

Obviation as Discourse Structure in a Swampy Cree *âcimowin*

KEVIN RUSSELL

University of Southern California

In this paper I will address some of the issues arising from the use of obviation in a Cree narrative, especially as it relates to other devices that the speaker uses to structure the text.

Looking at obviation as a means of grammatically encoding point of view, one is led to ask why these points of view should be operating on such a medium-sized scale in stories. At one extreme, Cree could have had a system that changed narrative point of view between every clause, yet obviation status shows remarkable consistency across clauses. At the other extreme, once a point of view is chosen for a story, there is no immediately obvious reason why it should ever change, yet in almost all narratives it does at least twice. Why should Cree narrators manipulate point of view the way they do?

I shall be using some of the insights and techniques of those who argue that native North American performed narratives are better seen as oral poetry than as what western cultures have classified as prose. The two major proponents of this view are Dell Hymes (1984) and Dennis Tedlock (1984). Their work has been extended in many areas by other researchers; some prominent examples are Bright (1984) on Karok, Sherzer (1987) on Kuna, Scollon and Scollon (1981) on Athapaskan, and Woodbury (1987) on Eskimo.

The greatest difference between the approaches of Hymes and Tedlock is the criteria they believe an analyst should use in inferring the structure of a narrative and dividing it up into constituents. Tedlock restricts himself almost completely to phonological phenomena, specifically intonation and pausing. Hymes prefers to use intuitions about syntactic constituency and patterns of form-content parallelism. I admit I am more sympathetic with Tedlock's (1984:55-61) approach, and with his arguments that Hymes's methods are more likely to lead an analyst to impute things to the narrative that simply are not there. But I find the most sensible attitude toward the

disagreement to be Woodbury's, who manages to capture systematically the fact that *both* types of phenomena are important.

Woodbury identifies five components, what he calls "modules", contributing to the overall rhetorical structure of a text. These are:

- (1)
 - a. prosodic (i.e., intonational) phrasing
 - b. pause phrasing
 - c. syntactic constituency
 - d. global form/content parallelism
 - e. adverbial particle phrasing

In prosodic phrasing, for example, each intonation contour marks a separate discourse unit, often called a line. As well, all lines up to one with a falling terminal pitch can be grouped as a unit which is often called a verse or stanza. In adverbial particle phrasing, adverbial particles can be used to mark out the beginning or the end of a constituent such as a stanza as in Chipewyan *pekú* (Scollon and Scollon 1981) or paragraph as in Ojibwe *mii* (Rhodes 1979), or Fox *o'ni* (Goddard 1990).

Each of these components is to some extent independent. Each uses its own principles to "segment the stream of speech simultaneously into different kinds of units according to different kinds of criteria.." (Woodbury 1987:179). In the default case the five components divide up a text the same way, as in (2a). But this is by no means necessary. They may give different results; there may be mismatches between the segments they mark out, as in (2b) or (2c).

- (2)

| | | | |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| | a. | b. | c. |
| component 1 | | | |
| component 2 | | | |

Woodbury argues that meaning is conveyed by these violations of the expected alignments. In his study of Yupik narratives, the meanings he finds are usually abstract expressive values such as 'an impression of rapidity' or 'dramatic anticipation'.

In the Swampy Cree text I shall be dealing with, the segmentations given by intonation and by pausing coincide to a large degree, and it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine their relation to each other. I shall for the most part talk as if intonation and pausing defined the same constituents, though I do not wish this to be taken as a theoretical claim.

1. Cree Obviation

Obviation in Cree has been discussed by many writers, including Wolfart (1973) and Dahlstrom (1986). Foley and Van Valin (1984) and Comrie

(1989) discuss how it fits into a general typology of reference-tracking devices. See also Goddard (1984, 1990) on Fox.

Cree divides nouns into two genders: animate and inanimate. This division is semantically motivated but partly arbitrary, e.g., 'truck' is animate. Animate nouns can appear in two morphological forms: proximate (unmarked) and obviative (marked).

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| (3) | proximate | proximate | obviative | |
| | sg. | pl. | sg. or pl. | |
| | nâpêw | nâpêwak | nâpêwa | 'man' |
| | otâpânâsk | otâpânâskwak | otâpânâskwa | 'truck, car' |
| | maskwa | maskwak | maskwa | 'bear' |

The basic idea of obviation is this: in any discourse segment (to be characterized later), only one third person participant is entitled to appear in the unmarked proximate form; all others must appear in the obviative form. This is only an upper bound: it is quite possible for all participants to be in the obviative. Using Algonquian languages' system of direct/inverse marking, we can have the proximate referent acting on the obviative or vice versa. This ensures that a referent will not be forced to change its obviation status between clauses merely because of a change in semantic roles. This in turn opens up the possibility of long stretches of text with the same referent as proximate.

A speaker will choose one of the relevant third person referents to be proximate. It is not clear exactly what factors determine this choice. Some typical statements on the role of the proximate referent in Algonquian languages are:

The proximate third person represents the topic of discourse, the person nearest the speaker's point of view, or the person earlier spoken of and already known. (Bloomfield 1962:38)

The proximate is the more prominent, "the hero of the discourse", and the obviative less prominent. (Goddard 1984:273)

The proximate third person may be the topic of the discourse, similar to what Karmiloff-Smith 1980 calls the thematic subject. The proximate third person is also usually the focus of the speaker's empathy (cf. Kuno and Kaburaki 1977); in narratives, proximate often corresponds to the character whose point of view is being represented. (Dahlstrom 1986:108)

I shall assume the choice is related to this loosely defined concept of "point of view" or, perhaps more accurately, what literary theorists have explored under the rubric of "focalization" (Bal 1984; Rimmon-Kenan 1983).

The significance of obviation for the structure of narratives comes from two facts. First, while it is perfectly possible for the proximate referent to change from clause to clause, it usually does not. We can, and typically do, find long stretches of narrative with the same participant marked as proximate throughout. Second, while it is theoretically possible for the same referent to be proximate throughout an entire story, this rarely happens. For example Dahlstrom (1986) finds only one such narrative in the 46 texts in Bloomfield (1934).

These two opposing tendencies of lumping and splitting seem to establish a prima facie claim for the same-proximate stretches as mid-level discourse units: obviation groups clauses and sentences together into larger units and divides the entire narrative into smaller units. Obviation seems to be performing exactly the same functions as Woodbury's five components in (1).

In the rest of this paper, I shall see what results come from treating stretches of same-proximate text as medium-sized discourse units of the same stripe as paragraphs, verses, episodes and so on.

Borrowing terminology from Goddard (1984) and Wolfart (1973), I shall call a stretch of narrative where the same referent is in the proximate a "proximate span", and the point where the referent marked with the proximate changes from one participant to another a "proximate shift".

2. "The Bear as Truck Driver"

The narrative I look at is "The Bear as Truck-Driver", the fourth story in the collection *pisiskiwak kâ-pîkiskwêcik: Talking Animals* (Beardy 1988). The stories were told by Lazarus Beardy, a native speaker of Swampy Cree, to H.C. Wolfart in the fall of 1970. Wolfart tape-recorded the oral performances, edited the collection for publication and prepared a translation, in the Sapir-Bloomfield tradition of prose translation.¹

These stories belong to the genre of *âcimowina*, rather than the other major genre, *âtañôhkêwina*, mythic stories in which the trickster Wisahkê-câhk usually figures prominently. Most, including "The Bear as Truck Driver", belong to the sub-genre of *wawiyatâcimowina*, or 'funny stories', though one is plainly autobiography. In this paper I am making claims only about the conventions of the Swampy Cree *âcimowin* genre. For discussion of Cree narrative genres, see Brightman (1989) and Ahenakew and Wolfart's preface to Vandall and Douquette (1987).

¹I am grateful to H.C. Wolfart for providing me with a copy of the tape, and for several enlightening discussions on things Cree. This paper has also benefited, but not as much as it should have, from discussions with Bernard Comrie, Jim Gee, and the participants at the Algonquian Conference. Standard disclaimers apply.

The text of "The Bear as Truck Driver" appears as an appendix to the present paper. Using the tape of the oral performance, I have measured pause lengths and noted intonation contours, and tentatively divided the text into lines on that basis.² In the appendix, the first column of the text is the line number. The second column is Wolfart's transcription of the oral narrative, preserving his punctuation and notation of false-starts (~), though interrupted by a few pause length notations of my own in angle brackets. The right-hand column is a rough line-by-line translation of the Cree, which relies very heavily on Wolfart's.

The three central columns of the appendix represent some of the prosodic aspects of Beardy's performance. The symbol .h means the narrator took an audible breath after this line. Numbers in angle brackets show the length of the pause after that line, measured in seconds. The As and Bs in the middle are a rough indication of the intonation contour of the line. I use a modified version of Woodbury's notation, whose major conventions are:

- (4) A a lead contour, little or no final fall in pitch
 B a core contour, falling terminal pitch
 B+ emphatic core, greater rise and greater terminal fall than usual
 B⁰ core supplements, echo the contour of the preceding core line, often attenuated pitch range or amplitude

I have added a B- to Woodbury's list for those embarrassingly many cases where I honestly could not tell whether the intonation contour should be an A or B.

Unlike many analysts, I have not tried to establish any higher level discourse units, like verses, stanzas, or episodes partly because there are often no good reasons to pick one component's segmentation over another's, but also because, if we take seriously Woodbury's idea of multiple structures, no single segmentation can adequately reflect the true nature of the narrative.

3. Obviation in the Beardy Narrative

This text contains three animate characters: the man, the bear, and the truck, all of whom get a chance at being the proximate referent. I shall continue to call the truck a "character", since as an animate noun it has effects on the obviation patterns of the text. The man is proximate throughout most of the story, though the proximate marking often shifts to the bear

²I have separated onto a line any stretch of the narrative with a clearly falling intonation contour and/or following pause longer than 0.1 sec. False starts that are less than complete words have not been placed on their own lines, nor have words been split across lines, regardless of how long an intra-word pause may be.

and occasionally to the truck. Example (5) shows the proximate spans of the story, and which character is proximate in each.

(5) The proximate spans of the narrative:

| lines | proximate | animate referent |
|---------|-----------|--|
| 1-17 | man | parenthesis: part of 16, truck |
| 18-23 | bear | |
| 24-27 | man | |
| 28-29 | bear | quotation: part of 29, man |
| 30 | man | |
| 31-34 | bear | |
| 35-36 | truck | |
| 37 | bear | |
| 38-52 | man | quotation: 41 truck 42-43 someone (i.e., the bear) 47-48 someone (i.e., the bear) |
| 53 | truck | |
| 54-55 | bear | |
| 56-60 | man | |
| 60 part | truck?? | |
| 61-64 | bear | |

One preliminary comment on line 60 is in order. In editorial square brackets, Wolfart interprets the non-overt proximate subject of the verb *é-kihihcĩnit* 'he or she stops' to be the truck, for reasons that are not clear to me. The truck may be the most likely referent, but I think we could interpret any of the three characters as the referent without a great deal of mental gymnastics. I shall not commit myself to any particular interpretation here.

If we are looking at how the proximate spans interact with the discourse units defined by intonation, pausing, and syntax, there is an immediate problem: we cannot find any easy correlations.

We might expect proximate spans to coincide with the other medium-sized discourse units. At the very least, we should expect proximate shifts to occur only where the other types of units have their boundaries as well, that is, between sentences, after a final falling intonation contour, coinciding with a long pause, and so on. We do not. At least, not always.

4. *Obviation and Syntactic Constituents*

First, there is no complete correspondence between the pattern of proximate spans and syntactic constituency. There are of course important syntactic consequences of proximate spans, not the least of which is that overt NPs almost always occur in the first line of a span and almost never anywhere else. What is at issue here is to what extent the boundaries of syntactic constituents and obviation constituents coincide.

(6) Correlation of proximate spans and syntactic constituency:

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| well-behaved: | 18, 24, 28, 30, 38, 53, 56 |
| not so well-behaved: | 35, 37, 54, 60 |
| downright unruly: | 31, 61 |

Simplifying somewhat, and relying on Wolfart's punctuation, almost half of proximate shifts are well-behaved. The shifts after lines 18, 24, 28, 30, 28, 53, and 56, come after sentences with independent-order verbs. Wolfart marks them with periods or semi-colons.

We also have periods or semi-colons in lines 35, 37, 54, and 60, but if these close off sentences, they are sentences that consist entirely of conjunct-order verbs. This is by no means unusual, but conjunct-order main verbs are a non-canonical construction and ideally we should like to find some explanation why they are used in these places.

It is difficult to get out of the problem posed by the shift after 31 and the possible shift after 60. I repeat the two stretches below:

- (7) 30 êkwân ê-kî-sipwêhtêt awa .h A <0.5> So when the man had walked
nâpêw ispi, away
31 kâ-pôsit êsa maskwa anita .h B <1.2> the bear got into it (I hear),
trakihk. there into that truck.
- (8) 60 . . . ; ispiê-kipihcîñit, .h B- <0.8> And so (I hear) he ran towards
the bear; at that moment she[?] stopped,
61 êkwân êsa kâ-sipwêyâmot .h B <1.0> and then (I hear) the bear ran
nôhcimihk maskwa. off into the woods.

Nothing clearly separates the spans prosodically: in intonation, a questionable falling contour at best; in pausing, an unspectacular 0.5 sec. and 0.8 sec. The shifts occur in the middle of a sentence, however we may want to define sentence. We have two clearly subordinate when-clauses marked with the particle *ispi*.

Ironically, the presence of *ispi* suggests a potential escape hatch. Cree can express general temporal co-occurrence perfectly well without it. It is

not immediately clear what it is doing here. Significantly, the only other place in the Beardy narratives where we find an intra-sentential proximate shift is in the following passage from "The Frog as Model":

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (9) êkwân êsa, | And then (I hear) |
| ispi ê-kî-mayawipañit awa | when this car goes past |
| otâpânâsk | |
| "âstam", êkwa itêw êsa, | "come here", he [frog] says to |
| | them [his family] (I hear), |
| êkwâni kâ-kî-âsowihtahât. | and then he took then across. |

The proximate referent here changes from a car in the second line to the main character frog in the third line, in the middle of a sentence. Finding the *ispi* in the subordinate clause here is left as an exercise for the reader.

It seems that the particle *ispi* shields its clause from the usual requirement in Cree that a subordinate clause have the same proximate referent as its main clause. Why it should want to is another question.

5. *Obviation and Prosodic Constituents*

Looking at the discourse units defined by prosodic features, again we find no simple correlation with proximate spans. With the possible counterexample of line 60, the line at least shows integrity. But beyond this level, there is no equivalence to be had.

(10) Prosodic markings on the last line before each proximate shift:

| end of line | shift from | to | intonation contour | pause length |
|-------------|------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 17 | man | bear | B+ | 1.6 |
| 23 | bear | man | B+ | 0.6 + cough + 0.8 |
| 27 | man | bear | B+ | 1.3 |
| 29 | bear | man | B+ | 1.6 |
| 30 | man | bear | A | 0.5 |
| 34 | bear | truck | B | 0.8 |
| 36 | truck | bear | B | 0.7 |
| 37 | bear | man | B | 1.2 |
| 52 | man | truck | B+ | 0.9 |
| 53 | truck | bear | B | 1.3 |
| 55 | bear | man | A ⁰ | 1.4 |
| 60 | ? | bear | B- | 0.8 |

There are, of course, large stretches where we can say that proximate shifts respect prosodic boundaries. For example, the spans of lines 1-17, 18-

23, 24–27, 38–52, and the 56–59 part of 56–60 are set off by clear intonational and pause boundaries. On the other hand, in the stretches from 28 to 37 and from 50 to 55, any prosodic unit larger than one line that we might care to propose stands a very good chance of containing at least one proximate shift.

(11) Correlation of proximate spans and prosodic units:

well-behaved stretches: 1–17, 18–23, 24–27, 38–52, 56–59
 others: 28–37, 50–55

6. *The Mismatches*

Not coincidentally, the two prosodically problematic areas of the text listed in (11) are the same two areas of the text where our problems with syntax were clustered. If the ideal situation is a one-to-one correspondence between the units marked by each component of rhetorical structure, we have to explain why these two stretches of the text are such a mess.

The two stretches are in some sense the high points of the story, the places where the most significant actions occur. We might even call them the climaxes. Lines 28–37 tell about the bear first climbing into the truck and driving it. Lines 50–61 tell of the final encounter between the man and the bear. Conversely, long stretches with a single proximate span tend to be devoted to background information or states, rather than actions of the story. For example, lines 1–17 are devoted entirely to establishing the setting and the man's work. Lines 38–49 are devoted mostly to the man's thinking.³

It seems that part of the function of proximate shifts is to mark heightened action. The more intense the story, the more frequently the proximate referent changes. It is interesting to note that classical Hollywood movies use the frequency of cuts between shots for much the same purpose.⁴

We might also consider the frog story I quoted from in number (9). The proximate shift in (9) comes just as the frog's family has narrowly escaped being run over on the highway. Though the story is short, the first half

³Bernard Comrie has pointed out to me the possibility that there may be two adjacent proximate spans that happen to have the same proximate referent. Lines 1–17 would seem to be a good candidate for this. To the extent that proximate spans have any tangible existence beyond the identity of the proximate referent (e.g., their impact on overt noun phrases), there does seem to be a shift after line 6. This possibility deserves to be explored further. It will, however, have little direct bearing here, where the relevant consideration is not that a particular span is *long*, but that it is well-behaved with respect to other components.

⁴My thanks to Donna Cunningham for discussions on this. Goddard (1984) pointed out this similarity to cinematic techniques in a footnote that did not appear in the published version of the paper.

consists of a single proximate span (the father frog's) which sets the scene, followed by four proximate shifts in rapid succession as the family tries to cross the highway.

This connection between frequent proximate shifts and heightened action suggests part of an explanation for the behaviour of *ispi* 'when', and why it occurs near the climaxes in the Beardy narratives. Ordinary subordinate clauses do not take kindly to proximate shifts between them and their main clauses, but making two main clauses instead would have distorted the intended relationship between the two events. In an environment of general excitement that encourages frequent proximate shifts, *ispi* allows the speaker to accomplish one felicitously without disrupting the syntactic flow.

More work needs to be done on the role of "staggered boundaries", instances where there is a mismatch between components, but the form that mismatch takes is conventionally restricted. Goddard (1990) reports that it is common in Fox for a proximate shift to occur at the end of a paragraph, i.e., shortly before a major boundary as marked by the other components. He points out that if the second referent of line 60 is read as the bear, the same thing is probably going on here. (A cinematic analogue would be the sound bridge, where a film cuts to the visual component of a new scene before it cuts to the sound component, or less often vice versa.)

7. *Conclusion*

Earlier I said that only one referent could be proximate in any one discourse segment — and promised to characterize these discourse segments later. I exaggerated. In a sense there is no further characterization to be had. It would certainly have been possible, perhaps expected, for Cree to define proximate spans in terms of other independently defined units — sentences, prosodic stanzas, the sorts of segments marked out by adverbial particles, and so on — Cree just happens not to work that way. Proximate spans define their own segmentation of the discourse, with all the rights and privileges attending thereto.

As Woodbury predicts, most of the time proximate spans align exceptionally well with the segments marked out by the other components. In those cases where there is a mismatch, we can attribute a distinct meaning to it — a sense of heightened action or tension.⁵ Point of view or focalization, instantiated as obviation in Cree, should be added to Woodbury's list of the devices available to languages to structure narrative.

⁵This is similar to Longacre's (1983) notion of the narrative peak as a "zone of linguistic turbulence". I would not, however, want to commit myself to the stronger claim that the only possible textual function of component mismatch is to mark narrative peaks.

We may even want to go far out on a limb, and claim that point of view serves to structure narrative more widely, across genres, across languages, even across modalities. It is easy to see how point of view plays a role in Cree *âcimowina*, because Algonquian languages have found a way to partially grammaticalize it. If we look carefully at texts in languages that have no explicit grammatical marking of point of view, we may nonetheless find it to be at work in structuring narrative there as well.

Appendix
"The Bear as Truck-Driver"

| | |
|----------------|--|
| A | a lead contour, little or no final fall |
| B | a core contour, falling terminal pitch |
| B+ | emphatic core, greater rise and greater terminal fall than usual |
| B ⁰ | core supplements, echo the contour of the preceding core line, often attenuated pitch range or amplitude |
| !A, !B | exclamatory intonation |
| - A, - B | low pitched line |
| A ⁰ | lead contour echoing the previous line |
| B- | questionable core contour |
| .h | audible breath |
| < > | length of pause in seconds |

man proximate:

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|-------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | péyakwâw êsa | .h B | <1.5> | Once (I hear) |
| 2 | nâpêw, | .h B | <1.4> | a man |
| 3 | it~ ê-âwatâsot, ita cimân | .h B- | <1.9> | was freighting, where the boat docks; |
| 4 | (ê) <0.5> pôsihtâsona | A | <0.6> | [where] freight |
| 5 | kâ~ <0.4> | .h B- | <0.6> | was being unloaded, |
| | kâ-kapatênikâtêki, | | | |
| 6 | wanikahp mâka ki-ihakon; | .h B | <1.5> | but it was a portage; |
| 7 | êkwâni wi~ | A | <0.6> | and |
| 8 | awa otâpânâskwa | .h A | <0.6> | this one had this truck, |
| | ki-ayâwêw, | | | |
| 9 | awa nâpêw, "trak" kâ-itiht. | .h B | <1.3> | this man, what's called a "trak". |

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------|---|------------------------------|
| 10 | êkwâni, | A | <0.9> | And |
| 11 | pô~<0.1> ê~<0.1> .h A | <2.0> | he was hauling these loads (I hear), | |
| | ê-âwatât ês ôhō pôsihtâsona, | | | |
| 12 | ki~ ê-takopañik cimân, ki- .h B | <1.4> | when the boat arrived, he used to haul them (I hear), | |
| | âwatâw êsa, | | he used to haul them across; | |
| | ki-kaskêyâwatâw; | | | |
| 13 | cikêmâ wanikahp ôma. | .h B+ | <0.8> | after all, it was a portage. |
| 14 | êkwâni .h A | <0.5> | And as he was almost finished loading, he climbed on, | |
| | <0.1> ê-ati- (h) <0.3> kisi-pôsihtâsot, pôsâhtawiw, | | | |
| 15 | anita otôtâpânâskohk | .h A | <0.5> | there on his vehicle — |
| 16 | — trak awa — otrakimihk, | .h B | <0.9> | this truck — on his truck, |
| 17 | êkwâni k-âti-pôsihtâsot. | .h B+ | <1.6> | then when he was loading it. |

bear proximate:

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 18 | êkwân êsa B | <0.8> | And (I hear) a bear had been secretly watching him, | |
| | kîmôci-kanawâpamêw mâna maskwa, | | | |
| 19 | ôhō nâpêwa, | B- | <0.1> | this man — |
| 20 | nôhcimihk ohci, | B- ⁰ | <0.3> | from the bush, |
| 21 | ê-kâsot, | .h B- ⁰ | <1.1> | she was hiding —, |
| 22 | tânis ê-itôtamiñit .h | B+ | <1.5> | what he did when he started it up, |
| | ispiê-sipwêpañihâñit ôhō, | | | |
| 23 | ôh otâpânâskwa. | B+ | <0.6> | this vehicle. |
| | [cough] | | <0.8> | |

man proximate:

| | | | | |
|----|--|-------|--|---------------|
| 24 | êkwani k~ âspin .h B- | <1.5> | And then, when the man drove off, | |
| | kâ-sipwêpañit awa nâpêw, | | | |
| 25 | êkwân êsa | A | <1.1> | then (I hear) |
| 26 | ki-ati-sipwêhtatâw anihi B | <0.1> | he took a load of freight, | |
| | pôsihtâsona, | | | |
| 27 | kihtwâm .h B | <1.3> | and then he came back across again with his truck and left it there. | |
| | ki-pê-kaskêwêhtahêw otôtâpânâskwa, êkota ki-nakatêw. | | | |

bear proximate:

- 28 "âw," itēñitam ês .h A <0.5> "Now then," thought the
âwa maskwa, "mahti nika- bear (I hear), "let me try
kocihtân,
29 awa .h B <1.6> what this man has done,"
nâpêw kâ-tôtahk," itēñitam thought the bear (I hear).
êsa maskwa.

man proximate:

- 30 êkwân ê-kî-sipwêhtêt awa .h A <0.5> So when the man had
nâpêw ispi, walked away,

bear proximate:

- 31 kâ-pôsit êsa maskwa anita .h B <1.2> the bear got into it (I hear),
trakihk. there into that truck.
32 ê-kakwê-otâpahât ôhò A <0.7> She was trying to drive that
33 otâpânâskwa, B <1.2> vehicle,
34 êkwâni kâ-~ <0.3> kâ- B <0.8> and she turned it on (I hear);
piminât êsa;

truck proximate:

- 35 â, aspin êsa sêpwêpañit, .h A <0.8> well, as it started off (I
hear),
36 aw otâpânâsk, .h A <0.7> that vehicle, it went across
kaskêwêpañiw itê to where it had gone before;
kâ-kî-ispâñit;

bear proximate:

- 37 êkot[ê] êsa nakacipahêw ôhò, .h B <1.2> over there (I hear) the bear
maskwa otâpânâskwa. ran off and left it, the vehi-
cle.

man proximate:

- 38 êkwân ê-pê-takosihk awa B <1.0> And when the man got back,
nâpêw, kihtwâm [2 coughs] when he came back again,
ê-pê-itohtêt,
39 êkota kâ-miskawât .h B <1.2> he found his vehicle there [at
otôtâpânâskwa. the far side].
40 "wâ, mâmaskâc," itēñitam .h !A <0.7> "Well, this is strange," he
êsa, thought (I hear),
41 "môñ ôta nitôhci-nakatâw B+ <0.5> "I had not left my vehicle
nitôtâpânâsk, here,
42 awiyak .h B- <0.3> somebody (I hear) has
êsa kâ-pê- <0.7> kaskêwê-~ driven it across;
<0.2> -kaskêwêpañihât;

- 43 kânik âwêna," .h B- <0.9> I wonder who?"
44 itēñitam êsa. .h !B <1.6> he thought (I hear).
45 êkwâni .h B- <0.7> And when he drove his truck
kihtwâm kâ-kaskêwêpañihât back across again, he left it
otôtâpânâskwa, êkotê over there [at the dock].
nakatêw.
46 "wâ, mahti nika-kâson," A <0.4> "Well, I'll hide myself,"
47 itēñitam, "mahti .h B- <0.8> he thought, "I'll try to find
nika-kakwê-kiskêñimâw out who it is
awên âwa
48 kâ-~ <0.1> B <0.4> that took my vehicle," he
kâ-otinât notôtâpânâskwa," said (I hear).
itwêw êsa.
49 êkwân êsa kâ-kâsot, ê-pêhât .h - B⁰ <1.5> And (I hear) when he had
ôhò ta-pê-kaskêwêpañiñit. hidden himself, he waited for
it to come across.
50 êkwân êsa, êk-~ - A <0.7> So then (I hear)
51 êkotê kî-kâsow nômakê, A <0.2> he hid over there [at the far
side] for a while,
52 kinwês nawac. .h B+ <0.9> a little longer.

truck proximate:

- 53 kêtahawin kâ- B <1.3> All of a sudden thr truck
pêtwêwêpañit aw otâpânâsk
— could be heard coming —

bear proximate:

- 54 awên âwa kâ-otâpahât! A <0.1> Who was it that was driving
it!
55 maskwa êsa kâ-otâpahât. .h A⁰ <1.4> It was a bear (I hear) driving
it.

man proximate:

- 56 "yôho," itwêw .h A <0.6> "Wow," said the man (I
ês awa nâpew, "tânitê ohci hear), "how does he know
kaskihât nitôta-~; [how to drive] it?
57 maskwa nâ awa tâpwê, !B+ <0.6> Is this really a bear,
58 êkâ maskwayâna awiyak ê- .h B <1.3> not someone who has put on
kî-pohciskawât," a bear-hide,"
59 it-~ ay-itisow êsa, .h B <1.2> he kept saying to himself (I
ê-ayamihisot awa nâpêw. hear), the man was talking
to himself.

man proximate; ?? proximate:

60 êkwân ésa kâ~ <0.4> kâ- .h B- <0.8> And so (I hear) he ran towards the bear; at that moment she[?] stopped,
nâciphât ôhô maskwa; ispiê-
kipihcîfiit,

bear proximate:

61 êkwân ésa kâ-sipwêyâmot .h B <1.0> and then (I hear) the bear ran off into the woods.
nôhcimihk maskwa.
62 êkwâni, - A <0.2> So
63 ê-ki-otâpahât maskwa, .h A <0.4> a bear had driven it,
64 ôh ôtâpânâskwa. .h B+ <1.4> this vehicle.
65 êkos ôm ê-it~ <0.3> ê-itât- - B <0.7> This is the story I am telling,
~ <0.3> ê-itâcimoyân,
66 anohc kâ-kîsikâk, - B⁰ <0.3> today,
67 anohc kâ-otâkosik. - B⁰ this afternoon.

REFERENCES

- Bal, Mieke
1984 *Narratologie: Essais sur la signification narrative dans quatre romans modernes*. Utrecht: HES.
- Beardy, Lazarus
1988 *pisiskiwak kâ-pîkiskwêcik: Talking Animals*. H.C. Wolfart, ed. and trans. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.
- Bloomfield, Leonard
1934 Plains Cree texts. *Publications of the American Ethnological Society*, 16. New York: G.E. Stechert.
1962 *The Menomini Language*. Charles Hockett, ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bright, William
1984 *American Indian Linguistics and Literature*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Brightman, Robert A.
1989 âcaðohkiwina and âcimôwina: Traditional Narratives of the Rock Cree Indians. *Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper* 113. Ottawa.
- Comrie, Bernard
1989 Some General Properties of Reference Tracking Systems. Pp. 37-51 in *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*. Dong Arnold, Martin Atkinson, Jacques Durand, Claire Grover, and Louisa Sadler, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy
1986 Plains Cree Morphosyntax. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California/Berkeley.

Foley, William, and Robert Van Valin

1984 *Functional Syntax and Universal Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goddard, Ives

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

Hymes, Dell

1984 "In Vain I Tried to Tell You": *Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Longacre, Robert E.

1983 *The Grammar of Discourse*. New York: Plenum Press.

Rhodes, Richard

1979 Some Aspects of Ojibwa Discourse. Pp. 102-117 in *Papers of the Tenth Algonquian Conference*. William Cowan, ed. Ottawa: Carleton University.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith

1983 *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Fiction*. London: Methuen.

Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne B.K. Scollon

1981 *Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communications. Advances in Discourse Processes* 7. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sherzer, Joel

1987 Poetic Structuring of Kuna Discourse: The Line. Pp. 103-139 in *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric*. Joel Sherzer and Anthony C. Woodbury, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tedlock, Dennis

1984 *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Vandall, Peter, and Joe Douquette

1987 *wâskahikaniwiyiniw-âcimowina: Stories of the House People*. Freda Ahenakew, ed. and trans. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Wolfart, H.C.

1973 Plains Cree: A Grammatical Sketch. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 63, pt. 5. Philadelphia.

Woodbury, Anthony C.

1987 Rhetorical Structure in a Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo Traditional Narrative. Pp. 176-239 in *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric*. Joel Sherzer and Anthony C. Woodbury, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.