

COUNTING CHEYENNE CONJUNCT MODES

Wayne Leman

University of Oregon and SIL

Building on the work of his predecessors, Leonard Bloomfield helped solidify a descriptive framework and vocabulary for the understanding of Algonquian languages. Bloomfield's "Algonquian" (1946), known as "the Sketch", continues to be used as a synopsis of the major morphosyntactic phenomena of the language family.

Cheyenne, a geographically western member of the Algonquian family, is easily described within the Bloomfieldian categories. Once one understands important phonological innovations which initially make Cheyenne appear somewhat divergent from the more commonly studied "central" languages, the basic outlines of Cheyenne morphosyntax look very much like those of other Algonquian languages.

Using Bloomfield's vocabulary, there are, for instance, three verbal orders within Cheyenne: Independent, Conjunct, and Imperative. The orders are structurally distinguished by having distinct morphological paradigms. And they have different functions. On the whole verbs of the Independent order appear as independent clauses. Verbs of the Conjunct order appear as dependent clauses (with a few exceptions). And verbs of the Imperative order appear as commands.

1. INDEPENDENT MODES. Within orders there is subcategorization by modes. Analysis of verbs of the Independent order yields five mode categories. The categories are clearly distinguished suffixally. Semantically, the modes encode distinct evidential and modal information. The five Independent modes are salient to Cheyenne speakers who manipulate them for rhetorical effect.

The five Independent modes, illustrated with the verb stem /-némené/ 'sing', are:

- (1) Indicative (Eyewitness)
é-néméne /é-némené/ 'he sang'¹
3-sing
- (2) Yes/No Interrogative
é-némené-he /é-némené-he/ 'Did he sing?'
3-sing-INTERR

- (3) Dubitative (Inferential)
 mó-néméné-hé-he /mó=némene-hé-hé/ 'he must have sung'
 DUB=sing-NEG-NONAFFIRM
- (4) Attributive (Hearsay)
 é-néméné-séstse /é-néméné-seht/ 'he is said to have
 3-sing-ATTRIB sung'
- (5) Preterit ("Mediate"/Emphatic/Surprisa!l)
 é-néméné-hoo'o /é-néméné-hoon/ 'he sang!'
 3-sing-PRET

David Pentland (1984:14) first noticed the morphological relationship of what has been called the "Mediate" mode of Cheyenne (Petter 1952, Leman 1980) to the Preterit mode of other Algonquian languages. The Attributive and Preterit modes commonly occur in Cheyenne legends and folktales.

2.1. CONJUNCT MODES. While recognition of the five modes of the Independent order is clearcut, it is not nearly so easy to determine the number of Conjunct modes in Cheyenne. In Leman (1980:24) I suggested a list of nine. In Leman (1987b:433) the number was increased to ten. Following the methodology which I have used earlier, we can, in fact, probably increase the number to twelve or thirteen. But are there actually that many distinct Conjunct modes in Cheyenne? Can such a relatively large list actually be reduced to a smaller one, using reliable structural and/or functional criteria? This is the issue at hand.

2.2.1. CONJUNCT SUFFIX SETS. Independent order verbs mark person by prefixation. There is interaction with suffixes for number and local/direct/inverse distinctions, e.g.

- (6) ná-mane 'I drank'
 né-mane 'You (sg.) drank'
 é-mane 'He drank'
 ná-mané-me 'We (excl.) drank'
 né-vóom-átse 'I saw you (sg.)'
 né-vóom-e 'You (sg.) saw me'
 né-vóom-ǎǎ'e 'They saw you'

Conjunct verbs, on the other hand, mark all person information through suffixation, different suffix sets from those found in the Independent order.

Four structurally distinct suffix sets are found in the Conjunct. All person combinations appear in each set, as they do in the Independent, except that the exclusive vs. inclusive

distinction of the first person Independent is neutralized in the Conjunct. We label the four sets Participle, Indicative, Subjunctive, and Iterative, with rationale for the labeling to be seen in the remainder of this paper.

The Participle, Indicative, and Subjunctive suffix sets are distinct from each other only in the third person. Even in the third person, the paradigms are maximally distinct only in third person plural and the obviative. The Iterative takes person endings (of the Indicative) plus Iterative suffix /-et/:

Participle:	/-ht/ '3SG',	/-se/ '3PL',	/-te-se/ '3''
Indicative:	/-s/ '3SG',	/-vós/ '3PL',	/-te-s/ '3''
Subjunctive:	/-ht/ '3SG',	/-vóht/ '3PL',	/-te-ht/ '3''
Iterative:	/-s-et/ '3SG',	/-vóht/ '3PL',	/-te-s-et/ '3''

2.2.2. PARTICIPLE. The Participle encodes "relative clauses", both with and without an NP head. In (7) the Participle is glossed as '___ who sing(s)', as for third person singular, tsénéménéstse 'he who sings, he who sang, the singer'. The symbol 3' indicates obviative, the "other" third person, common in Algonquian grammar, sometimes called a fourth person.

(7)	1	tsénéménéto	/té-néméné-tó/
	2	tsénéménèto	/té-néméné-to/
	1PL	tsénéménétse	/té-néméné-té/
	2PL	tsénéménése	/té-néméné-sé/
	3	tsénéménéstse	/té-néméné-ht/
	3PL	tsénéménèse	/té-néméné-se/
	3'	tsénéménéstse	/té-néméné-te-se/

The final suffix indicated phonemically is the synchronic Cheyenne marker of person. /-te/ is the conjunct marker of obviation. An alternate suffix for the third person plural Participle is /-so/. I have heard this from at least one male elder.

2.2.3. INDICATIVE. Like the Participle, Conjunct Indicatives begin with the prefix tsé-. This prefix must then be followed by one or more preverbs. In the absence of any another preverb, the morpheme /h-/ must be present. This morpheme encodes past tense in Independent order verbs. In the conjunct it likewise encodes past tense but it has also been extended to encode Location, Reason, and some other non-nuclear² semantic roles. Hence, in the appropriate discourse context, the first verb of the following Indicative paradigm may be translated as 'when I sang' or 'where I sang' or, less frequently, even as 'because I sang':

(8)	1	tséhnémenéto	/té-h-némené-tó/
	2	tséhnémenèto	/té-h-némené-to/
	1PL	tséhnémenétse	/té-h-némené-té/
	2PL	tséhnémenése	/té-h-némené-sé/
	3	tséhnémenése	/té-h-némené-s/
	3PL	tséhnémenévóse	/té-h-némené-vós/
	3'	tséhnémenètsése	/té-h-némené-te-s/

Some verbs taking the Indicative suffixes, but with other preverbs are: Causal tsé-h-vé'-némenévóse 'because they sang', Reason tsé-x-hése-némenése 'the reason why he sang', and Complement tsé-heše-némenése 'that you (pl.) sang'.

We mentioned, at the beginning of this section, that verbs of the Indicative set take the tsé- prefix. Actually, there is also a small set of pronoun-like conjunct verbs which I label as Constitutive, which take the Indicative suffix set, but which do not take the tsé- prefix. Examples are néh-néšé-vóse 'the two of them, both of them' and nés-tóxé-tse 'all of us', both of which take a /néh-/ prefix. I label these forms Constitutive because they have a meaning having to do with encompassing or constituting the entirety of a quantity. Constitutive "pronouns" seem related to another set of Conjunct "pronouns" which do take the prefix tsé- and which typically function emphatically, e.g. tsé-h-nééhóvé-tse 'ourselves, by ourselves'. Neither set of Conjunct "pronouns" is well understood. Further discussion is not germane to the focus of this paper.

2.2.4. SUBJUNCTIVE. We illustrate the Subjunctive paradigm set with the Irrealis prefix /mah-/, which in some sense is the unmarked member of the set of eight prefixes which take Subjunctive suffixes. /mah-/ encodes yet to be realized actions or qualities and, particularly with the addition of the preverb /vé'-/, conditionality:

(9)	1	máhnémenéto	/mah-némené-tó/
	2	máhnémenèto	/mah-némené-to/
	1PL	máhnémenétse	/mah-némené-té/
	2PL	máhnémenése	/mah-némené-sé/
	3	máhnémenéstse	/mah-némené-ht/
	3PL	máhnémenévóhtse	/mah-némené-vóht/
	3'	máhnémenètséstse	/mah-némené-te-ht/

The 3PL verb, as an example, would be glossed as 'when they sing', referring to action which has not yet occurred. With the conditional preverb, we obtain máhvé'némenévóhtse 'if they sing'.

Examples of forms taking the Subjunctive suffixes but with other prefixes are:

- (10) Subjunctive Iterative
 hó'-némenévóhtse 'when(ever) they sing/sang, if they sing'
- (11) Infinitive
 é-me'-heše-némené-vóhtse 'how they should sing'
 PFX-should-REL-sing-3PL
- (12) Optative
 momóxe-némenévóhtse '(I wish) they would sing'
- (13) Polar Interrogative (Polar = Yes/No)
 éó-némenévóhtse '(I wonder) whether they sang'
- (14) Identity Interrogative
 he'-tónéšévóhtse 'whatever they were doing'
- (15) Contraindicative
 máa'séó=némenévóhtse 'I thought they had sung (but they hadn't)'
- (16) Dubitative
 mó=x-ho'nó-némené-vóhtse 'they must not have sung'
 DUB-PST-NEG-sing-3PL

It is easily seen that the prefixes carry a critical semantic role in determining how the various Conjunct forms function. Several, perhaps most, of the prefixes derive from erstwhile particles, preverbs, or even verb roots, but most have grammaticalized to become true morphological prefixes in presentday Cheyenne. We note, for instance, that the Optative prefix (12) is historically related to the verb root *momóhtsem-* 'to beseech someone'. In an unpublished paper (Leman 1987a) I have suggested that the prefix *hó'-* may derive from the relative preverb *ho'-* 'to such an extent, arrive'. The Contraindicative "prefix" probably can still function phonologically as a separate word, a particle (thus written in Leman 1980:111). It typically cliticizes to the Conjunct verb it governs, the junction indicated in (15) by clitic "=", rather than morpheme (prefix) boundary "-".

There have been some labeling changes as I have studied the Conjunct categories. (10) was previously (Leman 1980, 1987:433) simply labeled Iterative. (13, 14) have slightly modified labels.

The Conjunct Dubitative is aberrant in terms of synchronic categorization. It is morphosyntactically a Conjunct verb, but it functions as an Independent verb. It is simply the negative counterpart of the Independent Dubitative. The Conjunct

Dubitative reflects historical governance of the conjunct by a negative particle. This Conjunct paradigm, for many presentday speakers, has been reanalyzed to include the Independent Dubitative clitic /mó=/. Many other speakers, however, do not include the Dubitative /mó=/.

2.2.5.1. ITERATIVE. The true Iterative paradigm takes a verb-final /-et/:

(17)	1	òhnémenétonòtse	/oh-némené-tón-ot/
	2	òhnémenétoséstse	/oh-némené-tos-et/
	1PL	òhnémenétsee'éstse	/oh-némené-té-et/
	2PL	òhnémenésee'éstse	/oh-némené-sé-et/
	3	òhnémenèséstse	/oh-némené-s-et/
	3PL	òhnémenévoséstse	/oh-némené-vós-et/
	3'	òhnémenétseéstse	/oh-némené-te-s-et/

The prefix plus suffixes together give the idea of 'whenever such and such occurs/occurred'. So, the first person plural verb of (17) would be glossed as 'whenever we sing' or 'whenever we sang'. The prefix /oh-/ is sometimes omitted, especially in rapid speech. The Iterative can refer to events which have not yet occurred, but which are the normal set of circumstances. Once I was told (Leman 1980:204):

(18)	hátšéškeho	éohkéhéne'	enánóvo	to'séhoo'	kóhoo'	éštse.
	ants	know		going.to-rain-ITER		

éohkéésevonéhneo'o hátšékeoméé'e
they.crawl.into ant-lodge

'Ants know when it's going to rain. They crawl into their homes.'

The third word of (18) is an Inanimate Intransitive (II) Conjunct Iterative. Note that the speaker omitted the /oh-/ prefix.

The verb-final /-et/ Iterative morpheme is suffixed after Conjunct person markers. (There is a morphophonemic change to /-ot/ for first person singular.) Synchronically, the person markers appear to be those of the Indicative suffix set. There is a minor historical complication involving loss of personal suffix-final /-n/ and /-s/ for first and second singular, respectively. Because of this apparent structural relationship, it may be possible to say that the Iterative paradigm is actually a subset of the Indicative paradigm. Semantically, there are important differences, but structurally this relationship may allow us to say there are actually only three major suffix sets.

I have found it difficult to characterize the difference in meaning between forms using the Subjunctive Iterative prefix (hó'-, above) and the true Iteratives. Even though forms with hó'- can sometimes be translated as 'when(ever)', I assume, at this point, that there is typically a greater degree of conditionality encoded by the Subjunctive. This is borne out by its use within a text "The Whiteman and the Coyote" (Leman 1987b:320) where the whiteman says of the coyote:

- (19) Hó'taoŕmo naa mato hó'táháemo náme'taonáháxéstsenáŕho
'If I hit him or if I startle him I might cause him to
be bloodshot'

The translation with conditional 'if' was supplied by a Cheyenne speaker. With the addition of the preverb něše- to the Subjunctive Iterative prefix, we obtain a Concessive, which is semantically related to conditionality, e.g.

- (20) Hó'-něšé-háo'omenéhéto hétséhéto ho'žva
'Even though I am poor here on earth,

náváhtomenéméne
I still sing'

(20) is taken from a popular Cheyenne church song (Tse-se-Ma'heone-Nemeotótse 1982:141). Cheyenne Concessives are translated by English 'even though' and sometimes by 'even if'.

2.2.5.2. PROPER NAME PARTICIPLES. We should note that some proper name participles are formed by using the /oh-/ prefix and Participle suffix, e.g.

- (21) óht-amevonžhné-stse 'Crawler'
PFX-crawl-3 (lit. the one who crawls)

Prefix-final /t/ of óht- is intrusive, inserted before a vowel. Note that proper name participles do not use the /-et/ Iterative suffix, but, rather, suffixes of the Participle set.

2.2.5.3. CONTRA-OBLIGATIVE. Another Conjunct form, labeled here as Contra-obligative (but Obligative in Leman 1980:110, 1987:433), also uses the /-et/ final suffix:

- (22) á-h-némené-vos-éstse 'they should have sung'
PFX-PST-sing-3PL-ITER

A complete Contra-obligative paradigm would look like the true Iterative paradigm (17), except for prefixes. The Contra-obligative occurs rarely today. I have only heard it in

direct elicitation; I cannot recall seeing it in any texts. It seems difficult for speakers to process the Contra-obligative which suggests that it is being lost. Although it is morphosyntactically of the Conjunct order, like the Conjunct Dubitative, it may function as if it were of the Independent order. Petter (1952:103) mentions the \underline{a} - prefix, shows the sharing of Iterative suffixation, and gives glosses with 'ought to'. There is no further labeling or explanation.

3. SEMANTIC UNITIES. We have shown that there are four structural suffix sets in Conjunct paradigms. One, the Iterative, may be a subset of the Indicative, reducing the number of sets to three. To return to our original question, are there, then, three or four Conjunct modes? Unlike with the analysis of the number of Independent order modes, the answer to this question is not clearcut. But we can attempt an answer based on what we have seen in the data.

First, as noted, we can structurally categorize Conjunct verbs according to the three or four suffix sets which they use. Cheyenne speakers are sensitive to "errors" made in selecting a suffix from the wrong suffix set.

Second, although semantic unities are often more elusive to categorical observations than structural ones, we can still note semantic relationships within the three or four posited Conjunct sets.

Conjunct Indicative forms refer to verbal actions and states which have "reference", that is, have already occurred or are believed will occur. Hence, there is a semantic unity to the kinds of semantic propositions encoded by Conjunct Indicatives, e.g. Locatives (telling where a specific action occurred), Temporal (when an action occurred), Causal (telling why some action occurred or is believed to occur), and Complement ('that' some action occurred).

There is semantic variety among the forms taking the different prefixes of the Subjunctive suffix set verb. But a semantic unity can be found among all the members of the Subjunctive set which contrasts with the Indicative nature of the preceding set. The Irrealis refers to an action or state which has not occurred, and which may not occur. There is a strong conditional flavor to the Irrealis. The Infinitive, an as yet ill understood construction, refers not to actions which are presumed to have occurred, but to those which somehow 'should' occur. The realis element of the Indicative Complement is apparently missing from the Subjunctive Infinitive which is another kind of complement. The Optative obviously has a Subjunctive, non-realis flavor, as does the Polar Interrogative

which indicates 'yes/no' uncertainty about some (syntactically embedded) proposition. The Identity Interrogative indicates a kind of uncertainty about the identity of an action or individuals. The Contraindicative encodes a proposition which had been presumed true incorrectly, a clear retreat from a realis state.

As noted earlier, I cannot explain why the Contra-obligative takes the Iterative suffix.

We have properly been trying to see if there are legitimate semantic unities among forms taking the different suffix sets. We can note, in passing, that there may even be a semantic unity among forms which take the same prefix but different suffix. The foremost example is tsé-, prefix for most participles and for Conjunct Indicatives. I suggest that this prefix may encode referentiality, that is the tsé- Participles refer to nominal entities which are believed to exist or which are spoken of as if they do, as when one might say, vo'éstane tsénéménéstse 'a person who sings'. In contrast, there is no presumption of referentiality with Cheyenne nouns. Both nouns and participles may be definitized through use of adjectival demonstratives. While Participles reference nominal entities, Conjunct Indicatives reference events or states which are presumed to have occurred, be true, or are otherwise in a realis state.

4. DIACHRONIC SUPPORT. Is there historical support for reducing the number of different Conjunct modes in Cheyenne from twelve or so to a much smaller number, say, four or three? I believe there is.

Hockett (1950:279) posits six Conjunct modes for Fox which, he says, "shows the largest number of modes of parallel formation" (of the Central Algonquian languages).

Indicative	pya:či	'that he comes'	-i	Indic.
Subjunctive	pya:te	'if he comes'	-e	Subj.
Injunctive	pya:če	'let him come'	-ye	Inj.
Iterative	pya:čini	'whenever he comes'	-ini	Iter.
Unreal	pya:tehe	'if he had come'	-ehe	Unreal
Participle	pya:ta	'one who comes'	-a	Part.

The personal ending for the third person is /-t/, which mutates (an Algonquian process of patalization) to č preceding a high front vowel or semivowel. The first person personal ending is /-yain/, as seen in the following (Hockett 1950:279):

Indicative	pya:ya:ni	'that I come'
Subjunctive	pya:ya:ne	'if I come'
Injunctive	-----	
Iterative	pya:ya:nini	'whenever I come'
Unreal	pya:ya:nehe	'if I had come'
Participle	pya:ya:ni	'I who come'

The mode suffixes, seen to the right of the third person paradigm, are used in each person in Fox, with the exception that the first and second person Participles use the same ending as the Indicative.

In Cheyenne, there has been widespread loss of verb-final vowels through apocope. So it should not be surprising, as is the case, that most Algonquian mode vowels are lost in Cheyenne. The effect of those word-final vowels, however, is still retained in phonological alternations which differentiate the Conjunct suffix sets. (Again, as noted at the beginning, the distinctions are maximally clear only in the third person.)

In Cheyenne third person Conjunct forms there is an ht/s alternation. This is the expected alternation by regular sound law of the Algonquian (specifically, here, Fox) mutation alternation between t and č. So, while Cheyenne has lost Algonquian Conjunct mode vowels, it still retains mode distinctions by alternations in personal suffixes.

Let us suggest that Cheyenne has four modes in the Conjunct, reflected structurally in the third person (maximally in third person plural and obviative) and through semantic unities. We can then compare the Fox and Cheyenne Conjunct mode inventories according to third person singular endings:

	Fox	Cheyenne	
Indicative	č	s	
Subjunctive	t	ht	
Injunctive	č	---	
Iterative	č-ini	s-et	(third person + Iterative)
Unreal	t	ht	(Cheyenne Polar Interrog.?)
Participle	t	ht	

Whereas in Fox the mode vowels which conditioned mutation were retained, they have been lost by apocope in the Cheyenne third person singular, except in the Iterative, where its loss was blocked because the conditioning Algonquian vowel is penultimate, rather than ultimate.

The Cheyenne Iterative suffix /-et/ is cognate with Fox Iterative /-ini/ by regular sound law. In the first person, Cheyenne /-t6/ is cognate with Fox /-ya:n/. I suggest that the

Cheyenne cognate of the Fox suffix-final /n/ of the first person is retained in the Cheyenne Iterative, òhnéménétò-n-òtse 'whenever I sang' (the appropriate Cheyenne /n/ is blocked off by hyphens).

The Cheyenne Polar Interrogative may correspond to the Fox Unreal mode. I suggest that this Cheyenne category is today a submode of the Cheyenne Subjunctive. The status of submode is, I suggest, held by all other Cheyenne categories which are subsumed under the four main modes, Participle, Indicative, Subjunctive, and Iterative. Just because the Polar Interrogative or other category is classified as a submode does not make it less important semantically within Cheyenne. In fact, the difficulty of classifying the mode categories of the Cheyenne Conjunct suggests that the semantics of the Conjunct prefixes are probably at least as important to Cheyenne speakers, if not more so, than are the less phonologically salient varying suffix sets.

5. How many Conjunct modes, then, are there in Cheyenne? There are, I suggest four, but because the Iterative seems structurally related to the Indicative there may only be three. We have suggested semantic support for our reduced mode number analysis. It is quite possible that our reduced number of Conjunct modes is not nearly as salient to Cheyenne speakers as is the firm number of five mode categories of the Independent order. If it is even possible to measure such salience, it must await further study.

NOTES

¹Diacritics used are: ˈ = high, ˜ = mid, ˘ = lowered high, and ˆ = voiceless. A hyphen indicates a morpheme boundary, while the equals sign indicates cliticization. The apostrophe represents glottal stop. See Leman and Rhodes (1978) for discussion of Cheyenne devoicing and other important phonological processes. See Leman (1981) for discussion of the rules which adjust Cheyenne pitches.

²I here use the term non-nuclear for clausal roles other than Subject (typically semantic Agent) or Object (including Patient and Recipient). Location, Goal, Source, Time, Instrument, Reason, etc. are non-nuclear.

REFERENCES:

- BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. 1946. Algonquian. Linguistic Structures of Native America, 85-129. New York: Viking Fund Publications

- in *Anthropology*, no. 6.
- HOCKETT, CHARLES F. 1950. The conjunct modes in Ojibwa and Potawatomi. *Language* 26:278-282.
- LEMAN, WAYNE. 1980. A reference grammar of the Cheyenne language. Vols. 1 and 2. Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Linguistics Series, no. 5. Greeley: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.
- . 1981. Cheyenne pitch rules. *IJAL* 47:283-309.
- . 1987a. Grammaticalization of Cheyenne directionals. Ms.
- (ed.). 1987b. náéváhóó'óhtséme/We are going back home: Cheyenne history and stories told by James Shoulderblade and others. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, Memoir No. 4.
- , and Richard Rhodes. 1978. Cheyenne vowel devoicing. *Papers of the Ninth Algonquian Conference*, ed. by William Cowan, 3-24. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- PENTLAND, DAVID. 1984. New modes in Old Ojibwa. *Algonquian and Iroquoian newsletter* 9:11-17.
- PETTER, RODOLPHE. 1952. Cheyenne grammar. Newton, Kansas: Mennonite Publication Office.
- Tsese-Ma'heone-Nemeotótse (Cheyenne spiritual songs). 1982. Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press.
- WOLFART, H. CHRISTOPH. 1973. Plains Cree: a grammatical study. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.