidentials in Montagnais Secondhand Narratives. In John D. Nichols and Arden C. Ogg. (eds.), *Nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in Honour of H.C. Wolfart.* Memoir 13, Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, 171-194.

Dryer, Matthew. 1992. A Comparison of the Obviation Systems of Kutenai and Algonquian. In William Cowan (ed.), *Papers of the Twenty-Third Algonquian Conference.* Ottawa: Carleton University, 119-163.

Ellis, C. Douglas. 1995. Introduction. In C. Douglas Ellis (ed.), *âtalôhkâna nêsta tipâcimôwina: Cree Legends and Narratives from the West Coast of James Bay.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, xiii-xxxvi.

Goddard, Ives. 1984. The Obviative in Fox Narrative Discourse. In William Cowan (ed.), *Papers of the Fifteenth Algonquian Conference.* Ottawa: Carleton University, 273-286.

—. 1990. Aspects of the Topic Structure of Fox Narratives: Proximate Shifts and the Use of Overt and Inflectional NPs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56, 317-340.

Grafstein, Ann. 1981. Obviation in Ojibwa. In Lynn Drapeau (ed.), *Linguistique amérindienne II: études algonquiennes. Recherches Linguistiques a Montreal/Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, 83-134.

Grice, H. Paul. 1999. Logic and Conversation. In Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *The Discourse Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 76-88.

Jaworski, Adam and Nikolas Coupland. 1999. Introduction: Perspectives on Discourse Analysis. In Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *The Discourse Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 1-44.

—. 1999. *The Discourse Reader.* London and New York: Routledge.

Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience. In June Helm (ed.), *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society.* Seattle and London: University of Washington, 12-44.

Labov, William. 1999. The Transformation of Experience in Narrative. In Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *The Discourse Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 221-235.

Mailhot, José. 1997. *Pour une orthographe unique de la langue innue.* Sept-Iles, Québec: Institut culturel et éducatif montagnais.

Nichols, John D. and Arden C. Ogg. 1996. *Nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in Honour of H.C. Wolfart.* Memoir 13, Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, 171-194.

Paltridge, Brian. 2000. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis.* Queensland, Australia: AEE Publishing.

Pustet, Regina. 1994. Obviation and Subjectivization: The Same Basic Phenomenon? A Study of Participant Marking in Blackfoot. *Studies in Language* 18, 37-72.

Rhodes, Richard A. 1979. Some Aspects of Ojibwa Discourse. In William Cowan (ed.), *Papers of the Tenth Algonquian Conference.* Ottawa: Carleton University, 102-117.

Rich, Etuat. 1999. Meshapush/The Great Rabbit. In Josée Mailhot et al. (eds.), *Sheshatshiu atanukana mak tipatshimuna. Myths and tales from Sheshatshit. Collected by Madeleine Lefebvre and Robert Lanari in 1967, Booklet 2.* St. John's, NF: Labrador Innu Text Project, 9-14.

—. 1999. Uapush mak Umatshashkuk^{u}./Hare and Frog. In José Mailhot et al. (eds.), *Sheshatshiu atanukana mak tipatshimuna. Myths and tales from Sheshatshit. Collected by Madeleine Lefebvre and Robert Lanari in 1967, Booklet 1.* St. John's, NF: Labrador Innu Text Project, 9-14.

Russell, Kevin. 1991. Obiation as Discourse Structure in a Swampy Cree *âcimowin.* In William Cowan (ed.), *Papers of the Twenty-Second Algonquian Conference.* Ottawa: Carleton University, 320-335.

—. 1996. Does Obviation Mark Point of View? In John D. Nichols and Arden C. Ogg. (eds.), *Nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâskihtêpayih! Studies in Honour of H.C. Wolfart.* Memoir 13, Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, 367-382.

Sherzer, Joel and Anthony C. Woodbury, (eds.), 1987. *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric.* Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate culture, 13. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity. In R.M.W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages.* Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 112-171.

Spielmann, Roger. 1998. *'You're So Fat!' Exploring Ojibwe Discourse.* Toronto: University of Toronto.

Thomason, Lucy. 1995. The Assignment of Proximate and Obviative in Informal Fox Narrative. In David H. Pentland (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Algonquian Conference.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 462-496.

Valentine, Lisa Philips. 1995. *Making it Their Own: Severn Ojibwe Communicative Practices.* Toronto: University of Toronto.

APPENDIX A:
Interlinear Translation of *Uâpush mâk Umâtshashkuk*^{u}

```
\ref 001
\tx Pepâmipâtât       ekw  Uâpush.
\mr papâmipâtâ -t     ekw  uâpush
\gl IC.run.dup -CIN.3 then hare
\ps VAI        -sfx   p    NA

\f Hare was off on his run.

\ref 002
\tx Uiâpamât            auennua
\mr uâpam  -ât          auen      -inua
\gl IC.see -(TA)CIN.3>4 someone   -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTA    -sfx         pro.indef -sfx

\tx akushînua                          kâkua.
\mr akushî     -ini -u     -a          kâkw      -a
\gl be.perched -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl) porcupine -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI        -sfx -sfx   -sfx       NA        -sfx

\f He (Hare) saw someone, the porcupine, perched (in a tree).

\ref 003
\tx Akushînua             auennua
\mr akushî     -inua      auen      -inua
\gl be.perched -obv(s/pl) someone   -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI        -sfx       pro.indef -sfx

\tx   uâpameu,
\mr   uâpam -e              -u
\gl   see   -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   VTA   -sfx            -sfx

\tx uâuieshinua                 kâkua.
\mr uâuieshin -u     -a         kâkw      -a
\gl be.round  -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl) porcupine -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI       -sfx   -sfx       NA        -sfx

\f He saw someone who was perched, a round porcupine.

\ref 004
\tx Tshâuepâtât        ekw, pâtutepâtât          uîtshît.
\mr tshîuepâtâ  -t     ekw  pîtutepâtâ    -t     uîtshû -ît
\gl IC.run.home -CIN.3 then IC.run.inside -CIN.3 home   -Loc
\ps VAI         -sfx   p    VAI           -sfx   NI     -sfx

\f Then he ran back and ran inside his home.
```

\ref 005

```
\tx Ka  - uî            utâmaitsheuâ
\mr ka    uî            utâmaitsh -e              -u     -â
\gl subjv try.to        hit       -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 -sbjctv
\ps prfx  prv           VTA       -sfx            -sfx   -sfx

\tx ekue           itit       anite       utshipishkuâmît.
\mr ekue           iti -t     anite       u-    tshipishkuât -im   -ît
\gl at.that.moment do  -CIN.3 there       3-    doorway      -poss -Loc
\ps p              VAI -sfx   dem.adv     prfx- NI           -sfx  -sfx
```

\f He seemed to be trying to hit out; he did it there at the doorway.

\ref 006

```
\tx - Tân  etîn             ekw  ? itikû.
\mr   tân  iti   -in        ekw  ? it  -ikw            -u
\gl   what IC.do -(AI)CIN.2 then ? say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   p    VAI   -sfx       p    ? VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "What are you doing?" he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 007

```
\tx - « Tân  etîn             ?      » ituekâtueu.
\mr     tân  iti   -in        ?        ituekâtue -u
\gl     what IC.do -(AI)CIN.2 ?        reply     -IIN.3
\ps     p    VAI   -sfx       ?        VAI       -sfx
```

\f "What are you doing?" he (Hare) repeated back to him.

\ref 008

```
\tx Minâush tshitshî  pipimûten,      iteu.
\mr minâush tshi- tshî pimûte   -n     it  -e              -u
\gl hardly  you-  can  walk.dup -IIN.2 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps p       prfx- prv  VAI      -sfx   VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "You can hardly walk," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 009

```
\tx Tshika     nakatitin             takushinitî.
\mr tshi- ka   nakat        -itin    takushin -tî
\gl 2-    fut  leave.behind -IIN.1>2 arrive   -(AI)CS.3
\ps prfx- prfx VTA          -sfx     VAI      -sfx
```

\f "I (Hare) will leave you behind when he (porcupine) arrives."

\ref 010

```
\tx Mueu                          anite   mishtikua          auen
\mr mu  -e                -u      anite   mishtikw -a        auen
\gl eat -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 there   tree     -obv(s/pl) someone
\ps VTA -sfx              -sfx    dem.adv NA       -sfx       pro.indef
```

```
\tx nuâpamâu,                          akushîu          anite.
\mr ni-   uâpam -â          -u     akushî     -u     anite
\gl 1-    see   -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3 be.perched -IIN.3 there
\ps prfx- VTA   -sfx        -sfx   VAI        -sfx   dem.adv

\f "I saw someone eating a tree there; he (porcupine) was perched up
there."

\ref 011
\tx Mishta - kushtâshinâkushû        tshîtshue.
\mr mishta   kushtâshinâkushi -u     tshîtshue
\gl very     look.scary       -IIN.3 really
\ps prfx     VAI              -sfx   p

\f "He really looked very scary."

\ref 012
\tx - Tshîtshue uîtshitu
\mr   tshîtshue uîtshiti   -u
\gl   really    taste.good -IIN.3
\ps   p         VAI        -sfx

\tx ne,         nishtesh,     itikû.
\mr ne          ni-   shtesh  it  -ikw           -u
\gl that        1-    brother say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps pro.dem.an prfx- NAD     VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "It really tastes good, my older brother (Hare)," he (Frog) said to
him.

\ref 013
\tx Mâte      itutâî              anite,  ekw tshe nipâik.
\mr mâte      itutâi -i           anite   ekw tshe nipâi -k
\gl well.then take   -(TA)Imp.2>1 there   so  fut  kill  -(TA)CIN.1
\ps p         VTA    -sfx         dem.adv p   prv  VTA   -sfx

\f "So, take me (Frog) there now, and I will kill him (porcupine)."

\ref 014
\tx - Eshe, iteu.
\mr   ehe   it  -e              -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Yes," he (Hare) told him (Frog).

\ref 015
\tx Tshâtuâtamât            ekw, ekw
\mr tshîtuâtam -ât          ekw  ekw
\gl IC.carry   -(TA)CIN.3>4 then then
\ps VTA        -sfx         p    p
```

```
\tx nepâiât                nenua
\mr nipâi    -ât           nenua
\gl IC.kill -(TA)CIN.3>4. that
\ps VTA      -sfx          pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx kâkua                 ne         Umâtshashkukw,
\mr kâkw       -a         ne         umâtshashkukw
\gl porcupine -obv(s/pl) that       frog
\ps NA         -sfx       pro.dem.an NA

\tx nepâiât                nenua.
\mr nipâi    -ât           nenua
\gl IC.kill -(TA)CIN.3>4. that
\ps VTA      -sfx          pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\f He (Hare) carried him (Frog), and then Frog killed the porcupine, he
killed him.

\ref 016
\tx Kâtshî nipâiât             ekue           tshîuetâiât.
\mr kâtshî nipâi -ât            ekue           tshîuetâi -ât
\gl after  kill  -(TA)CIN.3>4. at.that.moment take.home -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps prv    VTA   -sfx          p              VTA       -sfx

\f After killing it (porcupine), he (Frog) took it home.

\ref 017
\tx Piâtâkuepanit          ekw  ne         Uâpush.
\mr pâtâkuepani     -t     ekw  ne         uâpush
\gl IC.singe.quills -CIN.3 then that       hare
\ps VAI             -sfx   p    pro.dem.an NA

\f Then Hare burned the quills off the porcupine.

\ref 018
\tx - Nipâ        ! iteu.
\mr   nipâ          it  -e              -u
\gl   sleep.Imp.2   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   VAI           VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Go to sleep!" he (Hare) told him (Frog).

\ref 019
\tx Tshika     ashamitin      an,        tshika
\mr tshi- ka   asham -itin    an         tshi- ka
\gl 2-    fut  feed  -IIN.1>2 that       2-    fut
\ps prfx- prfx VTA   -sfx     pro.dem.an prfx- prfx

\tx pekunitin          tshîshtenueiânî.
\mr pekun     -itin    tshîshtenue         -iânî
\gl wake.s.o. -IIN.1>2 be.finished.cooking -(AI)CS.1
\ps VTA       -sfx     VAI                 -sfx

\f "I will feed you; I will wake you when I am done cooking."
```

\ref 020

```
\tx Ekw  nepât          tâpue,
\mr ekw  nipâ     -t    tâpue
\gl then IC.sleep -CIN.3 indeed
\ps p    VAI      -sfx  p

\tx ne         Umâtshashkukw  nipekâshû.
\mr ne         umâtshashkukw  nipekâsh         -u
\gl that       frog           pretend.to.sleep -IIN.3
\ps pro.dem.an NA             VAI              -sfx
```

\f Then he (Frog) indeed went to sleep, but Frog only pretended to sleep.

\ref 021

```
\tx Kâtshî piminuepanit            ekue
\mr kâtshî piminuepani -t          ekue
\gl after  cook        -CIN.3      at.that.moment
\ps prv    VAI         -sfx        p

\tx muâkuet.
\mr muâkue        -t
\gl eat.porcupine -CIN.3
\ps VAI           -sfx
```

\f After he (Hare) finished cooking, he ate the porcupine.

\ref 022

```
\tx Nipânua                       nenua
\mr nipâ  -ini -u     -a          nenua
\gl sleep -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)  that
\ps VAI   -sfx -sfx   -sfx        pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx ushîma.
\mr u-    shîm            -a
\gl 3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD             -sfx
```

\f His younger brother (Frog) was asleep.

\ref 023

```
\tx - Tânite  nânâ       tshikâkum             ?
\mr   tânite  nânâ       tshi- kâkw      -im   ?
\gl   where   that(dead) 2-    porcupine -poss ?
\ps   p.intrg pro.dem.an prfx- NA        -sfx  ?

\tx itikû.
\mr it  -ikw            -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Where is your dead porcupine?" he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 024

```
\tx - Takushinîpanat          nekanât          tshishteshat,
\mr   takushin -pan   -at     nekanât          tshi- shtesh  -at
\gl   arrive   -IIP.3 -IIN.3p those(absent)    2-    brother -NA.pl
\ps   VAI      -sfx   -sfx    pro.dem.an.pl    prfx- NAD     -sfx

\tx nitashâmâuat,                        kassinû
\mr ni-   ashâm -â          -u     -at    kassinû
\gl 1-    feed  -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p all
\ps prfx- VTA   -sfx        -sfx   -sfx   p

\tx nekâni              tshitamueuat,
\mr nekâni              tshitamu       -e              -u     -at
\gl those(absent)       eat.completely -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p
\ps pro.dem.an.obv      VTA            -sfx            -sfx   -sfx

\tx iteu.
\mr it  -e              -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Your (Frog's) older brothers were here and I (Hare) fed them and they finished all of it (porcupine)," he said to him.

\ref 025

```
\tx ( Uîn an         mueu,
\mr   uîn an         mu  -e              -u
\gl   3   that       eat -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   pro pro.dem.an VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx peikukueshu. )
\mr peikuku      -e              -shi -u
\gl do.s.t.alone -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -dim -IIN.3
\ps VTA          -sfx            -sfx -sfx
```

\f (He was the one that had eaten it, all by himself)

\ref 026

```
\tx Ekw  apû mîtshishunitî            kanapua.
\mr ekw  apû mîtshishu -ini -tî       kanapua
\gl then not eat       -obv -(AI)CS.3 definitely
\ps p    neg VAI       -sfx -sfx      p
```

\f Then, he (Frog) had nothing at all to eat.

\ref 027

```
\tx Mînuât ekue           tshîtûtet,      mînuât eshpish
\mr mînuât ekue           tshîtûte -t     mînuât eshpish
\gl again  at.that.moment leave    -CIN.3 again  as.much.as
\ps p      p              VAI      -sfx   p      prv
```

```
\tx anite   tât.
\mr anite   itâ -t
\gl there   be  -CIN.3
\ps dem.adv VAI -sfx

\f Again he (Hare) took off, again while he was there.

\ref 028
\tx Pepâmipâtât,        shakâpîunû                          nete
\mr papâmipâtâ -t       shakâpîu                -ini -u     nete
\gl IC.run.dup -CIN.3   be.water.full.of.bushes -obv -IIN.3 over.there
\ps VAI        -sfx     VII                     -sfx -sfx   dem.adv

\tx eishpâtât.
\mr ishpâtâ               -t
\gl IC.leave.running.dup -CIN.3
\ps VAI                  -sfx

\f He (Hare) ran there where the stream was full of bushes.

\ref 029
\tx Tshekuânnû          tshemâtenit,            uîshtinû          !
\mr tshekuân -inû       tshimâte -ini -t        uîsht -inû        !
\gl what     -obv(s/pl) IC.stand -obv -CIN.3    lodge -obv(s/pl) !
\ps p/NI     -sfx       VAI      -sfx -sfx      NI    -sfx        !

\f What was standing there but a beaver lodge!

\ref 030
\tx Nânâtuâkamenua
\mr nânâtuâkam       -e              -ini -u     -a
\gl break.in.two.dup -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTA              -sfx            -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\tx mishtikua.
\mr mishtikw -a
\gl tree     -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA       -sfx

\f They (the beavers) were chewing down trees.

\ref 031
\tx Tshâuetishimut       ekw.
\mr tshîuetishimu -t     ekw
\gl IC.run.back   -CIN.3 then
\ps VAI           -sfx   p

\f He (Hare) ran back home.

\ref 032
\tx Kâtshî tshîuetishimut,      ekw       tekushipâtât
\mr kâtshî tshîuetishimu -t     ekw       takushipâtâ       -t
\gl after  run.back      -CIN.3 then      IC.arrive.running -CIN.3
\ps prv    VAI           -sfx   p         VAI               -sfx
```

```
\tx anite          uîtshît.
\mr anite          uîtshû -ît
\gl there          home   -Loc
\ps dem.adv        NI     -sfx

\f After running home, he ran into his home.

\ref 033
\tx Ka    - uî      utâmaitsheuâ                              anite
\mr ka      uî      utâmaitsh -e              -u     -â       anite
\gl subjv   try.to  hit       -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 -sbjctv there
\ps prfx    prv     VTA       -sfx            -sfx   -sfx    dem.adv

\tx ekue            itit       anite       utshipishkuâmît.
\mr ekue            iti -t     anite       u-    tshipishkuât -im   -ît
\gl at.that.moment  do  -CIN.3 there       3-    doorway      -poss -Loc
\ps p               VAI -sfx   dem.adv     prfx- NI           -sfx  -sfx

\f He seemed to want to hit something there, and he did it there at his
doorway.

\ref 034
\tx Ashuâpameu                              nenua,
\mr ashuâpam -e               -u            nenua
\gl wait.for -(TA)TS.dir.3>4  -IIN.3        that
\ps VTA      -sfx             -sfx          pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx kushteu                          tshetshî
\mr kusht     -e              -u     tshetshî
\gl fear.s.o. -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 so.that
\ps VTA       -sfx            -sfx   prfx.conj

\tx nâshâukut.
\mr nâshâu     -ikw            -t
\gl swim.after -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -CIN.3
\ps VTA        -sfx            -sfx

\f He waited for him, because he was afraid that he might have been
followed.

\ref 035
\tx - Tân  etîn         ekw  nishtesh      ? itikû.
\mr   tân  iti   -in    ekw  ni-   shtesh  ? it  -ikw            -u
\gl   what IC.do -CIN.2 then 1-    brother ? say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   p    VAI   -sfx   p    prfx- NAD     ? VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "What are you doing, my brother?" he (Frog) said to him (Hare).
```

\ref 036
\tx - « *Tân etîn ? » ituekâtueu.*
\mr tân iti -in ? ituekâtue -u
\gl what IC.do -(AI)CIN.2 ? reply -IIN.3
\ps p VAI -sfx ? VAI -sfx

\f "What are you doing?" he (Hare) repeated back to him.

\ref 037
\tx *Minâush tshitshî pipimûten, iteu.*
\mr minâush tshi- tshî pimûte -n it -e -u
\gl hardly 2- can walk.dup -IIN.2 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps p prfx- prv VAI -sfx VTA -sfx -sfx

\f "You can hardly walk," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 038
\tx *Mîtshuâp anite tshimâteu.*
\mr mîtshuâp anite tshimâte -u
\gl house there stand -IIN.3
\ps NI dem.adv VII -sfx

\f "There's a house standing there."

\ref 039
\tx *Mishtikua nenua*
\mr mishtikw -a nenua
\gl tree -obv(s/pl) that
\ps NA -sfx pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx *nânâtuâkameuat anite*
\mr nânâtuâkam -e -u -at anite
\gl break.in.two.dup -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p there
\ps VTA -sfx -sfx -sfx dem.adv

\tx *shâkaikanît.*
\mr shâkaikan -ît
\gl lake -Loc
\ps NI -sfx

\f "They (the beavers) are chewing down trees, there at the lake."

\ref 040
\tx *Mishta - kâshimâpitetshenat,*
\mr mishta kâshimâpite -tshen -at
\gl very have.sharp.teeth -(AI)IDN.3 -IIN.3p
\ps prfx VAI -sfx -sfx

\tx *tshîtshue mâkumitâkuî, tshessinât tshika*
\mr tshîtshue mâkum -itâkuî tshessinât tshi- ka
\gl really bite -(TA)CS.3>21 surely 2- fut
\ps p VTA -sfx p prfx- prfx

```
\tx nipâikunânat,
\mr nipâi -ikw             -inân       -at
\gl kill  -(TA)TS.inv.3>21 -(AI)IIN.21 -IIN.3p
\ps VTA   -sfx             -sfx        -sfx

\tx iteu.
\mr it  -e              -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "They(beavers) must have very sharp teeth.  Indeed, if they were to
bite us, they would surely kill us," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 041
\tx - Tshîtshue uîtshitû,          nishtesh,
\mr   tshîtshue uîtshiti   -u      ni-   shtesh
\gl   really    taste.good -IIN.3 1-    brother
\ps   p         VAI        -sfx   prfx- NAD

\tx itikû.
\mr it  -ikw            -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "It (beaver) really tastes good, my older brother," he (Frog) said
to him.

\ref 042
\tx Amishkw an.
\mr amishkw an
\gl beaver  that
\ps NA      pro.dem.an

\f "It is a beaver."

\ref 043
\tx Mâte      tshe ituâtamin,                   tshe
\mr mâte      tshe ituâtam             -in      tshe
\gl well.then fut  bring.on.one's.back -CIN.2>1 fut
\ps p         prv  VTA                 -sfx     prv

\tx nipâiâkut.
\mr nipâi -âkut
\gl kill  -(TA)CIN.21p>3p
\ps VTA   -sfx

\f "Well, carry me there, and we will kill them."

\ref 044
\tx - Eshe, iteu.
\mr   ehe   it  -e              -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Yes," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 045

```
\tx Tshâtuâtet                          uiâpannit
\mr tshîtuâte              -t           uâpan      -ini -t
\gl IC.leave.carrying.s.o. -CIN.3       IC.be.dawn -obv -CIN.3
\ps VAI                    -sfx         VII        -sfx -sfx

\tx ushîma,
\mr u-    shîm            -a
\gl 3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD             -sfx

\tx papâmutâieu                                    nenua
\mr papâmutâi        -e               -u           nenua
\gl carry.around.dup -(TA)TS.dir.3>4  -IIN.3       that
\ps VTA              -sfx             -sfx         pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx uâ      nipâituâkushitî           tshekuânnû,
\mr uî      nipâi -tuâkushi -tî       tshekuân -inû
\gl IC.want kill  -?        -(AI)CS.3 what     -obv(s/pl)
\ps prv     VTA   -?        -sfx      p/NI     -sfx

\tx papâmuâteu,
\mr papâmuât                -e              -u
\gl carry.on.one's.back.dup -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA                     -sfx            -sfx

\tx tshâtshipâtâht          ekw, nete
\mr tshîtshipâtâ -ht        ekw  nete
\gl IC.run.away  -(AI)CIN.3p then over.there
\ps VAI          -sfx       p    dem.adv

\tx petshitinât             tâpue.
\mr patshitin   -ât         tâpue
\gl IC.put.down -(TA)CIN.3>4 indeed
\ps VTA         -sfx         p
```

\f He (Hare) left the next day with his younger brother (Frog), carrying him on his back. He was walking around when suddenly he took off, and then he (Hare) put him (Frog) down.

\ref 046

```
\tx Ekw  iesset                       ekw.
\mr ekw  esse                 -t      ekw
\gl then IC.break.ice.for.beaver -CIN.3 then
\ps p    VAI                  -sfx    p
```

\f Then he (Hare) chopped through the ice to get to the beavers.

\ref 047

```
\tx Anite   uâshkaimw                                nenû
\mr anite   uâshk              -am         -u       nenû
\gl there   place.sticks.around -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 that
\ps dem.adv VTI                -sfx        -sfx     pro.dem.in.obv

\tx ekue           tshipâuât.
\mr ekue           tshipâu       -ât
\gl at.that.moment close.s.o.off -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p              VTA           -sfx
```

\f He (Hare) put sticks around (and) then he closed off (the lodge entrances).

\ref 048

```
\tx - Ekw, iteu,
\mr   ekw  it  -e              -u
\gl   then say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p    VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx tshe tshishkaimân,                tshe utinamishkuein.
\mr tshe tshishk -am         -an      tshe utinamishkue      -in
\gl fut  dig     -(TI)TS.3>4 -CIN.1>4 fut  grab.beaver.Imp.2 -(AI)CIN.2
\ps prv  VTI     -sfx        -sfx     prv  VAI               -sfx
```

\f "Ok," he (Hare) said to him (Frog), "I will dig around with my stick. You grab the beavers."

\ref 049

```
\tx - Eshe, itikû                      nenua
\mr   ehe   it  -ikw            -u     nenua
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3 that
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx   pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx Umâtshashkukua.
\mr umâtshashkukw -a
\gl frog          -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA            -sfx
```

\f "Yes," Frog said to him (Hare).

\ref 050

```
\tx - Tshe utinamishkuein,         iteu.
\mr   tshe utinamishkue -in        it  -e              -u
\gl   fut  grab.beaver  -(AI)CIN.2 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   prv  VAI          -sfx       VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "You grab the beavers," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 051

```
\tx - Eshe, itikû.
\mr   ehe   it  -ikw            -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

```
\f "Yes," he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 052
\tx Ekw  ne          Umâtshashkukw
\mr ekw  ne          umâtshashkukw
\gl then that        frog
\ps p    pro.dem.an NA

\tx teuâshkunamuât
\mr tuâshkun             -am         -uât
\gl IC.knock.down.sticks -(TI)TS.3>4 -CIN.relational.3
\ps VTI                  -sfx        -sfx

\tx nenua                amishkua.
\mr nenua                amishkw -a
\gl that                 beaver  -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) NA      -sfx

\f Frog took the poles away for the beavers.

\ref 053
\tx Tuâshkunamu                          ekue
\mr tuâshkun          -am         -u     ekue
\gl knock.down.sticks -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 at.that.moment
\ps VTI               -sfx        -sfx   p

\tx shâpûshâpûtuepannitî,
\mr shâpûtuepanîu           -ini -tî
\gl go.straight.through.dup -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps VAI                     -sfx -sfx

\tx shâpûshâpûtuepanîunua
\mr shâpûtuepanîu           -ini -u     -a
\gl go.straight.through.dup -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI                     -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\tx nenua.
\mr nenua
\gl that
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\f He(Frog) took the sticks out and the beavers went through, they went
through.

\ref 054
\tx - Mâ,   tân  etiht             ânât       ?
\mr   mâ    tân  iti   -ht         ânât       ?
\gl   intns what IC.do -(AI)CIN.3p them       ?
\ps   p     p    VAI   -sfx        dem.pro.pl ?

\tx iteu.
\mr it  -e              -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Well, what happened to them?" he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 055
```
\tx Ekw  uiâpâtamuât.
\mr ekw  uâpât       -am         -uât
\gl then IC.see.s.t. -(TI)TS.3>4 -CIN.relational.3
\ps p    VTI         -sfx        -sfx
```

\f Then they (the beavers) saw it (the hole/opening).

\ref 056
```
\tx Ekue           tshîtûteht          tâpue.
\mr ekue           tshîtûte -ht        tâpue
\gl at.that.moment leave    -(AI)CIN.3p indeed
\ps p              VAI      -sfx       p
```

\f At that moment, indeed, they (the beavers) took off.

\ref 057
```
\tx - Utinamishkue      ! iteu.
\mr   utinamishkue      ! it  -e              -u
\gl   grab.beaver.Imp.2 ! say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   VAI               ! VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Get the beavers!" he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 058
```
\tx Ekw  ât      uetinamishkuenitî,
\mr ekw  ât      utinamishkue   -ini -tî
\gl then even.if IC.grab.beaver -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps p    p       VAI            -sfx -sfx

\tx shâpûtuepanua                          mâni.
\mr shâpûtuepani        -u     -a          mâni
\gl go.straight.through -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)  usually
\ps VAI                 -sfx   -sfx        p
```

\f Then, he(Frog) was trying to grab the beavers but they kept going through.

\ref 059
```
\tx - Tân  etîn            an          ? iteu.
\mr   tân  iti   -in       an          ? it  -e              -u
\gl   what IC.do -(AI)CIN.2 that       ? say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p    VAI   -sfx      pro.dem.an ? VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "What are you doing?" he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 060
```
\tx Kassinû apû tânitî             shâsh.
\mr kassinû apû itâ -ini -tî       shâsh
\gl all     not be  -obv -(AI)CS.3 already
\ps p       neg VAI -sfx -sfx      p
```

\f None of them (the beavers) were there anymore.

\ref 061

```
\tx Uiâpâtamuât                                  anite
\mr uâpât       -am         -uât                anite
\gl IC.see.s.t. -(TI)TS.3>4 -CIN.relational.3 there
\ps VTI         -sfx        -sfx                dem.adv

\tx epinitî,
\mr api    -ini -tî
\gl IC.sit -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps VAI    -sfx -sfx

\tx tuâshkunamuenishapanî.
\mr tuâshkun          -am         -u     -eni -shapanî
\gl knock.down.sticks -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 -obv -IDRP.obv
\ps VTI               -sfx        -sfx   -sfx -sfx
```

\f As he sat, he saw (the opening) there; he (Frog) must have taken away too many sticks.

\ref 062

```
\tx Uetamishtikuâneuât           ekue
\mr utamishtikuâneu -ât          ekue
\gl IC.hit.on.head  -(TA)CIN.3>4 at.that.moment
\ps VTA             -sfx         p

\tx pakashtueuât                nete.
\mr pakashtueu     -ât          nete
\gl throw.in.water -(TA)CIN.3>4 over.there
\ps VTA            -sfx         p
```

\f He (Hare) hit him (Frog) on the head and then he threw him in the water.

\ref 063

```
\tx Tshâuet          ekw.
\mr tshîue    -t     ekw
\gl IC.return -CIN.3 then
\ps VAI       -sfx   p
```

\f Then he (Hare) returned (home).

\ref 064

```
\tx Ekw  muieshtâtât          ushîma,
\mr ekw  muishtât -ât         u-    shîm            -a
\gl then IC.miss  -(TA)CIN.3>4 3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl)
\ps p    VTA      -sfx        prfx- NAD             -sfx

\tx tânite  nipâieu.
\mr tânite  nipâi -e             -u
\gl where   kill  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps p.intrg VTA   -sfx            -sfx
```

\f Then he (Hare) was lonely for his younger brother, since he killed him.

\ref 065

```
\tx « Ninipâiâu                    », itenimeu.
\mr   ni-   nipâi -â          -u     itenim -e              -u
\gl   1-    kill  -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3 think  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- VTA   -sfx        -sfx   VTA    -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "I killed him (Frog)," he (Hare) thought.

\ref 066

```
\tx Ekue           kutapanîunitî                niâte.
\mr ekue           kutapanîu     -ini -tî       niâte
\gl at.that.moment go.underwater -obv -(AI)CS.3 that(over.there)
\ps p              VAI           -sfx -sfx      dem.adv
```

\f Then, he (Frog) went under water.

\ref 067

```
\tx Ekw  nete           nenâtâuât
\mr ekw  nete           nanâtâu        -ât
\gl then over.there     IC.swim.to.get -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p    p              VTA            -sfx

\tx nenua                amishkua,
\mr nenua                amishkw -a
\gl that                 beaver  -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) NA      -sfx

\tx nipâieu                        anite   nipît      ne
\mr nipâi -e               -u      anite   nipî  -ît  ne
\gl kill  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4  -IIN.3  there   water -Loc that
\ps VTA   -sfx             -sfx    dem.adv NI    -sfx pro.dem.an

\tx Umâtshashkukw.
\mr umâtshashkukw
\gl frog
\ps NA
```

\f Then Frog swam underwater to get the beavers and killed them there in the water.

\ref 068

```
\tx Ekw  uetâpânikâshut,          ekue           utâpâikâshut.
\mr ekw  utâpânikâshu     -t      ekue           utâpâikâshu   -t
\gl then IC.load.toboggan -CIN.3  at.that.moment load.toboggan -CIN.3
\ps p    VAI              -sfx    p              VAI           -sfx
```

\f Then he (Frog) loaded the toboggan, then he loaded the toboggan.

\ref 069

```
\tx Kâtshî utâpânikâshut,       ekue            tshîuetâpet       ekw
\mr kâtshî utâpânikâshu  -t     ekue            tshîuetâpe -t     ekw
\gl after  load.toboggan -CIN.3 at.that.moment  pull.home  -CIN.3 then
\ps prv    VAI           -sfx   p               VAI        -sfx   p

\tx utamishkuma.
\mr u-    amishkw -im   -a
\gl 3-    beaver  -poss -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NA      -sfx  -sfx
```

\f After he (Frog) loaded the toboggan, then he pulled his beavers home.

\ref 070

```
\tx Kâtshî tshîuetâpet       nenua
\mr kâtshî tshîuetâpe -t     nenua
\gl after  pull.home  -CIN.3 that
\ps prv    VAI        -sfx   pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx utamishkuma,                   ekw    iteu.
\mr u-    amishkw -im   -a         ekw    it  -e              -u
\gl 3-    beaver  -poss -obv(s/pl) then   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps prfx- NA      -sfx  -sfx       p      VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx Nishtesh,     petâ        mâ    anite   ishkuteu.
\mr ni-   shtesh  petâ        mâ    anite   ishkuteu
\gl 1-    brother bring.imp.2 intns there   fire
\ps prfx- NAD     VAI+O       p     dem.adv NI
```

\f After he (Frog) pulled his beavers home, he said to him(Hare): "My older brother, bring me some fire there."

\ref 071

```
\tx Nuî           kutuenikâtuâuat
\mr ni-   uî      kutuenikâtu             -â          -u     -at
\gl 1-    want    build.fire.to.warm.s.t. -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p
\ps prfx- prv     VTA                     -sfx        -sfx   -sfx

\tx nitamishkumat.
\mr ni-   amishkw -im   -at
\gl 1-    beaver  -poss -NA.pl
\ps prfx- NA      -sfx  -sfx
```

\f "I want to make a fire (to cook) my beavers."

\ref 072

```
\tx Uetshipitât.
\mr utshipit     -ât
\gl IC.grab.s.o. -CIN.3>4
\ps VTA          -sfx
```

\f Then he (Hare) grabbed him (Frog).

\ref 073
```
\tx - Uuu, uuu, iteu,                          nâsht
\mr   uuu  uuu  it  -e                -u       nâsht
\gl   ooh  ooh  say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 really
\ps   intj intj VTA -sfx              -sfx     p

\tx tshitakuînâua.
\mr tshi- akuî -inâua
\gl you-  hurt -IIN.sbjctv.2>1
\ps prfx- VTA  -sfx

\f "Ooh, ooh," he (Frog) said to him, "you're really hurting me."
```

\ref 074
```
\tx Tshitshîtshîpishin              anite   kâ   utâmuîn.
\mr tshi- tshîtshîpishi -n          anite   kâ   utâmu         -in
\gl 2-    shudder.dup   -IIN.2      there   past hit.with.s.t. -CIN.2>1
\ps prfx- VAI           -sfx        dem.adv prfx VTA           -sfx

\f "You are hurting me.  Don't hit me."
```

\ref 075
```
\tx - Aaa, iteu.
\mr   aaa  it  -e                -u
\gl   aah  say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p    VTA -sfx              -sfx

\f "Aaa," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).
```

\ref 076
```
\tx « Nipashkamikuat                                    »,
\mr   ni-   pashkam          -ikw              -at
\gl   1-    break.with.teeth -(TA)TS.inv.3p>1 -IIN.3p
\ps   prfx- VTA              -sfx              -sfx

\tx tshipâ       itâuat.
\mr tshi- pâ     it  -â          -u     -at
\gl 2-    should say -(TA)TS.2>3 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p
\ps prfx- prv    VTA -sfx       -sfx   -sfx

\f ""They (beavers) bit me (Frog)," you (Frog) should say to them."
```

\ref 077
```
\tx Pâtukâiât             ekw       ushîma,
\mr pîtukâi  -ât          ekw       u-    shîm            -a
\gl bring.in -(TA)CIN.3>4 then      3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl
\ps VTA      -sfx         p         prfx- NAD             -sfx

\tx pîtûteueshpimitameu
\mr pîtûteueshpimitam -e              -u
\gl throw.s.o.in      -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA               -sfx            -sfx
```

```
\tx utamishkuminua.
\mr u-    amishkw -im   -inua
\gl 3-    beaver  -poss -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NA      -sfx  -sfx

\f When he (Hare) let his little brother (Frog) inside, he threw his
brother's beavers inside his tent.

\ref 078
\tx Ekw  peminuet              ekw  nenua
\mr ekw  piminue -t            ekw  nenua
\gl then IC.cook -(AI/II)CIN.3 then that
\ps p    VAI     -sfx          p    pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx amishkua.
\mr amishkw -a
\gl beaver  -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA      -sfx

\f Then he(Hare) cooked the beavers.

\ref 079
\tx - Nipâ        ! iteu
\mr   nipâ        ! it  -e              -u
\gl   sleep.Imp.2 ! say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   VAI         ! VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx nenua                ushîma.
\mr nenua                u-    shîm           -a
\gl that                 3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) prfx- NAD            -sfx

\f "Go to sleep!" he (Hare) told his brother (Frog).

\ref 080
\tx Ekw  nepekâshunitî                    nenua
\mr ekw  nipekâshu          -ini -tî      nenua
\gl then IC.pretend.to.sleep -obv -(AI)CS.3 that
\ps p    VAI                -sfx -sfx     pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx ushîma                          tâpue.
\mr u-    shîm           -a         tâpue
\gl 3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl) indeed
\ps prfx- NAD            -sfx       p

\f Then his brother (Frog) indeed pretended he was sleeping.

\ref 081
\tx Kâtshî tshîshtenuet,              mâtshishut       ekw, tshekât
\mr kâtshî tshîshtenue        -t      mîtshishu -t     ekw  tshekât
\gl after  be.finished.cooking -CIN.3 IC.eat    -CIN.3 then almost
\ps prv    VAI                -sfx   VAI       -sfx   p    p
```

```
\tx tshetâmuât                      nenua
\mr tshitâmu          -ât           nenua
\gl IC.eat.everything -(TA)CIN.3>4  that
\ps VTA               -sfx          pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx amishkua,          kutuâsht itashinua.
\mr amishkw -a         kutuâsht itashi          -ini -u     -a
\gl beaver  -obv(s/pl) six      be.such.a.number -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA      -sfx       p.num    VAI              -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\f When he (Hare) was finished the cooking, he started eating. He had
almost finished eating all of the six beavers.

\ref 082
\tx - ashamî             ekw  ! itikû.
\mr   asham -î           ekw  ! it  -ikw             -u
\gl   feed  -(TA)Imp.2>1 then ! say -(TA)TS.inv.4p>3 -IIN.3
\ps   VTA   -sfx         p    ! VTA -sfx             -sfx

\f "Feed me!" he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 083
\tx - Ekâ pitamâ, iteu.
\mr   ekâ pitamâ  it  -e              -u
\gl   not now     say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   neg p       VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Not now," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 084
\tx Tshî mîtshishuiânî,      pâtush tshe mîtshishuîn.
\mr tshî mîtshishu -iânî     pâtush tshe mîtshishu -in
\gl can  eat       -(AI)CS.1 after  fut  eat       -(AI)CIN.2
\ps prv  VAI       -sfx      p      prv  VAI       -sfx

\f "You can eat after I have eaten."

\ref 085
\tx - Mâuât, itikû,                        ashamî             !
\mr   mâuât  it  -ikw            -u        asham -î           !
\gl   no     say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3    feed  -(TA)Imp.2>1 !
\ps   neg    VTA -sfx            -sfx      VTA   -sfx         !

\f "No," he (Frog) said to him (Hare). "Feed me (now)!"

\ref 086
\tx Nika       uîtamuâu                  nishtesh      ekâ uâ
\mr ni-   ka   uîtamu -â          -u      ni-   shtesh  ekâ uî
\gl 1-    fut  tell   -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3  1-    brother not IC.want
\ps prfx- prfx VTA    -sfx        -sfx    prfx- NAD     neg prv
```

```
\tx ashamîn.
\mr ashâm -in
\gl feed  -(AI)IIN.1
\ps VTA   -sfx

\f "I will tell him that my older brother won't give me any."

\ref 087
\tx - Aaa, mâuât, iteu,                    apû
\mr   aaa  mâuât  it  -e             -u    apû
\gl   aah  no     say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 not
\ps   p    neg    VTA -sfx           -sfx  neg

\tx tshika     tshî ashâmitân.
\mr tshi- ka   tshî ashâm -itân
\gl 2-    fut  can  feed  -CIN.1>2
\ps prfx- prfx prv  VTA   -sfx

\f "Aah, no," he (Hare) said. "I can't give you any."

\ref 088
\tx Pâtush tshî mîtshishuiânî,      tshe mîtshishuîn.
\mr pâtush tshî mîtshishu -iânî     tshe mîtshishu -in
\gl after  perf eat       -(AI)CS.1 fut  eat       -(AI)CIN.2
\ps p      prv  VAI       -sfx      prv  VAI       -sfx

\f "When I am done, then you can eat."

\ref 089
\tx Nekamut        ekw  : « nishtesha
\mr nikamu  -t     ekw     ni-   shtesh  -a
\gl IC.sing -CIN.3 then    1-    brother -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI     -sfx   p       prfx- NAD     -sfx

\tx uâpusha           ama nuî        ashâmiku
\mr uâpush -a         ama ni-   uî   ashâm -ikw
\gl hare   -obv(s/pl) not 1-    want feed  -(TA)TS.inv.3>1
\ps NA     -sfx       p   prfx- prv  VTA   -sfx

\tx nishtesha                uâpusha          »,
\mr ni-   shtesh  -a         uâpush -a
\gl 1-    brother -obv(s/pl) hare   -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD     -sfx       NA     -sfx

\tx itueu       ne         Umâtshâshkuku, «
\mr itue -u     ne         umâtshâshkukw
\gl say  -IIN.3 that       frog
\ps VAI  -sfx   pro.dem.an na

\tx ama nuî       ashâmiku              Uâpush ».
\mr ama ni-  uî   ashâm -ikw            uâpush
\gl not 1-   want feed  -(TA)TS.inv.3>1 hare
\ps p   pfx- prv  VTA   -sfx            NA
```

\f Then he (Frog) started singing, "MY BROTHER, HARE, DOESN'T WANT TO FEED ME" said Frog. "Hare doesn't want to feed me."

\ref 090
\tx *Ekw niâtâuât ne ûhû.*
\mr ekw nâtâu -ât ne ûhû
\gl then IC.fly.to -(TA)CIN.3>4 that owl
\ps p VTA -sfx pro.dem.an NA

\f Then an owl flew to him (Hare).

\ref 091
\tx - *Apû uî ashamâut nenua*
\mr apû uî ashâm -âut nenua
\gl not want feed -C??.3>1 that
\ps neg prv VTA -sfx pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx *tshishîminâna,*
\mr tshi- shîm -inân -a
\gl 2- younger.sibling -21 -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD -sfx -sfx

\tx *iteu.*
\mr it -e -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx -sfx

\f "He (Hare) doesn't want to give our brother anything to eat," he (the owl) said.

\ref 092
\tx - *Nâtâu, itâkanû.*
\mr nâtâu it -âkani -u
\gl fly.to.Imp2 say -indf>3 -IIN.3
\ps VTA VTA -sfx -sfx

\f "Fly over to where he(Hare) is," he(the owl) was told.

\ref 093
\tx *Niâtâuât ekw.*
\mr nâtâu -ât ekw
\gl IC.fly.to -(TA)CIN.3>4 then
\ps VTA -sfx p

\f Then he (the owl) flew over to him (Hare).

\ref 094
\tx *Ekw pet teueunitî nenua*
\mr ekw pet teueu -ini -tî nenua
\gl then here land -obv -(AI)CS.3 that
\ps p p VAI -sfx -sfx pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

```
\tx ûhûa           anite   utashtuaikanît,
\mr ûhû -a         anite   utashtuaikan -ît
\gl owl -obv(s/pl) there   ridge.pole   -Loc
\ps NA  -sfx       dem.adv NI           -sfx

\tx shieshkâshkupanîut       niâte            ne         Uâpush.
\mr shieshkâshkupanîu -t     niâte            ne         uâpush
\gl move.into.forest  -CIN.3 that(over.there) that       hare
\ps VAI               -sfx   dem.adv          pro.dem.an NA
```

\f When the owl landed on top of the ridge pole, the hare quickly moved back into the forest.

\ref 095

```
\tx - Ekw  mîtshishu mâ    !       iteu.
\mr   ekw  mîtshishu mâ    !       it  -e               -u
\gl   then eat.Imp.2 intns !       say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p    VAI       p     !       VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Well, now you can eat," he (Hare) told him (Frog).

\ref 096

```
\tx Ekw  mâtshishut         tâpue.
\mr ekw  mimîtshishu -t     tâpue
\gl then eat.dup     -CIN.3 indeed
\ps p    VAI         -sfx   p
```

\f Then indeed he (Frog) ate.

\ref 097

```
\tx Ekw  etât               mâni : - Ekuan  ekw,
\mr ekw  it     -ât         mâni     ekuan  ekw
\gl then IC.say -(TA)CIN.3>4 usually enough then
\ps p    VTA    -sfx        p        p      p

\tx tshe tshitamut                                      ekw  !
\mr tshe tshit          -am         -u     -t           ekw  !
\gl fut  eat.completely -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 -(TA)CIN.2>3 then !
\ps prv  VTI            -sfx        -sfx   -sfx         p    !
```

\f He would say every now and then: "That's enough, you're eating it all!"

\ref 098

```
\tx Apû tshî nâtât,            tânite
\mr apû tshî nât   -ât         tânite
\gl not able go.to -(TA)CIN.3>4 where
\ps neg prv  VTA   -sfx        p.intrg

\tx kushteu                          nenua
\mr kusht     -e             -u      nenua
\gl fear.s.o. -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 that
\ps VTA       -sfx            -sfx   pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)
```

```
\tx ûhûa,          akushînua                          anite   tânite.
\mr ûhû -a         akushî     -ini -u     -a          anite   tânite
\gl owl -obv(s/pl) be.perched -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl) there   where
\ps NA  -sfx       VAI        -sfx -sfx   -sfx        dem.adv p.intrg

\f He (Hare) couldn't approach him (Frog) because he was afraid of the
owl, who was still perched on top of the tent.

\ref 099
\tx Ekw  iteu                       : - Tshe
\mr ekw  it  -e              -u     :   tshe
\gl then say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 :   fut
\ps p    VTA -sfx            -sfx   :   prv

\tx tshitamut                       ekw, ekuan  !
\mr tshitamu       -t               ekw  ekuan  !
\gl eat.completely -(TA)CIN.2>3     then enough !
\ps VTA            -sfx             p    p      !

\f "Well," he (Hare) said to him (Frog): "You're going to finish it
all!"

\ref 100
\tx Ekw  tshâtâpamikut                      mâni
\mr ekw  tshîtâpam -ikw            -t       mâni
\gl then IC.watch  -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -CIN.3>4 usually
\ps p    VTA       -sfx            -sfx     p

\tx ûhûa,          kâu    niâte            pâtâpipanîu       mâni.
\mr ûhû -a         kâu    niâte            pâtâpipanî -u     mâni
\gl owl -obv(s/pl) again  that(over.there) run.back   -IIN.3 usually
\ps NA  -sfx       p.time dem.adv          VAI        -sfx   p

\f The owl kept staring at him, which made the hare run back.

\ref 101
\tx Ekue           mîtshishut       ekw.
\mr ekue           mîtshishu -t     ekw
\gl at.that.moment eat       -CIN.3 then
\ps p              VAI       -sfx   p

\f Then he (Frog) ate.

\ref 102
\tx - Shâsh,  shâsh   nitepishkun,
\mr   shâsh   shâsh   ni-   tepishku        -n
\gl   already already 1-    be.full.of.food -IIN.1
\ps   p       p       prfx- VAI             -sfx

\tx iteu                        ne         Umâtshashkukw.
\mr it  -e              -u      ne         umâtshashkukw
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3  that       frog
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx    pro.dem.an NA
```

```
\f "Okay, okay, I am full now," said Frog to him (Hare).

\ref 103
\tx Kâtshî mîtshishut       tâpue, ekw
\mr kâtshî mîtshishu -t     tâpue  ekw
\gl after  eat       -CIN.3 indeed then
\ps prv    VAI       -sfx   p      p

\tx nekatâukuht
\mr nakatâu         -ikw            -ht
\gl IC.leave.behind -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -(AI)CIN.3p
\ps VTA             -sfx            -sfx

\tx nenua                 ûhûa.
\mr nenua                 ûhû -a
\gl that                  owl -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) NA  -sfx

\f When he (Frog) was finished eating, then the owl flew away.

\ref 104
\tx - Ka
\mr   ka
\gl   subjv
\ps   prfx

\tx tshitshitamuâua
\mr tshi- tshit          -am         -u     -âu             -a
\gl you-  eat.completely -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 -(TI)IIN.sbjctv -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- VTI            -sfx        -sfx   -sfx            -sfx

\tx an         !       iteu.
\mr an         !       it  -e              -u
\gl that       !       say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps pro.dem.an !       VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "You seem to have eaten it all up!", he (Hare) said.

\ref 105
\tx Ekue           iâpit  nakatâukut.
\mr ekue           iâpit  nakatâu      -ikw            -t
\gl at.that.moment anyway leave.behind -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -CIN.3
\ps p              p      VTA          -sfx            -sfx

\f And then, he(the owl) flew off anyway, leaving him behind.

\ref 106
\tx Mînuât pepâmipâtât,      pepâmipâtât        mînuât.
\mr mînuât papâmipâtâ -t     papâmipâtâ -t      mînuât
\gl again  IC.run.dup -CIN.3 IC.run.dup -CIN.3 again
\ps p      VAI        -sfx   VAI        -sfx    p

\f Again, he (Hare) was off on his run.
```

\ref 107

```
\tx Eukuannû              uiâpâtât                    mûsha.
\mr eukuan    -inû        uâpât              -ât      mûsh  -a
\gl that's.it -obv(s/pl) see.tracks.of.s.o. -CIN.3>4 moose -obv(s/pl)
\ps dem       -sfx        VTA                -sfx     NA    -sfx
```

\f He (Hare) saw the tracks of a moose.

\ref 108

```
\tx Tshâuepâtât        ekw.
\mr tshîuepâtâ  -t     ekw
\gl IC.run.home -CIN.3 then
\ps VAI         -sfx   p
```

\f Then he (Hare) ran back home.

\ref 109

```
\tx Pîtutetishimû        uîtshît.
\mr pîtutetishimu -u     uîtshû -ît
\gl run.inside    -IIN.3 home   -Loc
\ps VAI           -sfx   NI     -sfx
```

\f He (Hare) ran into his tent.

\ref 110

```
\tx Ka    -       aieshkunamuâ
\mr ka            aieshkun               -am          -u     -â
\gl subjv         hold.within.reach.dup -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 -sbjctv
\ps prfx          VTI                    -sfx         -sfx   -sfx

\tx mishtikunû          ekue              itit              anite
\mr mishtikw -inû       ekue              iti -t            anite
\gl tree     -obv(s/pl) at.that.moment    do  -(AI/II)CIN.3 there
\ps NA       -sfx       p                 VAI -sfx          dem.adv

\tx utshipishkuâmît               kâtshî  pîtutepâtât.
\mr u-    tshipishkuât -im   -ît  kâtshî  pîtutepâtâ -t
\gl 3-    doorway      -poss -Loc after   run.inside -CIN.3
\ps prfx- NI           -sfx  -sfx prv     VAI        -sfx
```

\f It seemed as if he were getting a stick ready by the door after he got in.

\ref 111

```
\tx - Minâush, iteu,                      tshitshî   pipimûten.
\mr   minâush  it  -e              -u     tshi- tshî pimûte   -n
\gl   hardly   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 2-    can  walk.dup -IIN.1
\ps   p        VTA -sfx            -sfx   prfx- prv  VAI      -sfx
```

\f "I can hardly walk," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 112

```
\tx Nuâpâtâu                                    anite
\mr ni-   uâpât            -â          -u      anite
\gl 1-    see.tracks.of.s.o. -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3 there
\ps prfx- VTA              -sfx        -sfx    dem.adv

\tx auen,     mishta - mâtshishkamw.
\mr auen      mishta   mâtshishk       -am         -u
\gl someone   very     make.big.tracks -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps pro.indef prfx     VTI             -sfx        -sfx

\f "I saw the tracks of something.  He left big hoofprints."
```

\ref 113

```
\tx - Tân  eshinâtîkushit                    ?
\mr   tân  ishinâtîkushi                -t   ?
\gl   what IC.look.like.caribou.tracks? -CIN.3 ?
\ps   p    VAI                          -sfx ?

\tx itikû.
\mr it  -ikw           -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx           -sfx

\f "What did they look like?" he (Frog) said to him (Hare).
```

\ref 114

```
\tx - Tâssikanashteu       an,        iteu.
\mr   tâssikanashte -u     an         it  -e              -u
\gl   be.split.hoof -IIN.3 that       say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   VAI           -sfx   pro.dem.an VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "It has split hooves," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).
```

\ref 115

```
\tx - Mishta - uîtshitû          an
\mr   mishta   uîtshiti   -u     an
\gl   very     taste.good -IIN.3 that
\ps   prfx     VAI        -sfx   pro.dem.an

\tx tshîtshue, nishtesh,     itikû.
\mr tshîtshue  ni-   shtesh  it  -ikw            -u
\gl really     1-    brother say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps p          prfx- NAD     VTA -sfx           -sfx

\f "It tastes very good, my brother," he (Frog) said to him (Hare).
```

\ref 116

```
\tx Mûsh  an         ishinîkatâkanû.
\mr mûsh   an         ishinîkat    -âkani  -u
\gl moose that       name.as.such -indf>3 -IIN.3
\ps NA    pro.dem.an VTA          -sfx    -sfx

\f "It was a moose."
```

\ref 117
```
\tx Ninipâiâtî                              ne          mâni.
\mr ni-   nipâi -â          -tî             ne          mâni
\gl 1-    kill  -(TA)TS.1>3 -(AI)IIP.1/2    that        usually
\ps prfx- VTA   -sfx        -sfx            pro.dem.an p
```

\f "I used to kill them."

\ref 118
```
\tx Mâte,
\mr mâte
\gl well.then
\ps p

\tx utashâmikuî                                          napatekât, ekw
\mr utashâm                -ikw            -î        napatekât  ekw
\gl make.snowshoe.for.s.o. -(TA)TS.inv.2>1 -Imp.2>1   one.leg    then
\ps VTA                    -sfx            -sfx      p          p

\tx tshe nâtâkw.
\mr tshe nât   -âkw
\gl fut  go.to -CIN.21>3
\ps prv  VTA   -sfx
```

\f "Well, make me a snowshoe for one leg. Then we will go fetch him."

\ref 119
```
\tx Nika       nâshâuâu,                    itikû.
\mr ni-   ka   nâshâu     -â          -u     it  -ikw            -u
\gl 1-    fut  swim.after -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3 say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps prfx- prfx VTA        -sfx        -sfx   VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "I will swim to go find him (the moose)," he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 120
```
\tx - Eshe, iteu.
\mr   ehe   it  -e              -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Yes," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 121
```
\tx - Nika       nâshâuâu,
\mr   ni-   ka   nâshâu     -â          -u
\gl   1-    fut  swim.after -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- prfx VTA        -sfx        -sfx

\tx itikû.
\mr it  -ikw            -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

```
\f "I will swim after it," he (Frog) told him (Hare).

\ref 122
\tx Ekw  tâpue  tshâtuâtamât
\mr ekw  tâpue  tshîtuâtam -ât
\gl then indeed IC.carry   -CIN.3>4
\ps p    p      VTA        -sfx

\tx ushîma.
\mr u-    shîm            -a
\gl 3-    younger.sibling -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD             -sfx

\f Then he (Hare) carried his younger brother (Frog) with him.

\ref 123
\tx -Tshe pet  mitimeîn               meshkanâu,
\mr  tshe pet  mitime      -în        meshkanâu
\gl  fut  here follow.road -(AI)CIN.2 path
\ps  prv  p    VAI         -sfx       NI

\tx itikû.
\mr it  -ikw           -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Just follow the tracks here," he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 124
\tx Ekw  tâpue  niâshâuât                 ne,
\mr ekw  tâpue  nâshâu       -ât          ne
\gl then indeed IC.fly.after -(TA)CIN.3>4 that
\ps p    p      VTA          -sfx         pro.dem.an

\tx ekue           âtimât
\mr ekue           âtim               -ât
\gl at.that.moment catch.up.with.s.o. -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p              VTA                -sfx

\tx ekue           nipâiât             nete
\mr ekue           nipâi -ât           nete
\gl at.that.moment kill  -(TA)CIN.3>4. over.there
\ps p              VTA   -sfx          dem.adv

\tx nenua                 mûsha            ne          Umâtshashkukw.
\mr nenua                 mûsh  -a         ne          umâtshashkukw
\gl that                  moose -obv(s/pl) that        frog
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)  NA    -sfx       pro.dem.an  NA

\f Then he ran after it. He caught up to it, and then Frog killed the
moose.
```

\ref 125
```
\tx Kâtshî nipâiât
\mr kâtshî nipâi -ât
\gl after  kill  -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps prv    VTA   -sfx

\tx ekue           manishtikuâneshuât.
\mr ekue           manishtikuâneshu    -uât
\gl at.that.moment cut.off.s.o.'s.head -CIN.relational.3
\ps p              VTA                 -sfx
```

\f After he (Frog) killed it (moose), he cut its head off.

\ref 126
```
\tx Nete       tshe utûtenitî
\mr nete       tshe utûte          -ini -tî
\gl over.there fut  arrive.by.foot -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps p          prv  VAI            -sfx -sfx

\tx ushtesha                ekute       anite
\mr u-    shtesh  -a        ekute       anite
\gl 3-    brother -obv(s/pl) right.there there
\ps prfx- NAD     -sfx      p           dem.adv

\tx etashtât          nenû           ushtikuânim.
\mr itashtâ     -t    nenû           ushtikuân    -im
\gl IC.put.down -CIN.3 that          his/her.head -poss
\ps VAI+O       -sfx  pro.dem.in.obv NID          -sfx
```

\f He put the head where he knew his older brother would be when he came home.

\ref 127
```
\tx Shiâkâshkuaik                                Uâpush.
\mr shâkâshku               -am        -t       uâpush
\gl IC.come.out.of.the.woods -(TI)TS.3>4 -CIN.3>4 hare
\ps VII                     -sfx       -sfx     NA
```

\f Hare came out from the woods.

\ref 128
```
\tx Auennua
\mr auen      -inua
\gl someone   -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.indef -sfx

\tx nenua                 petâshtamâpinua,
\mr nenua                 petâshtamâpi -ini -u     -a
\gl that                  sit.facing  -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) VAI          -sfx -sfx   -sfx
```

```
\tx mûsha            !
\mr mûsh  -a         !
\gl moose -obv(s/pl) !
\ps NA    -sfx       !

\f He (Hare) saw a moose facing him.

\ref 129
\tx Itashtânua                          anite   ushtikuânnû.
\mr itashtâ  -ini -u       -a           anite   ushtikuân    -inû
\gl put.down -obv -IIN.3>4 -obv(s/pl)   there   his/her.head -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI+O    -sfx -sfx     -sfx         dem.adv NID          -sfx

\f The head was facing him.

\ref 130
\tx Kueshtât                  ekw, tshâuepanîut.
\mr kusht        -ât          ekw  tshîuepanîu    -t
\gl IC.fear.s.o. -(TA)CIN.3>4 then IC.turn.around -CIN.3
\ps VTA          -sfx         p    VAI            -sfx

\f He (Hare) was afraid of him (the moose), then he suddenly turned
around.

\ref 131
\tx Mînuât nete       kueshte    uet
\mr mînuât nete       kueshte    ût
\gl again  over.there other.side IC.from
\ps p      p          p          p

\tx shâkâshkuaik.
\mr shâkâshku             -am         -t
\gl come.out.of.the.woods -(TI)TS.3>4 -CIN.3
\ps VII                   -sfx        -sfx

\f Again, he came around from the other side of the woods.

\ref 132
\tx Ekute       anite   etashtât          ne.
\mr ekute       anite   itashtâ     -t     ne
\gl right.there there   IC.put.down -CIN.3 that
\ps p           dem.adv VAI+O       -sfx   pro.dem.an

\f He (Frog) put it down right there.

\ref 133
\tx Uâpitîtânua                       nenua          ûpana.
\mr uâpitîtâ -ini -u     -a           nenua          u-    upan -a
\gl whiten?  -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)   that           3-    lung -obv
\ps VAI      -sfx -sfx   -sfx         pro.dem.in.pl prfx- NID  -sfx

\f His lungs were white.
```

\ref 134

```
\tx - Nishtesh,     petute    ekw, itikû.
\mr   ni-   shtesh  petute    ekw  it  -ikw            -u
\gl   1-    brother come.here then say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- NAD     p         p    VTA -sfx            -sfx
```

\f "Come here, my older brother," he (Frog) said to him (Hare).

\ref 135

```
\tx Niâtât            tâpue.
\mr nât      -ât      tâpue
\gl IC.go.to -CIN.3>4 indeed
\ps VTA      -sfx     p
```

\f He (Hare) went over to him.

\ref 136

```
\tx Mishta -      uâuîtshinamw
\mr mishta        uâuîtshin                -am         -u
\gl very          find.it.good.to.eat.dup -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps prfx          VTI                      -sfx        -sfx

\tx nenû               etashtenit                tshekuânnû,
\mr nenû               itashte      -ini -t      tshekuân -inû
\gl that               IC.be.placed -obv -CIN.3  what     -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.in.obv     VII          -sfx -sfx    NI       -sfx

\tx mûsha            tânite uâpitîtânua
\mr mûsh  -a         tânite uâpitîtâ -ini -u     -a
\gl moose -obv(s/pl) where  whiten?  -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA    -sfx       p.intrg VAI     -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\tx ûpana,            ekw  tshîtshue shâuenit.
\mr u-    upan -a     ekw  tshîtshue shâueni   -t
\gl 3-    lung -obv   then really    be.hungry -CIN.3
\ps prfx- NID  -sfx   p    p         VAI       -sfx
```

\f He found it very good to eat, that which had been put there, the places where the moose's lungs were white; and he was really hungry.

\ref 137

```
\tx - Nenua                mîtshî          nishtesh,
\mr   nenua                mîtshi   -î     ni-   shtesh
\gl   that                 eat.s.t. -Imp.2 1-    brother
\ps   pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) VAI+O    -sfx   prfx- NAD

\tx itikû,                    mishta -   uîkana
\mr it  -ikw            -u    mishta     uîkan      -a
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3 very       taste.good -(II)pl
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx   prfx       VII        -sfx
```

```
\tx nenua          mâtshinânûkâui.
\mr nenua          mîtshi    -nânû       -kâui
\gl that           eat.s.t.  -(AI)Indef. -CS.3p
\ps pro.dem.in.pl  VAI+O     -sfx        -sfx

\f "Eat those, my brother," he said to him.  "They are very good when
eaten."

\ref 138
\tx Ekw  mâtshit             tâpue.
\mr ekw  mîtshi      -t      tâpue
\gl then IC.eat.s.t. -CIN.3  indeed
\ps p    VAI+O       -sfx    p

\f Then he (Hare) ate it.

\ref 139
\tx Nâsht  tshîtâu                nenua          ûpana.
\mr nâsht  tshîtâ          -u     nenua          ûpan -a
\gl really eat.completely -IIN.3 that           lung -in.pl
\ps p      VAI             -sfx   pro.dem.in.pl NI   -sfx

\f He (Hare) finished the lungs.

\ref 140
\tx Tshâueht              ekw.
\mr tshîue    -ht         ekw
\gl IC.return -(AI)CIN.3p then
\ps VAI       -sfx        p

\f Then he(Hare) went home.

\ref 141
\tx Kâtshî takushiniht                ekw  iâkushit.
\mr kâtshî takushin -ini -ht          ekw  âkushi     -t
\gl after  arrive   -obv -(AI)CIN.3p then IC.be.sick -CIN.3
\ps prv    VAI      -sfx -sfx        p    VAI        -sfx

\f When he (Hare) got home, he became sick.

\ref 142
\tx Akushu          ne          Uâpush, pûtûpanû
\mr âkushi  -u      ne          uâpush  pûtûpani -u
\gl be.sick -IIN.3  that        hare    swell    -IIN.3
\ps VAI     -sfx    pro.dem.an  NA      VAI      -sfx

\tx nenû,           pûtûshkâkû
\mr nenû            pûtûshku    -ikw              -u
\gl that            bloat.s.o.  -(TA)TS.inv.4p>3  -IIN.3
\ps pro.dem.in.obv  VTA         -sfx              -sfx
```

```
\tx nenua          ûpana.
\mr nenua          u-    upan -a
\gl that           3-    lung -obv
\ps pro.dem.in.pl prfx- NID  -sfx

\f The hare was sick.  The lungs made him bloated.

\ref 143
\tx - Tshîtshue nitâkushin,          iteu.
\mr   tshîtshue ni-   âkushi -n     it  -e              -u
\gl   really    1-    hurt   -IIN.1 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p         prfx- VAI    -sfx   VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "I am really in pain," he (Hare) said to him (Frog).

\ref 144
\tx Aiâtshîtak       ne          nimânitûm.
\mr âtshî    -tak    ne          ni-   mânitû -im
\gl move.dup -IDRN.3 that        1-    worm   -poss
\ps VAI      -sfx    pro.dem.an prfx- NA     -sfx

\f "My worm must be moving around."

\ref 145
\tx - Eshe, tânite  ushâm   tshuî      mimîtshishun
\mr   ehe   tânite  ushâm   tshi- uî   mîtshishu -n
\gl   yes   where   because 2-    want eat.dup   -IIN.2
\ps   p     p.intrg p       prfx- prv  VAI       -sfx

\tx mâni,   tshipâ           tshî â     ekâ âkushin        ?
\mr mâni    tshi- pâ         tshî â     ekâ âkushi  -n     ?
\gl usually 2-    should     can  intrg not be.sick -IIN.2 ?
\ps p       prfx- prv        prv  p     neg VAI     -sfx   ?

\f "Yes.  No wonder you're sick, you always want to eat and eat,"

\ref 146
\tx itikû                    nenua
\mr it  -ikw            -u   nenua
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3 that
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx   pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx Umâtshashkukua.
\mr umâtshashkukw -a
\gl frog          -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA            -sfx

\f Frog said to him (Hare).

\ref 147
\tx Apû minekâsh  tâpue  ekw  piâkumut.
\mr apû minekâsh  tâpue  ekw  pâkumu   -t
\gl not long.time indeed then IC.vomit -CIN.3
\ps neg p         p      p    VAI      -sfx
```

```
\f Indeed, not long after, he (Hare) threw up.

\ref 148
\tx Pâkumutueu                              nenua
\mr pâkumutu      -e              -u        nenua
\gl vomit.up.s.t. -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3    that
\ps VTA           -sfx            -sfx      pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx umishkumîma.
\mr u-      mishkumî -im   -a
\gl poss.3- ice      -poss -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx-   NA       -sfx  -sfx

\f He (Hare) threw up his ice.

\ref 149
\tx Umishkumîmîshapan   anite   atâmît.
\mr umishkumîmi -shapan anite   atâmît
\gl have.ice    -IDRP.3 there   under
\ps VAI         -sfx    dem.adv p

\f He (Hare) must have had ice inside (himself).

\ref 150
\tx Ekw  mîshkut           apishîsh mâtshishut
\mr ekw  mîshkut           apishîsh mîtshishu -t
\gl then on.the.other.hand little   IC.eat    -(AI/II)CIN.3
\ps p    p                 p        VAI       -sfx

\tx kâtshî pâpaniât           nenua
\mr kâtshî pâpani    -ât      nenua
\gl after  eliminate -CIN.3>4 that
\ps prv    VTA       -sfx     pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx umânitûma.
\mr u-      mânitû -im   -a
\gl poss.3- worm   -poss -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx-   NA     -sfx  -sfx

\f But then, after he (Hare) passed the worm, he didn't eat very much.

\ref 151
\tx Eukuan    eshkuâiâtshimâkanit.
\mr eukuan    ishkuâiâtshim                  -âkani  -t
\gl that's.it IC.tell.story.of.such.a.length -indf>3 -CIN.3
\ps dem       VTA                            -sfx    -sfx

\f That's it, that is the length of the storytelling.
```

APPENDIX B:
Interlinear Translation of *Meshâpush*

```
\ref 001
\tx  Eukuan    tshe âtanûtsheiân.
\mr  eukuan    tshe âtanûtshe     -iân
\gl  that's.it fut  tell.a.legend -(AI)CIN.1
\ps  dem       prv  VAI           -sfx

\f I will tell a legend.

\ref 002
\tx Ekw  anite   etûtet                nâneu,
\mr ekw  anite   itûte          -t     nâneu
\gl then there   IC.go.by.foot -CIN.3 shore
\ps p    dem.adv VAI           -sfx   NI

\tx uâpameu                    namesha,
\mr uâpam -e               -u     namesh -a
\gl see   -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 fish   -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTA   -sfx            -sfx   NA     -sfx

\tx mishta - mîtshetinua.
\mr mishta   mîtsheti -ini -u     -a
\gl very     be.many  -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx     VAI      -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\f Then, where he (Meshapush) walked along the shore, he saw fish.
There were really a lot of them.

\ref 003
\tx Kuetû tûtueu,                      apû tshî nipâiât.
\mr kuetû tûtu   -e               -u     apû tshî nipâi -ât
\gl end   do.s.t -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 not able kill  -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p     VTA    -sfx            -sfx   neg prv  VTA   -sfx

\f He did everything possible, (but) he couldn't kill them.

\ref 004
\tx At      tshikâkuâteu                       mâni,
\mr ât      tshikâkuât -e              -u     mâni
\gl even.if spear      -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 usually
\ps p       VTA        -sfx            -sfx   p

\tx mukw  apû tshî nipâiât.
\mr mukw  apû tshî nipâi -ât
\gl but   not able kill  -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p     neg prv  VTA   -sfx

\f He would spear them, but he couldn't kill them.
```

\ref 005
```
\tx Ekue            tshîuet.
\mr ekue            tshîue -t
\gl at.that.moment  return -CIN.3
\ps p               VAI    -sfx
```

\f Then he returned home.

\ref 006
```
\tx - Nûkum,            iteu,                       apû tshî
\mr   ni-   ûkum        it  -e              -u      apû tshî
\gl   1-    grandmother say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 not able
\ps   prfx- NAD         VTA -sfx            -sfx    neg prv

\tx nipâikâu            anite   nameshat,       mishta -
\mr nipâi -akâu         anite   namesh -at      mishta
\gl kill  -(TA)CIN.1>3p there   fish    -NA.pl  very
\ps VTA   -sfx          dem.adv NA      -sfx    prfx

\tx mîtshetuat.
\mr mîtsheti -u     -at
\gl be.many  -IIN.3 -IIN.3p
\ps VAI      -sfx   -sfx
```

\f "Grandmother," he said to her, "I couldn't kill the fish; there were very many."

\ref 007
```
\tx - Tâu        anite   nussim,
\mr   itâ -u     anite   ni-   ussim
\gl   be  -IIN.3 there   1-    grandchild
\ps   VAI -sfx   dem.adv prfx- NAD

\tx itikû,                  ânapîtsheu            enikw.
\mr it  -ikw            -u  ânapîtshe  -u         enikw
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3 make.a.web -IIN.3  spider
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx   VAI        -sfx    NA
```

\f "There is, my grandchild," she said to him, "a spider who makes nets."

\ref 008
```
\tx Eukuan    mukw  tepishkânitî      ekw   iânapîtshet.
\mr eukuan    mukw  tipishkâ    -nitî ekw   ânapîtshe     -t
\gl that's.it but   IC.be.night -obv  then  IC.make.a.web -CIN.3
\ps dem       p     VII         -sfx  p     VAI           -sfx
```

\f "But she only makes nets at night."

\ref 009
```
\tx Apû tshî uâpamâkanit          an
\mr apû tshî uâpam -âkani  -t     an
\gl not able see   -indf>3 -CIN.3 that
\ps neg prv  VTA   -sfx    -sfx   pro.dem.an
```

```
\tx iânapîtshetî,              tepishkânitî            ekw
\mr ânapîtshe     -t     -î    tipishkâ    -nitî       ekw
\gl IC.make.a.web -CIN.3 -CS   IC.be.night -obv        then 3
\ps VAI           -sfx   -sfx VII         -sfx        prv

\tx iânapîtshet.
\mr ânapîtshe     -t
\gl IC.make.a.web -CIN.
\ps VAI           -sfx

\f "No one can see her when she make the nets. At night, she makes the
nets."

\ref 010
\tx - Nete       nika       natuâpamâu,
\mr   nete       ni-   ka   natuâpam -â          -u
\gl   over.there 1-    fut  look.for -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.3
\ps   p          prfx- prfx VTA      -sfx        -sfx

\tx iteu.
\mr it  -e              -u
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "There, I will look for her," he(Meshapush) said to her.

\ref 011
\tx - Tshika     nipâikû,                 itikû.
\mr   tshi- ka   nipâi -ikw        -u     it  -ikw            -u
\gl   2-    fut  kill  -(TA)TS.3>2 -IIN.3 say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- prfx VTA   -sfx        -sfx   VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "She will kill you," she said to him.

\ref 012
\tx - Mâuât apû tshika     tshî nipâit.
\mr   mâuât apû tshi- ka   tshî nipâi -t
\gl   no    not 2-    fut  able kill  -(TA)CIN.3>1
\ps   neg   neg prfx- prfx prv  VTA   -sfx

\f "No, she will not kill me."

\ref 013
\tx Niâtât,                auennua              uîtshinua
\mr nât       -ât          auen      -inua      uîtshû -inua
\gl IC.go.get -(TA)CIN.3>4 someone   -obv(s/pl) home   -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTA       -sfx         pro.indef -sfx       NI     -sfx

\tx tâpue.
\mr tâpue
\gl indeed
\ps p

\f He went to find her (Spider) and indeed, there was her home.
```

\ref 014
\tx *Uet* *unuîht* *ishkuessat.*
\mr ût unuî -ht ishkuess -at
\gl IC.from come.out -(AI)CIN.3p girl -NA.pl
\ps p VAI -sfx NA -sfx

\f Then, girls came out (of Spider's house).

\ref 015
\tx - *Natuâpamekw* *uîssîtâkw,*
\mr natuâpam -ekw uîssîtâkw
\gl look.for -(TA)Imp.2p>3 rotten.tree
\ps VTA -sfx NA

\tx *iteu* *uetakussinit.*
\mr it -e -u utakussi -ini -t
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 IC.be.evening -obv -CIN.3
\ps VTA -sfx -sfx VII -sfx -sfx

\f "Go look for rotten wood," she (Spider) said to them (Girls) in the evening.

\ref 016
\tx *Ekâ uîn peshuekw* *uâpushitakw.*
\mr ekâ uîn peshu -ekw uâpushitakw
\gl not 3 bring -(TA)Imp.2p>3 hare.wood
\ps neg pro VTA -sfx NA

\f "Don't bring hare wood."

\ref 017
\tx - *Eshe, itikû.*
\mr ehe it -ikw -u
\gl yes say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps p VTA -sfx -sfx

\f "Yes," they said to her (Spider).

\ref 018
\tx *Tâpue* *tshâtûteht* *anitshenat*
\mr tâpue tshîtûte -ht anitshen -at
\gl indeed IC.leave -(AI)CIN.3p that.one -NA.pl
\ps p VAI -sfx dem -sfx

\tx *ishkuessat,* *pietûtâiâht*
\mr ishkuess -at petût -â -ht
\gl girl -NA.pl IC.bring -(TA)TS.2>3 -(AI)CIN.3p
\ps NA -sfx VTA -sfx -sfx

\tx *nenua* *uîssîtâkua.*
\mr nenua uîssîtâkw -a
\gl that rotten.tree -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) NA -sfx

```
\f Indeed, the girls went and brought the rotten wood.

\ref 019
\tx Ekute       anite   etât        ne
\mr ekute       anite   itâ   -t     ne
\gl right.there there   IC.be -CIN.3 that
\ps p           dem.adv VAI   -sfx   pro.dem.an

\tx Uâpush, nenua               uîssîtâkua.
\mr uâpush  nenua               uîssîtâkw   -a
\gl hare    that                rotten.tree -obv(s/pl)
\ps NA      pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) NA         -sfx

\f That's where Hare was, in the rabbit wood.

\ref 020
\tx Kâtshî tshîtûteht,          ekue           ânapîtshet.
\mr kâtshî tshîtûte -ht         ekue           ânapîtshe  -t
\gl after  leave    -(AI)CIN.3p at.that.moment make.a.web -CIN.3
\ps prv    VAI      -sfx        p              VAI        -sfx

\f After they (Girls) left, then she (Spider) made the net.

\ref 021
\tx Uiâpamât            iânapîtshenitî
\mr uâpam  -ât          ânapîtshe     -ini -tî
\gl IC.see -(TA)CIN.3>4. IC.make.a.web -obv -(AI)CIN.3
\ps VTA    -sfx         VAI           -sfx -sfx

\tx tepishkânit.
\mr tipishkâ    -ini -t
\gl IC.be.night -obv -CIN.3
\ps VII         -sfx -sfx

\f He (Meshapush) saw her (Spider) make the net during the night.

\ref 022
\tx Ekw  uenuîpanîut.
\mr ekw  unuîpanîu   -t
\gl then IC.come.out -CIN.3
\ps p    VAI         -sfx

\f Then he came out (of the log).

\ref 023
\tx - Shâsh   tshitshî   tshissinuâpamitin,
\mr   shâsh   tshi- tshî tshissinuâpam      -itin
\gl   already I-    perf learn.by.observing -IIN.1>2
\ps   p       prfx- prv  VTA                -sfx

\tx iteu,                       etânapîtshein,
\mr it  -e              -u      itânapîtshe            -in
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3  IC.weave.in.such.a.way -(AI).CIN.2
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx    VAI                    -sfx
```

```
\tx etâpekaut              tshitânapî.
\mr itâpekau -t            tshi- ânapî
\gl IC.weave -(TA)CIN.2>3 2-    net
\ps VTA      -sfx          prfx- NA

\f "I already saw what you were doing," he (Meshapush) said to her
(Spider), "the way you weave your net."

\ref 024
\tx At      utûtâmueu                        enikw, apû kâ
\mr ât      utûtâmu -e              -u       enikw  apû kâ
\gl even.if hit.dup -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 spider not past
\ps p       VTA     -sfx            -sfx     NA     neg prfx

\tx tsheshtâuât.
\mr tsheshtâu  -ât
\gl hit.target -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps VTA        -sfx

\f The spider kept trying to hit him, but she kept missing him.

\ref 025
\tx Ekue           unuîpâtânitî.
\mr ekue           unuîpâtâ -ini -tî
\gl at.that.moment run.away -obv -(AI)CIN.3
\ps p              VAI      -sfx -sfx

\f Then he (Meshapush) ran away.

\ref 026
\tx Tshâuepâtât       ekw.
\mr tshîuepâtâ -t     ekw
\gl run.home   -CIN.3 then
\ps VAI        -sfx   p

\f Then he ran home.

\ref 027
\tx - Uâshkashâpe,      pishakânapî
\mr   uâshkashâpe       pishakânapî
\gl   cut.babiche.Imp.2 rope
\ps   VAI               NI

\tx tûta,                iteu
\mr tût       -a         it  -e              -u
\gl make.s.t. -(TI)Imp.2 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTI       -sfx       VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx ekw  ûkuma.
\mr ekw  u-    ûkum        -a
\gl then 3-    grandmother -obv(s/pl)
\ps p    prfx- NAD         -sfx

\f "Cut babiche, make a rope," he (Meshapush) said to his grandmother.
```

\ref 028

```
\tx Ekw  uiâshkashâpepanit              ne         ishkueu, kûkûminâsh.
\mr ekw  uâshkashâpepani -t             ne         ishkueu  kûkûminâsh
\gl then IC.cut.babiche  -(AI/II)CIN.3 that       woman    old.woman
\ps p    VAI             -sfx          pro.dem.an NA       NA
```

\f Then, that woman, the old woman, started cutting the babiche.

\ref 029

```
\tx Kâtshî uâshkashâpet              ne
\mr kâtshî uâshkashâpe -t            ne
\gl after  cut.babiche -(AI/II)CIN.3 that
\ps prv    VAI         -sfx          pro.dem.an

\tx kûkûminâsh, ekue
\mr kûkûminâsh  ekue
\gl old.woman   at.that.moment
\ps NA          p

\tx ânapîtshet               Uâpush,      ânapîtshepanû.
\mr ânapîtshe  -t            uâpush       ânapîtshepani   -u
\gl make.a.web -(AI/II)CIN.3 hare         make.net.on.own -IIN.3
\ps VAI        -sfx          NA           VAI             -sfx
```

\f After the old woman made the babiche, Hare made the net; he made the net on his own.

\ref 030

```
\tx Kâtshî ânapîtshet        ekue           nipâiât
\mr kâtshî ânapîtshe  -t     ekue           nipâi -ât
\gl after  make.a.web -CIN.3 at.that.moment kill  -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps prv    VAI        -sfx   p              VTA   -sfx

\tx namesha           tâpue.
\mr namesh -a         tâpue
\gl fish   -obv(s/pl) indeed
\ps NA     -sfx       p
```

\f After he made the net, indeed he caught fish.

\ref 031

```
\tx Mishta - mîtshetinua
\mr mishta   mîtsheti -ini -u     -a
\gl very     be.big   -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx     VAI      -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\tx namesha           nepâiât.
\mr namesh -a         nipâi   -ât
\gl fish   -obv(s/pl) IC.kill -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps NA     -sfx       VTA     -sfx
```

\f He caught many fish.

\ref 032
\tx - *Apû takuâk*
\mr apû takuan -âk
\gl not be -(II)CIN.3
\ps neg VII -sfx

\tx *mûkumân, iteu* *ne* *kûkûminâsh.*
\mr mûkumân it -e -u ne kûkûminâsh
\gl knife say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 that old.woman
\ps NI VTA -sfx -sfx pro.dem.an NA

\f "There is no knife," that old woman said to him.

\ref 033
\tx *Tâu* *anite* *kâiassîkumanitshesht.*
\mr itâ -u anite kâiassîkumanitshesht
\gl be -IIN.3 there metalworker
\ps VAI -sfx dem.adv NAP

\f "There is a metalworker."

\ref 034
\tx *Tshipâ* *tshî mînikw* *natuenitamutî*
\mr tshi- pâ tshî mîn -ikw natuenitamu -tî
\gl 2- should can give -(TA)TS.inv.3>2 ask.for -CS.2>3
\ps prfx- prv prv VTA -sfx VTA -sfx

\tx *assîkumâna* *tshetshî* *mûkumânitshein.*
\mr assîkumân -a tshetshî mûkumânitshe -in
\gl metal -NI.pl so.that make.knife -(AI)CIN.2
\ps NI -sfx prfx.conj VAI -sfx

\f "Perhaps he would give you metal to make a knife, if you asked him for it."

\ref 035
\tx - *Eshe, iteu.*
\mr ehe it -e -u
\gl yes say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps p VTA -sfx -sfx

\f "Yes," he said to her.

\ref 036
\tx *Tshâtshipâtât* *tâpue.*
\mr tshîtshipâtâ -t tâpue
\gl IC.run.away -CIN.3 indeed
\ps VAI -sfx p

\f Then indeed he ran off.

\ref 037

```
\tx Uiâpamât              auennua
\mr uâpam  -ât            auen      -inua
\gl IC.see -(TA)CIN.3>4.  someone   -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTA    -sfx           pro.indef -sfx

\tx pemûtenitî                - Petâ  mâ,
\mr pimûte  -ini -tî            petâ  mâ
\gl IC.walk -obv -(AI)CIN.3     bring intns
\ps VAI     -sfx -sfx           VAI+O p

\tx mînî              assîkumân, iteu,
\mr mîn  -î           assîkumân  it  -e               -u
\gl give -(TA)Imp.2>1 metal      say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA  -sfx         NI         VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx nuî        mûkumânitshen.
\mr ni-   uî   mûkumânitshe -n
\gl 1-    want make.knife   -IIN.1
\ps prfx- prv  VAI           -sfx
```

\f He (Meshapush) saw someone (Metalworker) walking. "Give me metal or iron," he said to him, "I want to make a knife."

\ref 038

```
\tx Ekue           mînât
\mr ekue           mîn  -ât
\gl at.that.moment give -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps p              VTA  -sfx

\tx ne         kâiassîkumanitshesht, papatshishekushinû
\mr ne         kâiassîkumanitshesht  papatshishekushi -ini -u
\gl that       metalworker            be.thin.dim      -obv -IIN.3
\ps pro.dem.an NAP                    VII              -sfx -sfx

\tx nenû           mîneu.
\mr nenû           mîn  -e              -u
\gl that           give -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps pro.dem.in.obv VTA  -sfx            -sfx
```

\f Then, the metalworker gave him a very thin piece of metal.

\ref 039

```
\tx Ekw  tshâuepâtât.
\mr ekw  tshîuepâtâ  -t
\gl then IC.run.home -CIN.3
\ps p    VAI         -sfx
```

\f Then, he ran home.

\ref 040
\tx *Ekw apû tshî uînameshet eshkw,*
\mr ekw apû tshî uînameshe -t eshkw
\gl then not able clean.fish -(AI/II)CIN.3 still
\ps p neg prv VAI -sfx p

\tx *ushâm papakâshinû nenû,*
\mr ushâm papakâshi -ini -u nenû
\gl because be.thin.dim -obv -IIN.3 that
\ps p VII -sfx -sfx pro.dem.in.obv

\tx *uâkâpissinamw*
\mr uâkâpissin -am -u
\gl bend -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTI -sfx -sfx

\tx *mâni nenû ât uâ uînameshetî.*
\mr mâni nenû ât uî uînameshe -tî
\gl usually that even.if IC.want clean.fish -(AI)CS.3
\ps p pro.dem.in.obv p prv VAI -sfx

\f But, he couldn't clean the fish yet. It (the metal piece) was too thin. He kept bending it as he tried to clean the fish.

\ref 041
\tx - *Mâuât apû minuât au,*
\mr mâuât apû minuâ -t au
\gl no not be.good -CIN.3 it.is.that.one
\ps neg neg VII -sfx pro

\tx *iteu nenua*
\mr it -e -u nenua
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 that
\ps VTA -sfx -sfx pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx *ûssima.*
\mr u- ussim -a
\gl 3- grandchild -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD -sfx

\f "No, it's no good," she (Grandmother) said to her grandson (Meshapush).

\ref 042
\tx *Etatû menuânit kanuenitamw*
\mr etatû minuâ -ini -t kanuenit -am -u
\gl more IC.be.good -obv -CIN.3 own -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps p VII -sfx -sfx VTI -sfx -sfx

\tx *an.*
\mr an
\gl that
\ps pro.dem.an

```
\f "He has a better one."

\ref 043
\tx « Apû minuât          », tshe itât.
\mr   apû minuâ   -t        tshe it  -ât
\gl   not be.good -CIN.3 .3 fut  say -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps   neg VII     -sfx      prv  VTA -sfx

\f "It is no good," she would say to him.

\ref 044
\tx - Eshe, itikû.
\mr   ehe   it  -ikw            -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Yes," he said to her.

\ref 045
\tx Mînuât tshâtshipâtât       Uâpush, niâtât.
\mr mînuât tshîtshipâtâ -t     uâpush  nât       -ât
\gl again  IC.run.away  -CIN.3 hare    IC.go.get -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p      VAI          -sfx   NA      VTA       -sfx

\f Again Hare ran off to get him.

\ref 046
\tx - Apû minuât                au
\mr   apû minuâ   -t            au
\gl   not be.good -(AI/II)CIN.3 it.is.that.one
\ps   neg VII     -sfx          pro

\tx ka    mînin,        iteu,
\mr ka    mîn  -in      it  -e              -u
\gl subjv give -CIN.2>1 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps prfx  VTA  -sfx     VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx uâuâkâpissipanû.
\mr uâuâkâpissipani -u
\gl bend.metal.dup  -IIN.3
\ps VII             -sfx

\f "What you gave me is no good," he said to him (Metalworker), "it
keeps bending."

\ref 047
\tx - Apû tshî mînitân       mînuât,
\mr   apû tshî mîn  -itân    mînuât
\gl   not able give -CIN.1>2 again
\ps   neg prv  VTA  -sfx     p
```

```
\tx itikû,                          nitâpashtân
\mr it  -ikw            -u      ni-   âpashtâ -n
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3  1-    use     -IIN.1
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx    prfx- VAI+O   -sfx

\tx au              tânite      nenua                 assîkumâna.
\mr au              tânite      nenua                 assîkumân -a
\gl it.is.that.one  because     that                  metal     -NI.pl
\ps pro             p.intrg     pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)  NI        -sfx

\f "I cannot give you anymore," he said to him. "I'm using the metals."

\ref 048
\tx - Eshe, iteu.
\mr   ehe   it  -e              -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Yes," he (Meshapush) said to him (Metalworker).

\ref 049
\tx Tshâuet          ekw, ekue
\mr tshîue    -t     ekw  ekue
\gl IC.return -CIN.3 then at.that.moment
\ps VAI       -sfx   p    p

\tx tshîuepâtât       nete       kâu.
\mr tshîuepâtâ -t     nete       kâu
\gl run.home   -CIN.3 over.there again
\ps VAI        -sfx   p          p.time

\f Then he (Meshapush) went home, and then ran back again (to the
metalworker).

\ref 050
\tx Ekw  anite   ushpishkunnît          uet
\mr ekw  anite   ushpishkun   -ini -ît  ût
\gl then there   his/her.back -obv -Loc IC.from
\ps p    dem.adv NID          -sfx -sfx p

\tx nâtât,              pemûshinâtâuât,
\mr nât    -ât          pimûshinâtâu -ât
\gl go.get -(TA)CIN.3>4 throw.at     -(TA)CIN.3>4.
\ps VTA    -sfx         VTA          -sfx

\tx keutâuât               ne,
\mr kautâu     -ât         ne
\gl knock.over -(TA)CIN.3>4 that
\ps VTA        -sfx        pro.dem.an

\tx uetshipitamuât
\mr utshipit     -am         -u       -ât
\gl IC.grab.s.o. -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3>4 -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps VTI          -sfx        -sfx     -sfx
```

```
\tx nenû            utassîkumânnû,
\mr nenû            u-      assîkumân -inû
\gl that            poss.3- metal     -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.in.obv  prfx-   NI        -sfx

\tx tshâuepâtuât                  nenû
\mr tshîuepâtu           -ât      nenû
\gl IC.run.home.carrying -CIN.3>4 that
\ps VAI+O                -sfx     pro.dem.in.obv

\tx menuânit,               eukuannû             tâpue.
\mr minuâ      -ini -t      eukuan    -inû       tâpue
\gl IC.be.good -obv -CIN.3  that's.it -obv(s/pl) really
\ps VII        -sfx -sfx    dem       -sfx       p
```

\f Then he (Meshapush) went over there towards his (Metalworker's) back, he crept up behind him, he threw something (metal), knocked him down, grabbed his piece of metal, ran back with the good piece; indeed it was the one (that he wanted).

\ref 051

```
\tx Ekw  ne          uîâshkamenimut,            apû
\mr ekw  ne          uâshkamenimu        -t     apû
\gl then that        IC.become.conscious -CIN.3 not
\ps p    pro.dem.an  VAI                 -sfx   neg

\tx akuannit          nene          utassîkumânim
\mr akuan -ini -t     nene          u-    assîkumân -im
\gl exist -obv -CIN.3 that(absent)  3-    metal     -poss
\ps VII   -sfx -sfx   pro.dem.in    prfx- NI        -sfx

\tx ne          kâiassîkumanitshesht.
\mr ne          kâiassîkumanitshesht
\gl that        metalworker
\ps pro.dem.an  NAP
```

\f Then, when he woke up, the metalworker's metal was gone.

\ref 052

```
\tx Minuânû              ekw  umûkumân.
\mr minuâ   -ini -u      ekw  u-    mûkumân
\gl be.good -obv -IIN.3  then 3-    knife
\ps VII     -sfx -sfx    p    prfx- NI
```

\f His (Meshapush's) knife was good.

\ref 053

```
\tx Tûtamûpanû        mûkumânnû,
\mr tûtamûpani -u     mûkumân -inû
\gl make.s.t.  -IIN.3 knife   -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTI        -sfx   NI      -sfx
```

```
\tx ekw  uânameshet           tâpue.
\mr ekw  uînameshe     -t     tâpue
\gl then IC.clean.fish -CIN.3 indeed
\ps p    VAI           -sfx   p

\f He made a knife.  Then, indeed he cleaned the fish.

\ref 054
\tx Kâtshî uînameshet,       apû tshî
\mr kâtshî uînameshe  -t     apû tshî
\gl after  clean.fish -CIN.3 not able
\ps prv    VAI        -sfx   neg prv

\tx piminuet                                ekw, apû
\mr piminue                 -t              ekw  apû
\gl finish.(doing).cooking -(AI/II)CIN.3 then not
\ps VAI                     -sfx            p    neg

\tx takuânnit          ishkutenû.
\mr takuan -ini -t     ishkuteu -inû
\gl exist  -obv -CIN.3 fire     -obv(s/pl)
\ps VII    -sfx -sfx   NI       -sfx

\f After he cleaned the fish, he couldn't cook them, since there was no
fire.

\ref 055
\tx - Nika       nâtshi-ishkutuen,      iteu
\mr   ni-   ka   nâtshi-ishkutue -n     it  -e               -u
\gl   1-    fut  go.get.fire     -IIN.1 say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- prfx VAI              -sfx   VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx nenua                ûkuma.
\mr nenua                u-    ûkum        -a
\gl that                 3-    grandmother -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) prfx- NAD         -sfx

\f "I will go get fire," he said to his grandmother.

\ref 056
\tx Utânapîa               tâkuneu,                    ekw
\mr u-    ânapî -a         tâkun -e              -u    ekw
\gl 3-    net   -obv(s/pl) take  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 then
\ps prfx- NA    -sfx       VTA   -sfx            -sfx  p

\tx anite   etûtet                      matshiteu,
\mr anite   itûte          -t           matshiteu
\gl there   IC.go.by.foot -(AI/II)CIN.3 to.a.peninsula
\ps dem.adv VAI           -sfx         p

\tx ekw  nekamut              : «  Mishtamekw     tshiku
\mr ekw  nikamu  -t                mishtamekw
\gl then IC.sing -(AI/II)CIN.3     very.big.whale
\ps p    VAI     -sfx              NA
```

```
\tx mishtamekw      tshiku           ashiuakumuuku
\mr mishtamekw      ?                ?
\gl very.big.whale unknown.word      unknown.word
\ps NA              ?                ?

\tx mishtamekw »,       tshiku      itueu.
\mr mishtamekw          ?           itue -u
\gl very.big.whale      unknown.word      say  -IIN.3
\ps NA                  ?                 VAI  -sfx
```

\f He (Meshapush) took his net, then, and went to a point in the land, and then he started to sing: "very big whale, very big whale, join together to form a bridge across, very big whale," he sang.

\ref 057

```
\tx Ekue            ne         âshakumuat           tâpue
\mr ekue            ne         âshakumuat           tâpue
\gl at.that.moment that        be.in.group.in.water indeed
\ps p               pro.dem.an VAI                  p

\tx uâpamekuat,         âshakumuat           neka
\mr uâpamekw    -at     âshakumuat           neka
\gl white.whale -NA.pl be.in.group.in.water absent
\ps NA          -sfx    VAI                  pro.dem

\tx ite   akâmît.
\mr ite   akâm       -ît
\gl there other.side -Loc
\ps p     p          -sfx
```

\f Then, it is true, the white whales got themselves hooked together right across the river.

\ref 058

```
\tx - Ekâuî        kâssipishinân.
\mr   ekâuî        kâssipit -inân
\gl   emphatic.not scratch  -Imp.2>21p
\ps   neg          VTA      -sfx
```

\f "Don't scratch us."

\ref 059

```
\tx Nika       kutapanîunân          uesh    kâssipishîâtî,
\mr ni-   ka   kutapanîu     -nân    uesh    kâssipit -âtî
\gl 1-    fut  go.underwater -IIN.1p because scratch  -CS.2>1p
\ps prfx- prfx VAI           -sfx    p       VTA      -sfx

\tx iteu                      ne         uâpamekw.
\mr it  -e              -u    ne         uâpamekw
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 that       white.whale
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx  pro.dem.an NA
```

\f "We will go underwater if you scratch us," the white whale said to him.

\ref 060
```
\tx - Eshe, itikû.
\mr   ehe   it  -ikw            -u
\gl   yes   say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3
\ps   p     VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "Yes," he (Meshapush) said to him (Whale).
```

\ref 061
```
\tx Tâpue teshkamipâtât        ekw.
\mr tâpue tashkamipâtâ  -t     ekw
\gl true  IC.run.across -CIN.3 then
\ps p     VAI           -sfx   p
\f Then, indeed he ran across.
```

\ref 062
```
\tx Uâuîkuekashepanîu,                          tâtakussepanishû
\mr uâuîkuekashepanî                 -u     tâtakussepanishi -u
\gl put.claws.out.and.in.repeatedly -IIN.3 step.on.dup      -IIN.3
\ps VAI                              -sfx   VAI             -sfx

\tx anite.
\mr anite
\gl there
\ps dem.adv

\f He kept scratching (them).  He stepped on each one there.
```

\ref 063
```
\tx Nete       tshekât nenua                 mâshten
\mr nete       tshekât nenua                 mâshten
\gl over.there almost  that                  last
\ps p          p       pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) p

\tx kâssipiteu                      ekue
\mr kâssipit -e              -u     ekue
\gl scratch  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 at.that.moment
\ps VTA      -sfx            -sfx   p

\tx kutapanîunitî.
\mr kutapanîu     -ini -tî
\gl go.underwater -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps VAI           -sfx -sfx

\f He was almost on the last one when he scratched him and it went
underwater.
```

\ref 064
```
\tx Kutapanîunua
\mr kutapanîu     -ini -u     -a
\gl go.underwater -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI           -sfx -sfx   -sfx
```

```
\tx ekue            kapât          nete.
\mr ekue            kapâ    -t     nete
\gl at.that.moment get.off -CIN.3 over.there
\ps p              VAI     -sfx   dem.adv

\f It (the last whale) went underwater and he fell off there.

\ref 065
\tx Ekute       ekuâukushit,
\mr ekute       akuâukushi     -t
\gl right.there IC.wash.ashore -CIN.3
\ps p           VAI            -sfx

\tx akuâukushû         anite   uînipekût.
\mr akuâukushi  -u     anite   uînipekw -ît
\gl wash.ashore -IIN.3 there   ocean    -Loc
\ps VAI         -sfx   dem.adv NI       -sfx

\f He washed up on shore, there in the ocean.

\ref 066
\tx Anite   tshimâtenû          mîtshuâpinû
\mr anite   tshimâte -inû       mîtshuâp -inû
\gl there   stand    -obv(s/pl) house    -obv(s/pl)
\ps dem.adv VII      -sfx       NI       -sfx

\tx pessîsh, mishtikussuâpinû,        ekw  anite
\mr pessîsh  mishtikussuâp -inû       ekw  anite
\gl close.by cabin         -obv(s/pl) then there
\ps p        NI            -sfx       p    dem.adv

\tx pepâmûteht                      ishkuessat.
\mr papâmûte           -ht          ishkuess -at
\gl IC.walk.around.dup -(AI)CIN.3p girl     -NA.pl
\ps VAI                -sfx         NA       -sfx

\f There stood a house close by, a house built of wood.  There were
girls walking around.

\ref 067
\tx Auennua             uâpameuat,
\mr auen   -inua        uâpam -e          -u     -at
\gl who    -obv(s/pl)   see   -(TA)TS.3>4 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p
\ps pro.wh -sfx         VTA   -sfx        -sfx   -sfx

\tx akuâukunua
\mr akuâukushi  -ini -u     -a
\gl wash.ashore -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI         -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\tx nenua                Uâpusha,          tshekât
\mr nenua                uâpush -a         tshekât
\gl that                 hare   -obv(s/pl) almost
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) NA     -sfx       p
```

```
\tx nipinua                        shâsh.
\mr nipi -ini -u     -a            shâsh
\gl die  -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)    already
\ps VAI  -sfx -sfx   -sfx          p

\f Who did they see washed up on shore, but Hare, who was already
almost dead.

\ref 068
\tx - Aaa, iteu,                          tshe metuâtsheiâkw              !
\mr   aaa  it  -e              -u         tshe metuâtshe      -iâkw       !
\gl   aah  say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 fut  play.with.s.t. -IMP.21p>3 !
\ps   p    VTA -sfx            -sfx   prv  VAI             -sfx        !

\f "Hey," she said, "Let's play with it!"

\ref 069
\tx Tshîuetâiâtâu       !
\mr tshîuetâi -âtâu     !
\gl take.home -Imp.1p>3 !
\ps VTA       -sfx      !

\f "Let's take him home!"

\ref 070
\tx Ekw  tshâuetâiâht                        tâpue  nenua.
\mr ekw  tshîuetâi -â          -ht            tâpue  nenua
\gl then take.home -(TA)TS.3>4 -(AI)CIN.3p   indeed that
\ps p    VTA       -sfx       -sfx           p      pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\f Then they (Girls) indeed took him home.

\ref 071
\tx - Nûtâ,         iteu,
\mr   ni-   ûtâ     it  -e              -u
\gl   1-    father  say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- NAD.voc VTA -sfx            -sfx

\tx nipeshuânân                        ne          aueshîsh.
\mr ni-   peshu -â          -inân       ne          aueshîsh
\gl 1-    bring -(TA)TS.1>3 -IIN.1p>3   that        animal
\ps prfx- VTA   -sfx        -sfx        pro.dem.an  NA

\f "Father," they said, "we brought home an animal(Meshapush)."

\ref 072
\tx Nika       metuâtshenân.
\mr ni-   ka   metuâtshe      -inân
\gl 1-    fut  play.with.s.t. -(AI)IIN.1p
\ps prfx- prfx VAI            -sfx

\f "We will play with it."
```

\ref 073
```
\tx - Mâuât, nipâikw              anite,
\mr   mâuât  nipâi -ekw           anite
\gl   no     kill  -(TA)Imp.2p>3 there
\ps   neg    VTA   -sfx          dem.adv

\tx itikû                      nenua
\mr it  -ikw            -u     nenua
\gl say -(TA)TS.inv.4>3 -IIN.3 that
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx   pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx ûtâuîa.
\mr u-    ûtâuî  -a
\gl 3-    father -obv(s/pl)
\ps prfx- NAD    -sfx

\f "No, kill it there," their father said to them.
```

\ref 074
```
\tx Meshâpush an   etshe.
\mr Meshâpush an   etshe
\gl Meshapush that it's.probably
\ps NA.name   dem  p.dub

\f "It must be Meshapush."
```

\ref 075
```
\tx - Namaieu  an,        iteu.
\mr   namaieu  an         it  -e              -u
\gl   it's.not that       say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps   p        pro.dem.an VTA -sfx            -sfx

\f "No, it isn't," she (one of the girls) said to him.
```

\ref 076
```
\tx Etatû an         tshipâ       mishishtû        Meshâpush.
\mr etatû an         tshi- pâ     mishishti -u     Meshâpush
\gl more  that       2-    should be.big    -IIN.3 proper.name
\ps p     pro.dem.an prfx- prv    VAI       -sfx   NA

\f "It would be bigger if it were Meshapush."
```

\ref 077
```
\tx Ekw  tâpue  piâshuâht
\mr ekw  tâpue  peshu    -â          -ht
\gl then indeed IC.bring -(TA)TS.3>4 -(AI)CIN.3p
\ps p    p      VTA      -sfx        -sfx

\tx anite,  nete       kâtshishâpissiteshît    pessîsh
\mr anite   nete       kâtshishâpissitesh -ît  pessîsh
\gl there   over.there stove              -Loc close.by
\ps dem.adv dem.adv    NAP                -sfx p
```

```
\tx âneuat.
\mr ân    -e          -u       -at
\gl place -(TA)TS.3>4 -IIN.3>4 -IIN.3p
\ps VTA   -sfx        -sfx     -sfx

\f Then they indeed brought him inside.  There, they put him close to
the stove.

\ref 078
\tx Ekw  piâshut                 ne          Uâpush.
\mr ekw  pâshu     -t            ne          uâpush
\gl then IC.be.dry -(AI/II)CIN.3 that        hare
\ps p    VAI       -sfx          pro.dem.an NA

\f Then Hare dried off.

\ref 079
\tx Tshek ekue
\mr tshek ekue
\gl then  at.that.moment
\ps p     p

\tx nakatâht                              anite   e
\mr nakat        -â          -ht          anite   e
\gl leave.behind -(TA)TS.3>4 -(AI)CIN.3p there   so
\ps VTA          -sfx        -sfx         dem.adv pfx

\tx patshituâht.
\mr patshituâ -ht
\gl check.net -(AI)CIN.3p
\ps VAI       -sfx

\f Then they left him behind there when they checked the net.

\ref 080
\tx Nakateuat                                      anite,  shâsh
\mr nakat        -e               -u     -at      anite   shâsh
\gl leave.behind -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 -IIN.3p there   already
\ps VTA          -sfx             -sfx   -sfx     dem.adv p

\tx âiâtshîshinua.
\mr âtshî    -ini -u     -a
\gl move.dup -obv -IIN.3 -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI      -sfx -sfx   -sfx

\f They left him there.  He was starting to move around.

\ref 081
\tx Ekw  sheshkâuât
\mr ekw  sheshkâu       -ât
\gl then open.with.feet -(TA)CIN.3>4
\ps p    VTA            -sfx
```

```
\tx nenua                utânapîa.
\mr nenua                u-    ânapî -a
\gl that                 3-    net   -obv(s/pl)
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl) prfx- NA    -sfx

\f Then he opened his net with his feet.

\ref 082
\tx « Tshîmâ pâkushut       nitânapî    »,
\mr   tshîmâ pâkushu -t     ni-   ânapî
\gl   wish   be.dry  -CIN.3 1-    net
\ps   p      VAI     -sfx   prfx- NA

\tx itenimeu.
\mr itenim -e              -u
\gl think  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA    -sfx            -sfx

\f "I wish my net would dry out," he was thinking.

\ref 083
\tx Ekw  piâkushunitî             nenua
\mr ekw  pâkushu   -ini -tî       nenua
\gl then IC.be.dry -obv -(AI)CS.3 that
\ps p    VAI       -sfx -sfx      pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)

\tx utânapîa,              ute   shekutîkuâmeshû.
\mr u-    ânapî -a         ute   shekutîkuâmeshi -u
\gl 3-    net   -obv(s/pl) here  be.in.armpit    -IIN.3
\ps prfx- NA    -sfx       p.adv VAI             -sfx

\f Then his net dried out, as it was in his armpit.

\ref 084
\tx Ekue           ishkuteushinitî,           uenuîpâtât.
\mr ekue           ishkuteushi -ini -tî       unuîpâtâ   -t
\gl at.that.moment catch.fire  -obv -(AI)CS.3 IC.run.out -CIN.3
\ps p              VAI.dim     -sfx -sfx      VAI        -sfx

\f The net caught on fire; he ran out.

\ref 085
\tx Tshâuepâtât        an.
\mr tshîuepâtâ  -t     an
\gl IC.run.home -CIN.3 that
\ps VAI         -sfx   pro.dem.an

\f He ran back home.

\ref 086
\tx Tâtakussepanû        uâpamekua,
\mr tâtakussepani -u     uâpamekw    -a
\gl step.on.dup   -IIN.3 white.whale -obv(s/pl)
\ps VAI           -sfx   NA          -sfx
```

```
\tx nenua                  mâ     mâshten
\mr nenua                  mâ     mâshten
\gl that                   intns  last
\ps pro.dem.an.obv(s/pl)   p      p

\tx kâssipiteu.
\mr kâssipit -e              -u
\gl scratch  -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps VTA      -sfx            -sfx

\f He stepped on the white whales and then scratched the last one.

\ref 087
\tx Ekue            kutapanîunitî
\mr ekue            kutapanîu      -ini -tî
\gl at.that.moment  go.underwater  -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps p               VAI            -sfx -sfx

\tx kassinû etashinitî.
\mr kassinû itashi               -ini -tî
\gl all     IC.be.such.a.number  -obv -(AI)CS.3
\ps p       VAI                  -sfx -sfx

\f Then then all went underwater.

\ref 088
\tx - Tshikâssipitikunân                  !  itâkanû.
\mr   tshi- kâssipit -î       -kunân      !  it  -âkani  -u
\gl   2-    scratch  -CS.2>1p -Inv.3>21p  !  say -indf>3 -IIN.3
\ps   prfx- VTA      -sfx     -sfx        !  VTA -sfx    -sfx

\f "You are scratching us!" they said about him.

\ref 089
\tx Eukuekuâ       kuetapanîunitî                  kassinû.
\mr eukuekuâ       kutapanîu        -ini -tî       kassinû
\gl they.are.gone  IC.go.underwater -obv -(AI)CS.3 all
\ps pro.pl         VAI              -sfx -sfx      p

\f All of them went underwater.

\ref 090
\tx Ekue            kâ   pâpatât,
\mr ekue            kâ   pâpatâ  -t
\gl at.that.moment  past run.dup -CIN.3
\ps p               prfx VAI     -sfx

\tx tshîuepâtuât                  nenû
\mr tshîuepâtu        -ât         nenû
\gl run.home.carrying -(TA)CIN.3>4 that
\ps VAI+O             -sfx        pro.dem.in.obv
```

```
\tx utishkutem.
\mr u-    ishkuteu -im
\gl 3-    fire     -poss
\ps prfx- NI       -sfx

\f Then he ran ashore, and ran home with fire.

\ref 091
\tx - Shâsh   nimishken                    ishkuteu !
\mr   shâsh   ni-   mishk -e          -n    ishkuteu !
\gl   already 1-    find  -(TI)TS.1>3 -IIN.1 fire     !
\ps   p       prfx- VTI   -sfx        -sfx  NI       !

\tx iteu                      ûkuma.
\mr it  -e              -u    u-    ûkum        -a
\gl say -(TA)TS.dir.3>4 -IIN.3 3-    grandmother -obv(s/pl)
\ps VTA -sfx            -sfx  prfx- NAD         -sfx

\f "I have already found fire!" he told his grandmother.

\ref 092
\tx Kuetuet             ekw,       peminuet       ekw,
\mr kutue        -t     ekw        piminue -t     ekw
\gl IC.make.fire -CIN.3 then       IC.cook -CIN.3 then
\ps VAI          -sfx   p          VAI     -sfx   p

\tx mimimîtshishu, mâtshishut       ekw.
\mr mimimîtshishu  mîtshishu -t     ekw
\gl eat.dup        IC.eat    -CIN.3 then
\ps VAI            VAI       -sfx   p

\f Then he made a fire, and then cooked. He ate and ate and ate, and
then ate (some more).

\ref 093
\tx Kâtshî mîtshishut       tâpue  ekuan, shâsh
\mr kâtshî mîtshishu -t     tâpue  ekuan  shâsh
\gl after  eat       -CIN.3 indeed enough already
\ps prv    VAI       -sfx   p      p      p

\tx tânite  utishkutemû        an.
\mr tânite  utishkutemi -u     an
\gl because have.fire   -IIN.3 that
\ps p.intrg VAI         -sfx   pro.dem.an

\f After he had indeed eaten enough, that was it, (already) he had fire
now.

\ref 094
\tx Eukuan    uet         takuâk            ne
\mr eukuan    ût          takuan -âk        ne
\gl that'sit  IC.because  exist  -(II)CIN.3 that
\ps dem       p           VII    -sfx       pro.dem.in
```

```
\tx ishkuteu inânû,                  ne         kassinû ishkuteu.
\mr ishkuteu i   -nâni       -u      ne         kassinû ishkuteu
\gl fire     say -(AI)Indef. -IIN.3 that       all     fire
\ps NI       VAI -sfx        -sfx    pro.dem.in p       NI

\f That is why there is fire, it is said, all the fire.

\ref 095
\tx Uâpush nenû           tûtamw.
\mr uâpush nenû           tût       -am         -u
\gl hare   that           make.s.t. -(TI)TS.3>4 -IIN.3
\ps NA     pro.dem.in.obv VTI       -sfx        -sfx

\f Hare did it.

\ref 096
\tx Apû ût      takuâk            ute
\mr apû ût      takuan -âk        ute
\gl not because exist  -(II)CIN.3 here
\ps neg p       VII    -sfx       p.adv

\tx tshînânû ishkuteu ueshkat, mukw       nete
\mr tshînânû ishkuteu ueshkat  mukw       nete
\gl we       fire     formerly only       over.there
\ps pro      NI       p        p          dem.adv

\tx kâtâkw takuânîpan.
\mr kâtâkw takuan -pan
\gl far    exist  -IIP.3
\ps p      VII    -sfx

\f We never had fire here long ago; only over there far away did it
exist.
```

APPENDIX C:
Tables 9, 18, and 19

Table 9: Obviative Status of *Umâtshashkuk"*

Umâtshashkuk" 'Frog'						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comments**
6	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
8	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
12	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
14	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
15	O		I	Vobj	carried	nonAG
15	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**kills**	**AG**
16	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**takes, kills**	**AG ×2**
18	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
20	**P, P**	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj ×2**	**sleeps, pretends to sleep**	**AG ×2**
22	O	**OS**	E	POSSD4	ushîma	AV
23	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
24	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
25	O		I	Vsbj-O	eats	AV
35	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
37	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
40	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
41	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
44	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
45	O, O		E	POSSD4, Vobj	ushîma, put down	AV, nonAG
48	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
49	O		E	itikû-sbj (PN)	speaks (Umât.)	AV
50	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
51	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
52	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**removes poles**	**AG**
54	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
57	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
58	O		I	Vsbj	trying to catch	AV
59	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
61	O, O		I	Vsbj ×2	sitting, takes sticks	AV, AG
62	O, O		I	Vobj ×2	hit, thrown	nonAG

*Umâtshashkuk*ʷ 'Frog' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comments**
64	O, O		E	POSSD4, Vobj	missed, killed	nonAG
65	*O*		I	Vobj	killed	nonAG
66	O		I	Vsbj-O	goes underwater	AG
67	**P, P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj ×2 (PN)**	**rejoins, kills, (Umât.)**	**AG ×2**
68	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**makes a toboggan**	**AG**
69	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**loads a toboggan**	**AG**
70	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj, iteu-sbj**	**brings, speaks**	**AG, nonAV**
72	O	**OS**	I	Vobj	grabbed	nonAG
73	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG**
75	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
77	O		E	POSSD4	ushîma	AV
79	O, O		E	iteu-obj, POSSD4	spoken to, ushîma	AV
80	O		E	Vsbj-O, POSSD4	pretends to sleep, ushîma	AV
82	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
83	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
85	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
87	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
89	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj (PN)**	**sings (Umât.)**	**song, climax**
91	*O*	**OS**	E	POSSD4	our brother	
95	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
96	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**eats**	**AG**
99	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
101	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**eats**	**AG**
102	***P***		***E***	***iteu-sbj (PN)***	***speaks (Umât.)***	***nonAV***
103	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**eats**	**AG**
104	O	**OS**	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
111	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
113	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
114	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
115	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
119	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
120	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
121	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV

Umâtshashkuk^{u} 'Frog' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comments**
122	O		E	Vobj POSSD4	carried, ushîma	nonAG
123	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
124	**P, P, P**	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj ×3 (PN)**	**follows, reaches, kills (Umât.)**	**AG!**
125	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**kills, cuts off head**	**AG!**
126	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**puts down**	**AG**
132	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**puts down**	**AG**
134	O	**OS**	I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
135	O		I	Vobj	rejoined	nonAG
136	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**puts down**	**AG**
137	O	**OS**	I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV
143	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	AV
145	O, O		E	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV

Table 10: Obviative Status of *Uâpush*

Uâpush 'Hare'						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
1	**P**		**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**runs**	**AG**
2	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**sees**	**AG**
3	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**sees**	**AG**
4	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**runs**	**AG**
5	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**hits, does**	**AG**
6	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
7	**P**		**I**	**ituekâtueu-sbj**	**repeats**	
8	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
12	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
14	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
15	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**carries**	**AG**
17	**P**		**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**burns quills**	**AG**
18	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
21	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**cooks, eats**	**AG**
22	**P**		**E**	**POSSR3**	**ushîma**	**AV**
23	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**

Uâpush 'Hare' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
24	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
25	**P, P**		**E**	**(PN)**	**eats, uîn**	**AG, emphasis**
27	**P, P**		**E**	**(PN) Vsbj, Vsbj**	**meets, leaves**	**AG**
28	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs**	**AG**
31	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs**	**AG**
32	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**runs**	**AG**
33	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**hits, does**	**AG**
34	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**waits, fears**	**AG**
35	***P*, P**		**E, I**	**POSSR3, itikû-obj**	***nishtesh* spoken to**	**AV**
36	**P**		**I**	**ituekâtueu-sbj**	**repeats**	
37	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
40	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
41	***P*, P**		**E, I**	**POSSR3, itikû-obj**	**nishtesh, spoken to**	
44	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
45	**P, P**		**E, I**	**POSSR3, Vsbj**	**ushîma, carries**	**AV, AG**
48	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
49	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
50	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
51	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
54	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
57	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
59	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
61	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**sees**	**AG**
62	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**hits, throws**	**AG**
63	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**goes home**	**AG**
64	**P, P**		**I, I**	**POSSR3, Vsbj**	**ushîma, kills**	**AV, AG**
65	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**thinks**	**AG**
70	O, *P*	OS, PS	I, E	iteu-obj POSSD3	spoken to, nishtesh	
73	O	OS	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	nonAV
75	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
77	**P, P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj, POSSR3×2**	**brings, ushîma, utamishkuminua**	**AG**
78	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**cooks**	**AG**

Uâpush 'Hare' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
79	**P, P**		**I, E**	**iteu-sbj, POSSR3**	**speaks, ushîma**	
80	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj, POSSR3**	**pretends to sleep, ushîma**	**AG AV**
81	**P, P, P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×4**	**cooks, eats, eats…**	**AG**
82	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
83	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
85	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
87	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaking**	
89	*O, O*	OS	E, E	POSSD4, (PNobv)	sung to, Uâpusha	AV, song, climax, nonAG
89	***P***	**PS**	**E**	**PN Vsbj**	**not wanting**	**AG**
90	O	OS	I	Vobj	flown at	nonAG
91	***P***	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**not giving**	**AG**
92	*O*		I	Vobj	flown at	nonAG
93	O		I	Vobj	flown at	nonAG
94	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**moves back**	**AG**
95	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**FN**
97	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**says**	**FN**
98	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**doesn't rejoin, fears**	**AG**
99	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
100	**P**		**I**	**Vobj-Inv, Vsbj**	**watched, runs**	**AV, AG**
102	O		I	iteu-obj	spoken to	
104	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
106	**P**		**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**meets**	**AG**
106	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs**	**AG**
107	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**sees**	**AG**
108	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs**	**AG**
109	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs**	**AG**
110	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**does, runs**	**AG**
111	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
113	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
114	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
115	***P***		**E**	**POSSD3**	**nishtesh**	**AV, VOC**
115	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**

Uâpush 'Hare' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
119	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
120	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
121	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
122	**P, P**		**I, E**	**Vsbj, POSSR3**	**carries, ushîma**	**AG, AV**
123	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
126	O	OS	E	POSSD4	ushtesha	
127	**P**		**E**	**PN, Vsbj**	**Uâpush, comes out of woods**	**AG**
128	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**sees**	**AG**
130	**P, P, P**		**I, I, I**	**Vsbj**	**returns**	**AG**
134	***P*, P**		**E, I**	**POSSD3, itikû-obj**	**nishtesh, spoken to**	**AV, AV**
135	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**rejoins**	**AG**
136	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**is hungry**	
137	**P, P**		**E, I**	**POSSD3, itikû-obj**	**nishtesh, spoken to**	**AV, vocative**
138	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**eats**	**AG**
139	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**finishes**	**AG**
140	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**returns home**	**AG**
141	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**arrives, gets sick**	**AG, AG**
142	**P**		**E**	**(PN) Vsbj**	**Uâpush, is sick**	**AG**
143	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	
145	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV**
147	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**vomits**	**AG**
148	**P**		**I, E**	**Vsbj, POSSR3**	**vomits, his beaver**	**AG, AV**
149	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**has ice**	**AG**
150	**P, P**		**E**	**Vsbj ×2**	**vomits, eats less**	**AG**

Table 19: Obviative Status of *Meshâpush*

Meshâpush 'Great Rabbit'						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
2	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**walks, sees**	**AG**
3	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**does, kills (neg)**	
4	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**spears, kills (neg)**	
5	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**returns home**	**AG**
6	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**FN**
7	***P*, P**		**E**	**POSSD3, itikû-obj**	**nussim, spoken to**	**AV, FN**
10	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**FN**
11	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV, FN**
13	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**rejoins**	**AG**
21	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**sees**	**AG**
22	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**comes out (of log)**	**AG**
23	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
24	O, O	OS	I	Vobj ×2	hit, struck (neg)	nonAG
25	*O*		*I*	*Vsbj-O*	*runs away*	*AG*
26	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs home**	**AG**
27	**P, P**		**E**	**iteu-sbj, POSSR3**	**speaks, ûkuma**	**FN, AG**
29	**P, P**		**E**	**Vsbj ×2, PN**	**makes web, net, Uâpush**	**AG ×2**
30	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**makes net, kills**	**AG ×2**
31	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**kills (fish)**	**AG**
32	O	OS	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN, no knife
35	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
36	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs away**	**AG**
37	**P, P**		**I, I**	**Vsbj, iteu-sbj**	**sees, speaks**	**AG ×2**
39	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs home**	**AG**
40	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**cleans fish (neg)**	
41	O	OS	E	iteu-obj, POSSD4	spoken to, *ûssima*	metal bad, FN
43	O		I	itât-obj	spoken to	metal bad, FN
44	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	AV, FN
45	**P, P**	**PS**	**E**	**Vsbj ×2, PN**	**runs off, rejoins**	**AG ×2**
46	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
47	**P**		**I**	**itikû-obj**	**spoken to**	**AV, FN**
48	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speeaks**	**AG, FN**

Meshâpush 'Great Rabbit' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
49	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**runs home, returns**	**AG ×2**
50	**P ×5**		**I**	**Vsbj ×5**	**rejoins, throws, knocks, grabs, runs home**	**AG ×5!!**
52	**P**		**E**	**POSSR3**	**'his knife'**	**knife good**
53	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**makes knife, cleans fish**	**AG ×2**
54	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**cleans fish, cooks (neg)**	**AG**
55	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
56	**P ×4**		**I**	**Vsbj ×4**	**takes net, goes, sings, says**	**AG ×4 song**
59	O	OS	I	iteu-obj	spoken to	FN
60	O		I	itikû-sbj	speaks	FN
61	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs (over whales)**	**AG**
62	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**scratches, steps on**	**AG**
63	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**scratches (whales)**	**AG**
64	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**gets off (whales)**	**AG**
65	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**washes ashore**	
67	O, O	OS	E	Vobj PN-O, Vsbj-O	seen, is almost dead	nonAG ×2
69	***P***	**PS**	**I**	**Vobj-P**	**'let's take him'**	
70	O	OS	E	Vobj, DEM-O	taken, *nenua*	nonAG
71	***P***	**PS**	**E**	**PN**	**animal**	**lone 3p**
74	***P***		**E**	**PN**	***Meshâpush***	**naming**
76	***P***		**E**	**PN**	***Meshâpush***	**naming**
77	O	OS	I	Vobj	brought, placed	nonAG
78	**P**	**PS**	**E**	**PN, Vsbj**	***uâpush*, dries**	
79	O	OS	I	Vobj	left	nonAG
80	O, O		I	Vobj, Vsbj	left, moves	nonAG
81	**P**	**PS**	**I**	**Vsbj**	**lights net on fire**	**AG**
82	**P**		**I**	**itenimeu-sbj**	**thinks**	**AG**
84	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs out**	**AG**
85	**P**		**I**	**Vsbj**	**runs home**	**AG**

Meshâpush 'Great Rabbit' (Continued)						
Line #	**Prox/ Obv**	**Pattern**	**E/I**	**Syntactic Role**	**Semantic Role**	**Comment**
86	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**steps on, scratches**	**AG ×2**
90	**P, P**		**I**	**Vsbj ×2**	**runs, runs home**	**AG**
91	**P**		**I**	**iteu-sbj**	**speaks**	**AG, FN**
92	**P ×4**		**I**	**Vsbj ×4**	**makes fire, cooks, eats, eats**	**AG ×4!**
93	**P, P**		**E**	**Vsbj ×2, DEM**	**eats, has fire, *ne***	**AG**
95	**P**		**E**	**PN Vsbj**	**makes fire, *Uâpush***	**AG! lesson**